

Senator EXON talked about joining the Republican colleagues on the balanced budget amendment. We need to do that.

The last part of the legislation that the minority leader introduced as part of the Democratic legislation is congressional coverage reform. It is important that we deal with Senate coverage. We are going to do that. That is going to be a bipartisan effort. I worked as chairman of a task force last year to report to the majority leader, and then the minority leader Senator DOLE, and I think much that we did on the bipartisan task force is going to be part of the legislation. Lobbying reform, gift ban and campaign finance reform are a part of Senator DASCHLE's legislation. I recommend it to my colleagues on this side and the other side of the aisle and say to the American public I think this is the year we are going to accomplish something through teamwork.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have been pleased to listen to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Nevada, and I am very encouraged to hear his comments. I am satisfied that there are going to be many issues we will work together on, and I believe there are going to be many opportunities for cooperation in a bipartisan way this year.

I want to commend our new Republican majority leader for scheduling as the first piece of legislation we will take up the Congressional Accountability Act. We will have bipartisan support for that effort, and I think it is appropriate that we begin this year by saying we are going to have all the Federal laws that apply to the American people—in the States of Nevada, Tennessee, Mississippi, all across the country, apply to us also. So we will begin that debate on the first full legislative day of this year, and hopefully we will be able to reach an early agreement and pass that legislation quickly—perhaps in the next 2 days, or certainly by early next week. I look forward to working with the Senator from Nevada and others. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I say to the Senator, my friend from Mississippi, through the Chair, that I congratulate him on his recent leadership position. I am glad to see that my former colleague from the House is doing well. He had good training there. I served in the House when the Senator from Mississippi was minority whip. He did a fine job there, as I am sure he will do here. I wish him the very best in this Congress.

Mr. BRADLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as if in morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President.

Just for clarification, under a previous unanimous-consent agreement, there was a time agreement, I believe, for an hour and 20 minutes on each side. What is the present status of that time? All time has expired on the minority side. How much time is remaining on the majority side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 28 minutes and 16 seconds, and the minority is out of time.

Mr. LOTT. And when all time is used or yielded back, is the next order of business a statement by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], on his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next order of business would be to resume consideration of Senate Resolution 14.

Mr. LOTT. I thank you, Mr. President.

I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BRADLEY pertaining to the introduction of legislation are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX CUT—WRONG THING TO DO

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, as the bipartisan stampede for tax cuts begins here in the 104th Congress, I would like to raise a dissenting voice. Like every other elected official, I would really like to be able to support a tax cut for middle-class Americans. In fact, it would be great to be able to support a tax cut for all Americans. That is usually a very pleasant opportunity for an elected official to vote for that kind of tax cut.

I think it is the wrong thing to do right now, when we have just begun to make headway on reducing the Federal deficit. This new tax cut fever is just the most recent example of how far we seem to be straying in the path toward economic stability. We started moving in the right direction with deficit reduction in 1993, but I think in 1994, we started to stray from the path a little. Now, there are just far too many signs that not only are we straying from the path, but that we are about to make a

complete U-turn and head back toward soaring deficits, a mounting national debt, and putting off until tomorrow the fiscal housecleaning that is so desperately needed today. Let me just tick off very quickly some of the bad signs that we are about to move in the wrong direction.

One is that the Republican Contract With America, frankly, lays out what I think is an irresponsible plan that proposes a balanced Federal budget and, at the same time, says we are going to have major tax cuts and a significant increase in military spending. This is a proposal that Nixon's economic adviser, Herbert Stein, labeled hypocritical. So that is one sign—the Republican contract.

The second sign is that some folks are also saying we should use something called dynamic scoring techniques. I think this dynamic scoring technique is a bit of fiscal hocus-pocus. Business Week described it this way:

*** as the most dangerous thing to hit Washington since politicians discovered how to print money.

Dynamic scoring would abandon the tough pay-as-you-go budget rules that we have used in the past several years to bring down the Federal deficit. So I think that is a bad idea. In fact, we have seen voodoo economics in the past. I see this as voodoo mathematics.

Just so it is clear this is not just a partisan statement by any means, there is a third sign that we are moving in the wrong direction, and that is that President Clinton himself has proposed a \$25 billion increase in spending for a military budget that, in my view, is already bloated with obsolete, cold-war-era weapons systems.

Another sign: Members of both parties in this Senate just voted to waive the budget rules for the GATT implementing legislation. There are many other merits to it, but the fact is the measure does not offset the cost of the loss of tariffs of some \$40 billion over the next 10 years. So much of the progress we made on reducing the deficit could be lost because of the failure to pay for the GATT agreement.

The same goes, finally, for the proposal, the reaction to the Kerrey-Danforth Commission. People essentially ignore the important message that all things have to be on the table. Both discretionary spending and entitlements have to be on the table. You cannot have it only defense spending, only discretionary spending, or only entitlements if we are going to attack the deficit.

But perhaps the greatest risk to our efforts on the Federal deficit is the latest effort to try to come up with these tax cuts. That frenzy of tax cuts, particularly creating the tax breaks for special interests, gave us the biggest deficit in our history, a deficit that we have just begun to cut, with considerable pain and sacrifice for Americans. I do not think our economy can sustain another round of this political self-indulgence.

Mr. President, if the Federal Reserve reacts as anticipated and pushes interest rates up again, the economy could very well go through the windshield, and right now the President's proposed tax credit for families with incomes up to \$75,000 will cost \$90 billion over 10 years, and if you throw in the tax cuts he has proposed, the bill reaches \$174 billion. The Republican proposal to give tax credits for families earning up to \$200,000 will cost, Mr. President, \$244 billion over 10 years, and altogether the Republican contract, I am told, would cost a whopping \$712 billion over the next 10 years.

So, Mr. President, I think the conventional wisdom about tax cuts is something that has to be challenged. I realize not many people are doing it at this time. What I am noticing is that my constituents can smell a rat when someone suggests that a tax cut is just what the Nation needs right now.

It was not that long ago that I had a chance, as a candidate for U.S. Senate, to oppose a middle-class tax cut in a campaign. My opponents in the general election spent a lot of time and money making sure everybody in the State knew I was against the middle-class tax cut. But the voters realized that what they would get back in lower taxes, a meaningful amount to many people, was simply not worth it because of the devastation it would cause to our Federal budget.

Let me bring it right up to today. In my office, since the President made his speech, phone calls and letters have been running about 10 to 1 in favor of reducing the deficit rather than using spending cuts to cut taxes.

For example, a gentleman from Birnamwood, WI, wrote to me and said:

By all means, cut Government spending but use that savings to eliminate the deficit and pay down the debt that threatens to overwhelm us.

He said that is the only responsible thing to do.

A woman from Cornucopia, WI, the most northern point in Wisconsin, wrote:

I can't figure out why this is happening, this race to cut taxes, when the majority of people, according to all I have seen, heard, and read, don't care.

She says:

We wanted the deficit cut and we wanted our money spent more wisely.

A gentleman from Waupaca, a very Republican town in Wisconsin, wrote this to me. He said recently:

I want you to know that I strongly support your position against the proposed tax cuts. With an income of \$50,000, I guess I would benefit from most of the tax cut plans, but I feel the benefit would be short lived and would be clearly detrimental to the country. I hope that you will continue to oppose these tax-cut plans that are clearly nothing more than attempts to buy votes.

My office, Mr. President, has received hundreds of calls and letters that are similar to these. And I think that view is shared not just in Wisconsin. A USA Today-CNN poll published on December 20, 1994, found that 70 per-

cent of those polled said if Congress is able to cut spending, then reducing the deficit—reducing the deficit—is a higher priority than just giving out tax cuts.

So, Mr. President, to conclude, it is a little frustrating to hear constituents who could certainly use the money urge Congress to make deficit reduction a higher priority than tax cuts and then see this institution rush to see who can give the bigger tax cut. I hope the media and the political commentators will look closely at the campaign rhetoric of those who just recently pledged to fight to reduce the Federal deficit and compare that rhetoric to today's eagerness to join the bandwagon on tax cuts.

I thank the Chair, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PASSAGE OF A PROCOMPETITIVE, DEREGULATORY TELECOMMUNICATIONS BILL, THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPETITION AND DEREGULATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I think one of the major duties of the new Congress will be to pass a major telecommunications reform bill—a new procompetitive, deregulatory bill. I know there are many views in this body on national telecommunications policy. The Republican controlled 104th Congress has a truly historic opportunity to pass comprehensive telecommunications reform legislation.

Last year, the Congress almost passed a bill. The House of Representatives passed a bill by an overwhelming vote. The Senate Commerce Committee passed out a bill 18 to 2 that became entangled here on the Senate floor.

Why should we pass a telecommunications bill in 1995? The reason is that the country needs a roadmap for the next century in telecommunications as we continue to move forward in the Information Age. We need to have more competition and more deregulation. Past efforts to craft telecommunications legislation have been bogged down by overly regulatory approaches. A fresh look at the issues, grounded in procompetitive, deregulatory principles, is the best way to meet our common policy objectives.

We need to have all telecommunications markets open to competition. We need to have the cable companies competing in the telephone business and telephone companies providing cable television service. We need to have the long-distance companies competing in local telephone markets, and vice versa. We no longer should have

this regulatory apartheid scheme of having little patches or enclaves of competition for only one group of people or companies.

Telecommunications policy in America, under the 1934 Communications Act, has long been based on the now faulty premise that information transmitted over wires could easily be distinguished from information transmitted over the air. Different regulatory regimes were erected around different information media. That is what I refer to as the regulatory apartheid scheme.

This is an extremely complex and difficult area. It is easier said than done. The telecommunications field is a unique area of regulation in that one frequently has to use someone else's coaxial cable to get to a home or someone else's fiber optic cable or someone else's copper cable or copper wire to get one's product delivered. Nonetheless, I am quite confident we can work out many of those problems through the development of opening requirements in terms of unbundling, in terms of interconnection, in terms of number portability, in terms of resale and so forth.

It is my strongest personal conviction that one of the great accomplishments, on a bipartisan basis, of this 104th Congress will be the passage of a new major telecommunications reform bill.

I have been meeting and speaking with numerous CEO's from around the country in the telecommunications and information technology industries. I am meeting with consumers. I am talking with my fellow Republican and Democratic colleagues, both in the House and the Senate. I have spoken on a number of occasions with Vice President GORE about this most important topic. We must work together on a bipartisan basis to achieve this laudable goal.

Much of the recent discussion around the country has been about the Contract With America and some of the partisanship that might surround that debate. I think the contract is a very healthy thing and I will vote for it. But we will also have a substantial piece of substantive legislation in the Commerce Committee this year—a new procompetitive, deregulatory telecommunications bill—the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995. As the incoming chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee this year I have announced that this will be the Commerce Committee's top priority. I ask my colleagues to look at some of the materials we will send to your offices on this bill. It is very important that we reach consensus on this critically important issue and pass a new telecommunications bill.

My new telecommunications bill will rapidly accelerate private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies and services to all Americans by open-