

argument to validate my argument, my statement. Between the years of this Nation's birth, which are not on that chart, up until 1974, roughly, our deficit was either a slight one or non-existent. Beginning in 1974 and 1975 it skyrocketed off the charts.

For 10 years, Senator COATS and I have been working on this issue. For 10 years we have brought up this issue before this body, unable to do anything but ventilate the argument, ventilate the issue, talk about it and debate it, knowing full well that the Senator from West Virginia or the Senator from Oregon were going to pose a budget point of order and we would not succeed in that effort and we would be doomed to try again another day or another year.

I believe this is the defining moment for this issue. I believe we should engage in extended and in-depth debate in a manner and environment of respect for one another's views. At the same time, I believe if we lose this battle we are sending a message that we are willing to do away with our children's futures and any opportunity for fiscal sanity.

Before I yield the floor I again would express my appreciation to my dear, dear friend, Senator COATS, who has been, many times, the one who has helped restore my spirits after we have suffered defeat after defeat and encouraged me and himself. I hope I have encouraged him from time to time to stay at this very critical battle even at the risk of bruising friendships and relationships we might have with others in this body, and even at risk of appearing somewhat foolish from time to time as we jostled with a windmill in the form of a majority on the other side in full recognition we could not succeed.

But I say to my friend from Indiana, I do not know if we would be here today if we had not done all the things we did for the past 10 years. Without his help and friendship I do not believe we would be here.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, my understanding is that under the unanimous consent agreement time is managed by the Senator from Arizona. The Senator from Alaska has asked for 5 minutes of time in which—or more if he wishes—to introduce some legislation. I think if the Senator from Arizona will yield that time I think it would be appropriate at this time.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska whatever time he needs to consume.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Arizona. I find myself in an a position this year of applauding the leadership they are giving to this subject of the line-item veto. I

will be making a statement on that tomorrow.

(The remarks of Mr. STEVENS pertaining to the introduction of S. 575 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### THE NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, Calvin Coolidge may have been a man of few words, but the thoughts he expressed when he chose to speak were very precise. On the subject of government spending he once very accurately observed that, "Nothing is easier in the world than spending public money. It does not appear to belong to anyone."

How true those words were because we have seen a Congress spend the public's money in a way that has significantly reduced the respect and credibility of this institution in a way that has taxpayers across America not only scratching their heads in wonder but shaking their fists in rage, disturbed over the fact that while they are getting up in the morning and fighting traffic and getting to work and putting in an honest day's work for what they thought was an honest day's pay, they receive their paycheck at the end of the week and bimonthly and note the ever-increasing deduction for funds being sent to Washington to pay for programs and to pay for expenditures that they do not deem in the national interest.

They are becoming outraged, and they are frustrated. They expressed that outrage and frustration this past November. They wanted a change in the way that this Congress does business. They have been calling for it for years, even decades. Politicians have been going back home and promising change. "Elect me and we will do it differently." People ask, "Well, what can you do about it?"

Many of us were proposing two basic structural changes in the way that the Congress does business. One was the balanced budget amendment. Despite all of the fine rhetoric, all of the wonderful promises, all of the budget bills, the budget deals, the budget reduction packages that were debated, voted on, and promised by the Congress, despite all of that, Americans continued to see an ever-escalating debt, hundreds of billions of dollars annually of deficit spending, and a frightening explosion in the national debt.

In 1980, when I was elected to Congress, one of the very first pieces of legislation that we had to vote on was whether or not we would raise the national debt ceiling—that is, that level over which we could not borrow money—to raise that to \$1 trillion. Many of us were deeply concerned that we not break the trillion dollar threshold. We had campaigned that year in 1980 on fiscal responsibility. We campaigned on balancing the budget. We knew that, if we were going to balance the budget, we had to stop the flow of

red ink. That was our first priority. We knew, if we were going to reduce that debt, that we could not have any more years of deficit spending.

So we were concerned about raising that debt limit. Yet, for a whole variety of reasons—some of them valid and many of them invalid, but all because of a lack of discipline—we not only did not balance the budget but we saw the national debt explode; explode from the \$1 trillion level to nearly \$5 trillion today, a 500-percent increase. It almost is beyond our ability to comprehend how we as a Nation could have gone from a \$1 trillion debt level to nearly a \$5 trillion debt level.

Automatic spending as a way of meeting entitlement obligations clearly has played an enormous role in all of this, some necessary defense increases, some less than projected revenue estimates, but primarily a lack of will on the part of the Congress to curb its spending habits and its appetite for spending. I said then and I said in the debate a few weeks ago and I still believe that until we enact into the Constitution of the United States a requirement that this body balance its budget each and every year, we will not solve our debt problem. We will not begin to solve our debt problem.

My greatest disappointment in my years in Congress has been our failure by one vote to join the House of Representatives and pass on to the States for their consideration and, hopefully, their ratification a balanced budget amendment—one vote. We came that close. I think the American people instinctively know that, unless the Constitution forces us to balance the budget, we will always find an excuse not to. As Calvin Coolidge said, how easy it is to spend what appears to be someone else's money because it does not appear to belong anywhere.

We have seen year after year after year Congress saying, "Well, maybe next year, too many pressing priorities this year, too big a problem to address all at once, we will do it another time." Or, we have seen Congress say "Here is the legislation that will put us on the path to a balanced budget, that will bring finally fiscal discipline to this body." Of course, we have seen every one of those efforts fail.

Now we are looking at the second tool to try to curb congressional spending, this appetite for spending, spending, and paying for it not by asking the taxpayer to ante up, although we have done that, and it has I think had a negative effect on our ability to grow and provide opportunities for our young people and job opportunities for Americans. But we found a convenient way to pass on the debt to a different generation to a time when we are no longer here serving; pass it on by floating debt, by incurring debt which future generations will have to pay. We are paying it now. We are paying \$200-and-some billion a year just in interest. It is rapidly approaching \$300 billion a year—\$300 billion which could

be used either to impose a lesser tax burden on Americans, to provide a child tax credit which would give American families with children an opportunity to meet some of their financial obligations, to put aside money for college or savings, pay the rent, pay the mortgage, buy the clothes, or meet their monthly obligations. Or it could be used for more appropriate needs that exist in our society. But, no, it goes simply to pay interest on the debt, and it mounts every year. It is the second largest expenditure in our budget. If a few years, it will exceed the entire spending for national security, for all our military men in uniform, for all that we provide for national defense. Interest. Just paying obligations so that we can spend now and somebody can pay for it later.

So we come to the second tool. The Senate has rejected, unfortunately, by one vote, the right of the people, the right of the States to determine whether or not they want this fiscal discipline imposed constitutionally on the Congress of the United States. We now come to the second institutional change, the line-item veto. As my colleague, Senator MCCAIN, said, make no mistake about it, this will not balance the budget. This is not enough of a tool to do the job. But it is an institutional change. It is a structural change in the way that we do business, and it can make a difference and it can make a substantial difference.

Senator MCCAIN and I, as he recently has said, have been fighting this battle for a number of years. We have alternately introduced it. JOHN MCCAIN manages it one time, and I manage it another time—alternately introducing the line-item veto under different forms—enhanced rescission we called it. It is a statutory measure designed to secure passage with 51 votes instead of two-thirds. It is not a constitutional amendment. But we have been offering it in Congress after Congress, year after year, always falling short of the necessary number of votes to break a filibuster, because those who oppose line-item veto, those who believe Congress can exercise the will for fiscal discipline, those who feel that the power of making those decisions should not rest anywhere except in this body have been able to block our efforts.

Senator MCCAIN has been, as is his great talent, a man of extraordinary perseverance, extraordinary commitment, extraordinary dedication to this issue and many others that he has been involved with. He paid me a nice compliment by saying I shored him up at times when he was discouraged and we were not making more progress. He has picked me up equally as much, and maybe more. Sometime we think, what is the use, we are never going to get there, we are never going to break the power and the hold on the spending process that currently exists with those who see spending, or the control of the process, as advantageous, for whatever reason.

But I want to compliment him for continuing to persevere. He is a man of great perseverance. I want to compliment him for pushing through and insisting that we go forward. Together we are doing that. And we know we have the support of many colleagues and we have the support of a vast majority of the American people because they have lost confidence in Congress' promises, in Congress' ability to discipline itself. They know that we need system changes. They know that we need structural changes if we are going to get this accomplished.

It has become so easy to spend in this body that, every year, about \$10 billion worth of appropriations are tacked onto an already loaded Federal budget for spending that meets no emergency request, is not formally authorized by Congress, and that means it has not been discussed and debated and examined by the authorizing committees and voted on and put forward to our colleagues to examine. Nor has it been requested by the President. On the contrary, it is \$10 billion that serves only to appease or satisfy a particularly parochial special interest. As a result, Congress has become so addicted to spending other peoples' money, that the last time the Federal budget was balanced on a regular basis, Calvin Coolidge was still alive. Political scientist James Payne calls this a culture of spending. "Members of Congress," says Payne, "act as if Government money is somehow free." They distribute it like philanthropists helping worthy supplicants—except that they are usually lobbyists or special interests, and the money goes to a very narrow, very parochial use. In a recent tabulation of witnesses who testified at congressional hearings, Mr. Payne found that fully 95.7 percent of them came to urge more Government spending. Only 0.7 percent spoke against it. I do not know what happened to the other 3 or 4 percent. They probably just came to see the monuments and watch Congress in session.

This year, the President sent to Congress a budget that directs the Government to spend \$1.6 trillion. Every month of that year, the Government will spend \$134 billion; every week, \$31 billion; every day, \$4.4 billion; every hour, \$184 million; \$3 million a minute; every second of every day, the Federal Government will spend another \$50,000 of someone else's money.

By the end of 1996, the Federal deficit will have increased by \$200 billion, a figure that will be repeated in 1997, 1998, 1999, and the year 2000, after which it will rise even greater. That is a projection on which we almost always come in under what the actual figure is. But the sad fact is that even if the President could manage to send a balanced budget proposal to Congress, it probably would not make any difference. Congress would still choose to pad the bill with billions of extra dollars of parochial pork.

In some cases, these projects are tacked on—usually at the last minute—to legislation that is too important or too politically risky for the President to veto, like Federal disaster assistance when California is devastated by floods, when hurricanes devastate south Florida, or when the military needs a pay raise, or emergency spending is needed to cover deployments or costs that it has incurred, or benefits for veterans. These huge bills pass often, literally, in the dark of the night. But almost always we find tucked away in the very dark recesses of complicated bills, sometimes weeks and months later, we find items of appropriations that go for special interests, that go for special spending, which causes all of us to ask, how in the world did that become part of this bill? How in the world did the Congress ever pass something like that? In honesty, many of us say we did not even know we passed it. Well, it was part of the HUD-Independent Agencies appropriations bill. Well, that was a 1,300-page bill, and while we searched through it, we must have found tucked away in there—sometimes in very obscure language—spending that goes for something that the taxpayer finds is absolutely outrageous.

And every year, this type of spending adds up to billions of dollars worth of unnecessary spending that would wilt in a white-hot minute if it were forced to weather the glare of public scrutiny. If that item was brought to the floor of the Senate and debated solely on that item, and if Members were forced to vote yea or nay on that item, it would never pass; it would never stand the scrutiny of the light of public debate. Members would never risk a vote for an item that brings outrage to the American public when they hear about it.

The list goes on and on, and Senator MCCAIN and I will have the opportunity to detail some of that list. It is not our purpose tonight to castigate other Members. In one sense, we are all guilty. There is probably not a Member of Congress that has not gone to the Appropriations Committee and said, "Do you think there is a way we can get this particular appropriated item in the bill? It is important to my constituents and it is something that I think is important. Can we get it tucked on there? Has it been authorized?" "No. You know it is going to be tough to get that through the authorization process, and my colleagues might not understand. But could we just add it to this bill? This bill is going through."

There is probably not one of us that does not bear some responsibility, some blame, for this.

What we are saying here is that the system is bad, and the system needs to be changed. Some people make a career out of doing this. Others do it on occasion. But whether it is a standard operating procedure or whether it is just an occasional request, the system allows

it to happen and it is not right and it ought to stop.

If you happen to occupy an important position here, a position where you are influential in terms of appropriating certain funds, it is quite easy to add some items. Every year in appropriations bills, we find certain Members seem to do quite well, thank you. They happen to occupy positions that allow them that opportunity.

But we are not going to list the items. Americans read about them regularly in the newspapers, in the magazines. They hear about them on the national news. In fact, one network outlined on a regular nightly basis for several weeks—and perhaps it is still going on—how your money is spent. And each time they do that, our phones light up the next morning, the mail pours in, people stop you back at home and say, "How in the world can you take my hard earned dollars and spend it on that item?"

Mr. President, we have a budget process that encourages delay, rewards subterfuge, and works to the detriment of the American people. But any spending that must be attached or hidden is spending that cannot be justified on its merits.

It is time for us to change the system. It is time for us to shine a light in the deep, dark corners of deficit spending. It is time to give the President and to give the American people the line-item veto.

Just as a yellow highlight earmarks and highlights a text, the line-item veto will give the President the power to highlight Government pork by drawing bright lines through the billions of dollars of added on Federal waste. No longer will unnecessary expenditures be able to hide in the dark details of necessary bills. The line-item veto will spotlight their existence and force legislators to defend their merits in open debate.

More importantly, the line-item veto means that pork finally stops at somebody's desk. Even if the Congress persists in passing wasteful spending measures, the people can still demand that the President line out parochial pork barrel projects that increase their tax burden and threatens their children's future. The line-item veto is a giant step forward in fiscal responsibility.

Mr. President, today objections raised by the Congress against the line-item veto seem to boil down to some fundamental questions. One of the questions is: Is the line-item veto the best solution to the problem?

As I said earlier, the best solution would have been a balanced budget amendment. Congress failed by one vote in that effort.

But the next best structural change that can take place would be the line-item veto, in this Senator's opinion, because it is clear the Congress cannot muster the will to, on a regular basis or even on an occasional basis, balance the budget.

As I said, Calvin Coolidge was still alive the last time we did balance the budget. Our record is pretty sorry, despite our promises, despite our best efforts.

The other objection raised is: Is this constitutional? Let me address the first one: Is it the best solution?

Obviously, the best solution would be for the Congress to put the interest of the country before its own parochial interests, to follow the basic principle, which we attempted to teach our children around the kitchen table or sitting in the family room, that every corporation in America has to follow, that every home owner has to follow: If you keep spending more money than you take in, you are going to get yourself in deep trouble.

How many times have I told my children, how many times have any of us told our children, "Look, you can't spend more than you have. Sure you can get a plastic credit card, but the bill comes 30 days later and there is interest attached. And the interest is not cheap. It keeps adding up. And if you keep mounting that up, you are going to get yourself in a real hole."

And there are a lot of Americans that have done that.

Well, we each are given a credit card when we come here. It is called our ID. In the House, they actually use it to put it in a machine and that records their vote. Here, we vote by voice vote. But this is the most expensive credit card in America. It says "United States Senator." It allows us to walk in this Chamber and, because we can carry this card, we have license to the taxpayers' dollar.

What we are suggesting here is that that license has been abused. We have racked up the points. We have reached the limit and it is time to call each of us on that. And it is time to change the system, time to put some restrictions on the use of this card. Maybe I should say the abuse of this card.

We have demonstrated an institutional inability to restrain ourselves from unnecessary pork barrel spending. And perhaps the line-item veto is the only tool we have left.

Each year, Congress sends the White House massive bills, at most 13 appropriations bills. All of our spending is pretty much compressed into 13 bills.

Sometimes we send the President one continuing resolution. That combines all the bills that we have not passed separately into one bill and we have one vote, yes or no. We send this massive bill to the President—sometimes it is the entire spending for the entire Federal Government—and we say, "Well, Mr. President, the fiscal year runs out on September 30 at midnight. We are going to send you a bill up about 10 p.m., September 30. That is going to allow you to continue Government running until we get around to passing the separate appropriations bills."

Sometimes we never do. We just operate. In other words, we give him au-

thority to continue spending the money that he had last year.

Send it up there about 10 o'clock and say, "Mr. President, you have about 2 hours—I know the bill is several thousands of pages long—a couple hours to look at it. Now you can veto it. You might find some things in there you do not like. You can veto it. But, of course, the Government will shut down. Nobody will get paid. Everything stops. All the checks stop."

And the President is held almost in a position of blackmail because his only choice is to either accept the whole bill or veto the whole bill.

So the ground rules offered by Congress are very clear. Tie the President's hands by leaving him with a take-it-or-leave-it decision and obscure in the process all the uncounted billions of dollars of unnecessary pork-barrel spending.

Now this maneuver is very commonplace in the Congress. Because it seems that our facility for outrage has been dulled by the repetition of the times that we have done this. But I would suggest it is also contemptible, for when we hide those excesses behind the shield of vital legislation, we do it precisely to avoid making hard choices, to mask our actions and to confuse the American taxpayer.

In other words, we avoid public ridicule by consciously attempting to keep citizens from knowing how their money is spent. We hope they do not find out.

We criticize the press sometimes, but sometimes we have to give them credit. Sometimes those people sit down and pore through those bills and say, "Wait until you, American taxpayer, hear about this one." And we pick up the USA Today the next morning and there is the list of spending that just defies rationality, particularly at a time of burgeoning deficits.

In his 1985 State of the Union Address, President Reagan very effectively demonstrated this point; that is, the point of Congress dumping massive legislation on his desk in a take-it-or-leave-it proposition. The President slammed down 43 pounds and 3,296 pages of Congress' latest omnibus spending bill. He slammed it down on the desk of Tip O'Neill. It was the bill that represented \$1 trillion worth of spending—one bill. Not one penny of which he had the power to veto unless he rejected the entire bill.

As my colleague, Senator MCCAIN, has pointed out, Congress' addiction to pork barrel politics has reached the point where it is threatening even our national security and consuming resources that could be better spent on returning it to the taxpayers in the form of tax cuts, on deficit reduction, or any one of a legitimate number of worthwhile programs that would benefit all Americans—not just the few who happen to live in one particular State or one particular district.

The seriousness of this problem demands a serious response. I suggest, as

Senator MCCAIN suggested, the line-item veto is a serious response because it will force this Congress to get serious about spending and end business as usual because "business as usual" is something that this country can no longer afford.

Mr. President, before the Budget Impoundment and Control Act of 1974, Presidents could eliminate or impound political pork by simply refusing to spend the appropriated funds. Using this tactic, President Johnson in 1967 eliminated 6.7 percent of total Federal spending, which in today's terms would amount to about \$99 billion.

A few years later, President Nixon provoked Congress' wrath by impounding the money for more than 100 different programs. Typically, Congress was outraged, in 1974, it retaliated. Grab the power of unlimited political pork by passing legislation that would "ensure congressional budget control."

Now, I do not know if that is an oxymoron or not. I guess an oxymoron is just 2 years. Maybe this is an oxymoron. "Congressional budget control," it is like airline food and the Postal Service—they just do not seem to ring quite right. Congressional budget control. Dare we use the term "ensure" congressional budget control when we have seen the national debt increase from \$1 to \$5 trillion in less than 15 years?

Under the new law passed in 1974, the President can still propose cuts. The Congress said, "Well, listen, we will not take this power away from you completely. You can still propose cuts, but those cuts will not take effect," Congress said, "unless both the House and the Senate vote to approve those cuts in 45 days."

Well, as we can guess, this proved just a little too convenient for Congress. In order to kill a Presidential cut, Congress quickly learned it does not have to do anything, a skill at which we are very adept at, as history will testify.

So in the years that followed, only 7 percent of the proposed cuts that President Ford sent to the Congress were approved. From 1983 to 1989 we only approved 2 percent of President Reagan's proposed cuts. President Bush proposed 47 recisions. We approved one of them. Congress got its way.

But the result was not only more congressional control but more congressional spending. From 1969 to 1974, President Nixon kept domestic discretionary spending to an annual growth rate of 7.3 percent. In 1975, the first year the new recision provision went into place, that is, if Congress does nothing, the President cannot stop the spending. Federal spending, and nondefense discretionary programs grew by an unprecedented 26.4 percent. Let me make that point again: When he had the power to check congressional spending, congressional spending only grew, discretionary spending only grew at 7.3 percent a year.

The year after Congress took it away, took the President's power away to do this, it jumped to 26.4 percent. The wild growth in Federal spending can often be traced to a number of causes. One of the reasons is crystal clear: The President has had limited authority left to prioritize how funds are spent. Congress can no longer be checked by the prospects of Presidential impoundment.

Today what we have is a President with no reliable means to check the excesses of Congress, because by simple inaction Congress can perpetuate projects that we can no longer afford. Inertia is rewarded with scarce funds. Pet projects are shielded by our indecision. Predictably, the effect on the deficit has been dramatic.

Mr. President, I expect that the majority leader will introduce a substitute to the bill that Senator MCCAIN and I are introducing. We have been working very, very closely with the majority leader in crafting a measure which we believe is even more effective than the one which we proposed and which, hopefully, can secure additional support.

I want to commend the majority leader for his efforts in moving forward, in designating line-item veto as a top five priority for this Congress. Mr. President, S. 4 is the bill that was introduced by the majority leader. The one that Senator MCCAIN and I have been working on for a number of years, trying to refine the differences, pick up additional support.

We have been working now with the majority leader, the Chairman of the Budget Committee, and others in this Congress to write an even stronger bill, write an even better bill. We expect that the majority leader will be introducing that in a relatively short time—not tonight—but early next week.

Under that legislation, each item in an appropriations bill will be enrolled separately. That means it will be defined separately as a bill and presented to the President for his signature. In this way, the President will be able to pick and choose among funding, supporting those he considers worthy, and vetoing others.

Under this process, Congress will no longer be able to protect its excesses by simply wrapping egregious spending in one omnibus bill or tacking it in, hoping to hide it from public scrutiny. On the contrary, Congress will be forced to put itself on the record, and any conflict between the Congress and the President will be publicly aired before the American people.

The reform embodied in this amendment is not radical. It would simply restore a balance between the executive and legislative branches to what was regular practice for 185 years of American history.

As I said, since 1989 Senator MCCAIN and I have fought for the line-item veto as a tool to rein in out-of-control spending. I believe there is no surer

sign of our commitment to real change than our willingness to have this Republican Congress, in one of its first defining acts, to give this tool to a Democrat President.

If President Clinton had the line-item veto, the savings would not be miraculous, but they could be substantial. For years, Senator MCCAIN and I heard the charges from the opposition. "Well, you would not do this if it were a Democrat sitting in the White House. You would not give up that power." We said, "yes, we would." We are not giving it to a particular person. We are giving it to the office, to the office of the Presidency, because we so firmly believe that Congress has abused its privilege of deciding and solely determining the power of the purse that we believe that the President needs a check, a balance, that the President had prior to 1974.

It is not like we are giving him something new. We are restoring something that he already had. We want to give him that authority. Whether it is a Republican President or a Democrat President, there needs to be a check on the excessive spending habits of Congress.

Senator MCCAIN has mentioned that the GAO report that says that in the mid-1980's we could have saved \$70 billion if the President had line-item veto. Some will dispute that amount. No one can dispute—that no one can dispute—that we would have saved money. No one can dispute that we would have prevented a great deal of excess wasteful pork-barrel spending, whatever the amount.

If it were \$70 billion, think what that could have done. We can have doubled the personal exemption for families struggling to raise their children, to pay the bills. We could have paid for the entire student loan program for 5 years. We could have cut the national debt, and could have substantially reduced our interest obligations.

If the President gets this line-item veto authority, we will never know the full extent of the savings because what it will do is it will send a message to every Member of Congress that the days of pork-barrel spending are over.

The slick little habit that is exercised time and time again of attaching an item of spending that everybody knows deep down in their heart would never, never withstand the glare of public scrutiny, would never withstand the openness of public debate, would never achieve a majority of Senators voting for their particular item, that will never even get attached to a bill. But they know that the President has line-item veto authority and their spending item, their special interest parochial spending item is lined out and sent back to the Congress and that the only way it can be restored is to bring it to the floor and override the President's veto. We will never know how much money we will save in this process. We will never know how many

projects, how much special interest parochial spending would have been attached and hidden in the appropriations bills or a tax bill if the process is changed.

Mr. President, as I said, one of the other objections to this are the constitutional concerns. The majority leader's substitute will restore a healthy tension between the legislative and executive branches necessary for fiscal discipline. President Truman wrote:

One important lack in the Presidential veto power, I believe, is authority to veto individual items in appropriations bills. The President must approve the bill in its entirety or refuse to approve it. . . it is a form of legislative blackmail.

Some will argue that the veto is too high a standard; that it is difficult to muster the numbers to override it. To those, I would say, that the greater challenge today is to reduce our Nation's debt and balance our Nation's books. In this day, it should be a formidable challenge to continue to spend our children's and grandchildren's money. It is time for a higher standard.

Others will say that the separate enrollment is inconvenient; the President will be forced to examine and sign hundreds of bills instead of one; how is the House going to process all this?

I find it interesting that every President since Ulysses Grant, with a couple of exceptions, has asked for a line-item veto. Not one of them has complained about the inconvenience of a line-item veto.

I also will say to my colleagues that modern technology, the information age, is upon us, the computer age is here. What used to be a tedious task, what used to be a complex process, what used to be a question as to the decisionmaking power of an enrollment clerk—that is someone who writes up the bills and presents them for final approval to the executive branch—what used to be a complex process is now a very simple process. Software has been written for computers that can process this in a matter of moments. And so to separately line item and enroll a large appropriations bill is no longer a difficult process. So the objection to the nightmare of the mechanical difficulty has been met through the miracle of modern technology.

As I said, some question the constitutional standard. Article I, section 5, says that each House of Congress has unilateral authority to make and amend rules governing its procedures. Separate enrollment speaks to the question of what constitutes a bill, it does nothing to erode the prerogatives of the President as that bill is presented. The Constitution grants the Congress sole authority for defining our rules. Our procedures for defining and enrolling a bill are ours to determine alone.

There is precedent provided in House rule XLIX, the Gephardt rule. Under this rule, the House Clerk is instructed to prepare a joint resolution raising

the debt ceiling when Congress adopts a concurrent budget resolution which exceeds the statutory debt limit. The House is deemed to have voted on and passed the resolution on the debt ceiling when the vote occurs on the concurrent resolution. Despite the fact that a vote is never taken, the House is deemed to have passed it.

The American Law Division of the Congressional Research Service has analyzed separate enrollment legislation and found it constitutional. Let me quote from Johnny Killian of the CRS:

Evident it would appear to be that simply to authorize the President to pick and choose among provisions of the same bill would be to contravene this procedure. In [separate enrollment], however, a different tack is chosen. Separate bills drawn out of a single original bill are forwarded to the President. In this fashion, he may pick and choose. The formal provisions of the presentation clause would seem to be observed by this device.

Prof. Laurence Tribe, a constitutional scholar, has also observed that the measure is constitutional. He recently wrote, and I quote:

The most promising line-item veto idea by far is . . . that Congress itself begin to treat each appropriation and each tax measure as an individual "bill" to be presented separately to the President for his signature or veto. Such a change could be effected simply, and with no real constitutional difficulty, by a temporary alteration in congressional rules regarding the enrolling and presentation of bills.

He goes on to say:

Courts construing the rules clause of article I, section 5, have interpreted it in expansive terms, and I have little doubt that the sort of individual presentation envisioned by such a rules change would fall within Congress' broad authority.

The distinguished Senator from Delaware, Senator BIDEN, during his tenure as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, wrote extensive additional views in a committee report on the constitutional line-item veto. He wrote about a separate enrollment substitute he offered, and I quote:

Each House of Congress has the power to make and amend the rules governing its internal procedures. And, of course, Congress has complete control over the content of the legislation it passes. Thus, the decisions to initiate the process of separate enrollment, to terminate the process through passage of a subsequent statute, to pass a given appropriations bill, and to establish the sections and paragraphs of that bill, are all fully within Congress' discretion and control.

He goes on to say:

A requirement that Congress again pass each separately enrolled item would be only a formal refinement—not a substantive one. It would not prevent power from being shifted from Congress to the President, because under the statutory line-item veto, Congress will retain the full extent of its legislative power. Nor would it serve to shield Congress from the process of separate enrollment, because Congress will retain the discretion to terminate that process.

Mr. President, the line-item veto will discourage budget waste because it will encourage the kind of openness and

conflict that enforces restraint. The goal is not to hand the Executive dominance in the budget process. It is not a return to impoundment. It is a gentle and necessary nudge toward an equilibrium of budgetary influence, a strengthening of vital checks on the excesses of this Congress.

The President's veto or "revisionary" power, as the Constitution defines it, was intended to serve two functions: To protect the Presidency from the encroachment of the legislative branch, and to prevent the enactment of harmful laws.

Certainly, any attempt by a President today to line out unnecessary spending would meet the second of the Framers' objectives, that of preventing the enactment of harmful laws.

In 1916, a Texas Congressman, who shall go unnamed but will be quoted, had this to say:

There are a half a dozen places in my district where Federal buildings are being erected or have recently been constructed at a cost to the Federal Government far in excess of the actual needs of the communities where they are located. This is mighty bad business for Uncle Sam, and I'll admit it; but the other fellows in Congress have been doing it for a long time and I can't make them quit.

Now we Democrats are in charge of the House and I'll tell you right now, every time one of those Yankees gets a ham, I'm going to get myself a hog.

Mr. President, that was colorful language. We do not use that kind of language too much around here in 1995. But the principle is the same. Everybody else is getting it for their district, so I better get it for mine. If that fellow over there can get a ham, I am going to see that I get a hog.

That is not spending in the national interest. That is not appropriate spending even if our budget is balanced, but I guarantee you it is not appropriate spending when you have an unbalanced budget, when needs are being unmet, when the taxpayer is paying a higher burden than he should, when the debt is running out of control, when we are saddling future generations with a debt obligation which will bury them and bury their opportunity to enjoy the same standard of living available to each one of us.

The line-item veto is a measure whose time has come. The American people voted for it. The House has passed it. The President wants it. And now only the Senate, only the Senate, stands in the way of the line-item veto. Let us make sure that the Senate is viewed as the world's greatest deliberative body and not the world's greatest deliberative obstacle to the line-item veto.

Mr. President, I contend it is time to pass the line-item veto.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, the Citizens Against Government Waste have sent a letter that says:

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS  
AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE,  
Washington, DC, March 14, 1995.

DEAR SENATOR: The 600,000 members of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW) strongly endorse S. 4, the enhanced rescissions bill. S. 4 was introduced by Senator Majority Leader Robert Dole (R-KS) and Senators John McCain (R-AZ) and Dan Coats (R-IN). This line-item veto truly provides the president with a veto of congressional spending, by requiring a 2/3 vote to override.

The House of Representatives heeded the President's call for fiscal soundness and overwhelmingly supported enhanced rescission legislation over "expedited rescissions." Most Americans agree with the House and President Clinton on this issue—give the president the authority to weed out wasteful spending. In addition, CCAGW calls on the Senate to further strengthen S. 4 by extending the line-item veto power over tax and contract authority legislation, also havens for pork.

The inside-the-beltway crowd says the line-item veto will die in the Senate. It's time to prove them wrong. The defeat of the Balanced Budget Amendment made it painfully obvious that some members of Congress are not ready to give up their "pork perk." However, their victory should be short-lived. Passing S. 4 will strike a blow against wasteful spending and begin the long journey back to sound fiscal policy.

Sincerely,

TOM SCHATZ,  
President.

I would like to respond to my friends from Citizens Against Government Waste. We do intend in the Dole substitute, which will be brought up sometime early next week, to provide some power over taxing, in the respect that we are attempting to craft language that would eliminate the targeted tax benefits in the so-called transition rules which have really been egregious violations of the intentions of the law. They, like pork-barrel spending, are very anecdotal. An example is the person who owned a house on the ninth tee of the Augusta Golf Course in Augusta during the Masters tournament who rented it out for a week and got some huge tax writeoff.

The so-called transition rules that are hidden in tax bills, which give enormous tax breaks which the American taxpayer really never is aware of—certainly not sufficiently aware of—we are going to try to address that, I say to my friends at Citizens Against Government Waste. We have yet to figure out a way to address the contract authority situation, but I suggest, if we had the line-item veto that prevented the expansion of entitlements, that took care of targeted tax incentives, that took care of the appropriations aspect, we would go a very, very long way.

The National Taxpayers Union writes:

NATIONAL TAXPAYERS UNION,  
Washington, DC, March 16, 1995.

Hon. JOHN McCAIN,  
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR McCAIN: On behalf of our 300,000 members, National Taxpayers Union (NTU) strongly endorses S. 4, the "Legislative Line-Item Veto Act," which is clearly the best line-item veto bill before the Congress.

The need for a line-item veto has become more pressing in recent years as Congress has tended to aggregate legislation into mammoth continuing resolutions and omnibus bills. Such a practice greatly reduces the likelihood that the president will use his veto power because of his objections to a relatively small provision in the legislation.

The all-too-common congressional tactic is to attach parochial, pork-barrel appropriations to must-pass legislation that the president has little choice but to sign. Since many of these provisions are neither the subject of debate nor a separate vote, many Members of Congress do not realize they exist. The legislative line-item veto would allow the president to draw attention to pork-barrel provisions and force their proponents to justify them. Meritorious provisions would be repassed by Congress, while the rest would be eliminated.

Additionally, the line-item veto would make the president more accountable on the issue of wasteful spending. Many presidents have repeatedly criticized Congress on spending. With line-item-veto authority, the president could no longer blame Congress for loading up spending bills with non-essential spending and would have to work actively, rather than rhetorically, to trim wasteful spending.

Some people warn that the line-item veto will affect the balance of power between the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch. Our much greater concern, and I believe that of most Americans, is the risk inherent in a record amount of peace-time debt, which endangers our country's financial future. It is far beyond the point where we ought to quibble about whether this is going to slightly enhance the power of the president or Congress. We should recognize, as most people have, that the process has broken down and that our general interest as a nation lies in bringing our financial house to order.

The president is the only official elected by the nation who exerts direct control over legislation. It is entirely appropriate that the president be given an opportunity to veto items of spending that are not in the national interest. Again, National Taxpayers Union strongly endorses S. 4 and urges your colleagues to support it on the floor of the Senate.

Sincerely,

DAVID KEATING,  
Executive Vice President.

Mr. President, these two organizations, the Citizens Against Government Waste and the National Taxpayers Union, along with the Citizens for a Sound Economy, who also strongly support this legislation, are three organizations on whom I have relied over the years to educate the American people. They have performed a signal service. These three organizations have fought against Government waste and pork barreling in a dedicated and effective fashion. I believe without their help we would not be here today on the floor of the Senate, considering this legislation.

I am grateful for their participation. I am grateful for their support. Occasionally it is a bit amusing when we go to the annual publication of the "Pig Book," which is published by the Citizens Against Government Waste. There are these cute little pigs there, and every year they issue a Citizens Against Government Waste—this is the "Congressional Pig Book," and a State-by-State breakdown of projects.

It is partially entertaining but sometimes it is also very saddening. It is entertaining to see the uses and creativity of some Members and their staffs in appropriating funds to certain projects. Again I will relate my all time favorite of a couple of years ago, the \$2.5 million which was spent on studying the effect on the ozone layer of flatulence in cows. But there are many others. At the same time, when we view tens of millions and sometimes billions of dollars that are wasted in such a profligate fashion, then it is no longer amusing. It is very, very disturbing.

I want to emphasize what Mr. Keating said in his letter from the National Taxpayers Union, that there will be dire warnings, the tocsin will be sounded: You are transferring all this power over to the executive branch. You cannot do it. If you do it we are upsetting the balance of powers and our Founding Fathers will be spinning in their graves, et cetera, et cetera.

First of all, I do not believe it is true. Second, I have quoted extensively from the Federalist Papers as to the intent of our Founding Fathers. I think it is appropriate to mention that Thomas Jefferson said, in retrospect, long after the Constitution was written, that if he had it to do over again he would put in some mechanism that would force the Congress and the Nation to balance revenues with expenditures.

There is no doubt whatsoever that the President in most respects had the authority from the time that Thomas Jefferson refused to spend \$50,000 in 1801 to build some gunships, to 1974 when the President, President Nixon, unfortunately in my view, in a weakened Presidency, used the impoundment powers in such an abusive fashion that the Congress rose up and passed the 1974 Budget Impoundment Act.

From that point on—not since 1787, not since 1802, not since 1905—since 1974 has been when the deficit has sprung out of control and the debt has accumulated at a rate never seen before in the history of this country.

So, as the debate wears on, I ask my colleagues to keep in mind that all of the talk about the Greek civilization, the Roman Empire, the precedents set in the British parliament, are all very interesting if not entertaining expositions of history. But I must say, Mr. President, what we are really talking about is what has happened with the Federal deficit since 1974.

Mr. President, I had a chart up here earlier that showed for most of this century how both the expenditures and revenues had basically matched each

other with certain changes. With the exception of wartime, basically it had been a priority of this Nation to keep our financial house in order as every family in America is required to do. Something happened. Maybe in the view of some there was just some huge change in attitude. Maybe in the view of some it was a coincidence that the Budget and Impoundment Act was passed in 1974. I do not believe it was a coincidence. I know it is not a coincidence. I know what happened—that expenditures began to exceed revenues at an alarming rate.

This habit of tucking projects into appropriations bills became more and more rampant. The situation grew out of control because fundamentally the executive branch had no choice but to do two things: One, veto a bill which would then for all intents and purposes shut down the Government, or certain branches of Government, and deprive our citizens of much needed benefits and services provided by the Government and sort of have a showdown with the Congress. The other choice was to send forth a package of rescissions and hope that the Congress would act. Two things have happened since the Congress was not required to act. One is that Congress has simply not acted. That has been more and more the case since President Ford's administration, and the other is to take a rescission request on the part of the President and then change it all around so that it bears no recognition to the original rescission request made by the President.

So what we have really done is removed a check and balance that was fundamentally in place for nearly 200 years. Now what we are seeking to do is restore that balance and restore that check so that some fiscal sanity is restored.

Mr. President, I can thumb through this book and find most anything in here. Some of them I say are amusing. Electric vehicles—\$15 million for electric vehicles. That is out of the Defense appropriations bill; \$15 million. That was last year. I know that electric vehicles are probably something of the future. I hope that we will be able to develop them. I believe that they are probably important. But I am not sure where they fit into our defense requirements when we have 20,000 men and women in the military on food stamps, when we have not enough steaming hours or flying hours or training hours or pay raises for our military. But we want to spend \$15 million on electric car development out of the Defense appropriations bill.

I can pick out from any page of that several hundred pages of these projects. My point is that for many of these projects, if the sponsors of these particular lines knew that a President of the United States would say, "Here is the electric car. I do not know if they are needed or not, but we sure don't need to take it out of defense because we are having to cancel every modernization program and weapons system that we have and we do not have

enough money to maintain readiness. We are having trouble recruiting, and we need to have more money for that. And electric cars just is not my priority. So I am line-item vetoing it," I would suggest to you that the person who put that particular appropriation in with the best of intentions would certainly think twice before putting it in, especially if it was not deemed a priority by the Department of Defense.

Let me also point out that there are other projects which are worthy projects.

By the way, one just jumps out at me: The shrimp aquaculture, \$3.54 million for shrimp aquaculture. And I am astounded to see that one of the States that is getting part of this \$3 million is my home State of Arizona. We have a lot of wonderful things in Arizona but water is not in abundance. I am intensely curious—and I will find out, and put a statement for the RECORD—where the shrimp aquaculture project is in my State and how much money we have gotten for it. By the way, this shrimp aquaculture \$3 million is divided up amongst five different States.

Again, shrimp aquaculture might be a very vital project for my State's economy. I would be surprised to know that. But there are a lot of things that I do not know about my State. But if shrimp aquaculture is an important part of my State's economy, at least I think I would have known about it or been told about it before I had to read it in the congressional "Pig Book." So this is the kind of thing that in my view would never be inserted in an appropriations bill because it would be open to ridicule.

Frankly, Mr. President, being on the floor of the Senate and if somebody said, "You know. We are spending \$3 million or part of \$3 million in your State for shrimp aquaculture, what do you think about that?"—I would have to say in all candor I think it may be nice but I have not known in my 12 years of representing the State of Arizona, 4 years in the House and 8 years in U.S. Senate that it was an important item. In fact, in all seriousness I would have a great deal of difficulty defending it on the floor of the Senate if it were line-item vetoed by the President.

As I say, these items are sometimes amusing. But the reality is I do not think those items would creep in. So when we say how much money would be saved if we had the line-item veto, frankly we will never know. We will never know that. But when I see people like the former Governor, now our colleague, John Ashcroft, who was a very well-respected and regarded Governor of his State, say that he does not believe that there would have been fiscal sanity in his State during his two terms as Governor had he not had the ability to exercise the line-item veto, then I think we should notice that.

Mr. President, before this debate is over, we will have letters from nearly every one of those 43 out of 50 Governors in America that have a line-

item veto telling us how important a tool it is for them.

Let me just quote from several we have received already.

Besides providing greater authority to veto . . . the threat of a veto allows great flexibility in negotiating with the legislature or Congress. The key to a good budget is negotiations between both sides. This device is a mechanism for negotiation.

That is from a Utah Republican, Governor of the State of Utah.

I support the line-item veto because it is an executive function to identify budget plans and successful items.

That is from Hugh Carey, a New York Democratic Governor from 1975 to 1983.

Congress' practice of passing enormous spending bills means funding for everything from a Lawrence Welk museum to a study of bovine flatulence.

I am glad Governor Wilson also found that would be one of his favorite slips through Congress.

The President may be unable to veto a major bill that includes such spending abuses because the majority of the bill is desperately needed. A line-item veto would let the President control the irresponsible spending that Congress cannot. A line-item veto already works at the State level. It not only allows a Governor to veto wasteful spending but it works as a deterrent to wasteful-spending legislators who know it will be vetoed.

Pete Wilson, Governor of California.

I find Pete Wilson's statements most interesting because Pete Wilson, as opposed to most, has gone from being a Senator to Governor, rather, as many in our body, have been former Governors.

But I think it is also important to point out, whether I happen to like it or not, the State of California is by far the largest State in America with a population of some 30 million people. If we were looking from purely a gross national product standpoint, it would be the fifth-largest nation in the world—from a gross national product standpoint. And the Governor of that State is unequivocally committed to a line-item veto.

So I suggest that this Governor of California, Pete Wilson, has also had to struggle with a severe recession in his State and has had to make some very difficult budgetary decisions. I know for a fact because he told me that a line-item veto was a critical arrow in his quiver in his ability to be able to bring his State out of a terrible, terrible financial recession.

"Legislators love to be loved, so they love to spend money. Line-item veto is essential to enable the executive to hold down spending." That was William F. Weld, Governor of Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I happen to remember the days in the late 1980's when the Massachusetts miracle, as they called it, crumbled. I remember when the State of Massachusetts was in terrible shape, and I also know that Governor Weld has gotten well-deserved credit

for bringing the State of Massachusetts into a situation where, again, it has a very healthy economy.

I think his description is probably a little more blunt than some use around here. "Legislators love to be loved, so they love to spend money." But, at the same time, I am not going to argue with that language, even if I might not use it myself.

Of course, my favorite of all, obviously, is that of Ronald Reagan who said:

When I was Governor in California, the Governor had the line-item veto, so you could veto parts of a bill, or even part of the spending in a bill. The President can't do that. I think, frankly—of course, I am prejudice—Government would be far better off if the President had the right of line-item veto.

Speaking of the President, in December 1992, after President Clinton was elected, an article appeared in the Wall Street Journal and it was titled, "Where We Agree: Clinton and I on Line-Item Veto," by Ronald Reagan.

When Bill Clinton called on me the other day, it didn't take us long to find several things we agreed about, such as the line-item veto and trimming the size of Government in some areas. We also agreed on the importance of public-private sector dialog and cooperation in the planning of many Government programs.

Soon after the election, President Bush and President-elect Clinton named the leaders of their transition teams, the teams were formed and the process is moving forward in an orderly and completely civil manner.

\*\*\* In the course of our meeting, Governor Clinton spoke of his plan to trim the Federal work force through attrition. He wants to begin by downsizing the administrative staff at the White House. And he has invited Congress to do the same with its staff.

\*\*\* Both Mr. Clinton and I have had experience with the line-item veto as Governors. Our States, along with 41 others, allow their Governors to delete individual spending items from the annual budget without having to veto the entire thing. At the Federal level, it could become an important part of the system of checks and balances, as well as a significant tool in the deficit reduction process.

As President, Bill Clinton may have only a short time in which to get Congress to do his bidding before the new Members are overwhelmed by the impulse to spend more and to dish out pork to please the special interest groups. He should use the "honeymoon" period to get the line-item veto from Congress first.

Mr. President, I am disappointed that President Clinton did not take President Reagan's advice. I am doubly disappointed because I remember, with great clarity, when President Clinton came to have lunch with the Republican Senators shortly after his inauguration, which is the custom for incoming Presidents—to go to lunch with both Republican and Democrat Senators at their respective luncheons. I remember with great clarity, as President Clinton was speaking—and I still remember what a fine job he did that day—he said, "I am looking forward to working with Senator MCCAIN on the line-item veto." I must say that I was buoyed by that remark of President Clinton's.

Unfortunately, there never was any followup. Unfortunately, when Senator COATS and I took up the line-item veto again some 8 or 9 months later and sought to propose it as an amendment, since we were in a minority and unable to bring it up as a freestanding bill as we are now, I wrote a letter to the President asking for his support for Senator COATS' and my effort. The response I got back was disingenuous at best. It said that the President would support a line-item veto only when it came up as a free-standing bill. He could not provide his support if it were proposed as an amendment. Obviously, at that time, that was a catch-22 answer because the leadership on that side of the aisle, which was the majority, was not about to let the line-item veto be brought up. So we were stymied and did not receive the commitment I thought I had from the President that day at lunch.

Now, Mr. President, we are in a different situation. I do not want to confuse my remarks to "Mr. President," who is presiding in the Chamber—who perhaps should be President some day—with the President of the United States. Mr. President, I am speaking of the President of the United States when I say now is the opportunity of the President of the United States to do what he said in "putting people first"; but he said "putting people first," which was his campaign commitment to the American people, which was sent around to every library in America. It stated:

I strongly support the line-item veto because I think it is one of the most powerful weapons we can use in our fight against out of control deficit spending.

What the President said to me and what the President has said publicly and stated on several occasions after the 1994 elections, has usually been in the context that "I want to work with the Congress on some issues," and he almost invariably states the line-item veto.

Mr. President, we know what the reality is around here. We know we will probably have 54 Republican votes for cloture. The question is, Will we have six Democrats? I believe that, at last count, after the last crossover, there are now 46 Members on the opposite side of the aisle. I am asking the President of the United States to persuade 6 of them—not 46, but 6; not 26, not 36, not even 16, but 6.

So the responsibility, to a large degree, will rest on the President of the United States. Governor Clinton, on "Larry King Live," said, "we ought to have a line-item veto." Candidate Clinton emphasized "putting people first" and line-item veto to eliminate pork barrel projects and cut Government waste. He said, "I will ask Congress to give me the line-item veto."

Mr. President, I hope that the President of the United States will weigh in on this issue not only because of the fact that it would make his job a lot easier, because I am convinced that it

would, but because we must show some sanity and return ourselves to fiscal sanity. And there is no way of doing that, in my view, without a line-item veto.

Let me repeat, Mr. President—and I will say this on many occasions in the next few days—we will not balance the budget of the United States with a line-item veto alone. You cannot believe that. But the budget of the United States cannot be balanced without a line-item veto. The Chamber of Commerce sent me a letter, Mr. President, which said:

Dear Senator MCCAIN:

In the next few days, the Senate will consider legislation granting line-item veto authority to the President. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce—the world's largest business federation, representing 215,000 businesses, 3,000 State and local Chambers of Commerce, 1,200 trade and professional associations, and 72 American Chambers of Commerce abroad—strongly urges you to vote YES on S. 4, the legislative line-item veto.

The American business community believes that meaningful long-term deficit reduction can come about only through spending restraint. While a primary weapon in the fight against the deficit is a balanced budget amendment, our arsenal must also include a line-item veto or enhanced rescission authority. Such authority would provide the surgical strike capability necessary to take out specific spending targets.

S. 4, true enhanced rescission or legislative line-item veto, would provide the President with the ability to reduce or eliminate specific spending proposals. These cuts would become law unless Congress votes to disapprove the rescissions within a limited period. The President may then veto the disapproval, which Congress can subsequently override with a two-thirds majority vote. With such a framework, S. 4 appropriately restores the impoundment prerogative of every President from Jefferson to Nixon.

The American people have placed fiscal responsibility high on the agenda for the 104th Congress. We now urge you to act accordingly by voting YES on S. 4.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

Mr. President, while my colleague from Indiana was talking on the floor, I must confess that I did not remain on the floor for all of his remarks, which I knew were illuminating and important. I did go in the Cloakroom, because previously today, a talk show in my State had asked to talk to me about the line-item veto. And the talk show host had advertised that I was coming on the show. In the Cloakroom, I spoke on the talk show back in the State of Arizona on KFYI. The talk show host—an individual I have gotten to know very well—named Bob Mohan, informed me that all of the lines had been full since he had mentioned the line-item veto, and that his listeners were overwhelmingly in support of the line-item veto.

Mr. President, he also said something else that I thought was interesting and should be interesting to at least the Members on my side of the aisle.

He said, "You know, I am getting a lot of calls and they are saying that



the Senate is dragging their feet and they are not really doing anything, and that Republicans are not staying together and that Republicans are really not committed to the Contract With America. Can you allay some of those fears and concerns that we are hearing more and more of in our calls from our listeners?"

I said to Mr. Mohan, "Well, I can allay most of those fears. I would remind you that it was only one on this side of the aisle, one person that voted against the balanced budget amendment. And we decided in our Republican caucus that a vote of conscience on the part of any Senator was something that we not only would allow but we would respect."

But I did agree with him, to the extent that we are perhaps not pushing our agenda as hard as we could and as far as we could. At the same time, I attempted to explain that the rules of the Senate are far different than from that of the other body.

I guess what I am saying, Mr. President, is that we have a lot at stake here, not just those of us who reside on this side of the aisle, but I think that Congress has a lot at stake as far as our credibility with the American people.

I believe that most Americans believed, after the November 8 elections, starting and beginning on November 9, that the Congress of the United States would really fulfill the Contract With America. It is the first time in this century that I know of where a campaign was run on a national basis where there was commitments to do certain things. It was called a contract.

The American people's definition of a contract is an agreement between two parties which is binding. And some American citizens today are wondering if they, as a result of their votes, fulfilled their end of the contract and whether we are fulfilling our end of it.

Now, I believe we are making great efforts to do so on this side. But I would suggest that, after the defeat of the balanced budget amendment, it would be very, very important for all of us to recognize how serious the line-item veto is. I believe we will revisit the balanced budget amendment, Mr. President. I believe we will revisit it and I believe we will pass it because I have to believe that, when the overwhelming majority of American public opinion favors such a thing, a representative body—even one that plays the role of the saucer where the coffee is cooled—is going to, sooner or later, respond to the popular will.

Now, the balanced budget amendment is not some mania that swept across the country and everyone said, "Oh, gee, we need a balanced budget amendment," woke up in the morning and decided that.

Mr. President, the balanced budget amendment and the line-item veto, which I consider the crown jewels of the Contract With America, have long-standing, deeply-held support on the

part of the American people. And as they hear more and more and more excerpts from the "Pig Book," they hear more and more times on April 15 that their taxes have gone up and up and up, they are now sending more and more of their money to the Federal Government in Washington and, in their view, getting less and less in return.

Mr. President, in 1950, a family of four of median income sent \$1 out of every \$20 they earned to Washington, DC, in the form of Federal taxes. This April 15, that same median-income family of four will send \$1 out of every \$4 that they earn to the Federal Government in Washington. And if nothing changes, if nothing changes and we do not enact a single new entitlement program, we do not enact a single increase in expenditure, by the turn of the century, that will be \$1 out of every \$3 that they are sending to Washington in the form of taxes.

Mr. President, that is an enormous burden on median-income families. Then when you add in the State and local taxes, depending on which State they reside in, this jumps up to somewhere around 40 to 43 percent of their earnings go in the form of taxes. And then, bearing that heavy burden, they turn around and see their money spent on things which really do not bear the scrutiny of anyone. They see that and they rebel and they lose confidence in their elected representatives as a body.

And, strangely enough, they even lose confidence and faith in their elected representatives as individuals. We saw a strange phenomena in 1994. It used to always be, how do you feel about Congress? It was very low approval ratings, 10, 30 percent, whatever it was. But we saw a very great phenomena. Even the approval rating of their own elected representatives, Congressmen and Senators, also dropped dramatically.

And again I want to return though this situation of confidence in Government.

It is fascinating because every nation in the world that has emerged from oppression and repression, especially those that emerged from behind the Iron Curtain since the Berlin Wall came down and the Soviet Union collapsed, look to the United States as a model for how government should be run and how people should be represented and what really liberty and freedom are all about.

The students at Tiananmen Square erected a statue of liberty as their symbol of resistance to Communist oppression.

One of the most interesting experiences of my life was traveling to Albania and seeing the empty pedestals that once held the statues of their dictator Hoxha, who was one of the most incredible dictators in history in Albania, and the words "Long live Bush" on the pedestals. "Long live Bush."

Everywhere I travel in the world, it is the United States that is the role model—freedom, democracy, all of the

things that have to do with the rights of men and women. And yet, here in the United States in 1994, the place that they all admire, there was a dramatic upheaval. And that upheaval was largely bred by dissatisfaction with Government; not satisfaction, dissatisfaction and outright anger.

Now, Mr. President, a lot of that anger was understandably focused on the fact that their money was not being well spent. And not only not being well spent, it was wasted.

American families, many of them, over the last 10 to 15 years, experienced a real decrease in income. And that has been the case with many middle-American families. They have received increases in salary, but it has not kept up with inflation, it has not kept up with the taxes, it has not kept up with other things, and they find themselves running in place. And when that happens to American families, two bad things happen. One is, they lose confidence in their children's futures and they lose confidence in their Government.

The most astounding and alarming exit polling data of the 1994 election was this: for the first time since we have been taking polls, a majority of the American people believe that their children will not be better off than they are.

Mr. President, the essence of the American dream was that someone comes here from someplace else, they may come to Ellis Island, live in a ghetto in New York or Chicago, or some other place, and live under the most terrible conditions. But they work and save and they improve themselves and their own lives and most importantly provide an opportunity for their children. That is what America is all about. Story after story after story of poor people who come here penniless and they work and sacrifice and their dreams are fulfilled in their children. And now, most Americans believe that their children are not going to be as well off as they are.

How does all of this diatribe come back to the line-item veto? It means that unless we restore confidence in the American people in their Government, we are not going to restore the American dream.

Is a line-item veto all of that? No, clearly. But if we continue to fail to make the reforms that are necessary that will restore that confidence, then there will not be a restoration of the American dream.

Mr. President, I mean it. I mean it. I run into my fellow Arizonans every weekend when I am home, and they say, "Why are you doing this? I didn't send you there to do that." Maybe I, individually, had not done that, but we as a Congress have.

Maybe it is only a few million here. Maybe it is only \$15 million for the electric car; maybe only \$3 million for the aquaculture shrimp center, whatever it is; maybe it is only a small

amount of money when we are talking about a \$1.5 trillion budget.

To the average citizen, \$3 million is a lot of money. To the average citizen, \$15 million for electric cars is a lot of money. One of the things that I find most jading about our experiences here is how we throw around big numbers, \$100 million here, \$1 billion there, \$2 billion there, this for that program. After a while, it kind of loses its meaning. It is sort of like being at a crap table in a casino and playing only with chips, until you lose all the chips and then figure out that it was real money. I must say I have done that, too, Mr. President.

The fact is that the American people expect Congress to exercise fiscal sanity. There is a lot at stake here in this debate. There is a lot at stake—not because Senator COATS and I have worked for 10 years on this issue and obviously we feel very strongly and subjective about this issue—but it is important and critical, this issue is, because it is important and critical to the American people.

I hope that we can continue to conduct this debate, when the debate begins, on a very high plane. We can go a couple ways in this debate. I am not going to impugn anybody's integrity. I am not going to impugn anyone's motives. But I will make it perfectly clear what we have done since 1974. And what we have done is not a great service to the American people. In fact, it is a great disservice.

I hope that working with the people of the United States, working with some like-minded individuals such as Senator FEINSTEIN from California who is a cosponsor of this bill, and working together, we can persuade a sufficient number of our colleagues to cut off debate, in the form of invocation of cloture, and move forward with passage of the bill.

Now, Mr. President, I have talked with the majority leader, who obviously controls our activities here on the floor. The majority leader does not intend, and I agree with him, to drag out this debate for weeks as we did the balanced budget amendment.

This issue is very well known, Mr. President. It is not really a very complex issue. It is not nearly as complex as a number of issues that we address in a much shorter period of time on the floor of the Senate. The majority leader wants Members to put in long hours and put in a very few number of days and get this issue passed and behind us, because we do have a very large agenda. We do have a lot of issues that the American people expect the Senate to address.

I hope that we will maintain a high level of debate. I hope that we will put in long evenings, if it is necessary to do so. I hope in a very relatively short period of time we will be able to resolve this issue.

If we cannot resolve this issue favorably and enact a line-item veto, then, obviously, Senator COATS and I will not give up our quest for this very, very,

very crucial measure. At the same time, it would be rather pleasant for both Senator COATS and I to move on to other issues which also would command our attention.

I would like to say I appreciate the patience of the President in the chair. I know the hour is late. I want to thank him for that.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### A CHECKLIST APPROACH TO TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I wish to print in the RECORD a possible proposal for a checklist approach to the telecommunications bill. I invite comments for improving it from my colleagues. There have been many suggestions, and I hope my colleagues will consider these suggestions.

I ask unanimous consent that the checklist approach be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### [Discussion Draft]

March 16, 1995

#### "SEC. 255. INTEREXCHANGE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any restriction or obligation imposed before the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1995 under section II(D) of the Modification of Final Judgment, a Bell operating company, or any subsidiary or affiliate of a Bell operating company, that meets the requirements of this section may provide—

"(1) interLATA telecommunications services originating in any region in which it is the dominant provider of wireline telephone exchange or exchange access services after the Commission determines that it has fully implemented the competitive checklist found in subsection (b)(3) in the area in which it seeks to provide interLATA telecommunications services;

"(2) interLATA telecommunications services originating in any area where that company is not the dominant provider of wireline telephone exchange or exchange access service in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d); and

"(3) interLATA services that are incidental services in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e).

"(b) DUTY TO PROVIDE INTERCONNECTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—A Bell operating company that provides telephone exchange or exchange access service has a duty under this Act upon request to provide, at rates that are just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory—

"(A) for the exchange of telecommunications between its end users and the end users of another telecommunications carrier; and

"(B) interconnection that meets the requirements of paragraph (3) with the facilities and equipment of any other telecommunications carrier for the purpose of

permitting the other carrier to provide telephone exchange or exchange access services.

"(2) INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT PROCESS.—The provisions of section 251 (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) apply to the negotiation of a binding interconnection agreements under this section.

"(3) COMPETITIVE CHECKLIST.—Interconnection provided by a Bell operating company to other telecommunications carriers under this section shall include:

"(A) Nondiscriminatory access that is at least equal in type, quality, and price to the access the local exchange carrier affords to itself or to any other entity.

"(B) The capability to exchange telecommunications between customers of the local exchange carrier and the telecommunications carrier seeking interconnection.

"(C) Nondiscriminatory access to the poles, ducts, conduits, and rights-of-way owned or controlled by the local exchange carrier where it has the legal authority to permit such access.

"(D) Local loop transmission from the central office to the customer's premises, unbundled from local switching or other services.

"(E) Local transport from the trunk side of a wireline local exchange carrier switch unbundled from switching or other services.

"(F) Local switching unbundled from transport, local loop transmission, or other services.

"(G) Nondiscriminatory access to—

"(i) 911 and E911 services;

"(ii) directory assistance services to allow the other carrier's customers to obtain telephone numbers; and

"(iii) operator call completion services.

"(H) White pages directory listings for customers of the other carrier's telephone exchange service.

"(I) Before the date by which neutral telephone number administration arrangements must be established, nondiscriminatory access to telephone numbers for assignment to the other carrier's telephone exchange service customers. After that date, compliance with the neutral telephone number administration arrangements.

"(J) Nondiscriminatory access to databases and associated signaling, including signaling links, signaling service control points, and signaling service transfer points, necessary for call routing and completion.

"(K) Before the date by which the Commission determines that telephone number portability is technically feasible and must be made available, telecommunications number portability through remote call forwarding, direct inward dialing trunks, or other comparable arrangements, with as little impairment of functioning, quality, reliability, and convenience as possible. After that date, full compliance with full number portability.

"(L) Nondiscriminatory access to whatever services or information may be necessary to allow the requesting carrier to implement local dialing parity in a manner that permits consumers to be able to dial the same number of digits when using any telecommunications carrier providing telephone exchange service or exchange access service.

"(M) Reciprocal compensation arrangements for the origination and termination of telecommunications.

"(N) Telecommunications services and network functions provided on an unbundled basis without any conditions or restrictions on the resale or sharing of those services or functions, including both origination and termination of telecommunications services, other than reasonable conditions required by the Commission or a State. For purposes of this subparagraph, it is not an unreasonable