

Had that been signed, obviously we would not be in this mess.

I am not standing here saying the President has no prerogative to veto that. He vetoed it. Nonetheless, we had already passed many of the appropriations bills, and the President got on television yesterday and enumerated a whole series of things that were situations where either people are suffering because we have not passed certain appropriations bills, or the Government cannot do certain things like issue visas, so many foreigners cannot get in the country. And the President is critical of the Congress—in particular, the Republicans in the House—because he says they are to blame for this.

Let me remind the American people this is a two-way street. Had the President of the United States signed three bills which he vetoed—Commerce, State, Justice; Interior appropriations; VA-HUD appropriations—many of the long list and litany of things that have gone wrong in America would not have gone wrong. They would have been taken care of by these bills.

Now, there are some who took to the floor this morning and said the President has this absolute right to veto but Congress has no rights; they must respond and either give him what he wants or suffer the consequences of partial closure of Government. Not so. No student of our Constitution is going to tell you that. When he vetoes them, he bears some responsibility for vetoing them. We certainly have a responsibility to say, well, if he vetoed them, try something else and see if we can get through this.

I understand that is being tried and some targeted appropriations are being worked on. I hope it works. I hope the President understands the next time we send him something that is targeted that he does not have the absolute right to veto them and then claim it is our responsibility because the Government is closed. We have a right to stand up and say, "Mr. President, these are tough times. We do not agree on a lot of things, but you do not have the absolute immunity to veto bills and blame us because the Government is closed."

You might have to look at the next Interior bill. Mr. President, there was not very much money involved in that Interior bill. Frankly, you got some bad advice on the Interior bill, yet you get up and talk about cynicism when most of those U.S. monuments, the museums, would have all been opened if you had signed that bill. You look at your list, Mr. President, of why you vetoed it—pretty flimsy stuff. If you have some responsibility in this, then the public ought to look at why you vetoed them and what were your reasons.

Let me also suggest that the President used some very, very strained—strained—words when he spoke of cynical strategy. I am working in good faith with this President to try to get a balanced budget, but I believe he and his entire administration have been en-

gaged in a cynical strategy since June of this year when they produced a budget allegedly in balance that did not use the Congressional Budget Office numbers and economics but used their own, concocted by their own economists, by their own OMB personnel, and have never to this day produced a balanced budget using the Congressional Budget Office numbers. That is a strategy. It is a beautiful strategy. Since the word "cynical" is battered around, it is a cynical strategy because never to this day—while blaming Republicans for all kinds of things—never to this day has the President of the United States had to put a balanced budget on the table. We are negotiating with him and he still has never put one on. He has not put it on in the negotiations. And I am breaching nothing there, everybody understands he has not. He did not when we asked him to, and he signed a continuing resolution that said we would be bound by the Congressional Budget Office economics and numbers, and the conclusion on that is that means the final agreement will be judged that way, not that I have to produce one. Is that not interesting?

So, to this date, no balanced budget in 7 years using the CBO numbers has been produced by this White House, by this President, by his Cabinet. And they are now engaged in blaming this whole episode on Republicans.

At least it is a two-way street from here to Pennsylvania Avenue, and when Presidents veto bills that fund Government, they take a bit of the responsibility of what will happen if Congress chooses not to fund some of those. After all, I do not advocate this, but the truth of the matter is the Constitution is eminently clear. Congress has the purse strings of the U.S. Government. We decide how to spend the taxpayers' money, and that is not a shared responsibility, I regret to say. That is a singular responsibility, and we have been choosing not to fund what the President wants.

We are also trying to get a balanced budget, which the President either does not want or wants something different on. These are difficult political and philosophical times. What is at stake is big. For some of us what is at stake is whether future generations have to pay for our bills or whether we will pay for them ourselves.

So, whenever we have stories about things going wrong because Government is closed, none of us like that. But the big reason for all this, it all starts because Republicans have come to the conclusion that we want to live up to our commitment to use real numbers, no phony numbers, use Congressional Budget Office numbers and produce significant change in Government so as to produce a balanced budget.

So I wish I could have done this earlier in the day, but I think I have made my case. I think I have made my case that the reason we are in this mess is

not just because Republicans have not sent bills to the President to fund Government; the President bears some of the blame, and I have elaborated that as best I could here today. It is a two-way street, and bantering around words like cynicism, and a cynical strategy, deserves a response. Or it is not too far-fetched to conclude that their strategy in the White House has been a cynical strategy of rather significant proportions.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator from Georgia yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. NUNN. I yield the 30 seconds.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I think it is important at this point to have printed in the RECORD a quote from Investor's Business Daily, November 8 of 1995.

Gingrich has said he would force the government to miss interest and principal payments for the first time ever to force Democratic Clinton's administration to agree to his seven-year deficit reductions.

And a quote from Representative SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, a quote from the Los Angeles Times of November 14:

You have a group in our conference who could not care less if the government shuts down. . . . They will be cheering.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

BUDGET IMPASSE AND CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I have made it clear in previous remarks and other public statements that I oppose shutting down portions of the Federal Government as a tactic in the budget debate. I have supported the continuing resolutions that would restore funding for full Government operations as we continue to move toward the objective of a balanced budget.

I applaud the leadership of Senator DOLE, Senator DASCHLE, and others in this body who have concluded that the current situation is artificially created, it is unnecessary and is a wasteful burden on Federal workers and on the taxpayers they serve.

Mr. President, I recall here over the last 20 years, several debates on holidays, whether we ought to add another holiday to the overall holidays the Federal Government observes. I remember people totaling up the amount of money it costs to have one holiday and projecting that over 20 years and talking about the astounding cost when you pay people for a holiday. If anyone stops and thinks about what we are doing now, I believe we are about on day No. 20—there may be a few more days in that counting the previous shutdown—we really have had 20 to 25 additional holidays this year where the taxpayers of this country are paying for people who want to work but who are not allowed to work, but they are

going to be paid. And that is, to me, a real paradox, as to how you possibly can start off a quest to save \$1.2 trillion over 7 years by declaring over 20 paid holidays for workers.

And then, it is not only the workers themselves—it is unfair to them because they want to work, they are not getting paid now, and that is a hardship—but also it is terribly unfair to literally hundreds of thousands and growing to be millions of Americans who are suffering because of this shutdown.

Mr. President, there are many examples of the harm being done by the shutdown. One example which has not drawn much attention is the fact that the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the CDC in Atlanta, GA, is virtually shut down. Today is the 50th year of operation of the Communicable Disease Center, and it is effectively closed. Except for a skeleton staff, no personnel are available to fulfill the functions of the CDC.

This is bound to have an impact on the health and safety of the American people and, indeed, citizens around the world. The workers at the CDC are the same Federal workers who pinpointed the cause of Legionnaire's disease and toxic shock syndrome. These are the same men and women who risked their lives to investigate the recent outbreak of ebola and track the course of influenza, AIDS, and TB across the Nation and indeed the world. Their job is to investigate, to define, to monitor and to prevent disease—to get out in front of emerging infectious diseases, food and waterborne diseases, respiratory infections, birth defects, lead poisoning, air pollution, radiation, and other environmental health emergencies.

The problem in this area is you do not know it is an emergency if you are not out in front of it before it is too late. We will be lucky if we get by with this shutdown and closedown of the CDC without having some serious problem and erosion in the health of the American people.

In some cases, the CDC implements control measures during a critical time when minutes and even seconds count. Rarely a week passes by without the CDC directing the Nation's attention to important new research findings on public health issues. At this point, we do not know what public health crisis will emerge in 1996. With a CDC shutdown, we do not know what might be happening right now. What we do know is that the CDC plays a critical role in watching for signs and sustaining sophisticated surveillance and monitoring communications with medical health officers in our Nation and throughout the world. We do not know the impact of the Government shutdown on the health of the U.S. citizens. We may not know it until it is too late.

Like other Federal employees, the people in CDC are deeply dedicated, hard-working persons, scientists, physicians, and public health profes-

sionals. Some even risk their lives to investigate outbreaks of unknown, sometimes even deadly diseases. These people are protecting the Nation's health and they are anxious to return to their jobs.

In addition, the CDC personnel who are not at work, who would otherwise be there, they would be providing critical funding for technical assistance to State and local programs for sexually transmitted diseases, TB, HIV, childhood immunization, environmental health, national and international chronic and infectious disease prevention, breast and cervical cancer. We all need to recognize they are not on the job.

Mr. President, diseases, viruses, bacterial infections, and cancers do not stop because of a Government furlough or a partisan political and budget debate.

CDC grants to State health agencies to fund prevention programs that are fundamental to saving lives and maintaining the health of our population are also being affected adversely. Programs in 20 States for rape prevention are in danger, and funds for staffing hotlines for public health emergencies, such as violence, STDs, and HIV, may halt operations. All of this is in great risk.

We cannot afford to wait to open the doors at the CDC. The health of the Nation and the world could be at stake.

I urge our colleagues in the House to think again about the tactics they are using. They are trying to get the budget balanced, and that is a goal that all of us should work toward. And I hope we can achieve that. But the tactics being used are totally counterproductive to the taxpayers and to the country and to the health of our citizens. We must not continue to hold hostage the health and safety of American citizens who are paying for a service that is not being rendered.

THE BUDGET DILEMMA—A TWO-WAY STREET

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, my friend from New Mexico talked about the rights of the Congress regarding the purse strings, and the rights of the President regarding the veto. And he emphasized that this is a two-way street. I agree that the budget dilemma, the budget challenge, the effort to balance the 7-year budget, is indeed a two-way street. The American people should hold all of us accountable for that.

But this continuing tactic to keep the Government closed down is not a two-way street. There are a group of people who believe—I think erroneously so—that it gives them leverage. In effect they are saying that the President should care more about the health of the American people, about the workers out there, than the Congress does. Otherwise, why is it leverage? Is it leverage for you to hold somebody hostage if both have an

equal stake in returning that innocent victim without being harmed? If it is not leverage, then why do it? If it is leverage, that means that the Congress does not have an interest in the workers and does not have an interest in the people who are being affected in this country, and indeed abroad.

Mr. President, I do not understand any logic behind the House Republicans' position. And I again am gratified that the leadership of the Senate on both sides of the aisle recognize that this is counterproductive, and recognize that the wrong people are being held hostage in this high-level game of Russian roulette.

Mr. President, one closing thought again in response to the thoughts voiced by my good friend from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI.

This effort to get the budget under control is indeed a two-way street. As I think we have set forth in the Chafee group composed of about 10 Democrats and about 10 Republicans, there is no reason the parties cannot come together. It is not easy. It is not something that can be done in an hour or two hours but over a 2-, 3-, 4- or 5-day period should be able to be done.

I do not think there is any question about the responsibility of keeping the Government closed. That is a tactical decision made by House Republicans. But all of us are involved in the effort to try to get the budget under control. It is very clear what has to be done. The administration and Democrats have to be willing to save more on entitlements, to restrain the growth of entitlements more than has thus far been indicated. Republicans have to be willing to come down some on what they are doing in terms of the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid which are too severe. That is very apparent.

It is also apparent that both the Republicans and the White House need to take another thorough look at tax cuts. It is to me almost unbelievable that we can be starting a quest to get the budget under control by declaring a very large dividend at the very beginning before we have implemented anything. That is what large tax cuts do. So I am hoping that the tax cuts will come down, and that the Republicans will agree to that.

I am hoping that those of us on the Democratic side will recognize that we have to restrain the entitlement growth. That is the heart of what has to be done. It is apparent for all of us to see. There are a lot of complexities in doing it. But we will have to make those movements.

In the final analysis, there is a right of the President to veto, and there is a right of Congress not to appropriate. There also is a right of the American people to say, "We have had enough; a plague on both your houses. We send people to Washington to be able to reach reasonable compromises to govern this Nation effectively and both political parties are failing at that task."

At some point the American people are going to come to that conclusion,