

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.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.  
TOMORROW

Mr. LOTT. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:08 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, December 20, 1995, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by  
the Senate December 19, 1995:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE  
HUMANITIES

SPEIGHT JENKINS, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER  
OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM  
EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2000, VICE PHILIP BRUNELLE,  
TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

MARY ANN VIAL LEMMON, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE U.S.  
DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF LOU-  
ISIANA, VICE PETER HILL BEER, RETIRED.

MICHAEL D. SCHATTMAN, OF TEXAS, TO BE U.S. DIS-  
TRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS,  
VICE HAROLD BAREFOOT SANDERS, JR., RETIRED.