

favorite time of the year, Ashe agreed to be interviewed by the TimesDaily on June 27, provided the story would not be released until after his death.

His message on that hot, overcast day came in the form of a challenge to Sheffield residents to keep the city moving forward.

"This city has come so far in such a short period of time," Ashe said. "There's no reason we cannot continue in this direction when I'm gone."

"There's a sense of pride that has returned to Sheffield. People are proud to say they're from Sheffield again. I know it means something special to me to tell people where I live. God, I love this place."

That love and pride for his hometown is perhaps the biggest legacy Laughlin Ashe leaves. Ashe's enthusiasm is credited by many as one of the single biggest factors that made Sheffield a city on the move again.

To have heard him talk, you would, think the city is headed toward unprecedented growth.

"We have feelers out in every direction," Ashe said. "We've on the verge of some extremely big things, and slowly but surely we're going to get there."

Ashe downplayed his role in the revitalization of Sheffield, and he made repeated efforts not to point fingers at anyone from past administrations. Instead, he praised the City Council, which he said has done "an unbelievable job," and the residents who "feel as deeply about the city as I do."

"When I was running for office, Sheffield had gotten into a rut," Ashe said. "People were not negative but they certainly weren't positive, either. That kept us in that rut."

Change came subtly but quickly, a product of a joint effort between the council and Ashe.

#### WE'RE BUSINESSLIKE

We were fortunate enough to have six brand new people with no political experience to come into office at one time," Ashe said. "Not a single one of us knew that something couldn't be done. We didn't understand there was no way to get from one point to the other. So, we just did it."

"We don't have the pizzazz that Florence does with their nearly \$20 million budget, we don't have the little hint of scandal that may sometimes trouble Muscle Shoals where you have this faction hollering at another faction, and we don't have that little smoke like what's coming out of Tusculumbia. We've business-like. We discuss the issue and 20 minutes later we're out of there."

Ashe saw his role as one of a cheerleader. While promptly dealing with the negatives, Ashe focused on the positive things in Sheffield. It's an attitude that proved to be contagious.

"During these past three years, we have uncovered a lot of those needs and started serving them," he said, "When you get down to it, you provide the basic services and the rest is attitude."

"And hell, yes, our image has improved. I base that on what people say to me, my family and the council. The attitude has improved. The way to discover that is by driving through our neighborhoods like York Terrace, the Village and Rivermont and you'll see people building onto their houses and taking pride in their property."

During the Ashe administration, the city has attacked the problem of rundown houses and property that has gone unattended by landowners. Several of those eyesores have been torn down, at a cost of about \$10,000 per project.

That condemnation process is far from complete, according to Ashe. Singling out a property owner on Columbia Avenue, he said the face-lift ultimately will include the re-

moval of some house trailers and other unsightly residences.

Ashe also talked at great length about the council's ability to update equipment for the street and cemetery departments, while improving resources for the police and fire departments. Sheffield's 101 city employees have been given another raise, marking the third straight year they have received pay increases.

"We got behind during the level times of the 1980s, and we're still not where we want to be," Ashe said, "We have lost three or four top-notch police officers over the last month or so. We can't afford to keep them. We get them trained in the academy and then on the streets, and then they go to Muscle Shoals or Florence for a \$5,000 raise. And I don't blame them."

The purchases and raises are products of an improved economic and retail base. Ashe credited Sheffield businessmen Bob Love and Tony McDougal for initiating some of that growth before the 1992 election. The influx of restaurants in the city has revitalized downtown.

#### A REASON TO COME

"The thing Sheffield had been missing for so many years was a hook, a reason for people to come to the city," the mayor said. "There had been no real reason to come into Sheffield unless you had a specific purpose. We don't have the upscale anything for shoppers. Restaurants are changing that. They're giving people a reason to come into our city."

Ashe forecast that the crowning jewel of Sheffield's revitalization will be a promised overpass that will allow motorists to travel to Sheffield without fear of being delayed by passing trains at the Montgomery Avenue crossing. Despite the belief among some residents that the overpass will never be built, Ashe never wavered.

"I still go to bed at night and say my prayers and thank God this overpass is coming," he said. "This overpass is going to do more to change Sheffield positively as Woodward Avenue did in Muscle Shoals."

"We're going to have a business route again, and we're going to have traffic flow through here that made this town back in the '50s and earlier years. Once the traffic flow starts, the retail and commercial portions will come. We have some people already beginning to think in those terms."

Sheffield's long-range plan includes the development of an office park near the intersection of Nathan and Hatch boulevards, a project that will tie in with the Old Railroad Bridge walking-trail system. The city also is working on a softball-baseball complex.

As Ashe put it, "We've got so many things in the cooker it's hard to keep up with." That's why he asked the council to hire an assistant to the mayor during his final months, so he could make that person aware of those projects. The council responded by hiring Linda Wright, who will now play a role in the transition to a new mayoral administration.

#### THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, more than 3 years ago I began daily reports to the Senate to make a matter of record the exact Federal debt as of close of business the previous day.

As of the close of business Wednesday, November 1, the Federal debt stood at exactly \$4,981,703,482,414.58. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,910.63 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

It is important to recall, Mr. President, that the Senate this year missed

an opportunity to implement a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Regrettably, the Senate failed by one vote in that first attempt to bring the Federal debt under control.

There will be another opportunity in the months ahead to approve such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, is there 30 minutes reserved for the minority leader or his designee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DORGAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

#### CLASS WARFARE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday, I was on the floor of the Senate discussing the reconciliation bill and discussing some other issues, including trade issues, and I was confronted, once again, with the rejoinder that a discussion of the type that I was having was class warfare. I responded to that at the time. But I was thinking about this last night as I was reflecting on the discussion we had.

I thought to myself that it is interesting because every time you talk about the economic system in this country and who it rewards and who it does not reward, who it penalizes and who it does not penalize, somebody says you are talking about class warfare. What a bunch of claptrap, to call a discussion about economic strategy in this country and who benefits "class warfare."

Here is what I said yesterday. I was relating it to the reconciliation bill, a bill that, not me, but a Republican strategist said largely takes from those who do not have and gives to those who do.

I was reading an article written by John Cassidy, which I thought was interesting. He talks about the economic circumstances in our country. He said that if you were to line up all Americans in a row, with the richest American far on the right and the poorest American far over here on the left—line all Americans up in one row—and then go to the middle American, the one right in the middle, the average, and that middle American standing in the middle of that line would be a working American, who earns, on average, \$26,000 a year.

His article pointed out something I pointed out to the Senate previously, which I think relates to why people are sour in this country and why they are upset about where we are headed. He pointed out what that person making \$26,000 a year, that working family there making \$26,000 a year, has experienced in this country.

In September 1979, this person was earning \$498 a week. In September of 1995, if you adjust for inflation, this worker had lost \$100 a month in income. Let me state that again. This is a person working in this country—a country we always expect to have an economy that provides opportunity, growth, and advancement—a person who works for an income of \$26,000, in 16 years, discovers he is \$100 a month behind.

Why is that happening? Because our economic system in this country is one where we are saying to the American workers, "We want you to compete on a different level." Other people in this world are willing to work for pennies an hour. People putting shoes together in Malaysia work for 14 cents an hour. They hire kids in India to make rugs. They hire cheap labor in Mexico to make products that used to be manufactured in this country by people who had good manufacturing jobs.

It is because those jobs increasingly have moved out of our country, because wages in this country have diminished, because we have decided to allow foreign competitors to access our marketplace with a product of cheap goods, which are the product of cheap labor, people earning 20 cents an hour making shoes in Sri Lanka, or shirts from China. The list goes on and on and on. Is that good for the consumer? Yes, because in the short run they can buy cheaper goods, presumably. In the long run, American jobs are gone.

That middle-income wage earner, who loses \$100 a month in earnings in 16 years, discovers that this kind of global economics hurts middle-income wage earners.

The same article made a different point. The top 1 percent of the families in this country in 1977 were earning an average of \$323,000 a year. In 1989, the year for the comparison of the top 1 percent, that was up 78 percent; they went from \$323,000 a year in income to \$576,000 a year in income.

So while the person right in the middle in this country has lost \$100 a month, we have the upper 1 percent, whose incomes per person go up to half a million per year, with a nearly 70 percent to 80 percent increase in income.

My purpose was not to say that the people at the top are not worth it. I do not know whether someone making half a million is worth it. I do not know what they are doing. My purpose is not to say they do not deserve it. They may well deserve all of it.

My purpose is to say an economy that provides enormous rewards to the small group of people at the top but penalizes—because of its economic strategy—the middle-income families in the middle by saying to them, "Work 16 years and you will be \$100 less a month and you will be farther behind," something is wrong with that strategy.

That was the point I was making. I was equating that point to the strategy in the reconciliation bill that says to 50 percent of the American families—

and guess which 50 percent—the bottom half will pay more as a result of this bill; and then says to the top 1 percent—guess what—it is time to smile. When you get your envelope, it will have good news because you get a significant tax break.

That is the point I am making—not class warfare, just the facts, the facts that describe why a lot of people are upset about which economic strategy. Why do we see a \$26,000-a-year wage earner work hard for 16 years and lose ground?

Let me give examples. Here is a company that makes pants—slacks. On July 19, they filed a form down at the Department of Labor that says 280 of their workers now apply for trade adjustment assistance.

What does that mean? In plain English, they had 280 people working for them that are not working for them anymore because of foreign competition. That means this company moved their company to Mexico, fired the American workers, the American workers go on trade adjustment assistance. Then this company, after the taxpayers pay trade adjustment assistance for unemployed Americans who lost their job and takes its production to Mexico where it can hire cheap labor, makes the same product, and ships it back into this country.

The net result? More profits for this company, more profits for the pants maker, but 280 people out of work.

Are these slothful, indolent people who do not want to make their way in life? No, working families that had a job but cannot compete with people who make 70 cents an hour or \$1 an hour and should not be expected to compete in those situations because it is not fair competition.

This company, by the way, that has 280 of its people receiving trade adjustment assistance says the following: "They perform most of their sewing and finishing offshore to keep the production costs low." However, the finishing of garments sewn by third-party contractors is conducted either in one of its U.S. facilities or in the offshore facilities. The offshore plants pack the finished garments and ship them back to the United States for U.S. customers.

Here is what it says in the financial report. Certain of the companies that formed subsidiaries had undistributed retained earnings of \$21 million on November 4, 1994. No U.S. tax has been provided on the undistributed earnings because management intends to indefinitely reinvest such earnings in the foreign operations. In other words, they made \$21 million by moving the jobs outside of this country and pay zero tax.

What about their competitor? If their competitor across the street stays in this country and makes the same kind of pants and makes \$21 million, they pay a \$7 million tax to the U.S. Government. Said another way, this company gets a \$7 million tax break for moving its jobs offshore.

Last week, I offered an amendment here in the U.S. Senate—very simple. No one could misunderstand it. It said at the very least we should stop penalizing the companies who stay in this country and keep the jobs in this country, get rid of the tax incentive that says if you close your plant in America and move it overseas, we give you a tax break.

Stop this perverse, insidious tax break for companies who decide they will close their American plant and move the jobs overseas, giving them an advantage over the people who stay here and produce here and work here in this country. My amendment failed on a party-line vote. It failed on a party-line vote. I say if we cannot close this loophole, we cannot close any loopholes. We will have a chance to vote on this again.

Let me give another example of why that \$26,000 family is working harder and losing ground. This is from a Fruit of the Loom news story, October 31, 1995. That is the day before yesterday. Fruit of the Loom, the Nation's largest underwear maker said today it would close six U.S. plants and cut back operations at two others, laying off 3,200 workers, or 12 percent of its work force.

What you are seeing, said their spokesman, is the cumulative impact of NAFTA and GATT, our trade agreements.

This company will lay off 3,200 people. It does not mean much, just a statistic. A statistic is sterile, antiseptic, and does not mean anything to anybody.

One of the 3,200 is a person that has a name, went to school, had some hopes deep in their chest for themselves and their family and their future, who are called in some place and told, "Guess what? We have some news for you. This job you had at our company does not exist anymore. We are moving that job to a foreign country where we can buy labor for 50 cents an hour, 14 cents an hour or \$1 an hour. We think having to pay you \$5, \$7 or \$10 an hour is way too much money. So we will access profit by obtaining foreign labor and doing overseas what we used to do here."

This \$26,000 worker or one of these 3,200 people that have lost their jobs might ask the question these days: If productivity is up—and it is—productivity is up in this country; the stock market is up—it is at record levels; corporate profits are up—at record levels; if America is doing so well, why is this middle-income family losing ground?

I spoke yesterday about part of the reason for that. It is a combined strategy that says in this country that we measure economic health by what we consume, not what we produce. There is no premium on production. If we have not learned anything by studying several hundred years of economic lessons, we certainly have not learned the

lesson of the British disease—slow economic decline. Once you decide that production does not matter, consumption is what counts.

You measure consumption every month forever and talk about how good things are going in this country and have your production facilities leave America, you weaken this country forever. You inevitably weaken America's ability when you weaken its productive sector.

Now, I talked about all of that yesterday in the context of needing a new trade strategy, especially a new trade strategy. We cannot compete with one hand tied behind our back and should not be expected to compete with people making 14 cents an hour or we do not want to compete with those kids who are paid 12 cents an hour working 12 hours a day. American workers should insist that competition be fair in international trade.

I also said yesterday that not only is our economic strategy and trade strategy desperately in need of reform so that it responds to the needs of those who stand in the middle of the line of the income earners in this country. At a time when those on the upper side of the line are doing handsomely, the people in the middle are losing ground. Not only do we need a new economic strategy to address those issues as we discuss issues like the reconciliation bill in Congress, we also need to understand what all the statistics mean.

When we decide that the philosophy we pursue is one that says let the bottom 50 percent pay more and let the top 1 percent be handsomely rewarded, it is not any wonder that people are sour about the priorities here.

The earned-income tax credit, as an example in the reconciliation bill, the earned-income tax credit changes are the result or are the reason why the bottom half will largely pay marginally more tax after this reconciliation bill is passed.

What is the earned-income tax credit? It is the earned-income tax credit that goes to people that work at the low end of the income scale that provides incentives for them to work, the very thing we have debated for months.

We want to get people off of welfare rolls and onto payrolls. We need to provide incentives for people to go to work. People who are working, often at the bottom of the scale, need those incentives.

This reconciliation bill says, by the way, these incentives are unimportant to us, so what we will do is limit the earned-income tax credit. And what is important to us? Building B-2 bombers nobody asked for, building a star wars program nobody wants, buying F-16 and F-15 airplanes nobody ordered, buying two amphibious ships for \$2 billion that the Defense Department said it did not need, and spending \$60 million, without a hearing, for blimps.

I am still asking, and I am asking again today, if there is anybody in this Chamber who knows who wrote in the

\$60 million in the defense bill to buy blimps, please raise your hand or come to me in the coming days so I can give proper credit where credit is due. Who in the Senate thinks we ought to buy blimps in the American defense bill? Somebody does. Somebody wrote it in. Nobody now will claim credit.

This is all about priorities. It is not about class warfare, not about one group of Americans versus another. It is all about trying to make sure the American wagon train moves ahead without leaving some wagons behind. It is about the priorities in this economic strategy, a strategy that actually encourages American corporations to move jobs out of this country, move them overseas, through this perverse tax incentive that rewards them when they do it. It's the economic strategy that says we do not care about those who stay here. We will not offer a minimum level of protection against unfair competition by 12-cent labor or 12-year-old laborers, or stuff produced by companies overseas that pump pollution into the air or water.

It is not a strategy that makes sense for this country's future. We must find ways, not only as we discuss this strategy on trade but also as we discuss the reconciliation bill, to merge our interests and make sure that all Americans move ahead. This country succeeds when we make sure that we provide opportunities for everyone. The private sector, the job base, the opportunities that exist must exist for all Americans, not just a select few Americans.

Most people I know want an opportunity to succeed and want an opportunity to do better. Most people are willing to get training and get education and go search for jobs. Regrettably, these days, fewer and fewer good jobs are available. The good manufacturing jobs, they are going to Mexico, going to Sri Lanka, going to Bangladesh, Malaysia, and Indonesia. Those are jobs that used to be in Phoenix, yes, some in Bismarck, El Paso, Denver, Chicago, and Pittsburgh.

This country needs to rethink its economic strategy. It needs to rethink the strategy in the reconciliation bill, which is wrong. It needs to rethink its economic strategy in trade policy and have a broader economic game plan to try to encourage, persuade and retain an aggressive, thriving production industry in our country.

Not our country, not any country, will long remain an economic power, a world-class economic power, if it exports its productive base.

I asked a recent Trade Ambassador, who shall remain unnamed—Carla Hills—is there any area at all, any area of productive capability, steel, autos, any area that you think that we must not do without, that would hurt our country if we lose? No answer. Apparently, there is nothing the loss of which would hurt our country.

I could not disagree more. No country will remain a strong economic power unless it has an auto industry

that thrives, a steel industry, a transportation industry. The storm clouds are overhead. The small craft warnings are out already.

People who do not study these issues, including international trade and the broader economic strategy, and who wins and who loses, and people who do not study the consequences of the reconciliation bill, I think only add to the aggravation that a lot of American families feel about a system that says to them: Work harder and you will achieve less. Work 15 years and you will be \$100 a month behind, if you happen to be in the middle of American wage earners.

We have a lot of debate ahead of us on the issue of reconciliation because the President, justifiably and predictably, will veto this bill. This is a terrible piece of legislation. There will be a veto and then this country, in the tradition of 200 years of democracy, must come together and reach a compromise.

Republicans and Democrats may disagree on some things, but the fact is, it is required for us to compromise. That is the way the system works. One side or another may not like it, may not want to, but we are required to do that.

This stuff about default, train wreck, shutdown, is fundamentally irresponsible. No one in this country expects any thinking or any thoughtful legislator to believe that any of those strategies would be in America's best interests.

It is my hope in the coming days and in the coming next several weeks that Republicans and Democrats together will think through the common elements of a plan that makes sense for this country. Can anybody, anybody ever believe it is in our interest to provide a tax break to move your plant overseas? Anybody? I understand we have had a couple of votes on it. Both times I have lost. But one of these times it must not be political. One of these times people need to look at that and say: Is there a reason to provide a tax break to say to somebody, "Close your plant in America, move it overseas, kill those jobs in America, hire some foreign workers for pennies an hour, and we will give you a reward; in this case, we will give you \$7 million; close it up—a \$7 million benefit"?

We will not give that benefit to an American plant operator, some owner of an American business or some workers in an American business. We will not give that to them for staying there. We will just give it to somebody who decides to move the jobs out of our country.

I need to explain that vote to a number of constituents, honestly. We are going to vote on it again. That is just a small, baby step in the march of a better economic strategy that makes sense for this country in terms of the growth of the productive center, growth of good jobs and opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I make a point order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think in this continuing effort for the freshman and sophomore class to bring something of a unique view to this Senate, we have set aside, I believe, a half an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator is recognized under the previous order to speak in morning business for up to 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Chair. I would like now to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

#### RESTORING THE BONDS OF TRUST

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, it is a real pleasure to be able to join my fellow freshmen and sophomores with a message that has been consistent. It is a message asking for the courage of the American people to come forward to accomplish the agenda that has been set out in a very clear fashion.

Politics, like medicine, must be based on trust. Without trust, people lose more than their faith in Government. They lose all hope, hope that life in the future will be better than in the past.

That is why in the 1994 campaign, Republicans pledged not just to change politics but to restore the bonds of trust between the people and their elected representatives, to make us all proud once again of the way free people govern themselves.

The ideal of freedom and opportunity, which is the spiritual strength of our Nation, is what motivated our Founding Fathers. That ideal is what motivates us today.

As the poet Archie MacLeish once remarked in a debate about national purpose, "There are those who reply that the liberation of humanity, the freedom of man and mind, is nothing but a dream. They are right. It is. It is the American dream."

Mr. President, we can no longer sacrifice the future, the future of our children, by clinging to the past. We must work to restore the American dream for our children and for our grandchildren, but that means keeping our promises.

Keeping our promise to balance the budget means a better life for all Americans. As interest rates fall and productivity rises, all Americans will enjoy a higher standard of living.

Keeping our promise to save and strengthen Medicare means that for the first time seniors will have a voice but also a choice, and the Medicare system will be preserved for that next generation.

Keeping our promise to cut taxes means that all Americans who have watched their tax burden grow from as little as 2 to 5 percent in 1950 to almost 50 percent today will finally get to keep more of what they earn.

Keeping our promise to end welfare as a way of life means that the cycle of poverty that has trapped a generation of families in welfare will at last be broken and parents will be able to regain their pride and their dignity through work and personal responsibility.

It is a time to change. It is a time to call upon the courage of legislators, of representatives, and of the American people to recognize and carry out this change.

The decisions we make today will determine our future. Let us go forward with hope, confident that the future we leave to our children and to their children will be brighter than our past.

That is the legacy of our parents and that their parents left to them. It is the legacy all Americans inherited from our Founding Fathers, the legacy of the American dream. Let us not be the first generation who fails to pass it on.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I yield floor.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. I yield myself such time as I usefully use.

Mr. President, I congratulate my friend from Tennessee, who has certainly been a leader in the Medicare-Medicaid propositions that have come forward. He has been a leader partially because of his experience as a physician, but also having a very strong commitment to move forward in the changes that need to be made in order to strengthen and preserve these programs so that they will be useful. So I congratulate my friend.

#### LET US TALK ABOUT THE FACTS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we have been talking now for some time and will continue to talk, certainly through this month. I hope much of the bill will be completed within the next month so it will come to a closure that will be useful to the American people. I am confident that it will.

In the meantime, I think it is important that we continue to talk about what it is we are seeking to do, that we continue to foster an understanding in the country of what the issues are that we are talking about. I have expressed before and again say that I am very concerned that in this democracy, in this country, this Government of the people and by the people and for the people, that we need to have facts upon which each of us can make the deci-

sions that we need to make as citizens and as voters and as leaders in our communities there.

There are differences of view. That is legitimate. There will continue to be differences of view. There are extreme differences of view among some of the Members in this place. But the decisions that are made, regardless of that point of view, have to be made on facts.

We all have a right to our own opinion, but we do not have a right to our own facts. I am concerned about it. I am concerned about it. When I go home to Wyoming, people talk about what they perceive, what they have heard in the media, what they have heard from opinion analysts and things of that kind that are not necessarily so. So I hope that for the most part we can talk about the facts.

I received a letter, as a matter of fact, from a lady in Afton, WY, whom I know, who has been very involved in public issues and has been active as a silver-haired legislator. She expressed her concern about some of the decisions that are being made and are being proposed. But I thought the interesting part was that she expressed her particular concern about the future and about her grandchildren and the things that would affect them. She talked about the fact that things are not going well, in her judgment, in the country. And, indeed, they are not where we would like them to be.

I thought it was interesting that she resisted the idea of change. Basically that is what we are talking about here a lot. People will stand up, one after another, decry the situation we are in, talk about the future, talk about kids, talk about taxes, and then resist change, as if things were going to change by continuing to do what we have been doing. It seems to me that is a fairly simple concept. We have not balanced the budget for 26 years. We have got to do something different if we believe, as I do, that we need to balance the budget. I think most people know something of the condition that we are in, some of the conditions that we need to change. One of them is to balance the budget.

Let me read from this column, the Parade magazine column. This author uses this example:

Let's suppose you have an income of \$125,760 that comes not from work but from the contributions of all your friends and relatives who work. You're not satisfied with what \$125,760 can buy this year, so you prepare yourself a budget of \$146,060 and charge the \$20,300 difference to your credit card, on which you're already carrying an unpaid balance of \$472,548 . . . on which you pay interest daily. Multiplied by 10 million times, that's what our government did in the fiscal year of 1994.

That is what we have been doing, putting it on the credit card for these young people who will pay for it. We maxed out the credit card. We will be working in the next month to have to raise the debt limit to \$5 trillion. So balancing the budget, most everybody