

they would have extended from Manhattan's city hall to the city of White Plains more than 30 miles away. On that street, there would have been a robbery every 165 yards and a murder every half mile. And in Brooklyn, 1 out of every 10 people got food from public storehouses.

These pathologies met their match through society's intermediary, non-governmental, organizations. Their warm-hearted and hard-headed approaches helped save women and children and men. As the historian Marvin Olasky notes, "The solutions these reforms came up with forestalled an epidemic of illegitimacy and saved thousands of children from misery."

I believe that as we confront our own social pathologies, we must, we must do it the same way—with new ideas for the 1990's that were the standard fare of the 1890's. We must meet our challenges with a greater role for States and a greater role for intermediary organizations—both larger ones like the Salvation Army and the Goodwill and smaller ones like Best Friends and the Sunshine Mission.

So while the CIVIC Act begins the process of moving welfare from Washington to the States, it also begins the vital task of reinvigorating our intermediary organizations—organizations which can help meet people's deepest needs, organizations that we know will help solve our welfare problems.

The change that we want to see will not occur overnight. Neither will it come without hard work and thorough debate. The end of colonialism was not an easy process either. For independence means risk, the sacrifice of security. Economic mobility means work, hard work. But no nation and no people who have ever tasted the sweet fruits of freedom has called for the return of its colonial rulers.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. COATS, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. KYL, Mr. COHEN and Mr. LAUTENBERG):

S. 847. A bill to terminate the agricultural price support and production adjustment programs for sugar, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

#### AGRICULTURAL PRICE SUPPORT LEGISLATION

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise today with Senators REID, BRADLEY, COATS, COHEN, LAUTENBERG, and KYL to announce the introduction of legislation to repeal the sugar program. This legislation will eliminate the U.S. Department of Agriculture's [USDA] price support, subsidized loans, producer assessments, and marketing allotments for sugar.

The sugar program is big government at its worst. At a time when the American people are demanding that the Federal Government assume a more limited role in society, this program goes in the opposite direction. Instead of leaving the sugar industry to mar-

ket forces, the USDA wields the heavy hand of government intervention.

Why should Congress repeal the sugar program? That is a good question, and I will give you but a few examples:

It has been estimated by the General Accounting Office [GAO] that the program costs consumers and sweetener users an average of \$1.4 billion annually. The producers who sell the most sugar reap the biggest benefit. Right now, the world sugar price is half that of the United States.

The sugar program stifles competition. In 1991, the GAO estimated that 42 percent of the program's benefits went to only 1 percent of the growers. The 33 largest sugar plantations receive over \$1 million each year.

The U.S. has generally supported free and fair trade. How can we justify artificially inflating the price of a domestic commodity just to enrich and protect a particular industry? This legislation would not impact existing rules on tariffs and quotas. Therefore, there would be no dumping of foreign sugar into the U.S. market.

Like most Americans, I strongly support reducing the Federal budget deficit. Due to import tariffs and a 1.1 cents-per-pound tax on producers, the sugar program operates a no-net-cost to the Federal budget. While this is true, the program costs the American taxpayers \$1.4 billion. The sugar program is a regressive tax, which imposes a much greater burden on those who spend a great deal on consumption. Under the present system, the benefit of reducing the Federal budget deficit is far outweighed by the high cost to the American consumer.

One of the greatest environmental crises facing the State of Florida is the degradation of the Everglades. The Everglades is a national treasure, which is threatened by phosphate and pesticide runoff. The sugar program's continued high price supports have for years stimulated overproduction in the Everglades agricultural area. In effect, the Federal Government has encouraged the destruction of the Everglades through heavy-handed government intervention and misguided attempts to regulate the economy.

The repeal of the sugar program would have a minimal, if any, impact on jobs in the sugar industry. The American sugar industry, the pro-sugar lobby, has estimated a job loss of 420,000. This is factually and statistically untrue. The Census Bureau and the USDA have estimated that the sugar industry only accounts for 46,000 jobs. In fact, even with the program, sugar industry jobs fell by 18 percent between 1982 and 1992. It is believed by many economists that any job losses in the sugar industry would be offset by gains realized in the sweetener industry.

Mr. President, the time for wasteful and inefficient commodity programs

like the sugar program has come to an end. I hope the Senate will move quickly to pass this legislation and send a message to the relatively few that benefit from this program that the American consumer deserves a better deal.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today to join Senator GREGG and Senator REID to introduce legislation to eliminate the sugar program. The Federal Government has been meddling in the sugar market for over 200 years, and I believe the time has come to end what has become a wasteful practice.

The supporters of the sugar program argue that the system operates at no cost to the Federal Government, and therefore there is no need to eliminate this harmless program. Technically speaking this assertion is true; the Federal Government does not send checks to sugar growers. But the federal government does artificially raise the price of sugar by limiting imports, and, as a result, American consumers pay an additional \$1.4 billion each year for sweetened products, according to the Government Accounting Office. So while Americans may not pay for this program through higher taxes, they do pay for it every time they buy a soda, or a candy bar, or anything else which contains sugar or other sweeteners.

The supporters of the sugar program argue that this program is vital to the livelihoods of family farms. Unfortunately this program, like many other agricultural subsidies, was designed to help family farms, but actually tends to support big businesses. Seventeen of the over 1,700 sugarcane farms received roughly 58 percent of the benefits of this program in 1991. One family in Florida receives an estimated \$65 million a year as a result of the artificially high prices. Mr. President, this certainly does not fall within my definition of a "family" farm.

Finally, the supporters of the sugar program argue that the elimination of this program will kill the domestic sugar industry. While there will likely be some changes to the industry if this program is eliminated, I take issue with the argument that there is no life after subsidies. During World War II, a price support system was established for potatoes. Several years later Congress abolished the program. But the potato industry remains vibrant in the United States to this day. From Maine to California, farmers continue to grow potatoes without the benefit of a subsidy they once enjoyed.

Mr. President, the time has come to end the sugar program. Simply stated, its benefits go primarily to a select few, while its costs are borne by every consumer in America. Because food accounts for a higher share of the household budget of low-income families, these higher costs are especially regressive. For the sake of these families, I hope the Senate will pass this important legislation.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 230

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY] was added as a cosponsor

of S. 230, a bill to prohibit United States assistance to countries that prohibit or restrict the transport or delivery of United States humanitarian assistance.

S. 256

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to establish procedures for determining the status of certain missing members of the Armed Forces and certain civilians, and for other purposes.

S. 456

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 456, a bill to improve and strengthen the child support collection system, and for other purposes.

S. 630

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 630, a bill to impose comprehensive economic sanctions against Iran.

S. 647

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 647, a bill to amend section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 to require phasing-in of certain amendments of or revisions to land and resource management plans, and for other purposes.

S. 770

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. ASHCROFT] were added as cosponsors of S. 770, a bill to provide for the relocation of the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, and for other purposes.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to improve the provision of supplemental security income benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 833

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 833, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of semiconductor manufacturing equipment.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 34

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 34, a joint resolution prohibiting funds for diplomatic relations and most favored nation trading status with the Socialist Republic of Vietnam unless the President certifies to Congress that Vi-

etnamese officials are being fully cooperative and forthcoming with efforts to account for the 2,205 Americans still missing and otherwise unaccounted for from the Vietnam War, as determined on the basis of all information available to the United States Government, and for other purposes.

### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

#### THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

##### BRADLEY (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1122

Mr. BRADLEY (for himself, Mr. BREAUX, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. GLENN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002; as follows:

On page 74, strike lines 12 through 24 and insert the following: "budget, the appropriate budgetary allocations, aggregates, and levels shall be revised to reflect \$16,900,000,000 in budget authority and outlays of the additional deficit reduction achieved as calculated under subsection (c) for legislation that restores the full current law earned income tax credit under section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

"(b) REVISED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit to the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, budgetary aggregates, and levels under this resolution, revised by an amount that does not exceed the additional deficit reduction specified under subsection (d)."

##### GRAMM (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1123

Mr. GRAMM (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. HELMS, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. KYL, Mr. LOTT, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SMITH) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13), supra; as follows:

Strike all after the word "Section" on page 1, line 3 through page 79, line 15 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

#### 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996.

#### TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 2. Recommended levels and amounts.  
Sec. 3. Debt increase.  
Sec. 4. Social Security.  
Sec. 5. Major functional categories.  
Sec. 6. Reconciliation.

#### TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

Sec. 201. Discretionary spending limits.  
Sec. 202. Extension of pay-as-you-go point of order.  
Sec. 203. Tax reserve fund in the Senate.  
Sec. 204. Scoring of emergency legislation.  
Sec. 205. Budget surplus allowance.  
Sec. 206. Sale of Government assets.  
Sec. 207. Credit reform and guaranteed student loans.  
Sec. 208. Extension of Budget Act 60-vote enforcement through 2002.  
Sec. 209. Repeal of IRS allowance.  
Sec. 210. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

#### TITLE III—SENSE OF THE CONGRESS AND THE SENATE

Sec. 301. Restructuring Government and program terminations.  
Sec. 302. Sense of the Senate regarding returning programs to the States.  
Sec. 303. Commercialization of Federal activities.  
Sec. 304. Nonpartisan Advisory Commission on the CPI.  
Sec. 305. Sense of the Congress on a uniform accounting system in the Federal Government.

#### TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—(A) For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(i) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,051,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1997: \$1,063,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1998: \$1,112,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,165,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,220,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,285,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,353,900,000,000.

(ii) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$8,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1997: —\$19,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1998: —\$22,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: —\$21,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: —\$25,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: —\$28,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: —\$31,100,000,000.

(iii) The amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$103,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1997: \$109,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1998: \$114,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$120,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$126,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$133,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$140,400,000,000.

(B) For purposes of section 710 of the Social Security Act (excluding the receipts and disbursements of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund)—

(i) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1996: \$947,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1997: \$918,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1998: \$997,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1999: \$1,045,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2000: \$1,093,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2001: \$1,152,100,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,213,500,000,000.

(ii) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows: