the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 2854) to modify the operation of certain agriculture programs.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 168(b) of Public Law 102–138, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House to the British American Interparliamentary Group: Mr. CLINGER of Pennsylvania, vice chair, Mr. BROWNBACK of Kansas, Ms. MOLINARI of New York, Mr. PETRI of Wisconsin, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2202. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3103. An act 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.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following measure was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2202. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 3103. An act 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.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of March 29, 1996, the following reports of committees were submitted on April 10, 1996:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1664: An original bill 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 or work-authorized alien status, increasing penalties for alien smuggling and document fraud, and reforming asylum, exclusion, and deportation law and procedures; to reduce the use of welfare by aliens; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104–249).

S. 1665: An original bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reform the standards and procedures for the lawful admission of immigrants and nonimmigrants into the United States (Rept. No. 104–250).

By Mr. PRESSLER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1239: A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, with respect to the regulation of interstate transportation by common carriers engaged in civil aviation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 104–251).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1666. A bill to authorize the Federal district court for the Central Division of Utah to hold court in Provo and St. George; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGG:

S. 1667. A bill to change the date on which individual Federal income tax returns must be filed to the nation's Tax Freedom Day, or the day on which the country's citizens no longer work to pay taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1668. A bill to improve the job and income security and retirement security of the American worker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LOTT (for himself and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. 1669. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1670. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for postsecondary education expenses, to make permanent the exclusion for employer-provided education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1671. A bill to provide for cockpit voice recorders and flight data recorders on noncombat aircraft of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LOTT (for Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. FORD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. EXON, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. NUNN, Mr. PELL, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN)):

S. Res. 241. A resolution in tribute to Secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown and other Americans who lost their lives on April 3, 1996, while in service to their country on a mission to Bosnia; submitted and read.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. Res. 242. A resolution 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; considered and agreed to.

S. Con. Res. 51. A concurrent resolution to provide for the approval of final regulations that are applicable to employing offices that are not 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; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1666. A bill to authorize the Federal District Court for the Central Division of Utah to hold court in Provo and St. George; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE CENTRAL DIVISION OF UTAH FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I introduce a bill that would permit the Federal District Court of the Central Division of Utah to hold court in Provo and St. George. Under the relevant statutory provision, title 28, United States Code, section 125, District Court for the Northern Division of Utah may be held only in Ogden, and District Court for the Central Division of Utah may be held only in Salt Lake City.

The central division of Utah, however, is quite expansive: it encompasses 23 counties and spreads from the Salt Lake region down to Utah's southern

border. Due to the division's size, those involved in district court proceedings, whether as litigants, jurors, or lawyers, must travel to Salt Lake City for district court. The district judges and others in Utah have become concerned about inconveniences that have arisen due to the statutory constraints on the places of holding court in Utah.

On January 9, 1996, the district judges for the District of Utah voted to approve an amendment to title 28, United States Code, section 125 that would permit district court for the central division of Utah to be held not only in Salt Lake City, but also in Provo and St. George. The bill I introduce today embodies those changes. The Utah State Bar supports the bill.

This bill will help Utahns by facilitating the administration of justice in Utah, and by permitting easier access to the district courts to citizens and litigants throughout Utah, who have often had to travel to Salt Lake City to have their cases and concerns heard.

Provo itself is a significant city with a population of 86,835. The neighboring city of Orem, UT, adds a population of 67,561 to Provo's immediate region. St. George, while a smaller city, is located in the southwest corner of Utah, and would provide a convenient location for citizens of southern Utah.

The minor modifications embodied in the bill will place Utah in a similar position to many other States in which district court may be held at numerous statutorily designated locations. The vast majority of States enjoy far more than two places in which district court can be held. Just to cite a few examples, 13 cities in Alabama are designated as cities in which district court may sit, 11 cities in Arkansas are so designated, 17 cities in Georgia are named, 12 cities in Iowa are included, and 23 cities in Oklahoma are listed.

Under current law, only Delaware, Hawaii, Maine, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island stand with Utah in having two or fewer locations in which district court may be held. Utah is the largest of those States. Even with the change, a mere four cities in Utah will be designated as places for holding district court.

I note for my colleagues that the bill does not require any additional appropriations or any courthouse construction. It simply permits court to be held in two additional locations.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1666

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. HOLDING OF DISTRICT COURT IN PROVO AND ST. GEORGE, UTAH.

Section 125(2) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', Provo, and St. George'' after ''Salt Lake City''.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1668. A bill to improve the job and income security and retirement security of the American worker, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE AMERICAN WORKERS ECONOMIC SECURITY ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, throughout the decades of the cold war, the paramount national concern was national security. Now with the end of the cold war, concern is growing rapidly over another type of security. This type of security has four aspects: job security, financial security, health security, and retirement security. For millions of individuals and families, the proper word in each of these aspects of their lives is ''insecurity,'' not ''security.'' No political party deserves to prevail if it fails to address these concerns and propose a plausible strategy to end them.

The heart of the current crisis of economic insecurity is the growing realization that growth and prosperity no longer benefit all families fairly. The quarter century after World War II was a golden era. Hard work paid off as the economy grew and income rose for all. But no more.

Superficial signs of prosperity abound. The stock market has soared. Inflation is consistently low and unemployment is down. But the prosperity is less than it seems. Americans are working harder and earning less. Their standard of living is stagnant or sinking. They are worried about losing their jobs, losing their health insurance, affording their children's education, caring for their elderly parents, and somehow still saving for their own retirement.

The rich are still getting richer but more and more families are left out and left behind. The rising tide that once lifted all the boats is now lifting only the yachts.

Mr. President, these two charts reflect, I think, in a dramatic way what has effectively been happening in the U.S. economy over the period of the recent years. From 1947 to 1979, virtually 30 years, we found that in each of the groups, the bottom 20 percent, second bottom 20 percent, the middle 20 percent, the top 20 percent, the second top 20 percent, and even the top 5 percent of Americans for almost 30 years—30 years—effectively grew together, the real family income group. All Americans moved along and moved along together during periods of time when we had both recessions and inflation. Cumulatively over this period of time all Americans went along together.

But from 1979 to 1993, in the most recent period of time, taken collectively, we will find out that those again at the bottom level, the next to the bottom level, and even in the middle have been virtually losing ground; that is, the bottom 60 percent, while the top 40 percent have been moving well, and the top 5 percent has seen great growth, and the top 1 percent the largest growth. That reflects almost two-thirds of the American families over this period of time from 1979 to 1993 have been, in most instances, working harder, struggling longer hours, and have been gradually falling behind in terms of the real family income growth during this period, while those at the top end have seen this extraordinary growth.

Mr. President, once now profitable companies are even laying off good workers at unseemly rates for even fatter profits, even higher stock prices, and even more astronomical salaries and benefits for CEO's. And to add insult to injury, the fears on Main Street are met by cheers on Wall Street.

We saw that in recent times when we saw the dramatic increase in the total number of jobs just a short while ago, 600,000 or 700,000 new jobs, and the stock market going down over 100 points. And we saw it conversely when we saw bank mergers that were taking place just several weeks ago, a couple months ago, that saw the announcement of the loss of some 20,000 jobs, and the stocks as a result of the mergers going right up through the roof.

Mr. President, the Republican Contract With America is now largely defunct because it would have made these problems worse. Its massive cuts in Medicare, education, and other priorities would have exacerbated the security of most families, and the lavish tax breaks for the wealthy would have worsened the income gap. Clearly, the Republican strategy is to comfort the comfortable and afflict the afflicted.

The Republican strategy is designed to exploit the income gap—but do nothing to solve it. In fact, half of all the spending cuts in the vetoed Republican budget came from programs benefiting the neediest 20 percent of families. Less than a tenth came from the top 20 percent, while two-thirds of the Republicans' proposed tax breaks would flow to the top 20 percent, while the bottom 20 percent actually faced a tax increase.

So we found even in the last proposal more was being demanded from the working families, less from the wealthiest individuals, and yet those families were going to be the ones who were going to benefit the greatest amount from those proposed cuts and benefits from the Tax Code. Practical steps, not demagoguery, are needed to deal with each of the four economic insecurities facing individuals and families.

In other times, Congresses have enacted restraints on runaway free enterprise to end abuses and bolster the public interest. The most obvious precedents are the antitrust laws, civil rights laws, the child labor laws, minimum wage, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and Federal aid to education.

Today is April 15—tax day. Ordinary Americans across the country are filing their income taxes and wondering about their job security, their stagnant wages, their health care, their retirement, their ability to educate their

children, while our Republican colleagues are proposing tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals and corporations in America.

Let us work together to increase economic security for all families. We can find ways to align the interest of individuals and industries and allow them to grow together so that corporations and shareholders can still reap profits, but not at the expense of the wages and standards of living of their employees.

We should provide incentives to make it more profitable for employers to create jobs than eliminate them, share gains with employees rather than channel them solely to the CEO's and shareholders, and provide reasonable job training, health, and retirement benefits. We can pay for all those incentives by closing perverse incentives in the Tax Code that encourage firms to move jobs overseas and treat workers as disposable.

Action on several fronts is already underway. The Kassebaum-Kennedy bill to guarantee health insurance for workers has bipartisan support and will be taken up this week in the Senate. It will deal with two flagrant problems in health insurance today—the excessive use of exclusions, the preexisting conditions, and the loss of insurance coverage when employees lose their job or change their job.

The lesson of the health reform debate of 1994 is that a sharply divided Congress cannot make far-reaching changes in election years. Instead of repeating that mistake, we should enact the reforms that have broad bipartisan support and that are achievable this year, if both sides in the ongoing health reform debate refrain from piling on controversial additional provisions.

Second, it is time to raise the minimum wage, which will soon reach its lowest level in 40 years. April 1 marked the fifth anniversary of the last increase in the minimum wage. Raising it from $4.25 an hour to $5.15 an hour, in two steps this year and next year, as President Clinton has proposed, will increase the wages of 13 million Americans. It will be interesting to see whether Senator DOLE and other Republicans are prepared to join us as the debate goes on.

Third, Congress should reform the immigration laws to end antiworker abuses. Republicans and Democrats speak with one voice in urging the strongest possible crackdown on illegal immigration. But reforms and legal immigration are needed, too, in order to give American workers the protection they need and deserve.

We should make it illegal for U.S. firms to lay off American workers and replace them with cheap imported foreign labor. Before U.S. firms hire foreign workers they should make a good-faith effort to hire qualified American workers. If we refuse to enact reasonable restrictions to protect U.S. jobs, we will fuel the drive for extreme restrictions that will slam the door unfairly against all immigrants.

Other steps are also needed to assist the American workers. Today, I am introducing a bill to create a two-tier tax rate for companies and encourage firms to act more responsibly toward their employees. If a company invests in education and training for its workers, provides adequate health care and retirement benefits, shares its profits with its workers, increases the wages of its work force at or above the Consumer Price Index, and makes child care available for all workers, it will receive a 25-percent reduction in the income tax rate it pays on profits distributed as dividends to shareholders on this portion of its income.

The corporate tax rate will be reduced to 26 percent for corporations now taxed at 35 percent, and corporate reductions will be available to corporations now taxed at other rates. Under this plan, CEO's who resist measures to treat workers fairly will feel the wrath of shareholders, whose dividends will be lower because the corporations fail to act responsibly.

This is a two-tier tax rate for most-favored companies. I will show the difference between company A and a most-favored company, using this chart. What we find out is that if they have the profits, they retain the profits—in this case, they distribute them. They pay the $35. It will amount to $70 in this illustration if it is a most-favored company. If they retained $100, but distributed to shareholders the $100 distribution, this would be a $25 tax reduction on the shares distributed to the shareholders, which would mean there would be $26 on this segment, meaning there would be $61 rather than the $70.

So, the drive for this kind of reduction will be the shareholders that will be involved in this decision. This will rely on their interest, their involvement, their pressure, rather than a governmental institution or a State institution to be able to move this process forward. They will see, with the distribution, that their taxes on that distribution will be reduced.

We reward other countries with tariff benefits if they qualify as most favored nations. We should create a category of most-favored companies and reward them when they treat their employees as assets.

In addition, the bill I am introducing today provides that the Federal Government, with its billions of dollars in Government procurement and contracting, will give preference to these companies that treat their employees well and qualify for the tax benefits—about $85 billion, $85 to $100 billion in various contracts. Those most-favored companies would have the preference when competing with a nonfavorite for a particular contract. That would be true, as well as extended loan provisions that come through the various loaning agencies of the Federal Government. That is a smaller figure, about $20 billion, but it is still very, very important, particularly for smaller companies, and smaller companies would be very much encouraged to participate.

The bill also places new restraints on corporate mergers and acquisitions, which are causing enormous job insecurity for workers and substantial layoffs and serious dislocations for entire communities. This provision strengthens the antitrust laws by requiring a review of the impact of these mergers on workers.

The Federal Trade Commission, the Justice Department, the Labor Department, and the Securities and Exchange Commission will give greater scrutiny to the corporate transactions likely to result in the closing or downsizing of company, facilities, or plants that are part of the lifeblood of local communities.

Now, Mr. President, what we are talking about are the mergers and acquisitions, the amendments to the antitrust law. These two companies want to merge, so they go through a review. Then there is a judgment that is made that they will be able to go through and the merger will take place. As part of the remedy process, the commissions will consider not just competition considered at the present time but also consider the impact on workers and communities. They will consider both of those.

We are not assigning percentages to each of them but we are taking note that we believe that if we have established the antitrust laws to consider competition between the various companies, that we also ought to encourage them to take a look at what the impact is going to be on working families. Not to say that has to override, but just that it has to be considered as they are making the remedies, to go forward with any of the new mergers or with any of the divestitures. That is the place this will go on through. We see the total number of mergers—2,800 last year. They have been escalating dramatically. About 20 percent of those are reviewed carefully by the Federal Trade Commission and DOJ. Only a small amount of them ever get into this kind of a process, but that is an extremely important item and can make a very, very important difference.

Mr. President, in addition, the bill eliminates the tax deductions that encourage mergers and acquisitions and leveraged buyouts that cost American jobs and line the pockets of the financiers of the deals. Another major section protects retirement security by encouraging companies to provide greater pension coverage for employees.

Last Thursday, President Clinton proposed a series of needed reforms in the current laws applicable to workers who now participate in pension plans. These reforms will encourage new pension plans for small businesses, expands IRA eligibility, increases pension portability and prevents pension raiding.

In addition, I am proposing several other reforms to facilitate coverage for employees who do not have access to pension plans through their current employment plan. The bill establishes an individual pension plan mechanism for all individuals without access to employer-based plans. Workers will no longer be dependent upon their employer for retirement planning and savings. The bill will provide portability to all these workers who could never before gain access to a pension plan. They will be able to take these plans with them from job to job. The employer's sole responsibility is the payroll deduction of the employees' savings.

Less than 50 percent of the private work force is now covered by private pension plans. More than 68 million Americans have no pension coverage. Ironically, most of them work in smaller businesses, which are the driving force of the future economy. Yet their retirement needs are neglected. These are the workers who are the backbone of the economy during their working lives. They constitute more than half of the work force. We cannot ignore their retirement needs. Like health care, good pension coverage should be accessible, affordable, and portable.

This chart demonstrates the alternative pension plan which is employer based. Here we have the IRA's. The proposal that I am introducing today, the individual pension plan which is the more acceptable, what this does, it says the employer will permit the contribution by the employee into a pension system, that that pension system is going to have to live up to fiduciary and ERISA standards, which will give greater protections for the individual pension plans and the advantage of portability over the IRA's. Individuals will be able to take, though, their portable pension plans with them.

As we all know, most of the new jobs in the country are produced by the small businesses. Pension plans will serve the retirement needs of millions of existing and future small business workers with no pension options.

Finally, the bill I am introducing expands educational opportunities for workers by offering them the tax benefits for employers and families. This is an issue that is familiar to most Members of this body. What we find out once again, to learn what is the level of income from those that both do not finish high school compared to those that complete various segments of their education. This chart is the average annual earnings by level of education. We see that those that do not finish high school and are employed earn $12,800; those that have professional degrees, earn $74,000. We know the stories of World War II. Every dollar invested was returned eight times to the Federal Treasury. The more incentives that we can provide to increase opportunities for education, the better off our economy and our ability to compete. We have incentives for both the training programs as well as tuition of programs spelled out.

The bill pays for these provisions with revenues generated from the repeal of the incentives in the current tax law that encourage companies to close U.S. plants, uproot jobs in the United States, and transfer them to foreign countries abroad.

We can save $40 billion or more over the next 7 years by repealing tax breaks for profits earned in foreign countries, tax exemptions for companies that transfer title to goods on the high seas to avoid U.S. taxes; price rigging by multinational corporations that minimize U.S. income and maximize income in foreign tax havens; sham corporations that generate huge tax deductions for moving plants and jobs overseas, and loopholes that allow billionaires to thumb their noses at Uncle Sam and renounce their American citizenship and move to a foreign tax haven to evade taxes on the massive wealth they have accumulated in America.

The Members are familiar with this list because many of these have been offered by other Members of the Chamber at different times. We have already voted on the billionaires' tax loophole, which benefits a handful of Americans who have made substantial amounts of money—in some instances, billionaires. By renouncing their citizenship and moving overseas, they effectively escape all of the taxes on that money that was earned in the United States, and they avoid paying any of their tax obligations by just escaping and renouncing American citizenship. This is called the ''Benedict Arnold tax loophole.'' It is an appropriate name for it. The others are matters which raise some $40 billion, and this is not even a complete list.

We are, obviously, open to other recommendations, suggestions, or add-ons for this. But it does indicate that we do have an opportunity to reduce these kinds of incentives that, today, are impacting working families. We will hear that we should not use the Tax Code to achieve social outcomes. The fact of the matter is that these tax provisions, which exist in the Internal Revenue Code today, are all impacting and affecting adversely working families. We are saying, let us stop that. We cover the revenues here and provide the incentives for the American workers.

The ''quiet depression'' facing American workers is the central economic, social, and political issue of 1996. When the economy is wrong, nothing else is right. Progress and opportunity for all is a fundamental American value. We know the problem. We know its urgency. The only thing that is unacceptable is to do nothing.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1670. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for postsecondary education expenses, to make permanent the exclusion for employer-provided education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE COMMONSENSE MIDDLE-CLASS TAX RELIEF ACT

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I introduce the Commonsense Middle-Class Tax Relief Act.

Today, middle-class Americans are working longer hours for smaller paychecks. American families deserve a raise. And that's just what my legislation provides—a raise in incomes, a raise in education and skills, and a raise in living standards.

The Commonsense Middle-Class Tax Relief Act is based on a fundamental premise: a higher education means higher income.

The bill would provide a $10,000 tax deduction for a person or their parents for the costs of tuition and fees at a college or for a vocational education. The full deduction would be available for families with an adjusted gross income of $80,000 and would be reduced as the income exceeded that level, being completely phased out when the taxpayer's income exceeded $100,000 for joint filing taxpayers.

For individuals the full credit would be available for those with adjusted incomes of up to $60,000 phasing out completely at $80,000. For the current year, half of the $10,000 deduction would be available. The full $10,000 deduction would be available starting in 1997 and thereafter. This provision is similar to one proposed by President Clinton.

Under existing law, post-secondary expenses can only be deducted under very narrow circumstances: if it is for the improvement of one's skills in a job a person holds above the skills needed to acquire that position, but to acquire additional skills required by the government or the employer to stay in the position.

My measure also would restore the exclusion of employer-paid payments of post-secondary college and vocational education costs for improvement of an employee's job related skills that were allowed prior to January 1, 1995. It would make the exclusion permanent.

The Commonsense Middle-Class Tax Relief Act will cut taxes on hard-working families trying to get ahead, raise incomes, and prepare Americans for the 21st century. It will mean higher incomes, higher education, and higher quality jobs for hard-working Americans.

Mr. President, education is key to both the raising of incomes of average Americans and to increasing the competitiveness of America in an increasingly global economy. I ask unanimous consent that a recent article in the Washington Post by Lester Thurow on this topic be included in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this commonsense proposal. We should be able to agree on a bipartisan basis that this type of important middle-class tax relief is needed and will mean better opportunities and better incomes for millions of Americans.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 7, 1996]

PREPARING STUDENTS FOR THE COMING CENTURY

(By Lester C. Thurow)

Consider an alphabetical list of the 12 largest companies in America at the turn of the 20th century; the American Cotton Oil Company, American Steel, American Sugar Refining Company, Continental Tobacco, Federal Steel, General Electric, National Lead, Pacific Mail, People's Gas, Tennessee Coal and Iron, U.S. Leather and U.S. Rubber. Ten of the 12 were natural resource companies. The economy then was a natural resource economy, and wherever the most highly needed resources were to be found, employment opportunities would follow.

In contrast consider the list made 90 years later by the Japanese Ministry of international Trade and Industry, enumerating what it projected to be the most rapidly growing industries of the 1990s: microelectronics, biotech, the new material-science industries, telecommunications, civilian aircraft manufacturing, machine tools and robots, and computers (hardware and software). All are brainpower industries that could be located anywhere on the face of the earth. Where they will take root and flourish depends upon who organizes the brainpower to capture them. And who organizes the power most efficiently will depend on who educates toward that objective best.

But back to the industries for the moment: Think of the video camera and recorder (invented by Americans), the fax (invented by Americans), and the CD player (invented by the Dutch). When it comes to sales, employment and profits, all have become Japanese products despite the fact that the Japanese did not invent any of them. Product invention, if one is also not the world's low-cost producer, gives a country very little economic advantage. Being the low-cost producer is partly a matter of wages, but to a much greater extent it is a matter of having the skills necessary to put new things together.

Wages don't depend on an individuals's skill and productivity alone. To a great extent they reflect team skills and team productivies. The value of any single person's knowledge depends upon the smartness with which that knowledge is used in the overall economic system—the abilities of buyers and suppliers to absorb that individual's skills.

In an era of brainpower industries, however, the picture is even more complicated: The economy is a dynamic economy always in transition—the companies that do best are those able to move from product to product within technological families so quickly that they can always keep one generation ahead. Keeping one jump ahead in software, for instance, Bill Gates's Microsoft had a net income running at 24 percent of sales in 1995.

If a country wants to stay at the leading edge of technology and continue to generate high wages and profits, it must be a participant in the evolutionary progress of brainpower industries so that it is in a position to take advantage of the technical and economic revolutions that occasionally arise. Knowledge has become the only source of long-run sustainable competitive advantage. Recent studies show that rates of return for industries that invest in knowledge and skill are more than twice those of industries that concentrate on plant and equipment. In the past, First World citizens with Third World skills could earn premium wages simply because they lived in the First World. They had more equipment, better technology and more skilled co-workers than those who lived in the Third World. But that premium is gone Today's transportation and communications technologies have become so sophisticated that high-wage skilled workers in the First World can work together effectively with low-wage unskilled workers in the Third World. America's unskilled now get paid based on their own abilities and not on those of their better-trained co-workers.

Industrial components that require highly skilled manufacturers can be made in the First World and then shipped to the Third World to be assembled with ''low skill'' components. Research and design skills can be electronically brought in from the First World. Sales results can be quickly communicated to the Third World factory, and retailers know that the speed of delivery won't be significantly affected by where production occurs. Instant communications and rapid transportation allow markets to be served effectively from production points on the other side of the globe.

Multinational companies are central in this process: Where they develop and keep technological leadership will determine where most of the high-level jobs will be located. If these firms decide to locate their top-wage leadership skills in the United States, it will not be because they happen to be American firms but because America offers them the lowest cost of developing these skills. The decisions will be purely economic. If America is not competitive in this regard, the market will move on. The countries that offer companies the lowest costs of developing technological leadership will be the countries that invest the most in research and development, education and infrastructure (telecommunications systems, etc.).

If the person on a loading dock runs a computerized inventory-control system in which he logs delivered materials right into his hand-held computer and the computer instantly prints out a check that is given to the truck driver to be taken back to his firm (eliminating the need for large white-collar accounting offices that process purchases), the person on the loading dock ceases to be someone who just moves boxes. He or she has to have a very different skill set.

Factory operatives and laborers used to be high school graduates or even high school dropouts. Today 16 percent of them have some college education and 5 percent have graduated from college. Among precision production and craft workers, 32 percent have been to or graduated from college. Among new hires those percentages are much higher. In the last two decades, the linkage between math abilities and wages has tripled for men and doubled for women.

The skill sets required in the economy of the future will be radically different from those required in the past. And the people who acquire those skill sets may not be the unskilled workers who currently live in the first world. With the ability to make anything anywhere in the world and sell it anywhere else in the world, business firms can ''cherry pick'' the skilled or those easy (i.e., cheap) to teach wherever they live. American firms don't have to hire an American high school graduate if that graduate is not world-class. His or her educational defects are not their problem. Investing to give the necessary market skills to a well-educated Chinese high school graduate may well end up being a much more attractive (i.e., less costly) investment than having to retrain an American high school dropout or a poorly trained high school graduate.

Take Korea for example. In a global economy, what economists know as ''the theory of factor price equalization'' holds that an American worker will have to work for wages commensurate with a Korean's wages unless he works with more natural resources than a Korean (and no American can, since there is now a world market for raw material to which everyone has equal access); unless he has access to more capital than a Korean (and no American can since there is a global capital market where everyone borrows in New York, London and Tokyo); unless he has more skilled co-workers than a Korean (and no American can claim to since multinational companies can send needed knowledge and skills anywhere in the world); and unless he has access to better technology than a Korean (and few Americans have, since reverse engineering—tearing a product apart to learn how it is made—has become an international art form; highly refined in Korea). Adjusted for skills, Korean wages will rise and American wages will fall until they equal each other. At that point, factor price equalization will have occurred.

The implications for the future are simple. If America wants to generate a high standard of living for all of its citizens, skill and knowledge development are central. New brainpower industries have to be invented and captured. Organizing brainpower means not just building a research and development system that will put us on the leading edge of technology, but organizing a top-to-bottom work force that has the brainpower necessary to make us masters of the new production and distribution technologies that will allow us to be the world's low-cost producers.

To do this will require a very different American educational system. And building such a system is the new American challenge.

Progress has to start by ratcheting up the intensity of the American high school. The performance of the average American high school graduate simply lags far behind that found in the rest of the industrial world. Those Americans who complete a college course of study end up catching up (the rest of the industrial world doesn't work very hard in the first couple of years of university education), but three-quarters of the American work force doesn't ever catch up.

The skill gap doesn't end there. Non-college-bound high school graduates elsewhere in the industrial world go on to some form of post-secondary skill training. Germany has its famous apprenticeship system; in France every business firm by law has to spend one percent of its sales revenue on training its work force; and with lifetime employment as a fact of life, Japanese companies invest heavily in the work force's skills since they know that it is impossible to hire skilled workers from the outside. In America, government-funded programs are very limited in nature, and, with high labor-force turnover rates, American companies quite rationally don't want to make skill investments in people who will leave and take their skills elsewhere. The net result is a compounded skill gap for those Americans who do not graduate from college. Closing this gap and giving the country a competitive edge should be America's number one educational priority.●

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1671. A bill to provide for cockpit voice recorders and flight data recorders on noncombat aircraft of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE NONCOMBAT AIRCRAFT LEGISLATION

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill that requires all Department of Defense noncombat aircraft to have both cockpit voice recorders and flight data recorders. I was shocked to learn that the airplane that crashed in Bosnia with tragic loss of 35

lives including Ron Brown, the Secretary of Commerce was not equipped with those important devices.

We need to thoroughly understand why any plane crash occurs. With that knowledge, was can better protect other planes of a similar type. In this case, the Department of Defense plane used was very similar to civilian aircraft. In other cases that may not be true. But, in all cases, we need to fully understand crashes and near crashes to better improve our safety record.

The bill provides that the Department of Defense should establish rules to require that noncombat aircraft contain those devices within 120 days of enactment and that the devices be in place within 1 year. The legislation provides that the requirements for the Department be as similar as possible to those used by the FAA.

On April 9, I wrote to Secretary Perry about this issue and asked how many DOD noncombat planes do not have these devices and what would be the cost of placing those devices into those aircraft. It is possible that there may be some narrow category of noncombat aircraft where these devices would not be appropriate because of the specialized nature of the aircraft or extreme cost. If that is the case, I look forward to learning about the specific situations involved. There may be a need for some exceptions. But, I believe that the Congress should move forward to require that these devices be on DOD aircraft as quickly as possible. I hope that we will act to pass this legislation, perhaps with some modification, very quickly.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 358

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 358, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an excise tax exemption for certain emergency medical transportation by air ambulance.

S. 605

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 605, a bill to establish a uniform and more efficient Federal process for protecting property owners' rights guaranteed by the fifth amendment.

S. 743

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for investment necessary to revitalize communities within the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 773

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the names of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE] were added as cosponsors of S. 773, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for improvements in the process of approving and using animal drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 912

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 912, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the eligibility of veterans for mortgage revenue bond financing, and for other purposes.

S. 969

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] was added as a cosponsor of S. 969, a bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for a mother and child following the birth of the child, and for other purposes.

S. 984

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 984, a bill to protect the fundamental right of a parent to direct the upbringing of a child, and for other purposes.

S. 1027

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1027, a bill to eliminate the quota and price support programs for peanuts, and for other purposes.

S. 1028

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide increased access to health care benefits, to provide increased portability of health care benefits, to provide increased security of health care benefits, to increase the purchasing power of individuals and small employers, and for other purposes.

S. 1043

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1043, a bill to amend the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 to provide for an expanded Federal program of hazard mitigation, relief, and insurance against the risk of catastrophic natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions, and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to amend the act of March 3, 1931 (known as the Davis-Bacon Act), to revise the standards for coverage under the act, and for other purposes.

S. 1232

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1232, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude length of service awards to volunteers performing fire fighting or prevention services, emergency medical services, or ambulance services from the limitations applicable to certain deferred compensation plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1344

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1344, a bill to repeal the requirement relating to specific statutory authorization for increases in judicial salaries, to provide for automatic annual increases for judicial salaries, and for other purposes.

S. 1400

At the request of Mrs. KASSEBAUM, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1400, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to issue guidance as to the application of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to insurance company general accounts.

S. 1483

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. GRAMS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1483, a bill to control crime, and for other purposes.

S. 1505

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1505, a bill to reduce risk to public safety and the environment associated with pipeline transportation of natural gas and hazardous liquids, and for other purposes.

S. 1551

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] were added as a cosponsors of S. 1551, a bill to restore the broadcast ownership rules under the Communications Act of 1934 to the status quo ante the enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

S. 1574

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1574, a bill to provide Federal contracting opportunities for small business concerns located in historically underutilized business zones, and for other purposes.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the names of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1578, a bill to amend the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act of authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1997 through 2002, and for other purposes.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the name of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, a bill to repeal the emergency salvage timber sale program, and for other purposes.

S. 1623

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA] the Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], the Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1623, a bill to establish a National Tourism Board and a National Tourism Organization, and for other purposes.

S. 1639

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1639, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a demonstration project to provide the Department of Defense with reimbursement from the medicare program for health care services provided to medicare-eligible beneficiaries under TRICARE.

S. 1646

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. KYL] the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] were added as cosponsors of S. 1646, a bill to authorize and facilitate a program to enhance safety, training, research and development, and safety education in the propane gas industry for the benefit of propane consumers and the public, and for other purposes.

S. 1650

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the names of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] were added as cosponsors of S. 1650, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes.

S. JOINT RESOLUTION 49

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. WARNER] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 49, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require two-thirds majorities for bills increasing taxes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 152

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. FRIST] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 152, a resolution to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate to require a clause in each bill and resolution to specify the constitutional authority of the Congress for enactment, and for other purposes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 226

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the names of the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Bingaman], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 226, a resolution to proclaim the week of October 13 through October 19, 1996, as ''National Character Counts Week.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 238

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the names of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 238, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that any budget or tax legislation should include expanded access to individual retirement accounts.

SENATE RESOLUTION 241—IN TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY OF COMMERCE RONALD H. BROWN

By Mr. LOTT (for Mr. DOLE (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. FORD, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ASHCROFT, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BRADLEY, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. BUMPERS, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. EXON, Mr. FAIRCLOTH, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GLENN, Mr. GORTON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HEFLIN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERREY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. NUNN, Mr. PELL, Mr. PRESSLER, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. WYDEN)) submitted the following resolution; which was read:

S. RES. 241

Whereas, Ronald H. Brown served the United States of America with patriotism and skill as a soldier, a civil rights leader, and an attorney;

Whereas, Ronald H. Brown served since January 22, 1993, as the United States Secretary of Commerce;

Whereas, Ronald H. Brown devoted his life to opening doors, building bridges, and helping those in need;

Whereas, Ronald H. Brown lost his life in a tragic airplane accident on April 3, 1996, while in service to his country on a mission in Bosnia; and

Whereas, thirty-two other Americans from government and industry who served the nation with great courage, achievement and dedication also lost their lives in the accident: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States pays tribute to the remarkable life and career of Ronald H. Brown, and it extends condolences to his family.

SEC. 2. The Senate also pays tribute to the contributions of all those who perished, and extends condolences to the families of: Staff Sergeant Gerald Aldrich, Duane Christian, Barry Conrad, Paul Cushman III, Adam Darling, Captain Ashley James Davis, Gail Dobert, Robert Donovan, Claudio Elia, Staff Sergeant Robert Farrington, Jr., David Ford, Carol Hamilton, Kathryn Hoffman, Lee Jackson, Steven Kaminski, Katheryn Kellogg, Technical Sergeant Shelley Kelly, James Lewek, Frank Maier, Charles Meissner, William Morton, Walter Murphy, Lawrence Payne, Nathaniel Nash, Leonard Pieroni, Captain Timothy Schafer, John Scoville, I. Donald Terner, P. Stuart Tholan, Technical Sergeant Cheryl Ann Turnage, Naomi Warbasse, and Robert Whittaker.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of the resolution to each of the families.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

THE IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1996

DORGAN (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3667

Mr. DORGAN (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REID, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. FORD, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. FEINGOLD) proposed an amendment to the 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 or work-authorized alien status, increasing penalties for alien smuggling and document fraud, and reforming asylum, exclusion, and deportation law and procedures; to reduce the use of welfare by aliens; and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON A BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

It is the sense of the Senate that because Section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act prohibits the use of the Social Security trust fund surplus to offset the budget deficit, any proposal for a constitutional amendment to balance the budget should contain a provision creating a firewall between the receipts and outlays of the Social Security trust funds and the rest of the federal budget, and that the constitutional amendment should explicitly forbid using the Social Security trust funds to balance the federal budget.

ABRAHAM (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 3668

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SIMON, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. WARNER, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. BOND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill S. 1664, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place in the bill, insert the following: