

their behalf and supposedly in their interests. It is amazing to me that the President, when we are facing the highest tax burden in American history, would be talking about another \$91 billion of net taxes.

Let me talk about the tobacco settlement. The President is counting on \$65 billion of revenues coming from the tobacco settlement and, except for a tiny amount—\$800 million which is spent on Medicare—this \$65 billion goes to an array of new spending programs that have absolutely nothing to do with the tobacco settlement. I want to remind my colleagues and anyone who is interested in this issue that the whole logic of the tobacco settlement is that the tobacco companies, by selling tobacco to consumers, and through the health effects of smoking, have imposed a massive cost on the Federal taxpayer. But where has that cost occurred? It has not occurred in child care, it has not occurred in new school buildings, it has not occurred in the cost of new teachers—it has occurred in mounting costs for Medicare. Interestingly enough, while the States are big beneficiaries in their Medicaid Program from the tobacco settlement, for every \$1 of cost imposed on Medicaid by people smoking in the past, there have been perhaps \$6 of costs imposed on Medicare.

So I believe if we have a tobacco settlement, that money ought to be put to a noble cause and that cause is saving Medicare, not just for our parents but for our children. I don't think we ought to take money in the name of reimbursing the taxpayer for medical care costs that have been borne through Medicare and spend that money on other things. I believe, if there is a tobacco settlement, that the money ought to go to save Medicare and I intend, as chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over Medicare, to fight to see that any tobacco settlement goes to Medicare, that it doesn't just become a grab bag to fund new Government programs that have nothing to do with the health effects of tobacco.

The President says that he wants to use the surplus to save Social Security. No. 1, I think the President's words ring hollow when you note that he is busting the spending caps that we agreed to last year in a bipartisan budget. I am sure some of my colleagues will remember that I thought the spending level was too high in last year's budget. In fact, last year in writing that budget we broke the spending caps of the budget that President Clinton had pushed through Congress in 1993. But now the President is already trying to break the agreement that we adopted last year, and I reject that.

Finally, I don't know how the President can claim to be saving Social Security when the Social Security system will pay in \$600 billion more into the Social Security trust fund than will be spent on Social Security, and the President spends \$400 billion of the

\$600 billion. I believe we need to set up a program to take that \$600 billion and invest it in Social Security by making real investments that are owned by the individual worker so that young Americans will have some chance of getting some benefits from Social Security.

So I believe the President's budget breaks the agreement that he entered into with Congress last year. The President's budget breaks the spending caps. The President's budget proposes the largest increase in spending contemplated by Government since he proposed having the Government take over and run the health care system. The President proposes the largest tax increase, \$91 billion, larger than the tax cut from last year—he proposes the largest tax increase contemplated by our Government since 1993. The President takes \$400 billion that will be paid into the Social Security trust fund and spends it on general Government under this budget. I believe that should be stopped.

Finally, if we have a tobacco settlement, the money ought to go to save Medicare, it ought not to go to fund general Government.

So, I believe the President is breaking the deal that he made with Congress. I believe your word is your bond on these matters.

I am opposed to the President's budget. I think we should hold the line on spending. I think whatever surpluses we have, A, we ought not to do anything with them until we have them, and, B, when we do have them, we should use them to make real investments so that our young workers will have some benefit from Social Security, a program that they will pay into their entire working lives. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Will the Senator from Texas suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GRAMM. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for morning business until 2 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. THOMAS. I would like to speak up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

ISTEA FUNDING

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we have had this afternoon several Members rise to talk about ISTEA funding. I rise to support the things that they have said. One of the most important bills that we passed in our committee last year, and I think one of the most important elements before us now in the Senate, is the funding of the Intermodal Transportation Act.

We worked a great deal last year. I happen to be on the Committee on Environment and Public Works, and we came up with an extension of the ISTEA bill, which expired last year, by the way. Now, of course, we are operating on a temporary arrangement, which makes it very difficult for State highway departments to make the contracts that are necessary. I think it is particularly important for States like Wyoming and the northern part of the country, where you have a relatively small short contracting and construction time, that we move to pass this bill so that the States will know what money is available to them.

There should have been approval last year, other than an extension. Unfortunately, we couldn't come to an agreement with the House. Furthermore, right here in the Senate, as I recall, there were some things that were brought up that kept us from considering ISTEA. But now it is time to do that.

We also have before us a proposal to extend the authority for spending, to use more of the dollars that are collected, and I agree with that. I have not yet become a sponsor of it, but I, frankly, propose to be. We have been spending in the neighborhood of \$21 billion a year on ISTEA, but Federal taxes have been raising more like \$27 billion. Now, of course, as a result of last year's budget, we converted the 4.3-cent tax, having gone to the general fund, to now go to the highway fund. I support that idea. So it is time for us to do that.

I am concerned, of course, that we do it within budget guidelines. I am not interested in breaking the budget caps by simply spending. I know when you have a unified budget, if you are going to spend more money here, you have to make arrangements on the other side, too, which restricts spending. I am for that.

I think it is necessary for us to do it. I am sorry that it has been postponed. It was my understanding that it would be the first item of business to be considered or early, at least, in this session. I know there is controversy now with the budgeteers in terms of how that works, but this is an authorization, as I understand it. It is not an expenditure, of course. It authorizes what will then be put together by the budgeteers and appropriators.

Mr. President, I certainly want to endorse the notion that there is nothing more important or nothing that needs to be dealt with more currently than the idea of expanding ISTEA. I hope

that the leader and others in the leadership will give some consideration to that. I think we can move forward. I know that there is not certainty in the House as to the direction they want to take, but I believe passage of the Senate proposal and shipment of it to the House would cause that to happen. If it is difficult, it is difficult. It is no more difficult now than it will be later. To the contrary, as we get toward the end of this session, it may be even more difficult to find time.

I suggest, hope and urge that we bring it to the floor as soon as possible, and we resolve that issue so that we can move forward on this transportation question, which is probably one of the most important economic things we do in our States. These dollars go there, they are contracted, they go into business, and we provide a better transportation system.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MCKINLEY WISE: THE SENATE'S FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN REPORTER OF DEBATES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this month marks the 22nd year the United States has celebrated Black History Month. I want to take this opportunity to mark a relevant piece of Senate history. I am proud to serve with CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN of Illinois and to have served with Edward Brooke of Massachusetts. These outstanding Senators and African Americans are well known and recognized by those who follow the Senate. But today, I also want to recognize McKinley Wise.

Twenty years ago this month, McKinley Wise was asked to work in the office of the Official Reporters of Debates and in March 1978 became the first African American to stand on the Senate floor and record the words of this body.

I was privileged to be a Member of the Senate at that time, and I know that this happened not because there was a quota to be achieved but because McKinley Wise's ability qualified him to work on the floor of the Senate.

In 1978, the Senate was beginning its debate on the Panama Canal treaties. Because this was such an important debate and all Senators were expected to participate, the Chief of the Official Reporters of Debate expected long hours and knew that they were going to need more staff. G. Russell Walker, the chief reporter at the time, set out to find qualified people to work part time and help record the Senate's debate. One of those people he recruited was McKinley Wise. Here's how Mr.

Walker explained how Mr. Wise's name came to his attention:

We had before the Senate in late January the Panama Canal Treaties, and there was a very good possibility of the Senate's having 12- and 14-hour-a-day sessions, and we needed more reporters. I went through our file and saw McKinley Wise's name. He was well qualified, had all the certificates, and seemed to have a good background. I asked for and received authority to call him, to see if he could come down and assist us. It was on Friday, February 24th, when I called him and asked him if he could come in the following Tuesday. Not many reporters could leave their businesses and come to Washington on such short notice, but Mac was there, and he did a magnificent job.

Mr. President, I remember that very well. And we did have those 12- and 14-hour and sometimes longer days. But he was there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the May 1978 issue of the Circuit Reporter, the official publication of the United States Court Reporters Association, be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I bring this to the attention of the Senate to highlight not only this moment in the Senate's history, but also to note that qualifications and hard work do count. Although no longer working for the Senate, McKinley Wise has continued to use his skills over the past 20 years and is currently working in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. We spend a lot of time in the Senate talking about opportunity and providing every American the same chance at life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Hard work is the key to success, but people need the opportunity to perform. The Senate gave that opportunity to Mac Wise in 1978, and both are better for it.

EXHIBIT NO. 1

FORMER U.S. DISTRICT COURT REPORTER,
FIRST BLACK REPORTER ON SENATE FLOOR

February 24, 1978, was the day a dream came true. McKinley (Mac) Wise, a former Official Court Reporter in the United States Court in Philadelphia, Pa., had long dreamed that some day he would have the honor and privilege of being the first black court reporter to serve on the Senate floor—but he thought it was just another of his dreams.

G. Russell Walker, Chief Reporter, Official Reporters of Debates, United States Senate, had Mac's name on his list of highly qualified reporters to call upon in an emergency. He made that call to Mac on February 24, inquiring whether Mac could report for temporary duty in connection with the expected lengthy debate on the Panama Canal Treaties.

Mac lost no time in rearranging the busy schedule of his reporting firm, McKinley Wise & Associates, Inc., of Philadelphia, and four days after the call he was on his way to achieving another "first" in his long career of "firsts."

When he arrived at the Office of the Official Reporters of Debates, Mac was cordially greeted by all of the reporters, transcribers, and staff, and before he knew what was happening, he was there—on the Senate floor—with his Stenograph machine.

A feeling of awe came over Mac when he realized that here he was at last, sitting among this august and distinguished body of United States Senators. At first, Mac had a supervisor beside him, identifying the speakers, and explaining the procedures. Mac said, "I was able to conquer the words spoken, but when it came to putting them into the proper format, it was an art to which I had never been exposed. In the beginning I felt inept, but said to myself, 'The job must do done', and I did it."

Everything went along smoothly until the arrival of Morning Business, which was somewhat like taking pleas before a magistrate. The proceedings go very rapidly, because it is usually routine to the lawmakers, with deviations coming later in the office where proper headlines and sub-headlines are inserted.

Mac said that the cooperation of his colleagues overwhelmed him, and that their knowledge on just about any subject was astounding. No one was ever too busy to take time to answer any question that Mac had.

Mac said, "I think that being the first black reporter on the Senate floor, especially at a time when a debate of critical importance to the country was taking place, is something which I will never forget. It isn't often that one of your wildest dreams comes true."

Mr. Walker, Chief Reporter of the Official Reporters of Debates, confirmed the fact that McKinley Wise was the first black or any other minority reporter to serve on the Senate floor. Walker said that, to his knowledge, no black or minority reporter has yet served on the floor of the House.

When asked how he came to call Mac Wise, Mr. Walker replied, "We had before the Senate in late January the Panama Canal treaties, and there was a very good possibility of the Senate having 12 and 14-hour-a-day sessions, and we needed more reporters. I went through our file and saw McKinley Wise's name. He was well-certified, with all of the certificates, well-qualified, and he seemed to have a good background."

"I asked for and received authority to call him, which I did, to see if he could come down and assist us. It was a Friday when I called Mac, asking if he could come in the following Tuesday. Not many reporters could leave their business and come to Washington on short notice, but Mac was there, and he did a magnificent job."

Mr. Walker went on to say, "Ordinarily, when someone comes into this office as one of the Official Reporters of Debates, he or she is given great in-depth training in all of our forms, and parliamentary procedures, Senate rules, and so forth. I didn't give Mac any of that. We just wanted somebody to write, and write fast, because this is the kind of debate where there was not at that time a lot of parliamentary procedure going on; it was mostly stand-up, straight, hot and heavy debate."

"As I said before, he did a magnificent job."

Mac was born in Jeanrette, Louisiana, but with his parents moved to Port Arthur, Texas, at a very early age. He was graduated from Lincoln High School there, after which he served in the United States Navy, where he was given a stenomask reporting in order to report courts-martial and other related proceedings. Mac found the stenomask unsatisfactory, and while in the Navy started studying stenotype at the Certified School of Stenotype in San Francisco, California, completing his course after being discharged from the Navy.

Since then Mac Wise has had a varied reporting career, involving free lance work in New York City, substituting in many of the courts in New York City; serving as an assistant in the Philadelphia County courts,