

say: We are ready to come to work. We will volunteer. There are things that have to be done. Passports have to be issued; social welfare claims have to be heard; and so on. It is the same throughout this country.

Remember these same Government employees who died for this country in Oklahoma, these same Government employees who make the greatest democracy on Earth operate with a quarter of a billion people. They should not become pawns in a budget chess match.

#### THE BIPARTISAN BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I applaud the bipartisan budget agreement that was reached yesterday between President Clinton and the congressional leaders in both parties because it ends the longest Government shutdown in our history, and it sets the stage for bipartisan negotiations to achieve a balanced budget by 2002, something that in the debate most people forget. The vast majority of Republicans and Democrats want that balanced budget.

So it is truly a bipartisan compromise in the best sense of both of those words. It puts away partisan politics. It uses common sense to reach shared values. It commits Congress and the President to the worthy goal of a balanced budget in 7 years while also committing us to achieve a balance with compassion—not just “hard, cold, numbers crunching,” as the expression goes. We are past, I hope, the political posturing and the finger pointing.

Thanks to those Government employees who will keep the Government working during the time of the negotiations in the coming weeks as the Congress and the President build on this temporary agreement. It is not going to be easy. But we have to succeed.

I suggest three principles of common sense and reason to make these negotiations work.

First, scale back the \$245 billion in tax cuts in the Republican budget plan. I learned many years ago that the best way to get out of a hole is to stop digging. Past Presidents and Congresses have spent our country into a \$5 trillion debt. With this kind of huge debt we cannot afford \$245 billion more in tax cuts. We ought to be spending that money to get us out of debt—not create more debt.

Second, plow back the savings from scaled-back tax cuts that will lower the reductions in Medicare and Medicaid. Keep our commitment to the current generation of Medicare recipients, and preserve the system for future generations. Also keep the Medicaid safety net in place for our most needy citizens. If we scale back those tax cuts, we can avoid unnecessary cuts in Medicare and Medicaid.

Third, invest in our future; provide adequate funding for education and nutrition programs for our children. It only makes sense that we give the next

generation every chance to succeed in today's demanding economy, an economy far more demanding than when I was a child. We also have to maintain our environmental protection to preserve our natural resources for future generations.

If we use these three principles, I believe Democrats and Republicans can resolve our differences, and make our Government work to achieve a fair balanced budget.

We have to understand, Mr. President, that all of us are in this together, and that each one of us is going to have to cast votes that will be unpopular. It will be unpopular for Democrats or unpopular for Republicans. We have to take steps that may be unpopular at the moment but that are for the good of the future.

We are not going to pass a Gingrich budget. We are not going to pass a Dole budget, or a Daschle budget, or a Clinton budget, or a Leahy budget. But we can pass parts of each that will make a better budget for this country. But think of the long-term gains. Think about what we want in the future. Think of our children. My children are going to live most of their lives in the next century. That is probably true of many of them. Let us think of them and have a policy for our country.

We have been guided by policy through pollsters. Instead, let us be guided by legislation through leadership. It would be a refreshing change in this country. Just ignore the polls of the day.

It seems that we come in here and somebody sneezes or gives a speech, and there is a poll of the hour. There is a poll that says the President is ahead at this moment, the Congress is behind; 3 hours later the Congress is ahead and the President will be behind, and we seem to try to adjust to that.

I do not think the American people are impressed by that. I think the American people would be impressed if the polls said what we are doing is what we think is best in moving forward. If we do that, we are going to have the kind of budget we want.

I was 1 of 11 who voted against Reaganomics back in the 1980's. With the deficits and the huge increase in our national debt built up during that time, we are now spending \$1 billion a weekday in interest, \$1 billion a weekday in interest on what we did then. I remember the polls were 10 to 1 against my vote. But I think it is like some of the votes on Vietnam at one time; a lot of people wish they could go back and do it over again.

We have to find a way. I voted for the plan of the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD]. I voted for a lot of things in that plan that are going to be unpopular back in Vermont, but they bring us to a balanced budget.

Let us assume that we all want that balanced budget, and we do. But we also have to invest in our future. We also have to make sure our education opportunities are there for our chil-

dren. We have to make sure we do those things that create jobs, that allow us to lower the enormous trade deficit.

The enormous trade deficit in this country is hurting us more than our deficit in our Federal budget because it is owed to people outside of this country exclusively, and the more that deficit builds up the more our jobs flee the United States and go to the Pacific basin and go to Europe and go to other parts of the world.

Let us improve our ability to compete with the rest of the world in our education, in our financing, and all these other things so that we create the jobs here and we start exporting far more and the money comes back into this country. That would not only lower our trade deficit but it would, more importantly, put hundreds of thousands, millions of Americans back to work in good, productive jobs. Bring those jobs back into the United States. Use the productivity and the genius of our Nation but make sure our investment is in keeping that genius and that productivity in education, in health and nutrition.

Mr. President, I think now is the time for us to step back, applaud the good motives of people in both parties and of the President, but let us close the door on the pollsters setting policy. Let us use our own leadership to pass legislation that is good for this country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will suspend just one moment, I failed to read the previous order.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 10 minutes each.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi.

#### CONDITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS FROM NOVEMBER 20 OR 21 UNTIL NOVEMBER 27 OR 28, 1995

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, at the request of the majority leader and with the understanding that it has been cleared on both sides of the aisle, I send the adjournment resolution to the desk and ask that it be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) providing for a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate on Monday, November 20,

1995, until Monday, November 27, 1995, and a conditional adjournment of the House on the legislative day of Monday, November 20, 1995 or Tuesday, November 21 until Tuesday November 28, 1995.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be considered and agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 32) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 32

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Monday, November 20, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until a time to be determined by the Majority Leader on Monday, November 27, 1995, or until one hour after the House has voted on H.J. Res. 122, unless the House agrees to the Senate amendment.

SEC. 2. The two houses shall convene at 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House of Representatives adjourns on the legislative day of Monday, November 20, 1995, or the legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1995, it stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 28, 1995, or until 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 3. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the resolution provides that the Senate adjourn today until Monday, November 27 or 1 hour after the House votes, if they amend or defeat the continuing resolution that the Senate passed last night.

#### DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is very reassuring to this Senator to see the Congress work out this continuing resolution as it has done over this past weekend providing for the continued funding of the departments of the Government that had not been funded through the passage of regular appropriations bills.

There has been a great deal of confusion over what the issues were and why the continuing resolution was needed. I think everyone in the Senate and certainly those who worked to put together the resolution which was adopted by the Senate fully understand it all, but the American people, who do not have access to the information

that is available on a daily basis here, had to be confused by the procedures and what the issues were.

One of the issues that can also be dealt with today is whether or not the bill that has been passed by Congress to fund the Department of Defense for the next fiscal year can be signed by the President so that not only can people who work for the Department of Defense be secure in the knowledge that they are going to be paid under the terms of not only employment arrangements but contracts, independent contractors, defense contractors, and the rest, but that we will be keeping a commitment to the military so that they can make plans, they can use the funds that are coming to them under the regular fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill in a thoughtful way that does not actually end up costing money.

What worries me is that the President is sending signals that he may veto this bill because he thinks it provides too much money for defense, more than he had requested in his budget submission. I will tell you a lot of things have changed in the world since the President submitted his budget to the Congress. For example, we are seeing negotiated right now among different factions in the former Yugoslavia an arrangement which the President says may require additional United States forces, activities under our NATO alliance on the part of United States defense forces that will require more money than had been anticipated when this budget was submitted.

One of the provisions in the Defense appropriations bill which our committee approved was a contingency appropriation of \$643 million which is made available to the administration, to the Commander in Chief for use by the Department of Defense for contingency operations that had not been anticipated when that budget had been submitted. If this bill is not signed, there will be prolonged negotiations among the committees of the Congress with jurisdiction over defense matters. We do not know what the next bill will provide. We do not know how much will be provided or denied for contingency operations. There is a great deal of controversy right now, and the President surely knows this, in the Congress over whether we ought to support and fund and provide the resources for a massive ground force in the former Yugoslavia as a part of any peacekeeping operation.

So I am suggesting that is an issue which can be certainly dealt with in a way that ought to be pleasing to the administration and favorable to the administration's interests, if this Defense appropriations bill is signed.

The President has stated in numerous public addresses his commitment to a strong national defense. As a matter of fact, in his second State of the Union Address on January 25, 1994, President Clinton said:

The budget I send to Congress draws the line against further defense cuts. It protects

the readiness and quality of our forces. Ultimately, the best strategy is to do just that. I hope Congress without regard to party will support that position.

I suggest that this Defense appropriations bill does support that position. There are some in Congress and in the administration who are going to argue that the President should veto the bill because it exceeds his budget request, but there are things that have come to light in terms of threats against the security of our country, particularly the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the capabilities that some countries have now of sending such weapons over long distances with new missile technologies that are beginning to develop around the world. These are in countries that are historically not our most serious security threats, but have become so or are capable of becoming so through these emerging technologies and the ability to acquire technologies from countries willing to sell these weapons and sell these new technologies.

So, provided in this Defense appropriations bill are some additional funds to help meet these new threats, and it seems to me that this is a matter of grave national concern. I hope that the President will sign the bill, not only because it takes the Department of Defense out from under the continuing resolution which we just adopted last night, but because it goes a long way toward meeting the challenge that the President himself laid before the Congress in his last State of the Union Address and the address in 1994.

I hope we can resolve these issues as they develop. There are other bills that are contentious as well. The Senator from Vermont mentioned a couple of them. The distinguished leader mentioned the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, which has not yet been brought to the floor of the Senate because the Democrats have been objecting and insisting on debating at length the motion to proceed to consider the bill. We hope that bill can be passed and the President will sign it as well.

Mr. President, seeing no other Senator seeking recognition, 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. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COCHRAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I understand we are in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.