

material on base? Can a commander ask questions based on these reasons, if he concludes that knowledge of these activities is such to undermine effectiveness of his unit?

Will a commander who turns a blind eye to obvious evidence of homosexuality in the military be giving tacit approval to homosexuality and thus invite legal challenges? What if another soldier on base reports that he witnessed homosexual conduct? Can a commander pursue an investigation based on this alone? What if a homosexual soldier tells his roommate he is a homosexual and the roommate asks for another room? Is this information that the commander can act upon, or must he wait for further cohesion problems to develop?

What are the legal rights of the heterosexual who is forced to live with a homosexual because the commander has ordered him to do so? Or what are the legal ramifications if the commander removes the homosexual individual from the heterosexual's room and either gives that individual a separate room, to the discrimination of all others in the unit, or assigns that person to another individual? What are the legal ramifications of all of that? What is the potential breakdown of unit morale and cohesion?

Now the "don't tell" portion of "don't ask-don't tell." "Don't tell" also presents difficulties. For instance, what exactly are service members forbidden to tell? Are they not supposed to reveal their sexual orientation, or are they supposed to hide sexual conduct, which might be a criminal offense under the Uniform Code of Military Justice? Will the Department of Defense be forced to change its definition of homosexuality and effectively create two classes of homosexuals—those who are homosexual by virtue of their conduct, or those who are homosexuals only in their minds and thoughts?

With a new definition of "telling," will the Department of Defense be caught up in litigation for the next 20 years? I think this is a very valid question, because if you are operating under a policy which essentially says that homosexuality and military service is incompatible, does a modified policy under a "don't ask-don't tell" proposal create a whole series of questions that only the courts will resolve, and what will this do relative to military effectiveness in the future?

With a new definition of "telling," then the question is: What kind of litigation will follow, and what will the impact and effects of that litigation be? These are questions, Mr. President, not all conclusive. There are many, many more that need to be asked. These questions still search for answers, and I fear that the policy of "don't ask-don't tell" may not just be unclear, but inconsistent. Commanders in the field must live in a real world of practical actions and choices. That

would must be our first priority, not the world of politics and its demands.

The pursuit of compromise is a noble legislative art. But on certain matters that process utterly fails. It fails because some problems are so durable and so insistent, they will not disappear with a hand shake or a rhetorical flourish. Some questions cannot be finessed; they must be decided.

I have not come to a final conclusion or opinion on "don't ask-don't tell" as a policy. I think the questions I have asked are valid. I hope we can find adequate answers to those questions. But I have come to one conclusion: A political compromise is not adequate to this military problem. Our policy on homosexuals in the military must be immune from every consideration save the safety and effectiveness of our soldiers.

On "don't ask-don't tell," the intentions are good, but the outcome is uncertain. The stakes are high and the questions are disturbing. While those questions remain, I think we should withhold judgment in terms of which policy we ultimately decide and believe is the best policy for our military in deciding this question.

I yield the floor.

CONGRESSIONAL SPENDING LIMIT AND ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1993

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. NICKLES, Mr. President, I alert my colleagues that in a few moments we are going to be voting on an amendment I have offered which would limit the total amount of subsidies or entitlements to candidates participating or running for U.S. Senate. The limit is \$1 million per candidate.

Some people think that is too high. I think it is too high. But I will tell you, if we do not have this limit and if this bill that is now pending becomes law, we are going to find that candidates for the U.S. Senate will be receiving millions of dollars of public and private subsidies per election cycle.

We do not have a race in North Dakota in 1996. But, for example, in 1998 in North Dakota, the eligible candidate would receive \$1.5 million of private and public subsidies, public subsidies because we are talking mail rates, mail discounts; we are talking about vouchers, communication vouchers that are in the several hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Again, I will use North Dakota because of the Presiding Officer. In North Dakota, in 1998, an eligible candidate will be able to receive \$574,000 of communications vouchers and be able to receive special mailing rates of \$15,000. That is probably one of the lowest amounts in that category. We assume no amount for excess expenditures. But if you have an opponent who spends several million dollars, you will receive \$1.2 million for excess expenditure amount. So it is that amount, as well.

The total amount of Federal subsidies in that case would be \$1.8 million. And then add private subsidies, and that is the fact you can buy communication or get your broadcast one-half the rate of someone else for the last 60 days. That probably equals \$496,000. We are talking about \$1.5 million, if you have no excess expenditures amount that matched. Add the \$1.2 million on that, and you will be up to \$2.7 million in public and private subsidies just running for office in North Dakota.

My point is, the bill as written is wide open for flagrant abuse of taxpayers. It can cost millions of dollars in every single State. For every major candidate, the subsidy can well exceed \$1 million in some States. In the large States, it can be several million dollars. For example, in California in 1998, the total private and Government subsidies could equal over \$7 million, and that is including no excess expenditure amount, and we are bound to have that. So you can see that amount is well over \$10 million.

You could find, in a State like Florida—again, assuming no excess expenditure amount where the taxpayers will duplicate the funds that are over and above what the general election limit is—an amount of over \$4 million of public subsidies.

So the purpose of this amendment is just to make sure that no candidate for the U.S. Senate under this bill will receive public and private subsidies in excess of \$1 million. We limit farmers to \$50,000. We have limits on student loans. We have a lot of limits on entitlements. If my colleagues are not aware of it, this bill is an entitlement for politicians. I hope they will be aware of that. I hope they are aware of it, because this bill provides for several entitlements.

It says, on page 16: "An eligible Senate candidate shall be entitled to * * *" and on page 17, it lists four new entitlements that a Senate candidate can receive.

All this amendment that we have right now says is that the total amount of entitlements cannot exceed \$1 million per candidate for the election cycle.

I hope my colleagues will concur. Mr. BOREN, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Montana be allowed to proceed as if in morning business for 3 minutes.

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

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BURNS. That is fine. I thank my friend from Oklahoma. I will just take a few minutes here before we have the vote on this particular amendment.

COMMENTS ON THE CLINTON TAX AND SPEND

Mr. BURNS, Mr. President, you know sunshine is a wonderful thing and, of

course, we are getting a lot of it here in Washington, DC, now; maybe a little more than some folks would like because of the humidity. It does not make it too comfortable. But sunshine also works very well when it comes to legislation.

I went home, as all of us did, during the Memorial Day recess, and talked with some of our people at home. We found out that once people understand this legislation and what is in that piece of legislation, they find out right away they are not very supportive of it. And that is the way it was when we started talking about this tax bill now that is going to come before Congress.

Mr. President, I have never seen a time, since I have been involved in politics—which has not been a long time; it has only been since 1986—when the American people are so concerned about spending and so energized to do something about it.

If there was any indication of the kind of mood we are in nationally, it had to show up this week in my home State of Montana. We do not have a sales tax in Montana, and in order for some tax reform, my Governor wanted to shift some of the tax burden from personal property over to a sales tax. That sales tax went down 4 to 1.

All we have to do is look at the Senate race in Texas, which was based solely on tax-and-spend policies.

So what we are seeing here now in this country—I used to call it a mild tax rebellion, but now it is for real. And when we start talking about different taxes for different segments of our economy, as proposed in the package that was passed by the House of Representatives, we have had news to report and the people of America really understand it.

I just want a minute here to put everything in perspective so the American people know what we are dealing with here. Unlike the \$3 in spending cuts that were originally promised last fall, this bill that passed the House contained 6.7 cents in spending cuts for every dollar in new taxes raised. For every dollar in spending cuts, the plan has \$15 in revenue increases. In other words, we are going to tax more so we can spend more.

The total bill is 89.5 percent taxes. I do not think I can reconcile that. I do not think the American people can, either. Now we hear that the administration is willing to make changes to the Btu tax. Perhaps it will be scaled back or replaced with a transportation tax. It is not certain at this point what the deal of the day will be.

If the compromise includes a tax on fuels used for transportation, consumers and industry will still be hard hit. Whether they call it a Btu tax or a transportation tax, it is still a tax increase. And it still packs a pretty hard punch to people in rural States like Montana. We have to fill up the gas tank a lot more often to get the job done. The folks in Harlowton cannot hop on the bus to go to their doctor ap-

pointment—most towns in Montana do not have public transportation. Consumers will still see prices increase because the cost of getting products to market will be higher.

We are spending a lot of time and effort trying to find new and creative ways to make Americans pay more taxes. I think we should scuttle the entire tax increase instead. Let us make up the difference with real spending reductions. It is what should have happened from the start.

The House-passed tax and spend bill still has spending increases and tax hikes that are classified as tax cuts; 93 percent of the cuts are not going to take place for another 3 or 4 years.

The 3 or 4 years from now is an abstraction out here in Washington. The economic estimates being used in the tax-and-spend bill assume that higher taxes will not have any negative effects on the economy in the coming years.

But economic policy does not occur in a vacuum. Higher taxes will result in less expansion in the private sector. Less expansion means fewer jobs. Fewer jobs means reduced tax revenue. So the deficit may not decrease at all after these new taxes go into effect. If history repeats itself, spending will increase \$1.56 for every \$1 of additional taxes that are raised.

This is not what the American people are asking us to do. I think their message is clear: As their representatives, we need to cut spending first.

As the saying goes: If you find yourself in a hole, stop digging. I encourage my colleagues to heed this advice and to vote against the Clinton tax-and-spend bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the floor managers for this 3 minutes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as if in morning business for a period not to exceed 4 minutes.

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

The Senator is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MACK. Thank you, Mr. President.

CUT SPENDING FIRST

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, the American people are desperately trying to send Washington a message, and neither the President nor the Congress are listening.

The Democrats are falling all over themselves trying to figure out who to tax to help pay for the President's big spending plans. Do we tax Btu's, gas consumption, Social Security benefits, income, and anything else that is unfortunate enough to move?

The people in my State of Florida and all over the country are saying: "Stop. Wake up and listen. Cut spending first."

A shocking new survey says that 8 out of 10 Americans believe it will be harder for the next generation to achieve the American dream. That is frightening. The No. 1 reason is higher taxes. We are here to advance the American dream, not put it out of reach.

By a 3-to-1 margin, Americans believe the Clinton tax and spend plan will make it harder to achieve their dreams.

President Clinton is taking our country in the wrong direction. As countries around the world embrace the American model so that their people can achieve their version of the American dream, we are doing the opposite. Here is what the head of Sweden's New Democracy Party recently said:

(The Swedes) are moving away from the welfare state. On your side, you are moving into it, and you risk destroying your country.

And I will add to that: destroying the American dream. Let us stop, listen, and cut spending first.

A just completed survey of blue chip economists tells us that professional analysts are worried about the effects of higher taxes on the economy. Specifically, by a 2-to-1 margin, expert economists have lowered their forecasts of economic growth. The No. 1 reason is higher taxes.

The American people want us to cut spending first. Economists are telling us to cut spending and warning us about the dangers of higher taxes. Everybody seems to get it and agree—everybody that is but the President and his Democratic loyalists on the Hill.

Mr. President, let us give the American people back their Government; let us give them back their money, and most importantly, let us give them back their dream.

Mr. President, we need to stop, listen, and cut spending first.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 4 minutes of the Senator from Florida have expired.

CONGRESSIONAL SPENDING LIMIT AND ELECTION REFORM ACT OF 1993

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BOREN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I move to table the pending Nickles amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr.