

sleep better at night than you did yesterday.

Mr. INHOFE. Up until that statement, I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that we are almost in agreement on a couple of things. We need to do what we can to defend against terrorist attacks, whether it is fertilizers bombs in suitcases and any other way. But just because that is also a threat does not mean we should abandon our national missile system because that threat is there. The Senator talks about what our capabilities are today. The Senator talks about a dome. I am not talking about a dome. I think it is demeaning to the American people to keep using over and over again the statement "star wars." I know the President does that quite often.

Mr. DORGAN. I reclaim my time. This is my time. The reason I use "star wars" is because the proposal that the Senator and others pushed is a proposal that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I really came to the floor to speak for about 5 minutes about an economic task force. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 7 additional minutes, and for the next 2 minutes let us deal with this and let me give the statement I intend to on the economic task force.

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

Mr. DORGAN. The bill the Senator supported last year included both multiple sites on the ground and the possibility of space-based laser systems.

Mr. INHOFE. We are talking right now about going into that position. We have something in space we are concerned about, and that is our satellite technology that warns us in advance 30 minutes before it reaches the United States. If one should come from North Korea, that gives us adequate time. That technology is here now. Brilliant Eyes would tie into our ground-based radar and give us warning so we would be able to project and hit it. But we are not talking about that at this point. We are talking about a bad missile that would reach the stratosphere. We have 22 Aegis ships that we have a tremendous investment in, and I am sure the Senator maybe disagreed with the amount of money that we invested in that to begin with. But it is here. We were in this body at the time that decision was made. They have now those out there floating. We want to get in the position that we can use that investment by having maybe three ships on the east coast and three ships on the west coast to reach into the atmosphere and hit missiles coming toward the United States. That is hardly an umbrella over the United States. But it is common sense—I still contend—that your figures are not accurate. And for approximately 10 percent more in investment than we have already made we could have a system that would defend Americans against missile attack.

Mr. DORGAN. I respect the Senator's views. And he comes with great energy, as do many of his colleagues when we have this discussion on the floor. I will be here when it comes again this year on the Defense authorization bill. I am not suggesting that we ought not be involved in these kinds of questions or issues. I could have supported a level of \$370 million of R&D for a national missile defense. I think that is a little high. But the fact is that was in the administration's budget. We agreed with that. We disagreed with adding over 100 percent to that, or increasing by 100 percent.

Interestingly enough, this comes at a time when the workhorse of our strategic defense are still effective. The B-52 bomber, for example, is a wonderful airplane. It has lots of life left. The Air Force does not have enough money. So they are putting B-52's in storage. We are going to draw down that bomber force? Why? Because we do not have enough money to retain the bomber force. You can run 25 B-52's for I think 5 years for the cost of one new B-2 bomber, as I recall.

The tradeoffs here are what I am talking about. I am not suggesting that we should not make good investment to defend this country. I am saying let us make sure that what we are doing represents the right kind of tradeoffs in the things that are necessary for this country's defense in the future.

Mr. INHOFE. I agree. I cannot think of anything more valuable when you are talking about tradeoffs than defending the lives of Americans.

The reason I brought up the thing in Oklahoma City was I was there for the 168 people who were killed, and many were dear friends of mine. The point there is that the smallest warhead known could kill 1,000 times that many. That is a real threat to Americans.

Mr. DORGAN. I understood the point the Senator was making. I think all of us in this Chamber understand the heartbreak and the sadness which was visited on Oklahoma and Oklahoma City and this entire country by that tragedy, by that senseless violence that happened. It maybe in a lot of ways reminds us all again of how fragile things are and how easy it is for someone deranged, or some group deranged, to want to visit great damage on a country, or a region, or a city, or a people. We need to be vigilant about that. But there are a whole range of threats. We need to consider the entire range.

As always, I enjoyed the visit with the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, thank you for indulging us and sitting and listening to this exchange. But you will hear much of this exchange again when we have the Defense authorization bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, let me ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for the next 5 minutes.

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

TASK FORCE ON JOBS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we had this morning a task force that involved its work on the issue of jobs over in the Dirksen Building.

I and Senator DASCHLE and Senator BINGAMAN from New Mexico, who is chairman of this task force, were a part of it. I wanted to point out some of what we are trying to do.

This issue of Pat Buchanan moving around this country talking about jobs is not an accident. He understands what many of us understand—that the center pole of the tent for the economic debate in this country ought to be jobs. I happen to think Pat Buchanan has a few dark sides to his debate. I do not like some of the influences which I see and some of the references. But the fact is on the issue of jobs, it seems to me, the voters of New Hampshire and others responded to the issue of jobs and economic opportunity. And it is something that we have been working on in our caucus under the leadership of JEFF BINGAMAN now for about a year. Today, we are unveiling a series of recommendations on the issue of creating jobs in our country.

We have an interesting economy in America. America is still a strong country, and a wonderful place. Nobody wants to leave. People want to come here. We have some folks running for the Presidency who I think want to build a fence down there to keep people out of our country. What does that say about our country? It has a lot of problems but it is also a wonderful place and a magnet where a lot of people want to come to. We have an economy, however, where economists measure economic progress by taking a look at car wrecks, heart attacks, and earthquakes. There are economists down at the Federal Reserve who are measuring economic strength by examining car accidents, heart attacks, and earthquakes. Hurricane Hugo added one-half of 1 percent of GDP to this country because this country measures its economic health by what it consumes and not what it produces.

In the long run the question of whether this country has a strong, vibrant, healthy economy will depend on how we produce, what we produce, and whether we have a strong manufacturing base. We have an economic system that has been redefined in our country in recent years by large international economic organizations. And they have redefined it by saying we choose to want to produce. Whether it is to produce and sell in established markets, we choose to access 20-cent an hour labor, or \$1 an hour labor, and sell the shoes, or the products from that labor, the shirts, the belts, the cars in Pittsburgh, or Tokyo, or Fargo, or Denver. The problem is that disconnects. That is a global economic circumstance that we probably cannot

change very much in the broader sense but that we address with respect to additional rules because it disconnects the income from the source of production from the consumers who are going to be consuming the benefits, or the fruits of production.

The engine of progress in this country, in my judgment, is how do we create new, good-paying jobs? When people sit at the dinner table at night and talk about their lives as a family, the only question that matters is, "Are we increasing our standard of living?" And, regrettably for 60 percent of the American families, the answer is, "No. We are working harder." And over the last 20 years we are making less money, if you adjust it for inflation. There is no Government program, none that is as effective as a good job, or a substitute for a good job, that pays well.

Now, the question is, Why are we losing manufacturing jobs? Why are jobs moving out of our country? Why are jobs going overseas? And what can we do about it?

First, fair trade and fair competition. Our country ought not be ashamed ever to stand up and say we demand fair trade. We expect to compete, but we demand the competition be fair as well. When I was a kid walking to school, I knew every day that our country could win just by waking up; we were the biggest, the strongest, the best, and we could win the economic contest with one hand tied behind our back. But times are different, and we cannot do that today. And we ought to insist that fair competition and fair trade be hallmarks of our economic circumstances in this country.

Second, it seems to me we ought to change our Tax Code. I introduced some legislation, and I am introducing more that says let us stop subsidizing movement of jobs overseas, this insidious, perverse provision in our Tax Code that says, if you close your plant here and move your jobs to a tax haven overseas, we will give you a little bonus. We will give you a tax break. We have already voted on that on the floor of the Senate, and I was unable to pass closing the tax break that says we will reward you if you move your jobs overseas. But guess what. You are going to get a chance on a dozen more occasions this year to vote on the same thing. We ought to shut down the tax breaks in our Tax Code that say to people: Move the jobs overseas and we will reward you.

Third, we ought to provide some basic incentive to create jobs here, and I propose a 20 percent payroll tax credit for those who create new net jobs in this country. Let us shut off the incentive to move jobs overseas and create incentives to create new jobs in this country.

I am not much interested in how many jobs exist in Japan or how many jobs exist in Germany or how many jobs exist in Mexico. I am interested in how many jobs exist in our country.

This is an economic competition in which we are involved. It is a competition with winners and losers. It is not a circumstance where everybody wins. It is a circumstance where, if the rules are unfair and the competition is not fair, there are winners and losers. We are losing our manufacturing base in this country, and we can do something about it, the quicker the better. The task force that was headed by JEFF BINGAMAN from New Mexico is a task force that makes serious and specific recommendations that will try to create the incentives to create new jobs in this country—not elsewhere; in this country—in the future. The currency of ideas that are represented by the recommendations of that task force will be a set of ideas we will discuss over and over again in this Congress in 1996.

It will not surprise anyone to understand the anxiety that exists in our country today. People are worried. They know that they are less secure in their jobs. You can work 20 years and be laid off without a blink by some enterprises. Their jobs pay less adjusted for inflation than they did 20 years ago in many cases. So they are worried about fewer jobs, jobs that pay less, and jobs with less security, and they want something done about it that increases the standard of living in this country.

Government cannot wave a wand to make that happen, but the rules and the debate about how you create good jobs and how you stop the hemorrhaging of jobs from our country moving overseas is a debate that we ought to have right here in the center of the Senate.

We are going to have an Olympics in Atlanta in August, and everybody is going to be rooting. We will root for all the wonderful athletes all around the world, but especially we will decide as Americans that those men and women wearing the red, white and blue are our team and we want them to do well. There is another competition that is not on the field of athletics. It is in the field of economics, worldwide economic competition to decide who wins and advances with new jobs and better opportunity and who suffers the turn-of-the-century British disease of long economic decline, who wins and who loses.

Frankly, I want us to have a plan. I want our team to win. I want our team to decide that we will compete and we will win, and we will make sure the rules are fair as we compete. That is the purpose of trying to put together a series of steps that say our intent is to try to encourage new jobs created in this country and try to discourage, through the insidious provisions in our Tax Code, the export or the shipment of good jobs in America overseas. We ought not pay for that. We ought not provide incentives to move jobs elsewhere. I tell you what. Anybody who thinks that makes sense is not thinking. And I hope we will get the Senate to think a lot about that in 1996.

Mr. President, we will be discussing at some greater length the legislation

that I have introduced, and we will discuss at greater length the recommendations of the high wage task force of Senator BINGAMAN in the future as well. I look forward to those discussions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment for 1 minute and that, immediately following the reconvening of the Senate, time for the two leaders be reserved, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and that I be recognized as if in morning business.

There being no objection, at 1:06 p.m., the Senate adjourned until 1:07 p.m. the same day.

The Senate met at 1:07 p.m., and was called to order by the Honorable MIKE DEWINE, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. For the benefit of those in the gallery and whoever may be watching on C-SPAN 2 and for me, too, we now have a new legislative day.

Would the Chair, without reference to the Parliamentarian, explain the procedural purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To qualify resolutions to go to committees.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair and the Parliamentarian, Mr. Dove.

LEGAL AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment about the immigration bill which is scheduled to come before the Judiciary Committee tomorrow and, first of all, an amendment which will be offered by a number of Senators, including the distinguished Presiding Officer, Senator DEWINE of Ohio, under the leadership of Senator SPENCER ABRAHAM of Michigan, to divide the appropriations bill into two parts, that relating to legal immigration and that relating to illegal immigration.

I think it is important to do so, that the bills have independent status and that there not be an effort made to tie either bill to the other. The bill on legal immigration has no more to do with the bill on illegal immigration than, say, the telecommunications bill has to do with the crime bill. Illegal immigration is a major problem in America.

I picked the telecommunications bill not at random but because the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee walked in for a moment.