



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1995

No. 185

## Senate

The Senate met at 2:30 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

### PRAYER

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

Almighty God, we come to You asking for a miracle of Your intervention. We claim Your promise given through Isaiah, "You shall hear a word behind you saying, 'This is the way, walk in it.'"—Isaiah 30:21. We humble ourselves and ask for that word of guidance today in the continuing deadlock over the budget and the shutdown of Government. Jesus' words in Mark 3:25 sound an alarm: "A house divided against itself cannot stand." We acknowledge that presently we are a divided government. Create in all of us a humble desire to find a solution. We all belong to You; we are here in leadership by Your appointment, and we believe that You will show us a way to bring resolution without a sacrifice of truth. If we all admit our need to turn to You at this crucial time, You will reveal a solution beyond our own wisdom. O God, bless us with Your guidance and grace. We pray specifically for our leaders BOB DOLE, TOM DASCHLE, TRENT LOTT, WENDELL FORD, NEWT GINGRICH, and President Clinton. Anoint their minds and hearts with Your inspiring and enlightening spirit. May we, along with them, listen to hear Your voice saying, "This is the way, walk in it \* \* \* and walk in it together." In the name of our Lord. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator DOLE, is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Thank you, Mr. President.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me tell the staffs that we do not normally have Sunday sessions. In fact, I think the most recent Sunday session was a few years back. We do not have the exact date. I apologize. But I think we have, hopefully, very important business to resolve today. I hope, in accordance with the message from the Chaplain, that we can find a way to reach out to one another. That process is going on as we speak.

I understand that the President's Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, is now meeting with the Democratic leadership, Senator DASCHLE and others. He will soon be meeting with Budget chairman, Senator DOMENICI, on this side, and the House Budget chairman, Mr. KASICH, in my office, room S-230. Following that meeting, hopefully, I will be able to visit with the Speaker. I just hope there can be some resolution of this matter today.

I am now advised that the last Sunday session was October 27, 1990. It has been a little over 5 years ago.

In my view, we made a good faith offer last night. I think it has been received as such by the President, or at least his representatives, and hopefully, if there is a small difference, we can resolve that.

We are prepared to act. We are prepared to stay here throughout the day, into the evening, if necessary. I know there is a human side to this, too. There are a lot of families out there who are very concerned and probably under a great deal of stress. I can assure them that, whatever happens, when they come back to work, they will be paid for the days they missed, because they were missed through no fault of their own. That we can assure them. So I hope they have that assurance.

So we will be working this afternoon and, hopefully, with everybody with the same mindset; that is, to see if we cannot come together.

I want to thank the Senator from Virginia, Senator WARNER, for his efforts throughout yesterday, and the other Senators on the floor, Senator COCHRAN, Senator GORTON, Senator COVERDELL, Senator SNOWE, and Senator HATFIELD, of course, the chairman of the committee. He would like to have us pass a continuing resolution. He would also like us to finish the other appropriations bills, and while I am at it, bring up the Labor-HHS appropriations bill and pass that, hopefully this afternoon, on a voice vote, so we can go to conference and have that one last appropriation bill disposed of if that is possible. Maybe we can accomplish that today.

We will have a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each. As I said last evening, if the rollcall vote is necessary, we will make certain that if we should reach some agreement, if a rollcall vote is necessary, we will notify all Members so nobody is disadvantaged. Hopefully, if we can reach agreement on both sides of the aisle, there would be no need for a record vote if we can do it by a voice vote. Some of our colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, are on business matters far from here. So we will try to accommodate their concerns.

If we are going to act before the next work week, we need to do it today so some of the workers will know they will be coming to work tomorrow or the next day.

So I thank my colleagues for their patience, and I thank everybody for their indulgence in this Sunday session. But, in my view, it is important and we should be here. We should be trying to resolve this controversy. On the other side, obviously, it is very important.

Everybody understands that the primary concern, at least on our side of the aisle, is that we have a 7-year balanced budget, a balanced budget by the year 2002. I guess I would say the major

• 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 17469

problem is who is going to do the scoring. This is sort of inside baseball, but the question is whether it will be the Congressional Budget Office, or the President's scoring apparatus known as the Office of Management and Budget.

So that is where we are. If we have any additional information, I will certainly pass it on to my colleagues as soon as it is received. After Members have spoken in morning business, then it would be my desire to have a recess subject to the call of the Chair, and we will see what develops in the next 30 or 40 minutes.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

#### CONTINUING NEGOTIATIONS ON THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader. He has been a tireless worker in this effort. We have another long day ahead of us today. Just addressing the issue that the distinguished majority leader raised, among the discussions that we had yesterday, again, he framed very accurately the fact that the 7-year balanced budget, that seems to be agreed upon really by both sides. The controversy that remains today to be negotiated is in the area of how you formulate the economic assumptions by which, over a period of the 7 years, the goal of a balanced budget is reached.

As the distinguished leader pointed out, the Congressional Budget Office primarily serves the Congress. The Office of Management and Budget serves the President of the United States. We feel very strongly, of course, that the CBO, Congressional Budget Office, will continue in the primary role of ascertaining those economic assumptions. Nevertheless, it seems, as the discussions went yesterday, there was certainly an offer on the side of the Congress to permit, for example, the unified balanced budget in subsection (a), which we talked about in this language shall be estimated by the Congressional Budget Office based on their most current economic and technical assumptions, following a thorough consultation and review with the Office of Management and Budget—again, involving the President and his principal advisers.

Incidentally, Mr. President, most importantly, "and other Government and private experts," which means that the Congress is not endeavoring to cloister itself simply with one set of economic factors. It simply is reaching out to the widest possible range to make the economic assumptions in a manner which,

hopefully, would be acceptable to both the President and the Congress.

I am pleased to be here today with my colleagues to continue this most valuable work. I yield the floor.

#### THE CURRENT SITUATION

Mr. COCHRAN. First, let me compliment the distinguished majority leader, Senator DOLE, for the way in which he is keeping the interests of the Senate in negotiations that are taking place on this resolution, not only regarding the continuing resolution, but the effort to get some commitment from the administration to support the effort and be an actively engaged partner in the effort to achieve a balanced budget. That is really what is at the heart and soul of the dispute between the Congress and the administration at this time.

We know some innocent people are sort of caught in the crossfire. That is unfortunate. I think that the majority leader's assurance to those who are being disadvantaged and put at some financial risk as a result of this impasse ought to be reassured by the statements of the leader.

There has been a lot of speculation. I know the distinguished Senator from Virginia has voiced concerns about how we go about making amends, or making sure that there is not an unfair result for some of those who have been laid off or furloughed temporarily.

The fact is, I think there is some misunderstanding about the situation. There is a commitment, as the majority leader has stated, to help make sure that those problems are resolved and that they are resolved as a part of this negotiation. We hope that is the case.

Some people have said, and they have called in saying, "If people are not essential, if they are not necessary to the operation of the Government, why do you have them on the payroll to start with?" That is not the definition of this situation. That is, that there are some who are considered essential for the protection of life and property. That is the definition. I think that is why there is the misunderstanding, those whose presence and whose active involvement on the payroll or on the job is necessary for the protection of life and property are considered essential under this situation.

The President, however, has the obligation to make that definition in many cases. He has a good deal of leeway in making those decisions. I think people recognize that after the first furlough and first definitions, within the Departments there have been some changes. Some who were considered not necessary or essential for the protection of life and property have been summoned to come back to work, who were not first considered essential.

So, this is a situation that does not happen every day. It is very unusual. It is out of the ordinary. No wonder there

is some wonderment or bewilderment, confusion, about this situation.

I think all can be assured that certainly this Senate is going to continue to look out for the interests not only for those who have been put at some financial disadvantage, but also the American people as a whole, and the interests of States. We are here representing State governments as well. That is one of the original roles of the U.S. Senate. We have two Senators per State so each State can be equally and fairly represented. So the interests of local governments are being taken into account in this process, too.

The point I am trying to make is that although there are some anxieties and although there is some confusion, no one should be confused about what the goal is. That is, to get this dispute resolved as quickly as we can and as fairly as we can and without compromising our commitment to achieve a balanced budget. That is the whole purpose of this.

We are sorry the dispute has turned into what some are characterizing as a political game or of one-upmanship, one trying to outdo the other with public rhetoric and news releases and the like.

There is some very serious and hard work going on, and all through the weekend, and has been going on the last several days. I hope we can resolve it today. Everyone here is paying a very serious commitment in that direction.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Before the able Senator from Mississippi departs, yesterday you were present throughout the day and at a number of meetings, but repeatedly the majority leader of the Senate, Senator DOLE, expressed compassion for the people who are necessarily furloughed as a consequence of this problem. In the presence of the Speaker and others at various times there was never any doubt—never any doubt—that the Congress would take appropriate action, perhaps as a separate measure from a continuing resolution. But, nevertheless, the Congress would take appropriate legislative action to ensure that furloughed persons are made whole with respect to their salaries.

We cannot make them whole for the emotional loss and strain and the uncertainty, but certainly when it comes to the question of their just compensation, that will be done.

I thank the Senator and join him in recognizing the leadership provided by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, the majority leader, Senator DOLE.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator for his leadership in this effort. He has been stalwart in always helping us resolve these difficult situations. That has certainly been the case in this instance, as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The Senator from Georgia.

## BALANCE THE BUDGET

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I, too, commend all the Members of the Senate and the House that have labored to try to resolve this dilemma, but I take just a moment, if I might, Mr. President, and step back from it.

I have just returned from Georgia, and many of the citizens I talked to are somewhat concerned. There is an anxiousness as to just what is happening here. I think it is very important that we remember that the ultimate issue that has driven all of these events for the last several days is whether or not the United States is going to balance its budget or not after 30 years of not doing so.

Just the other evening, in a very historic vote, 52 to 47, the U.S. Senate passed a balanced budget, the first one in 3 decades. The House has done the same.

The President has said he will veto this balanced budget, which is perplexing because, first of all, if any message came out of the last election it was that the American people want their budgets balanced. They deal with it in their family, they deal with it in their business, and they simply do not understand a Federal Government that cannot manage itself. They want the budgets balanced.

The President, in 1992, as he ran for President, promised the American people that he would balance the budget in 5 years. The proposal that he has been sent balances the budget in 7 years.

This Congress, the 104th Congress, came from the elections to balance the budgets. They have fulfilled that promise. It is time for the President to do the same. He has said repeatedly, as I said, in 1992 he was for a balanced budget in 5 years. He then said he would submit a balanced budget in 10 years. I think he has mentioned every number in between at one time or another.

The point is that he has never—never—submitted a budget in balance, which is, of course, why, when his budget came before the Senate, it was rejected, on one occasion, 99 to 0, and on the next, 96 to 0.

This is not just a contest or philosophies and the like, Mr. President. The Bipartisan Entitlement Commission appointed by the President, chaired by a member of his own party, Senator KERREY of Nebraska, cochaired by Senator DANFORTH of Missouri, told the Nation in the beginning of this year that within a decade—that is on all of our watch—within a decade all the vast resources of the United States will be consumed by only five of our programs.

It is almost difficult to imagine all the vast resources of the United States being consumed by just five programs, but they are. They are Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Federal retirement, and the interest on our debt—and then there is nothing else. That would be a travesty, for this generation to be the first generation of Americans that gave the country to the future

crippled and unable to manage itself. How could we even imagine doing that to future generations, the children and grandchildren yet to come? No generation of Americans has ever willfully—willfully given the future a country crippled, stumbling into the next century.

As sober a message as that is, we need to be reminded that if we seize control of our destiny, if we manage these financial affairs as proposed in this balanced budget, we will enter the next century with more opportunity than one could even imagine or has ever known or seen before. We will be putting resources back in the American family because we will lower the devastating interest rates they pay on their home mortgage, on their car, on borrowing, on their student loans. We will dramatically shorten the lines for employment because we will have an expanding economy with vast new opportunities. And, I might say, we should remember that, as the world's greatest power, we will then enter the next century with the muscle to back it up. What would some of these world rogues rather see than the United States crippled economically, stumbling into that century? We should never give them that opportunity.

I saw a fact sheet just the other day and I have asked it be expanded. The balanced budget that we have submitted, if ratified, would save, over the next 7 years, my State of Georgia \$333 million in debt service. It would save my capital city, in which I live, \$121 million in debt service.

As I said a moment ago, it will save every Georgia family nearly \$2,000 to \$3,000. That means we, in effect, will have increased their disposable income between 10 percent and 20 percent. Who else is getting a raise like that? What a bonus we could give the American family by simply being responsible.

So, while we are talking about shutdown and the like, and the disputes and the meetings that are going on, let us just remember, this is about a Congress that is intent on balancing the budget of the United States so we can save the integrity of the Union for the future, for a new century.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

## CONGRESSIONAL PAY

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today on an issue that is related to this shutdown, and that is the issue of pay. I want to express my very deep disappointment that we have not been able to bring up the legislation which I proposed that would treat the pay for Members of Congress and the President in the same manner the pay is being treated for Federal employees who are currently working and who will find their paycheck is suspended during this period of a shutdown.

I worked on this legislation in conjunction with the Senate majority

leader, who supports it, and with Senator BOXER, who proposed similar legislation for future shutdowns. I wanted to be sure that this issue also applied to this current shutdown, so my legislation would make it retroactive.

I have 24 Members of the Senate who support this legislation, who have co-sponsored it. Besides myself, the Senate majority leader, Senator BOXER, Senators THOMAS, WARNER, KEMPTHORNE, GRASSLEY, MCCAIN, COHEN, ABRAHAM, CHAFEE, JEFFORDS, PRESSLER, NICKLES, SIMPSON, SPECTER, HUTCHISON, DOMENICI, DEWINE, KASSEBAUM, BROWN, CRAIG, COATS, and HARKIN.

Here we stand today. We have had a session yesterday and we had a session today and we will have sessions tomorrow, hopefully, to resolve this shutdown.

In the meantime, there is a tremendous disparity between Federal employees who are working, like our staffs, and other Federal employees, and those, of course, who are furloughed, and Members of Congress and the President. You might ask, what is the disparity? The fact is, Members of Congress will not face any disruption in their pay, yet those Federal employees who are working are going to face a disruption. Their pay will lapse during this period of time.

You might ask, why such a discrepancy? That is a very good question. That is why I proposed this legislation. Unfortunately, we cannot reach a consensus among all Senators about bringing this legislation up for immediate consideration. I find it somewhat ironic, because at the beginning of this Congress, setting off in a new direction and a new course, the very first bill that this Senate and this House considered was the Congressional Accountability Act. That would require that the laws that apply to the rest of society would also apply to the U.S. Congress.

I cannot think of a greater example than right here, where we could put our money where our mouth is. Yet, unfortunately, we are back to the same old procedures and business as usual. We are still preserving the status quo when it comes to how Members of Congress are treated, and the President, vis-a-vis the rest of society. In this case, it happens to be Federal employees.

I would think every Senator would support this legislation. After all, hundreds of thousands of Federal employees and their families are going to face serious economic disruption, hardships, inconveniences. Yet Members of Congress will not. I do not see the equity in such an example. I do not see the fairness. I do not see the responsibility. Because each of us, individually and collectively, has a responsibility to this institution and to preserving the integrity of this institution.

The very thing we should be preserving is the public's confidence in the way we do business. Obviously, it has

suffered during this current shutdown. But, at the very least, we can say yes, we are going to face similar problems, similar inconveniences as to those Federal employees who will find their paycheck has lapsed. Unfortunately, we are not going to find that unless this legislation is brought up for immediate consideration and ultimately passed.

Unfortunately, as I said, we have objections from others who do not support this approach. I find that remarkable, given the conversations I have had with Federal employees and even my own staff, in what they are going to be facing because they will not have the assurance of a steady paycheck.

There are many people who have to live paycheck to paycheck. I think at the very least we ought to be setting an example, and not setting ourselves apart as somehow isolated from the problems that are associated with this current Government shutdown.

As the Senator from Arizona was just saying, Senator McCAIN, what about the businesses—the many businesses, the hotels and the restaurants that are associated, that depend on Federal employees working, whether it is here or the Grand Canyon? They will never recover their losses.

So what we are saying here is at least we ought to be experiencing some problems as a result of this shutdown, the same problems that others are experiencing, and certainly with respect to Federal employees. Tomorrow is another payday period. Again, there is a difference between how Members of the Congress and the President are being treated versus Federal employees. The difference will be that those Federal employees who are working currently will see a reduction in their pay, but Members of Congress and the President will not.

I hope, Mr. President, that we will find on our calendar this legislation because I think it is important to provide confidence in this institution, and the direction this country is taking, but also to restore the public's trust in its elected officials. And I hope that we will try to set an example by sharing in the same undue burdens that are being placed on Federal employees and their families. Those same burdens should be placed on Members of Congress and the President.

So I hope that every Member of this body will consent to providing for the consideration of this legislation on the calendar tomorrow.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### MEMBERS' OBLIGATION TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to share some thoughts with fellow Senators with regard to the nature of this problem. I do not think it is any mystery to most Members of the Senate why we are here.

Yet, as I hear this issue discussed in the national media, sometimes the real crux of the problem is missed. It can be summed up by taking a look at the reference in one of the documents provided in the last budget round. Interestingly enough, that document was provided by the President of the United States. Included in the information on the back page is this figure. It is an answer to a question of what the child born today would have to pay in the way of taxes to maintain the current programs that we have in place. Mr. President, that figure is calculated by a straightforward calculation that assumes there are absolutely no new programs added. That has never happened.

In the last quarter of century we have never had a time where we have not added new programs or expenditures. It assumes there are no emergencies. Even assuming no emergencies and no new programs, the child born today will pay 82 percent of everything they earn in their entire life in taxes simply to honor the current programs that are on the books.

Mr. President, let me repeat that, because I think that number must astound most people. It astounds me when I look at it. Eighty-two percent, according to the President's own numbers, will have to be paid in taxes simply to honor the existing programs we have.

The short answer of why that is true is simply because we have passed in prior years programs that are open-ended, that spend out automatically what are called entitlements that continue to increase automatically, and will take a larger and larger share of our gross domestic product.

We are here today because there is a crisis, and that crisis is that Congresses in the past have obligated future generations to a point where 82 percent of everything a child earns will have to be paid to the Federal Government just to honor existing programs.

Mr. President, there is no person, liberal or conservative, Democrat or Republican, who can look at that figure and imagine that America will be competitive with 82 percent of everything we produce being paid in taxes. It will destroy incentive. It will destroy our competitiveness in world markets. And anyone who comes to this floor and fails to recognize the desperate need for us to address these programs is simply not taking a look at the facts.

The facts also show we have the biggest deficit of any country in the world. We have the biggest debt of any country in the world—almost \$5 trillion. We have the biggest trade deficit of any country in the world. We have one of the lowest savings rates of any major industrialized country on the face of the Earth.

Mr. President, when you look at the facts they are awesome. I hope Members of the Senate who have come to the floor and said no action is necessary will think again. If America is to remain strong, viable, competitive,

and provide a future for our children other than 82 percent of everything they earn paid in taxes, we have to change. All the rhetoric cannot hide the fact that our future is dismal unless we change it. It is why I think there is such optimism in the country over the willingness of Congress to stand fast and insist on changes.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maine mentioned her bill which would place Members of Congress in the same circumstance as other Federal employees when we have a shutdown like this. I am proud to be a cosponsor of it. I very much hope it passes. When it comes to the floor for consideration, I want to add an additional amendment. I do not pretend that it will be popular. But I think it is along that same line, along the line we treat ourselves like everyone else; and, that is this:

For over a quarter of a century this Congress has passed budgets and ignored them. They have come up with phony estimates, and then they have overspent the budgets time and time again. Some of the Members who talk the loudest and the longest about balancing the budget happily turn around and then vote to exceed the budget each year. That is why we need an incentive. That is why we need the constitutional amendment to balance the budget recognizing the fact that Congress has been unable to face the reality that calls for difficult decisions.

I cannot imagine anyone in private thinking other than the fact that we have to have some discipline. And while some Members have shied away from a constitutional limitation—as the distinguished Presiding Officer recalls, we were one vote away from referring that constitutional amendment out to the States—I believe some discipline is possible. And it relates to the way private sectors are treated.

Mr. President, the proposal is going to be simply this: If we meet our budget targets in passing the budget this year, our pay stays the same. But, if we fail to meet them, for every \$5 billion we realize in debt that is over that target, we would lose 1 percent of our pay. So if it is \$10 billion over, we lose 10 percent. If we are \$20 billion over, we would lose 4 percent. This would cap out at a 30-percent pay reduction.

Mr. President, this will provide the real incentive because it will provide that Members of Congress will pay a personal price when they do harm to the fiscal soundness of this Nation, and the future of our children. We will have a direct financial interest in seeing that we meet our budget targets. Is it dire action? Yes, possibly. Is it essential? Mr. President, I believe it is essential.

I do not know whether that measure is going to pass or not. But I do know that some discipline is essential, and in a way this treats us exactly like the private sector. You see, if a private business does not perform, the owners and the employees are penalized in

what they can be paid and what they can earn. There is no reason to exempt this Congress of the United States from the real discipline of the marketplace. Our major responsibility is to get this country back on track.

I intend to offer an amendment to the measure of the distinguished Senator from Maine that would add that incentive for Members to honor their obligation to meet budget targets.

Mr. President, the controversy involves two major questions. I think some Americans may be surprised to focus on those because the national media have not focused on them perhaps the way we think they should. It involves commitment of this country to balance its budget in 7 years. And it involves honest real numbers. The President has said that he cannot live with the commitment to balance the budget in 7 years. The President has said he wants other than the Congressional Budget Office figures, ones from his administration, or perhaps others, to be the standard for the numbers.

Mr. President, I simply want to draw Members' attention to one fact. While the President now says he finds it unacceptable to be committed to a balanced budget in 7 years, when the President himself ran for office in 1992 he looked the American people in the eye and promised to balance it in 5 years.

Mr. President, he has never presented a budget that does that. Now, not only is he not willing to stand up for a 5-year commitment, he said he would veto a continuing resolution—he has, indeed, vetoed a previous one—if it insists on a commitment to a 7-year balanced budget.

Most Americans must be surprised at this. It runs directly contrary to his promise to the American people when he ran for office.

The President specifically promised a balanced budget in 5 years. Later he said a balanced budget in 7 years, and later in 8 years, and later 9 years, and later in 10 years. That is one of the major differences of two in the failure of the President to keep his commitment to try to balance the budget.

The second difference is over economic assumptions. I must say I find no item more important than realistic economic assumptions. The distinguished Democratic leader, for whom I have a great deal of respect, has come to this floor and noted for the record that we have had assumptions that were not optimistic enough in the last few years. It is quite true that prior assumptions in periods of economic upturn have proved sometimes too conservative. It is the nature of the assumptions. We have had assumptions in the past that follow a general rule. They are not optimistic enough when we have an economic recovery, and they are not pessimistic enough when we have an economic downturn.

I submit the judgment and the weight of long-range economic assumptions should not just be how they per-

form in the short term of an upswing or a downswing but how they perform over the long term. Here the record is very clear. No one should be mistaken about it. The assumptions we have used for the last quarter of a century, whether they be from the Executive Office or the Congressional Budget Office, have been wildly optimistic. They have overstated the revenue that would come and they have understated the outgo, the spending of the Federal Government. The reality is this has been one of the major places of gamesmanship. Economic assumptions have been used to mislead the American people.

All one need to do is take a look at the budgets for the last 25 years. Every single one of them except for the last couple years have suggested, while they would not balance the budget this year, they would balance the budget the following year or the year after that or the year after that. It used to be we would balance the budget 1 year out and then 2 years out and then 3 and then 4 and then 5. No one can honestly look at the economic assumptions that have been used in calculating our budget and not conclude that they were fraudulent. They have consistently overstated revenue and consistently understated expenditures. One need only look at the Social Security assumptions to see the fraud.

I do not want to overdo this point, but I think it is critical that people understand how important the economic assumptions argument is because it goes to the very integrity of the books, it goes to the very integrity of whether or not we achieve a balanced budget.

The President is suggesting that we cook the books. That is what this controversy is all about—his refusal to honor his commitment on balancing the budget and his unwillingness to live up to realistic estimates.

I do not know how many Members had a chance to look at the details of the President's proposal in terms of economic assumptions earlier this year. Dr. Laura Tyson defended them before the Budget Committee. One of the things I found so extreme in the President's proposal was literally the suggestion that they were going to use two rates of inflation, one rate of inflation when calculating income and another rate of inflation when calculating expenditures.

I understand how reasonable men and women can differ on the value and the content of economic assumptions. To assume different rates of inflation when you are calculating the income and expenditures is absurd. Could they be off slightly in the way we do the calculations? Of course. But there was a significant and is a significant difference in the way the President's people calculate inflation. It is absolutely fraudulent. There is no integrity in those numbers.

If we adopt economic assumptions that undercut the integrity of this budget process, we will have deceived the American people.

Men and women can honestly disagree, and we are going to negotiate over how much tax cut we should have, and we are going to negotiate how much spending we should have. And everyone understands there has to be a compromise in those areas.

There should be no compromise on the integrity of the budget process. Congress has compromised the integrity of the budget far too long. It is one of the core reasons why we find ourselves in the disaster situation that stands before us.

I hope there is an agreement reached today, but I for one cannot agree to destroy the integrity of the budget process. I for one think it would be a great mistake if included in that agreement is a willingness to accept phony numbers and phony assumptions and false claims. It is the road that has gotten us to this problem. It is the problem we must address honestly and straightforwardly. I believe, if we do, if we use honest numbers and realistic changes, this country's economy will blossom in the future as it has in the past.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

#### EFFECTS OF SHUTTING DOWN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, I wish to share my views of appreciation for the remarks just made by the Senator from Colorado. I would also like to express my appreciation to the Senator from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], on the introduction of her legislation, and I urge the leadership on both sides of the aisle to take up that legislation and pass it.

As the Senator from Maine pointed out, there is a great credibility gap here in the Congress that we treat ourselves all too often differently from the American people. This is a glaring example of it. People who also work for the Federal Government are not receiving their pay and benefits, and we in the Congress continue to do so.

That is not a good message for us to send. I do believe that as in the past there is very little doubt we will compensate those who have been laid off as nonessential workers, although I would certainly hope we in the Congress would examine the impact or the lack of impact of the absence of some of those nonessential workers and perhaps over time we could use that as a guide to downsizing the size of Government. In the meantime, we in the Congress should not accept our paychecks when Federal workers are also not receiving them.

Mr. President, I wish to also point out that some of the actions taken in this downsizing or laying off of essential workers and providing what is deemed nonessential, cutting off what are deemed nonessential services to the

American people has gone a little bit too far, and I speak specifically of the Grand Canyon.

For the first time in its history, the Grand Canyon has been closed down with a very few number of employees. Most of the services could have been provided to people who come from all over the world. I think it is just a disgrace and a bit of political demagoguery that the Grand Canyon is being shut down because of this crisis. The Federal Government, the Department of the Interior and, most of all, Secretary Babbitt should know that we could provide services to about 90 percent of the visitors with just a handful of employees. I urge the President and the Secretary of the Interior to reverse that decision.

I also point out that in our zeal—and it is well-founded zeal—to protect those who are Government workers who are not receiving their pay, let us remember that there are tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of Americans who are directly dependent upon places like the Grand Canyon—the hotel employees, the concessionaires, the people who supply all of the things that go into these provisions of Government services that will never be compensated. They will never be compensated. I appreciate very much what the Senator from Maine is trying to do for Government workers and what we will do, but let us not forget that there are a whole lot of people who are not Government employees but who are dependent upon Government for their economics and their livelihoods, and their families are dependent upon it, and they will have a very bleak Thanksgiving because they have already lost income which they can never regain.

That is what the tragedy of this whole confrontation and crisis is all about. I understand why many Americans say, as a commentator this morning on one of the talk shows said, it is a food fight and mothers would not approve of their sons behaving the way we have seen happen, especially wrestling matches in the Chamber of the House of Representatives and a great deal of disparagement of integrity and character and personal attacks that are being mounted on both sides.

But, Mr. President, I do not think we should let it distract us from the fact that there is an enormous amount at stake here. And that is really whether we are going to carry out the commitment that we made to the American people in the election of 1994. And for us to depart from the valid assumptions which have been supported by Members on the other side of the aisle, by the President of the United States, and all of us, and the Congressional Budget Office, as providing us the basis for economic assumptions, would be an absolute travesty.

Mr. President, I will not go through again the number of times the President of the United States has changed his view as to how many years it would

take to balance the budget. But I do remember quite well in 1993 when in a rather raucous State of the Union message the President of the United States said—and I quote from his State of the Union Address, as he explained to Congress and the American people why he used CBO numbers to score his 1994 budget proposal.

He said:

I did this so that we could argue about priorities with the same set of numbers. I did this so that no one could say I was estimating my way out of this difficulty. I did this because if we can agree together on the most prudent revenues we are likely to get if the recovery stays, and we do the right things economically, then it will turn out better for the American people than we say. In the last 12 years, because there were differences over revenue estimates, you and I know that both parties were given greater elbow room for irresponsibility. Let us at least argue about the same set of numbers so the American people will think we are shooting straight with them.

Mr. President, let us let the American people know that we are shooting straight with them. We can only do it with Congressional Budget Office numbers. I heard one of the President's advisers this morning going through the same routine that they have, that if we balance the budget in 7 years, if we stick to the CBO numbers, we will destroy the American's ability to receive welfare, education, student loans, et cetera, et cetera.

It is the same line we have been hearing for a long, long time. Clearly for quite awhile it has had resonance with the American people. There is a legitimate question that needs to be asked. If we do not balance the budget, what happens to all of those programs—education, Medicare, welfare, all of those programs if we do not stop this reckless spending? And I think the answer is obvious. None of those programs can be funded if we continue to amass this enormous debt that has laid \$175,000 debt on every child born in America today, only to pay the interest on the debt that we have already accumulated.

Mr. President, I hear a lot of talk about a compromise, so do my colleagues. And compromise is the name of the business in Government. But if we compromise our 7-year commitment, and if we compromise the Congressional Budget Office numbers, then we will have done a great disservice not only to the overwhelming majority of the American people that told us they wanted the budget balanced in the last election but to future generations of Americans who, by us using irresponsible numbers and unrealistic figures, would do a great disservice to them.

Let me also point out one other thing, Mr. President. This is really all about how much money Government can spend. If we use the Office of Management and Budget numbers, they will provide different estimates which will then say less sacrifice is required to balance the budget thereby giving

the executive branch and the other bureaucracies more money to spend.

The question is, are we going to let the American people keep that money and spend it themselves or are we going to send it to Washington and continue to fund many, many failed programs which have not only not helped the American people but in the view of many of us in the case of the failed welfare system, harmed the American people more than it has helped. So it is really about how much money is going to be spent.

I always enjoy it when my colleagues—I see my colleague from North Dakota who has been very active on this issue on the floor—say we want to balance the budget, too. Give us your plan over 7 years, and give us credible numbers, and we do not have a problem. We can start the Government back to work in a New York minute. But the question is whether there is going to be the commitment over 7 years and whether we are going to use realistic numbers.

Mr. President, this morning the Concord Coalition took out a full page ad in the Washington Post. I urge my colleagues to look at it. I do not agree with everything said here by the Concord Coalition, but I do think they make some very important and valid points.

We can either get an agreement here today or tomorrow or the next day or the next day or on Thanksgiving Day or afterward, but at some point we are going to have to agree and get the Government going again. I do not know when that will be. I hope it is today. But what we decide today or tomorrow, or when we make that agreement, it will directly impact the future of America. And those that call this a food fight, or whether somebody was snubbed on an airplane or not, are not cognizant of the fact this is really what the differing philosophies are all about, between this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle, whether the American people should keep their money and not send it to Washington, DC, or whether the Government spends the money that is their hard-earned money, which is now for an average family of four in America is \$1 out of every \$4. In 1950 that same average family of four sent \$1 out of every \$50 to Washington, DC, in the form of taxes. And I know of no one who believes that same family in 1995 is better off than that family in 1950.

Mr. President, I know my time has nearly expired. I urge my colleagues to agree rather than disagree, and regain the level of civility that is required for us in order to reach reasoned and mature decisions and judgments.

Mr. President, I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent request made earlier be amended so that I be allowed to continue in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. REID. Parliamentary inquiry.

It is my understanding that the procedure now before the Senate is that we are in morning business, and that we are each allowed to speak up to 10 minutes. Is that true?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEAHY. I am sorry. I understood it was 5 minutes. That is why I requested 10 minutes.

I ask that I simply seek recognition under the normal order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

#### WORKING TOGETHER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I know that the distinguished Democratic leader is going to speak here on the floor in a few minutes to describe the offer that was made and, apparently, rejected by the Republican leadership. And I would hope that Senators and the public would listen to it. I say this because I have a feeling in many, many ways that if we were left to the situation where the Democrats and Republicans in the Senate were able to work together on this, with the White House, we would have a solution to this impasse.

Certainly, we would have a solution that would put a lot of hard-working men and women back to work, people who cannot afford to miss paychecks and who want to be at work, people who have mortgages to pay, children to educate, parents to care for, have medical bills to pay, car payments to make, and can ill-afford to lose paychecks, especially when there are jobs that need to be done and people want to do them.

I say that I think we could work it out between the Senate and the White House. It appears to me, however, that the other body and its leadership do not feel it is possible and that they say there is nothing that can be done. I see this remarkable situation where the other body simply recessed even though appropriations and spending bills begin—spending bills by custom; revenue bills by Constitution—begin in the other body. They have left.

They have this fiction of waiting for the call of the Chair. But, in fact, their leadership has decided they would recess and that they would leave. They are shirking their duty. They are being paid. They ought to stay. They ought to stay and work this out for those tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands of men and women who are not being paid, who are loyal Americans, who have given a great deal of their life and effort to this country and want to keep this country going.

We have a situation where we have become the laughing stock of the world. The President of the United States cannot go to a major economic summit in Japan at a time when perhaps a greater danger to this Nation is

perhaps not the deficits we now face but our trade deficit. At least much of the deficit we owe to ourselves, but our trade deficit involves countries abroad who are eating our economic lunch.

Every time we have \$1 billion more in our trade deficit, we lose tens of thousands of American jobs. The President was going to represent this country at a meeting in Japan where we could at least talk about that with the country that has the greatest trade imbalance with the United States, but he has to remain here. He is remaining here at work. The distinguished Presiding Officer is remaining here at work. I am here at work.

I wish the Republican leadership in the House would let the House come back to work, because, Mr. President, there is one thing that ought to be very evident to everybody: We are not going to pass a Gingrich budget. We are not going to pass a Clinton budget. We are not going to pass a Dole budget. We can pass a budget for the American people. We will pass a budget that reflects the views of both Republicans and Democrats of the House and of the Senate and of the President because, frankly, under the Constitution, under the laws and under the history of this great country, we are all in this together.

So I urge everybody to stop thinking there is going to be one party that is going to win everything in this. That may work in a game of marbles on a playground in kindergarten. That does not work here. This is not a playground, even though it may appear that way to some. It is not kindergarten, although it may appear that way to some. It is not a game of marbles, even though it may appear that way to some. This is the budget of the country, the most powerful, greatest Nation on Earth, the most significant democracy history has ever known, the largest economy in the world, and we are standing here because some feel they may have been slighted or some feel that they must make a point that will fit on a bumper sticker in next year's election, congressional or Presidential.

Mr. President, I am one Democrat who says let us have Democrats and Republicans sit down. Set aside short-term political gains and do what is best for this country. Stop thinking that we will have a Speaker Gingrich budget, or a leader Dole budget, or a President Clinton budget, but rather that we will have a budget that can take the best of the proposals of each of the three, and let us work at it.

We have had proposals here. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota and I have voted for a budget that would give us a balanced budget within the 7 years. We all want that. But before we balance a budget that intends, in large part, to slash very needy programs so that a tax break can be given to people at the highest level, let us ask if that is what the American public really want.

Do they want to see money for education cut so that the most wealthy in this country can have a tax break? I doubt it.

Do they want to see nutrition programs for the most needy in this country slashed so that the wealthiest can get another tax break? I doubt that the American people want that.

Do they want to see Medicare and Medicaid attacked to that the wealthiest in this Nation can have a tax break? I doubt that very much.

If we are going to be saving money, let us protect the most in need. And if there is extra money left over, let us apply it to the deficit. Let us apply it to the deficit, not to another tax break for the wealthiest who already pay less in taxes than any industrialized nation on Earth. We do not need to put it there. If we really want to do something for our children, rather than giving it as a tax break for the wealthiest, apply it to our national debt, apply it to our deficit.

In the deficits that grew up during the Reagan and Bush era, today we spend nearly \$1 billion in interest—in interest alone—almost every day, \$1 billion just in interest on the deficits and the increase in the national debt built up during the terms of only two Presidents, Ronald Reagan and George Bush.

Let us be honest about that. Some who were the greatest proponents of the Reagan deficits have stood in the last 2 days on the floor of this Senate and said, "We have to do something about this terrible deficit." Well, I tell them that virtually our whole deficit is caused just by what we pay in interest on those profligate days in the eighties where we made huge tax cuts and huge defense buildups and borrowed the money from the next generation to pay for it.

That is what happened then, Mr. President. What happens now, though, is what happens now. Today, we have hundreds of thousands of people out of work needlessly. We have hundreds and hundreds of thousands more who will be out of work because of the ripple effect, whether it is the people who want to get into our national parks, whether it is those who will not be able to borrow money for their mortgage, VA loan, or anything else, whether it is those who want to make new claims in Social Security.

Think of the hundreds of thousands, even millions of people who will be out of work because of the Government programs that have stopped, Government programs that all of us, Republicans and Democrats, have supported, whether it is in the VA or whether it is in our various mortgage programs or Social Security or anything else.

Let us say, OK, everybody has made their political point. They can use them in their ads next year. Let us sit down and remember, we are not going to have a Republican House or Republican Senate or a Democratic House or Democratic Senate budget or Presidential budget, but together we can



have one that serves the best of this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ABRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Michigan.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I want to speak today on a couple of topics.

First of all, I would like to lend my voice of support for the proposal that was earlier discussed by the Senator from Maine, Senator SNOWE, in regard to legislation she introduced, legislation I am a cosponsor of, to treat the salaries and pay of the Members of Congress in the same fashion that other Federal employees are being treated during this period of Government shutdown.

I share the opinion the Senator from Maine expressed very effectively earlier that it is important for the public to understand that those of us in Congress are no different than anybody else and that we should live by the same sets of rules that govern the rest of the people of similar status as we; and that is, the laws of the country should apply to us the way they apply to the rest of the country.

We did that earlier this year. We ended a long period of time in which Congressmen and Senators were exempt from any laws which people back in our States were forced on a daily basis to adhere to. In the same vein as Federal employees ourselves, we should be required to be treated in the same fashion as the Federal employees whose families this week have been confronted with the issues surrounding the Government shutdown.

Also, I am intrigued by and likely to support the amendment that Senator BROWN discussed in his remarks. I have long felt, in fact, in my campaign I talked about the need for us to place some sort of incentive for the Members of Congress to bring about a balanced budget that they all campaigned on but went to Washington and somehow found very elusive.

The notion of in some way treating us like the officers of a corporation that is running in the red intrigues me a lot, and it is very appealing, I think, to citizens across this country. If the country keeps running big deficits, it hurts the country. If a business runs big deficits, it hurts the business. When the business runs those deficits and is hurt, it is its owners, its managers who ultimately pay a price, and normally that comes in the form of seeing their salaries reduced.

In the same vein, it strikes me perhaps we, as the Nation's stewards of our economy, should have the same kind of responsibility and the same sort of incentive that people running a company have to make sure that we do not run a deficit.

So I look forward to working with the Senator from Colorado to try to

come up with a proposal or a program or an amendment that could address that set of incentives as well.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to talk briefly about why at least those of us who supported the Balanced Budget Act Friday night, who have been so strongly keeping committed to the notion of balancing the budget in 7 years, adhere to this position, because I think those Americans who are watching us in Washington, probably from time to time are wondering why are the stakes so high, why is it so critical that this budget be balanced and the sooner the better, not in 10 years, 9 or 8 years, but in the 7 years we have talked about?

The answer is, a balanced budget means important things to virtually everybody in this country. To average working families, Mr. President, it means a chance to keep more of what they earn.

Most families in our country pay interest on something, some pay interest on car loans that they have taken out; some pay interest on home mortgages, some pay interest on student loans, some pay interest on all of the above. Of course, there are many other items that people borrow money from lending institutions for today, and these interest rates are a big price that they pay along the way.

Putting the Nation's budget into balance means those interest rates we pay are going to come down. It means average families who work hard in this country and want to keep more of what they earn will see rates come down and see more money in their own pockets, instead of sending those dollars along to the persons from whom they have borrowed the dollars. That means more money to pay for children's education, more money to spend on other family necessities. In short, average working families get to have more control over their destinies.

Putting the budget into balance also means a lot for young people in this country. I mentioned already the impact of the student loans and interest rates paid on those loans. Let us talk about a young person who is looking forward to getting out of school in the near future and going to work and earning their own living and addressing their own needs, starting their own families, and so on. Considering the current rate of our national spending growth and the deficits we have been generating and projecting that on into the future, without restraint, means that young people today are confronting a debt burden that is incredibly large.

Already, earlier the Senator from Arizona talked about the impact of these deficits on a child born in 1995. It is estimated that a child born this year, Mr. President, will, in their lifetime, pay \$187,000 just to pay their share of interest on the national debt that already exists and will grow during their lifetime. That would mean, Mr. President, that if we do not bring this

spending spree, this sort of unlimited credit card type of Government operation under control, we will pass on to the children of our country a lot less opportunity than we inherited. It seems to me that all of us have a responsibility to take care of our own bills—not to pass them on to the next generation.

The Senator from Vermont talked about these deficits, and I recognize that they are not just deficits that started today. They have been building over time. One of the reasons I ran for the Senate last year and I think a lot of the other people in the freshman class ran, was to come down here and end the way business had been conducted—no matter who was in the White House, no matter who controlled Congress, because our objective is to try and set the Nation on a new course.

So as we continue this discussion, as we continue to strive to find common ground with regard to starting the Government, we should not lose sight of the overall objective—the objective for this Senator, at least, is to bring the budget into balance in 7 years so the families of this country will be able to keep more of what they earn, so that the children of this country will not grow up with a huge debt burden confronting them and spend too much of their time working to send money to Washington and to pay for their parent's bills, so that our Nation can compete even more effectively in a new century in which global competition will dominate even more than it does today.

For those reasons, I am very proud of what we did Friday night, that for once, despite all the conversations and talk and claims, and so on, that have gone on for many years about balancing the budget, we actually did something about it. We ended the talk and put a bill before the House and before the House of Representatives which, if enacted, would balance the budget. I am proud to say I voted for that bill, and I am proud to say that the bill passed.

For once, Mr. President, on Friday night, we took a stand that was more than just rhetoric. It was a commitment to a specific piece of legislation that would accomplish the balanced budget we all talk about in Washington, and that people have talked about here for a quarter century. After 25 years of rhetoric, Friday night, we did something about it.

Mr. President, I am glad I was part of that effort.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

#### THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have not heard all of the presentations on the floor today, but I am sure I would agree with some of what has been said in the context of the shutdown of Government.



The shutdown of Government should not have happened. It should not continue even another minute. There is a lot of talk about who is to blame, and there is probably plenty of blame to go around. Yesterday, I said there is not any juice left in this lemon. It has been squeezed in a dozen different directions. The fact is that this shutdown ought to end.

The Speaker of the House, beginning last April, talked about creating a train wreck, creating a shutdown of Government, boasting about a titanic confrontation resulting in a shutdown. Well, so we have had a titanic confrontation and a shutdown. Regrettably, it hurts our country. It ought not last. We should have and will have, in my judgment, an aggressive debate about the priorities of this country. We will not have a debate and should not have a debate about whether the budget should be balanced. Of course, it should be balanced.

The debate is about how you balance the budget. I hope that negotiators, this afternoon, will decide quickly that the Government shutdown ends immediately, that the negotiations on a reconciliation bill to get to a balanced budget begin immediately, and that we balance the Federal budget.

There is, however, more at stake than just balancing the budget. We certainly should do that. But the plan to do that also represents the spending plan for the next 7 years, or, said differently, it represents the spending priorities of this country for the next 7 years. That is important. The Senator from Arizona, before he left the floor, referenced me and said that I have been active on this. He is correct. But then he said that the difference is, those on the other side of the aisle want the people to send more of their money to Government and those on his side of the aisle want the people to be able to keep more of their money. I am telling you that is not the case. There is not that difference between the two sides of this aisle. I want to demonstrate that there is not that kind of difference.

The difference is in what we would choose to spend the public's money for. I want to use a chart to demonstrate that. We recently had an appropriations bill on the floor, the Defense bill. The majority party, the Republicans, decided that the Pentagon was not asking for enough money. They said: You are not asking for enough, we demand that you take more. We insist that you accept \$7 billion more in spending in this 1 year, over \$30 billion more in the 7 years. We insist that you spend more money. We insist that you buy some B-2 bombers. You did not ask for them and we understand that. You asked to keep the production line open but not to buy more bombers. We insist you start buying more bombers. We have a plan and we insist you buy 20 more B-2 bombers that cost over \$30 billion. We do not have enough money, they say, however, to keep the Head Start Pro-

gram fully funded. We are short \$533 million for that. So 50,000 kids, every one of whom has a name, little boys and girls currently in the Head Start Program are going to be told we cannot afford you, we know the Head Start Program works. It is a wonderful program. A tremendous investment in young kids who come from homes of difficulty, low-income homes. It works. It makes a difference in young kids' lives.

We are told by this plan that we do not have enough money for 50,000 of those kids. But we put the almost identical amount of money into B-2 bombers that the Pentagon did not ask for, did not order, and does not want. The national missile defense, star wars—it is a fancy way of saying star wars. There is \$375 million more stuck in the budget for star wars that the Defense Department did not ask for. And \$1.3 billion is put in the budget for an assault ship, amphibious assault ship that the Pentagon did not ask for; \$974 million is stuck in the budget for a second assault ship that the Pentagon did not ask for. In fact, most people thought the Pentagon does not want one, but Congress wants one, so Congress will decide which of these two it shall buy.

On that side of the aisle, they said, heck, as long as we have the public credit card, the sky is the limit, so buy them both. We have plenty of money. Buy both of those ships for \$2 billion. Then we say for veterans health care, for those veterans who need outpatient visits, 46,000 fewer hospitalizations, and about a million fewer outpatient visits; we are going to save money on you, veterans, because we do not have the money. We spent it on ships the Pentagon did not ask for.

Low-income home energy assistance, 1.3 million households in the middle of the winter when it gets cold, get assistance for the home heating bill because they do not have the money. Well, they are sorry, they say we do not have the money.

But when it comes to F-15 and F-18 airplanes, they say, "By the way, let's buy more, the Pentagon is not right. We know they only asked for a certain amount but we insist they buy more."

I raise these points because when someone stands up and says, "We are the ones who want the taxpayers to keep their money and you on this side of the aisle, you are the ones who want to take it from them." I say baloney, what a bunch of nonsense. You all want to spend it on jet fighter planes and B-2 bombers and star wars. We want to spend it on Star Schools and nutrition programs and Head Start and education that invests in people.

It is not a question of how much we spend. It is a question of what we spend the money on.

I mentioned yesterday, there is probably no better metaphor for the difference in priorities—not the difference in the desire to balance the budget. We

should, we must and we will balance the Federal budget.

Seven years, that is fine with me. Make it 5 if we can get Alan Greenspan and the Federal Reserve to get the boot off the public's neck. Every time we get any amount of economic growth at all, the Fed jumps up and raises interest rates to slow the economy down. We can get some decent economic growth in this country and we can balance the budget in 5 years. We do not need 7.

The metaphor that I think is the best on priorities is a little program called Star Schools. It is a \$25 million program nationally, Star Schools. In the proposal given to us this past week, Star Schools is cut 40 percent; 40 percent of the funding for Star Schools is gone.

But star wars, national missile defense, ergo star wars, a 100-percent increase. The Pentagon does not ask for star wars funding. These folks say, "We want 100 percent increase in star wars funding." A little program, about one-twentieth the size, a 40-percent cut in Star Schools funding.

That represents a difference. These differences in priorities are not little issues for a lot of the American people.

A Republican, David Gergen, who also worked for Democratic administrations—he worked for the Clinton administration as well as Reagan and Bush, but he said recently in an article the following: The lowest 20 percent of the population, "Would lose more income under these spending cuts than the rest of the population combined. At the other end, the highest 20 percent would gain more from the tax cuts than everyone else combined."

That is a difference in priorities, a legitimate difference, one we ought to have an ambitious debate on. But we ought not, because of a continuing resolution and the intransigence of some, have the Government shut down while we debate that.

I am not convinced these days with what is going on in Congress and with the kind of extremism and the interest and, yes, even the appetite to create chaos and, as I said before, what one participant called a titanic confrontation, I am not convinced that the Congress could very easily approve the Ten Commandments. Surely they would find something wrong with them. Almost certainly it would provoke enormous debate. Should there be 11 commandments or maybe only 8? Should we combine six and seven?

The fact is, all of us represent the same interests in this country. Yes, we belong to different political parties. We may be conservatives and liberals. But I think the American public would like us to first of all end this shutdown, and second, turn our attention in a serious way to balance the Federal budget and then do much, much more because our lives are not just about balancing the budget.

That is important, and we should do that. That is not the only thing we can

do in this country. There is much, much more to do to move this country ahead, to advance our economic interests, to compete with others around the world who are shrewd, tough international competitors, to help create more jobs, more opportunity, and more income for the American people. There is much, much more to be done on all of that.

I know there are some in the Congress who do not believe in much of anything that Government does. They do not like Government. But you know Government builds our schools, our roads. We create a police force. We do it together, in something called Government. We have done a lot of wonderful things in 50 years. We have made some mistakes, but we do it together.

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

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent for an additional 30 seconds.

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

Mr. DORGAN. In this debate about priorities, what we need to do is decide—all of us, of every political persuasion—that we want the same goals for America. And then we debate, with the guidance of the American people, how we achieve those goals.

Do we, in fact, achieve those goals by doubling the funding for star wars and deciding star schools are unimportant? I do not think so. Some others may think so. If that is the case, we should have that debate and have the counsel of the American people, as we do, and make decisions.

Mr. President, 200 years of differing views in this country have required us in a democratic system to make decisions by compromise. This time is no different. Compromise is necessary now. I hope by the end of today we are over this hump, the Government shutdown has ended, and we get on to the serious business of balancing the Federal budget and making America better by the right investments in the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Chair advise the Senator from Nevada when there is 1 minute of the 10 minutes remaining.

#### BALANCED BUDGETS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, people in the audience, people in the State of Nevada, people all over this country, are wondering what this is all about.

Kevin Phillips, who is a Republican, did a piece on public radio this week that I think fairly well illustrates what the problems are between those on that side of the aisle and those of us over here, when he said:

If the budget deficit were really a national crisis instead of a pretext for fiscal favoritism and finagling, we'd be talking about shared sacrifice with business, Wall Street, and the rich, the people who have the big

money making the biggest sacrifice. Instead, it's senior citizens, the poor, the students, and ordinary Americans who will see programs they depend on gutted while business, finance, and the richest 1 or 2 percent, far from making sacrifice, actually get new benefits in tax reductions.

Mr. President, this is what it is all about. This is extremely inconvenient, extremely difficult for everyone in the country, especially States like Nevada where there is such a huge Federal presence, national parks, large recreation areas, the busiest recreation area in America, the biggest entity of the Park System. I should not say the largest—the most heavily visited in the entire Park System, Lake Mead Recreation Area. Almost 10 million people visit there each year, almost a million a month. They cannot get there. It is locked up.

A lot of sacrifices. But the principle, Mr. President, is important, as indicated by a Republican, Kevin Phillips, when he said what is being done by the Republicans is something to benefit the rich, those people of position, and hurting the middle class and the poor. That says it all.

Mr. President, why are we in this situation we are in today? I see my friend from the State of California, who was previously of one of the most famous cities in America, the city of San Francisco, someone who recognizes crisis because she was thrown into the mayorship as a result of an assassination, an American who has spent her life trying to balance budgets, who has come to Congress and the Senate, talking about money, someone who has struggled with how to vote on these issues—because I have spent time with her—and who recognized she would not balance the budget on the back of senior citizens by virtue of her vote, earlier, when we excluded from the balanced budget amendment, Social Security. These are tough decisions, tough decisions for people who strongly believe in a balanced budget.

I resent, Mr. President, because it is not factual, that people on the other side of the aisle say those of us here do not believe in a balanced budget. I point to my friend from California as someone who has lived for balancing budgets.

Yesterday, when I was on this floor, I was between the two Senators from the State of Nebraska, former Governors, the former chairman of the Budget Committee, JIM EXON, and the former Governor of Nebraska, BOB KERREY, chairman of the Entitlement Commission. In a dialog they indicated how they had worked over their political lives for a balanced budget.

No, Mr. President, the balanced budget is not something that the Republicans hold the prize on. We have as many on this side of the aisle who have spent their entire lives talking about balanced budgets.

This is not a battle over a balanced budget. We all acknowledge there should be a balanced budget. It is a question of priorities. We all believe

there should be a balanced budget. This Senator from Nevada believes there should be a balanced budget. But I, along with the Senator from California, did not feel it should be done using Social Security proceeds. I, like Kevin Phillips, Republican political analyst, do not believe the sacrifices should be made "by senior citizens, the poor, students, ordinary Americans who will see programs they depend on gutted, while business, finance, and the richest one or two percent, far from making sacrifices, actually get new benefits and tax reductions." This is not a Democrat who wrote this for a Democratic magazine. This is a Republican who gave an honest analysis on National Public Radio.

Why are we here? We are here because the Republican majorities in the House and the Senate have not passed the appropriations bills. It is as simple as that.

We could spend a lot of time discussing how is the best way to balance the budget, and I think it is appropriate that we do that. But we should do it in the context of real legislation, not contrived crises that we see develop here. If the appropriations bills had been passed on time, we would all be home today with our families.

We all have stories to tell. I will have my five children together for the first time in a long time, Thanksgiving. They are all now gathering in Nevada without the patriarch of the family. But that is OK, because I believe what we are doing here is important and I believe my five children also believe what I am doing here today is important, because what we are doing is a matter of principle.

People have called my office. They want this thing resolved. I do not blame them. They do not identify themselves as Democrats or Republicans. They are average Americans whose greatest expectation of Government is it operate to serve people's interests. They are the kind of people who pay their taxes, play by the rules, and vote for the person and not the party. They want to know why this standoff is occurring, and I have explained why the standoff is occurring. It would be easy for all of us to fold our tents. I would go home to Nevada to my five children and everybody would disperse throughout the United States, but it is not that easy.

We are stuck at an impasse because the bills that finance Government were simply not passed on time. Under the congressional budget process, the House Appropriations Committee is supposed to finish the last annual appropriations bill by June 10. Is it not interesting, we have 13 appropriations bills and none of them were finished on time. Commerce, State, and Justice, July 19, 6 weeks late; DC appropriations, October 19, 4 months late; Labor-HHS, July 24, 7 weeks late; Defense, July 25—on and on, and, simply, they could not do it. The Senate then had to follow suit. We did the best we could.

I have to hand it to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Oregon, a fine, fair chairman who has done the best he can under very difficult circumstances.

There is no excuse for these bills not having passed. But I think it was part of a contrived program, established by the leaders in the House. I do not make this up. Why were these annual appropriations bills not passed on time? Because stuck inside most of these bills are controversial legislative proposals that otherwise would not be passed. Abortion, in many of the appropriations bills, has simply drawn them to a grinding halt.

Wiping out environmental protection—one bill had 17 environmental riders to, in effect, wipe out the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to protect clean air, clean water. They stuck in things like grazing.

I am a western Senator and I have fought the good fight on grazing for many years. There is a time and a place for grazing. It should be in authorizing legislation, not on appropriations bills. The same as mining, same as drilling in ANWR, same as clear-cutting of trees in various parts of this country. Why do we not do these in the ordinary, regular procession of authorizing regulation? Why in appropriations bills?

Many of these appropriations bills read more like legislative wish lists. The majority knew these bills must be signed into law to keep the Government operating, and they viewed these bills from a gambler's perspective. They gambled, notwithstanding controversial legislation that they could not get passed in the ordinary process, that the President would sign them anyway.

They were wrong. Even if the President refused and the Government were to shut down, they would use the shutdown as a weapon, and that is what they have done. They would force the President to sign legislation that the majority of the American public opposed for the sake of keeping the Government operating. This was apparent as far back as April.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is advised, at his request he was to be reminded when he had 1 minute remaining.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to have 4 more minutes.

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

Mr. REID. In April, House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH vowed to create a titanic standoff for President Clinton by adding vetoed bills to must-pass legislation increasing the national debt. This was reported in a number of places, including the Washington Times, on April 30. He boasted that "the President will veto a number of things and we will put them all in the debt ceiling, and then he will decide how big of a crisis he wants." Again, this is a quote from Speaker GINGRICH.

We learned, a couple of days ago, why the Speaker is allowing this standoff to continue and why, even from his own perspective, it is tougher than it would have been ordinarily. Do you know why? Because he had to leave Air Force One from a door that he did not feel was appropriate, and the President did not spend enough time with him on the airplane. This is going to the funeral of an assassinated Prime Minister of the State of Israel.

In the Washington Post, the Speaker is quoted as saying, because the President did not speak with him on the flight to Israel for Prime Minister Rabin's funeral, "that is part of the reason why you ended up with us sending down a tougher interim spending bill." The Speaker is also quoted as saying, "It is petty, but I think it is human."

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is not human; it is just plain petty.

Let us talk about some facts. Fact No. 1: Speaker GINGRICH said, as early as April, that a Government shutdown and default were political tools he was likely to use as a lever to push his extreme agenda. That is a fact.

Fact No. 2: There are 12 appropriations bills necessary to fund the Government. Since this Government has been in session starting last January, the majority has simply failed to do this, and that is why we have the crisis we have today.

Fact: President Clinton favored a balanced budget and is fighting for one. The fight is over how to get there. The Republicans want to do it on the backs of seniors, the poor, students, and ordinary citizens. The Republicans want to do it in their own way.

We have now an economy that is great. We have the lowest inflation, the lowest unemployment in 50 years. We have the third year in a row where we have had declining deficits—certainly not enough, but the third year in a row for the first time in 50 years. We have 175,000 fewer Federal employees than we had 2½ years ago, the highest economic growth since the days of Johnson, the highest corporate profits in the history of the country. Why? Because the Democrats, a couple of years ago, passed a budget that cut \$500 billion from the deficit. That is why the economy is so good.

Do you know we did not get a single Republican to vote with us? The Vice President had to come and break the tie.

Fact: Recent polling shows Americans do not want the extreme agenda pushed by the radical right in the GOP. That is why the Speaker is using the Government shutdown and the threat of default as a way to blackmail this Congress and this President.

Final fact: Since the Republicans cannot pass their ideologically extreme agenda through normal legislative channels, they are trying to force the President to agree to their demands to shut the Government down. That is not how the system should work.

Mr. President, the crisis has been planned by Professor GINGRICH. He knows how crises develop. He has studied it. We have one here. It is all of his own doing, and I say, people of good will, both Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, should stand up and say that is not the way to run a government.

Legislation is the art of compromise, and we should work this out. We all agree on a balanced budget. It is a question of priorities. Let us fight out the priorities on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House the way we have done it for 200 years.

Mr. GORTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I am requested by the leadership to ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, those of the distinguished Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], and those of the distinguished Democratic leader, the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Washington is recognized.

#### THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, about 3 days ago when we began to debate a continuing resolution which would have caused the Government to go back to work while we attempted to reach a balanced budget, the leading member of the Democratic Party on the Budget Committee, the Senator from Nebraska, pleaded with us for what he called—and I quote him—a "simple extension."

Mr. President, this standoff is taking place because—between a "simple extension" and the dramatic change represented by the formal 7-year budget passed by this body 2 nights ago that would balance the budget by the year 2002—there is a great gulf fixed. This is not a petty difference. This is not a minor difference in opinion on a slight change in direction for the Government of the United States. It is reflected in what the majority leader said if that bill passed. That profound difference was reflected by the remarks of the majority leader to the effect that the vote that he cast to cause the budget to be balanced was probably the most important that he had cast in all of his many years in the U.S. Senate.

We on this side of the aisle wish to end the practice of spending \$200 billion a year on programs which we like and support eloquently but refuse to pay for and, therefore, send the bills to our children and grandchildren. Members on the other side wish for a simple extension of the present course of action. They argue eloquently for the status

quo. They like what Government is doing at the present time, and they are quite content to spend money and send the bills to someone else in some future generation.

We have been informed that, if we do in fact pass a set of laws that will balance the budget by the year 2002, the Federal Government itself will receive a dividend of \$170 billion in lower interest rates on the debt and in higher tax collections because people are making higher incomes. The dividends to the people of the United States is some half a trillion dollars in lower interest rates on their homes, their automobiles, in better job opportunities, and in higher wages. We look to the future. They look to the present and to the past.

The President now in the present negotiations is willing to set a goal of a balanced budget, a dream of a balanced budget, the thought that the budget might be balanced sometime long after he ceases to be President, but he is unwilling to state it as a policy.

Even if we are to go to a balanced budget, there is another struggle which is not at all petty, Mr. President, between whose figures we will use, those of the Congressional Budget Office, the very Congressional Budget Office which the President himself said was the neutral arbiter just 2 years ago, and the figures that the President himself through his own office comes up with to suit his own purposes.

Many, including some otherwise thoughtful commentators on national television, say, "This is \$1 million difference. Why are you quarreling over it?" Mr. President, we are quarreling over it because the difference in those estimates in the next 10 years is \$1 trillion in spending. This President wants to use estimates that will allow him to spend \$1 trillion more in the next 10 years, half a trillion dollars more in the next 7 years, the 7 which separate us in the debate on the balanced budget. That is not a modest difference, Mr. President—half a trillion dollars in the next 7 years.

What is the difference given the fact that neither side can be certain that it is right? If the White House is wrong and the Congressional Budget Office is right, and we adopt the White House figures, we will never have deficits lower than \$150 billion or \$200 billion even at the end of the 7 years. If, on the other hand, we are wrong, we are too conservative and they are right but our policies are adopted, what happens then? We balance the budget in 5 years rather than 7. We simply reach our goal more rapidly with a larger fiscal dividend.

Let us put it very straightforward. Two days ago this Congress passed a continuing resolution, one which would have put all Government employees back to work with the single requirement that we state that we would come up with a budget that would be balanced by the year 2002 using the honest and realistic figures of the Congress-

sional Budget Office. It did not confine the President or the other party to any particular tax cut, to any particular defense budget, or to any particular reductions or slowing of growth in any program at all. It simply said that we would debate from the same set of figures, and we would reach the same desired end. That is all.

So this is an important difference. If you want to spend another half a trillion dollars in the course of the next 7 years, you should favor the President's course of action. That is what he wants to do. That is his budget. If you feel that it is immoral, as well as economically wrong, to spend money today and to bill your children and grandchildren for it, and you can accomplish those goals while still allowing spending in the U.S. Government to go up by an average of 3 percent a year, then you take our side of this debate, Mr. President.

The debate is an important one. It is a vital one. It is, as the majority leader said, at least the single most important debate in the last 10 years, if not longer. It is a debate between those who believe that the budget ought in fact to be in balance at the end of 7 years and those who have other and higher priorities and want to continue to spend money that they do not put up themselves but that they will bill to their children and their grandchildren.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair, Mr. President.

#### THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak this afternoon as one of the seven Democrats who voted for the continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 122, which passed the Senate on Friday.

Essentially, as has been stated, this resolution provided what we have all wanted, a clean continuing resolution. In its third title, it said the Congress and the President, "shall enact a balanced budget by the year 2002 which is balanced." I believe a balanced budget is something that a majority of this body supports—perhaps it draws more support on your side of the aisle, Mr. President, than on our side, but a balanced budget draws support from our side of the aisle as well.

It is my understanding this continuing resolution has not yet gone to the President—in fact, that it is still in the enrolling clerk's office of the Senate. It is my hope that this resolution would go to the President for his signature. I would like to take a few minutes and explain why I think it is important that he do the statesmanlike thing, and sign this resolution, put Government back to work, call the parties together, and begin to negotiate on what is really the heart of the debate—the reconciliation bill.

As long as we keep Government shut down over the absence of a continuing

resolution, essentially all we are doing is talking about the size and shape of the table.

Now, there are those who would say, oh, that is not correct because, inherent in the continuing resolution is a very important point. The Congressional Budget Office provides the economic and technical data which enables one to judge the revenues with which one would be able to balance the budget. In fact, many people believe that regardless of whether you use the Office of Management and Budget or the Congressional Budget Office estimates, both will in fact be off and perhaps by some significant amount. The differences could translate into billions of dollars, so it is a significant issue.

But we have to keep our eyes focused on the economy. I know in California, for the first time in several years, revenues have begun to move ahead, some \$700 million, ahead of estimates in this quarter of the year for the State of California. That is a good omen. It means that perhaps the economy will move ahead at a higher level than has been anticipated. The CBO's estimates then could be amended.

For me, it is not a big difference because I think the economic projections will be amended, and they will be figured into the base of the future years as we move along. But I think what is important is that we put an end to what is taking place now because it has gone on now for 5 days and is in fact beginning to hurt people. There are small businesses in my State that are contractors with the EPA or with Defense that are now laying off employees. There are 60,000 Head Start youngsters that now may not be able to attend school.

I listened to Senator STEVENS quite eloquently outline on the floor of this body yesterday afternoon the impact that this shutdown is beginning to have on the military. He pointed out that in just a matter of a week, there will be no fuel. He pointed out that already people beginning to move on military leave to go home for Thanksgiving are being stopped; that there is no money being paid for many kinds of duties that the military must carry out.

We know what is happening with our national parks. The Senator from Arizona very eloquently stated the conditions at the Grand Canyon. At Yosemite National Park, I can tell you that \$22,000 a day is unable to be taken in because it is closed.

We know that the Securities and Exchange Commission is unable to collect higher filing fees for stocks and bonds because we have no appropriation bill in place, and that has cost United States taxpayers about \$10 million on the first day of this stalemate.

Then there are the hundreds of thousands of employees that have their house payments, their car payments and additional real facts of life that they have to be able to carry out to exist. This dispute has gone on long

enough and we can simply put an end to it.

Another course is to bring back the earlier continuing resolution, move for its reconsideration, amend it, and then send it to the President. The President should be given the opportunity to sign a clean continuing resolution.

Let me tell you why I think it is important that the President of the United States make a statement agreeing with the 7-year balanced budget. Let me clarify, I do not believe I am alone on this side of the aisle. Each week, I have a group of constituents for breakfast, and I give them a small handout. It is not blown up and it is not fancy, but it is useful information and I would like to try to explain it here.

One pie chart represents 1969 Federal outlays, and the other represents 1995 Federal outlays. So there is a 26-year interval between the two charts.

In 1969, military outlays were 44.9 percent of all Federal outlays. Today, 26 years later, we see they are just 16.6 percent of all Federal outlays.

We see where discretionary spending in 1969 was 21 percent of all Federal outlays. Today, it has dropped to 17 percent.

Now I would like to turn to net interest on the debt, not gross interest, but net interest, which in 1969 represented 6.9 percent. Today, net interest is 14.5 percent of Federal outlays. So, in 26 years, net interest on the debt has doubled as a share of Federal outlays.

We also see the major problem. We see entitlements at 26.9 percent of all Federal outlays in 1969 now exceeding the military budget, to 51.8 percent. So that today, in 1995, in terms of Federal outlay dollars, 66 percent of those dollars comprise entitlements and net interest on the debt.

What has been predicted is that in the next 20 years, absent an effort to balance the budget, entitlements and net interest will absorb all of that, leaving a crushing burden of debt on those who follow us.

That is really the message of why a balanced budget is so important, and why a 7-year balanced budget, I believe can be reached.

In the reconciliation bill, once we get to it, we have to resolve conflicting priorities, and I think that is where there are differences on both sides of the aisle. But, I believe those differences can be met.

I listened to Senator CHAFEE, whom I greatly respect, speak yesterday afternoon on this floor on some of the changes that could be made in Medicare. I happen to agree with the Republican premium levels on Medicare. I also happen to strongly disagree with the Republicans on what they have done with quality care involving the poorest Medicare recipients and the abolition of the Medicaid Program that would allow the poorest seniors to be able to pay their Medicare premiums and copayments through Medicaid.

That is a point of difference. But I think reasonable people can sit down

at the table and solve these problems, particularly if the majority is willing to delay a tax decrease.

Many of us find egregious the fact—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator has an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Many of us find very egregious the fact that a \$245 billion tax decrease essentially drives deeper cuts in what I view as very vital, safety-net programs. So I would be hopeful that we could end the debate on the size and shape of the continuing resolution, pass a clean continuing resolution, send this resolution to the President, and I would urge him to sign it.

I would then urge the parties to reach across the aisle and begin to discuss how we can resolve the differences in the reconciliation bill.

I thank the President, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time in morning business is reserved for the Democratic leader.

The Chair notes the absence over a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. 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. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous order, I be permitted to speak for up to 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE WEARY

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, we are engaged in an exercise of trying to balance the budget. That term has been on every Presidential candidate's lips since the 1970's. Indeed, in this Chamber, in my 21 years in Congress, we have had a number of speeches on proposals to balance the budget. We have had the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings legislation that was supposed to balance the budget. We had the Muskie rules back when Senator Muskie was here—he used to sit right over here, I remember—to balance the budget. Then we have had numerous votes on the debt ceiling. We have debt ceiling legislation that we are supposed to provide as a vehicle that would force a balanced budget. This has gone on and on and on, and the American people are weary.

Finally, today, we are faced with a situation where our Government is shutting down because we cannot reach an agreement on balancing the budget.

I feel that there might be a better mechanical way of going about this. I would rather force the Congress to have a vote every hour and stay here, or I would rather that the President be forced to come and meet with the congressional leaders every 4 hours, something like they do in some of the railway labor negotiations where negotiations are forced rather than shutting down the Government.

I have been trying to find some way of sponsoring legislation so we have an alternative vehicle to bring this type of impasse to a climax. I think it is a poor way to do business, that we are shutting down some of our services and that we are going through this exercise that will probably be costly in the long run, as a way of forcing the issue. But, nevertheless, we are here. This is where we are as of this hour.

So where do we go from here? I hope our leaders do not compromise at this point on anything less than something that will really balance the budget with real numbers. If we come up with phony numbers and a more lengthy period of time, it will severely hurt the long-term bond market, in my opinion. It will mean that long-term interest rates will go up substantially. It will mean that mortgage interest rates will go up substantially. It will mean eventually that student loan interest rates will go up substantially. It will mean that farmers' and ranchers' interest rates will go up substantially. And it will mean that our economy will be subject to inflationary pressures with high interest rates. That would be very damaging to the prosperity that we enjoy.

Let me say that I feel passionately that balancing the budget is a moral issue, and I am not one to come to this floor with a lot of moralistic speeches. But it is moralistic because it is right. It is the right thing to do to pay our debts. It is also moralistic because we are shoving a responsibility off to someone else, our children and grandchildren or future generations. We are not taking responsibility for what we are spending during our watch. That is a moral issue.

It is also a moral issue because we are going to be robbing future middle-class wage earners and working people of part of their paychecks without consulting them. We are going to be robbing senior citizens of a standard of living that they have come to expect and enjoy in the future, and we are going to be robbing people who are poor, who expect to get Government benefits or jobs or whatever from an economy that is abundant.

Therefore, I look upon this as a moral issue, as much as anything else. So I feel passionately that we must carry through at this time and do what we have to do.

During this past year, I have voted for the Dole-Domenici budget in this Chamber. By that, I mean the Republican budget or the budget put forth by

Senator DOMENICI and the Budget Committee of the Senate and Senator DOLE, our leader. On all the votes that have come along, there have been efforts to untangle that budget that have been apple-pie-and-motherhood votes to add this on or add that on.

I have voted with Senator DOMENICI to hold together that budget package because I feel it is the best budget we have had in my 21 years in Congress. It is the first time we have had a budget that has a vision to move us to a balanced budget by the year 2002. That does not say we are paying anything on the Federal debt. We are not. We still have that huge debt to deal with. It does not say anything that we are going to get into a balanced budget until 2002. We are still engaging in deficit spending until 2002.

What is the big fight about here in town? The President of the United States campaigned on a platform to balance the budget within 5 years. I remember Jimmy Carter's was he was going to balance the budget in 4 years during the time he was President. Ronald Reagan campaigned on a program to balance the budget. Every Member of this Senate has run for the Senate on a program to balance the budget.

The point is, it goes on and on and on, and there are excuses and there are phony numbers, there are CBO numbers, there are these numbers, that numbers. But the American people have said, enough is enough, get on with a plan. There are going to be some people in this segment of the economy angry, some people in that segment.

I think it just takes an across-the-board approach. I think the Domenici-Dole budget has some flaws in it. There are some things in it I disagree with but, generally speaking, it cuts the rate of increase. Some of these programs have been increasing at 12 percent a year. This reduces the rate of increase to between 5 and 7 percent.

With that rate of increase, we can absorb the increases and bring us to a balanced budget. So when we talk about cuts, for the most part, we are not talking about cuts at all. We are talking about increasing at a slower level, but still increasing probably at the rate of inflation. So at least let us get with it. At least let us do it. And I hope our leadership does not compromise away this work and these votes that we have cast this year. I hope we stick to our guns and stick to this plan that has been put forward, which I call the Domenici-Dole budget.

Mr. President, let me say something about middle-class working people. One way or another, they end up paying most of the taxes in this country. I think that is unfortunate. I am a member of the Finance Committee, and I have tried to change that. There are promises about a flat-rate tax in the future, and there are promises about a tax on consumption instead of income taxes in the future. But it will still end up that those families or those individuals who work hard, obey the law, they

end up pulling the wagon. They are the ones paying for this nonsense, and they are the ones out there who helped elect this new Congress. In frustration, they are saying, "Let us do something about this."

Mr. President, I think it is time for us to do something. I hope to continue to be a part of that. I ask our leadership not to make compromises that are unnecessary, that go beyond the framework of the Domenici-Dole budget, that would leave us, once again, going away from here with the American people being promised that there is going to be a balanced budget and there is not. I hope that the President and the Congress will heed the American people.

I thank the Chair for this opportunity to speak.

#### RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I understand that the Democratic leader no longer wishes to speak at this time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:51 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair; whereupon, the Senate reassembled at 5:19 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me first state, since I have told my colleagues I would inform them when we had any information, the negotiation is still ongoing as far as the continuing resolution is concerned. I think we made a lot of progress this afternoon. That is how I would characterize the exchange.

We have exchanged options. We have now given an option to Senator DASCHLE, who I understand will be discussing it with Mr. Panetta, the President's Chief of Staff, and Mr. GEPHARDT, the Democratic leader in the House. Hopefully, we can, as I said earlier, resolve this this evening.

If so, I think the process would be we would pass a 1-day continuing resolution, send it to the House, which they could act on tonight. Then we would hopefully pass the other agreed resolution in the Senate tonight, and they would take that up in the House tomorrow. Those are tentative indications of what would happen.

But I wanted to speak about another very important matter.

#### PEACE TALKS IN DAYTON

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there are news reporters indicating that the administration is trying to wrap up peace talks in Dayton, OH, by tomorrow morning.

No doubt about it, the administration has put a great deal of effort into this diplomatic process. A significant number of our diplomats have been working around the clock to get an agreement. Their hard work should be recognized.

However, I hope that in their understandable haste, our negotiators will not lose sight of the objective—which is not just to secure a peace, but to secure a just and lasting peace.

Most Members of Congress would agree that for an agreement to have a reasonable prospect of achieving a stable peace, it must include the following provisions:

First, a clear demarcation of defensible borders for Bosnia and Herzegovina and resolution of all territorial issues among the parties;

Second, clear lines of demarcation between the military forces of the parties to the agreement and procedures for separating the forces;

Third, concurrence by all parties and witnesses to the agreement to multilateral lifting of the arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina upon entry into force of the agreement;

Fourth, acceptance by all parties and witnesses to the agreement to United States involvement in an effort to equip, arm, and train Bosnian Federation Forces;

Fifth, establishment of clear standards for violations of the agreement and the unrestricted use of force by NATO to include air power as necessary to respond to violations of the agreement which threaten not only the peace, but the security of our forces;

Sixth, an end to military intervention by the Governments of Croatia and Serbia and Montenegro in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Seventh, the dismantlement of the integrated air defense network linkages between Serbia and Bosnian-Serb held areas of Bosnia and Herzegovina;

Eighth, full NATO implementation of the deny flight operation; and

Ninth, measures to ensure that indicted war criminals are not in positions of authority, including any elected office.

Mr. President, it seems to me that these are the minimum elements of a viable peace agreement. Without these elements, it is unlikely that a genuine peace will hold. Without these elements, it is unlikely that Bosnia will survive.

We should not mistake securing any peace agreement in Dayton with securing a stable peace. No matter how difficult the negotiations are, if they fail to achieve an agreement that secures the integrity and independence of Bosnia they will have been a waste of time.

Also essential to a stable peace is restoring public confidence and trust in the Government, institutions, and leaders of Bosnia. Absent justice, there will be no trust and no peace will endure. For the long-suffering Bosnian people, to believe in the peace, they

must witness for themselves that justice will be done in Bosnia. Justice is the only comfort we can provide to mothers and fathers who have lost their children to war crimes. This will not be a just peace if war criminals remain at large and unaccountable for their heinous crimes.

Furthermore, Mr. President, any peace will be short-lived if it does not provide the Bosnians with the authority and the means to defend their territory and their people. Absent a stable military balance, those who have clearly been the aggressors in this conflict will seek to press their advantage again. Whatever agreement is initialed in Dayton, it must provide for lifting the arms embargo and for addressing the existing military imbalance. If it does not, it will serve no greater purpose than to delay an inevitable return to hostilities. It will simply be another invitation to future aggression.

Placing these important matters aside, foremost on the minds of the American people is whether or not young Americans should be ordered to enforce a peace agreement in Bosnia.

Mr. President, in my view, the deployment of American forces into harms' way requires very careful deliberation on the part of the administration and the Congress. The President has informed me that he will come to Congress for support. That is the right thing to do. It would be unwise to send American forces without the support of the Congress and the American people. Right now, I do not believe that the President has it.

He certainly will not have it, if a peace agreement does not include the provisions I have mentioned. But, he is also unlikely to receive our support if the implementation plan for our military forces does not, at the very least, include the following essential provisions:

First, well-defined and clearly stated mission objectives achievable through military means;

Second, robust rules of engagement allowing for disproportionate responses, as appropriate, to any attacks on United States and NATO forces and no restrictions or impediments on the ability of United States and NATO military forces to defend themselves;

Third, United States military forces will operate only under a unified NATO command whose orders and authority cannot be constrained, conditioned, blocked or vetoed by any other party including the United Nations;

Fourth, United States military forces shall use the authority granted in any annexes to the maximum extent consistent with their resources and shall act to deter, defeat or punish any violations from whatever source;

Fifth, clear criteria for measuring progress toward achieving the objectives of the operation, a detailed exit strategy, and adequate resources for achieving these objectives and effecting a safe exit for all United States forces from Bosnia;

Sixth, procedures for integrating appropriate UNPROFOR forces currently in Bosnia into a NATO-led implementation force and procedures for withdrawing any other UNPROFOR forces from Bosnia; and

Seventh, specific provisions to prevent conflict between United States and non-NATO Forces and members of the civilian population of Bosnia.

Mr. President, I believe that these criteria are very simple and very basic. I am not certain that Congress will go along with sending American Forces even if these provisions are included in a peace agreement and implementation plan. However, I am certain that without these elements, not only will Congress overwhelmingly disapprove of the peace agreement and the plan to send American Forces as peacekeepers, but that neither of these plans will have a chance of succeeding.

The administration says that NATO will collapse if the United States does not send Americans into Bosnia as peacekeepers, but what happens to NATO if Americans are used to keep a peace which cannot be kept? What happens if we send Americans without adequate authority and provision to protect themselves? NATO should remain strong and united, however, unity in failure is the worst possible outcome. How much worse off would NATO be if United States and other NATO Forces were deployed in Bosnia only to leave in failure?

Which brings me to my final question: Why this option? Why is sending 20,000 American troops to Bosnia the only option being considered by the Clinton administration? Why was no consideration given to using American air power and American supply lines for ground forces provided by our European allies?

Mr. President, many questions remain. The President has not yet made the case for American involvement in Bosnia on this massive scale. The Congress has clearly stated its view that the President should seek authorization for any deployment to Bosnia. The Congress has also clearly stated its preference for lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia so that Bosnians may defend themselves. And we have done this time after time after time on a bipartisan basis. Many of us who supported lifting the embargo, did so not just because of our support for Bosnia's inherent right to self-defense, because we hoped we could avoid sending thousands of Americans into Bosnia to defend Bosnians. But, the President chose not to do that—and now we are where we are.

Mr. President, we fully understand the constitutional authority of the President of the United States. We also understand the constitutional responsibility of the Congress. There is no greater responsibility for an elected representative than to prevent the needless shedding of American blood. We intend to exercise that responsibility with the utmost care.

Mr. President, I want to particularly thank the Presiding Officer for his efforts not only in helping me prepare this statement, but for his consistent support for the position that I have outlined here and for his leadership on the Senate floor and in the Senate negotiations on both sides of the aisle.

I appreciate very much his help.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, before the distinguished leader departs here momentarily, I would like to join in acknowledging the Presiding Officer's very active participation in this and a broad range of matters relating to the military. He served on the Armed Services Committee with great distinction.

#### THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I would like to bring up the subject of the appropriations bill. I addressed the distinguished majority leader earlier today. We had indications that the President might sign two of the three pending appropriations bills.

But at this hour there seems to be still some doubt as to whether or not he will sign the Defense appropriations bill which, as the majority leader recalls, the distinguished Senator from Alaska and the Senator from Hawaii, being chairman and ranking members of that committee, put through with a very strong vote.

It would seem to me inconsistent. It seems to me if the President were thinking about a further commitment, a commitment for which I still have serious reservation, of ground troops into that theater that you would need to have as a foundation the signing of the Defense appropriations bill.

There are \$647 million in that bill for the specific purpose of contingency operations—not included in Bosnia but other operations, and should you put a further financial burden on the defense budget without the allocation of those funds for the ongoing, it seems to me to be just an inconsistent operation. I hope that this message would go to the White House at this moment.

Mr. DOLE. I appreciate the Senator's interest in the defense appropriations bill.

It has also been expressed by the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator STEVENS, I think in a conversation earlier today with Senator WARNER, a telephone conversation. I understand the President was going to sign legislative appropriations and Treasury, Postal appropriations about 5 o'clock today. I hope he has done that. That would mean, if we do not come together on a continuing resolution, which I think we will, that those people could be back at work.

But I would underscore what the Senator from Virginia has stated. If the President is thinking about it—and I know he is thinking about it—any deployment in Bosnia, it seems to me he would be in a much stronger position—I leave that judgment to him because I have not made a judgment yet on that



issue—if he signed the Defense appropriations bill and did it very quickly and sent the appropriate signal that he was not going to weaken our defense in any way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNER). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Before the majority leader leaves the floor—and I know he is involved in very delicate negotiations in trying to get our Government running again—I express my appreciation for again what is clearly a balanced statement. It is one that clearly recognizes the constitutional authority of the President of the United States. But the majority leader's statement also clearly recognizes the constitutional responsibility of the Congress of the United States, and there is nothing in the majority leader's statement nor anything that has been done in this body that would be in abrogation of that constitutional authority the President has. But at the same time, as the majority leader said, we have no greater responsibility than to ensure that if our young men and women are sent into harm's way, we have exercised our responsibility in our role as those who provide the funding and the approval or disapproval.

I think also Senator DOLE's statement clearly sends a signal to the President of the United States that he can send troops, and he does have that constitutional authority, but without the approval of the Congress and the American people that exercise is doomed to failure. When we express our concern about the fragility or the permanence of NATO, nothing could be more damaging to NATO and the Atlantic Alliance than the dispatch of troops and some casualties taken by Americans because it was a peace agreement that did not meet the criteria just laid out in the majority leader's statement, and therefore the American people demand, as they did in Somalia and as they did in Beirut—only this time that crisis would be magnified by a thousandfold—that our American troops be withdrawn because it was a peace that could not be kept. Then I would suggest to our supporters of NATO—and the majority leader and I are members of that group—there is no greater damage that could be done to the Atlantic Alliance than that scenario. So before we send troops, I would hope there would be debate on this floor, debate and discussion, as there was concerning the Persian Gulf.

Again, I recognize how great are the responsibilities the majority leader has at this moment. They are intense and severe. But I think it is very important, since we may be going out of session for this week, that the majority leader make this statement. He reflects the views of the overwhelming majority, I believe, of Members of both sides of the aisle. This statement may be lost in the short term, but we will be balancing what agreement is made, if an agreement is made, with the majority leader's statement, the criteria

and the provisions which were laid out which I think are not only unreasonable but a bare minimum as the criteria for any agreement and any possibility it may have of being permanent.

Again, I do not know exactly how to express the appreciation of lots of people for the role that the majority leader has played in this crisis, especially in his effort to lift the arms embargo. I do not believe we would have lost the tens of thousands of innocent lives if the arms embargo had been lifted at the time the majority leader first tried to achieve that goal, but now we are where we are. Now we are playing the hand we are dealt. I believe that if in the formulation of a peace agreement the criteria and provisions that the majority leader outlined are adhered to, we may have an opportunity to receive the approval of the Congress and the American people and prevent what could possibly be a very serious confrontation between the two branches of Government.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, again let me thank the Senator from Arizona for his constant assistance and leadership on this issue. I think he is correct. I think we speak for Senator LIEBERMAN and countless Senators on the other side of the aisle. If they were here at this point, they would be speaking out. So this is not a partisan issue. It never has been a partisan issue. It is about what steps should be taken before we decide to commit American forces anywhere under any condition. There are many concerned parents and grandparents around the country as well as young men and women themselves. I think we owe it to them and to their families and anybody in the future to make sure that certain criteria have been met. In my view, these are reasonable. I hope the President will find the criteria outlined in the statement to be reasonable. We will be furnishing a copy to Mr. Lake, the President's security adviser, within the next few moments.

(Mr. MCCAIN assumed the chair.)

Mr. DOLE. We are still working on the agreement. We are very hopeful. So I think unless there is somebody wishing to speak, I would ask we stand—does the Senator from Virginia wish to be recognized?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. DOLE. Then would the Senator then go into recess subject to call.

#### SIGNING OF APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I indicated earlier the President was about to sign legislative and Treasury. I am now informed he has signed the legislative appropriations bill and the Treasury, post office appropriations bill. So that brings it to a total of six that have been signed, two or three that are still in conference, and one still has not passed the Senate because of objections on the other side, the Labor-HHS bill.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I assume, I say to the distinguished majority leader, if the message has come down those two bills have been signed, that still casts doubt as to the Defense appropriations bill, and both the majority leader and the distinguished Presiding Officer and the Senator from Virginia send this urgent message to the President to sign that key piece of legislation.

#### UNITED STATES TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I just wish to supplement my remarks by once again commending the Presiding Officer and, indeed, the distinguished majority leader for their leadership on this issue throughout. But I do recall so vividly at the time that President Bush was dispatching our troops into the gulf region he specifically came to Congress. I recall the debate, a very thorough and careful debate went on for 2 days in the Senate, and the final vote was but five votes apart; by a bare margin of five votes the Senate gave its approval, I would say—under the Constitution, of course, the President has the right, but the Senate gave its approval of the President exercising his constitutional right to use the troops that were then already deployed in the gulf region in a role which could involve the use of force of arms.

That same type of resolution—very simple, very straightforward—should be employed in this case if it is the desire of the President to go forward. I am hopeful, as the distinguished majority leader said, that there could be other options. People should recognize that the United States is heavily involved in the air missions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER has given detailed accounts many times on the floor of the Senate of the involvement of the men and women of our air arm and the risks that they have taken. Likewise at sea, the United States is providing the principal naval units for the purpose of the enforcement of certain embargoes that are now in place. And likewise, we have on duty in the Adriatic often a carrier and often other ships supporting the helicopters that are needed for backup for rescue operations, should that be necessary. We saw that, of course, at the time the distinguished Air Force officer was shot down and then eventually rescued.

So, Mr. President, the United States is very heavily engaged at this time. Also, the American taxpayers have footed a bill that exceeds \$1 billion, as we would want to do for humanitarian and medical and other types of humanitarian assistance to people of that war-torn region.

So, I hope tonight we urge upon the President to reflect very carefully before he makes a final decision, and that he regards it essential to come to the Congress, as did President Bush. And, lastly, once again, I am hopeful that he will sign the Defense appropriations

bill. The distinguished Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, and I did talk earlier today. He has been very active with the White House in giving the reasons, together with Senator INOUE of Hawaii, for the need for the signing of that bill.

#### RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, seeing no other Senator present, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, at 5:41 p.m., the Senate recessed until 6:53 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader is recognized.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am going to propound two unanimous-consent requests. I think they have been cleared by everyone on each side. We have contacted everyone we thought might have questions. Then, I think, after we have reached the agreements, there may be Members who would like to make statements. I think first we would like to get the agreements.

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to consideration of Calendar No. 246, House Joint Resolution 123.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 3061

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] proposes an amendment numbered 3061.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I

##### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations

Act for the fiscal year 1995 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1995 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations Acts:

The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), and section 53 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act;

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947;

The District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956;

The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996, H.R. 2492;

The Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996:

*Provided*, That whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted in these Acts is greater than that which would be available or granted under current operations, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this section as passed by the House as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House or the Senate, whichever is lower, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That where an item is not included in either version or where an item is included in only one version of the Act as passed by both Houses as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 or 112 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

(c) Whenever an Act listed in this section has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate per-

mitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That where an item is funded in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and not included in the version passed by the one House as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 or 112 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 102. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 1995 or prior years, for the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 1995 funds, or to initiate, resume, or continue any project, activity, operation, or organization which are defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element and for investment items are further defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item which includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 105. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) November 20, 1995, whichever first occurs. For purposes of this resolution, the period of time covered by this resolution shall be considered to have begun on November 14, 1995.

SEC. 107. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 108. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the

applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 109. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1996 referred to in section 101 of this joint resolution that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 110. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 111. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, whenever an Act listed in section 101 as passed by both the House and Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, does not include funding for an ongoing project or activity for which there is a budget request, or whenever an Act listed in section 101 has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and an item funded in fiscal year 1995 is not included in the version passed by the one House, or whenever the rate for operations for an ongoing project or activity provided by section 101 for which there is a budget request would result in the project or activity being significantly reduced, the pertinent project or activity may be continued under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 by increasing the rate for operations provided by section 101 to a rate for operations not to exceed one that provides the minimal level that would enable existing activities to continue. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366. For the purposes of the Act, the minimal level means a rate for operations that is reduced from the current rate by 25 percent.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, whenever the rate for operations for any continuing project or activity provided by section 101 or section 111 for which there is a budget request would result in a furlough of Government employees, that rate for operations may be increased to the minimum level that would enable the furlough to be avoided. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except sections 106, 111, and 112, for those programs that had high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of funding at the beginning of the fiscal year in fiscal year 1995 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, similar distributions of funds for fiscal year 1996 shall not be made and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 114. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 115. The provisions of section 132 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act,

1988, Public Law 100-202, shall not apply for this joint resolution. Included in the apportionment for the Federal Payment to the District of Columbia shall be an additional \$15,000,000 above the amount otherwise made available by this joint resolution, for purposes of certain capital construction loan repayments pursuant to Public Law 85-451, as amended.

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the authority and conditions for the application of appropriations for the Office of Technology Assessment as contained in the conference report on the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996, House Report 104-212, shall be followed when applying the funding made available by this joint resolution.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, any distribution of funding under the Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research account in the Department of Education may be made up to an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operation for this account provided by this joint resolution as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the authorities provided under subsection (a) of section 140 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution, notwithstanding paragraph (3) of said subsection.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the amount made available to the Securities and Exchange Commission, under the heading Salaries and Expenses, shall include, in addition to direct appropriations, the amount it collects under the fee rate and offsetting collection authority contained in Public Law 103-352, which fee rate and offsetting collection authority shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution.

SEC. 120. Until enactment of legislation providing funding for the entire fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, funds available for necessary expenses of the Bureau of Mines are for continuing limited health and safety and related research, materials partnerships, and minerals information activities; for mineral assessments in Alaska; and for terminating all other activities of the Bureau of Mines.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, funds for the Environmental Protection Agency shall be made available in the appropriation accounts which are provided in H.R. 2099 as reported on September 13, 1995.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations for projects and activities that would be funded under the heading "International Organizations and Conferences, Contributions to International Organizations" in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, shall be the amount provided by the provisions of sections 101, 111, and 112 multiplied by the ratio of the number of days covered by this resolution to 366 and multiplied further by 1.27.

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations of the following projects or activities shall be only the minimum necessary to accomplish orderly termination:

Administrative Conference of the United States;

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (except that activities to carry out the provisions of Public Law 104-4 may continue);

Interstate Commerce Commission; Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation;

Land and Water Conservation Fund, State Assistance; and

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Rural Abandoned Mine Program.

## TITLE II

### SEC. 201. WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR PARCHMENT PRINTING.

(a) WAIVER.—The provisions of sections 106 and 107 of title 1, United States Code, are waived with respect to the printing (on parchment or otherwise) of the enrollment of any of the following measures of the first session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress presented to the President after the enactment of this joint resolution:

- (1) A continuing resolution.
- (2) A debt limit extension measure.
- (3) A reconciliation bill.

(b) CERTIFICATION BY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT.—The enrollment of a measure to which subsection (a) applies shall be in such form as the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives certifies to be a true enrollment.

### SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this joint resolution:

(1) CONTINUING RESOLUTION.—The term "continuing resolution" means a bill or joint resolution that includes provisions making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

(2) DEBT LIMIT EXTENSION MEASURE.—The term "debt limit extension measure" means a bill or joint resolution that includes provisions increasing or waiving (for a temporary period or otherwise) the public debt limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) RECONCILIATION BILL.—The term "reconciliation bill" means a bill that is a reconciliation bill within the meaning of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3061) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123), as amended, was passed.

Mr. DOLE. I just say for the information of all of my colleagues, the amendment I just sent to the desk would extend the full continuing resolution for 1 day.

The Senate will now call up the comprehensive continuing resolution the Senate passed Thursday and modify that resolution with the so-called compromise language and pass that joint resolution. It is my understanding that the House of Representatives will pass the 1-day CR tonight and the comprehensive continuing resolution tomorrow.

I will be happy to yield to the Democratic leader. Does the Democratic leader want me to send up the other one?

Mr. DASCHLE. I think we can send up the second resolution.

#### VITIATION OF ACTION ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 122

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that third reading and final passage be vitiated with respect to House Joint Resolution 122.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 122) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3062

Mr. DOLE. I send an amendment to the desk modifying the text of the joint resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] proposes an amendment numbered 3062.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I

##### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1995 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations Acts:

The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), and section 53 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act;

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947;

The District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956;

The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996, H.R. 2492;

The Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996:

*Provided*, That whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted in these Acts is greater than that which would be available or granted under current operations, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this section as passed by the House as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House or the Senate, whichever is lower, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That where an item is not included in either version or where an item is included in only one version of the Act as passed by both Houses as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 or 112 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

(c) Whenever an Act listed in this section has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That where an item is funded in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and not included in the version passed by the one House as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 or 112 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 102. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 1995 or

prior years, for the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 1995 funds, or to initiate, resume, or continue any project, activity, operation, or organization which are defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element and for investment items are further defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item which includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 105. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) December 15, 1995, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 107. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 108. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 109. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1996 referred to in section 101 of this joint resolution that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 110. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 111. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, whenever an Act listed in section 101 as passed by both the House and Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, does not include funding for an ongoing

project or activity for which there is a budget request, or whenever an Act listed in section 101 has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and an item funded in fiscal year 1995 is not included in the version passed by the one House, or whenever the rate for operations for an ongoing project or activity provided by section 101 for which there is a budget request would result in the project or activity being significantly reduced, the pertinent project or activity may be continued under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 by increasing the rate for operations provided by section 101 to a rate for operations not to exceed one that provides the minimal level that would enable existing activities to continue. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366. For the purposes of the Act, the minimal level means a rate for operations that is reduced from the current rate by 25 percent.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, whenever the rate for operations for any continuing project or activity provided by section 101 or section 111 for which there is a budget request would result in a furlough of Government employees, that rate for operations may be increased to the minimum level that would enable the furlough to be avoided. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except sections 106, 111, and 112, for those programs that had high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of funding at the beginning of the fiscal year in fiscal year 1995 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, similar distributions of funds for fiscal year 1996 shall not be made and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 114. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 115. The provisions of section 132 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1988, Public Law 100-202, shall not apply for this joint resolution. Included in the apportionment for the Federal Payment to the District of Columbia shall be an additional \$16,575,016 above the amount otherwise made available by this joint resolution, for reimbursement to the United States of funds loaned for certain capital improvement projects pursuant to Public Law 81-533, as amended; Public Law 83-364, as amended; Public Law 85-451, as amended; and Public Law 86-515, as amended, including interest as required thereby.

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the authority and conditions for the application of appropriations for the Office of Technology Assessment as contained in the conference report on the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996, House Report 104-212, shall be followed when applying the funding made available by this joint resolution.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, any distribution of funding under the Rehabilitation Services and Disability Re-

search account in the Department of Education may be made up to an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operation for this account provided by this joint resolution as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the authorities provided under subsection (a) of section 140 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution, notwithstanding paragraph (3) of said subsection.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the amount made available to the Securities and Exchange Commission, under the heading Salaries and Expenses, shall include, in addition to direct appropriations, the amount it collects under the fee rate and offsetting collection authority contained in Public Law 103-352, which fee rate and offsetting collection authority shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution.

SEC. 120. Until enactment of legislation providing funding for the entire fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, funds available for necessary expenses of the Bureau of Mines are for continuing limited health and safety and related research, materials partnerships, and minerals information activities; for mineral assessments in Alaska; and for terminating all other activities of the Bureau of Mines.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, funds for the Environmental Protection Agency shall be made available in the appropriation accounts which are provided in H.R. 2099 as reported on September 13, 1995.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations for projects and activities that would be funded under the heading "International Organizations and Conferences, Contributions to International Organizations" in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, shall be the amount provided by the provisions of sections 101, 111, and 112 multiplied by the ratio of the number of days covered by this resolution to 366.

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations of the following projects or activities shall be only the minimum necessary to accomplish orderly termination:

Administrative Conference of the United States;

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (except that activities to carry out the provisions of Public Law 104-4 may continue);

Interstate Commerce Commission; Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation;

Land and Water Conservation Fund, State Assistance; and

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Rural Abandoned Mine Program.

SEC. 124. COMPENSATION AND RATIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—(a) Any Federal employees furloughed as a result of a lapse in appropriations, if any, after midnight November 13, 1995, until the enactment of this Act shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation for the period during which there was a lapse in appropriations.

(b) All obligations incurred in anticipation of the appropriations made and authority granted by this Act for the purposes of main-

taining the essential level of activity to protect life and property and bring about orderly termination of government functions are hereby ratified and approved if otherwise in accord with the provisions of this Act.

## TITLE II

### SEC. 201. WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR PARCHMENT PRINTING.

(a) WAIVER.—The provisions of sections 106 and 107 of title 1, United States Code, are waived with respect to the printing (on parchment or otherwise) of the enrollment of any of the following measures of the first session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress presented to the President after the enactment of this joint resolution:

- (1) A continuing resolution.
- (2) A debt limit extension measure.
- (3) A reconciliation bill.

(b) CERTIFICATION BY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT.—The enrollment of a measure to which subsection (a) applies shall be in such form as the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives certifies to be a true enrollment.

### SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this joint resolution:

(1) CONTINUING RESOLUTION.—The term "continuing resolution" means a bill or joint resolution that includes provisions making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

(2) DEBT LIMIT EXTENSION MEASURE.—The term "debt limit extension measure" means a bill or joint resolution that includes provisions increasing or waiving (for a temporary period or otherwise) the public debt limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) RECONCILIATION BILL.—The term "reconciliation bill" means a bill that is a reconciliation bill within the meaning of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

### SEC. . COMMITMENT TO A SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET.

(a) The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, and the President and the Congress agree that the balanced budget must protect future generations, ensure Medicare solvency, reform welfare, and provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans, and the environment. Further, the balanced budget shall adopt tax policies to help working families and to stimulate future economic growth.

(b) The balanced budget agreement shall be estimated by the Congressional Budget Office based on its most recent current economic and technical assumptions, following a thorough consultation and review with the Office of Management and Budget, and other government and private experts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3062) was agreed to.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

So, the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 122), as amended, was passed.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, that was the compromise language that would extend until December 15 the date agreed upon. In fact, I ask that a copy

of the resolution—I might just read it quickly. This is the agreement reached. I want to thank my colleague, Senator DASCHLE, and thank Senator EXON. Also, of course, I want to thank my colleague, Senator DOMENICI, and the others who have been working on this throughout the day and throughout yesterday. There have been Members on each side. I know Senator WARNER has been involved, as have others. But what we have agreed to now, in a bipartisan, nonpartisan way, I think, is a very satisfactory conclusion to what has been a rather tense situation the past several days.

(a) The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, and the President and the Congress agree that the balanced budget must protect future generations, ensure Medicare solvency, reform welfare, and provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans, and the environment. Further, the balanced budget shall adopt tax policies to help working families and to stimulate future economic growth.

(b) The balanced budget agreement shall be estimated by the Congressional Budget Office based on its most recent current economic and technical assumptions, following a thorough consultation and review with the Office of Management and Budget, and other Government and private experts.

We also take care of back pay in this resolution. And the continuing resolution will be at 75 percent. I will ask the chairman of the Appropriation Committee to explain this in more detail. And it will extend until December 15.

I would be happy to yield to the distinguished Democratic leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the President pro tempore.

I want to commend the distinguished majority leader for his leadership in the effort he has made in the last 24 hours to achieve this agreement. I also commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, our chairman of the Budget Committee, for his effort. It was the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Nebraska, our ranking member, who have done a great deal of work in the last couple of days to get us to this point. I appreciate very much their efforts.

I have discussed this with the President. He fully supports it and will sign it. As the majority leader has indicated, this resolution will allow us to continue to fund the Government until the 15th of December at a level of 75 percent. It reopens the Government and gets people back to work. It reaffirms our commitment to balancing the budget, it spells out our commitment to protecting our priorities—Medicare and Medicaid, education, the environment, defense, agriculture, and veterans. There will be consultation on economic assumptions with the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget and private

experts. It really presents the framework for negotiations.

Now that this is behind us, I think the time for us to negotiate the real balanced budget is at hand. This gives us that opportunity. I am very pleased that we were able to reach the agreement tonight.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, let me also thank Senator LOTT who has been on the telephone the last hour or two checking with Members who had problems.

Also, Senator GORTON who helped us with some editorial comment and corrected a few things which were not quite accurate.

Senator MACK and Senator COCHRAN were there yesterday afternoon and again today helping us bring this together.

And, of course, Senator WARNER has been on the floor and in the meetings. We appreciate that very much. Coming from Virginia he has a number of concerns about Federal employees.

As I said earlier, the Senator from New Mexico deserves great credit. I think it is fair to say it indicates again if we can reach out we can come together.

I think we preserved a very important principle: a balanced budget in 7 years. That was very important to Members on this side and I think to a number of Members on the other side.

Also, obviously the Presiding Officer has been in the thick of this from the start. We appreciate the President pro tempore's discussions, and a number of other colleagues, Senator MCCAIN, who is not on the floor, and Senator PRESSLER, who was there for a few hours this afternoon. We had a lot of people come and go and a lot of input.

I yield now to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for 30 seconds?

I also think a number of staff people, including Bill Hoagland and John Hilley, deserve special commendation for the terrific work they have done. They and many other members of the staff have worked for the last couple of weeks to achieve this. I appreciate very much their effort and all the work they have done to make this happen.

On our side, Senator REID and Senator DORGAN and Members of our leadership have also been extremely helpful and demonstrated a significant level of leadership.

Let me also thank Leon Panetta and members of the White House for the cooperation and tremendous effort that they also made to make this happen tonight.

A number of people are responsible for the fact we are here tonight. I think it is fair to say we have shared in a great deal of effort to make it happen, and we are very pleased.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senator HATFIELD is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I, first, would like to add my word of congratulations to our leadership, Senator DOLE, Senator DASCHLE, the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee, and others who have been very much involved.

Let me just say, we now have 6 appropriations bills of the 13 signed. So this continuing resolution will cover the seven bills not signed. I think it is very important to note we have now extended until December 15. We must act upon these remaining bills in order to get agreement between the White House and the Congress. And the most important bill, in my view, is the Labor-HHS. That is the only appropriations bill the Senate has refused to consider, and we must move on that bill in order to get it covering the important programs of education, health and public services.

Also, for those programs that have been terminated by either the House or the Senate, this will fund those programs at 75 percent of level until that date. Also, it restores the back pay. That may be the best news of all for some of those who are getting down to the end of their resources and need this assurance they will be paid for those days they have been furloughed.

So I want to, again, say this is a great occasion to see this impasse brought to an end, and through the extraordinary bipartisan effort of both sides of the aisle and the White House, this achievement is very significant.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, this agreement will allow all Federal workers to return to their jobs tomorrow morning and all Government operations will return to normal. This is not a win for Republicans or Democrats, this is a win for the American people.

This will ensure the first balanced budget plan in more than a quarter century. Up until today, Republicans in Congress had passed and committed to a 7-year balanced budget, but after today, the President is now on board. He and his administration are now committed to achieving a balanced budget in 7 years using the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. While this is a giant first step, there is a lot of work to getting it done, and I pledge my full effort to try to get this done in the next 3 to 4 weeks.

I yield the floor.

• Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I am concerned that we are in the process of jimmying the numbers so that President Clinton can spend tens of billions of dollars that we do not have on programs that we cannot afford.

It appears that we are laying the predicate for assuming away the deficit problem.

I intend to oppose any budget which increases total spending above the level we set out in our budget.●

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield to the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Senator EXON, who is seeking to make a statement.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I thank my friend from North Dakota. I just want to add my voice of thanks for the true bipartisan effort that was made, especially over the last 2 days, certainly under the effective leadership of Senator DASCHLE, on this side, and Senator DOLE on the other, in cooperation with my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI, the excellent staffs on both sides, Bill Hoagland on the Republican side and Bill Dauster over on our side, and all associated therewith. We came to many points on the cliff when I was not sure we were ever going to jump across, but we did on many, many occasions.

I am very pleased with the fact that, as Senator DOMENICI just said, it was a bipartisan effort. We were not trying to make political points, we were trying to reach an agreement to balance the budget in 7 years that this Senator has stood for for a long, long time and accommodate as many as we could.

The main thing, of course, is that finally, as I have been suggesting for the last few days, what we did was have a breakthrough today, finally, by extending the argument, if you will, to December 15. That means that everybody can go back to work, if we can get this passed in both the House and the Senate this evening, and the Government can return to full functioning by tomorrow morning. This has not been easy, but it has been rewarding, once again, that after a lot of effort and understanding among friends who sometimes have different views on how we get from point A to point B, we do get together and accomplish what we want to do.

Mr. President, I simply say and emphasize that while this is a good agreement, it really requires a lot of heavy lifting between now and the 15th day of December, because we have all of these contentious areas remaining with regard to how we do meet the 7-year balanced budget goal and the different parts of the budget and how we allocate the funds are going to be contentious.

I just hope that the bipartisan spirit that brought this short-term agreement together can be carried on to a considerable degree with the heavy lifting that we have yet to do.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

## MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following joint resolution was ordered placed on the calendar on November 18, 1995:

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1424. A bill to redesignate the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument as a national park, to establish the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area, to establish the Curecanti National Recreation Area, to establish the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park Complex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 1424. A bill to redesignate the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument as a national park, to establish the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area, to establish the Curecanti National Recreation Area, to establish the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park Complex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

### THE BLACK CANYON NATIONAL PARK COMPLEX ACT OF 1996

● Mr. CAMPBELL. Madam President, I introduce a piece of legislation that has been a long time coming; to the State of Colorado and in particular, the western slope of my State, as well as to myself.

Today, I am introducing legislation to create the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park Complex. This represents, in my view, an innovative approach to protecting unique natural resources for future generations in the most fiscally responsible manner possible.

Madam President, this legislation does far more than simply create a new national park from what is now a national monument on the western slope of Colorado. This legislation establishes a cooperative approach to managing this natural resource and calls for all affected resource management agencies in the area, to play key collaborative roles.

Madam President, I want to stress that equally important to what this legislation does, is what it does not do: this legislation does not require additional Federal expenditures, it does not require additional land acquisitions, and the collective management approach that this legislation creates does not in any way require, imply, or contemplate an attempt by the Federal Government to usurp State water rights and State water law.

The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture will manage the entire area as it should be managed—as a single, interrelated and inseparable unit, connected by the magnificence of the Gunnison River itself.

Establishment of the complex will afford the Secretaries the opportunity to share both fiscal and human resources in the administration and management of this unique resource. This legislation will eliminate duplicative management operations and form a coordinated, streamlined and fiscally responsible management structure.

Implementation of this act will cost next to nothing. It is good business. No land acquisitions will be needed, no new areas will be created and this will not be an additional burden to the taxpayer. In fact, implementation of this act will save money by enabling the agencies to cooperate and share resources to a much greater extent than the current management allows.

Beginning at the upper most reaches of the proposed complex, this legislation will create the Curecanti National Recreation Area. This area has a long history of being operated by the National Park Service and the Bureau of Reclamation as a widely popular recreation area. The new Curecanti National Recreation Area will encompass three lakes created by the three dams on the Gunnison River which form the heart of the area. Together, these lakes are a recreationalist's paradise and a fisherman's heaven, regardless of the season.

Within the recreation area will be created the Curecanti Archaeological District. This area contains prehistoric sites dating as far back as 10,000 years. These unique sites may provide dramatic information that will significantly augment our knowledge of early human occupation of the high mountain valleys in the mountains of Colorado. New chapters will be added to what is known about southwestern archaeology.

This legislation will also establish the Denver and Rio Grande National Historic Site at Cimarron, within the recreation area. This site is a monument to the talents of the early mountain railroad builders and is a focal point to illustrate the crucial role of the narrow gauge railroad in realizing the development of western Colorado and the entire west.

The Gunnison National Forest forms the other boundary of the national park complex. This forest offers a wide variety of recreational opportunities as well as incredible scenic views. Portions of the forest have been included within the complex and will be managed in concert with the other resources in this area.

What is now the Gunnison National Monument lies immediately upstream of the recreation area. Visitors to this wonderful site describe this resource with adjectives such as gorgeous, awesome, and spectacular. Everyone who has visited this 2,000 foot deep, nearly impenetrable canyon go on to say that



those words are inadequate to describe the impact of this glorious national wonder. This area is clearly worthy of the designation "National Park," and all the protections and management policies that designation bring to it.

This legislation, when enacted, will designate the monument as the newest national park in the National Park System, again with practically no cost to the agency or the taxpayer. Visitors will be able to look over the side of the sheer canyon walls, hear the roar of the river, feel its strength, and view the canyon which, today, is no different than the day thousands of years ago when the first humans visiting the area failed to cross its chasm.

Upstream and adjacent to the new national park, the Bureau of Land Management will administer and manage the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area which would also be created by this act.

This 64,139-acre tract will be managed for the protection and visitor use of the canyon. Recreational opportunities from raft trips, to hunting, fishing, camping, and hiking offer a wealth of opportunities to enjoy the natural resources at their very best. This area clearly deserves increased protection for future generations, as well as for today's visitors.

The national park complex which will be created by this legislation, taken in its entirety, is a world class site. Managed cooperatively as an interagency project, it can only improve.

It is important to note, Madam President, that while all Americans will benefit by the creation of this national park complex, my constituents living in Gunnison, Montrose, and the other nearby communities, will be impacted most. For this reason, the legislation I am introducing today is not a finished product and I am looking forward to detailed hearings to receive the advice and counsel of all interested parties.

My subcommittee staff will immediately begin soliciting feedback on this legislation, and hearings in the early spring will follow. Following those comments and hearings, my staff and I will make the appropriate technical changes to this legislation and will work closely with leadership in the full committee, our leadership in the Senate and our colleagues in the House to promptly move this legislation and present it to the President for his signature.

Throughout this process, my staff and I are eager to listen to the views of all concerned and to fine-tune this legislation cooperatively and in good faith with all who wish to participate.

Finally, Madam President, I would take a moment to pay special tribute to three special—and new—members of my staff who have worked with special drive and determination on this legislation. Ms. Rhea Suh, of my personal staff, Ms. Kathryn "Kayci" Cook, and Jim O'Toole of the committee staff,

have been invaluable to me in the process.

In previous years, I have introduced Black Canyon legislation that, quite simply, went nowhere. It was written in an attempt to be all things to all people and that, unfortunately, resulted in nothing more than printed chaos.

In the 104th Congress, we threw away all the old concepts and started, quite literally, from ground zero. It was only with the fresh, energetic, and creative minds of these fine professionals that, together, we were able to come up with an entirely new concept. This concept which I am introducing today, presents our Nation with the opportunity to provide the greatest protection of a unique resource through the least amount of bureaucracy and expenditure. Now, finally after all these years, I am introducing legislation which I am confident will meet with broad support and which will, finally, become the law of the land.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1424

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Black Canyon National Park Complex Act of 1996".

#### SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF BLACK CANYON OF THE GUNNISON NATIONAL PARK.

(a) There is hereby established the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park (hereinafter referred to as the "park") in the State of Colorado. The Black Canyon National Monument is abolished as such, and all lands and interest therein are hereby incorporated within and made part of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park. Any reference to the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument shall be deemed a reference to Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park, and any funds available for the purposes of the monument shall be available for purposes of the park.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) acting through the Director of the National Park Service shall manage the park, subject to valid existing rights, in accordance with this Act and under the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the National Park System including but not limited to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), and other applicable provisions of law.

#### SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE GUNNISON GORGE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) There is hereby established the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area (hereinafter referred to as the "conservation area") in the State of Colorado, consisting of approximately 64,139 acres as generally depicted on the map entitled "Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park Complex—Map No. 2, dated 10/27/95" (hereinafter referred to as the "map").

(b) The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall manage the conservation area, subject to valid existing rights, in accordance with

this Act, the Federal Land Management and Policy Act of 1976, and other applicable provisions of law.

(c) In addition to the use of motorized vehicles on established roadways, the use of motorized vehicles in the conservation area shall be allowed to the extent compatible, in accordance with existing off-highway vehicle designations as described in the current, approved management plan, or as part of the management plan prepared pursuant to this Act.

(d) Within four years following the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop and transmit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate and to the Committee on Resources of the United States House of Representatives a comprehensive plan for the long-range protection and management of the conservation area. The plan shall describe the appropriate uses and management of the conservation area consistent with the provisions of this Act. The plan may incorporate appropriate decisions contained in any current management or activity plan for the area. The plan may also incorporate appropriate wildlife habitat management or other plans that have been prepared for the lands within or adjacent to the conservation area, and shall be prepared in close consultation with appropriate agencies of the State of Colorado and shall use information developed in previous studies of the lands within or adjacent to the conservation area.

#### SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, AND THE DENVER AND RIO GRANDE RAILROAD NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) There is hereby established, the Curecanti National Recreation Area (hereinafter referred to as the "recreation area" in the State of Colorado. The recreation area shall consist of the lands and waters within the area designated "Curecanti National Recreation Area" as depicted on the map.

(b) The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service shall manage the recreation area, subject to valid existing rights, in accordance with this Act and under provisions of law generally applicable to units of the National Park System including but not limited to the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535, 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666; 16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.), and other applicable provisions of law, except as otherwise provided in this section.

(c) The establishment of the recreation area under subsection (a) shall not affect or interfere with the validity of withdrawals made before the date of enactment of this Act for reclamation or power purposes. Operation of improvements on and the management of lands occupied by dams, structures, or other facilities subject to the Colorado River Storage Project Act of 1956 (42 U.S.C. 620 et seq.) shall be the responsibility of the Secretary, acting through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. Such lands shall be delineated through a joint agreement among the Bureau of Reclamation, the National Park Service, and all associated entities. The Secretary may enter into additional agreements which address sharing of jurisdiction and authorities on the delineated lands. All lands within the recreation area which have been withdrawn or acquired by the United States for reclamation purposes shall remain subject to the purposes and uses established under the Colorado River Storage Project Act of 1956 (42 U.S.C. 620 et seq.) The Secretary may exclude any area from the recreation area for reclamation or power purposes upon determining that it is in the national interest to do so.

(d) The Secretary shall administer the recreation area subject to all Public Laws,

memoranda of interagency agreement, memoranda of agreement and/or understanding, including cooperative agreements, licenses, permits, and contracts and right-of-way agreements currently in effect, and/or referenced in the Curecanti National Recreation Area Statement for Management, dated November 1990.

(e) Within the Recreation Area there is hereby established, subject to the provisions of this section, the Denver and Rio Grande National Historic Site (hereinafter referred to as the "historic site") consisting of the Denver and Rio Grande rolling stock and train trestle at Cimarron, as depicted on the map. The Secretary may include those portions of the historic railroad bed within the boundaries of the historic site which would serve to enhance or contribute to the interpretation of the development of the railroad and its role in the development of western Colorado.

(f) Within the Recreation Area there is hereby established, subject to the provisions of this section, the Curecanti Archeological District (hereinafter referred to as the "District") as depicted on the map.

(g) Within one year after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a comprehensive list of laws, rules, regulations, right-of-way permits and agreements, licensing agreements, special-use permits or other authorizing documents issued by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service, for the use of lands within the recreation area, to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate and to the Committee on Resources of the United States House of Representatives.

#### SEC. 5. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BLACK CANYON OF THE GUNNISON NATIONAL PARK COMPLEX.

(a) There is hereby established the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park Complex (hereinafter referred to as the "complex") in the State of Colorado. The complex shall include the following lands as depicted on the map.

- (1) The park,
- (2) The conservation area,
- (3) The recreation area, and

(4) Those portions of lands comprising the Gunnison National Forest as depicted on the map.

(b) The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service shall manage the park, recreation area, historic site and district; and acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall manage the conservation area in accordance with this Act, and other applicable provisions of law.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service shall manage, subject to valid existing rights, those portions of the forest that have been included in the complex in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations pertaining to the National Forest System and this Act.

(d) The Secretaries shall manage the areas under their jurisdiction within the complex in a consistent manner to the maximum extent practical. Wherever possible, regulations, permits, licenses, and other agreements should be issued jointly. The Secretaries shall ensure that, to the maximum extent practical, that personnel, equipment, and other resources are shared among the agencies and that the duplication of effort is reduced or eliminated.

#### SEC. 6. WATER RIGHTS.

Nothing in this Act, nor in any action taken pursuant thereto under any other act, shall constitute an express or implied reservation of water for any purpose. Nothing in this Act, nor any actions taken pursuant

thereto shall affect any existing water rights, including, but not limited to, any water rights held by the United States prior to the date of enactment of this Act. Any water rights that the Secretary determines are necessary for the purposes of this Act shall be acquired under the procedural and substitutive requirements of the laws of the State of Colorado.

#### SEC. 7. RECREATIONAL AND MULTIPLE-USE ACTIVITIES.

(a) In carrying out this Act, in addition to other related activities that may be permitted pursuant to this Act, the Secretaries shall provide for general recreation and multiple use activities that are considered appropriate and compatible within the areas of their respective jurisdiction, including, but not limited to, swimming, fishing, boating, rafting, hiking, horseback riding, camping and picnicking. The Secretaries shall also provide for certain multiple use activities, subject to valid existing rights, including grazing and the harvesting of hay; the maintenance of roads, stock driveways, and utility rights-of-way. Within the boundaries of the recreation area the Secretary shall also provide for off-road vehicle use below high water levels, on frozen lake surfaces, and on related designated access routes; and other such uses as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

(b) The Secretaries shall permit hunting, fishing, noncommercial taking of freshwater crustaceans, and trapping on the lands and waters under the Secretaries jurisdiction in accordance with applicable laws and regulations of the United States and the State of Colorado, except that the Secretaries, after consultation with the Colorado Division of Wildlife, may issue regulations designating zones where and establishing periods when no hunting or trapping shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, or public use and enjoyment. Subject to valid existing rights, hunting and trapping will not be allowed within the boundaries of the park.

#### SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.●

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1220

At the request of Mr. REID, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1220, a bill to provide that Members of Congress shall not be paid during Federal Government shutdowns.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996 JOINT RESOLUTION

#### DOLE AMENDMENTS NOS. 3061-3062

Mr. DOLE proposed two amendments to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 122) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; as follows:

##### AMENDMENT No. 3061

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of appli-

cable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I

#### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1995 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations Acts:

The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), and section 53 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act;

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947;

The District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956;

The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996, H.R. 2492;

The Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996:

*Provided*, That whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted in these Acts is greater than that which would be available or granted under current operations, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this section as passed by the House as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House or the Senate, whichever is lower, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That where an item is not included in either version or where an item is included in only one version of the Act as passed by both Houses as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 or 112 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations

Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

(c) Whenever an Act listed in this section has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That where an item is funded in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and not included in the version passed by the one House as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 or 112 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 102. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 1995 or prior years, for the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 1995 funds, or to initiate, resume, or continue any project, activity, operation, or organization which are defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element and for investment items are further defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item which includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 105. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) November 20, 1995, whichever first occurs. For purposes of this resolution, the period of time covered by

this resolution shall be considered to have begun on November 14, 1995.

SEC. 107. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 108. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 109. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1996 referred to in section 101 of this joint resolution that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 110. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 111. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, whenever an Act listed in section 101 as passed by both the House and Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, does not include funding for an ongoing project or activity for which there is a budget request, or whenever an Act listed in section 101 has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and an item funded in fiscal year 1995 is not included in the version passed by the one House, or whenever the rate for operations for an ongoing project or activity provided by section 101 for which there is a budget request would result in the project or activity being significantly reduced, the pertinent project or activity may be continued under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 by increasing the rate for operations provided by section 101 to a rate for operations not to exceed one that provides the minimal level that would enable existing activities to continue. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366. For the purposes of the Act, the minimal level means a rate for operations that is reduced from the current rate by 25 percent.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, whenever the rate for operations for any continuing project or activity provided by section 101 or section 111 for which there is a budget request would result in a furlough of Government employees, that rate for operations may be increased to the minimum level that would enable the furlough to be avoided. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except sections 106, 111, and 112, for those programs that had high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of funding at the beginning of the fiscal year in fiscal year 1995 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, similar distributions of funds for fiscal year 1996 shall

not be made and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 114. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 115. The provisions of section 132 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1988, Public Law 100-202, shall not apply for this joint resolution. Included in the apportionment for the Federal Payment to the District of Columbia shall be an additional \$15,000,000 above the amount otherwise made available by this joint resolution, for purposes of certain capital construction loan repayments pursuant to Public Law 85-451, as amended.

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the authority and conditions for the application of appropriations for the Office of Technology Assessment as contained in the conference report on the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996, House Report 104-212, shall be followed when applying the funding made available by this joint resolution.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, any distribution of funding under the Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research account in the Department of Education may be made up to an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operation for this account provided by this joint resolution as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the authorities provided under subsection (a) of section 140 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution, notwithstanding paragraph (3) of said subsection.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the amount made available to the Securities and Exchange Commission, under the heading Salaries and Expenses, shall include, in addition to direct appropriations, the amount it collects under the fee rate and offsetting collection authority contained in Public Law 103-352, which fee rate and offsetting collection authority shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution.

SEC. 120. Until enactment of legislation providing funding for the entire fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, funds available for necessary expenses of the Bureau of Mines are for continuing limited health and safety and related research, materials partnerships, and minerals information activities; for mineral assessments in Alaska; and for terminating all other activities of the Bureau of Mines.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, funds for the Environmental Protection Agency shall be made available in the appropriation accounts which are provided in H.R. 2099 as reported on September 13, 1995.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations for projects and activities that would be funded under the heading "International Organizations and Conferences, Contributions to International Organizations" in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, shall be the amount provided by the provisions of sections 101, 111, and 112 multiplied

by the ratio of the number of days covered by this resolution to 366 and multiplied further by 1.27.

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations of the following projects or activities shall be only the minimum necessary to accomplish orderly termination:

Administrative Conference of the United States;

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (except that activities to carry out the provisions of Public Law 104-4 may continue);

Interstate Commerce Commission;

Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation;

Land and Water Conservation Fund, State Assistance; and

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Rural Abandoned Mine Program.

## TITLE II

### SEC. 201. WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR PARCHMENT PRINTING.

(a) WAIVER.—The provisions of sections 106 and 107 of title 1, United States Code, are waived with respect to the printing (on parchment or otherwise) of the enrollment of any of the following measures of the first session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress presented to the President after the enactment of this joint resolution:

- (1) A continuing resolution.
- (2) A debt limit extension measure.
- (3) A reconciliation bill.

(b) CERTIFICATION BY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT.—The enrollment of a measure to which subsection (a) applies shall be in such form as the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives certifies to be a true enrollment.

### SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this joint resolution:

(1) CONTINUING RESOLUTION.—The term “continuing resolution” means a bill or joint resolution that includes provisions making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

(2) DEBT LIMIT EXTENSION MEASURE.—The term “debt limit extension measure” means a bill or joint resolution that includes provisions increasing or waiving (for a temporary period or otherwise) the public debt limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) RECONCILIATION BILL.—The term “reconciliation bill” means a bill that is a reconciliation bill within the meaning of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

## AMENDMENT No. 3062

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

## TITLE I

### CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 for continuing projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this joint resolution) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1995 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations Acts:

The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), and section 53 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act;

The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947;

The District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996, notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956;

The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996, H.R. 2492;

The Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Act, 1996;

The Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996:

*Provided*, That whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted in these Acts is greater than that which would be available or granted under current operations, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this section as passed by the House as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House or the Senate, whichever is lower, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That where an item is not included in either version or where an item is included in only one version of the Act as passed by both Houses as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 or 112 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

(c) Whenever an Act listed in this section has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That where an item is funded in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and not included in the version passed by the one House as of the date of en-

actment of this joint resolution, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 or 112 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 102. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 1995 or prior years, for the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 1995 funds, or to initiate, resume, or continue any project, activity, operation, or organization which are defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element and for investment items are further defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item which includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account, for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 105. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enumerated in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this joint resolution.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this joint resolution or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this joint resolution, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) December 15, 1995, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 107. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this joint resolution.

SEC. 108. Expenditures made pursuant to this joint resolution shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 109. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1996 referred to in section 101 of this joint resolution that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(c) of this joint resolution.

SEC. 110. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this joint resolution may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 111. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, whenever an Act listed in section 101 as passed by both the House and Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, does not include funding for an ongoing project or activity for which there is a budget request, or whenever an Act listed in section 101 has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and an item funded in fiscal year 1995 is not included in the version passed by the one House, or whenever the rate for operations for an ongoing project or activity provided by section 101 for which there is a budget request would result in the project or activity being significantly reduced, the pertinent project or activity may be continued under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 by increasing the rate for operations provided by section 101 to a rate for operations not to exceed one that provides the minimal level that would enable existing activities to continue. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366. For the purposes of the Act, the minimal level means a rate for operations that is reduced from the current rate by 25 percent.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, whenever the rate for operations for any continuing project or activity provided by section 101 or section 111 for which there is a budget request would result in a furlough of Government employees, that rate for operations may be increased to the minimum level that would enable the furlough to be avoided. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except sections 106, 111, and 112, for those programs that had high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of funding at the beginning of the fiscal year in fiscal year 1995 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, similar distributions of funds for fiscal year 1996 shall not be made and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this resolution that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 114. This joint resolution shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the resolution shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 115. The provisions of section 132 of the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 1988, Public Law 100-202, shall not apply for this joint resolution. Included in the apportionment for the Federal Payment to the District of Columbia shall be an additional \$16,575,016 above the amount otherwise made available by this joint resolution, for reimbursement to the United States of funds loaned for certain capital improvement projects pursuant to Public Law 81-533, as amended; Public Law 83-364, as amended; Public Law 85-451, as amended; and Public

Law 86-515, as amended, including interest as required thereby.

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the authority and conditions for the application of appropriations for the Office of Technology Assessment as contained in the conference report on the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1996, House Report 104-212, shall be followed when applying the funding made available by this joint resolution.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, any distribution of funding under the Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research account in the Department of Education may be made up to an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operation for this account provided by this joint resolution as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the authorities provided under subsection (a) of section 140 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236) shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution, notwithstanding paragraph (3) of said subsection.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the amount made available to the Securities and Exchange Commission, under the heading Salaries and Expenses, shall include, in addition to direct appropriations, the amount it collects under the fee rate and offsetting collection authority contained in Public Law 103-352, which fee rate and offsetting collection authority shall remain in effect during the period of this joint resolution.

SEC. 120. Until enactment of legislation providing funding for the entire fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, funds available for necessary expenses of the Bureau of Mines are for continuing limited health and safety and related research, materials partnerships, and minerals information activities; for mineral assessments in Alaska; and for terminating all other activities of the Bureau of Mines.

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, funds for the Environmental Protection Agency shall be made available in the appropriation accounts which are provided in H.R. 2099 as reported on September 13, 1995.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations for projects and activities that would be funded under the heading "International Organizations and Conferences, Contributions to International Organizations" in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, shall be the amount provided by the provisions of sections 101, 111, and 112 multiplied by the ratio of the number of days covered by this resolution to 366.

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 106, the rate for operations of the following projects or activities shall be only the minimum necessary to accomplish orderly termination:

Administrative Conference of the United States;

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (except that activities to carry out the provisions of Public Law 104-4 may continue);

Interstate Commerce Commission;  
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation;

Land and Water Conservation Fund, State Assistance; and

Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Rural Abandoned Mine Program.

SEC. 124. COMPENSATION AND RATIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—(a) Any Federal employees furloughed as a result of a lapse in appropriations, if any, after midnight November 13, 1995, until the enactment of this Act shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation for the period during which there was a lapse in appropriations.

(b) All obligations incurred in anticipation of the appropriations made and authority granted by this Act for the purposes of maintaining the essential level of activity to protect life and property and bring about orderly termination of government functions are hereby ratified and approved if otherwise in accord with the provisions of this Act.

## TITLE II

### SEC. 201. WAIVER OF REQUIREMENT FOR PARCHMENT PRINTING.

(a) WAIVER.—The provisions of sections 106 and 107 of title 1, United States Code, are waived with respect to the printing (on parchment or otherwise) of the enrollment of any of the following measures of the first session of the One Hundred Fourth Congress presented to the President after the enactment of this joint resolution:

- (1) A continuing resolution.
- (2) A debt limit extension measure.
- (3) A reconciliation bill.

(b) CERTIFICATION BY COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT.—The enrollment of a measure to which subsection (a) applies shall be in such form as the Committee on House Oversight of the House of Representatives certifies to be a true enrollment.

### SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this joint resolution:

(1) CONTINUING RESOLUTION.—The term "continuing resolution" means a bill or joint resolution that includes provisions making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996.

(2) DEBT LIMIT EXTENSION MEASURE.—The term "debt limit extension measure" means a bill or joint resolution that includes provisions increasing or waiving (for a temporary period or otherwise) the public debt limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(3) RECONCILIATION BILL.—The term "reconciliation bill" means a bill that is a reconciliation bill within the meaning of section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

### SEC. . COMMITMENT TO A SEVEN-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET.

(a) The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, and the President and the Congress agree that the balanced budget must protect future generations, ensure Medicare solvency, reform welfare, and provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans and the environment. Further, the balanced budget shall adopt tax policies to help working families and to stimulate future economic growth.

(b) The balanced budget agreement shall be estimated by the Congressional Budget Office based on its most recent current economic and technical assumptions, following a thorough consultation and review with the Office of Management and Budget, and other government and private experts.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1995

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10:30 a.m., Monday, November 20; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date; that no resolutions come over under the rule; that the call of the calendar be dispensed with; that the morning hour be deemed to have expired; that the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that there be a period for morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROGRAM

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will be in session tomorrow to adopt an adjournment resolution. It is also possible that the Senate may consider any legislative or executive business cleared for action during Monday's session.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, after an opportunity has been given to speak for the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

#### GOOD NEWS FOR THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this is good news tonight. The impasse has been broken. It is certainly good news for the country, and good news for the hundreds of thousands of Federal workers who have been furloughed and who have been wondering if this Thanksgiving would be a happy one for their families. It is good news for citizens around the country who are wanting to have their Government back in action.

Mr. President, now that we have achieved this breakthrough tonight, in what was really an initial skirmish on a much larger issue about how we bring balance to the budget, and how we bring the fiscal affairs of this country into balance, I think now, perhaps, is the time to start looking ahead at how we could achieve the greater agreement, how we could balance the budget in a unified way over the next 7 years, and how we could do it within the constraints of this agreement.

I say to my colleagues that there are a number of ways that we could have a breakthrough on the larger debate that is underway. I urge my colleagues to look at CBO and OMB economic forecasts as one way out of the morass that we are headed into with respect to a long-term agreement.

Mr. President, we could settle this dispute, balance the budget on a unified basis by 2002, but do it in a balanced way, in a way that was fair to all interested parties. Just so my colleagues have something to think about over the week break that we are about to have, I am going to put in the RECORD one possible compromise. I stress that it is a compromise, because this is not a proposal that will find favor among every Democrat, it is not a proposal that will find favor among every Republican; but I think we have to remember that a Democrat controls the White House, the Republicans control the Congress, and the President can maintain a veto with the number of Democrats that are in the House and in the Senate.

So, ultimately, we are going to have to compromise between what the Republicans want to do and what the Democrats want to do. Both sides are moving from principle, both sides have strong views about what is in the best interest of the country. Ultimately, neither one is going to get everything they want. We are going to have to compromise. It will be a principled compromise when it is finally made, but I urge my colleagues to take a look at what I am going to outline this evening, as they take this break for Thanksgiving and see if it is not at least an outline of what we can achieve if we worked in good faith and sat down together and reasoned out a final agreement.

Mr. President, first of all, you take the 7-year goal. I think the vast majority of Members of Congress agree that 7 years is an appropriate goal to bring balance to the unified budget of the United States. I want to stress that that is not the end of the job, because to achieve real balance, we are going to have to balance without using Social Security trust fund surpluses. But the first step is to achieve unified balance, and to do that in 7 years is a good goal.

One of the great disputes we have had is whether we ought to use CBO economic forecasts or the OMB economic forecasts. I think a lot of people get lost and say: What is CBO? What is OMB? Simply, for those who are listening, CBO is the Congressional Budget Office; OMB is the Office of Management and Budget. The Office of Management and Budget is controlled by the President; the Congressional Budget Office is controlled by the two Houses of Congress. They have two different scenarios for what the economic growth is going to be in this country over the next 7 years. CBO says 2.3 percent; OMB says 2.5 percent. Interestingly enough, over the last 20 years, economic growth has averaged 2.5 per-

cent. Interestingly enough, the Wall Street Journal, last week, endorsed the President's economic assumptions. But they said that both of them are too pessimistic.

Well, what would happen if we just compromised between the OMB and CBO economic forecast? That would provide an additional \$225 billion that we could distribute over the next 7 years, if we used the OMB economic forecast. Again, the Wall Street Journal says it is too pessimistic. If we did that and we went down the large categories of spending that we have to decide on, if we are going to achieve a balanced budget on a unified basis by 2002, one can see the possibility of a compromise that would look something like this: In the Republican bill, in domestic discretionary spending, they have achieved savings or cuts, if you will, of \$440 billion over the next 7 years.

In a potential compromise, we might have a hard freeze, and just freeze domestic discretionary spending for 7 years—freeze it. That would save \$289 billion. We have had intense debates on this floor about Medicare. In the Republican proposal they have saved \$270 billion out of Medicare. On a compromise that would balance on a unified basis in 7 years, we could have a savings of \$140 billion. That would preserve and protect Medicaid. It would strengthen the program, and it would do what the trustees say is necessary. But it would not threaten to close rural hospitals in the same degree as the Republican plan. It would not put the same burden on beneficiaries as the Republican plan.

I suggested to my colleagues a potential compromise. On Medicaid, the Republican plan calls for \$163 billion of savings, or cuts, if you will, over the next 7 years. A compromise might follow more closely the commonsense plan introduced by conservative Democrats in the House and Senate, an \$80 billion savings out of Medicaid.

On agriculture, the Republican plan is to cut \$12 billion. Here it is not restricting the rate of growth. Here it is a real cut—no question about it. It is \$12 billion less in agriculture. An alternative would be the President's number of \$4 billion.

Mr. President, the Republican plan goes too far. It goes too far. They eliminate the authorization for an agriculture program that has been in the law since 1938. They eliminate it. I think everybody recognizes agriculture needs some changes, but we should not be eliminating the farm program in this country. We certainly should not, when our competitors are already spending three or four times as much as we are on agriculture, and just waiting for us to wave the white flag of surrender. That does not make sense.

So I submit to my colleagues that perhaps a \$4 billion reduction could be part of a final package that achieves balance on a unified basis by the year 2002.

Student loans. The Republican package calls for a \$5 billion reduction. Mr. President, this is one area where I think most Members on our side—certainly, I think every Member on our side—would say we should not cut student loans by a nickel. That is not good for the future of America, to restrict people's ability to go to college. So let us eliminate that one area of cuts—the \$5 billion that is in the Republican plan.

Welfare reform. The Republican plan has \$107 billion.

An alternative would be a number, about \$47 billion, again, close to what was in the commonsense plan offered by conservative Democrats in the House and the Senate.

I say to my colleagues, this difference is important because if we are serious about our rhetoric, if we really want people to go to work and not be on welfare rolls, we have to understand that will cost some money.

The Republican Governor of Wisconsin has reminded people if you really want to put people back to work, you have to have the child care that will allow them to go back to work. We know that means a savings of less than what is in the Republican plan.

In addition, in the Republican plan, they dramatically reduce the earned income tax credit. Ronald Reagan said the earned income tax credit was the best profamily, prowork program that ever came out of Congress.

Mr. President, I do not think we want to be cutting the earned income tax credit that will actually mean a tax increase for some 7 million families in America. We should not be increasing their taxes.

On veterans, the Republican plan calls for \$7 billion of savings; the alternative, \$5 billion.

Now, some people are beginning to wonder, where do you get this extra money? First of all, remember, we have adopted a compromise between the economic assumptions of CBO and OMB. When we do that, we have \$225 billion of additional resources that can be used over the next 7 years.

I want to swiftly point out that every forecaster in the private sector has suggested that OMB is actually quite conservative with their economic forecasts. Most of the private-sector forecasts are more optimistic than either OMB or CBO.

Another way we get additional resources is by an adjustment in the Consumer Price Index. The Consumer Price Index is used to adjust Social Security payments. It is used to index the income tax system. The whole idea of the Consumer Price Index and using it has been that we are adjusting to the cost of living.

The experts are now telling us that the Consumer Price Index overadjusts for the cost of living. It is making too big an adjustment. In fact, we just had a commission that reported to the Finance Committee and said that we are overcorrecting from 0.7 of 1 percent to

2 percent a year in the Consumer Price Index.

If we would adopt just a half-a-point correction, 0.5 correction in the Consumer Price Index, that would save \$139 billion over the next 7 years.

Other mandatory spending, the Republican plan, \$16 billion of savings; this alternative that we propose, \$58 billion.

Then we go to revenues. Loophole closures: In the Republican conference report they call for \$18 billion of loophole closures. In the alternative, we double that and call for \$37 billion in loophole closures.

I might just say to my colleagues, the biggest pot of money that we have are the tax entitlements. We have heard a lot of talk about reducing the spending entitlements—Medicare, Medicaid, a lot of talk that they are growing too fast. Indeed, they are. So we achieve savings in the spending entitlements of Medicare and Medicaid.

The tax entitlements are the biggest pot of money of all. We are going to have \$4 trillion of tax entitlements over the next 7 years, compared to \$3 trillion spent on Social Security, about \$2 trillion spent on Medicare. So the biggest pot of money of all is the tax entitlements.

We could achieve \$39 billion of savings out of a pool of \$4 trillion without any heavy lifting around here. It ought to be done.

Mr. President, the Republican plan calls for \$245 billion of additional tax preferences—tax cuts. Very frankly, a compromise would require something less than that. There are many of us that do not see the wisdom of reducing revenue when we are adding \$1.8 trillion to the national debt that already stands at \$5 trillion.

Why are we cutting taxes when we already have a debt of \$5 trillion and we are adding \$1.8 trillion to it over the next 7 years?

We will have to borrow every penny of that tax cut. So compromise might be to reduce that proposed tax cut in the Republican plan from \$245 to \$131 billion.

Then we get to the so-called fiscal dividends. In the Republican plan, the CBO says they get a fiscal dividend of \$170 billion. Fiscal dividend, Mr. President, simply means that once we move toward balance, the markets in this country are going to adjust. They are going to get lower interest rates. We are going to get greater economic growth, and that will produce a fiscal dividend of \$170 billion. The alternative plan I am discussing tonight, that would be a fiscal dividend of \$114 billion.

Then, of course, because we substantially reduce the deficit under the Republican plan, there would be \$150 billion of debt-service savings. Under this alternative plan that I am discussing tonight, the debt-service savings would be \$113 billion.

Then, of course, there is the difference in the economic assumptions that I mentioned at the beginning, the

bridge between the Congressional Budget Office economic forecast and the Office of Management and Budget economic forecast. That is a difference of \$225 billion.

The bottom line: deficit reduction in the Republican plan of \$1.131 trillion over the next 7 years. In the Democratic plan—I will not label it a Democratic plan because really this would be a compromise. This would be a compromise between the Democratic alternatives that have been offered previously, the Democratic priorities and the Republican priorities. Maybe we ought to call it the American plan.

It would achieve deficit reduction of \$1.121 trillion. It would achieve unified balance in the year 2002. We would have done it with much less in the way of cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, no cuts to education. We would have done it with much less in the way of cuts in reductions to food programs and agriculture. It would still be a tax reduction, but would not be as big as the Republicans have been calling for.

There would be more money for highways and bridges. There would be more money for research, which I think is critical to the future of this country.

Mr. President, I will ask that a table that outlines this potential compromise be printed in the RECORD. I hope my colleagues and the staffs of my colleagues would take a look at this over the break period, because at some point we will have to come together in the House and the Senate between the Congress and the White House. This is at least an outline, a suggestion, something to think about, about how we could bring the two sides together and achieve something great for America.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD.

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

#### COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE BUDGET PACKAGES

(Changes from CBO baseline)  
(7-year changes; in billions of dollars)

	Republican conference	Potential compromise
Discretionary: Discretionary savings .....	-440	-289
Mandatory:		
Medicare .....	-270	-140
Medicaid .....	-163	-80
Agriculture .....	-12	-4
Student loans .....	-5	0
Welfare reform (includes EITC, nutrition) .....	-107	-47
Veterans .....	-7	-5
CPI .....	-18	-139
Other mandatory .....	-16	-58
Revenues:		
Loophole closures .....	-18	-37
Tax cuts (shown as positive number b/c they increase the deficit) .....	245	131
Fiscal dividend .....	-170	-114
Debt service .....	-150	-113
CBO/OMB baseline bridge .....	0	-225
Total deficit reduction .....	-1,131	-1,121

Mr. REID. I advise the chairman that Senator HEFLIN does not wish to use his time. Therefore, I believe that all speakers have since departed the Chamber.



ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.  
TOMORROW

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 10:30 a.m, Monday, November 20, 1995.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:28 p.m., adjourned until Monday, November 20, 1995, at 10:30 a.m.