



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1995

No. 167

## Senate

The Senate met at 9 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Lord, the divine Potter of our lives, our days are in Your hands. Shape the clay as You have planned. May the day work out exactly as You have arranged it for Your glory and our growth. We say with the psalmist, "I delight to do Your will, O my God, and Your law is within my heart."—Psalm 40:8. We long to know what is best for our Nation. Now at the beginning of the day, we commit to You the challenges and decisions of this day. We desire to glorify You, so show us what You desire. With inspired intentionality, we put our relationship with You first and make our primary goal what is best for our Nation. In the name of the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Amen.

### THE BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1357) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Rockefeller motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions.

Brown modified amendment No. 2949 (to instructions of motion to commit), instructions that the committee should consider the findings of the trustees of the Federal Insurance Trust Fund.

Abraham amendment No. 2950, to establish beneficiary incentive programs to collect information on fraud and abuse against the Medicare Program and to collect information on program efficiency.

Harkin amendment No. 2957 (to amendment No. 2950), to strengthen efforts to combat Medicare waste, fraud, and abuse.

Bradley motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance with instructions.

Nickles/Brown amendment No. 2958 (to Bradley motion to commit the bill), to increase the earned income tax credit for families.

Mr. WELLSTONE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The Senator from Minnesota.

### MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the motion by Senator BRADLEY. Let me start out by saying, last night I think we had a good technical discussion and an important policy discussion. I must say, I think all of my colleagues are enormously impressed with Senator BRADLEY's mastery of the material.

Mr. President, what I would like to do today in the 5 minutes that I have, is to talk about this vote before us in a slightly different context. I say to my colleague from Wisconsin, my good friend, I have been thinking about the first class I will teach again at the college or university, community college, or University of Minnesota. In this class, which I hope to teach in 7 years from now, the first lecture is going to be about this week. It is going to start out with a definition of politics, and I am going to say politics is, in part, about values and what we all care about, and we can have honest disagreements.

The second part of the lecture I am going to give when I go back to teaching is going to be titled: Who decides? Who is asked to sacrifice? And how do these decisions take place? That really summarizes this motion that the Senator from New Jersey has offered, which I am so proud to be a cosponsor of.

A question: Who decides that we are going to have \$245 billion of tax giveaways to people already high-income and wealthy, least in need of those breaks? And whose parents, or whose children, go without adequate health care? It is that simple. Or, Mr. President—and this refers to some amendments that I will later on make sure that colleagues vote on—who decides that we are going to, essentially, leave untouched this area of corporate welfare, that if you have a \$5 million estate, you are going to get a tax cut, as my colleague from New Jersey pointed out last night, to the tune of \$1.7 million?

But at the same time that you have that kind of tax giveaway, at the same time you have special tax loopholes and breaks for oil companies, or insurance companies, or you have citizens who work abroad in other countries that do not have to pay any taxes on the first \$70,000 they make, or special breaks for pharmaceutical companies and, at the same time, Mr. President—and there is no better example—a \$5 million estate. How many people ever have that, and you get a \$1.7 million tax break.

Who decides that we are going to have that kind of tax giveaway to the wealthiest of the wealthiest citizens in this country, and not those whose children go hungry and whose children are not able to afford a higher education?

In the lecture that I give, when I teach again, I am going to continue to raise these questions. I will ask the question: Who decides that we are going to raise taxes for more than 200,000 people in Minnesota, families in Minnesota, with incomes under \$30,000 a year, hard-pressed people and, at the same time, we are going to let the one person in my State—or maybe two—with a \$5 million estate get \$1.7 million in a tax giveaway?

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

S 15707