

1993, President Clinton's tax increases were passed by one vote in the House, and a tie was broken in the Senate by Vice President GORE. Despite the fact that half the Senate opposed the taxes, they were imposed on the public.

I believe that this was wrong. We shouldn't be able to make such a fundamental change in how Americans are governed by their representatives in Congress without the support in Congress that a super majority vote for a tax increase requires. It should be hard to increase taxes. It should be harder to increase taxes—to take the people's money from them—than it is to cut taxes.

Mr. President, what the public is asking for is leadership.

It is not leadership to increase taxes on the elderly and everyone who drives a car, and claim you only hit the rich—which the Democrats did in 1993 without one Republican vote.

It is not leadership to veto tax cuts for American families, and then propose tax cuts again in the next election year.

It is not leadership to propose a budget with a \$200 billion deficit, and then veto a balanced budget.

And it is not leadership to propose a budget in the following year that balances only with huge spending cuts after the year 2000, when the President is sure to have moved back to Arkansas.

It is leadership to confront our fiscal problems head on, to show the people what we must do to preserve Medicare, to help families, to create jobs, to reform welfare, and to balance the budget. That is what the Republican Congress did.

America has led the world through the most tumultuous century of all time—from the age of horse power to the age of atomic power. Now that the threat to our liberty from communism is gone, and freedom is spreading throughout the world, it's time to return the government's power to the people. We can start by giving them their money back.●

IMMIGRATION—JUST THE FACTS

● Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Priscilla Labovitz had an op-ed piece in the New York Times, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD after my remarks. It deserves the attention of all of us interested in the problems of immigration.

It is fascinating reading, in addition to being important for policymaking.

The material follows:

IMMIGRATION—JUST THE FACTS

(By Priscilla Labovitz)

WASHINGTON.—Congress is considering immigration reform. Patrick Buchanan used the issue to rev up his Presidential campaign. And a few polemicists have even called for a moratorium on all immigration. The subject may be hotly debated, but ultimately the facts and figures speak for themselves.

Percentage of the United States population that white Americans think is Hispanic: 14.7.

Percentage that is Hispanic: 9.5

Percentage that white Americans think is Asian: 10.8.

Percentage that is Asian: 3.1.

Percentage that white Americans think is black: 23.8.

Percentage that is black: 11.8.

Percentage that white Americans think is white: 49.9.

Percentage that is white: 74.

Number of legal immigrants admitted in 1820 (the first year for which statistics are available): 8,385.

The number of legal immigrants in 1907: 1,285,349.

The number admitted in 1990: 1,536,483.

The number admitted in 1994 (the latest figures available): 804,416.

Percentage of decrease in legal immigration from 1993 to 1994: 9.3.

Countries that sent the most students to America in 1994: Japan (more than 65,000), South Korea (more than 38,000), China plus Taiwan (more than 36,000).

The number of United States residents who emigrate each year: 195,000.

Countries from which legal immigration decreased most since 1993: El Salvador (32 percent), Vietnam (30.6 percent), China (17.7 percent), Philippines (15.3 percent).

Percentage that employment-based legal immigration decreased from 1993 to 1994: 16.

Percentage of decrease in applications for political asylum from 1994 to 1995: 57.

State with the largest number of legal immigrants from Mexico admitted in 1994: California.

State with the largest number of legal immigrants from all foreign countries combined admitted in 1994: California.

Percentage (estimated) of all illegal immigrants who live in California: 42.6.

State where fewest legal immigrants settled in 1994: Wyoming.

Home state of Alan Simpson, the senator who authorized the principal bill to reduce immigration: Wyoming.

Countries from which most illegals in New York City emigrate: Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Italy, Poland.

Countries from which the highest number of legal immigrants on welfare in New York City emigrate: Russia, Dominican Republic.

Proportion of United States population that was foreign-born in 1990: 7.9 percent.

Proportion that was foreign-born in 1910: 16 percent.

Continent of origin of immigrant group with highest educational attainment: Africa.

Welfare programs for which illegal aliens are not eligible: Aid to Families With Dependent Children, food stamps, Medicaid, Medicare, Supplemental Security Income.

Presidential candidate who said: "I think God made all people good, but if we had to take a million immigrants in, say Zulus, next year, or Englishmen, and put them in Virginia, what group would be easier to assimilate and would cause less problems for the people of Virginia?" Patrick Buchanan.

Total number of immigrants who settled in Virginia in 1994: 15,342.

Total number of legal immigrants born in United Kingdom who settled in Virginia in 1994: 404.

Total number of Zulus, Unknown.

Sources: Census Bureau statistics, Immigration and Naturalization Service statistics, National Immigration Law Center, New York City Planning Commission, The Washington Post.●

THE TAX LIMITATION AMENDMENT

● Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, as American taxpayers are well aware,

today is Tax Day, and it is a most appropriate time to express my strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 49, the tax limitation amendment. This resolution proposes to amend the Constitution to require a two-thirds supermajority vote to increase tax rates or to impose new taxes.

It offers the American taxpayers a source of protection from a Federal Government that often sees their checkbooks as an unlimited line of credit. For too long, the Federal Government has lacked the restraint that the Founding Fathers surely envisioned, and it has consistently grabbed an increasing share of the taxpayers' money.

The American people have sent some \$14 trillion to Washington since 1980. This is an enormous amount of money.

I think that it is sufficient to run the Federal Government. I believe that most taxpayers think that it is sufficient to run the Federal Government.

However, it is apparently not enough for the big spenders in Washington. There are bills on the calendar to boost taxes ever higher. There are those still eager to grab yet more money from the taxpayers.

This amendment will stop the big spenders.

It is far too easy to raise taxes. The largest tax increase in American history—the Clinton tax bill of 1993—is a case in point. The Democrats controlled both the White House and the Congress, and, yet the Clinton budget passed the other Chamber by a mere six votes. In this Chamber, the Vice President was forced to bring out the motorcade, and he rode to the Capitol to cast a tie-breaker vote. The President, just months after his election, could not even muster a majority of the elected Senators.

The tax limitation amendment, however, would have stopped that tax bill, and, if it is adopted, it will prevent other ill-considered congressional raids on constituents' checkbooks.

Its opponents decry the supermajority requirement as "anti-democratic." However, the Constitution includes 11 supermajority provisions, and these hurdles were engineered to further safeguard important processes. Indeed, the procedures used to govern this Chamber include supermajority requirements, and I see little restraint in their use on the other side of the aisle. These supermajority requirements compel the development of a broad consensus for action. These procedures often serve this Chamber well. However, I find it impossible to believe that the taxpayers do not deserve similar protection.

It is no surprise that the tax limitation amendment is seen as a revolutionary measure in Washington. However, it is a time-tested procedure in 12 States, and one-third of all Americans live in States with supermajority tax requirements.

Maybe this amendment scares people in Washington because it is so effective. Just look at the numbers. Between 1980 and 1993, the taxpayers in States without supermajority tax limitations faced a 2 percent rise in taxes as a share of personal income. However, taxpayers in States with supermajority tax limitations enjoyed a 7 percent drop in taxes as a share of personal income.

President Clinton bragged in the 1992 campaign that he held the line on taxes in Arkansas as governor. Well, he tried to raise taxes, but Arkansas adopted a three-fourths supermajority requirement to raise most taxes in 1934, long before President Clinton was born.

The tax limitation amendment will impose some real and necessary restraint on the Congress. For too long, Washington lawmakers, unwilling to pare the scope of the Federal Government, simply embarked on pirate-style raids on their constituents' checkbooks. Consequently, the Federal tax burden on the average family has grown from 3 percent in 1948 to some 25 percent today.

Chief Justice Marshall long ago wrote that the power to tax involves the power to destroy. The power to tax is indeed an awesome power. The history of the United States includes chapters of revolution and rebellion rooted in issues of taxation.

The tax limitation amendment is a moderate response to the escalating bite of the Federal Government. It merely requires a little additional deliberation in the exercise of the power of taxation. In a democracy, I believe that we owe the people at least that.●

THE DEATH OF ROBERT MARLOWE

● Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, it is with regret that I must report the recent passing of a true leader in Georgia agriculture. Long-time Georgia Farm Bureau Director, Robert W. "Bob" Marlowe, died on March 26 in his home in Macon, GA, after a brief illness.

Mr. Marlowe was a true leader at the Farm Bureau and was a solid citizen. A native of Barrow County, GA, Bob graduated from the University of Georgia before teaching in his local school system for a number of years. After leaving teaching, Bob returned to production agriculture, working for the Cotton Producers Association as a poultry adviser and managing co-op stores. Bob worked for the Georgia Farm Bureau in Macon for 23 years and was an active member of his church and community organizations such as the Lions Club. He was also active in agriculture advocacy through his appointment on the Government's Advisory Council for Tri-State Water Issues and through his work with the State's various commodity commissions. I can attest that he was very helpful in my office's efforts in the formulation of the 1996 farm bill.

I know that Bob will be missed greatly by his family and colleagues at

Georgia Farm Bureau. Georgia agriculture and this office will surely miss the likes of Bob Marlowe and I salute him for his exemplary service to our State and the Nation.●

MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 3103

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair if H.R. 3103 has arrived from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is informed that the bill is at the desk.

Mr. SIMPSON. Therefore, I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3103) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve portability and continuity of health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets, to combat waste, fraud, and abuse in health insurance and health care delivery, to promote the use of medical savings accounts, to improve access to long-term-care services and coverage, to simplify the administration of health insurance, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I now ask for its second reading, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be read a second time following the next adjournment of the Senate.

PROVIDING FOR THE APPROVAL OF FINAL REGULATIONS THAT ARE APPLICABLE TO THE SENATE AND THE EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 242 submitted earlier in the day by Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 242) to provide for the approval of final regulations that are applicable to the Senate and the employees of the Senate, and that were issued by the Office of Compliance on January 22, 1996, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SIMPSON. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 242) was considered and agreed to.

(The text of the resolution will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

RELATING TO CERTAIN REGULATIONS REGARDING THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 51 submitted earlier by Senator WARNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) to provide for the approval of final regulations that are applicable to employing offices of the House of Representatives or the Senate, and to covered employees who are not employees of the House of Representatives or the Senate, and that were issued by the Office of Compliance on January 22, 1996, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. SIMPSON. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the resolution appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) was considered and agreed to.

(The text of the concurrent resolution will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Senate Resolution 227, the Whitewater legislation, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Senate Resolution 227, regarding the Whitewater extension.

Alfonse D'Amato, Dan Coats, P. Gramm, Bob Smith, Mike DeWine, John H. Chafee, Jim Jeffords, Frank H. Murkowski, R.F. Bennett, Spencer Abraham, Conrad Burns, Al Simpson, Bill Roth, Bill Cohen, Slade Gorton, Strom Thurmond.

Mr. SIMPSON. I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur on Wednesday, April 17, at a time to be determined by the two leaders, and that the mandatory quorum under Rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I now withdraw the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed is withdrawn.