

Carl Bruce Jones, western district of Missouri, charged with distribution of marijuana, use of a telephone in distribution of marijuana, has been offered a Presidential pardon;

Candace Deon Leverenz, northern district of California, date of sentence, 1972, unlawful distribution of LSD, pardoned by the President;

Susan Lauranne Prather, western district of Arkansas, charged with causing marijuana to be transported through the mail, pardoned;

Patricia Anne Chapin, western district of Missouri, falsifying prescription for a controlled substance, pardoned by the President;

Jackie A. Trautman, northern district of Ohio, sentenced in 1992. Unclear whether this is original or reduced sentence. Probably the latter. Thirty-three months imprisonment, conspiracy to distribute cocaine, pardoned by the President.

Johnny Palacios, middle district of Florida, 71 months imprisonment, conspiracy to possess with intent to distribute marijuana, pardoned.

Mr. President, as we are now learning, there is a massive program on the part of the administration to accelerate the naturalization of citizens. The objective is to naturalize 1.3 million applicants during this fiscal year, reminding ourselves that last year it was 450,000.

The problem with speeding this up is that the FBI checks are not completed, and we have now certified that at least 5,000 are guilty of crimes, murder and rape amongst them.

This all goes together, and, Mr. President, the message here is probably the most important thing with the pardons and with the change in policy, this cavalier approach of the President in saying on MTV when asked, "Would you inhale if you had a second chance?" "Yes, I would. I should have the first time."

The message that sends to 8-year-olds, 10-year-olds, 11 and 12, the most vulnerable of our populations, is that it is OK and it is not dangerous.

The result is in, and it is tragic, it is epidemic, and it is deadly serious. My message to parents is, you better be talking to your children. They are in a drug-infested environment, I don't care where they live. The first line of defense before we can turn this program back, which the Congress will have to do, with or without the help of the administration, is for parents and policymakers and businesses and colleagues at home to warn their friends and neighbors and sons and daughters.

Mr. President, I yield back any time remaining, and 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2156 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

RELOCATION OF THE PORTRAIT MONUMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, House Concurrent Resolution 216, to move the Suffrage Statue from the crypt to the rotunda is a good compromise.

I congratulate Representative CONSTANCE MORELLA and the leadership of the House for devising and approving this measure.

The House resolution compliments the resolution passed in the Senate last session and recognizes three important women leaders: Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and Susan B. Anthony; and an important right—the right for women to vote. That change in our democracy changed the world.

This statue will inspire some 4 million visitors to the rotunda next year with the physical reality that this Nation was shaped by both men and women leaders.

There are several people that deserve special recognition: Of the \$75,000 required for the move, \$1,600 was raised by 9-year old Arlyss Endres from Arizona; Coline Jenkins—the great granddaughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton—worked tirelessly with the Woman Suffrage Statue campaign committee.

Marian Miller, vice president of the Federation of Republican Women, and political activists from both sides of the aisle such as Republican Ann Stone and Democrat Joan Wages, demonstrated the commitment of women across the Nation to this cause.

Among the literally thousands of men and women contributing their time and money to this project, I would like to recognize for the record the work of Shelley Heretyk, Kay Cash-Smith, Maia Greco, Sherry Little and cochairs Joan Meacham and Karen Staser.

The resolution affirms our respect for the historic contributions of women.

There is an unfinished portion of the statue that represents future generations of women leaders. My hope is that young women, like my own daughters, will take inspiration in the accomplishments of these historic figures.

Mr. President, these were real women who made real sacrifices to accomplish real social change. I am gratified that the Congress has acted to recognize them with this resolution.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 216—a resolution that has received unanimous support in the House of Representatives. This resolution directs the Architect of the Capitol to relocate to the Capitol rotunda, the suffrage monument of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucretia Mott, three pioneers who fought for women's enfranchisement.

In the House, this legislation passed under the able leadership of Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA from Maryland. This resolution represents a 76-year battle to honor these visionary women. First presented to the Congress in 1921, the all-male legislature unveiled the statue with fanfare and pageantry in the Capitol rotunda. Not one day later, the sculpture was promptly ushered to the relative obscurity of the Capitol crypt. Four legislative attempts and 75 years later, my good friend and colleague from Alaska, Senator TED STEVENS, secured the support of the Senate for this bill to commemorate the milestone anniversary of woman's suffrage. The House of Representatives then considered the measure and expressed concerns about the use of public funds for the relocation costs. As a result, the resolution was tabled and negotiations for an acceptable compromise began.

Mr. President, I am proud that this compromise has the unanimous support of the House of Representatives, the U.S. Senate, 72 national women's organizations and the very dedicated woman suffrage statue campaign. House Concurrent Resolution 216 will allow women across America the opportunity to personally participate in making their history visible. Armed with \$75,000 in donations from citizens across the country—dollars from schoolchildren in Arizona, businessmen in Tennessee, as well as many committed women from my home State of Virginia—the woman suffrage statue campaign is now prepared to donate those funds to recognize women's rich achievements in our society. This resolution will also create a bipartisan commission to select a permanent site for this monument and develop an appropriate educational display that will focus on the lives and hard-won struggles of these crusaders. This is a solid compromise that represents the views of the House of the Representatives, the U.S. Senate, many diverse women's organizations, and, I believe, the views of most Americans.

Mr. President, I want to recognize those individuals who have been truly committed to this effort: The thousands of American citizens who contributed their hard-earned dollars toward this worthy cause. Those who spread the word to friends, sisters, mothers and daughters about the campaign. Members in the House, Representative MORELLA, Representative SCHROEDER, and Representative JOHNSON for their diligence in reaching this compromise. And especially Karen Staser and Joan Meacham, cochairs of the woman suffrage statue campaign, and Sherry Little of my Rules Committee staff. All of these individuals have worked diligently to make this historic piece of legislation a reality.

Mr. President, this bill represents 76 years of effort on the part of American women. I am proud to say that passage of this legislation ensures that every American who visits the U.S. Capitol

will see the history of the woman suffrage movement preserved in our Nation's rotunda. I am honored to have taken part in an effort that, after so many years, makes visible the traditions of equality and democracy that make our country great.

USA TAX PLAN AND ITS PROVISIONS PROMOTING INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, today I would like to again discuss tax reform and in particular an aspect of the unlimited savings allowance [USA] tax plan which I believe is very important to our Nation's future—the USA tax plan's tax treatment of exports.

Before discussing this specific issue, I would like to refresh the memories of my colleagues about why the replacement of the current Tax Code with a superior alternative is so necessary for the health of the country and our economy. In my judgment, until we make this case to our fellow citizens on the economic merits of fundamental change, structural tax reform will not happen.

Central to this case is the urgent need to raise the level of national savings. It is critical that we recognize the current bias in our Tax Code against the saving and investment that are the key to higher living standards, and take steps to correct that bias.

Higher savings lead to more investment. More investment will, in turn, lead to increased productivity from American workers. The more productivity we have from our workers, the more competitive we are in the international arena. The more competitive we are in the international arena, the better jobs we have. The better jobs we have, the higher income we have as Americans.

Our current saving rate is low by our historical standards and it is the lowest of all major industrialized nations.

In the 1980's, our savings rate dropped to an average of 3.6 percent, half the level of the 1950's, 1960's, and into the early 1970's. In the first 5 years of this decade, 1990 to 1994, the U.S. savings rate has fallen almost 50 percent from the already low levels of the 1980's, to just 2.1 percent, and reports show that our savings rate is continuing to erode. This is far below the comparable figures of 10 percent in Germany, 18 percent in Japan, and the even higher savers along much of the Pacific rim.

Without adequate savings, our level of investment will continue to be correspondingly low. Low saving, in short, directly imperils our future standard of living.

Behind the saving shortfall lurks a very serious abdication of our economic responsibility to the next generation of Americans. We seem to have forgotten the principle tenet of the American dream—that, like our forefathers did for our generation, we must improve and better prepare our country for the generations that follow.

Every day we are bombarded with messages equating spending with the good life and a strong economy—in short, consumption as personal privilege and patriotic duty. Proponents of thrift have been made to appear self-punishing, antisocial, and scrooge like.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Saving is simply the deferral of some consumption today so that we and our children can consume more in the future. Because our current level of national saving is so low, we cannot be assured of vigorous economic growth in the future. Politically, the failure of Americans to save for their future—one study estimates that the average American has about \$7,000 in assets in retirement—means that entitlement programs such as Social Security have become economic life rafts that can not indefinitely support the load they are being asked to carry.

Polls have shown that a majority of today's younger generation believe it is more likely that UFO's exist than believe the Social Security program will exist—in its present form—when they reach retirement age. As our former colleague Russell Long used to point out, leadership is often determining which direction the people are going and running like heck to get in front of them to lead them where they already are going. The American people have a better understanding of the problems we face as a Nation than our political leaders seem to acknowledge and it is incumbent on our Nation's leaders—the President and the Congress—to begin to exercise responsible leadership in developing long-term policies to address these shortcomings.

As most of my colleagues acknowledge, the best thing we can do to improve national saving is to balance the Federal budget. Chronic budget deficits have in recent years siphoned away what meager private and business saving we have managed to amass. It has driven up the costs of acquiring this capital and it requires that we run massive trade deficits to finance our country's need for capital.

But progress against the deficit isn't enough. We have an even more difficult task before us: Helping our fellow citizens to understand that thrift isn't counterproductive to the long-term health of the economy.

This is a matter of leadership. But it is also a matter of policy. And that is where fundamental tax reform comes in.

For it is inescapable that the current Tax Code, because of its bias against saving relative to consumption, subsidizes the present at the expense of the future.

That is the core, intrinsic, systemic problem that requires fundamental correction. It is around this fact—that the government extracts revenues from the economy in a way that hinders the ability of people to provide for their futures and of companies to grow—that a lasting movement for change can be built.

Certainly it was America's saving and investment crisis that motivated Senator DOMENICI and me to develop the USA tax system. Our proposal rests on a few central features designed to end the current code's bias against saving and investment.

First, the USA individual tax treats all income alike regardless of source and it taxes that income once and only once.

Second, the USA individual tax permits every taxpayer an up-front, overt, and unlimited deferral on that part of their annual income they use to add to their total saving.

Third, the USA business tax allows the expensing of all real business investment.

These three points are at the revolutionary heart of the USA tax. They constitute a revolution in the tax base—in what we tax and how we tax. That is where the revolution is needed and where, given public understanding, it can have its most lasting impact.

The USA tax plan has other important features. It is more efficient than the current tax Code. According to the tax Foundation, the USA tax plan would cut by 76 percent the compliance costs now imposed by the individual and corporate income taxes.

In terms of fairness and understandability, the USA tax treats all income alike. It treats all businesses, from corporations to partnerships to farmers to sole proprietors, alike. It retains the progressivity of the current code.

It is designed to be revenue neutral. It is internally inconsistent to try to encourage private saving on the one hand and encourage public dissaving on the other. The USA tax maintains the proportion of the overall tax bill paid by individuals and businesses. There is no intention like the 1986 tax Reform Act to shift the tax burden from individuals to the corporate community.

The USA tax also grants to employees and to employers a dollar for dollar tax credit for the deeply regressive FICA payroll taxes. I have addressed this very important feature of our proposal in separate remarks.

Today, I would like to highlight another key feature of the USA plan, its treatment of imports and exports. With respect to competitiveness, the USA business tax levels the international playing field for American business by implementing a territorial and border adjustable tax. All goods, whether produced here or abroad, sold in the United States will bear the same US tax burden, while U.S. exports will not carry the cost of U.S. taxes when sold abroad.

Mr. President, many times I have heard my colleagues say that we must have a level international playing field on trade issues. I can recount some of the numerous legislative initiatives, including the super section 301 provision, the Market Promotion Program, and the Export Enhancement Program, that have been enacted to provide this level playing field. I have supported