

Senate to read the committee report and tell me what we are going to do with the money for the B-2. Is it for advanced procurement for more bombers? Or is it to take care of the flaws in the present bombers?

The committee report had one line that was the most curious line I have ever seen in a conference committee report. It said the Senate conferees believe so and so. Who cares what the Senate conferees believe? It is what the conference of the House and the Senate both believe that we are supposed to be voting on.

It reminds me of a story about a little boy. The teacher said, "What do you believe?" The boy said, "I believe what the Methodists believe." She says, "And what do the Methodists believe?" He says, "They believe what I believe." "And what do both you and the Methodists believe?" "We both believe in the same thing."

Mr. President, I invite all of my colleagues to read the committee report and tell me where the \$493 million is going.

Finally, I can remember all the years I have been here and posing the question about things in our defense budget: Why are we doing this and why are we doing that? And the answer has been, well, the President wants it, the chiefs want it, and the Secretary of Defense wants it. So we went merrily on our way spending tens of billions of dollars because they wanted it.

Now you ask the powers that be in the U.S. Senate. Why are we doing it when the Secretary does not want it, the President does not want it, and the chiefs do not want it? The answer is, what do they know?

Mr. President, at a time when everybody is groaning and straining to deal with the balanced budget and trying to accomplish a balanced budget, we have a defense appropriations bill which the President has already signed. I disagreed with the President on that because, as I have said before, my good friend, the President, has a right to be wrong just like I have. There is \$7 billion more in that bill than anybody asked for—ships being built that they did not ask for, and in places where there was no bidding.

So, Mr. President, I do not know how much longer this bill will be debated, but I can truthfully say that I think it is a terrible mistake. I think the world will be less safe once we pass this conference report.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. GRAMS. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, during this second shutdown of the Federal

Government, I am reminded of the old saying that two wrongs do not make a right.

I believe it is wrong to tell 300,000 Federal workers that because the Government considers them nonessential, they cannot come into work today.

But Mr. President, it is even more wrong to then turn to the American taxpayer and tell them to pay these workers for not working.

That's right. For the second time this year, Washington is requiring taxpayers to pay with their hard-earned dollars for services that will never be given.

While we may have honest differences about the amount of government people should pay for, I think we can all agree that taxpayers should not be forced to give something for nothing. But that is exactly what they are getting for their tax dollars: nothing.

What is worse is that this whole situation has arisen because President Clinton has refused to carry through on his promise to deliver a 7-year balanced budget using real numbers.

One month ago, when the first Government shutdown occurred, the debate was over whether or not to balance the budget in 7 years. It took a week, 800,000 furloughed employees, and a lot of complaints from the American taxpayers, but the President finally got the message.

We came to an agreement by both Congress and the White House that the American people would finally get what they have been calling for—a real 7-year balanced budget. Gridlock was over. Or so we thought.

Instead of following through on his promise, President Clinton has deliberated, deferred and delayed his balanced budget proposal. The only thing he has not done is delivered—and it does not look like he ever will.

Make no mistake about it—the shutdown of the Federal Government and the problems it has caused the American people lie squarely on the shoulders of one man—William Jefferson Clinton.

Nothing symbolizes that fact more than President Clinton's generous offer this weekend to pay out of his own pocket the cost of keeping the White House Christmas tree lit.

What the President did not say is that the bill which would pay for this expense—the funding bill for the Department of the Interior—was sitting right on his desk over the weekend, unsigned.

Now that the President has vetoed the Interior appropriations bill, is he prepared to pay for all the programs at the Department of Interior that he is holding up?

Will he personally pay for the expenses at the Departments of Veterans' Administration, Housing and Urban Development, Commerce, Justice, State and any other agency whose funding he has vetoed?

Are the Democrats who are holding up the Labor-HHS bill in the Senate

willing to use their salaries to pay for the programs at the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education?

Are they willing to pay with their own money for the Low-Income Heating Energy Assistance Program, the funding for which they have stalled and refused to consider, even today in mid-December?

Obviously, the answer is no. But if they did, if they were the ones forced to pay the bills, instead of the taxpayers, maybe things would be different. Maybe we would not be so willing to lay off Federal workers and then pay them for not working. Maybe we would not have so much Government to pay for in the first place.

Unfortunately, justice and fairness for the taxpayers is not a concept well received in Washington, and as a result, the American taxpayers are stuck with the bill but without services rendered.

On Friday, I introduced legislation that I believe will reverse this trend and restore some fairness to the taxpayers. The Federal Employment Taxpayer Accountability Act would eliminate the current distinction in law between nonessential and essential Federal workers, thereby considering them all essential.

After all, if a worker is considered nonessential on 1 day of the year, what makes them so essential on the other 364? And why should we force the taxpayers to pay for a service that is considered nonessential?

My legislation would ensure that all Federal workers are at their desks every day, that they no longer be used as pawns in a Washington chess match over the budget.

It will help lift the morale of Federal workers by letting them know that their efforts are recognized and appreciated, while guaranteeing the taxpayers that only an honest day's work earns an honest day's pay.

Mr. President, two wrongs do not make a right, nor do three or four or the many wrongs Washington has done the American taxpayer.

Let us do something right for a change. Let us protect the taxpayers from having to pay for unsolicited vacation days in Washington because it is the right thing to do. Let us pass and get signed into law the remaining appropriations bills because it is the right thing to do. And let us deliver the American people a real, honest 7-year balanced budget before Christmas because it is the right thing to do.

As 1995 comes to an end, I ask Congress and the President to make an early New Year's resolution on behalf of the taxpayers and our children and grandchildren that we will keep them in forefront of our minds as we conduct the people's business by doing the right thing.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to continue up to 10 minutes as if in morning business.

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

A DEFICIT DILEMMA

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post, there was a very interesting op-ed piece that I cannot refrain from commenting on. It is written by Terry Deibel, and it is entitled, "A Liberal Deficit Hawk's Dilemma."

Mr. Deibel describes himself as a liberal who believes in Government, believes that the Federal Government can and does do wonderful things, but that the Government should not "spend more money to do these things than it collects."

He then offers us this fascinating solution to our present dilemma from his position as a self-styled liberal deficit hawk. And I am quoting, Mr. President.

To be sure, a good deal of budget balancing could be done in a policy-neutral fashion. A simple freeze on outlays at current levels or a small across-the-board cut in everything—all spending, all entitlements, including Social Security—prolonged over several years of economic and revenue growth eventually would do the trick without any allocation decisions.

I was stunned when I read this. Here is a man who is a liberal, describes himself as a liberal deficit hawk who is proposing a program far more draconian than anything the Republicans have ever contemplated, a freeze, Mr. President, in all spending across the board, or even a small across-the-board cut in everything—entitlements, including Social Security.

No Republican has dared offer anything that drastic or that draconian. What this says to me, Mr. President, is that Mr. Deibel has fallen victim to the rhetoric of this Chamber and, if you will, of the White House. He has come to believe, as do many of my constituents, that the Republicans are calling for drastic cuts in everything, and he says let us solve the problem with a simple freeze.

Let me give you a few numbers, Mr. President. Total Medicare spending in 1995 was \$178 billion. If this proposal were put in place, that means years from now Medicare spending would be frozen at \$178 billion in contrast to the draconian Republican call for spending of \$301 billion in the year 2002. He is calling for a commonsense, neutral position that would freeze the budget at \$178 billion but, no, those stingy Republicans want to increase it from 178 to 301—a 69 percent increase.

I say to you, Mr. President, he, like too many people, has fallen victim to the rhetoric of this debate without looking at the facts.

On Medicaid—another area where we are being told the Republicans are calling for heartless slashes—this man, a

liberal, says, no, let us take care of Medicaid by simply freezing it at its present level. Its present level is \$83 billion. Under the Republican proposal, by the year 2002, it will reach \$143 billion, a 58-percent increase. But we are being pilloried for being heartless when common sense tells this man we can solve the problem if we just freeze it.

Again, he is a victim of the rhetoric. He does not realize, as, unfortunately, too many people do not realize, the Republicans are not saying let us slash these programs. The Republicans are saying the programs are legitimate, the programs need to grow, as the needs of our people need to grow, but let us let them grow at some kind of intelligent rate. But with the rhetoric, even a man of his knowledge and understanding—and he is identified in the Washington Post as chairman of the Department of National Security Policy at the National War College—even a man of his position and understanding has fallen victim to this rhetoric. I hope he will understand now that the freeze he is calling for as the logical solution is so much more draconian than what the Republicans have suggested that if we were to in fact embrace his proposal, we would be crucified—I think justly—by both the press and, of course, the members of the opposite party.

Now, I cannot conclude without referring to one specific that he talks about which is a further demonstration of the way the rhetoric has distorted the reality. He says:

It is quite possible, after all, to cut corporate welfare or end the great-western-lands-grazing-and-mining free-lunch program, for example, rather than cut poor people's welfare and the school lunch program.

Once again, if you listen to the rhetoric on this floor, you would think that the reason the budget is out of balance is because of the tremendous spending in the West on grazing and the reason we are heartless is because of our cuts in school lunches.

I participated in the filibuster that was mounted on this floor to prevent the Secretary of the Interior from implementing his increase in grazing fees, which we were told would be the way to make everything fair.

The total amount of money that would have come to the Federal Government if the Secretary of Interior had been successful in his effort to increase those grazing fees is \$19 million per year. That is million, "m" as in "minuscule," Mr. President, \$19 million. That is less than we spent to put the new subway between the Capitol and the Senate office buildings.

By comparison, his implication is you could pay for school lunches if only you did away with the grazing program in the Midwest. In 1995 we will spend \$7.9 billion on child nutrition, "b" as in "big." And in 7 years, under the draconian Republican budget, spending on child nutrition will increase to \$9.2 billion a year, a 16.4-percent increase.

I challenge anybody to try to pay for the present program, let alone the increased program, by doing something about a grazing plan in the United States that is currently, by the Secretary of the Interior's own analysis, costing the taxpayers \$19 million.

Before I leave that, however, because \$19 million is, after all, \$19 million, I would refer you to the study that demonstrated that had the Secretary's proposal gone through, instead of receiving \$19 million in additional revenue, in fact it would have driven enough marginal operators off the range that the actual income to the Federal Government would probably not only have been less than \$19 million, but in fact might have endangered the money that they were receiving from the present grazing fees. The revenues could have gone down rather than up.

I will not pursue this any further, Mr. President. I think this is an example of what is wrong with our political dialog. The Republicans are proposing increases, in many cases very substantial increases, in some of our most fundamental programs, and yet the rhetoric around it has been so extreme that even a man of Mr. Deibel's position and understanding thinks he can improve on the Republican's proposals by freezing everything at the present level.

If there was ever a demonstration of the excess and inaccuracy of the rhetoric of this debate, it is Mr. Deibel's op-ed piece in this morning's Washington Post.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMS). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE BUDGET AND OUR COUNTRY'S FINANCIAL MARKETS

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, this past Friday I made some pretty strong comments with respect to President Clinton's—maybe it was Mr. Panetta's—proposal which we saw. There was great anticipation, if the President will recall, that last Friday there was going to be a new, serious proposal to balance the budget that President Clinton was going to bring to the table.

I felt, and I think expressed in pretty strong language, that it was a phony attempt. In fact, I thought it was an insult to the Congress, frankly, that the President would come forward with that proposal.

But something significant has happened since Friday. We may in fact have a new player in this budget debate. We may in fact have a new player to the debate which over the last 30 days or so has been between the White House, the President, on one hand and the Congress on the other. The third party who I think has now come to the debate is the financial markets of our country.

For those who have not been observing what has occurred today in the