

In Illinois in 1993, Al Ronan, a legislator turned casino lobbyist, pulled lawmakers off the floor and handed them white envelopes containing campaign checks of \$50 to \$300.

"The gambling companies have been like a bull in a china shop," said William R. Eadington, director of the Institute for the Study of Gambling and Commercial Gaming, at the University of Nevada at Reno. "These were companies that did not have the sophistication to understand the nuances of political activity."

Some experts, noting the intense issue that gambling money has become in some states and localities, believe that the industry has turned into its own worst enemy.

Despite devoting \$16.5 million to the referendum on casino legalization in Florida last year, pro-gambling forces were crushed at the polls, 62 percent to 38 percent, at least partly because of voter discomfort with that level of spending.

And given the corruption investigation in Louisiana, candidates for governor there spent much of the race this year trying to trump each other's anti-gambling stands.

Further, after St. Louis County Executive George Westfall accepted more than \$150,000 in contributions from companies competing for a riverboat casino license, the County Council this year approved a ban on the industry's political donations.

In recent months, some casino companies have decided to put a stop to their own multimillion-dollar political wagers.

One such company is Mirage Resorts, which spent more than \$10 million in a four-year failed campaign to place a casino in Bridgeport, Conn.

"Our company policy right now is that we are not going to go or in any jurisdiction and actively lobby to change any law, to actively try to convince people," said Richard D. Bronson, a member of Mirage's board and president of the company's development arm. "Look what happened in Connecticut."

Added Alan M. Feldman, Mirage's vice president for public affairs: "It has told us that this isn't our bag. We're just not political animals." •

MEASURE READ FOR THE FIRST TIME—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 132

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I inquire of the Chair if House Joint Resolution 132 has arrived from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. LOTT. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 132) affirming that budget negotiations shall be based on the most recent technical and economic assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office and shall achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 based on those assumptions.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask for the second reading of the joint resolution, and I object to my own request on behalf of the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

CLOTURE VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED TO THE LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL POSTPONED UNTIL WEDNESDAY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote on

the motion to proceed to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill be postponed to occur on Wednesday at a time to be determined by the majority leader after consultation with the minority leader.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am prepared now to go to the closing statement so that the staff of the Senate can proceed home in view of the ice and the weather that we are confronting. I wondered if the Senator from Nebraska had any further comments, or could we go ahead and proceed to close the Senate?

Mr. EXON. I thank my friend from Mississippi for his offer. I will take 5 minutes allotted in morning business, and then I will be glad to join others on my trek home, if that is satisfactory with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. I certainly understand that. Then I will have to reserve the right, depending on what is said, for 5 minutes of my own.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

THE BUDGET

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I would not be on the floor tonight, and had not intended to be on the floor tonight, until I saw a bevy of Republicans coming on the floor to try and beat up on the President, in particular, and the Democratic Party in general. When I heard that, I have responsibilities as the lead Democrat on the Budget Committee, and I decided to stay here and hear what is going on.

The Senator from Washington made several statements that I would like to take issue with. One thing that the Senator from Washington requested was that if I was concerned about the back-loading on the Republican budget plan, where 60 percent of the savings in the Republican budget plan to balance the budget are put off until the sixth and seventh year, did I have any suggestions as to how we could eliminate that. Well, I sure do.

If we would eliminate the \$242 billion tax cut that basically benefits the wealthiest among us, for the most part, that would be one way we could alleviate that.

I would also like to comment briefly on the several statements made on the floor by those on that side of the aisle regarding the President of the United States breaking his agreement with regard to the continuing resolution that we worked out 2 weeks ago, I guess it was. I was there. I was part of that agreement. The President has not broken his word. The President of the United States said that he would accept a 7-year plan to balance the budget. And he has had a pretty good record as President, because under President

Clinton, we have had 3 straight years of reduction in the deficit of the budget of the United States of America. That is the first time that has happened since Harry Truman. So this President has had some experience in fiscal responsibility.

The President has said in that agreement that he would agree to balance in 7 years, and that we would accept Congressional Budget Office numbers, with the understanding that CBO would review those numbers with the Office of Management and Budget and outside experts to make sure that their projections were as nearly accurate as possible.

He also said the other condition of making that agreement was the fact that we wish the Republicans to enter into discussions with us to protect programs that the Democratic Party has worked long and hard to protect—Medicare, Medicaid, educational programs, veterans benefits, agriculture, and others. We did not feel that, rushing to judgment, the Republicans had lived up to their part of that agreement. So, therefore, I think that there can be legitimate differences of opinion. And because that was worded in that manner, I think almost anyone could have interpreted that particular agreement as they wanted to.

It has been mentioned by my friend from Nevada that—and we are talking about the appropriations bills—if the President would just sign the appropriations bills, that would alleviate some of the problems. The appropriations bill should have been passed by the Republican-controlled Congress by October 1, 1995, when the new year began. Here we are in December, just passing appropriations bills—it is very late, almost 90 days late—and then we say to the President of the United States that because it is so late, because we are so late getting these to you, of course, you cannot veto them. That would be unfair.

We have also heard said that the President had shut down the Government. He has not. The President of the United States, through the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, made offer after offer, which the Republicans rejected, regarding a continuing resolution that would not have been necessary to have 1 day of shutdown. So I do not think it is fair to blame the President of the United States for that.

I am happy to say that I think, given the circumstances, we are now making some progress, as Senator DOLE and Senator DASCHLE earlier indicated on the floor. I am not sure that we accomplish a great deal with partisan bickering over something that we have placed, for their deliberation, consultation, and hope of resolving, in the hands of the President of the United States, the majority leader, ROBERT DOLE; the Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH; the Democratic leader in the House, Congressman GEPHARDT; and our own TOM DASCHLE, the Democratic

leader in the Senate. Those five individuals have heavy, heavy responsibilities, and they have very serious differences of opinion on a whole series of subjects.

I just hope that we can in good faith work with them and not bicker, at least until after we hear what their results and recommendations are. I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will be brief. I apologize for the little time that I will take, but there has been so much said here in the last 10 minutes that needs debunking and refuting, it is all I can do to restrain myself.

I would like to take a bipartisan tone and hope that these discussions would be successful, and I wonder why they were not completed a week ago, 2 weeks ago, a month more or even longer. There are so many inconsistencies being put out that I just cannot stand still and not respond to some of them.

With regard to the 60 percent back end question, that there has been a lot of talk how 60 percent of the savings come at the back end, as a matter of fact, that is the result of genuine real reforms in the so-called entitlement programs that we make this year. If we do not make them this year, we will never get them. Even if we make them this year, the impact builds over the years.

That is the exact reason why we need these entitlement reforms, because if we do not have these reforms, these programs will continue to explode out of control, go up at the rate of 10 percent or 11 percent or more. Medicaid, I think, was going up at one point in the high teens. We want to reform these programs to save them.

What really amazes me is my colleagues say, "Yes, we want a balanced budget. We want to reduce the debt, but we do not want to control spending." You cannot have it both ways. You cannot say we are not going to touch the entitlements, we will not touch welfare, we will not touch Medicare or Medicaid, and by the way, we want to spend endless amounts on appropriations bills. You just cannot have it both ways. To get a balanced budget, you have to agree to some controls or, Heaven forbid, some cuts.

Now, this talk about how the Congress majority this year has not sent the appropriations bills to the President. In 1987 and 1988, the Democratic Congress did not send a single—not one—appropriations bill to the President. In 1987, all 13 appropriations bills were lumped into one big wad, with the budget, with the debt ceiling, sent down to the President of the United States, President Reagan. The Congress left town and said, "Good luck, Mr. President. Goodbye."

Do not give me alligator tears how we have not passed appropriations bills. When we pass them and send them to the President and he vetoes them and he says the Congress closed down the Government, my goodness,

all he had to do was to use the Lyndon Johnson pen that has so much experience spending the people's money, sign the bill, and he would have kept the Government open.

Why did he not sign them? A couple good reasons: No. 1, this President wants business as usual. Spend more money. "I want more money for Interior Department. I want more money for Housing and Urban Development. I want more money for State and Justice and Commerce. Yes, more money for everything and everybody. And the other thing is, I have these little policy questions. I do not like it because you are allowing too much timber to be cut in Alaska." Give me a break. The people in Mississippi think trees are to be harvested. We certainly do not want to see the Government shut down by the President because of the number of feet of timber we are going to cut in Alaska.

I am amazed that the President of the United States can go on TV and say, "I am vetoing the appropriations bills, and, gee, I wish Congress would not shut down these departments." Yesterday, the last 48 hours, if the President signed three appropriations bills, 621,000 Federal employees would have been at work.

But look, that is not the big issue. The big issue is what can we do to get together to legitimately get a balanced budget. It is time we do that.

Now, I believe—I know it is something that a lot of Members do not accept—I believe you let the hard-working taxpayers of the country keep a little bit of their money, as a matter of fact, save it or spend it, it helps the economy. I know we cannot get dynamic scoring, but when you let people keep their money, we wind up getting more money in the Treasury, not less.

I ask the Democrats, do they want to keep the marriage penalty in the Tax Code? I assume the answer is no. The only way to get rid of it is to do it, and it costs a little money. You call that tax cuts for the wealthy? Baloney. That is tax cuts for young people, whom we hope will get married and pay not more taxes but at least the same. Do you object to spousal IRA for the working spouse in the home? The only people in America that cannot have an IRA are working spouses in the home. The only way to get it is to give them an opportunity to save in an individual account. Capital gains tax cut, I am for. A lot of people in Mississippi like that. They have timberlands and do not want 40 percent taken by the Government.

I emphasize this on the floor of the Senate. We really criticize tax cuts. Do you know what tax cuts are? This is letting the people that pay the taxes keep a little of their money. The American people are taxed basically at 50 percent.

My time is expired. I could go on and on about all of this. I will stop at this point. Yes, I would like for us to cool down the rhetoric. It is a two-way

street. Every time the President gets on TV and just lowers the boom on us, are we supposed to stand here and say, "Gee, thank you very much." No. We have got to stand up and speak up and make sure the American people hear the other side of the story and then, of course, that begets a response on the other side. It is time we bring this to a conclusion and get a balanced budget. That is all I care about. We can do it. We can do it.

Mr. EXON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. EXON. Did I understand the Senator to say—what year was it—1987?

Mr. LOTT. It was at least a couple years in there, 1987 and 1988, the Democratic Congress did not pass a single appropriations bill. Put it in a big CR.

Mr. EXON. I do not remember the reasons for that, but 1986, of course, we had a Republican-controlled Senate, and I would not want to blame them for that.

Mr. LOTT. I said 1987.

Mr. EXON. In other words, what you are saying, it was a Democratically controlled House and Senate that did that?

Mr. LOTT. I believe it was, yes, sir.

Mr. EXON. It probably was 1987 and 1988 because in that time we did control both Houses, not 1986.

I have no further comments, and if we are ready to close, I am ready to close.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1995

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10 a.m., Wednesday, December 20; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed as having expired, and the time of the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day.

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

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that at 10 a.m. the Senate turn to the consideration of Senate Resolution 199.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will begin consideration of Senate Resolution 199 regarding the Whitewater subpoena at 10 a.m. We are hoping that a time agreement can be reached on that resolution to allow a vote after a reasonable amount of debate. Senators can therefore expect votes to occur throughout the day during Wednesday's session.