

of America has been caught in a Clinton crunch of stagnating wages and increased taxes, finding it increasingly hard to make ends meet.

Federal taxes have risen under this administration to their second highest level in U.S. history. Federal revenues have risen from 19 percent of gross domestic product in the first quarter of 1993 to 10.5 percent in the first quarter of 1996. Taxes reached their highest level in 1981, just before the Reagan tax cut took effect, at 20.8 percent of GDP. At the peak of World War II, in 1945, taxes consumed just 20.1 percent of GDP.

Have this administration's high taxes produced a more equal income distribution in America? Hardly. As the rich have become richer, most Americans have seen their incomes stagnate. The average real income of the top 5 percent of households rose by 19.8 percent between 1992 and 1994. Those in the top 20 percent of households experienced an increase of 10.1 percent. Meanwhile, those in the bottom 80 percent of households saw an average increase of only 0.6 percent. The result: The share of total income going to the top 5 percent increased from 17.6 percent in 1992 to 20.1 percent in 1994, and the share going to the top 20 percent rose from 44.7 percent to 46.9 percent.

Republicans are not the party of envy. We do not believe it is government's job to penalize Americans for doing well in a free market economy. However, we can tell that something is wrong when the already well off are the only ones to see their incomes go up. And that is exactly what has happened under this administration.

Real median family income in 1994 dollars has fallen from \$40,890 in 1989 to \$38,782 in 1994. So far in the Clinton administration real median family income has averaged just \$38,343, compared to \$39,632 in 1992. Real compensation per hour, wages plus benefits actually fell 0.7 percent in 1993 and 0.5 percent in 1994, and grew only 0.3 percent in 1995. This compares with a 2.1 percent growth rate in 1992.

Why have most Americans experienced stagnant wages? Because the Clinton expansion, held back as it is by excessive taxes, has been lackluster at best. In 1995 real GDP grew at only a 1.3-percent rate. Growth in output per hour has fallen from 3.2 percent in 1992 to 0.1 percent in 1993, 0.5 percent in 1994 and 0.7 percent in 1995.

And the much-vaunted drop in the unemployment rate from 5.6 percent in May to 5.2 percent in June hides a deeper problem. The broader measure of unemployment, the U-6 rate, actually rose from 9.5 percent to 10 percent. This rate includes discouraged workers who have left the labor force and those working part time who cannot find full time work. Indeed, Mr. President, much of the decrease in the unemployment rate is illusory because 7.7 million workers now must hold down two jobs to make ends meet.

Even holding down two jobs is proving insufficient for many Americans to

survive the Clinton crunch. The personal saving rate has fallen from 5.9 percent in 1992 to 4.5 percent in 1995. Consumer debt has skyrocketed from \$731 billion in 1992 to over \$1 trillion in 1995. And the American people cannot shoulder that much debt. The credit card delinquency rate reached 3.53 percent in the first quarter of 1996, compared with 2.93 percent in the fourth quarter of 1992. And personal bankruptcies reached 252,761 in the first quarter of 1996, only slightly below the yearly rate in the early 1980's. At this rate, personal bankruptcies will reach 1 million this year, an all time high.

What we have, then, is a weak recovery held back by an astounding burden of taxation. I am not engaging in mere hyperbole, Mr. President. Federal taxes would have to be cut by \$111 billion this year just to get the tax burden back to where it was when President Clinton took office. Worse, this extra tax burden has brought us greater unemployment than would otherwise be the case, along with consumer hardship for all but the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. President, my friends on the other side of the aisle are fond of claiming that their's is the party of working families. But the economic news of recent months shows this to be false. Those who know how to hide their incomes do better under their high tax policies, while other Americans must take on extra work and go into debt just to hold ourselves and our families together. It is my hope that we can learn from this experience and set our Nation back on a course of lower taxes, less government and greater opportunity for the ordinary working families of America.

NOMINATION OF ANDREW S. EFFRON TO BE A JUDGE ON THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, on July 10, 1996 the Senate confirmed the nomination of Andrew S. Effron to be a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces. I want to take a few moments today to speak about this fine individual, who as many in the Senate know, has served on the staff of the Committee on Armed Services since 1987.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Andy's complete and impressive biography be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, Andy comes from a family with a strong tradition of public and community service. His parents, Marshall and Marion Effron, have been deeply involved in political, civic, and charitable organizations in Andy's hometown of Poughkeepsie, NY. Andy's wife, Barbara, has held numerous offices in PTA and civic associations in Arlington and Fairfax Counties. Their children are continuing

the tradition. Robin, a rising senior at W.T. Woodson High School, is on the student council and serves as an officer for the chorus, Model U.N., and Tri-M arts society. Michael, who will be entering seventh grade next year, was vice president of the Student Council at Canterbury Woods Elementary School, and he is also an All-Star Little Leaguer.

Andy's confirmation hearing on July 9 was a bittersweet day for me and, I am sure, for all the members of the committee. It was sweet because we were so pleased that someone whom we have known and worked with for so long and whom we have admired and respected for his extraordinary ability and expertise had been nominated by the President to be a Judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces.

It was bitter, though, because the committee will soon be losing one of the finest talents the committee has ever had the good fortune of having on its staff.

The Armed Services Committee first became familiar with Andy Effron in 1986 when he was in the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Defense and was one of three individuals from the Department who worked with us during the Senate-House conference on the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act. We were so impressed with Andy's expertise that we asked him to join the staff the following year and he has continuously confirmed our initial judgment ever since.

Andy has not just confirmed our initial judgment, he has consistently demonstrated an amazing capacity for hard work, an ability to perform at the highest level, and a willingness to tackle and master any issue of importance to the committee. As a matter of fact, Andy has been involved in so many important matters—important to the committee, to the Department of Defense, and to our national security—that I won't even attempt to enumerate them because the list would fill many pages of the RECORD.

Suffice it to say, that Andy Effron epitomizes the best in what a professional staff member should be. He is a consummate professional whose hallmarks of service have been his loyalty and his dedication. This Senator, and indeed the entire Senate, have been the fortunate beneficiaries of Andy's good judgment and wise counsel.

It was a wonderful tribute to Andy that his nomination, following close scrutiny, received the unanimous bipartisan support that it did. Those of us who have known and worked with Andy for so many years, of course, were not surprised.

Mr. President, I commend the President for nominating Andy Effron to this very important position. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Services will be gaining an extraordinary legal talent in the very near future. While the Senate is losing one of the very best to have ever served, gratefully Andy Effron will continue to

serve the U.S. Armed Forces and the Nation. I am proud of Andy Effron and grateful to him for all the many sacrifices he has made in the course of his long service to the committee. I wish Andy and his family much continued happiness.

EXHIBIT 1

BIOGRAPHY OF ANDREW S. EFFRON

Andrew S. Effron serves on the staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee as Minority Counsel. He previously has served as the Committee's General Counsel (1988-95) and Counsel (1987-88).

Prior to joining the Committee, he served as an attorney-adviser in the Department of Defense Office of General Counsel (1977-87); as Trial Counsel, Chief of Military Justice, and Defense Counsel in the Office of the Staff Judge Advocate, Fort McClellan, Alabama (1976-77); and as a legislative aide to the late Representative William A. Steiger (1970-76; 2 years full-time, the balance between school semesters).

Mr. Effron was born September 18, 1948 in Stamford, Connecticut, and raised in Poughkeepsie, NY, where he graduated from Poughkeepsie High School (1966). He is a graduate of Harvard College (1970, B.A., magna cum laude), where he was Editor in Chief of the Harvard Political Review; Harvard Law School (1975, J.D. cum laude), where he was Executive Editor of the Harvard Civil Rights Civil Liberties Law Review; and the Judge Advocate General's School, U.S. Army (Basic Course Distinguished Graduate, 1976; Graduate Course, by correspondence, 1984).

Mr. Effron's publications include: "Supreme Court—1990 Term, Part I," *Army Lawyer*, Mar. 1991, at 76 (with Francis A. Gilligan and Stephen D. Smith); "Supreme Court Review of Decisions by the Court of Military Appeals: The Legislative Background," *Army Lawyer*, Jan. 1985, at 59; "Post-Trial Submissions to the Convening Authority Under the Military Justice Act of 1983," *Army Lawyer*, July 1984, at 59; "Military Participation in United States Law Enforcement Activities Overseas: The Extraterritorial Effect of the Posse Comitatus Act," 54 *St. John's L. Rev.* 1 (1979) (with Deanne C. Siemer); "Punishment of Enlisted Personnel Outside the UCMJ: A Statutory and Equal Protection Analysis of Military Discharge Certificates," 9 *Harv. CR-CL L. Rev.* 227 (1974).

Mr. Effron's awards include the Army Meritorious Service Medal (1977); the Defense Meritorious Service Medal (1979); and the Department of Defense Distinguished Civilian Service Medal (1987).

Mr. Effron and his wife, Barbara, live in Annandale, Virginia. They have a daughter, Robin, and a son, Michael.

CATHOLIC BISHOPS' STATEMENT
ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the Nation's Catholic bishops have long been concerned with the fair treatment of immigrants and refugees. In fact, the U.S. Catholic Conference maintains the Nation's largest immigrant and refugee service organizations in the country, and they provide a broad range of assistance to newcomers to America.

Last month, the bishops took up the immigration issue at their annual conference in Portland, OR. A statement issued by the bishops provides valuable insight and guidance to Congress as we consider the many important issues in-

involved in immigration reform. The statement speaks forcefully for maintaining a strong safety net for immigrant families, and for continuing our tradition of providing a haven for persecuted refugees. The statement also urges Congress not to take the unwise step, as some have proposed, of denying innocent undocumented immigrant children access to public education.

I commend this statement to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

A STATEMENT ON IMMIGRATION BY BISHOP ANTHONY M. PILLA, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC BISHOPS

The Catholic Bishops of the United States take seriously the responsibility entrusted to them as Pastors and Teachers to speak on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves. We have spoken frequently in recent times of our concerns about the treatment of immigrants and refugees in the United States. Regrettably, since our last statement just a year ago, the public debate has become even more acrimonious, and Congress is now considering the final form of restrictive legislation that runs counter both to Christian teaching and the proud tradition of this nation of immigrants.

The Church has long acknowledged the right and the responsibility of nations to regulate their borders for the promotion of the common good. For that reason it is appropriate for the United States to engage in a debate about its immigration and refugee policies. Unfortunately, though, that debate has taken on a punitive tone which seems to seek to diminish the basic human dignity of the foreign born.

In particular, I express grave concern and dismay at provisions of the legislation which would target the most vulnerable among us—children, the sick, and the needy—in an impractical effort to cure our nation's social and economic ills. Health care and education are among the most basic of human rights to which all have a moral claim, yet this legislation seeks to restrict severely or flatly deny these rights to those who were not born in this country. Indeed, there is a disregard for human life in this legislation which is inconsistent with the Gospel and which I find morally objectionable.

Refugees and asylum seekers, those fleeing persecution and possible death in search of safehaven in the United States, risk the real possibility of being returned immediately to their oppressors as a consequence of this legislation. As emphasized by the Bishops in a statement last year, these people "have a special moral standing and thus require special consideration."¹

The health and well-being of immigrants who gain entry into the United States are similarly threatened by this legislation. All of us at some point may be affected by hunger, poor health, housing needs, family crises, and aging. This legislation is so overreaching and restrictive that it would make it almost impossible for legal taxpaying immigrants to seek assistance when confronted with these vicissitudes of life. The undocumented are put even more at risk. They may be faced with deportation simply for seeking food and medical care for themselves and their children. By denying these most basic needs merely on the basis of where a person was born is to place the health and well-being of the entire community at risk.

Furthermore, undocumented children could be denied access to education in a misguided effort to hold them accountable for the actions of their parents. Consequently, immigrant youths face the possibility of being left illiterate and idle, turned out on the streets to be tempted by crime and delinquency—or to become their victims. Teachers will be forced to become de facto agents of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Surely, the common good cannot be served by such measures.

Finally, at a time when great emphasis is being placed on the renewal of the American family, this legislation would effectively prevent the reunification of immigrant families by mandating financial tests which would be impossible for most sponsors to meet. I believe this to be contradictory and counterproductive. Immigrants, like the nature born, draw strength from their families in times of need, and as we said in our statement last year: "Family reunification remains the appropriate basis for just immigration policy."²

The principles of human dignity and human solidarity, which the Church has long taught, should be factors in shaping the goals of public policy, including immigration. Pope John Paul II has forcefully spoken on the need for solidarity:

"Solidarity is undoubtedly a Christian virtue. . . . One's neighbor is then not only a human being with his or her own rights and a fundamental equality with everyone else but becomes the living image of God the Father, redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ and placed under the permanent action of the Holy Spirit. One's neighbor must therefore be loved, even if an enemy, with the same love with which the Lord loves him or her; and for that person's sake one must be ready for sacrifice, even the ultimate one: to lay down one's life for the brethren (cf. 1 Jn. 3:16)"³

Pope Paul VI's lament nearly 30 years ago that "[h]uman society is sorely ill,"⁴ sadly is still true today. Now as then, we agree that the cause of society's illness may be attributed to "the weakening of brotherly ties between individuals and nations."⁵ Therefore, all people, and particularly those who have been entrusted with leadership, are given the moral charge to build up the ties between individuals and nations. I call on Congress and the President to address and correct the punitive provisions of the pending immigration legislation which will provide for a more thoughtful bill respecting the human dignity of our foreign born sisters and brothers who aspire to come to our country. In welcoming them, we welcome Jesus Himself.

FOOTNOTES

¹NCCB, Committee on Migration. "One Family Under God," 1995, p. 9.

²NCCB, Committee on Migration. "One Family Under God," 1995, p. 11.

³John Paul II, Encyclical letter "Sollicitudo Rei Socialis," 1987, §40-41.

⁴Paul VI, Encyclical letter "Populorum Progressio," 1967, §66.

⁵Ibid.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, 4 years ago when I commenced these daily reports to the Senate it was my purpose to make a matter of daily record the exact Federal debt as of the close of business the previous day.

In my very first report on February 27, 1992, the Federal debt the previous day stood at \$3,825,891,293,066.80, at the close of business. The Federal debt has,

Footnotes at end of statement.