

tax increase just a few weeks ago. He raised taxes by \$240 billion when he said he would not increase taxes during the first term in office, over a 5-year-period, and we are cutting taxes by \$240 billion approximately over a 7-year period.

We are basically at a wash. We are getting back to the point that the President appears to want to be at now when he said he raised taxes, too. We are trying to correct that, getting taxes back to where they were when he came to office.

Independent of that we hear—the crocodile tears about it being horrible what is being done here to the poor and moderate income Americans by the Republican tax cut, and helping the wealthy—first, it is factually inaccurate. The tax cut that we are proposing, 70 percent of it flows to people, families with incomes under \$75,000, and 90 percent of it flows to people with incomes under \$100,000, and people with incomes up to \$70,000 are not wealthy in this society.

More significantly, something that is conveniently ignored by the other side in the area of Medicare legislation and which the President appears ready to veto is the fact we are saying to the wealthy Americans who are seniors, “Hey, you have to stop being subsidized by your working children and grandchildren.” We do not think it is right that a working child and grandchild who is trying to raise a family should have to pay 69 percent of the cost of the insurance of the fellow who just retired from IBM last year and is making hundreds of thousands of dollars maybe—tens of thousands, anyway—in pension benefits.

It is not fair that a person who is working 40, 50, 60 hours a week trying to make ends meet on a computer assembly line in New Hampshire or at a farm in the Midwest or at some other activity—garage or a restaurant—that an individual, family, a husband and wife, working their hearts out trying to make ends meet should have to subsidize the top 100 people who retired from General Motors or Ford last year, whose incomes on pensions exceed the earnings of the people who are paying the taxes to subsidize their health benefits. It is just not right.

So, in the Republican plan, we say if you have more than \$50,000 of individual income or as a husband and wife you have more than \$75,000 of income, you have to start paying a higher percentage of the cost of your part B premium. Instead of being subsidized at 69 percent by the working Americans in this country, you are going to have to start to pay more. And if your income exceeds \$100,000 as an individual or \$150,000 as a husband and wife, then you have to pay the full cost of your part B premium. That is good policy. That is exactly what we should be doing. We should be making this more fair.

So, let us have a little integrity in the process here as we debate this issue. Let us note that, when the Presi-

dent says he wants to reduce the amount of the premium that seniors are paying, when he wants that 31 percent to go down to 25 percent, that is a tax increase on the people who pick up the difference, the people who pick up the cost for that tax cut to seniors. It is a tax increase on working children and grandchildren. Mr. President, 70 percent today, or 69 percent, of senior's premiums today are already subsidized and we have accepted that as a fair number. But to go to 75 percent, as the President wants, means you are going to raise the taxes on working Americans, the children and grandchildren of those seniors, by at least 6.5 percent, under the President's proposal. That is not right and it is not fair.

Let us remember also that wealthy Americans today are subsidized by working Americans who cannot afford it. It is time to change that and that is what the Republican proposal does.

As we continue this debate I think a little forthrightness on the facts would help the process.

I yield.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to proceed for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All Senators should be notified that the period for morning business has concluded, but the request of the Senator is in order. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

THE INTEGRITY OF MEDICARE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, my good friend and colleague from New Hampshire has basically not responded to the central thrust of our amendment, and that is the cuts which are being proposed by the Republican program, according to CBO, means that there will be \$50 billion in premium increases and \$24 billion in increases in deductibles. We are also talking about \$245 billion in tax breaks for the wealthy individuals.

He failed to explain the connection, but the connection is there for everyone to see. The Democrats offered, under the leadership of TOM DASCHLE, the proposal which would guarantee the financial integrity of the Medicare system without a single dime increase for the premiums for those under Medicare and Social Security; not a single dime. Every Democrat voted for that and only one Republican voted for it. Every other Republican voted against it. It would have preserved the integrity of the Medicare system for the next 10 years.

But, nonetheless, the Republicans wanted to move the burden over to the

payment of senior citizens, to collect the \$50 billion—\$51 billion, according to CBO. It is right there in the chart, \$51 billion. It says, “Increase in the premiums, \$51 billion.” It is there under your proposal. It is not there under ours. What is under yours is the tax breaks for wealthy individuals that is going right along with this proposal. That is the justification and the reason for this kind of cut. We can maintain the integrity of the Medicare system without having these kinds of increases. The only reason you need these kinds of increases is to have a tax cut.

So the American people have to say why should the major tax cut, that is being proposed by the Republicans, go to the wealthy individuals and corporations, and the premium increases are coming out of people who are going to rely on \$5,300 or \$7,800 or, at the top, \$10,000 a year to survive?

So this, the increase in premiums for our seniors over this period of time, is \$12,400 more in premiums over the 7 years. That is what the seniors are going to pay under the Republican proposal.

You can complain all you like about what your proposal is going to do, but you cannot argue with the CBO figures. If you have something better on it, then address it. And that kind of wholesale increase, tax increase, the wiping out of the COLA's, the increasing of the premiums and the deductibles by that amount in order to justify a tax break is something that I find is absolutely unacceptable and I think most Americans find unacceptable. Certainly the seniors would find that unacceptable.

To do it on a continuing resolution at this time without full discussion and debate, I think, is unjustified and unwarranted and unfair.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BRYAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for a period of time not to exceed 5 minutes.

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

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

IMAGE-ENHANCING EFFORT AT DOE

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, those of us in public life are accustomed to being surprised as the morning newspaper is delivered to us each day to find extraordinary examples of bureaucratic abuse, waste, and misuse of the taxpayers' dollars. I must say, this morning the level of my outrage at this most recent abuse, which I will comment on in just a moment, has been unsurpassed in my recent memory.

As the Wall Street Journal reports this morning, the Secretary of the Department of Energy, Mrs. O'Leary, has

hired an investigative service at taxpayers' expense in the amount of \$43,500.

This is not a clipping service. All of us are familiar with clipping services. I think they have a legitimate purpose in ascertaining what types of information may be being printed, broadcast, as the case may be, about the functions of an agency. But this is an image-enhancing effort in which the Secretary has engaged, again at taxpayers' expense, to the amount of \$43,500, an investigative service. This outfit is known as "Carma International." They were charged with not only clipping stories but doing some investigative reporting, both as to the reporters themselves and the stories. I think, if I might just share a paragraph or two very briefly with my colleagues, the flavor of this story will be very clear.

From April through August, the service, Washington-based Carma International, tracked more than two dozen individual reporters and hundreds of newspapers, magazines and newscasts. It also pored over thousands of stories, giving each one a numerical ranking based upon how favorable or unfavorable it was. It then calculated scores for how favorably or unfavorably the DOE fared on various issues, from nuclear waste to Mrs. O'Leary's own reputation. And it scrutinized sources quoted in those stories.

Then, Mr. President, it went on to compile a "Top 25" list of "Unfavorable Sources."

I must say, in a previous generation, this has a striking similarity in terms of the mentality involved of the Nixon "Enemies List." This is not an attempt to gather information or ascertain what has been reported. This is a subjective analysis of "look how the reporters from a particular news service or news organization are treating us."

For this kind of money to be expended at taxpayers' expense is simply outrageous. I cannot conceive of a rationale or a justification to spend this kind of money.

So I am going to ask in a moment this article be printed in the RECORD, but also indicate it is my intention to call upon the Secretary to reimburse the American taxpayers at her own expense for what I believe to be a truly outrageous expenditure of taxpayers' dollars, without any public use or justification at all, primarily driven, I suspect, by the ego of the individual involved and by a paranoia that seems rampant at some levels in the agency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the article from the Wall Street Journal of this morning be printed in the RECORD.

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

TURNING THE TABLES, ENERGY DEPARTMENT REPORTS ON REPORTERS

IT PAID \$43,500 IN TAX DOLLARS TO FIND "UNFAVORABLES," "A LITTLE BIT OF NIXON"

(By Michael Moss)

Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary had an image problem. Her department seemed to be taking a drubbing in the press for everything from nuclear waste-disposal problems to its allegedly bloated bureaucracy.

Mrs. O'Leary wanted those unfortunate stories to go away. Badly. So she hit on a plan: She would "build communication and trust," explains Barbara Semedo, the Department of Energy's press secretary.

And just how did she plan to build that trust?

By reporting on the reporters.

In an extraordinary tale of man-bites-dog, Mrs. O'Leary quietly hired an investigative service to poke into the reporters who were poking around the DOE. From April through August, the service, Washington-based Carma International, tracked more than two dozen individual reporters and hundreds of newspapers, magazines and newscasts. It also pored over thousands of stories, giving each one a numerical ranking based on how favorable or unfavorable it was. It then calculated scores for how favorably or unfavorably the DOE fared on various issues, from nuclear waste to Mrs. O'Leary's own reputation. And it scrutinized sources quoted in those stories, coming up with its own "Top 25" list of "Unfavorable Sources."

The result: detailed monthly reports, chock full of colorful graphics and charts, with each report culminating in favorability rankings for reporters, sources and news organizations. All for \$43,500—paid for with U.S. tax dollars.

The DOE's Ms. Semedo defends the investigations, saying a reporter's unfavorable rating "meant we weren't getting our message across, that we needed to work on this person a little."

Some of the journalists and sources who were scrutinized aren't so sanguine. None knew about the existence of the lists before being contacted by this newspaper yesterday. It's "an enemies' list," says Jerry Taylor of the Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank, who ranked No. 25 on the July list of unfavorables. "I guess it shows you there's a little bit of Nixon in everybody in the federal government."

BOTTOMING OUT

Carma is part of a small but growing cottage industry of firms that analyze reporters—and reporters' sources. Government agencies and corporations have long used clip searches, which find articles about them or about issues in which they are interested. But these new services go much further, coming up with pseudo-scientific methodology to rate reporters. Some of the services, not including Carma, also delve much deeper. They interview reporters' sources, their employers and their friends and colleagues, and report on information about the reporters' personal lives and activities outside of work.

The DOE provided copies of reports for two months, April and July, which make clear which reporters and news organizations were considered friendly—and which weren't. Its July report, for example, ranked the Associated Press's H. Josef Hebert dead last, with a 30.8 overall score. That month, he wrote an article that said "sloppy" Energy Department monitoring at weapons facilities led to radiation exposure, and another about victims of secret government-radiation tests during the Cold War.

If a reporter gets "too good a rating, you aren't doing your job," Mr. Hebert said yesterday. Also scoring relatively low in July was Matthew Wald of the New York Times, who received a 46.7 for stories on plutonium storage. (The Wall Street Journal didn't appear in the reports.)

At the other end of the spectrum were several reporters for smaller newspapers, including Tony Batt of the Las Vegas Review-Journal, who got a 56 in the July report. "I've never been rated before, especially by a government agency," says Mr. Batt, who

works in the paper's Washington bureau. "I'm uneasy about that."

"SLANTED" STORIES

DOE resorted to this latest tactic after a 1993 survey it commissioned found it to be one of the least-trusted entities around—right "down with Congress," Ms. Semedo marvels. At first, the department thought it would monitor the press itself, at an estimated cost of about \$80,000, she says. Then DOE officials heard about Carma, which also had done work for the Internal Revenue Service and the U.S. Postal Service.

Carma, which stands for Computer-Aided Research and Media Analysis, warns in brochures that "stories are sometimes 'slanted.'" It boasts that if a reporter seeks an interview with a CEO, Carma can find "if a predetermined bias has shown up in past coverage," thus giving the CEO "a strategic advantage."

For DOE, Carma went through a rather complex process to evaluate reporters and stories. Carma employees—generally former academics or people with journalism backgrounds—scrutinized close to 800 articles some months, paying close attention to captions, photos and headlines, says Albert J. Barr, president. Each employee also was armed with a list of 55 issues DOE had identified, from energy taxes to worker safety. For every article, the employee singled out which issues were discussed and assigned a score of 0 to 100 to each issue mentioned, with 50 signaling a neutral comment and 100 an extremely favorable one.

Using the individual scores of every issue in a single article, Carma employees worked out an overall score for the article. That score was then fed into a computer, which calculated a cumulative rating for the reporter involved and for each of the issues mentioned.

SURPRISE: NO SURPRISES

And with all that scientific scrutiny, what bombshells did DOE uncover?

Well, actually, none. "It confirmed what those of us who work with these reporters daily know—who is going to write what and how are they going to cover us," Ms. Semedo says.

Indeed, Carma's "Top 25" lists of favorable and unfavorable sources hardly required sophisticated analysis. Topping the April list of "Favorable" sources: Mrs. O'Leary herself. And leading the pack of "Unfavorables": Sen. Robert Dole, a longtime critic of the agency who has suggested it should be dismantled. Also making appearances on the "Unfavorable" list were such obvious choices as Beatrice Brailsford, program director of Snake River Alliance, a watchdog group created in response to an Idaho DOE project; and civil-rights attorney Roy Haber, who is representing people suing over exposure to radiation beginning in 1944.

"This is wild, it's absolutely wild," Mr. Haber said yesterday, calling the list "disturbing" and "frightening." He added, "This will be investigated in great depth, and we're going to find out the genesis of who promulgated that list."

At this point, he may no longer have to worry. If the reports are any judge, the DOE's reputation only got worse during the time Carma monitored the press, with its overall favorability steadily dropping from 52 in January to 50, or neutral, in July. Certainly, the DOE wasn't helped by its admission that cleanup of former weapons-production sites could cost at least \$230 billion, or by press reports sniping about Mrs. O'Leary flying first class and patronizing expensive hotels.

Ms. Semedo, who in an earlier interview said Carma had been dropped for budgetary reasons, said yesterday, "It wasn't particularly useful, and we stopped the service."

Anyway, she added, Secretary O'Leary only read a few of the reports: "She found it too complicated."

Mr. BRYAN. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

If there is no Senator seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I permitted to speak as if in morning business.

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

REMEMBERING KRISTALLNACHT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, tonight is the 57th anniversary of a horrible event. In Germany, 57 years ago this evening, it was "the night of broken glass"—Kristallnacht—when throughout Nazi Germany, Jews were killed and Jewish cultural and business sites were destroyed in an organized campaign by the Nazi state.

In a little under 2 days, many Jews were murdered, and 30,000 were arrested by the Nazi authorities, sent to swell the growing populations of Dachau, Buchenwald, and the other camps already built. On the night of Kristallnacht, over 1,000 synagogues were destroyed, and their sacred texts were burned and defiled. Jewish businesses around the country were sacked. Cemeteries were desecrated. Homes were burned. The police and fire departments were instructed not to intervene.

Kristallnacht marked an escalation in kind of the Nazi persecution. It came barely 6 weeks after the infamous Munich conference, which produced the chilling declaration of peace in our time. After Kristallnacht, the world could no longer ignore the behavior of this evil regime. President Franklin D. Roosevelt said, 5 days later:

The news of the past few days in Germany has deeply shocked public opinion in the United States * * * I, myself, could scarcely believe that such things could occur in 20th century civilization.

But within a week of Kristallnacht, Jews were banned from the German school system. Within a month, Jews were being banned from public places.

The Holocaust, as it would come to be known, was fully underway. Within less than a decade, this conflagration of historic proportions would result in the systematic murders of 6 million European Jews.

While it represented the nadir of anti-Semitism in our modern age, the destruction spawned by the Nazis' racial hatred consumed many more millions of others, including Poles, Gypsies, Jehovah's Witnesses, homo-

sexuals, and persons with physical and mental disabilities.

Mr. President, 57 years after Kristallnacht, we are fortunate to still have survivors of the Holocaust among us. There are still some neighborhoods in this country where, tonight, survivors and their families commemorate the night of broken glass by burning candles in the windows. These flames are in memory of those who suffered the Holocaust. These flickers in the windows are the testaments of the survivors.

Mr. President, I worry about the memory of the Holocaust when the survivors will no longer be here. With each passing year, we have fewer survivors among us.

Mr. President, as the decades have passed from the dark era of the Holocaust, I have been greatly troubled by the increase in pronouncements by those who willfully disbelieve the existence of the Holocaust. These "Holocaust deniers," as they have come to be known, present us with a troubling specter. They threaten our collective memory with lies, distortions, and half-truths to challenge the reality of the Holocaust.

One of America's preeminent scholars of this phenomenon, Dr. Deborah Lipstadt of Emory University, has written:

While Holocaust denial is not a new phenomenon, it has increased in scope and intensity since the mid-1970's. It is important to understand that deniers do not work in a vacuum. Part of their success can be traced to an intellectual climate that has made its mark in the scholarly world during the past two decades. The deniers are plying their trade at a time when much of history seems up for grabs and attacks on the Western rationalist tradition have become commonplace.

Sadly, this erosion in the intellectual climate has infected our popular culture. Today, in addition to the pseudo-scholarly venues the Holocaust deniers have created, they have managed to present their injurious views on high school campuses, in the media, and, in a few cases, in the political process.

Mr. President, we are fortunate, for many reasons, that we live in a free and democratic society, and one of those reasons is that freedom preserves the ability of the scholar to study historical truth. An open society such as ours allows the student of history to apply methods of historical scrutiny and verification without bias or distortion, and thus to openly determine historical fact.

I must stress, Mr. President, that the same principles of an open and democratic society also allow for the holding of unpopular opinions, however factually incorrect or hurtful to others. A free society must protect the opinions of all, Mr. President, and that includes the contrarians and solipsists. If you choose to believe the Earth is flat, that is your right in this society.

Our freedom of expression is wide, but falsehoods must be answered with the truth. Denying the Holocaust is absurd.

Holocaust denial may be animated by ignorance and solipsism, but we cannot avoid the fact that it is often motivated by anti-Semitism and hatred. We must recognize that many of those who promote Holocaust denial do so not out of an innocent but willful ignorance, but do so to promote political agendas, anti-Semitism and hatred.

We must deplore, in the words of the scholar Kenneth Stern "anti-Semitism masquerading as objective scholarly inquiry."

That is why I am introducing this resolution today, along with several of my colleagues, which "deplores persistent, ongoing and malicious efforts by some persons of this country and abroad to deny the historical reality of the Holocaust." This resolution also praises the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum for its essential work in honoring the memory of all the victims of the Holocaust, and teaching "all who are willing to learn profoundly compelling and universally resonant moral lessons."

Mr. President, as the last generation of Holocaust survivors fades from our midst, we are left with a chasm, a generational divide between the primary witnesses and the rest of us, who must carry their witness. Into that chasm the Holocaust deniers may throw their malicious lies.

It is our responsibility that we close that chasm with a dedication to promoting scholarship about the Holocaust. We must cultivate the history of the Holocaust in order to preserve our memory and to reinforce the lessons we learn from such horrors. We must strengthen our younger generation's weakening grasp on history.

A free and democratic society must be supported by an informed populace. And an informed populace requires a knowledge of history. As individuals with amnesia suffer degrees of disorientation, a society separated from history is bereft of its shared experience with the world.

Mr. President, we must recognize the crucial role played by education in preserving the memory of the Holocaust. In 1980, the U.S. Congress assumed this responsibility when we chartered the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. Since its opening in 1993, the Museum has played a signal role in teaching the history of the Holocaust.

So powerful has the museum's message been that in it has been operating beyond capacity since its opening. Of the more than 2 million visitors each year, 80 percent have traveled more than 100 miles to visit this awesome place. As of today, 5.3 million have visited this remarkable institution, a number four times greater than expected.

People come to witness and to learn. More than 11,000 scholars and university students, more than 700 members of the media and museum community, and more than 14,500 survivors have used the museum's research institute. Through its connections to the information superhighway, 50,000 inquiries