

he discussed with me a number of problems he was having with the United Nations, including financial problems. But he certainly did not mention anything about giving the U.N. authority to impose taxes upon the American people. I think that maybe the Secretary General has overspoken himself in asserting his belief that the United Nations should be allowed to collect taxes directly from American citizens.

I was astonished, Mr. President, when in an interview with the BBC, U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali made the absurd suggestion that the United Nations should be allowed to collect taxes directly from American citizens—and citizens of other sovereign nations—to finance the operation of the United Nations. His stated reason for creating such a U.N. tax, Mr. Boutros-Ghali said, would be so that the U.N. "would not be under the daily financial will of member states."

In the first place, the gentleman obviously has scant knowledge of the Constitution of the United States. I have heard a lot of disturbing suggestions coming out of the United Nations over the years, but this one—with all respect to the Secretary General—is among the most unacceptable yet. The United Nations will never be able to tax the American citizens, certainly not as long as Senator DOLE is in the Senate or elsewhere in the Government, nor as long as I am here. And I am happy to join Senator DOLE in offering this legislation today, S. 1519, bearing the title of the Prohibition of United Nations Taxation Act, requiring the United States to cut off all funding to the United Nations if the United Nations does intend or attempt to impose such a scheme.

Despite what the U.N. Secretary General and the international bureaucrats may want to believe, the United Nations is not a sovereign entity. It is not a world government, and the Secretary General is not president of the world. No Secretary General in the future should entertain or even express such foolish notions. The United Nations is purely a consultative body, made up of sovereign nations, who did not check their sovereignty at the U.N. door when they sent representatives to the functions and deliberations of the United Nations.

Furthermore, the American people absolutely would not stand for any form of U.N. taxation; they are already paying more than 24 percent of their income to the U.S. Federal Government. They do not need nor will they accept paying another dime to fund a world government in New York led by a nonelected bureaucrat.

The Secretary General has several times advocated a standing U.N. military. His idle suggestion giving the United Nations the power of direct taxation is a matter that invites a worldwide rejection and distrust of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I again assure the majority leader that I will schedule hear-

ings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for the purpose of investigating this matter, and to make clear that the United States must oppose any and all efforts to give the United Nations such unprecedented powers. And, Mr. President, if the Secretary General somehow succeeds securing either the powers of direct taxation, or a standing military, then the United States must withdraw immediately from the United Nations.

I yield the floor.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 607

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] were added as cosponsors of S. 607, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to clarify the liability of certain recycling transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 837

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SPECTER] were added as cosponsors of S. 837, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of James Madison.

S. 881

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 881, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify provisions relating to church pension benefit plans, to modify certain provisions relating to participants in such plans, to reduce the complexity of and to bring workable consistency to the applicable rules, to promote retirement savings and benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 978

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] were added as cosponsors of S. 978, a bill to facilitate contributions to charitable organizations by codifying certain exemptions from the Federal securities laws, to clarify the inapplicability of antitrust laws to charitable gift annuities, and for other purposes.

S. 1146

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1146, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the excise tax treatment of draft cider.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to amend the Act of March 3, 1931 (known as the Davis-Bacon Act), to revise the stand-

ards for coverage under the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1392

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to impose temporarily a 25 percent duty on imports of certain Canadian wood and lumber products, to require the administering authority to initiate an investigation under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to such products, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39—PROVIDING FOR THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOLE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 39

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 23, 1996, at 9 p.m., for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.*

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 209—TO PROVIDE FOR THE APPROVAL OF INTERIM REGULATIONS

Mr. DOLE submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 209

*Resolved,*

#### SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF INTERIM REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The interim regulations applicable to the Senate and the employees of the Senate that were adopted by the Board of the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996, are hereby approved until such time as final regulations applicable to the Senate and the employees of the Senate are approved in accordance with section 304(c) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1384(c)).

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to affect the authority of the Senate under such section 304(c).

#### NOTICES OF HEARINGS

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Senate Subcommittee on Post Office and Civil Service, of the Committee on Governmental Affairs, and the House Subcommittee on Postal Service, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, will hold a hearing on January 25, 1996, on USPS Reform—The International Experience.

The hearing is scheduled for 9:30 a.m. in room 342 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building. For further information, please contact Pat Raymond, Senate Staff Director, at 224-2254, or Dan Blair, House Staff Director, at 225-3741.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FORESTS AND PUBLIC LAND  
MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management to receive testimony on the oversight of the management of the national forests.

The hearing will take place Thursday, January 25, 1996, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Those wishing to testify or who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, please call Mark Rey at (202) 224-6170.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE JONES ACT SHOULD NOT BE  
REPEALED

• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, there are proposals afoot—generated by foreign-flag shipping interests and foreign corporations—to repeal the Jones Act. This 1920 Act, named for Senator Wesley Jones of my State, mandates the use of U.S.-built, U.S.-crewed, U.S.-flagged vessels for voyages between two U.S. ports and on our Nation's inland waterways. Similar laws have been on the books since the 1790's, and nearly 50 nations have similar requirements for shipping in their own domestic commerce.

This law should not be repealed.

Mr. President, the domestic waterborne trades of the United States contribute more than \$15 billion to the American economy, including more than \$4 billion in direct wages to U.S. citizens. The economic impact of that income is multiplied by the thousands of additional jobs in cabotage-related businesses, the Jones Act employers and employees pay \$1.4 billion in State and Federal taxes.

The Jones Act is critical to the State of Washington and other coastal and inland waterways' States, and indirectly, it generates American jobs, tax revenues, and economic activity, in all 50 States.

Unlike our international waterborne trades which are also the shipping lanes of our trading partners, the Jones Act trades are strictly a family trade—the commodities and the vessels move exclusively between American ports. So our trading partners have no reciprocal economic interest at stake in these trades. Indeed, our trading partners understandably have no interest in furthering the national interest objectives which the Jones Act is intended to enhance—jobs for Americans and a fourth arm of defense in times of national emergency.

It seems to me that it makes no more sense to invite foreign shipping interests into our domestic trades, than it does to invite a stranger to intervene in a family matter. In either case, there is no necessity for doing so, and the results can be disastrous.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, that is precisely what those who advocate repeal of the Jones Act would do, have outsiders intrude in the family's business.

The needless risk of permitting this was recently detailed by Stanley H. Barer in his remarks before the American Association of Port Authorities.

Mr. Barer is cochairman and CEO of Totem Resources Corp., a Jones Act operator which is headquartered in Seattle, WA, and which runs high-speed, roll-on, roll-off liner vessels between the lower 48 contiguous States and Alaska. At one time, he was also the Merchant Marine Counsel to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. So his considerable knowledge and expertise have been acquired in the real world of ocean shipping and regulation. What Mr. Barer had to say to the AAPA is, in my view, very instructive and illuminating because it offers a realistic view of the worth and importance of the Jones Act to our economy and national security.

Mr. President, I ask that Mr. Barer's remarks be inserted in the RECORD.

## REMARKS OF STANLEY H. BARER

Thank you very much. It is a pleasure to be here at this convention. I hope I can set the record straight for you about the U.S. merchant marine and, in particular, the Jones Act.

The Jones Act requires that America's domestic waterborne trade must be reserved for carriers owned by Americans, aboard vessels that fly the U.S. flag and were built in this country, and that are crewed by American citizens. Reserving U.S. water transport for American companies and crews is what our cabotage system is all about. And it's a pretty easy idea to understand.

With its extraordinary land mass and diversity, the United States is in substantial part bound together as one nation because of our ability to travel from place to place, thus assuring that all parts and all people of our nation have access to the goods and services that give us the highest standard of living in the world. We would be quite foolish, with a nation of our size, diversity and transportation requirements, to turn our domestic transportation over to the mercy of foreign carriers. Let us never forget that when you talk about the Jones Act, you are talking about transportation services that take place within the United States involving only the movement of goods or people from one part of the country to another.

This national policy of self-sufficiency in domestic transportation is also reflected in rail, trucking and aviation. It has been a consistent policy of our nation and nearly every other advanced nation on the face of this earth. And, when you think about it, it is not unusual to have such a transportation policy. Under our immigration laws, work in virtually every industry of our country is reserved for our own citizens. It is the rule, not the exception, that nations reserve the job opportunities inside their own borders to their own citizens, so long as their own citizens have the capacity to do the work.

Thanks to this policy, today the U.S. has a Jones Act fleet of over 44,000 vessels, which provides direct employment for 124,000 American workers. And those workers earn more than \$3.3 billion in wages a year.

Opponents of the Jones Act point out that U.S. labor costs on our ships, tugboats, barges and shipyards run two to three times the so-called "world labor rate." This is true. Of course, you could make the same

statement about virtually any industry in this country. And, in fact, the merchant seafarers of Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Holland and Japan all earn higher net wages than their American counterparts. Jones Act opponents say that, by bringing foreign ships and foreign crews into our coastal and inter-coastal trades we can lower wage operating costs by up to 50 percent.

Let's look at those world wage rates. Under the International Transport Federation standard, the average wage for the captain of a tanker or large container ship is \$12 an hour, and the other officers are just slightly above the U.S. minimum wage of \$5.25 an hour. The entire rest of a ship's crew under the ITF guidelines would be paid less than the U.S. minimum wage. And the ITF requires no payments for health, pension or other benefits. Ultimately, I believe, the issue is not whether Jones Act maritime workers carrying our domestic cargo make more than the "world standard," the real issue is whether those workers are being paid a fair American wage, with respect to the other transportation modes.

Each of our domestic transportation modes—water, rail, trucking and air cargo—employs Americans at American wage levels and none of them faces domestic competition from foreigners. For example, a tanker captain earns about \$80,000 a year, which is \$30,000 less than a pilot flying a domestic cargo plane. A tugboat captain might earn \$50,000, about the same as a railroad engineer. A deck hand on a Jones Act ship makes about the same pay as a domestic flight attendant, about 25,000 to 30,000 a year. Compare that to a long-distance, line-haul truck driver, who might make as much as \$75,000 a year.

And it is also important to keep in mind the hours worked by our merchant mariners. While the air cargo pilot averages 83 hours in flight time, or about 20 hours a week, a tanker or tugboat captain works at least 12 hours a day and is on duty 24 hours a day on the vessel. This goes on seven days a week, sometimes for weeks and sometimes for months. Our captains on our big roll-on, roll-off liner vessels to Alaska are on their vessels 24 hours a day, seven days a week for months at a time. They are away from their families, and their work is dangerous.

Now, Jones Act opponents are arguing for getting rid of our domestic maritime workers and bringing in foreign ships with foreign crews. Let's think about what would happen if that came true.

I assume that the truckers who compete directly against water carriers would come storming to Congress and say: "You have upset the competitive balance between water, rail, truck and air cargo. We can't compete against the water carriers with our high-priced U.S. truck drivers." Truckers will say, to keep the balance fair we need to bring in foreign, below-minimum-wage truck drivers. And they would have a good argument—what would Congress say? And if you let the water carriers and truckers use foreign labor, the railroads and then the air cargo carriers are going to demand the same ability.

At this point, we have thrown hundreds of thousands of Americans out of work. What would happen next? I have an idea.

Companies outside domestic transportation, companies that compete on a daily basis in the global economy, will demand the right to fire Americans and bring in low-cost, below-U.S.-minimum-wage foreign workers. After all, if we are going to do this for domestic transportation, which is currently immune from foreign competition,