

NF and neurofibromatosis research is already providing breakthroughs in understanding more about cancer. And we all know how to pronounce that.

I want to thank you for having me here, for joining me in an effort to raise awareness of a disease that is in dire need of acknowledgement, community education, and extensive research if we are going to find a cure.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

[Small girl hands her flowers.]●

SENATE QUARTERLY MAIL COSTS

● Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in accordance with section 318 of Public Law 101-520 as amended by Public Law 103-283, I am submitting the frank mail allocations made to each Senator from the appropriation for official mail expenses and a summary tabulation of Senate mass mail costs for the second quarter of fiscal year 1996 to be printed in the RECORD. The second quarter of fiscal year 1996 covers the period of January 1, 1996, through March 31, 1996. The official mail allocations are available for frank mail costs, as stipulated in Public Law 104-53, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1996.

The material follows:

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING MAR. 31, 1996

Senators	Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita	Fiscal year 1996 official mail allocation
Abraham	705	0.00007	\$203.74	0.00002	\$160.875
Akaka	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	48.447
Ashcroft	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	109.629
Baucus	99,100	0.12027	23,260.70	0.02823	46,822
Bennett	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	56.493
Biden	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	44.754
Bingaman	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	56.404
Bond	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	109.629
Boxer	1,500	0.00005	425.49	0.00001	433.718
Bradley	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	139.706
Breaux	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	92.701
Brown	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	86.750
Bryan	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	56.208
Bumpers	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	69.809
Burns	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	46.822
Byrd	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	59.003
Campbell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	86.750
Chafee	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	48.698
Coats	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	112.682
Cochran	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	69.473
Cohen	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	52.134
Conrad	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	43.403
Coverdell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	131.465
Craig	34,783	0.03260	8,667.83	0.00812	49.706
D'Amato	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	262.927
Daschle	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	44.228
DeWine	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	186.314
Dodd	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	80.388
Dole	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	70.459
Domeneici	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	56.404
Dorgan	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	43.403
Exon	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	57.167
Faircloth	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	134.344
Feingold	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	102.412
Feinstein	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	433.718
Ford	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	86.009
Frist	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	106.658
Glenn	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	186.314
Gorton	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	109.059
Graham	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	259.426
Gramm	3,300	0.00019	752.30	0.00004	281.361
Grassley	8,923	0.00199	7,335.17	0.00164	96.024
Gregg	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	73.403
Harkin	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	50.569
Hatch	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	73.403
Hatfield	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	56.493
Hefflin	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	89.144
Helms	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	134.344
Hollings	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	85.277
Hutchison	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	281.361
Inhofe	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	82.695
Inouye	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	48.447
Jeffords	12,700	0.02228	2,591.76	0.00455	42.858
Johnston	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	92.701
Kassebaum	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	70.459
Kempthorne	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	49.706

SENATE QUARTERLY MASS MAIL VOLUMES AND COSTS FOR THE QUARTER ENDING MAR. 31, 1996—Continued

Senators	Total pieces	Pieces per capita	Total cost	Cost per capita	Fiscal year 1996 official mail allocation
Kennedy	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	117.964
Kerrey	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	57.167
Kerry	931	0.00016	247.38	0.00004	117.964
Kohl	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	102.412
Kyl	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	93.047
Lautenberg	783	0.00010	678.21	0.00009	139.706
Leahy	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	42.858
Levin	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	160.875
Lieberman	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	80.388
Lott	342,000	1.3083	59,962.12	0.02294	69.473
Lugar	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	112.682
Mack	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	259.426
McCain	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	93.047
McConnell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	86.009
Mikulski	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	101.272
Moseley-Braun	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	184.773
Moynihan	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	262.927
Murkowski	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	42.565
Murray	110,600	0.02153	22,048.97	0.00429	109.059
Nickles	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	82.695
Nunn	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	131.465
Pell	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	48.698
Pressler	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	44.228
Pryor	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	69.809
Reid	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	56.208
Robb	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	121.897
Rockefeller	132,152	0.07293	27,775.63	0.01533	59.003
Roth	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	44.754
Santorum	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	199.085
Sarbanes	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	101.272
Shelby	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	89.144
Simon	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	184.773
Simpson	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	41.633
Smith	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	50.569
Snowe	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	52.134
Specter	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	199.085
Stevens	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	42.565
Thomas	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	41.633
Thompson	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	106.658
Thurmond	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	85.277
Warner	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	121.897
Wellstone	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	96.024
Wyden	0	0.00000	0.00	0.00000	52.135

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for the amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 4019

Mr. DOMENICI. On behalf of Senators DOLE, HATCH, and HELMS, I submit an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration. I guess I need consent. I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for Mr. DOLE, for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. HELMS, proposes an amendment numbered 4019.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

The Senate finds that:

Drugs use is devastating to the nation, particularly among juveniles, and has led juveniles to become involved in interstate gangs and to participate in violent crime;

Drug use has experienced a dramatic resurgence among our youth;

The number of youths aged 12-17 using marijuana has increased from 1.6 million in 1992 to 2.9 million in 1994, and the category of "recent marijuana use" increased a staggering 200% among 14 to 15-year-olds over the same period.

The Senate finds that:

Since 1992, there has been a 52% jump in the number of high school seniors using drugs on a monthly basis, even as worrisome declines are noted in peer disapproval of drug use;

1 in 3 high school students uses marijuana;

12 to 17-year-olds who use marijuana are 85% more likely to graduate to cocaine than those who abstain from marijuana;

Juveniles who reach 21 without ever having used drugs almost never try them later in life;

The latest results from the Drug Abuse Warning Network show that marijuana-related episodes jumped 39% and are running at 155% above the 1990 level, and that methamphetamine cases have risen 256% over the 1991 level;

Between February 1993 and February 1995 the retail price of a gram of cocaine fell from \$172 to \$137, and that of a gram of heroin also fell from \$2,032 to \$1,278;

It has been reported that the Department of Justice, through the United States Attorney for the Southern District of California, has adopted a policy of allowing certain foreign drug smugglers to avoid prosecution altogether by being released to Mexico;

It has been reported that in the past year approximately 2,300 suspected narcotics traffickers were taken into custody for bringing illegal drugs across the border, but approximately one in four were returned to their country of origin without being prosecuted;

It has been reported that the U.S. Customs Service is operating under guidelines limiting any prosecution in marijuana cases to cases involving 125 pounds of marijuana or more;

It has been reported that suspects possessing as much as 32 pounds of methamphetamine and 37,000 Quaalude tablets, were not prosecuted but were, instead, allowed to return to their countries of origin after their drugs and vehicles were confiscated;

It has been reported that after a seizure of 158 pounds of cocaine, one defendant was cited and released because there was no room at the federal jail and charges against her were dropped;

It has been reported that some smugglers have been caught two or more times—even in the same week—yet still were not prosecuted;

The number of defendants prosecuted for violations of the federal drug laws has dropped from 25,033 in 1992 to 22,926 in 1995;

The efforts of law enforcement officers deployed against drug smugglers are severely undermined by insufficiently vigorous prosecution policies of federal prosecutors;

This Congress has increased the funding of the Federal Bureau of Prisons by 11.7% over the 1995 appropriations level;

This Congress has increased the funding of the Immigration and Naturalization Service by 23.5% over the 1995 appropriations level;

It is the Sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that the Attorney General promptly

should investigate this matter and report, within 30 days, to the Chair of the Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary.

That the Attorney General should change the policy of the United States Attorney for the Southern District of California in order to ensure that cases involving the smuggling of drugs into the United States are vigorously prosecuted; and

That the Attorney General should direct all United States Attorneys vigorously to prosecute persons involved in the importation of illegal drugs into the United States.

Mr. DOMENICI. This amendment, Mr. President, is a sense of the Senate that says funding in the resolution assumes that the Attorney General should conduct an investigation promptly into a number of areas and report to them. If the reports that have been made are correct about the administration's prosecution of drug smugglers, they are disturbing. This asks for certain reports. I have nothing further on the amendment.

Now, if Senator FEINGOLD can proceed, we will follow the unanimous consent request.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

Mr. President, first, I very much thank the chairman and ranking member for their courtesy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside temporarily so I may offer an amendment.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

AMENDMENT NO. 3969

(Purpose: To eliminate the tax cut)

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 3969, and I call it up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], for himself, Mr. SIMON, Mr. BUMPERS, and Mr. ROBB proposes an amendment numbered 3969.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 5, increase the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 7, increase the amount by \$24,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 8, increase the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$16,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$24,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$16,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, decrease the amount by \$24,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by \$16,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by \$24,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by \$16,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by \$15,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by \$20,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by \$24,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 16, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 17, decrease the amount by \$23,000,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by \$16,000,000,000.

On page 51, beginning with line 6 strike all through line 17.

On page 55, beginning with line 18 strike all through page 56, line 20.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. President.

After the debate of the past year, a casual observer might believe that we have finally achieved a broad political consensus that we must balance the budget. Republicans and Democrats and bipartisan groups have all offered plans to balance the budget over the next 6 years. The President has submitted a budget that reaches balance in 6 years, and 5 years if you use the assumptions and numbers of the OMB. This budget resolution provides for a balanced budget by 2002, as do several alternatives that we have been debating in the process of looking at that budget resolution.

Mr. President, one might think that it is only a matter of moving ahead with these various plans until a proposal that can be enacted simply evolves from the political process. Mr. President, the balanced budget veneer of many of these proposals and of this budget resolution in particular obscures a flaw that will make it difficult and maybe impossible to eliminate the deficit and reach balance despite this apparent consensus.

Mr. President, that flaw is the massive tax cut that has been proposed and is still being proposed.

Let me quickly add that this problem is certainly not unique to the budget resolution before us. The plan that was discussed extensively tonight, the Chafee-Breaux plan, has this defect, and to a lesser extent, the President's plan has this flaw as well.

In fact, of course, I was pleased to hear all the bipartisan cooperation on the Chafee-Breaux plan, but as the distinguished ranking member has pointed out just a few moments ago, the money that is raised from the changes in the Consumer Price Index, in the CPI, are not under the Chafee-Breaux plan going to be used to reduce the deficit. They are going to be used to fund a tax cut. That is not pleasant, but it is the cold, hard fact. In their plan, the Chafee-Breaux plan, there is \$126 billion in changes in the CPI, and lo and behold, \$130 billion in tax cuts. It is almost a dollar-for-dollar transfer from CPI to tax cuts. It is not a dollar-for-dollar transfer from CPI to deficit reduction.

So it is not being used for deficit reduction. As the distinguished ranking member points out, those funds from the CPI are not even being used for purposes of bolstering the Social Security trust fund. These are two purposes that I think rank much higher than a tax cut at this time.

So the question is whether this flaw of including a tax cut is a fatal flaw. It is debatable. But I think it may well be a fatal flaw of the plans before us.

I think these tax cuts being included are certainly irresponsible budgeting. It is a risk not worth taking when we have the central and critical goal being to actually eliminate the Federal deficit over the very few next years.

Mr. President, I have opposed major tax cut plans of both parties for some time now. I was the first Member of either body to do so. I can attest that it is not very much fun to oppose tax cuts or to oppose a President of your own party on such an issue.

I am proud to say, though, we have had some good company. Three of the Senate's most ardent champions of deficit reduction, the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. BUMPERS, the Senator from Virginia, Mr. ROBB, and my neighbor and good friend, the Senator from Illinois, Mr. SIMON, have consistently opposed these reckless tax cuts. I am pleased that they are cosponsors of the amendment that I have just offered.

I am also very pleased, Mr. President, to tell you that we have the support for this amendment of the Concord Coalition, which does believe that tax cuts are not the top priority but that deficit reduction is.

Mr. President, in many ways the concerns of those of us who have fought these fiscally irresponsible tax cuts have been realized. The initial call for major tax cuts in the Contract With America, followed by the President's own proposals, has in fact, as we feared, led to a bidding war on tax cuts. We have too easily moved away from the deficit reduction track. We are still consumed with enacting tax cuts no matter what cost that has for the integrity of the budget process.

Mr. President, every time you turn around, we are bumping into another proposal for some other kind of tax cut, whether well disguised or not.

They come in all shapes and sizes. Some come clothed as tax reform. The so-called flat tax plans we saw offered during the Presidential primaries were really nothing more than plans to cut certain taxes. You did not see anyone calling for a flat tax that raised taxes for anyone. All the plans that were put forward touted tax cuts. In fact, the debate on the flat tax really amounted to which flat tax plan cuts taxes the most.

The Wall Street Journal recently reported that a trendier tax cut plan is a 15 percent across-the-board cut in income tax rates, phased in over 3 years. I am sure we will be hearing a lot more about that before the summer is out. Let me add to this display of a trend on tax cuts, especially in recent weeks.

We have just spent 2 weeks debating on and off the issue of a 4.3-cent gas tax cut, and the other body has sent us a \$1.7 billion special adoption tax credit and is working on another \$7 billion tax cut for small businesses. This is beginning to look, Mr. President, like a stampede for tax cuts. As I said, unfortunately, even the bipartisan budget alternative includes major tax cuts.

Mr. President, let me say again, and I know you have been a very valued participant in this process. I have enormous respect for those who participated in putting together the bipartisan plan. I think a majority of that group is committed to a balanced budget plan, and I think they would have supported the plan without including the tax cuts. I regret the views of a few in the group who actually prevailed on

the tax cut issue. Rather than broadening the appeal for the plan, as I think some of the group hoped the tax cuts undermined the long term fiscal and political integrity of the budget plan, and I believe it cost the plan some significant support both within the Congress and among the American people who know very well you can only spend a dollar once—either for tax cuts or you can spend it to balance the budget—but you cannot spend it for both.

Mr. President, even discounting the short-term effect of election-year politics, we have again really strayed from the course of reducing the deficit. For those whose highest economic priority is a balanced budget, our worst fears may be realized. A tax cut bidding war still dominates the policy debate. Tax cuts, tax cuts—not the need to balance the budget—are the driving force behind many of the policy decisions in this resolution.

Mr. President, those who doubt this need only look to the highly unusual, almost unprecedented, unprecedented special tax cut reconciliation measure envisioned in this resolution. In this “bucket brigade” construction of three successive reconciliation bills, it is the tax cut legislation that is the end game. That is the end goal of this technique.

I am told that the parliamentary skids have been greased for that tax cut reconciliation bill and that there may have been some precedent for it in the past. Nevertheless, it is, at best, ironic and, at worst, offensive to grant a tax cut bill the special procedures

normally reserved for legislation to reduce the deficit.

Mr. President, let me just close by suggesting this vote is more than just a good vote for the Concord Coalition scorecard, though it certainly is that. It is a vote against this insane tax cut bidding war. It is a vote to get us back on track, to reducing the deficit and balancing the budget. Mr. President, I believe it is a vote for a sensible and sound budgeting process.

Mr. President, I urge the body to consider this alternative. If you take a look at the plan offered by the bipartisan group, all you have to do is eliminate the tax cuts and the whole issue of the CPI would be also eliminated and you would have a balanced budget. It is as simple as that.

I hope as the negotiations and discussions continue people realize we have an even simpler solution before us, and that is to forego the tax cuts, balance the budget first, and then I think all of us will be eager to find the opportunity to reduce taxes for all Americans.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 9 a.m., Tuesday, May 21, 1996.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:23 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, May 21, 1996, at 9 a.m.