

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

the country is not editorializing on it every single day.

Think about it. The people who make less than \$30,000 a year get virtually not one dime of it, and if you make \$300,000 a year, you are going to get over \$8,000 a year in tax cuts. What kind of a nation passes tax bills like that?

Let me go back. That is based on a CBO assumption that the budget will be balanced in the year 2002, and by doing so, interest rates will decline to the point that over a 7-year period, we will save \$245 billion. I can tell you that is a massive assumption, one that I can almost guarantee you will never come about.

In order for that to come true, every single projection of growth rate, interest rates, and unemployment which the Congressional Budget Office puts out would have to come true, literally true—every one of those things.

It also means that next year and the next year and the next year, through 7 years, Congress will do precisely what was projected in this 1995 budget resolution. We will not even do what the budget resolution does in 1996. I can bet you we will not do it. We certainly are not going to do it every year between now and the year 2002. You are going to have tornadoes in my State, you are going to have floods in the Midwest, you are going to have hurricanes in Florida, you are going to have droughts throughout the Midwest, and we are going to pick up the tab for every bit of it. None of that is anticipated in the budget resolution.

But for purposes of argument, because the President did, in fact, come out with his own tax cut, not nearly as massive as this one, but why not say to the Republicans: "You're hot for a \$245 billion tax cut. You want to spend all of \$245 billion the Congressional Budget Office says you are going to save over the next 7 years. We do not believe that. Not only do we disagree strongly on who would get the tax benefits, we do not think those savings will ever materialize. But to prove our good faith, why don't we do this? Let's wait until the budget for 1998 comes up before we get into this tax-cutting business. If all CBO's projections have come true, interest rates are as low as they projected, all the other economic indices are the way they projected them and the savings are materializing, then say, 'OK, we'll accept a \$200 tax refund for all the children in America,' and if it goes according to Hoyle for 2 more years, up it to \$400."

Why would that not be a simple solution to it? After all, once you put that tax cut in place, if this place falls apart and the dome of the Capitol falls to the ground, you will not be able to take that tax cut away. You are going to be spending the money for a tax cut that you do not have, because we will never undo it. So why do it, unless you know the savings are going to be there?

I heard the majority whip say this morning that this President is the first

President that ever wanted more money. He never heard of anybody vetoing a bill because they wanted more money. I remind the Senator from Mississippi, Ronald Reagan used to go around saying, "I'm being accused for these massive deficits, and you know I can't spend a penny that Congress doesn't appropriate."

To the ordinary layman out there, that is fine, because the people always liked the President better than Congress.

I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, we were to go into recess. The Senator is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. While he was saying, "I can't spend a penny that Congress doesn't appropriate," he was never vetoing any money bills. He signed everything we sent him, and the people should be grateful, because while he was President, Congress appropriated billions less than he asked for. But he vetoed a defense bill because it was not high enough, and we had to give him more money to get him to sign the bill.

Mr. President, the American people last fall were angry about a host of things. There was no one single thing that people were angry about. There were a whole host of things they were angry about. It is an interesting thing, you take 1 percent of the vote last fall and shift 1 percent of the vote here, here and there, and we would not have anything bordering on an American revolution.

As far as the bonded Contract With America, so far two things have passed both Houses and have been signed by the President, and both of them would probably have been passed without the so-called Contract With America.

People were not voting for the Contract With America, because they did not know anything about it. They were voting because they were angry. They were angry about the deficit, they were angry about gays in the military, they were angry about some Members getting in trouble. It was a whole host of things.

But I can tell you, Mr. President, the one thing they were not voting for was chaos. So far, that is all they have gotten out of it.

The other day I mentioned James Baldwin, a great black author, who wrote a book called "Go Tell It on the Mountain." In the book—it was sort of autobiographical, I guess—the person who was the central character in the book was obviously James Baldwin.

He described the churches when he was a youngster and how people would have dinner on the grounds after church. Senator HEFLIN, and southerners like Senator HEFLIN and I know what that is like. He has been to a thousand dinners on the grounds after church on Sundays, just as I have.

James Baldwin describes in the book listening to some of the black preachers talk about how many souls they

had saved in the last revival, how many souls they had saved in the last year, and this youngster who wanted to be a preacher was offended by the way they talked about how many souls they had saved, not as individual people who were actually saved but macro numbers, and he took a vow that never would he take the gift of God so lightly.

As you might guess, as you go on into the book, he becomes a minister, and the first thing you know, he is one of the big stars at the dinner on the grounds after the church services, and he is talking about how many souls you save, as he said originally, as though you were talking about ears of corn being lopped off the stalk. Yes, he fell into it, too. It was a magnificent novel. I recommend it to you. Here we talk about 250,000 employees, which is a big number. Do you know what they are? They are red-blooded human beings with families, with obligations. Some of them are losing their credit rating right now because they cannot pay their bills. They, each one, count.

When people sometimes ask me how I would sum up our democracy and the Constitution of the United States—which is sacred to me—I always say the Constitution of the United States says one thing. Well, it does not say it, but it means one thing and, that is, each one of us counts. Our criminal justice system, our whole legal system, all of our freedoms in the Constitution say each one of us counts, and each one of these 250,000 people who are suffering count. I know how nice it is to go into a coffee shop. "It has not hurt me any." "I have not lost a thing." "It looks to me like we can probably do without those 250,000 from now on." You let this go on another 2 weeks and see what they are saying in the coffee shops.

So, Mr. President, these are human beings, and they are depending on Congress to do the right thing, to govern and not abuse their power. What is the cost of this? Why are the American people not up in arms about this? They say \$45 million a day. I do not know who computed that, but add \$12 million to that as of Sunday night. The 10-percent airline costs—do you want to take a guess what revenues that produces to the U.S. Government every year? Between \$4 and \$5 billion. We are losing \$12 million a day. Add that to the \$45 million, and then you take the loss of revenues of the communities who are dependent on Government, national parks, and so on. You are going to be at \$100 million a day, while we continue to negotiate and bargain and bicker about sums much, much smaller than that. It is the height of irresponsibility to hold this country hostage in order to get your way. It is an outrageous abuse of power. I do not mind saying, in a partisan way, that I believe a lot of people are going to pay for this come next November.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOMENICI. What is the situation in the Senate now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair indicates to the Senator that we are acting on a unanimous-consent request that the Senate go into recess subject to the call of the Chair immediately after the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas, and those have just finished.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity this morning to speak because I had to be elsewhere, which you might suspect.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call for 5 minutes after which I be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes and then the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can ask for a quorum call but cannot predetermine what takes place after that. The Senator can ask unanimous consent to speak or put in a quorum call and then state that request, and the Chair would consider that.

Mr. DOMENICI. The quorum call needs to run before I make the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. If the Senator will withhold for a moment, is the Senator prepared to proceed now?

Mr. DOMENICI. I need that 5 minutes that I was seeking.

Mr. SARBANES. Senator NUNN would also seek 10 minutes. Why do we not take a quorum call and then see if we can work that out.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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. THOMAS. 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. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SARBANES. Reserving the right to object. Could we have 3 minutes on this side, as well? We have been doing an equilibrium thing here all day.

I amend the request to ask unanimous consent that this side of the aisle have 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

#### THE NEED FOR A LIMITED CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have been in the chair listening for some time, and I wanted to make a couple of observations. First of all, I agree thoroughly with Senator DOLE and the

Members of this body in seeking to have a resolution which would put the Government back in place. It seems to me that that is what we should do. We ought to have a limited CR in which there is time to proceed with what I hope are useful negotiations that are going on. We need to put this thing behind us and get on with resolving the problems.

There are, however, I think, a couple of other things that we also ought to be able to expect. One is that the White House and the President should deliver what they said they would. We did this on November 19, I believe. We had an agreement that we would have a CR, that during that time there would be a balanced budget based on CBO numbers, over 7 years. It did not happen. That did not happen. Then we had an opportunity—the White House did—to pass appropriations bills, to put almost all those back to work who are now furloughed. They did not do that. He vetoed it.

Mr. President, there is another difficulty that we have had in Wyoming. It has to do with Yellowstone Park. There was an article in the paper this morning about it. Our Governor sought to negotiate with the Secretary of the Interior so that the State would take responsibility for part of Yellowstone Park. There was no real effort on the part of the Secretary to do that. Promise to return calls, promise to do something to consider a proposition by the State, did not do that. So not only are the employees of the National Park Service in this case not working, but neither are the concessionaires, neither are those who had contracted to do work, because the Department of Interior did not, frankly, make the real effort to do anything about that. So there has to be some responsibility assigned there in terms of doing what we said we would do.

Second, Mr. President, it seems to me that those who are doing the negotiating, if they really wanted to find a solution, if there was a real, honest-to-goodness effort on the part of the parties to find a solution, they could do that. It is time to do that.

Frankly, I suggest that the three principles sit down, the President, the majority leader, and the Speaker of the House—eliminate all the observers, eliminate the staff—and come to some agreement, come to the snubbing post on what we ought to do. There is a lot of leeway within this outline, and we can do that. Mr. President, that is our job.

Our job is to find solutions. That is what we are here for. That is why we are the trustees for the American people. Our job is to keep the Government functioning in as effective way as we know how. Our job is to make decisions and to move forward. We have great opportunities to do that, great opportunities in this place to do that. There are opportunities in the White House.

There is not much point in assigning blame, but there is plenty to go

around. We ought to come to the snubbing post and make some decisions. I yield the floor.

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. DOMENICI. 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. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, I be recognized to speak for not more than 10 minutes, Senator NUNN be recognized thereafter for up to 15 minutes, and following those remarks, I ask that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

#### THE CURRENT SITUATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, there has been a rather lengthy discussion this morning about the continuing resolution and the status of our public employees. I very much wanted to be here this morning to talk about it, but obviously I had some other things I had to do as we seek to get a balanced budget.

I thought I might take just a few minutes and talk about the fact that the situation that we are in today is the result of both the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States having certain rights and certain responsibilities. In a sense, it is a two-way street, not a one-way street like everybody has been talking about, including the President, who used the words "cynical strategy" to talk about the Republican Congress, albeit he chose to say it was the Republican House rather than both of us. "Cynical strategy" seemed to indicate that the entire blame for where we are today should be borne by the U.S. House Republicans, or a combination of the House Republicans and the Senate Republicans.

Mr. President, and fellow Americans, that is not true. Let me state what Republicans have done and what I perceive that the President has not done that put us in this situation that we are in today. Before I begin that, I would like very much to state once again that I hope we can resolve the issue of Federal employees who have not been paid and who have been relying upon their paychecks while they work without pay or relying upon them because we promise to pay them. I think we ought to solve that issue and solve it quickly. They are not responsible for the problem.

Having said that, Republicans in both Houses produced a balanced budget using real numbers and using the Congressional Budget Office estimates. We already did that. The President of the United States, in his capacity as the Chief Executive, chose to veto that.