

If I could single out this one thing that I heard from the President's State of the Union Message 2 days ago, this is the most disturbing thing that came out of his message. We can concentrate on the inconsistencies or the statements he made about wanting to have welfare reform, when in fact he vetoed the very bill he says he now wants; and when Americans stood up and applauded when he said he was going to downsize Government, when he, in fact, is increasing the size of Government every day in assigning new tasks and putting more jobs into job programs and into retirement programs and into environmental programs—he mentioned 14 different areas of Government he wanted to increase—in every area except for defense, he wants to increase government.

"Wait a minute," he said, "Now I am very proud to tell you we have 200,000 fewer Government employees than when I took office." Let me tell you where the employees came from. They came from the Defense Department. They came from our defense system. If you exclude the defense system, our Government has grown dramatically, whether you talk about the budget or whether you talk about the number of employees. It is very deceptive for the President to say that.

Again, all of that aside, as offensive as that may be to thinking Americans, the thing that has to be looked at is this new role that our military has of peacemaking as opposed to the role of defending America.

I wish that more people in this Senate Chamber had been able to be with me on the days following April 19 in Oklahoma City, in my beautiful State of Oklahoma, where the most devastating terrorist attack, domestic attack, in the history of the world took place. When you saw, as we saw in the Chamber the other day, Richard Dean, who went in there after he himself had gotten out of the building and dragged out three or four other people. The stories of the heroes of that disaster were just incredible. Jennifer Rodgers, the police officer acknowledged during the State of the Union Message—and I appreciate the President doing that—sure, ask Jennifer Rodgers or Richard Dean about the devastation of that bomb in Oklahoma City. That bomb was measured as equal to 1 ton of TNT. The smallest warhead we know of today, nuclear warhead, is equal to 1,000 tons of TNT.

Now, that has to tell you, if you are concerned as we were about what happened in one building and all the tragedy surrounding that, that if you multiply that by 1,000—and I do not care if it is a city in Oklahoma or New York or Washington or anywhere else in the world—that is a pretty huge threat that is out there. It is a very real threat. As yesterday's paper indicates, it is even a greater threat and a more documented threat than it was before. Yet the President has shown no regard for the defense of this country against this threat.

Mr. President, we will have a chance to address this. Yes, we do want to pass the Defense authorization bill even though missile defense has been taken out of it. But we will return to the battle over missile defense, and to this new humanitarian role that our military has, in future debates.

I guess I will conclude with another concern that is not as life-threatening. Of course, we are concerned about the lives that would be lost if we failed to defend ourselves, but in these various humanitarian peacemaking missions that is the new rule of our military, somebody has to ask the question: Who is going to pay for this? We have a President who has taken virtually all of the money out of the military budget that would go into equipment to defend America, and yet we are going to have to come around and pay for all this stuff that is going on in Bosnia and elsewhere.

I picked up something the other day in last week's Defense News that I guess has the solution. Pentagon officials said on January 3 that the budget cuts could come from areas where Congress has increased funding, such as missile defense, to pay the bill for these missions. This is from Pentagon officials. "Congress increased Clinton's overall budget request by \$7 billion in 1996. It is intuitive that any money above the President's request would be reprogrammed to pay for Bosnia," one senior Pentagon official said on January 2.

That tells us two things. First of all, the \$1.5 billion that the President says it will cost for the humanitarian exercise in Bosnia is grossly understated. It could be up to \$7 billion. The studies I have seen show it around \$5 billion. I guess we not only are redirecting our military to a new role and that new role is peacemaking, but we are also going to pay for it with the dollars we would otherwise use to defend America. This is wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from Arkansas.

SENATE BUSINESS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, tomorrow is the drop-dead date for Congress on how we will keep the Government going. In addition, the deadline is fast approaching on honoring the full faith and the credit clause of the Constitution. I say not only to the people of this country but to people all over the world that we intend to honor the debentures you hold, and we will pay you interest for helping us finance our debt.

I have never really felt that when push came to shove, there would be any question about whether or not we would extend and raise the debt ceiling. There still is not. I feel sure this will happen. If it does not happen tomorrow, as it should, it will certainly happen by the last day of February. To do otherwise would be the height of ir-

responsibility. So I am not really worried about that, and I applaud some of the comments I have seen by Mr. ARMEY and Speaker GINGRICH on that subject.

Now, tomorrow, as I understand it, the Senate will vote on a continuing resolution to keep the Government afloat until March 1. Also, I understand that the continuing resolution will fund most of the programs not covered by enacted appropriations bills at 75 percent of the fiscal year 1995 funding level or the lower of the funding levels provided by the fiscal year 1996 House or Senate appropriations bill, if that level exceeds the 75 percent funding level. However, programs funded pursuant to the HUD-VA bill and State, Justice, Commerce bill, will be funded at the levels provided in their conference reports.

Programs funded pursuant to the third bill on which we have a conference report, namely Interior, as I understand it, are going to be funded instead as if the Interior bill did not have a conference report. All the agencies funded in that bill will have to live on the lower of the House or Senate bill, or 75 percent of what they got in 1995.

Mr. President, tomorrow when the debate on the continuing resolution begins, I hope somebody will be able to tell me why we are treating the programs funded by the Interior appropriations bill differently. I do not like that. I see no reason not to treat Interior the same way we do HUD-VA, and State, Justice, Commerce.

Second, at some point tomorrow there is going to be a motion made by the majority leader to adjourn the U.S. Senate until February 26. I can tell you categorically that I do not intend to vote for that motion. It is almost as unfathomable to me why we would leave here, with all this work undone, until February 26, as it is why we want to shut the Government down all the time around here.

I have been here 21 years and things have happened here in the last 3 months that, in my opinion, are not only unfathomable and unexplainable, but inexcusable. We are supposed to be here to govern. We are not supposed to be here making sure all 100 Senators and all 435 Congressmen, get their way. I think it was Longfellow who said one time: "You better be careful about what you pray for because you might get it." You have 100 Senators here and everybody is saying if I cannot have my way there will be no way. Governing is the art of compromise. There are strong feelings on that side of the aisle and this side of the aisle on hundreds of items.

I did not get my way on the space station or that sucker would have been dead a long time ago. One hundred billion dollars squandered. And we say we need more money for education?

Congress has provided \$7 billion more for the Defense Department than the administration requested. "We don't

want the extra 20 B-2's. It is true you only put \$500 million in for 20 B-2's, but what is the total cost down the road? It is \$30 billion. We do not need them. We do not want them." Many times, when I used to come out here if I was opposing something in the Defense bill, Members on the other side of the aisle, who are prone to vote for every single dollar for defense no matter what it is, would say to me, "You are opposed to this but the Secretary wants it, the President wants it, and all the Chiefs want it." So it would sail through here like a firestorm.

Now I raise that issue with Members on the other side and I say: The President does not want it, the Secretary does not want it, and the Chiefs do not want it. Why are you putting it in here? And they answer: What do they know? What do they know about building ships on a noncompetitive basis? What do they know about 20 B-2 bombers that we say they need and we do not care if they say they do not want them?

You see, if this were a perfect world and we had more money than we knew what to do with, I might not complain. Mr. President, 22 B-2 bombers and they would not dare fly one of them in Desert Storm for fear it would get shot down and that would kill the B-2 program, so they just did not fly them. They would not even let a B-1 fly over in Desert Storm for fear it would get shot down.

Why am I concerned about that? Because I believe in balancing the budget with compassion and with a concern for the future of the country.

When it comes to education, the people of this country have invariably reported in the polls they would pay more taxes if their children got a better education. Some of us here labor in the vineyards of education. Some of us try to keep the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for Humanities afloat because we believe culture is important. What has the majority done? They whack both endowments by 40 percent. So if there happen to be a few children around who are interested in opera or drama or art or anything else, and they need a few bucks from the Federal Government—forget it. Then you wonder why people act uncivilized. Why are people so rude? Most people who are leaving here—and in record numbers—do not say it in those words, but everybody knows that, perhaps not the principle reason, but one of the reasons is because civility no longer exists here. What a tragedy.

So, what are we going to do to improve civilized conduct? Cut every single program that has as its intention to enhance the understanding of the importance of the culture of the Nation, the importance of civilized conduct and civility, man-to-man, woman-to-woman, and so on.

They say the mining industry in this country can take billions of dollars' worth of gold, silver, platinum and pal-

ladium off lands that belong to the taxpayers of this country and not pay one dime for it while we cut Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment. Corporate welfare is too nice a name. I call it corporate ripoff.

I saw a report the other day, Mr. President, that said only 14 percent of the people in this country pay any attention to what is going on in Washington. That is the reason I can stand here and scream my lungs out day in and day out about this mining law of 1872, where the American mining industry has ripped this country off for billions and billions and continues to do so while we sit here and argue about how much we are going to cut education and the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities.

Mr. President, hundreds of millions of dollars were cut from environmental protection. A British philosopher once said there is nothing more impossible than undoing something that has already been done. When you kill somebody you cannot bring him back to life. And when you rape and pillage the environment in a permanent way, you cannot bring it back.

What are we doing? We are cutting the legs right out from under the people who enforce the environmental laws of this country, which over the past 25 years have increased the "swimmability" and the "fishability" of the lakes and rivers of this country. And there is not a sober person in America who does not want to continue that.

Finally, Mr. President, I want to be supportive of the President. He mentioned just about everything in his State of the Union Address that I care anything about. I applaud his stand for saying we can balance the budget without destroying everything we hold dear. We do not have to assault the elderly, we do not have to assault the poor, and we certainly do not have to assault the children of this country in order to get a balanced budget.

If you made me king for 10 minutes, I will produce a balanced budget in 7 years that does not do any of those things. However, it now appears that the White House and the majority party may be in the process of agreeing on the inane, crazy idea of cutting taxes. I will solve all of the problems of the balanced budget. You just give up on that tax cut.

I would say both to the President and to the Speaker and the majority leader, if you absolutely insist on a tax cut, at least wait a year or two until this whole thing fleshes out and we find out. Is it going to work? Once you put the tax cut in place, everybody knows you will not ever take it back.

So when you put the tax cut in place 7 years from now, CBO's estimate is that there will be \$254 billion in savings to the Government just in interest cuts alone. That may turn out to be zip, zero, nil. But the \$200-plus billion in tax cuts is already gone.

So why does not the President or Senator DOLE say, look, it is an

oxymoron to say we are going to cut taxes and balance the budget. We tried that, you know, back in 1981. What did we get out of it? We got a \$4 trillion increase in the national debt. But people have forgotten. The majority of the people in this body were not here in 1981 when we did that. They do not remember, so I am reminding them.

I want it put on my epitaph that I was one of 11 U.S. Senators that voted no on the proposal that claimed it would raise defense spending by 100 percent and cut taxes and balance the budget. People in Arkansas are taking a pretty big hit these days, but I can tell you one thing: People down there have enough sense to know that that one will not work.

So, Mr. President, I look forward to tomorrow and what I hope will be a civilized debate, an intelligent debate, and one that will say, do not put the farm bill on this. That is a nonstarter. Pass a clean debt ceiling bill. What we ought to do is adopt a clean continuing resolution to keep the Government going until March 1, and we ought to pass a debt ceiling limit so that people in the world, not just in the United States—bear in mind, of the \$5 trillion national debt, almost 40 percent of it, a third of it, is held by foreigners.

The people in this country and the people in Congress may think this holding the debt ceiling hostage is cute and funny, but the Japanese and Germans do not think it is funny. When they hold a U.S. Government bond that is supposed to return them 6 percent interest, when it comes due they want their 6 percent. They do not want all of this mickeying around about who is holding who hostage in the U.S. Congress. The very thought that we might falter in the payment of our interest on U.S. Government obligations is absolutely Byzantine.

Just to talk about things that have happened around here that you have never seen before and hope to God you never see again, here is a farm bill that the chairman of the Agriculture Committee in the House could not even get out of his committee. He is chairman. His own Republican membership reneged on him. It was brought up in the Senate just for talking purposes but not to be voted on, because everybody knew that it would be beaten soundly in the U.S. Senate. Called "Freedom to Farm," it never got out of the committee in the House, never passed the House, never passed the Senate, never was even considered by the Senate Agriculture Committee, and they talk about putting that thing on the continuing resolution tomorrow?

The farmers of my State want something definitive so they can go to the bank and borrow money and plant their rice and their soybeans. But they do not want that sucker, and nobody else does either.

So why do we not extend existing law for 1 year and put the fears and the apprehensions of the farmers of America at ease?

Mr. President, I am going to vote against the adjournment motion until some resolution of this farm program is made, and the rice farmers of my State, who produce 40 percent of all of the rice in this Nation, have some certainty. The first thing you know—as my colleague said in the press conference this morning, Senator PRYOR—you keep messing around so they cannot plant their rice, and the next thing you will know we will lose all of our world markets for American rice. We have squandered \$1 to \$1.5 billion mickeying around one-upping each other.

In closing, Mr. President, let me repeat. The people of the country last year had a right to be angry. They were angry for all kinds of different reasons. I will not presume to know precisely why everybody voted the way they did. They were not voting for chaos. They were not voting to see how much havoc we could create and impose on innocent people. They wanted changes. They did not want to see the Government dismantled. They did not want to see the Government shut down and leave the country defenseless, almost anarchistic.

So tomorrow I hope will be an interesting and enlightening and sensible debate. I hope when we leave here tomorrow night, if and when we do, that we leave with a pretty good feeling that we finally have begun to recognize each other's feelings about this and have finally begun to get our act together and reassure the people of the country that we are not really just a bunch of bickering children up here.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NEW WORLD MINE

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, as everyone in this body knows I have been a vocal proponent of reforming the 1872 mining law. This 124-year-old anachronism continues to permit the extraction of billions of dollars' worth of hardrock minerals from public land without compensating the taxpayers and in a manner that causes significant environmental degradation. Unfortunately, the new majority in Congress has little or no interest in meaningful reform of the mining law.

During the congressional recess an article appeared in the New York Times discussing the proposed New World gold mine which would be located within 2.5 miles of Yellowstone National Park. It is painfully obvious that unless action is taken soon, Yellowstone will be gravely imperiled. In fact, the World Heritage Commission

recently designated Yellowstone National Park a world heritage site in danger primarily due to the proposed mine.

Mr. President, some of my colleagues from the West argue that mining is a primary way of life in their States and any changes in the mining law that made it more difficult to pollute the land or provided for the payment of meaningful royalties would have a negative impact on their States. However, as the New York Times article points out, their constituents do not necessarily agree. In fact, much of the western economy depends on pristine land, air, and water. Certain mining operations are not synonymous with such conditions, especially in the absence of more stringent environmental restrictions.

The scars of previous mining operations are littered throughout the country. In fact, 59 sites on the Superfund national priority list are directly related to mining. According to the Bureau of Mines, there are 180,000 acres of land and 12,000 miles of rivers that have been polluted by waste from abandoned mines. The cost to taxpayers to clean up this mess will be astronomical. Yet no one seems willing to do anything to prevent future disasters, such as the New World mine. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider what we may be doing to our national treasures, such as Yellowstone Park, if we do not act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report that appeared in the January 7 issue of the New York Times regarding the "Montana Mining Town Fights Gold-Rush Plan" dealing with the gold mine that is about to be built just outside the gates of Yellowstone, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 7, 1996]
MONTANA MINING TOWN FIGHTS GOLD-RUSH
PLAN

(By James Brooke)

COOKE CITY, MT.—From Canadian mining barons to President Clinton to American environmentalists, the bitterest mining controversy of recent months has swirled like an alpine blizzard around this tiny mountain village of 80 people.

On one side, Canada's largest natural resources conglomerate is determined to dig \$750 million of gold and silver out of a nearby 8,900-foot peak. On the other, environmentalists assert that the mine would inevitably leak acid into Yellowstone National Park, three miles to the west.

Often overlooked in the international clash of press releases and lawsuits are the residents here who would be affected. In a town founded by gold miners, one might expect to find people enthusiastic about a plan to open the state's largest gold mine on Henderson Mountain, a peak named after a gold panner. But skepticism about the proposal is surprisingly plentiful here, reflecting a growing hostility to mining in Montana, a state that is shifting its economic base from mining to tourism.

Even at the Miner's Saloon, amid mining decor of picks and shovels, criticism is rife. "I'm vehemently against it," said Chris War-

ren, a 24-year-old resident, who was echoed by the bartender and four men nursing drinks at the bar.

In dissent, the saloon keeper, Larry Wick-er, said he appreciated the younger generation's patronage, but not their views on mining. "If it weren't for the miners, Cooke City would be part of little Russia," he said, referring to this sliver of private land surrounded by Government land, including Yellowstone and two national forests.

In a tribute to Montana's 19th century mining origins, the state seal bears the motto, "oro y plata," gold and silver. But Montana's combined income from mining and logging was surpassed in the early 1990's by recreational tourism—fly fishing, elk hunting, snowmobiling, hiking, camping and river rafting. Anglers alone spend \$410 million a year in this state.

The shifting political winds from this economic transformation are buffeting the Henderson Mountain mine project, which cannot proceed until it wins environmental clearances from various state and Federal authorities. The process could easily take two years or more.

On the far side of a mountain saddle here, the mining company, Crown Butte Mines Inc., would hollow out Henderson Mountain at the rate of 1,500 tons a day. Working at almost 9,000 feet, the miners would combat a forbidding climate that includes 23 frost-free days a year and about 40 feet of snowfall a year.

Crown Butte purchased the mining rights on the private land after deciding that technological advances and new discoveries would make mining profitable.

Environmentalists, pointing out Old Faithful geyser only 60 miles to the southwest, said the proposed mining site is in the nation's secondmost seismically active area after the San Andreas Fault. They contend that an earthquake would rupture a disposal site filled with potentially toxic waste from the operation.

But Crown Butte Mines maintains that it would build a dam strong enough to withstand any tremor of the magnitude registered in the last 150 years. While mining advocates often paint their environmental opponents as outsiders or newcomers, polls indicate that Montana voters are increasingly hostile to new mines and to economic growth, especially if it means new residents.

In a poll of 817 registered voters conducted in December for The Billings Gazette, 48 percent of the respondents said that economic benefits would not outweigh possible environmental damage from the project here, the New World Mine. Only 29 percent favored the mine.

Montana, with a population of 850,000, has only six people per square mile. But 31 percent of respondents called for no more population growth, and 45 percent agreed with the statement: "We're approaching our limits." The poll's margin of sampling error was plus or minus 3 percentage points.

The dispute over the mine may heat up soon when the United States Forest Service releases an environmental impact statement.

In the six months leading up to this report, world environmental attention focused on this remote mountain village. A city in name only, Cooke has a one-room school and a three-block-long Main Street that ends in a snowdrift half the year.

On Aug. 25, President Clinton thundered over Cooke City's proposed mine site in a military helicopter. Afterward, he ordered a two-year ban on mining in the 4,500 acres of National Forest land surrounding Henderson Mountain.

In September, the village visitors were members of the World Heritage Committee,