

legislature, we always sat down and worked together, and the people expected us to do that.

How can the people of the United States expect us to negotiate a budget or appropriations bills when one side will not even talk to us and all they do is send veto threats? I ask my colleague, how do you compromise? How do you work with, how do you negotiate with somebody who will not talk with you?

Mr. GORTON. Well, you do not. I must say, I found particularly striking the analogy of the Senator from Missouri to a 2- or 3-year-old child who simply says, "More."

In this case, what we have is an administration that only says, "More. We want more spending, we do not want any setoffs, but we want to send the bill to somebody else, to our children and our grandchildren. We really do not want a serious proposal that will lead us to a balanced budget, except maybe after the end of the next Presidential term. We will think about binding someone in the future, but we don't want to bind ourselves."

So we have now in front of us the proposition that \$164 billion is not enough money to spend, and the President will veto a bill that only spends \$164 billion, of which \$5 billion is fenced, as it were. "We've got to have \$166 billion to spend the way we want without any conditions imposed on that spending."

Again, I think the Senator from Oregon was too polite to say so, but I believe that if that is the proposition with which we are faced, it is pointless to spend a week or so of this body's time debating the details of a proposal which will be vetoed in any event.

Regrettably, we will perhaps have to approach the President with another of these notorious continuing resolutions; that is to say, short-term appropriations bills, which—and I think I can speak for my colleagues on this side of the aisle—when I say they will be for smaller amounts of money, they will be markedly smaller amounts of money in authorizations for the administration than is the bill that was arrived at working with both Republicans and Democrats in an attempt to reach a common ground somewhere between the last set of appropriations proposed by this body and those originally asked for by the President.

It is too bad, but here we are with a veto threat over the proposition that we are not going to spend \$166 billion in exactly the way the President wishes but only \$164 billion, with \$5 billion of it contingent upon the President agreeing to a balanced budget at some reasonable future time.

Mr. SIMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

STATEMENTS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON ARE RELEVANT TODAY

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I recently came upon some statements of-

fered by Thomas Jefferson, which, I think, appear to bear some remarkable relevance to our current predicament. To quote from one of them from 1816, in a letter to Governor Plumer, he said: "I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared."

On another occasion, he made the same point, perhaps even more dramatically, in a letter to Samuel Kerchival, also in 1816: "We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude."

It is when we are having the most difficulty attending to and resolving the most vexing issues of the day that we can profit most from such reminders and that much of what confronts us today has been dealt with by so many of our greatest public servants who came before us.

One simply cannot read many of the statements of our third President, Thomas Jefferson, without coming upon repeated, potent references to the necessity of eliminating public debt. I suggest that he would be horrified to learn that we would ever consider allowing our current impasse to stand and to leave deficits and mandatory spending to spiral upward unabated.

It is all very well, politically, to say that we will—our two parties—take our respective cases to the electorate in November to "let the people decide" as to who failed who in the realm of public responsibility. But, in the meantime, I think we do a tremendous disservice to our citizens for as long as we leave this situation unresolved.

Here is another quote from Thomas Jefferson, stated to Thomas Cooper in 1802, which says it perhaps more vividly and relevantly even than the others: "If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

Well, I think that is the nub of it. "If we can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

I certainly agree with that. I can think of few things more dangerous and more cruelly deceptive than to suggest that we must continue to pile debt and misery upon our children's heads because we dare not slow down, in any way, the current engines of spending growth, which churn out funding for various beneficiaries of Government largess. We do not "take care of" anybody when we do this. We do not take care of anyone's children by forcing tomorrow's children to pay lifetime tax rates of 80 percent. That will, I assure my colleagues, lead to more misery, more poverty, more hunger and need and deprivation, and more intergenerational hostility than anything ever contemplated in any balanced budget agreement.

Mr. Jefferson was fully acquainted with the dangers of mounting public debt. Indeed, one might say that the

principal challenge of the young republic was how to discharge the massive debts compiled by the individual States in the course of the American Revolution.

Alexander Hamilton was, of course, instrumental in diagnosing the severity and nationality of this problem, arguing that the Federal Government must bear the burden of lifting the national debt burden because we would all collapse together anyway if this was not properly done.

That brings to mind Daniel Webster's remark about Alexander Hamilton. If you think of rhetoric today and the emotion and passion of speech, Webster said this about Hamilton: "He smote the rock of the national resources, and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth. He touched the dead corpse of Public Credit, and it sprang upon his feet." Now, you can see that quote etched at the base of the Hamilton statue at the Department of the Treasury, if you so desire to check it.

Mr. Jefferson, again in a letter to Governor Plumer, stated his recognition of the necessity of reducing public indebtedness. Mr. Jefferson did not always agree with Alexander Hamilton's solutions and methods, to be sure. But they were certainly in agreement as to the necessity of eliminating the poison of mounting public debt.

To Governor Plumer, Jefferson wrote: "We see in England the consequences of the want of economy; their laborers reduced to live on a penny in the shilling of their earnings, to give up bread, and resort to oatmeal and potatoes for food; and their landholders exiling themselves to live in penury and obscurity abroad, because at home the government must have all the clear profits of their land."

That sounds like a pretty fair description of what is going to happen to us. Our own Government continues to increase its share of the Nation's "profits"—the savings and investment—which it must absorb in order to finance the massive spending increases we have programmed into our laws. Indeed, the burden of paying for that irresponsibility falls ultimately on the taxpayers, our taxpayers, our citizens, and cuts into the share of their own pay, which they would otherwise be able to use to provide for themselves.

I fully recognize there are many Senators here on both sides of the aisle who are equally committed to confronting and resolving these woes resulting from our debt. There are sincere disagreements as to how to accomplish that goal. I do believe there is now widespread recognition that the goal must be met.

I, therefore, close by reiterating my belief that we must not give up on this process. We must not give up on coming to agreement merely because of the disagreements which have divided us to this point. I do not find any reason to "give up" to be a convincing one. Give up because we believe we might hold political advantage if the impasse persists, or because we cannot agree on

the size of a tax cut? When "our cause" is the elimination of increases in the public debt, these are simply not sufficient reasons.

As a member of the bipartisan Senate group headed by Senators CHAFFEE and BREAUX, I have joined approximately two dozen Senators, from both sides of the aisle, in putting forward our best hope of "splitting the difference" between the two sides in order to get this job done. It might not be the only way and might not be the magic formula which produces an agreement, but it is certainly better than "packing it in" and, instead, morosely retreating to consult with our political advisers as to how best to cope with the public anger in the wake of our failure to complete our work—sitting with our gurus saying, "How do we get around this if we do not do anything?" Well, you do this and do that. We all know what that is.

So I suggest to my colleagues that they pay heed to these words of Thomas Jefferson and be reminded that we are truly facing a choice between "liberty" and "servitude" when we choose between a balanced budget and mounting debt. That is very much the choice that confronts our children and grandchildren, and we have now to make the choice for them. I do hope and pray that recognition of this will spur all of us on to renewed efforts to reach an agreement and to defer any further thoughts of simply extracting political advantage from failure. That would be terrible.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have a comment on a rather elusive matter. We work in an arena where truth is always a rather elusive entity. Many statements in this place seem to be repeated ad hominem and ad nauseam, however inadvertently, without regard to any basis in fact. A mischievous speaker may do this because he or she believes that, as has often been said, "A falsehood repeated often enough will be believed." Equally often, this happens because this is simply what the individual has been told, perhaps several times, and thus the rash assumption is made that a statement made so often "must be true." Thus, often, in good faith, speakers perpetuate ideas and statements which are simply and totally at complete variance with the facts.

To cite one specific case, I wish I could count how many times it has been stated as an article of pure faith by those on the other side that we have had however many hours of hearings on Whitewater and Travelgate, but only one, or none, on Medicare. The Democratic policy channel on the televisions in our offices also plays this old and tired tune. Many speakers on the other side of the aisle have repeated it in old and tired phrases. The only problem is, it is just simply not true. It is not even close to being true. It is one of those myths which has developed, somehow directly, in the teeth of the facts. I did a little checking of the record. I know

that is not what we are supposed to do. I did a little checking of the record on this matter. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a listing of all of the hearings held in the last year in the Senate Finance Committee alone on the subject of reforming Medicare, Medicaid, welfare, the Consumer Price Index, and any number of other related matters.

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

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE HEARINGS & MEETINGS 104TH CONGRESS (ORGANIZED BY ISSUE)

TOTAL HEARINGS & MEETINGS: 101

Full Committee Hearings: 62.
Subcommittee Hearings: 13.
Total Hearings: 75.
Executive Sessions including 3 Conferences: 22.
Private Meetings: 4.
Total Meetings: 26.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX—3 FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

3/13/95—Consumer Price Index.
4/6/95—Consumer Price Index.
6/6/95—Overstatement of Consumer Price Index.

MEDICAID—6 HEARINGS (5 FULL COMMITTEE, 1 SUBCOMMITTEE)

3/23/95—Medicaid Subcommittee—1115 waivers.
6/28/95—Medicaid, Opinions of the Governors.
6/29/95—Medicaid, Historical Background.
7/12/95—Medicaid, State Flexibility.
7/13/95—Medicaid, Interest Groups.
7/27/95—Medicaid, Formula Calculation.

MEDICARE—10 FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

2/28/95—Medicare Perspectives.
5/11/95—Medicare Solvency, part 1.
5/16/95—Medicare Solvency, part 2.
5/17/95—Medicare Solvency, part 3.
7/19/95—Medicare Payment Policies, part 1.
7/20/95—Medicare Payment Policies, part 2.
7/25/95—New Directions in Medicare, part 1.
7/26/95—New Directions in Medicare, part 2.
7/31/95—Medicare Fraud and Abuse.
8/30/95—Medicare: The Next Thirty Years.

MISCELLANEOUS—5 HEARINGS (2 FULL COMMITTEE, 3 SUBCOMMITTEE)

5/4/95—Vaccines for Children Program.
6/13/95—SS Subcommittee—AARP, part 1.
6/20/95—SS Subcommittee—AARP, part 2.
7/20/95—SS Subcommittee—Population Control.
7/28/95—Debt Limit.

NOMINATIONS—7 FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

1/10/95—Rubin Confirmation Hearing.
2/16/95—Chater, Vasquez, Foley Confirmation Hearing.
5/10/95—Lang Confirmation Hearing.
6/8/95—Shapiro, Hawke, Robertson, Moon, Kellison Confirmation Hearing.
7/21/95—Callahan, Schloss, and Summers Confirmation Hearing.
11/30/95—Bradbury, Gale, Lipton, Skolfield, Shafer and Williams Confirmation Hearing.
12/5/95—Gotbaum Confirmation Hearing.

SOCIAL SECURITY—7 HEARINGS (3 FULL COMMITTEE, 4 SUBCOMMITTEE)

3/1/95—Social Security Earnings Limit.
3/22/95—SS Subcommittee—Social Security Costs.
4/7/95—SS Subcommittee—Annual Report of Trustees.
5/9/95—1995 Annual Report of Trustees, part 1.
6/6/95—1995 Annual Report of Trustees, part 2.

6/27/95—SS Subcommittee—Solvency of the Trust Funds.

8/2/95—SS Subcommittee—Social Security privatization.

TAX—22 HEARINGS (19 FULL COMMITTEE, 3 SUBCOMMITTEE)

1/24/95—Estimating Revenue.
1/25/95—Economic Outlook.
1/26/95—Federal Budget Outlook.
1/31/95—Savings in our Economy.
2/2/95—Savings as Incentives.
2/8/95—FY 1996 Budget with Secretary Rubin.
2/9/95—IRAs 401K's & Savings.
2/15/95—Capital Gains.
2/16/95—Indexation of Assets.
3/2/95—Middle Income Tax Proposal.
3/7/95—FCC Tax Certificates.
3/21/95—Tax Subcommittee—Expatriation.
4/3/95—Tax Subcommittee—Research tax.
4/5/95—Flat Tax, hearing 1.
5/3/95—Alternative Minimum Tax.
5/18/95—Flat Tax, hearing 2.
6/7/95—Small Business issues.
6/8/95—Earned Income Tax Credit.
6/19/95—Tax Subcommittee—S corp reform.
7/11/95—Expatriation Tax.
7/18/95—Deficit Reduction Fuel Tax.
7/21/95—Foreign Tax Issues.

TRADE—5 HEARINGS (3 FULL COMMITTEE, 2 SUBCOMMITTEE)

4/4/95—Trade Policy Agenda.
5/10/95—World Trade Organization.
5/15/95—Caribbean Basin Initiative.
8/1/95—Trade Subcommittee—various issues.
12/5/95—OECD Shipbuilding Subsidies Agreement.

WELFARE—10 FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

3/8/95—Welfare Reform—States Perspective.
3/9/95—Broad Goals of Welfare.
3/10/95—Administration's Views on Welfare.
3/14/95—Teen Parents & Welfare.
3/20/95—Welfare to Work Programs.
3/27/95—SSI Program.
3/28/95—Child Support Programs.
3/29/95—Welfare, Views of Interested Organizations.
4/26/95—Child Welfare Programs.
4/27/95—Welfare Reform Wrap Up.

EXEC SESSIONS—21 MEETINGS INCLUDING 3 CONFERENCES

1/10/95—Organization Meeting & Vote on Rubin Nomination.
2/2/95—Executive Session appointing Joint Tax Members.
2/8/95—Executive Session appointing Subcommittees.
3/8/95—Vote on Foley & Vasquez Nominations.
3/15/95—Tax Markup on HR 831.
3/28/95—Conference on HR 831.
5/10/95—Vote on Lang Nomination.
5/24/95—Welfare Markup.
5/26/95—Welfare Markup.
6/8/95—Vote on Shapiro, Hawke, Robertson, Moon & Kellison nominations.
6/22/95—Conference on H.R. 483—Medicare Select.
7/21/95—Vote on Callahan, Schloss and Summers Nominations.
9/26/95—Medicare/Medicaid Markup.
9/27/95—Medicare/Medicaid Markup.
9/28/95—Medicare/Medicaid Markup.
9/29/95—Medicare/Medicaid Markup.
10/18/95—Tax Markup.
10/19/95—Tax Markup.
10/24/95—Conference on H.R. 4—Welfare.
11/2/95—Markup on revenue provisions of S. 1318.
11/30/95—Vote on Bradbury, Gale, Lipton, Skolfield and Williams Nominations.
12/14/95—Mark up of Social Security Earnings Limit Legislation and vote on the Gotbaum and Shafer nominations.

PRIVATE MEETINGS—4 MEETINGS

5/4/95—Meeting with Secretary Shalala.

8/2/95—Meeting on the Budget.

8/4/95—Meeting on the Budget.

8/10/95—Meeting on the Budget.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am now a member of that committee and I sat in on those hearings. They were often held at 9:30, 10 o'clock in the morning. Had I been chairman I might also have sought to have them in the afternoon. I was there for almost all of them, usually arriving after some haste ill-attained in getting through the D.C.'s fabled rush hour traffic from my home in Virginia.

We held 10 full Finance Committee hearings last year on Medicare alone—10. They were not about abstract, philosophical topics, but subjects directly related to the solutions presented in our budget proposal. On May 11, 16 and 17 we had hearings specifically on the question of how to restore solvency to the Medicare Program. We tackled the issue of payment policies in hearings on July 19 and 20. We explored more comprehensive reforms on July 25 and July 26. On August 30 we dealt with the subject which I personally think requires much more, much more attention—the 30-year future of Medicare. That is when the real problems all coalesce. This is only part of the list, as the record will show.

We also had multiple hearings on Medicaid. The proposals which we made in the course of budget reconciliation were all explored in depth at those hearings. The opinions of the Governors regarding our plan was heard on June 28. The importance of flexibility for the State Governments in administering Medicaid was explored July 12. The proper way to calculate the distribution of funds under the Medicaid formula was explored on July 27. Again this is only a partial list.

Even the issue of the Consumer Price Index reform, which so many have said we should "not rush to do," especially not rush to do in budget reconciliation, the CPI reform was the subject of several full committee hearings on March 16, April 6, and June 6. When somebody tells you we have not done anything—and looked into CPI; we do not want to rush into it—cite those, please. Having been right there personally I can tell you few experts believe we are acting with any sense at all on either side of the aisle in allowing the expensive errors in the CPI calculation to persist. That is absurd. It is out of whack either .5 or up to 2.2. Everybody that testified said that. If you dealt with it, knocked off a half percent or full percent in the outyears, in 10 years, at 1 percent, it is \$680 billion bucks—billion bucks—and we do not even play with it.

The senior groups all seem to flunk the saliva test when we begin to talk about the CPI. "Oh, break the contract, break the contract." I am telling you, they will break America. We are not talking about them or to them.

None of them will be hurt in anything we are doing. No one over 60 is even affected by the things we have in mind, but people between 18 and 40 will indeed be on a destructive path.

Mr. President, I do not know what to make of these assertions that we have not had hearings on Medicare or Medicaid. We have had many. The record speaks clearly. On Medicare alone, 10 full committee hearings. It seems to me be a trend in Washington saying that what has happened has not happened and vice versa. The media plays that well in their recountings of these things. Perhaps the assertions will be revised to state that we only had a minimal look at Medicare. That would probably be the result of the response to my remarks.

I do not know how many dozens of hours were needed to spend on that to escape the application of that term. I also note that this work continues on in the current year. We had another remarkable hearing on Medicaid last week with six of our Nation's Governors testifying—three Republicans, three Democrats—in describing the desires of the State governments with regard to Medicaid.

So I ask these items be printed, and I ask my colleagues to perhaps refrain from repeating the charge that we have not thoroughly explored Medicare in committee hearings. The facts are exactly otherwise, and I wish my good colleagues to know that.

INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING FUNDING

Mr. SIMPSON. Finally, a comment on family planning funding. I want to express my serious concerns about the severe restrictions this Congress has imposed on U.S. funding for international family planning assistance.

My colleagues will recall that the Senate successfully avoided a partial Government shutdown on January 26 by passing H.R. 2880 on a bipartisan vote of 82-8. At the time we faced a midnight deadline for passing legislation to avoid yet another Government shutdown. Because no one in this Chamber wanted another shutdown to occur, we passed this measure in the exact form it came to us from the House without amending or striking any provisions which we considered to be objectionable. We had no choice in the matter. It was a frustrating and vexing experience for many of us.

I was and continue to be deeply troubled by a provision of H.R. 2880 that prohibits funding for international family planning assistance programs until July 1 unless a foreign aid reauthorization bill is enacted prior to that date. After July 1, funds will be provided at only 65 percent of the fiscal year 1995 level, with a requirement they be spent in equal amounts over the following 15 months.

I believe that policy to be very shortsighted. It is preventing the U.S. Agency for International Development

[AID] from increasing access to family planning services for millions of citizens in the developing countries around the world. The ultimate result will be more unwanted pregnancy and even higher population growth in the poorest, most heavily populated nations of the globe.

Ironically, this policy, if it is not corrected, will also inevitably lead to more abortions, many of which will be performed under unsafe conditions that will surely result in infection, infertility, and death. This outcome deeply concerns me.

The people who so often resist these programs are talking continually about abortion, unwanted pregnancy, population and so on. I strongly urge all of my colleagues, whether they be pro-choice, pro-life, Democrat, Republican, conservative, liberal, moderate, to consider the tragic consequences of what we have done. Restricting access to family planning services—I did not say "abortion," and it is not there, either—restricting access to family planning services will assuredly result in more abortion. If anyone can refute this I welcome them to do so and come forward.

The harsh reality is that this misguided policy is contributing to a scenario where abortions are or will be the only form of birth control in some of the most impoverished places on Earth. This outcome sharply collides with the stated views of the very people who support it. Of all the issues the religious groups may consider when they compile their scorecards—I know where my scorecard is because I happen to be pro-choice, and I have always been pro-choice; always. In fact, I do not even think men should vote on the issue. So mine is rather clear and has been. So when they are compiling their scorecards on the performance of Members of Congress, I think this is surely one of the most important because it might be that they would show that these people somehow were in favor of abortion because of the misguided way they try to distort the issue.

The abortion issue alone offers a compelling reason for the Congress to reconsider the current restrictions on international family planning funding.

But we should also contemplate the consequences of unrestrained worldwide population growth. One study by the United Nations Population Division has estimated that if the world population trends of 1990 continue indefinitely into the future, worldwide population will increase to 694 billion by the year 2150. This is the equivalent of 12,100 people for every square mile of land on the Earth's surface. The possibility of this occurring is self-evident. The real issue is whether we will take thoughtful, rational steps to prevent this scenario or will we do nothing and simply allow nature to prevent this outcome in its own less civilized way?

Since the beginning of mankind to the year 1940 was a segment of population growth, and since 1940 to this