

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader had mentioned the Defense authorization bill, and the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the senior Senator from South Carolina, is also here on the floor.

Mr. President, I realize this would have to probably be hotlined from both Cloakrooms, but I certainly am willing to agree to a vote at a time certain. But I mention two provisos: First, at some point prior to the vote, and if the vote is going to be tomorrow, at that time tomorrow, that I be recognized for 20 minutes to speak—of course, with equal time on the other side, naturally—to speak on the subject of landmines.

I will do that with the understanding of the distinguished chairman that on the subsequent Defense authorization bill, there not be language on landmines, certainly not the language that I have stated my objection to and have given on the floor to him and to the distinguished Republican leader. I mention that for the sake of our distinguished majority leader, because I know he has to try to put together a schedule. I just want him to know, with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina here on the floor.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator from Vermont, and I thank also the chairman of the committee. That is satisfactory.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I think that is satisfactory to have a definite time to vote, and the distinguished Senator from Vermont will have 20 minutes before the vote and I will have 20 minutes before the vote to speak on the bill and have a definite time to vote. If we can agree on that time, I suggest maybe 12 o'clock tomorrow, if that suits the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I would leave it to the leaders to set the time. But I certainly would agree to whatever time the two leaders were able to set. I understand there are both Republican and Democratic Senators who wish to speak on it, on the bill. I do not want to preclude that. Certainly, within the normal course of things, my understanding was that the leadership wanted to have a vote sometime tomorrow. I would hope to accommodate whatever that is.

Mr. LOTT. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. THURMOND. Yes.

Mr. LOTT. That seems like a very reasonable proposal. I hope we can get that locked in as soon as possible. Why don't we check with both sides, our leaders, and see if we cannot get that cleared momentarily. We will work on it, and we hope the Senator from Vermont will do the same on his side. Thank you.

Mr. LEAHY. I assure the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from South Carolina that, with the understanding that I have with the distinguished chairman regarding the issue of landmines, I will be willing to ac-

commodate whatever time the joint leadership wants to have this vote. I ask only that the leadership, in setting that vote, provide 20 minutes each for the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and myself prior to the vote.

Mr. President, I know the Senator from Mississippi has some other scheduling and housekeeping to do. Once he is finished, at some appropriate point, I am going to retain the floor in my own right for a few minutes of morning business.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, that would give today for those who wish to speak on the bill, for or against it, to make their speeches, and then tomorrow we can have the vote. The leaders can agree on a time tomorrow. Senator LOTT is now representing the leadership on the Republican side, and he can get in touch with the Democratic leadership and agree on a time for the vote. But as I understand it, it will definitely be tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that it will be tomorrow.

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object, I think we need to have representation from both sides of the aisle before we enter an agreement on unanimous consent. Can I ask the chairman to withhold momentarily and we will check with the leaders?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from South Carolina withdraw that unanimous-consent request?

Mr. THURMOND. If that is the desire of the Senator from Mississippi, I will do that.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I reemphasize to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that we will be working on both sides of the aisle to see if we cannot get an agreed-to time to have a vote tomorrow on the Defense authorization bill. I think we can get that worked out. I thought the comments of the Senator from Vermont were very helpful. We will work on that in the next few minutes.

Mr. President, if I can clarify the parliamentary circumstances, we have a period of morning business now that will go for how long? Is it for a time certain or for a period of time?

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11:30, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that I have 10 minutes of that morning business period.

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

APPRECIATION OF THE SENATE CHAPLAIN

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I want to say, once again, how much this Senator—and I am sure all Senators—appreciates the prayers of our most distinguished Chaplain, who is having a

tremendous impact on this institution. I think maybe the problems we are wrestling with can only be resolved by divine guidance. We thank Dr. Ogilvie for his help, counsel, and prayers in this institution.

MR. PRESIDENT, SIGN THE BILLS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I want to switch to the matter of the appropriations bills and conference reports. Mr. President, the ball is in the President's court. It is in his hands. It seems to be missed in the news media that the Congress has been completing its work and sending bills to the President. He has bills on his desk that would, in fact, guarantee that approximately 621,000 Federal employees could be at work today or tomorrow. We do not need a continuing resolution for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary offices, the Interior Department, and VA-HUD Departments to be opened and operating.

So I say to the President of the United States, Mr. President, sign the bills. That is all you need to do. Sign the conference reports that you have before you and cut this problem down to almost nothing.

There are two remaining appropriations conference reports that are now ready to move and should also be in the President's hands in the next 2 days or so. That would be the D.C. appropriations conference report. I believe we were able to reach an agreement on Saturday that the House will act on sometime, hopefully today, and the Senate will follow suit. It was not a perfect agreement or solution, but it was one that we should be able to live with. So we should have the D.C. appropriations bill done sometime tomorrow for sure.

We also have broken loose again the foreign operations appropriations bill. We will try to move it through once again, and, hopefully, we will get both of those conference reports on to the President's desk. That will then be five of the remaining appropriations bills that will be with the President, leaving only the Department of Labor, Health, and Human Services appropriations conference report to be acted on.

That resides in this body's hands. We have tried repeatedly, frankly, sometimes on both sides of the aisle, to get this bill up for consideration. But it is being objected to because of some issues that are very small in terms of the big impact of Labor, Health and Human Services. The way it has been held up—listen to this—it is being held up by filibuster on the motion to proceed. The Democratic leader has said that we cannot even proceed to take this bill up. I say to the Senate, let us just go with the regular order, bring up the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, regular order, amendments are in order, the Democrats can offer amendments, Republicans can offer amendments, we will vote and somebody will win and somebody will lose. It will not always

be partisan; it will be bipartisan, the way the votes are recorded. And we will act on it.

But, no, repeatedly the Democratic leadership has said, "You cannot bring this bill up unless you take out in advance provisions we object to." Let me tell you what one of those provisions is—in fact, the key one. The conference has language that reverses the President's, in my opinion unconstitutional, act to reverse the Court's decisions on striker replacement. I believe most of the American people agree with the Republicans on this issue. But I say, let us bring it up, offer the amendment and let us vote. But we are being told, no, you cannot even vote on it. So that one strictly resides in the hands of the Senate because they will not allow the bill to be brought up and voted on.

Let me talk about the bills that the President can sign. They include Commerce, and within the Department of Commerce, you have the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Maritime Administration, Federal Communications Commission, the Small Business Administration, and the National Weather Service.

Sign the bill, Mr. President, and all those agencies will be back at work in the morning.

The Justice Department. This includes the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration, Immigration and Naturalization, and Federal prisons. Sign the bill, Mr. President, and put those agencies back to work.

The State Department. We all know what that does.

Veterans Department. If the President will sign the bill on his desk, the veterans' activities will go forward full steam.

Interior Department, including the Forest Service, Indian Health Services, and the Smithsonian. All the President has to do is sign the bill on his desk.

In all of these agencies that I have just been listing, the President has no problem with what is in these bills. He probably wants more spending in each category because that is the construction of the problem. He wants more money spent. Never before in the years I have been in the Senate, or in the Congress, for that matter, have I seen a situation where the President wants to veto appropriations bills because they do not spend enough money.

In the past, Presidents have vetoed appropriations bills because the Congress' insatiable appetite to spend more of the taxpayers' money could not be controlled. Now we have one where the President says, "Send me bills with more spending." It is a unique experience we are having.

Independent agencies: Consumer Product Safety Commission, Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Emergency Management Administration, National Aeronautics and Space, and the National Science Foundation. All of these independent agencies have funding. We have agreed to language. It is on the President's desk.

Sign the bills, Mr. President, and all of these agencies will be put right to work. What are we talking about in terms of the number of employees?

I have here a chart that shows the number of employees we are talking about. Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary involves this number of employees: 194,000 Federal employees; almost 200,000 people. Mr. President, 102,000 at Justice, 25,000 at Commerce, 28,000 that run Judiciary, 25,000 at State Department, 5,800 at SBA, and 8,000 at USIA, for a total of 194,000 Federal employees just affected by Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary.

VA-HUD. NASA has 20,000; National Science Foundation, 2,000; Veterans, 240,000; HUD, 11,000. By the way, I understand about 98 percent of the employees at HUD are considered non-essential—nonessential, 98 percent. There are not a whole lot of the employees that are actually affected by this bill. It would get those back to work, anyway. The Environmental Protection Agency and others, 20,000, for a total of 293,000 affected by the VA-HUD appropriations bill now on President's desk.

The Interior Department, 76,000 employees—seems like an awful lot to me; Indian Health Care, 15,500; Forest Administration, 38,000; Energy Department, 2,300, and 2,000 others, for a total of 133,800. You see part of the problem with the Federal Government: Look how many people you are talking about working for the Federal Government—almost 621,000 just affected by these departments.

Interestingly, too, is, why is the President objecting to the Interior appropriations bill? One, I am sure he wants more money. He wants more money for everything, of course. The thing they point to that they object to—get this—the big fight has been over how much timber footage would be allowed to be cut in Alaska in the Tongass area. There has been a long battle over what the agreement should be, but both sides have worked very diligently and reasonable people came up with an agreement between the Senators from Alaska and those in the House that might have some concerns about the number of board feet that is being cut.

Then there is some problem with the Columbia River basin. I do not know exactly what it is, but I emphasize it involves how much timber can be cut in Alaska. Does the President want to shut down the Washington Monument and Carlsbad Caverns because he wants a few hundred thousand less board feet of timber cut in Alaska? Give me a break. The news media are running around and saying, "Oh, the parks are closed down."

Ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues in the Senate, talking about a monument being shut down so terribly trivializes what is at stake here. What we are talking about is trying to control the size of spending of the Federal Government. We are talking about try-

ing to balance the Federal budget. We all know it needs to happen. This is important. You are talking about the Federal Government—what it does, how much to spend, taxes on the people—for the next 7 years. So it is important that we get control of the Federal budget and do it in such a way that more jobs will be created, inflation will stay under control, so that interest rates will fall. We are talking about future generations. We are talking about the future of my son and daughter and the sons and daughters of all of us. Yes, we are talking about my mother, but we are also talking about what will be the situation 7 years from now.

This is big. This is really important. The news media runs around saying, "Oh, the monument is closed." We are talking about billions of dollars. We have those saying, "I cannot get in to the monument." I think that we should be focusing on what we are really trying to accomplish here. This is serious. It is important. It is big. Do not miss the point. The President, with three strokes of the pen today with bills on his desk, can put almost 621,000 Federal employees to work. Should they be working if they are going to get paid? Absolutely, they should.

Mr. President, I emphasize again that the people need to look at what is really happening here. I see the latest wire service story says the President plans to veto today three bills covering Natural Resources, Veterans Affairs, Housing, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State. He says the spending cuts are too large. Yet, if you look at these bills over the next several years or 7 years, they will all go up. They will all go up. Only in Washington when you control the rate of increase is it called a cut.

The President can solve this problem, ladies and gentlemen. It is not the fault of the Congress. Just sign the bills, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is conducting morning business until 11:30.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to continue as in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes.

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

VETO PROTECTS OVERTURNING LEGISLATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have listened to the statement of my friend from Mississippi, and I appreciate his rhetoric and his ability to state his position. I think of the expression oft used in summations before the jury, taken in a light most favorable in favor of the opponent. One has to take his statement in the light most favorable to the opponent. The fact of the matter is that the President is right to veto a number of the pieces of legislation before him, not because of a question of