

year, and already the competition is fierce among candidates for election to "Safire's New Political Dictionary: The Definitive Guide to the New Language of Politics." Accordingly, Mr. President, I have the honor to propose as first-in-the-field, a remarkable triple-hyphenated safe bet and sure winner from the new year's day editorial of the Washington Post entitled, appropriately enough, "The New Year." The editorial looked back to its predecessor 50 years ago, when the Post editorial writer of that age, contemplating the end of the Second World War, pondered whether the United Nations might now bring peace on Earth. This year's editorial comments, "That sort of world-federal-ish talk seems almost quaint today." Indeed, it does. Cord Meyer apart, there are not likely to be as many as half a dozen Americans alive who remember the World Federalists and their unflinching attachment to world government. That, of course, is just the role editorials play in our lives; to remind us of forgotten fancies and dashed dreams, lest we become too much impressed with the wonders of our own age.

Mr. President, I can report that Mr. Safire, interviewed by telephone in his posh Washington offices, readily concurred that "world-federal-ish" was definitely an early starter for this year's pol-lexigraphic race, adding that it might prove a watershed compound and go on to win a triple crown.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER FOR RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, may I inquire, what is the current status of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the time of morning business for an additional 10 minutes, and that I be permitted to speak during that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, could I suggest to my colleague that we extend it until 2 o'clock with Members allowed to speak therein for 10 minutes?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have been informed that it is the leader's intention to go into recess subject to the call of the Chair immediately after my statement.

Mr. SARBANES. There is a Member on our side who actually has left his office and is on his way to the floor, and

we would like for him to have 10 minutes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. 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. COATS. Mr. President, I think we have an agreement here that we would extend the period of time for morning business by 20 minutes, with 10 minutes allocated to this Senator and 10 minutes allocated to the Senator from Arkansas, as given by the Senator from Maryland. If that is acceptable, I so ask unanimous consent.

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

Mr. COATS. And thereafter, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate go into recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have come for the first time to a disturbing conviction. That conviction is that I do not believe this budget process is going to succeed. I am beginning to believe that any amount of negotiating in the future is not going to result in agreement. I have come to this point because 44 days after the President said he agreed that we should enact a balanced budget, nothing has happened, and I am not sure that negotiating and bargaining is being done in any way that would fulfill that commitment.

The President, first of all, has not demonstrated any history of supporting or proposing a balanced budget and has yet to put a balanced budget as scored by the agency that he insisted it be scored by, on the table.

He has vetoed the only real budget that has come before his desk, and even now, today, January 4, as I said, 44 days after he agreed to enact a balanced budget, he has yet to propose a balanced budget. President Clinton has now proposed four budgets, none of which has produced a balance. The third so-called balanced budget he proposed was scored by the Congressional Budget Office as \$200 billion per year over balance as far as the eye could see, and then his fourth budget only managed to reduce the deficits to \$100 billion a year for every year ad infinitum.

Not one Member of the Senate, Republican or Democrat, has voted for the President's budget. In one vote, it was defeated 96 to nothing, in another 99 to nothing. So this is just not Republican rhetoric. This is a unanimous

rejection of the President's attempts to balance the budget by all Republicans and all Democrats in the Senate.

So for anybody who is under the illusion that the President has proposed a balanced budget with honest numbers, no one in this body, Republican or Democrat, agrees to that.

It seems to me, third, that at every stage of the negotiations the President has purposely tried to distract the Nation's attention from a balanced budget.

First, he talked about the number of years it would take to balance the budget and finally agreed, under duress I think, that 7 years would be the right number. But he was quoted as saying, and I quote again, "[As President] I would present a 5-year plan to balance the budget." He said that on Larry King in June.

And then in July, he said, "But I do not believe it is good policy, based on my understanding of this budget—which is pretty good, now—to do it in 7 years." That he said in a Rose Garden ceremony in July.

Then he said, well, I think we ought to "balance the budget in 10 years. It took decades to run up the deficit, it's going to take a decade to wipe it out." That was during his Presidential address to the Nation.

Then he used the scoring issue, that is, determining whether or not the numbers were real, as a distraction. He challenged us—and I sat over at the House of Representatives during his State of the Union Address—when he said, "Let's at least argue about the same set of numbers so the American people will think we are shooting straight with them." That was in his address before a joint session of Congress on administration goals in February 1993.

And so we accepted that challenge, and we said we will agree, Mr. President; let us use the agency that you want to use. That is the Congressional Budget Office. And then we argued back and forth, back and forth, and the President said, well, the Congressional Budget Office, I do not agree with them. I wish to use my own numbers.

For nearly 9 months he was able to distract the press, the Congress, and the American people from the real issue of balancing the budget by focusing the debate on how long it ought to take, on what numbers we ought to use. So he—I have to give him credit—he masterfully maneuvered and shifted the debate for month after month after month when the real issue was balancing the budget.

The President's attitude is particularly destructive because we are at a unique moment in recent history. We have the opportunity to pass a real balanced budget, interestingly enough, at a time when the differences between us are not that great. We have a chance to negotiate because really we are quite close. A number of Democrats have worked with Republicans in trying to put together an alternative budget

that would reach balance, and the number differences really are not that far apart.

The differences between the Republican budget and the President's only amounts to 2 percent of the entire budget. Even on the most divisive issues, those issues of Medicare, Medicaid, and welfare reform, we are quite close.

On the most contentious issue of all, Medicare, both the President and the First Lady have essentially stated that they would do more to slow the rate of growth than what the Republicans have done. In 1993 the President said:

... Medicare and Medicaid are going up at three times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at two times the rate of inflation. This is not a Medicare and Medicaid cut.

The First Lady in 1993 said:

We are talking about beginning to reduce the rate of increase ... in the Medicare from about 11 percent ... increase annually to about 6 or 7 percent increase annually.

So what the Republicans have done in their budget is exactly what both the President and the First Lady had indicated that we ought to do. And yet now it is politically turned to the fact that the Republicans are trying to cut when it is not a cut. We are trying to do what they suggested.

My point is, not necessarily that the President is playing politics with this, although clearly he is, my point is that we are not far apart at all.

I think we need to understand also that this partial shutdown of Government could be solved overnight if the President had simply signed the appropriations bills that were sent to him. He chose to veto the Interior appropriations, the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations, and the VA-HUD appropriations bills. Those hundreds of thousands of workers, Federal workers that are not now working that we hear about every day at drumbeat out of the White House could all be at work if the President had just signed the bills that we sent to him.

What is discouraging, Mr. President, is that we have come so close for a result so important and that the remaining differences between us are narrow. But it seems to me that the President is willing to sacrifice perhaps one of the most important things the U.S. Congress could do in this decade if not this century. We are sacrificing that, the demands of history for the demands of politics.

Look, this game cannot continue indefinitely. We have to end this political posturing. I think we have a moral obligation to do so. I am convinced that we should set some kind of firm deadline and prove once and for all if the President has any intention of supporting a balanced budget. That deadline ought to be set in weeks, not months.

If the President refuses to negotiate in good faith to reach that agreement and do what he said he would do, that is, put a budget on the table that actu-

ally balanced, if he is not willing to do this, then I think we should end this politically motivated pretense that is going on.

It would then become an issue to be decided in the 1996 elections. Voters would be presented with a very clear choice: The status quo, continue the Government growing as it has, leave it the same, that Government needs to do more, keep spending, keep taxing, or change the fundamental direction and course of Government and achieve a balanced budget.

If we do that, we can pass appropriations bills that produce enough savings to ensure that we can still reach a balanced budget in 7 years during this interim period between the time we cut off negotiations and the election of 1996.

Mr. President, I suggest that it is time for the games and the politics and the distractions to end. There is one issue, and one issue only that we must decide: Will we fulfill the promise of this unique moment in passing a balanced Federal budget? All the rest can be negotiated if both sides negotiate in good faith. If the President refuses to do so, as he has done to this moment, then the question will need to be put to the American people—is it enough for a President to talk about a balanced budget or do we need a President who will actually agree to a balanced budget?

Mr. President, I yield back any time I have remaining.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

HOW LONG UNTIL SOME MEMBERS IN CONGRESS COME TO THEIR SENSES?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, when I was a young man the Governor of Tennessee, the then-Governor of Tennessee, Frank Clement, delivered the keynote address at the Democratic national convention. As I matured and studied speeches like that, I decided it was not quite as great as I thought it was at the time. But the thrust of the speech was, "How long, America?" And he kept coming back to that recurring theme. "How long, oh, how long, America?" In other words, how long are we going to wait for solutions to these problems?

That would be a good speech to give today, how long the American people are going to have to wait until some people in this body, but especially in the House, come to their senses.

This morning we had a group of Social Security workers come into our Little Rock office. I was out at the time. My legislative director suggested that they call the Speaker of the House. He told them he would be happy to give them the names of the 73 freshmen Congressman over there, their telephone numbers, and reminded them that the Senate had voted to do precisely what should be done, thanks to the courage of the majority leader.

The majority leader probably is not interested in having a Democrat compliment him for what he did because I am sure he is taking unbelievable flak from some quarters in his own party. That goes with the leadership. If you are not willing to stand up for what you believe, you do not deserve to be called a leader. If you do not stand up for responsible Government, you do not deserve to be here.

We have a saying in Arkansas when something is really out of the ordinary. We say, "I have been to two State fairs and a goat rope, and I never seen anything like this before." I can tell you, I have never seen anything like this before. I pray to God we never see anything like it again, because if the checks and balances of the Constitution can be circumscribed and circumvented by a simple hard-core majority who are willing to stick together, and most of whom distrust Government, strongly distrust Government, the next question you have to ask yourself is, if people are willing to abuse their power by circumventing the Constitution in a way that was never intended by Madison and the other Framers, how long can we continue to govern ourselves? That is a very legitimate question that you are going to hear asked more and more if this is not resolved shortly.

The American people are divided to some extent. They do not understand it. But I can tell you, each day that goes on they become increasingly apprehensive about just what is going on, what is the meaning of it. They are not Federal employees, and so they are not very perturbed about it. But as they see their lives disrupted, as everybody's lives are going to be, if this goes on much longer, they are going to acclimate themselves and attune themselves to what is going on here.

We should not for one moment forget what is the overriding issue here. There is a minor constitutional crisis that could loom very large in the future; there is, obviously, a tremendous political battle going on, and that is where the American people really do not understand why we would subject this country to this for political reasons.

But we should not ever forget one simple fact: All we have to do is what the Senate did the night before last and pass a continuing resolution and get Government up and running. It has nothing to do—it has nothing to do—with the discussions going on at the White House. You can resolve every single issue that is at stake here without sending 250,000 workers home and others with half paychecks and scaring the pants off a lot of American citizens.

The tax cut is one of the issues. That is not an unsurmountable problem. I cannot tell you how I detest the thought of that \$245 billion tax cut, and every time I look at the statistics on who gets that \$245 billion, I am literally stunned that every newspaper in