

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. President, not seeing anyone seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MATHEWS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### NOT WHO WINS AND WHO LOSES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we are in the throes of enormous controversy in the U.S. Senate, in Washington, and in the country about the reconciliation bill to reduce the country's deficits. I read the newspaper this morning and, once again, I see the issue is who wins and who loses. Is the President losing? Is he having to retreat? Is he having to change his program substantially? Is that a sign of weakness?

Mr. President, it seems to me that the question for us is not who wins and who loses. Everyone in this country loses if we do not do something to end these crippling budget deficits.

As far as the Btu tax is concerned, I say good riddance. The Btu tax, as of this morning, I think, is dead. It will be replaced by a combination of two things: Deeper spending cuts, which the American people want, and less reliance on taxes, which the American people have also told us they want.

There will be an energy tax component in this new proposal, but I think by the end of this week or next week, this proposal to reduce the deficit will come out of this Senate. It will have greater spending reductions, it will have less reliance on taxes, it will not contain a Btu tax, it will contain some refigured or recharacterized energy tax. But it will move us in the right direction to reduce this country's deficits.

Mr. President, I was in my hometown last Thursday in North Dakota, a small town in southwestern North Dakota, of about 300 or 400 people. They, like everyone else, understand that we need to do something to end these crippling budget deficits. If you were talking about their spending programs in my hometown, they would fight like the dickens to keep their school. That is Government. They want it, they value it, they cherish it, they want to keep it. They understand the need for law enforcement. They fight to have improved streets and roads because they know it and they understand it.

Mr. President, there has been a disconnection between Government and the people in our policies in recent years; not just in the last decade, but even more. We got to a point in this country where there was almost a vending machine kind of political program. You find a national vending machine, you put a quarter in, and you get a new program. Then you move

right on to the next program without making sure the program you created to respond to a national problem really works and works effectively and works well. The result is burgeoning Federal spending that exceeds the amount of revenue, a crippling, crushing Federal debt that mortgages our future and the future of our children.

The question today is not who wins and who loses, and the question certainly is not whether we do something about this fiscal policy that has been in recent years dangerous, reckless, and irresponsible. The question is how do we do something about it to put this country back on track? How do we stop spending money we do not have on things we do not need? It takes a lot of courage to do that. There are people here who do not have an ounce of it and say: "Let us just postpone the day of reckoning, let us not make tough choices, let us not offer up tonic that is tough to take. This medicine can taste good, you can feel good."

That is not where we are. It requires all of us to have some courage, maybe risk our jobs, to do what is necessary to fix what is wrong in this country.

My friends on the other side of the aisle say the problem is spending. I say you bet it is, and we ought to cut it and cut it in real ways and honest ways. We also need some revenue, and I hope they say, yes, we do.

I am going to offer, when the reconciliation bill comes to this floor, one little piece of new revenue nobody ought to complain about. We now have a subsidy in the Tax Code that subsidizes companies that want to leave this country and move their plants overseas. We say: "Close up your plant in America, move it overseas and we will give you a tax break; we will pay you to do it."

I have had a bill for 3 years in the House and now in the Senate to deal with this. I intend to offer that as an amendment to the reconciliation bill. That will raise money; that is a tax increase. Should we not stop tax incentives that tell people to move their plants out of this country and take jobs elsewhere? You bet we should. That is a tax increase that ought not to hurt anybody and I hope this Senate will embrace it.

But the point I wanted to make today is let us not frame this debate in the question of whether Bill Clinton wins or loses. This President is compromising because he knows he must. This President is leading because he knows he must. And we must find a way to work together in a bipartisan way toward a common solution that fixes what is wrong in this country so that we can tell our kids we are building a future of hope and opportunity and jobs again for them and for all of us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business for a period not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the order this morning.

#### AN EMPTY ISSUE: CAMPAIGN FINANCE

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, today, we continue to debate an empty issue: campaign finance. If we really want campaign reform, we should adopt term limits. Let me just respond to a point that was made a moment ago of how do we stop spending money we do not have on programs we cannot afford? I guess my first suggestion would be we ought to just defeat the campaign finance reform bill. It has been said that the cost to the taxpayers just to finance the next two Senate elections will be \$113 million. It seems to me this would be an appropriate place to begin and just defeat this bill.

When I was in Florida last week, my constituents told me that we ought to find new ways of cutting spending, not new ways of increasing spending. This campaign finance bill is not cutting spending first; it is raising spending first. It is not what the American people want, and it certainly is not what the American people deserve.

During the week I spent in my State, I listened to the hopes and dreams of Floridians who want steady jobs and better lives for their families. I also heard about their doubts and their fears. What I heard most was their overwhelming concern that Government is too big, too intrusive on their lives, too out of control, and that spending must be cut. Above all else, they want us to cut spending first.

Let me cite just one story to illustrate that. I was traveling from Tampa to Orlando, and I stopped at a little restaurant called Buddy Freddie's just off Interstate 4. When I was having dinner, a fellow came up to me and said, "I have a very simple message: Cut spending; cut it, cut it, cut it."

The message of cutting spending is the same message sent by the people of Texas over the weekend. They rejected the candidate of the President's own party by an overwhelming 2-to-1 margin and elected KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON who campaigned to cut spending first.

But the President and his people just do not seem to listen. On the weekend TV talk shows the Secretary of the Treasury was busy defending the Btu tax. Spending cuts to the extent that they were mentioned were an afterthought.

Yesterday, however, the President said he would drop this crucial component of his tax bill. Does this retreat mean the President wants to abandon his tax-and-spend policies? Does it mean that he is finally listening to the American voters?

Unfortunately, I do not think so. If he were listening to the American people, he would substitute spending cuts

for his Btu tax. But instead, he just wants to find another way of raising taxes.

The chairman of the Finance Committee, my friend, the senior Senator from New York, appeared on another TV talk show this weekend and insisted that "We're going to have a program that is equal part spending reductions and increases taxes."

In other words, one for one. He clearly was trying to put a good face on the President's plan, claiming it will have as many spending cuts as tax increases after they scramble to cut an extra \$51 billion over 5 years and find a substitute to the energy tax.

But the puzzling thing is that the majority leader told us that the package of a couple of weeks ago had spending cuts equal to tax increases. Which is it? Did the old package have spending cuts equal to tax increases, or will the new package have spending cuts equal to tax increases? It cannot be both. If the Democrat leaders can get together and clear up this confusion, I am sure the rest of us would appreciate it.

But the irony is that voters do not care about these phony spending to tax ratios. They have been misled too many times. They know that Congress fiddles with the numbers and in the end no real spending cuts are made.

They are right. The ratio of taxes to spending cuts in the President's plan is not 1-to-1. In reality, the spending cuts are only a tiny fraction of the tax increases, and even then they are promised for the future.

The voters want to see spending cuts first, period. They want to see the President do what he promised and cut spending. Then and only then might they take the President seriously.

The President just does not seem to get it. Just last month, in commenting about the House version of the tax bill, he let slip that it will "bring in more revenues and permit us to spend more." It is clear he has in mind, and it is not what the American voters want.

The President's foot soldiers in the House of Representatives seem to get it even less. In their version of the President's tax bill, they stripped away the requirement that Social Security taxes be used to pay for Social Security benefits. The House bill specifically prohibits new revenues from the tax hike on Social Security benefits to be used for Social Security. This means the President's program writes into law that money which ought to go into the Social Security trust fund is forbidden to do so and will instead go toward the President's new spending. This is a practice which even the chairman of the Finance Committee has previously described as "thievery" and "embezzlement."

Mr. President, the bill on the floor today may be campaign finance, but the real issue is spending. Americans want Government to cut spending and

neither Congress nor President Clinton is doing it.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FEINGOLD). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON].

#### JAPANESE IMPORTATION OF APPLES

Mr. GORTON: Mr. President, in 1971, the Japanese Government lifted its restrictions which prohibited the importation of apples from the United States and from other countries to compete in the Japanese market against the local product. That was 22 years ago.

To this date, not one single apple from the United States, or from any other country, has been permitted into Japan. A series of regulations nominally imposed for phytosanitary reasons have been cited year after year and decade after decade to protect the market for the produce of the handful of Japanese apple orchards.

This Senator had the pleasure during the course of last week to spend 3 days in Japan discussing this matter with relevant Japanese officials, accompanied by several apple producers and members of the Washington State Apple Commission. This Senator would have to confess that he doubts that he would have had any greater degree of success than that attending previous groups visiting Japan for the same purpose, except for the very strong support which this Senator got from the Clinton administration through Secretary of Agriculture Espy and United States Trade Representative Kantor.

While previous administrations have supported opening that Japanese apple market, it is only with this administration that the situation has reached a Government-to-Government level and has been treated, properly, as a political and not a safety or phytosanitary issue.

The Trade Representative's Office has gone so far as to state that it regards this continuing prohibition as an invalid trade barrier and one which potentially can call for section 301 sanctions against the Japanese.

This Senator can report to you, Mr. President, that that message is received in Japan and is being treated with a great deal of seriousness.

In addition to the strong support from these two agencies of our Government in the United States, this Senator wishes to commend the work of the Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Armacoet and two members of the Foreign Agricultural Service assigned to the embassy in Tokyo, Messrs. Parker and Miller, both of whom were of great assistance to this Senator and to his companions from the State of Washington during the course of the last week. We have visited with high ranking officials at the level of vice-minister in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and

Forests with six additional members of the Japanese Diet. We left with them the message that we did regard this as a political issue; that we no longer regarded their technical objections as having any merit whatsoever, and viewed them as being designed entirely to protect the growers in Japan against perceived competition. Competition, it would be, Mr. President, as apples from Washington State, or from other States in the United States, would probably sell in the marketplace in Tokyo at a price between 20 and 25 percent of the price for apples produced in Japan itself.

That competition would obviously be healthy. It would be of great advantage to Japanese consumers who seem systematically underrepresented in the councils of Government in Japan itself.

These meetings last week were succeeded on Monday and yesterday by another set of technical discussions here in Washington, DC, between the two parties.

We, in Tokyo, insisted that these meetings here be considered to be definitive and that they be followed during the course of this month by a necessary visit on the part of Japanese inspectors to orchards in central Washington.

Acting on a set of requirements laid out by the Japanese in February of last year, there are now some 3,500 acres of orchards in central Washington growing apples specifically for the Japanese market under all of the requirements which were laid out at that time.

The cost of meeting these requirements adds substantially to the cost of producing apples in these orchards. They cannot be sold on the American market except at a very considerable loss. After meeting all of those requirements, the Japanese this year have come up with an additional set of requirements the result of which is the decision by our Ambassador to Japan and by the Trade Representative here that these objections are no longer technical but are purely protectionist in their view.

It is a goal of our growers and of our Secretary of Agriculture of the Government of the United States and of the Washington State Apple Commission that that Japanese market be opened to this year's crop of apples on January 1, 1994.

This Senator does not wish to end these remarks without commending three other Members of this body, Senators LUGAR, KASSEBAUM, and BRADLEY, who were also in Japan last week and who carried our message to a joint meeting of American Parliamentarians and Japanese Parliamentarians in an eloquent and I think effective fashion. Their help, together with that of the administration, is much appreciated by this Senator and by the apple growers of Washington State.

This provides a tremendous opportunity for Japan to lower another trade barrier and to lower some of the causes for distrust between our two countries