and for their families. At a time when we must moderate the growth of entitlement programs, this sort of change, I believe, is absolutely essential.

I know that many of us in America do not think we can afford to save. My response is that we have no real choice. Savings must become a greater priority in every household budget, just as it must in the Federal budget by lowering the deficit. It is Government's responsibility to help our citizens by providing a tax code that does not penalize them when they try to do what is best for their future and for their children's future.

Mr. President, I believe the U.S.A. tax offers a superior path to fundamental tax reform. Its savings deduction is understandable and equitable. Those who take the time to acquaint themselves with our legislation—which we tried to write in plain English in the hope that Americans will read it—will also see how the U.S.A. tax would simplify both the business and individual tax; encourage American exports by offering a tax rebate on sales or exports from this country; it would include vital deductions for education, charitable giving and retain the home mortgage interest deduction; and it would provide taxpayers and businesses with a credit for the payroll tax they must pay, which is enormously important to our small business community and, most of all, to our average working people.

Ultimately, however, neither Senator DOMENICI nor I see ourselves in some sort of fundamental win-or-lose conflict with advocates of the flat tax or a national sales tax. Fundamental tax reform must be a collaborative process. There are tremendous forces in favor of keeping the Tax Code as it is. They are already well along in their job of scuttling change. We assist these defendants of the status quo when we focus only on our differences and neglect what we have in common.

For all the conferences, column inches, research reports, and speeches devoted to fundamental tax reform over the last year or so, the truth of it is that those of us who want fundamental change stand at the beginning of a very long road. We must begin to travel that road together. We have to speak with the American people regarding what is really at stake in fundamental reform. We must solicit their views rather than stir up their passions. We must challenge our critics to help improve our work, and when we offer proposals for reform, we must employ similar revenue estimates and provide a comparable degree of detail about what we wish to do. We must begin to make apples-to-apples comparisons if people are going to be able to understand the debate and participate in it. Then and only then can the people of America decide, and the people will have to decide in the long run.

As we enter the Presidential election cycle, it is evident that the American people are restive and uncertain about our collective future. They wonder about which direction our country should take.

At another time of great national uncertainty, Abraham Lincoln offered some very practical advice. Quoting him, ''If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could then better judge what to do and how to do it.''

Those of us who believe that fundamental changes in the Tax Code are one important element, a very important element, in getting the country's house in order should heed Lincoln's advice. Let us work together to encourage a public understanding of where we are economically and how our current Tax Code constrains us and prevents us from fulfilling the American dream of a better life for all of our citizens. If we can do that, we may safely leave it to the public to judge what to do and how to do it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, before I proceed with my remarks, let me just offer my thanks and appreciation to my dear friend and colleague from Georgia for the statement he has made, for the leadership he has given on this issue. He is known best, I suppose, for the extraordinary leadership he has given on matters of national security now for more than two decades in the Senate, but he has been a courageous leader in other areas, including this one of tax reform. It reminds us about why we will miss him next year and why I hope he will continue to push us in the direction of reform from the private sector. I thank my friend for his superb words.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Senator.

COMMERCE SECRETARY RONALD H. BROWN

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, as we return to session today, it is spring in Washington. The blossoms are out. It is a beautiful time, and yet I am sure the experience I had in returning with my family yesterday was comparable with others coming back to Washington; it brought home the terrible tragedy that occurred while we were away, that of the plane going down in Croatia carrying Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown and so many others, including two corporate executives from Connecticut, Claudio Elia and Bob Donovan. And coming back here to this city, where many of us came to know Secretary Brown, filled me with a sadness and a sense of loss yesterday and today.

I wanted to come to the floor and share with my colleagues just a few thoughts about Ron Brown. I hope someday in the not too distant future to be able to offer to my colleagues some comments, if they did not have the opportunity to know them, about Bob Donovan and Claudio Elia, whose service to our country was extraordinary.

Today, however, I wanted to speak about Ron Brown. I am proud that I had the chance to work with Ron Brown during his all too short tenure at the Commerce Department. I tremendously enjoyed working with Ron Brown in his various capacities as a private attorney, as a leading Democratic activist, as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, and most closely and I think most creatively in this last period of years as Secretary of Commerce. I am honored that I can call him a friend. We are all going to miss him—it's painful to think that my staff and I won't have the sheer fun of working with him again—and the country will miss him even more. I have the greatest respect for him, as have so many others, as a wonderful, warm human being and as a leader who had a clear-eyed vision of how to make our people and our country better.

This is a case which is so often true where you interconnect with a person in a professional capacity, but you never think of a man in the prime of life not being here. In a way, I suppose it is death that makes you appreciate even more the great skills and the enormous service that this individual, Ron Brown, displayed for our benefit.

Ron Brown, it seemed to me, truly loved the job he had at Commerce. He always managed to fit well, wherever he was, and this job really did fit him like a glove, from the moment he took it. He had an early understanding that the mission of the Department of Commerce was to promote economic growth, that is job creation. He understood from his own experience the wide-open nature of our market system and that it was the unique way America had for creating opportunity for its citizens—the market, upward mobility.

Ron Brown never saw the business community as an enemy, he saw it as an ally in expanding opportunity, and he threw himself into this job with a single-mindedness and joyous commitment to forcing the system, the economic system, to deliver for all Americans.

Against this background, I want to talk about two areas of his time at Commerce that I think was so critically important. I believe that they were truly extraordinary, and set a new performance standard for our government's relationship with the private sector.

EXPORTS

The first has been written about extensively in the last days since his death, and even some over the preceding three years: The incredible export promotion operation he put together at Commerce. But I do not think that enough has been said about why that was so important.

Until the mid-1970's, the U.S. economy was on top of the world, dominating it. While our economic rivals, led

particularly by Japan, were figuring out that selling advanced manufactured goods for export was the key to economic growth and raising the living standards of people back home, our Government in a way was coasting on our success. We were not paying attention to that message.

Other countries built export promotion machines—and they were machines—through the most intimate and comprehensive alliances between business and government, the private sector and the public sector. But the truth is that our Government paid too little attention to that need to build those alliances. American businesses—and I would hear this repeatedly from business executives in Connecticut—would go abroad to compete, and they would see what the business-government alliances of our competitors were doing for export promotion.

I remember being told a story by the executive of one of the companies in Connecticut, telling me that they were competing against two other companies, one from Asia and one from Europe, for a very large job in a foreign country. They went over there to participate in simultaneous bidding among the three business competitors. This company from Connecticut, a big company, had its executives and lawyers in one room. But in the other two rooms, the executives and representatives of the Asian company and of the European company were teamed up with a representative of the Asian government and of the European government, respectively. In that case, the Connecticut company did not get the contract. We lost some opportunity and jobs.

The State Department, I am afraid, continued to treat American business as if it had to be held at arm's length. Too many administrations went along with that distant attitude. Preoccupied with the end of the cold war and retaining the political alliances required for it, the State Department embraced a traditional and outmoded notion of what foreign policy was all about, what mattered to people here at home. Too often they missed what was happening in the world economy and the American economy which has been a grave error. They made export promotion a low priority, while our rivals made it the top priority. The State Department treated U.S. business like pariahs, it was ''Upstairs-Downstairs''—trade was beneath our diplomatic priorities.

This hasn't ended. A Business Week editorial this week notes that, ''The U.S. foreign policy and security elite believe security should be divorced from economic issues. Some go so far as to suggest that providing security is a perk of global power.'' It concludes, ''We don't. American workers can't be expected to suffer economically to protect [other nations] from one another.'' Ron Brown shared this view, and he was the new momentum for bringing our economy into foreign relations. The President was his staunch ally on this effort, and helped him force change in this area.

Ron Brown, working together with President Clinton, understood that they had to create a central position in our foreign policy for our economic policy. Export promotion had to be at the core of our international outreach; that it was not a bad thing, but in fact it was a very good thing, that if a President visited a foreign country with the Secretary of Commerce and one of the items they discussed with the leadership of that foreign country was buying American goods.

I come from a very export-oriented State. In fact, it has the highest level of exports per capita of any State in the country. We know that exports create jobs, high-paying manufacturing jobs, and that each manufacturing job has an economic multiplier effect, creating a chain of goods and services behind it, longer by far than most other types of jobs.

The sad fact is that we have been disinvesting in manufacturing since the mid-1970's, even though we need those kinds of jobs more than ever to develop a strong economy and a better standard of living for our people which will continue America as the land of opportunity. Ron Brown, as Secretary of Commerce, understood this from the beginning of his service.

When he began his export promotion effort, within days of arriving at the Commerce Department, the leaders of the American business community that I spoke to—and I particularly heard this from heads of firms in Connecticut—were in disbelief. Someone was finally paying attention to their priorities. Somebody was finally trying to help them pull together an American governmental countermovement to the vast efforts rival countries and their businesses had been mounting for decades, to take jobs and exports away from us. Finally, someone with real power, the Secretary of Commerce, understood the problem. The fact is, at the beginning a lot of folks in the business community were skeptical that Ron Brown could make this all happen.

But he proved them wrong, to their delight. He was great at this. Trained as a lawyer and always a superb advocate, he used those skills on behalf of American businesses throughout the world. He knew how to run campaigns, and he ran this export operation like a campaign, which is exactly how it was. Nobody had ever done this before in the way that Secretary Brown did, and our country has never benefited as much before as we did from his service.

He even set up, in the Commerce Department, something like a campaign ''war room,'' where he would get reports on economic opportunities opening up to sell American products and create American jobs—an early warning system. Then the letters and the phone calls would start flying—Ron Brown was a phone wizard, it was a technology invented for him, he was forever reaching out to touch some business leader or a head of state abroad. Then following those calls with visits, such as the one he was on when his life on Earth ended. He was so enormously skilled, he was so hard working, he was absolutely and irresistibly likable, he had such a great smiling charm, such sharp intelligence, he was such fun, he had such energy.

The customers loved his performance. They all knew he spoke directly for and to the President of the United States, and that he would relay their messages back to the White House. Even our friends in Japan, who have systematically been denying entry for too many U.S. products for too long, liked him, as Ron Brown worked very hard at breaking down the barriers.

U.S. business strongly appreciated his commitment to them, an enormous accomplishment. He was a terrific political operator in the very best sense of this phrase—he was mobilizing the political system to serve the public's needs. The business community uncderstood this and respected it deeply—I've heard this again and again from U.S. companies. Ron Brown was a new kind of life force to them and they had great affection for him.

Ron Brown and his team's export success was only beginning when he left us, because the historical changes he was starting are a long-term project. But this new direction was a very important accomplishment for America. A major job for Secretaries of Commerce from now on will be to promote U.S. goods, not just on the offhanded, random way of the past, but with all the force of Ron Brown's campaigns, or they will be judged failures. From now on, the Federal Government is going to have to get down and get to work with business selling our economy. It's about time, but it took Ron Brown to show us how to do it. Ron Brown has set an entirely new standard for the country by which all that come after him will be judged.

INNOVATION

A second remarkable thing he did as Commerce Secretary was to fight for innovation. This has been almost nowhere mentioned in the press, and it is not well understood by the public or the fourth estate or Congress. But Ron Brown understood that for the American dream of opportunity to be sustained for a new generation, a higher level of economic growth was crucial. In addition to exports, he concentrated on another ingredient of that strategy: innovation. Even before he was sworn in as Commerce Secretary, his friend George Fisher, then president of Motorola and now of Kodak, invited him to speak to a leading group of business thinkers, the Council on Competitiveness. Ron Brown set out in that speech an aggressive agenda of technology development and promotion. He recognized that innovation has been the great American competitive advantage for generations, that it is now under attack as our competitors expand, and that it has to be renewed if we are

going to keep expanding our economy. Economists estimate that technology development—coupled with a technologically trained work force—has accounted for 80 percent of the increase in U.S. productivity and wealth for most of this century.

Innovation is our bread and butter.

Brown understood that since the Second World War, the Federal Government has backed most of the long-term research and development and applied R&D that has gone on in the United States, while business focused on shorter term product development. That is an economic reality—the risk and cost of R&D means that the private sector must focus on what it can raise capital for—shorter term products. It is a classic market failure problem, and until recently Congress on a bipartisan basis has supported the need for governmental support of innovation. Brown picked up a series of small technology and technology extension programs that had been quietly started at Commerce in previous administrations, and made them a central focus. With an able team around him, he made the Commerce Department the administration's leader in civilian technology development, and supported a new system of cooperative R&D development with business, requiring business to match Federal funding to ensure sounder Government R&D investments and leveraging Federal research dollars. He also helped expand a new system of manufacturing extension centers around the country, now in over 30 States, to bring advanced manufacturing techniques and technology to smaller and mid-sized manufacturers desperately in need of it to be able to compete with global competitors. In a time of budget cutting, he successfully found the resources to build these programs. He was also head of the administration's information infrastructure task force, formulating policies on the new information highway and how to expand our population's access to it.

He was a true innovation supporter, and was moving quickly toward making the Commerce Department what it long should have been: a department for trade and technology, where each of these two sides of the department provides synergy for the other. It was becoming an agency which provided governmental leadership in these two areas in support of the private sector, not trying to dominate it, and much stronger because of this.

Ron Brown's clear success, of course, led to the usual Washington political reaction against signs of creativity. Unfortunately, for too much of this past year he had to spend time deftly deflecting attacks on the existence of the Commerce Department. But he had helped make it into an instrument for growth and job creation, and his efforts had strong support among business and work force constituencies. He had begun the process to put the Commerce Department on the map as a unique American engine to support opportunity and growth in America. He had a great dream for his agency, and I respect that dream very much. I, for one, pledge to him that I am not going to sit here in this body and let it get dismantled.

All around this city of Washington are statues of Union Army generals. This is a good thing—they remind us of the crisis the Civil War represented to our country's future, of the great wave of sacrifice required thirteen decades ago to keep this country intact and to advance the freedoms it stands for. Now we are engaged in a different kind of conflict, a global economic conflict. There are no particular enemies in this conflict, at most we have rivals, not enemies, although in some ways the real enemy is ourselves because we have not yet been able to mobilize to confront our problems. This new conflict will test whether the great American dream of opportunity, of economic growth that will allow all our citizens to grow, will endure for future generations. Someday, if we are successful in keeping our opportunity dream alive, we should think about putting up some statues of the men and women in the private and public sectors who are the new generals, new kinds of heros, of that conflict. Ron Brown's statue should be one of the first we erect.

BARRIERS

I have discussed his innovative role at Commerce, but I want to say something about barriers, too. Occasionally, I think about how Chuck Yeager felt piloting his X–1 rocket plane when he was the first to break the sound barrier. Ron Brown was a great barrier-breaker, too, our first African-American to achieve many things. While Chuck Yeager's courage enabled him to break his barrier, the sound barrier remained and had to be broken again by countless additional pilots. Ron Brown's barrier breaking style was a little different. It also required courage, but he had a way of breaking barriers that began to erase them. He would get through a barrier in his wonderful, excited, buoyant way, and he would make everyone who watched him think, there goes another one, and why didn't we do that long ago? When Ron Brown became Commerce Secretary, many were expecting the President to name an experienced business leader, and were appalled when he named a friend and politician. Big business has long been a barrier for African-Americans, but Ron Brown's outstanding performance as Commerce Secretary, and the depth of support he built in the business community, was unlike anything any Commerce Secretary has been able to do before. We watched and thought, there he goes through another barrier, the biggest he had ever faced.

In so doing, Ron Brown broke an even bigger barrier. America has been blessed with a long line of outstanding African-American leaders. In the past, those leaders typically have been leaders of the African-American community, and that has been very important for the country, too, and we need many more. Ron Brown well-remembered and was intensely loyal to his African-American roots, but, like Colin Powell, he was also a national leader, who was clearly understood, in his great energetic way, to be battling for the well-being of every American. That is a new, promising thing in America, it is a strong new step down our country's freedom road.

Mr. President, he led this effort to take some small, relatively unknown program in the Commerce Department—the Advanced Technology Program is one—to build it into an engine for technology growth and job creation.

Much was said in the aftermath of Ron Brown's tragic death about him being a bridge builder. I say he was also a barrier breaker. I think sometimes about Chuck Yeager, how he felt piloting that X–1 rocket plane when he first broke the sound barrier.

Ron Brown was a breaker, too, but the thing about Yeager's accomplishment is that barrier has to be broken every time someone chooses to do it. Ron Brown broke barriers that erased them. When he became Commerce Secretary, many were expecting the Secretary to name an experienced business leader. They were disappointed when he named a friend and politician.

But Ron Brown, by his outstanding performance at Commerce and the depth of support he built in the business community, broke another barrier and brought with him the business community and a lot of Americans.

Ron Brown was true to and proud of his African-American roots and the community from which he came, but he became in his lifetime like Colin Powell: Not just an African-American leader, but a great American leader.

Mr. President, finally, I say this. All around our city of Washington are statues of our great military heroes. Now we are engaged in a different kind of global conflict: an economic global conflict. If we ever start building statues for those generals who served as courageously and with great success in the economic battles that affect the quality of life and job opportunity for people in our country, we ought to erect a statue to Ron Brown as one of the greatest of those leaders.

I yield the floor.

IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). Under the previous order, the clerk will report calendar No. 361, S. 1664.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1664) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase control over immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel and detention facilities, improving the system used by employers to verify citizenship