

1995, until Monday, November 27, 1995, and a conditional adjournment of the House on the legislative day of Monday, November 20, 1995 or Tuesday, November 21 until Tuesday November 28, 1995.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered and agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 32

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Monday, November 20, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until a time to be determined by the Majority Leader on Monday, November 27, 1995, or until one hour after the House has voted on H.J. Res. 122, unless the House agrees to the Senate amendment.

SEC. 2. The two houses shall convene at 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House of Representatives adjourns on the legislative day of Monday, November 20, 1995, or the legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1995, it stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 28, 1995, or until 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 3. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the resolution provides that the Senate adjourn today until Monday, November 27 or 1 hour after the House votes, if they amend or defeat the continuing resolution that the Senate passed last night.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is very reassuring to this Senator to see the Congress work out this continuing resolution as it has done over this past weekend providing for the continued funding of the departments of the Government that had not been funded through the passage of regular appropriations bills.

There has been a great deal of confusion over what the issues were and why the continuing resolution was needed. I think everyone in the Senate and certainly those who worked to put together the resolution which was adopted by the Senate fully understand it all, but the American people, who do not have access to the information

that is available on a daily basis here, had to be confused by the procedures and what the issues were.

One of the issues that can also be dealt with today is whether or not the bill that has been passed by Congress to fund the Department of Defense for the next fiscal year can be signed by the President so that not only can people who work for the Department of Defense be secure in the knowledge that they are going to be paid under the terms of not only employment arrangements but contracts, independent contractors, defense contractors, and the rest, but that we will be keeping a commitment to the military so that they can make plans, they can use the funds that are coming to them under the regular fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill in a thoughtful way that does not actually end up costing money.

What worries me is that the President is sending signals that he may veto this bill because he thinks it provides too much money for defense, more than he had requested in his budget submission. I will tell you a lot of things have changed in the world since the President submitted his budget to the Congress. For example, we are seeing negotiated right now among different factions in the former Yugoslavia an arrangement which the President says may require additional United States forces, activities under our NATO alliance on the part of United States defense forces that will require more money than had been anticipated when this budget was submitted.

One of the provisions in the Defense appropriations bill which our committee approved was a contingency appropriation of \$643 million which is made available to the administration, to the Commander in Chief for use by the Department of Defense for contingency operations that had not been anticipated when that budget had been submitted. If this bill is not signed, there will be prolonged negotiations among the committees of the Congress with jurisdiction over defense matters. We do not know what the next bill will provide. We do not know how much will be provided or denied for contingency operations. There is a great deal of controversy right now, and the President surely knows this, in the Congress over whether we ought to support and fund and provide the resources for a massive ground force in the former Yugoslavia as a part of any peacekeeping operation.

So I am suggesting that is an issue which can be certainly dealt with in a way that ought to be pleasing to the administration and favorable to the administration's interests, if this Defense appropriations bill is signed.

The President has stated in numerous public addresses his commitment to a strong national defense. As a matter of fact, in his second State of the Union Address on January 25, 1994, President Clinton said:

The budget I send to Congress draws the line against further defense cuts. It protects

the readiness and quality of our forces. Ultimately, the best strategy is to do just that. I hope Congress without regard to party will support that position.

I suggest that this Defense appropriations bill does support that position. There are some in Congress and in the administration who are going to argue that the President should veto the bill because it exceeds his budget request, but there are things that have come to light in terms of threats against the security of our country, particularly the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the capabilities that some countries have now of sending such weapons over long distances with new missile technologies that are beginning to develop around the world. These are in countries that are historically not our most serious security threats, but have become so or are capable of becoming so through these emerging technologies and the ability to acquire technologies from countries willing to sell these weapons and sell these new technologies.

So, provided in this Defense appropriations bill are some additional funds to help meet these new threats, and it seems to me that this is a matter of grave national concern. I hope that the President will sign the bill, not only because it takes the Department of Defense out from under the continuing resolution which we just adopted last night, but because it goes a long way toward meeting the challenge that the President himself laid before the Congress in his last State of the Union Address and the address in 1994.

I hope we can resolve these issues as they develop. There are other bills that are contentious as well. The Senator from Vermont mentioned a couple of them. The distinguished leader mentioned the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, which has not yet been brought to the floor of the Senate because the Democrats have been objecting and insisting on debating at length the motion to proceed to consider the bill. We hope that bill can be passed and the President will sign it as well.

Mr. President, seeing no other Senator seeking recognition, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I understand we are in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

TAX RELIEF FOR THE AMERICAN FAMILY

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I had the opportunity to listen to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Vermont. And now that we have established this interim accord and agreement, thankfully, for the first time in decades we will have a balanced budget in the United States. Now will come the debate of the priorities within that balanced budget, and we saw a precursor in the remarks by the Senator from Vermont.

The Senator takes exception to the tax relief proposal that is in the congressional budget that we will soon give to the President. Both the House and the Senate have approved \$245 billion in tax relief for American families and communities and businesses over a 7-year period.

Mr. President, just several weeks ago the President of the United States acknowledged to an audience in Houston, TX, that his 1993 tax increase, which was the largest in American history, might have been a mistake. In fact, he said it was a mistake. And it was indeed.

What is interesting is the size of that tax increase that the President has now suggested was a mistake was about \$250 billion. It is interesting to note that this tax relief that we are talking about is \$245 billion. One cannot miss the similarity of the two numbers. In fact, Mr. President, what you are about to have here is a Congress acknowledging that that tax increase was a mistake and is in the business of refunding it and undoing it and fixing it.

I am rather new here, Mr. President, but I am always amazed by the idea that you hear expressed here that the best way for the resources of America to be managed, in the minds of so many people in Washington, is that everybody gets a wheelbarrow out and ships everything they have earned up here so that a policy wonk can decide what the priorities are of American families and businesses and communities. I do not think our forefathers had that in mind, Mr. President.

I was just over at the first Senate Chamber a moment ago. I like to walk by there and think about Thomas Jefferson giving his inaugural address there. He did not have in mind that all the fruits of labor of American families was supposed to be shipped up to the capital and reconfigured and sent back according to the priorities of somebody here.

That is not what they had in mind. In fact, he is very quotable on this subject, almost refers to it as treasonous when the fruits of labor are taken from the person who earned it, removed from them and given to somebody else to pursue another set of priorities.

Mr. President, just 40 years ago—we do not have to go all the way back to Jefferson—just 40 years ago American families, in 1950, were sending 2 cents—2 pennies—out of every dollar they

earned to Washington, to defend the Nation, to build the ports, the roads, the basic functions of the Federal Government. Today, that same family sends virtually a quarter of their labor to Washington, and then almost that again to local and State governments. But the important point I am addressing here today is that a quarter of all the earnings of an American family are removed from the family.

We hear about, and heard it all through this debate, about how we have to have program after program for the benefit of the American family. And I can tell you, Mr. President, that if you line the American families up and ask them, "Would you rather have the resources yourself to decide how to best house and educate, provide for the health of your family, or would you rather send the check in to the Federal Government and let them decide how to manage your family," the crescendo in chorus of Americans would be, "We can do it better."

The leader just referred to the gentleman that had 10 children who under this tax relief proposal would have \$5,000 more to provide for those children. He is so right when he says, Mr. President, "I can do it better than you or the Federal Government."

In general, this tax relief will put \$2,000 to \$3,000 on the kitchen table of every average American family—\$2,000 to \$3,000. That is a combination of lower interest rates and an expanding economy that comes from the balanced budget and the tax credits and the tax relief.

Now, after we get through raking the Government through these families, they end up with about \$25,000 to \$27,000 that is left for them to run the average American family. That is disposable income, money that we have not taken away. That is not very much.

We have marginalized middle America. We have pushed them to the wall. So a proposal that gives \$2,000 to \$3,000 represents virtually a 10- to 15-percent pay raise and one they get to keep.

This money all becomes disposable income. That is a dramatic infusion of resources that will improve that family's ability to care for itself. In the end, Mr. President, it is the family we count on to raise America, not the Government. It is the family we count on to nurture and grow America and work and build a home and heat it and educate their children and care for the older members of the family. It is the family unit that we depend on to build America. That is where the resources need to go.

America will prosper from this because we will make those families stronger, more able to do the very jobs we want them to do for us. That is where America is built, in those average, hard-working families from my State to yours, Mr. President.

This proposal produces so much good for them. It means we will enter the new century with our families in better

condition. We will relieve the burden on them. We will have an expanding economy, and the world is watching us—the world is watching us. You suggested that in your remarks—the dangers of the world. We will be most able to be the superpower we are if we are financially healthy, and these balanced budgets do just that. These balanced budgets mean America will march into the new century, not stumble into the new century.

Mr. President, this Senator, and I know many, many others, like yourself, have waited long, long years for a Congress to seize our financial affairs and do the kinds of things that will make us a strong nation, because in the end, none of us know a family or a person or a business or a community that can do the job it is supposed to do if it becomes financially decrepit, which is the path we are on. You do not know people like that, nor will you ever, and this is true of nations as well, Mr. President. A nation must first be financially healthy, and then it can carry out its duty honorably and appropriately.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and in that no other Senator is present, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXPRESSING THANKS AND GOOD WISHES TO THE HONORABLE GEORGE M. WHITE

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 33, a concurrent resolution to express thanks and good wishes to the Honorable George M. White on the occasion of his retirement as Architect of the Capitol, submitted earlier today by Senators MOYNIHAN, WARNER, and PELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) expressing the thanks and good wishes of the American people to the Honorable George M. White on the occasion of his retirement as Architect of the Capitol.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

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

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution expressing the thanks and good wishes of the American people to the Honorable George M. White, FAIA, on the occasion of his retirement as the Architect of the Capitol on November 21, 1995,