

cut taxes if we are to balance the Federal budget within the next 6 years. Mr. President, do Americans want lower taxes? Of course they do. But given the choice between cutting taxes and balancing the budget, the American voter wants to balance the budget.

Make no mistake, Mr. President, that is the choice we have before us. We have to do one or the other. You cannot do both. Anyone who claims you can do both is either blowing smoke or simply does not understand the huge problem we have in this country with our deficit and the debt which underlies it.

Mr. President, we saw how politically unsustainable a budget package becomes when it attempts to provide a major tax cut while it also claims to be eliminating the deficit. The political developments of this past year are testimony to this fact.

Indeed, any budget package that eliminates the deficit will be difficult enough to sustain over the next few years that it would take to fully implement its provisions even without the added burden of funding a significant tax cut.

The failure of the tax-cut plans offered by either party to gain political momentum is, of course, not due to a lack of effort. Millions of dollars are being spent on carefully crafted television commercials advocating these tax-cut proposals. These plans are not new nor are the efforts to promote them.

The President's plan that we have heard about recently is similar, in many ways, to the one he proposed in December of 1994. The Dole plan clearly has its roots in the massive tax cut proposed as a part of the now famous Contract With America. In fact, many in this body will recall that the Speaker of the other body pronounced that the tax-cut proposal, of all the proposals in the Contract With America, was the "crown jewel" of the Contract With America, in his words.

Mr. President, the Speaker's characterization was notable. Of all the provisions in that political document, it was the tax cut that he, the leader of that charge, gave the privileged position. Yet, despite the considerable political inertia that is conferred by being singled out as the crown jewel of the Contract With America, the tax cut has not been enacted.

Mr. President, does anyone doubt that, if there had been strong broad-based support for that tax cut, it would have been enacted by now? Clearly it would have been. If the American people truly preferred tax cuts to deficit reduction, we would have seen an inevitable bipartisan rush to enact them. But that has not been the case.

In the Washington Post story on the failure of the Dole tax-cut plan to attract voter support, a gentleman named Ralph Miller, of Greencastle, IN, a self-described independent, is quoted as saying this:

When I hear all that talk about how they're going to cut taxes and balance the budget, it turns me against the both of them.

He added:

I don't believe anybody can do that \* \* \* I have respect for Bob Dole, but this seems ridiculous to me.

Mr. President, despite the lost opportunity to make even more progress to reduce the deficit during the 104th Congress, the deficit-reduction package passed in 1993 continues to lower the annual budget deficits below where they otherwise would have been.

As many have noted, in the last 4 years we have seen deficits come down from nearly \$300 billion to an estimated \$117 billion. That progress, of course, has come only with great difficulty. Finishing the job will be even tougher, but it is something that absolutely must be done.

Mr. President, proposals to provide large tax cuts jeopardize that effort by pirating the savings generated by spending cuts away from deficit reduction in order to fund tax cuts.

They also undercut deficit reduction by providing an alluring alternative to the often painful and unpopular work of balancing the budget.

It is much easier it is to talk of cutting taxes than it is to focus on where to cut spending.

The American people have not been swayed by the talk of cutting taxes by the Presidential candidates.

In fact, if President Clinton wins, as I hope and expect he will, it will in large part be because of his success in reducing the deficit, not because of his tax cut proposals.

Mr. President, in 1994, the first time many voters became aware of the Contract With America, including its crown jewel, was after the election.

But that fact was conveniently ignored when the new congressional leadership sought to advance their agenda.

The contract's provisions were held up as an electoral mandate, though I doubt 1 voter in 10 was in any way familiar with the real specifics of the Contract With America.

There will be no comparable, after-the-fact, document this year, Mr. President.

The differences between the two candidates are well known.

And despite the efforts of some in both parties, and the political and media specialists in both campaigns, the outcome of this election will rest in large part on whether voters choose reducing the deficit or cutting taxes as the higher economic priority of this Nation.

Mr. President, despite the loudly trumpeted promises made at the beginning of this Congress, and despite the significant political pressure brought to bear by well-funded special interests, we have succeeded in avoiding significant damage to the deficit, and to the goal of a balanced budget, that a huge tax cut would have meant.

If, in the 105th Congress, as I very much hope, we are finally able to enact a bipartisan budget plan that will balance the Federal books, it will be in large part because we did not enact a

fiscally irresponsible tax cut in the 104th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. D'AMATO pertaining to the introduction of S. 2136 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### COOPERATIVE RESEARCH EFFORTS BETWEEN THE NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE AND USDA'S EXPERIMENT STATION AT MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to report to Congress and the American people on a unique success story. A story about a public-private partnership. A story involving a cooperative effort of two Federal agencies. A story requiring teamwork between a State government and the Federal Government. A story about our land grant university for Mississippi, and catfish farmers in Mississippi's Delta.

First, let me say, I am proud to report to my colleagues that the Mississippi Delta produces 80 percent of the farm-raised catfish enjoyed in America. This farm-raised catfish industry represents approximately 70 percent of the commercial value of America's entire aquaculture industry. Clearly, farm-raised catfish is big business in America. And clearly, it is big business for Mississippi.

But, it was not always successful. The catfish industry in Mississippi struggled for 25 years. There were many tales of financial woe. However, with hard work and the willingness to accept large fiscal risk, Mississippians developed aquaculture into a dynamic and viable economic enterprise. The pioneers in this industry spent a lot of their own money to build a giant infrastructure which includes production, processing, transportation, marketing, distribution, and feed mill capacity. We are talking about a \$2 billion agricultural investment.

Mr. President, according to data provided to my office by the State of Mississippi, the Mississippi catfish industry employs more than 25,000. And this industry sells approximately \$0.5 billion each year of catfish at the pond bank.

Throughout the growth of this new fledgling agricultural enterprise over the past 25 years, the No. 1 priority for the catfish farmers has always been to find new production techniques. If you build a pond and fill it with catfish, the question is not where the fish are. No—the real question and challenge is how to harvest the fish of a certain size.

Similar to any other intensely managed livestock operation, the farm-raised catfish industry experienced enormous production challenges such

as nutrition problems, disease, and harvesting technology. There were many costly false starts in a search for solutions. Success was a hit or miss event. Gradually, solutions to feeding and health problems have been developed. Today, part of the catfish industry's attention is focused on obtaining new technology. This involves the National Marine Fisheries Service. The goal is to take advantage of existing technology.

Now, to many Americans fish are fish. To some, fish are classified as either fresh water or salt water. Here is where the Federal Government often draws a hard and fast bureaucratic line. The Federal Government has two different and distant agencies in two separate departments which deal with fish depending on the water they live in.

This is OK if these agencies talk to each other and share their success stories—yes, fish stories. And not about the one that got away. In Washington they call this dialog interagency coordination which is formalized with a memorandum of agreement. Sadly, this does not always occur.

Today, I stand here to tell you about one of those instances where the two Federal agencies did indeed find each other. They found each other without prodding from outside sources—like Congress. The story gets even better. When they found each other, there was a cooperative spirit to help America's catfish industry. Here, there is a success story.

Mr. President, it is encouraging for me to report to my colleagues there was a personal commitment, at the staff level, to help Mississippi's Delta catfish farmers. The National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS], in Pascagoula, which is part of the Department of Commerce took on the persistent fresh water pond harvesting technology problems. They worked with Scientists at the Department of Agriculture [USDA] laboratory, at Mississippi State University in Stoneville. Together they formed a joint effort to apply existing marine fisheries' technology to catfish ponds. The established saltwater fishing industry is excellent at catching fish. The new fresh water community is good at growing fish, however, they needed to learn how to be more effective at catching them. NMFS stepped in to share new gear technology with the fresh water fish community. This sharing of technology kept the fresh water community from reinventing the wheel.

The Government's traditional business as usual policy would have prevented the assistance and technology exchange. To provide this help across jurisdictional lines is a Federal no-no. More importantly the policy would have been prevented because it threatens budget authority and funding issues.

But, despite these Washington obstacles assistance was offered and received. A Mississippi success story.

The NMFS laboratory in Pascagoula committed itself because of its can do attitude. And clearly USDA and Mississippi State University were receptive. NMFS brought a range of potential solutions to the harvesting technology problems of the warmwater aquaculture industry because they had worked on this issue for years in the marine fishing industry. I want to single out two individuals. Specifically, John Watson and Charles "Wendy" Taylor of NMFS's Pascagoula laboratory. These two directly assisted in the development and retrofitting of harvesting equipment. They had lots of ideas. They offered hands-on help. They produced rapid results.

They showed those fresh water folks lots of new ideas and real solutions. Many of these ideas caused revolutionary improvements in the harvesting efficiency and quality control for the farm-raised catfish industry. Revolutionary is not an overstatement. This is not a fish story about the one that got away. This is about the catfish that got caught. The proof was tangible and quickly evident at the processing plants. John and Wendy made a difference in Stoneville.

The NMFS laboratory staff in Pascagoula could have told the scientists in Stoneville's USDA Laboratory that procedures and policies prohibit the marine fisheries' experts of Federal Government from sharing their technology with a sister industry. But, they did not. Instead, through the combined efforts of these two diligent scientists and the cooperative spirit of personnel with USDA's Stoneville Experiment Station and Mississippi State University, steps were taken to discover potential solutions to the technology problems which have plagued the farm-raised catfish industry.

I must say this cooperative spirit extends all the way back to Washington. It is also exhibited by Rolland Schmitt, the Director for the National Marine Fisheries Service. There is a leadership example which is reflected throughout the agency.

Mr. President, it is a pleasure to share with my colleagues this story of Federal interagency cooperation. It also illustrates that public-private partnership can be productive. I think it is worth noting that this cooperative effort has reduced duplication of Federal efforts. This makes fiscal sense, especially as we strive to make the services of government more efficient.

All of us should look for similar opportunities within Federal agencies in our own home States. I am sure there are more Stoneville's out there. I am sure there are more ways that the Federal Government can deliver cost-effective solutions to the problems. I am also sure there are more public-private partnerships that can make a difference. Let us use our oversight responsibilities in the next Congress to reexamine Government priorities, policies, and procedures for other interagency opportunities with an aim of

forming more partnerships with industry.

Mr. President, Stoneville should be the standard in the future, not the exception.

Again, I applaud the efforts of the National Marine Fisheries Service and I want to publicly thank them. They have significantly helped America's farm-raised catfish industry. I strongly encourage the continuation of the successful relationship between Stoneville and Pascagoula.

#### THE ACADEMY OF TELEVISION ARTS AND SCIENCES

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences as it celebrates its 50th anniversary.

The television industry reflects so much of what we are as Americans. The Academy of Television Arts and Sciences—with its annual Emmy Award—recognizes the positive impact television makes on so much of our everyday life.

I'm an avid channel surfer at home, so I watch a fair amount of television. I know how positive a messenger television can be—whether explaining the spread of a deadly disease, bringing us up-to-the-minute reports of world events, or simply making us laugh during a half-hour situation comedy when our day has ended and we're ready to take a break.

The people and programs honored with the Emmy Award are a permanent part of our country's history.

Just listen to some of the who's who's list of recipients of the acting awards in the comedy field alone: Lucille Ball—four time recipient—Red Skelton, Danny Thomas, Eve Arden, Jack Benny, Shirley Booth, Carol Burnett, Dick Van Dyke, Mary Tyler Moore, Julie Andrews, and today's recent recipients Candace Bergen—five time recipient—Kelsey Grammer, and Helen Hunt. The programs honored—"Dick Van Dyke", "The Odd Couple", "All in the Family", "Get Smart", "Taxi", and "Barney Miller"—show just why the programming of "Nick at Nite" is so popular with people trying to recapture the classic days of comedy.

The drama programs honored over the years also give us a snapshot of American life at the time the programs aired: "Studio One", "Gunsmoke", "The Fugitive", "Mission Impossible", "Marcus Welby, M.D.", "Masterpiece Theatre", "The Waltons", and the modern-day "Hill Street Blues" and "E.R." Who can forget the Waltons' powerful message of family persevering through the Depression or who can forget how "Hill Street Blues" showed us the life of a police officer like we had never seen it before.

For all that is good, educational and powerful on television, I am pleased to pay a small part in honoring the academy and the entire television industry for its work.