budget by 1984. So 1984 came around and the deficit was up to almost $200 billion. It was $58 billion his first year as President, and after we passed everything he asked for, the deficit in 1984 was not balanced, it was $200 billion out of balance.

Then we went to Gramm-Rudman. Gramm-Rudman was going to balance the budget in 3 or 4 years. And the rest of the story is painfully known to everybody in America. The budget deficit soared once again.

Then we had that fiasco at Andrews Air Force Base. We were going to balance the budget by 1993. What happened? The budget was headed for almost $300 billion in deficit.

Forgo the tax cut, Mr. President, and take two-tenths of a percent off the Consumer Price Index, and we will be 90 percent of the way home toward a balanced budget. We will not have to tell the nursing home patients of this country that their children are going to have to start picking up the tab for their care in the nursing home. You do not have to tell the elderly when they go to bed at night they might be destitute the next morning because of a catastrophic illness.

Mr. President, I came here to vent my frustration and, hopefully, make a little sense about what is going on and what is not going on. What is not going on is the people's business. I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, might I inquire of the Chair if we are in morning business or if we are on the Defense authorization bill at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are on the Defense authorization bill.

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, although it could be properly conducted on the authorization bill, under the Pastore rule I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized as if in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes. And it will probably be considerably less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBB. Thank you, Mr. President.

IMPASSE OVER BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I just want to address the question that is bothering just about everyone who serves in Congress today and most of the people who live in this area and many of the rest of the people around the country. And that question has to do with the current impasse over the budget negotiations and the shutdown of our Federal Government.

Mr. President, I understand the deep feelings and convictions held on both sides of this argument. It goes to some very fundamental choices that are important to this Government today and in the future.

I think it is very unlikely, given the deep-seated convictions that are involved on both sides of the question, that the budget impasse will be resolved in the near term. Indeed, if both sides were to agree today on how we could solve the budget problem—and I'm not simply talking about a continuing resolution, but the budget problem—we could not craft, draft, pass, and send to the President a responsible compromise budget in the time remaining before Christmas and the holiday period. I say this with the understanding that we are already in the first day of the Jewish holiday of Hanukkah as I speak.

Mr. President, while I have never been an advocate for tax cuts before we balance our budget, I have consistently supported a balanced budget. I have consistently supported a 7-year balanced budget. I have consistently supported using Congressional Budget Office figures. And, indeed, both sides have come to an essential agreement on these parameters for any compromise.

But, in light of the difficulty in forging an overall budget agreement, I suggest and appeal to the leaders on both sides of the Capitol to do what they can today to extend the continuing resolution that will allow the processes of Government to continue. This partial shutdown is simply irresponsible and, frankly, one that none of us can adequately explain to anyone who is affected by it.

Admittedly, I represent a State that has a disproportionate number of those most directly affected, but the pervasive effect of the partial shutdown goes far beyond the people who are actually the professionals of Government and who make Government run. It goes to the local economies in which these individuals live. It goes to the confidence of the international and national financial markets.

Indeed, with respect to the first shutdown, the original projections were very significant in terms of the dollars that were directly lost. We had some 800,000 Federal employees sent home and then ultimately paid for the time they were sent home. And we had a complete loss of confidence in our Federal Government for failing to do what we have been sent here to do.

As I have said, the differences between the two sides are clearly very difficult to reconcile. And, indeed, it is entirely possible that the question of whether or not we have block grants or entitlements may not be resolved until after the next general election when we will elect a President of the United States and all of the Members of the House of Representatives and a third of the Members of this body—because that question is fundamental to our system of values.

But nothing for either side will be accomplished by continuing the partial shutdown of the Federal Government. While it is only within the power of this body to end it, there has been resistance to passing a continuing resolution that does not affect, in part, the arguments that are embraced as part of the larger budget debate that is taking place.

But, Mr. President, both sides have made their points on the larger issues of balancing our budget. Now is the time to approve a continuing resolution that would allow our Government to function and not drain taxpayer resources and public confidence. Then the larger questions, where the views are so deeply held and the rhetoric to date has been so irreconcilable, can be addressed in due course.

So, Mr. President, to the leaders of Congress and the President, I say publicly, as I have done privately, continue to work on the great issues that are the subject of the debate that we are engaged in today, but also give the Government an opportunity to move forward at this time by allowing Congress to pass and the President to sign an extension of the continuing resolution. We can then continue to see whether or not we can resolve the larger questions.

I will close by thanking the Chair and thanking other Members who have been very patient while I have made this particular plea. The plight of many of those directly affected and many others indirectly affected at this time of year is serious, one that should not and, as far as I am concerned, cannot be ignored.

With that, I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

(The remarks of Mr. NICKLES pertaining to the introduction of S. 1484 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

THE BUDGET

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I see my friend and colleague from Arkansas is on the Senate floor and I heard part of his comments in regard to the budget impasse. I say as a person who has been in on many of these negotiations, I have been very frustrated that the administration has not kept its commitment to come up with a balanced budget in 7 years using honest economics. We have had 4 weeks since passage of the continuing resolution. That was 4 weeks of time almost totally wasted, and we have not had a fruitful or real productive effort by the administration. Their last budget submission did not use Congressional Budget Office economics which, because they have been revised, include $135 billion of savings, enabling it to be easier to balance the budget.

They did come up with a back door Gramm-Rudman to raise taxes if you

do not meet the deficit targets. That is not what we have done in the past. In the past if you did not meet the deficit targets we had an automatic sequester, or across the board cut, of spending. This administration did the opposite. They say if you do not meet the deficit targets—and they did not give us the specific language—but they said if you do not meet deficit reduction targets we will have tax increases or postpone tax reductions. In other words, taxpayers, you come out short if we are incorrect. If our spending exceeds our limits or if the deficit continues higher, instead of cutting off the money coming out of Washington, DC, we will take more money from taxpayers. Taxpayers beware—that is a bad deal.

I hope the administration will step back and say, ''Wait a minute we committed to do this. We will do what we say.'' I tell my friend from Arkansas that I think it is in President Clinton's interest to do it. Some say we have to have Republican winners or Democrat winners. We should not be doing that. Mr. President, we should be doing what is right for this country: Balance the budget. Can we balance the budget? Yes. Can we balance the budget and give modest tax relief? Yes. Have we said it is negotiable? Yes, but we need to negotiate. You cannot negotiate apples and oranges. This administration has yet to put down a real budget so we can compare figures.

They have engaged in a lot of demagoguery. It was very frustrating to me to hear the President of the United States on his radio program a week ago Saturday say, ''I cannot support that budget because it devastates Medicare, devastates Medicare. Unacceptable cuts in Medicare.'' The facts are we are spending $178 billion in Medicare today. The facts are in the year 2002 we will spend $293 billion in Medicare. That is not a cut. That is an increase of over 50 percent.

Mrs. Clinton when testifying before Congress in the summer of 1993 said, ''We want to not cut Medicare. We want to reduce the rate of growth in Medicare to 6 percent or 7 percent.'' That is not a cut. It is reducing the rate of growth to twice the rate of inflation. Mr. President, under our proposal Medicare grows by over 7 percent per year—more than what Mrs. Clinton called for 2½ years ago. Yet this President and many in Congress have tried to say play political Mediscare and see how many senior citizens they can scare into believing we have a bad budget and score political points instead of doing what needs to be done.

I was on the conference to help write the Medicare provisions and I think those provisions make sense. They offer senior citizens options and choices and medical savings accounts. They keep the premium at 31.5 percent for part B beneficiaries. To me that makes sense. Originally it was at 50 percent.

Some people believe it is better to score political points. Maybe they have been successful in scoring points, but certainly they have not been successful in doing what is right. What is right is balancing the budget and being fair and being honest. This administration has not been honest. That probably bothers me more than anything.

It bothers me when you have an administration that says ''Yes, we signed a continuing resolution''—it became law—''that says we will balance the budget in 7 years using updated Congressional Budget Office numbers,'' and they have not done so. Not in their first budget, their second budget, their third budget after the continuing resolution was signed, and last Friday on the fourth budget. They did not do it then, either. To me, that bothers me as much as anything else.

I would like to say we have an honest administration. I would like to say they are dealing in good faith, but that has not been the case. That has not been the case. It should be. We should have the President of the United States, when he signs something, does it. If he says he will submit a balanced budget in 7 years, he should do it. We did not use hocus-pocus numbers. We used revised Congressional Budget Office numbers, and they have yet to do it. To me that is very, very unfortunate.

Mr. President, I regret that the President of the United States vetoed the Interior bill. I regret that he vetoed the Department of Veterans and HUD and other agencies bills and the Commerce, State, Justice bill. That means there are hundreds of thousands of people that are furloughed. I will not say they are out of work. They may not be working today but most everyone assumes they will be paid. The President should have, in my opinion, signed those bills, and should be contacting the majority leader of the Senate, Senator DOLE, and the Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, and saying, ''Let's work out a deal and balance the budget.''

The numbers are not that far apart. I tell my colleagues under our proposal we were saying, according to Congressional Budget Office figures, our proposal would spend about $12 trillion in the next 7 years. The President's proposal in his June budget said they would spend about $12.8 trillion over the next 7 years. Since then, we have come up and said we are willing to spend a little more, and went to $12.1 trillion.

The President has never given us their outlay figures for the next 7 years. I asked for that weeks ago. They said they had a budget but they never told us, ''Here is how much money we want to spend in Medicare the next 7 years.'' They never said, ''Here is what we want to spend in Medicaid for the next 7 years.'' They never said, ''Here is what we want to spend for defense and other categories.'' They worked in broad categories and never gave us specifics on a year-by-year basis. So we have to say, where are their figures? They did not give them to us. How are we supposed to negotiate with them? We have figures. We can tell you what dollar amount we are going to spend in every single category in the Government for the next 7 years. How can we negotiate with an administration that will not give us the same thing?

That maybe voices a little of the frustration that I have working with this administration. I hope they will change. I hope they will get on the phone. I hope President Clinton will contact the congressional leaders and say: Let us work it out. Let us balance the budget. Let us do it and let us do it now, because it is the right thing to do. It should be done. It is irresponsible not to do it.

We have a chance to make history. We have a chance to do what is right. We have a chance to balance the budget. We have a chance to stop this process of $200 billion deficits forever, and that is what President Clinton's budget is. His June budget had $200 billion deficits forever, according to the Congressional Budget Office. That is not acceptable. That is totally not acceptable.

So, I think it is awfully important for us not to continue this kind of irresponsibility, in my opinion, by the administration. It cannot continue. We need to change it. I hope the President will contact the leaders and say: Let us sit down, let us talk, let us use real numbers, let us use the same numbers, let us work out our differences and come up with a package that will benefit all Americans—not really be a benefit for the Republicans or Democrats but be a real benefit for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, in a moment I want to make a few remarks about the defense bill. Before the Senator from Oklahoma, my good friend, Senator NICKLES, leaves the floor, I would like to pose these questions.

First, why is it that we have to shut the Government down in order to continue negotiating? Second, who do you think benefits from that?

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, I will say, the President had the opportunity today to sign three bills—there are six bills that are still outstanding. In my opinion five of those six bills could be signed by tomorrow. The only bill that is left outstanding is the Labor-HHS bill, which is not being held up by Republicans; it is being held up by Senate Democrats. I think that is very unfortunate.

Mr. BUMPERS. But, Mr. President, would the Senator not agree that, under the Constitution, if the President does not like a bill he not only has the right, but the solemn duty, to veto it? And Congress has the right and the solemn duty to try to override it.

Yet, while we have operated that way for 206 years, all of a sudden we have a new deal, that if you do not have the votes to override a veto, you shut the Government down, and, in addition to that, send 250,000 people home this morning, saying do not come to work but we will pay you for it anyway. Who benefits from that?

Mr. MACK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NICKLES. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from Florida in a moment. The President of the United States is the one who sent most of these individuals home because of his vetoes today and tomorrow. Those bills affected hundreds of thousands of people. The President had the right; he could veto the bill. But the President is the one who sent those individuals home. If he were to sign those bills, my colleague, I am sure, would concur, there would be no furloughs. Those employees would work. He had that option. He chose to veto bills. So he is directly responsible for sending those hundreds of thousands of people home today.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, if I may say so, I have only been here 21 years; not as long as the Senator from North Carolina who I see here on the floor, but pretty near. I have never—I have never—witnessed anything like this and hope to goodness I never witness it again, where, instead of passing a continuing resolution to allow people to operate at even a severely constrained level, even much less than they got last year, we shut down the Government instead. Actually, if I were the President I would be a little ambivalent about this, because, if we continue operating on a continuing resolution, we might get a balanced budget faster because a lot of these people are operating on a severely constrained budget.

But my point is this. We have never—we have never—taken the option of shutting down the Government simply because we disagree with the President. It seems to me we might wind up having to have a constitutional amendment one of these days to say that is absolutely prohibited. Congress would be solemnly bound to pass a continuing resolution or something.

I must tell you, I am at an absolute, abject, total loss as to how anybody can possibly believe that the country's business is being well served by shutting the Government down. I do not care how much you disagree with the President.

Mr. NICKLES. If the Senator will yield, I hope you will contact the President and tell him to sign those bills, and those individuals would go to work.

Mr. BUMPERS. Even if I did, he would not because he disagrees with them. And that is his prerogative as President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oklahoma and I, if we sat down and talked about this for a couple of weeks, we might work something out even though we have very serious disagreements. I know the Senator was euphoric, and I was depressed, in November 1994 when the American people took away the long, long, 40-year Democratic majority in the House and, I guess, about a 10-year majority in the Senate. They were voting for a whole host of reasons. Some of them were mad about gays in the military. Some of them were mad because we had not passed a constitutional amendment on prayer in school. Maybe some of them wanted a flag desecration amendment to the Constitution, or term limits. Maybe some of them missed a Social Security check that month. I do not know. I do not think there was one single thing, one single thread that ran through the election of 1994 that caused people to vote the way they did.

But I will tell you one thing. They did not vote for chaos, and that is all they have had.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the conference report.

Mr. BUMPERS. On the defense authorization bill, I was very pleased to listen last week to a man whom I believe is probably the most respected man in the United States on defense issues. He and I have had very serious disagreements, particularly about the size of defense spending. But I have never really questioned his motives, his intellect, or his understanding of the defense issues. Yet he stood on the floor last Friday and said he fully intended to vote against this defense authorization bill. That was SAM NUNN, the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

He gave a lot of reasons, not the least of which was this so-called national missile defense system.

Somehow or other, the people in this body simply cannot give up on the Soviet Union. Our defense policies and our State Department policies for as long as the memory of man runneth not, has been keyed to that terrible evil empire of the Soviet Union. We have spent tens and hundreds of billions—trillions, really, because we were so frightened of the military might of the Soviet Union.

Interestingly, 2 weeks ago we learned that a lot of our defense spending and a lot of our policies were based on misinformation given to us by spies for the Soviet Union who were feeding us disinformation about how powerful the Soviet Union was, and it played right into the hands of the defense industries and the hawks of this country, and we spent trillions of dollars. That is one of the reasons we are in the pickle we are in with a $5 trillion debt we are trying to do something about.

Now we come back, because we still cannot give up on that anti-Soviet mentality, and we say we want a national ballistic missile defense system in place by the year 2003 that will protect all 50 States. There is not any doubt, and neither the chairman nor the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee would refute, that that is going to require multiple antiballistic missile sites.

And when you start talking about multiple sites, you are talking about a direct abrogation of the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, one of the very few treaties we still have in existence with the Soviet Union, now Russia. It says that neither country will deploy a strategic antiballistic missile system at more than one site in its own territory.

I engaged Senator NUNN in a colloquy on this subject Friday afternoon, and asked him if this is not a legislative abrogation of the Antiballistic Missile Treaty. Senator NUNN very wisely answered in language that all lawyers understand. He said it constitutes an anticipatory breach. What that means is, once we deploy more than one site, we have in fact abrogated the treaty.

Colleagues, let me ask you a question. How would we react if the Russians were to announce today, as we sit here debating this bill, that they are going to deploy a national missile defense system that will have many sites? I promise you that all 100 Senators would be on the floor squealing like a pig under a gate. And you would hear, ''There they go again. You cannot trust them.'' Yet, here we cavalierly get ready to spend billions on a national missile defense system which will abrogate a treaty that is in the interest of the Russians, the United States, and all the people of the world.

I ask you this: To add to the question, what if the Russians were doing this, what would our response be? It would be to start deploying one as quickly as we could. And you tell me when the ABM Treaty is gone and the Russians and the United States both have national missile defense systems, who do you think is better off? I can tell you nobody is better off, and the world becomes again a very dangerous place living with a hair trigger.

The Russians are right now in the process of complying with START I. And they are complying with it by dismantling nuclear weapons. They, like the United States, are prepared to consider the ratification of START II which will cut nuclear weapons still further. Do you think if we go ahead with this national missile defense system the Russians are going to ratify START II? Of course, they are not. If we are going to deploy a system that will shoot down their missiles, they are not going to keep dismantling missiles. They are not stupid. They know exactly what is going on.

So I am going to vote against this bill because it costs too much money, because the national missile defense plan envisioned in it is dangerous in the extreme, and because we are putting $493 million more into the B–2 program. And I defy anybody in the U.S.