that because the Congress had completed action on only two appropriation bills for fiscal year 1996—legislative branch and military construction—he felt it would be inappropriate to provide full-year funding for Congress and its offices while most other activities of the Federal Government were being funded through a short-term continuing resolution. I am hopeful that the leadership will not send this bill to the President until Congress receives assurances that he will sign it.

For the benefit of Senators, let me briefly point out that this bill required many difficult decisions in order for the legislative branch to do its share in achieving substantial deficit reduction in fiscal year 1996. The bill appropriates $2,184,850,000 for fiscal year 1996 for legislative operations, which is a reduction of over $200 million from the 1995 level, or approximately 10 percent. The majority leader has cited the important features of the bill, which I will not repeat at this time, but, Mr. President, I do want to again thank Senator MACK, the chairman of the Legislative Branch Subcommittee, for his unfailing courtesy and to express my appreciation to him for the open and bipartisan spirit in which he has handled this important legislation throughout the year.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2492.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. I am pinch-hitting for Senator MACK of Florida, who is, right now, involved in a very important hearing on the Banking Committee. Let me indicate I will place in the RECORD at this point a summary of the funding recommendations.

As pointed out by my colleague from Washington, this is a reduction of about 8.6 percent. We believe we are setting an example for other branches. There are a number of areas where we made rather significant cuts, also terminating the OTA, for example, something that was not easy for many of my colleagues. But it is an indication we are concerned, we are sincere about a balanced budget, and we are prepared to do our share or more.

The bill includes a provision relative to the disposition of the records and property of the Office of Technology Assessment subsequent to its closure. Specifically, the agreement provides that OTA's property and records ''shall be under the administrative control of the Architect of the Capitol.''

The Office of the Senate Historian has raised a concern that this provision not interfere with the transfer of archival material of the Office of Technology Assessment to the legislative archives of the National Archives. It is my understanding that the conferees had no such intent, and that the Architect of the Capitol will only assume temporary, administrative control of the material before transferring appropriate records to the National Archives.

It is also my understanding that the Clerk of the House, after discussions with the Secretary of the Senate, has agreed that OTA's archival material shall be treated as records of the Senate and administered according to Senate Resolution 474 of the 96th Congress. This will give the Secretary of the Senate administrative jurisdiction over the archival records.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent a statement of a summary of funding recommendations be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

The total recommended is $2,184,856,000, a reduction of $205,698,700, or 8.6%, from FY95.

GAO is reduced 15% from FY95 levels; Committee is committed to another 10% in FY97 for a 25% reduction from FY95 levels over two years.

OTA is terminated; termination costs totalling $6,115,000 are provided. ($3,615,000 in FY96 funds, $2,500,000 reappropriated from FY95.)

Library of Congress granted $1,500,000 over FY95 for digital library initiative; all other Library activities, including CRS, at FY95 level.

CBO granted $1.1 million and 13 FTE's for unfunded mandates analysis.

Architect of Capitol activities in Title I reduced $16,163,000 overall (10%) from FY95 levels.

Joint Committees reduced commensurate with Senate committee cut.

New ''Office of Compliance'' created by Congressional Accountability Act funded as a joint item at $2,500,000. A permanent indefinite appropriation is recommended for settlements and awards arising from the new Accountability Act.

Total recommended Senate funding is $426,919,000, a reduction of $33,661,500. In addition, $63,544,723.12 from prior year funds is rescinded.

Committee funding is reduced 15%; Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms, and OFEP reduced 12.5%; Chaplain, Legal Counsel, and Legislative Counsel frozen at FY95 levels.

Official mail frozen at $11,000,000. (N.B. House merged official mail with office accounts.)

Statutory allowances for Senators' personal offices are not reduced.

Mr. DOLE. I also confirm the Senator from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, has, as indicated by the Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON, agreed to have hearings and a markup of an amendment that Senator SIMON would have offered to this bill.

So there are no amendments, no objections to it proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 2492) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MCCAIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call will roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for a period of up to 20 minutes as if in morning business.

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

FIVE STEPS CLINTON MUST TAKE TO PROVE HE IS SERIOUS ABOUT BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, last week we passed out of this body the reconciliation bill which will lead to a balanced budget. This is obviously a significant step on the road to guaranteeing our children a nation which can be prosperous and which is solvent. I believe most Americans understand the importance of the balanced budget. They certainly expressed it in my district, and I am sure in other States, year after year as they have gone to the polls. They understand it because in their homelife they experience the need to maintain fiscal solvency. They know that if they continue to spend every year more than they take in, it will lead to some sort of economic chaos in their own lives, and intuitively and logically they understand, therefore, that for the Federal Government to do that, not only year after year but what has amounted to generation after generation, leads inevitably to economic chaos.

So the Republican leadership in the Senate and the House has produced a budget which will give us a balanced budget by the year 2002. For the first time in years we will actually be living within our means. This is, I believe, a critical step on the path to assuring, as I said earlier, a solvent nation for our children, which is, I believe, our No. 1 responsibility as keepers of the flame of America as Members of this Senate.

The question, however, is whether or not the President will join us in this effort in a serious way. The President has repeatedly said that he wants to balance the budget. But so far his actions have certainly not matched his words. Although we have produced a serious proposal for balancing the budget, which the Congressional Budget Office has scored as being in balance, and are now trying to iron out the differences, we do not find that the President has been willing to join in substantively discussing this matter in a serious way.

Conventional wisdom holds, in fact, that the President will veto this bill and then he and the Congress will negotiate and reach some type of agreement, hopefully. But I am not so sure.

I say this because before we can negotiate, the President, despite all his nice political statements, still must prove he is truly serious with accomplishing a balanced budget. So far, he has not taken this action. He certainly has not proved it either to the Congress or to the American people.

In my view, there are five things which the President must do if he is to prove that he is serious about the issue of balancing the budget. These go beyond the rhetoric of campaign promises. I would like to go over these five items.

First, we must start using the same numbers to talk about the issue of balancing the budget. The administration began its term with a very grandiose statement back in February 1993 fresh off the election that they would use the Congressional Budget Office for the purposes of determining the fair scorekeeping of the budget process. He made this statement a number of times. But he made it most eloquently when he spoke in his initial speech to the Congress.

In taking this position when he was first elected President, he took the right position, the correct position. The Congressional Budget Office is the fair arbiter of the scoring of the budget process. However, since the Congressional Budget Office scoring process has no longer become convenient to the administration, the President has abandoned his original commitment. This is a mistake. The numbers which he sent up to us in June—which were basically a sheaf of paper and were not really a budget—represented, according to the President and to his people, a balanced budget which we would reach in 10 years. Unfortunately, those numbers used as their baseline and for their assumptions were numbers produced by his own inhouse accountants, the Office of Management and Budget.

When that budget was scored by the Congressional Budget Office, the fair arbiter of budget scoring in this body and which the President had initially said would be the fair arbiter, it turned out that their budget did not reach balance, that, in fact, it represented $200 billion deficits each year for as far as the eye could see and that there was no closure between spending and revenues.

So, the first thing the President's people have to do is be willing to agree to use numbers which are credible and which are acceptable. And I would suggest that we go back to the beginning of this Presidency and follow the counsel that he gave us at that time and use the Congressional Budget Office numbers.

In June, the President submitted a revised budget, and, as I mentioned, it alleged that it would reach balance in 10 years. Unfortunately, he only released 25 pages, and he gave us no specifics as to how he would accomplish this, even in terms of the numbers, which as I mentioned earlier, were inaccurate.

It is essential that we get details, that he—as we have as Members of the Senate and as Members of the House—produce a budget which has the details behind the numbers, which has substance, which has meat on the bones. We cannot possibly reach a budget agreement if we are simply going to work off a sheaf of paper which has no specifics.

We have put down on the table in extensive language what we as Republicans think should be done to correct some of the excesses of the Federal Government, to improve the manner in which it delivers services, to give people an opportunity to have a Medicare trust fund which will remain solvent. We need now to hear from the President as to his specifics in detail as to what he would do in the area of Medicare reform, in the area of Medicaid reform, in the area of welfare reform. Yet, we have not heard that. That is why one questions his sincerity when he talks about producing a budget that will be in balance.

Third, we need to reach an agreement as to when we should reach a balanced budget.

We, as Republicans, have put forward a budget which reaches balance in 7 years. It was not easy. It meant that we had to make some very difficult decisions. We had to agree—amongst ourselves, unfortunately, because the White House was not willing to participate—to agree to take $1 trillion of spending out of the Federal stream of spending. That did not mean we cut the size of the Federal Government. In fact, it will continue to grow by 3.3 percent annually. Medicare will continue to grow by 6.4 percent annually, and Medicaid will continue to grow by approximately 4.5 percent annually. But we did have to slow the rate of growth of those programs, and we did, in a number of programs, actually have to cut spending. For example, defense spending will go down in real terms over the next 7 years by $19 billion.

But we have to have a definable period when we are going to reach a balanced budget. The people of this country have a right to know that we are willing to step up to the issue and define the terms of the issue in benchmarks that are scorable and which we can be held accountable for. We have said we will reach a balanced budget in 7 years. We have produced a budget which accomplishes that. It is absolutely critical that the President give us a timeframe in which he is willing to put forward a budget which reaches balance with real numbers and with details. Recently, he said 7 years was something he could live with. If that is his position today, I believe he should state it. Unfortunately, sometimes his positions change. But hopefully he can stick with the 7-year commitment. If he can, that means we can reach agreement on that one critical point.

Fourth, if we are going to reach an understanding, we have to have the ability to sit down with the President and talk to him in terms that are substantive and not in simply political election-year rhetoric. If you look at what the President sent up here in June and you take those numbers and score them by CBO's accounting rather than by OMB's accounting, you find that we really were not that far apart. For example, in the area of Medicare, he wanted Medicare to grow at a rate of 7 percent. We suggested it grow at a rate of 6.4 percent. Both of those numbers were significantly less than the present 10-percent rate of growth that Medicare is experiencing. That 10-percent rate of growth we know is not sustainable. The Medicare trustees have told us that if we continue to allow Medicare to grow at that rate, it will be insolvent, there will be no trust fund for the seniors from which they can get a health care benefit.

So we have suggested proposals which will give seniors more choices, more options, which we think will strengthen the Medicare system and which will slow the rate of growth to 6.4 percent.

The President sent us up a number which when it was recalculated by CBO—granted, it came up under OMB's scoring mechanisms, but when it was calculated by CBO said we only want Medicare to grow at 7 percent. I believe that difference is not great. And yet if you listen to this administration, they talk in terms of hyperbole which would make you think that the Republican proposal on Medicare was going to slash, was going to devastate, was going to savage the rights to health care which we all recognize are absolutely essential for our seniors.

In fact, the Vice President of the United States had the temerity to come to New Hampshire just a few days ago and speak to a very self-serving audience, the AFL–CIO convention, and state time and again—in fact, I think we found the word ''extremist'' in every sentence during the period of a couple paragraphs—that our Medicare Program was slashing.

If our Medicare Program is slashing, and we are talking about a 6.4-percent rate of increase and the President is talking about a 7-percent rate of increase, which is 3 percent down from 10 percent and we are 3.5 percent down from 10 percent, what is the President's program? He would have to apply the same standards to his own. It would also be slashing. It would also be extremist.

The fact is that neither of the proposals are extremist or slashing. They are both—at least in our case—a reasonable attempt to try to strengthen the Medicare system so that seniors will have a solvent trust fund.

If the President would send up details of his proposal, maybe we could say that his proposal was also a reasonable attempt to accomplish the same goal, but at least the number he is talking about, a 7-percent rate of growth, is something that is within the ballpark,

within the range of doability and certainly within the range of what is necessary to keep the trust fund solvent.

So in substance what he sent up here in June can be discussed, and it can be worked for the purposes of resolving the matter. But when the President and the Vice President talk in such outrageous political terms and use such hyperbole, it is not constructive to the process.

So the fourth thing I think the President must do is stop running for reelection all the time and start trying to govern the country. Is that not his job for the next year and a half? There will be plenty of time to have an election next summer. Let us get about governing the country. Let us start talking some substance around here.

And that comes to my fifth point, which is leadership. If there is one obligation of the Presidency, it is to lead. Regrettably, this President has been leading like a bumper car. It is time that he gave us some definition and direction. It is time that he sent up here a budget based on numbers which everyone can agree are honest and fair, CBO numbers—a budget which has details attached to it, or if not a whole budget at least major programmatic activities that have details attached to them so that we can evaluate them.

It is time he started talking to Members of Congress as if they were colleagues working on a problem rather than opponents created by some political spinmeister that he has hired to do his polling for him. The fact is that leadership does not involve running for reelection. Leadership involves guiding this country through some very difficult times.

So the time has come, in my opinion, for the President to engage in these five areas, to show that he is serious about balancing this budget. We have put on the table serious proposals to balance this budget, to give our children a future, to make sure that this country brings under control its most serious threat to its future, which is the expansion of its Federal debt and the fact that our generation is borrowing from the next generation to finance day-to-day activity that we are benefiting from today.

If the President is serious, he has to address these five points. He has to start using numbers that we all agree are reasonable. And I suggest CBO numbers are the ones that are the best. He has to start giving us some details of what he intends to do in these major programmatic areas such as Medicare and Medicaid. He has to agree to a goal that is scorable, such as a 7-year goal to reach a balanced budget. He has to stop politicizing the issue, using the extreme language that may score well in the polling place but does nothing to move the process along.

Finally and most importantly, he has to give us some definable leadership that shows us where he feels we can reach compromise and govern rather than run for reelection.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12:45, the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 219, S. 1372, regarding an increase in the earnings test.

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

The Senator from New Jersey.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to some of the speeches that were being made this morning, and I heard speeches that decry the President's use of his opportunities for political reasons and to disagree with virtually everything that President Clinton has accomplished. I find it a strange anomaly. As Yogi Berra, the famous New Jersey philosopher said, ''It's deja vu all over again.''

I stand here listening to political speech after political speech in which the President of the United States is accused of being excessively political.

I think we ought to look at the record just for a couple of minutes. First of all, we are faced with a reconciliation bill put out by the Republican majority—and I sit on the Budget Committee, and I can tell you this—and this is no surprise—that is going to take care of lots of wealthy wage earners, income earners, big investment yields, at the expense of lots of little people, if I can use that word to describe them, those who are dependent on Medicare for the sustenance, for the maintenance of their health, those who depend on Medicaid, in many cases the only source, the only source to enable them to get the health care they require.

And so it is despite the fact that Health and Human Services has projected an $89 billion program to keep Medicare viable until the year 2000, during which period we will have a chance to evaluate what is taking place, maybe get to work on some of the problems we know exist that are solvable and will not require less to be available to the Medicare beneficiary—waste, for instance. We know there is a significant amount of waste. We know that there is fraud—this is not a secret—amounting to billions of dollars.

Those options ought to be examined before we turn to people who on balance in the senior community have less income than $25,000 a year, to the extent of three-quarters of that population. Three-quarters of the senior citizen population have incomes of less than $25,000 a year; 35 percent have incomes of less than $10,000 a year.

But yet we say here in a majority voice that it is OK. ''We're going to save you from the demise of this program. We're going to save you by making sure you pay more, significantly more, in premiums for part B, in higher copays, in higher deductibles. We're saving you. We're taking money out of your pocket and transferring it over to those on the other side.''

By way of example, the House bill calls for a $20,000 tax break for those making $350,000 a year. The Senate, a more modest program, allows for a $6,000 tax break for those earning $350,000 a year. But at the same time, we are saying to the senior citizens, whose profile and income I just gave you, that they on balance will pay an average of $3,000 over a 7-year period more for their health care.

There is something funny, as they say. And the question is raised, in my mind, whose side are we on? I think it is pretty obvious that on that side of the aisle, from there over, that they are on the side of the wealthy and the comfortable and those who have special access. It is obvious. The arithmetic is there. If only the American people get the full story, then we will start to see changes, I believe.

We have already seen it. Congressmen in my State, who were dead full throttle behind the Gingrich proposal, the Contract With America, have now retreated because they are beginning to smell the ire of the constituency. They are beginning to hear the message that ''We do not want you to take money from us hard-working, modest-income people and transfer it to those who have been fortunate enough to make lots of money in this society.''

So, Mr. President, as we look at the record that President Clinton has compiled, it is a pretty good one. We just finished a year in which we saw one of the smaller deficits in many years, $164 billion, and it is on the decline since President Clinton has taken over. We notice that we have a robust economy, that until the end of September, the economy grew at a very firm rate.

At the same time, we see almost an ideal situation in terms of inflation—modest growth, so little as to be of relatively minor consequence in the perspective that the people in this financial community have.

So, we have seen growth in the economy, we have seen growth in jobs, we have seen inflation under control, we have seen the budget deficit at a relatively low point. And yet the President gets little or no credit and lots of criticism as the debate obscures the reality of what is taking place in this reconciliation discussion: Taking care of those who have money, who have influence, who have power, at the expense of those who work hard, who plan their futures, and who are concerned about what tomorrow brings.

BOSNIA

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Last, Mr. President, we hear about the concerns expressed by people on both sides about Bosnia and about whether or not we ought to have American service people in Bosnia as part of a peacekeeping operation. I think that question is yet to