United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1995 No. 38

Senate

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 22, 1995)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Our prayer this morning will be offered by a guest Chaplain, Father Paul Lavin, of St. Joseph's Catholic Church, Washington, DC.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, the Reverend Paul Lavin, offered the following prayer:

In Psalm 51 (verses 1–3) we read:

Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy lovingkindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies, blot out my transgressions.

Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin.

For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me.

Let us pray:

Almighty Father, as so many of the Members of this Senate join millions of our fellow citizens in accepting ashes as a public sign of our desire to understand more deeply the meaning of salvation and to reflect that salvation in the way we live, help each of us to recognize Your gifts to us and help us to use those gifts for the good of our families, for the good of this Senate, for our fellow citizens, and for all Your people. Amen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished majority leader is recognized.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PERMITTING USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 20, just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for House Concurrent Resolution 20, which would permit the use of the Capitol rotunda to commemorate the Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust.

It has now been more than 50 years since Adolf Hitler mounted his systematic effort to destroy the Jewish people. Today, many survivors of the Holocaust are aging or have died. Soon, they will no longer be able to share their first-hand accounts of Hitler's savagery.

Now more than ever, we must redouble our efforts to remember the terror of the Third Reich, and to teach our children important lessons about the need for tolerance and the dangers of intimidation.

The Days of Remembrance is a week-long commemoration of the Holocaust. On April 27, an international day of commemoration, there will be a ceremony on the Capitol rotunda consisting of speeches, readings, and musical presentations, to honor and remember the 6 million innocent victims of the Holocaust. As a humane and tolerant society, we must stamp on our souls the haunting memories of these victims: men and women, young and old, who were tortured and killed not because of something they did, but simply because of who they were.

Mr. President, we are all familiar with the adage that those who do not learn from history are doomed to repeat it.

Our duty to those who died on the trains, in the fields and in the gas chambers, is to make sure that their story is told from generation to generation. We must study and reflect on the atrocities of the Nazis, in order to make sure that this dark chapter of history is never repeated.

It is a painful study, Mr. President, but it is the only way we can sanctify the memory of the victims and make sure that their suffering is never forgotten.

Mr. President, there is often a temptation to obscure the dark passages to humanity, but we know that we cannot be true to history unless we reveal them. The Days of Remembrance are a time for us to undergo this painful reflection and I laud my colleagues for passing this important resolution.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20) was agreed to.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

REPORT ON THE NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS—PM 23

Under the authority of the order of January 4, 1994, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 1, 1995, during the recess of the Senate, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 603 of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, I am transmitting a report on the National Security Strategy of the United States.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1995.*

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY—MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING THE RECESS—PM 24

Under the authority of the order of January 4, 1994, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 1, 1995, during the recess of the Senate, received the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the requirements of section 657 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91; 42 U.S.C. 7267), I transmit herewith the 13th Annual Report of the Department of Energy, which covers the years 1992 and 1993.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1995.*

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

AN INVESTMENT IN AFRICA

• Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, as the Congress begins to debate the foreign aid budget this year, U.S. assistance and involvement in Africa is once again in question.

It would be a grave mistake for the United States to disengage completely from Africa, particularly at this point. As the success stories of South Africa, Namibia, Mozambique, and other African nations in transition tell, there is potential for great gains in Africa—both politically and economically. At the same time, even recent history demonstrates that if we ignore Africa, conflicts and problems can explode into political, economic, and humanitarian disasters for which we all pay the price.

On this note, I commend to my colleagues an article which appeared in the New York Times this weekend entitled, ''In Africa, West Can Pay Now or Later.'' It charts several reasons for international involvement in Africa in the global context, and documents some reasons for U.S. investment in the continent.

Though some would like to write off Africa as irrelevant to U.S. interests, it is impossible to argue that what happens in a continent of close to 1 billion people has no effect on us. An investment in Africa of money, diplomacy, and attention today will help develop political stability, which in turn will yield economic benefits for Africans and international trading partners: Together political and economic developments will help reduce the number and level of tragedies we have witnessed in Africa.

Reducing the Federal deficit is in our national interest and should be our top priority. But a wholesale abandonment of U.S. investment in regions of the world such as Africa is not in the U.S. interest. We need to make sensible decisions about necessary U.S. investments. In the long run, our populations, the environment, universal human rights, and international markets will benefit greatly from a relatively small investment today.

I ask that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 26, 1995]

IN AFRICA, WEST CAN PAY NOW, OR LATER

(By Howard W. French)

ABIDJAN, IVORY COAST.—Having struggled across the Sahara, 250,000 starving Sudanese refugees assemble on the Moroccan coast, hoping to cross the Straits of Gibraltar to Europe. As an armada of camera crews film them, the refugee's leader launches this challenge to European Union coastal guards who would stop them: ''All we ask of you is, watch us die.''

The event is pure fiction, the final scene of a 1990 BBC television drama. But development experts say it neatly illustrates a stark choice looming for the industrialized world: Pitch in more energetically to bring Africa into the global economic fold, or wait and watch as the continent decends into a quickening spiral of disaster.

AN EXPLODING POPULATION

With its population due to double to about 1.2 billion in less than 30 years, and expected to reach 2 billion by 2050, an Africa is crisis could well become the desperate stage for a mass emigration the likes of which have never been seen.

Despite such warnings, however, the West seems to have grown only more indifferent to Africa's fortunes. Some American congressmen have recently likened aid to the continent to throwing money into a rathole; Britain has said it will cut its contributions to Africa through the European Union, and even France is grappling with ways to reduce obligations to its former possessions.

In response, frustrated development experts and new democratic leaders in Africa have argued that would be far cheaper to help the continent out of its problems now than to rescue it later.

To get a sense of scale, it helps to look at two examples where extremely rapid population growth rates—well over 3 percent a year—are expected by United Nations statisticians between now and the year 2000. They are Nigeria, which in the early 1990's had 116 million people and a gross national product per capita of only $350, and Kenya, which had 25 million people and produced just $340 per person.

Nevertheless, the experts on Africa recognize that in an era of austerity at home, arguments about investing abroad today to prevent crisis tomorrow have limited appeal. They now argue that traditional aid grants are not necessarily the answer. ''The most effective thing that could be done for Africa right now doesn't involve new money, but systematic debt relief,'' said Thomas Callaghy of the University of Pennsylvania. ''You could write off all of Africa's debts tomorrow, and it wouldn't affect international financial markets.'' But then, ''When you look at what has just happened in Mexico you realize just how hard a thing this is to sell politically.''

If Africa's approaching peril is not enough to motivate the West to act with greater generosity, many hope that old-fashioned appeals to profit might. Whether it was spices or gold or slaves or vast quantities of gems and minerals, the continent has always been a rich, if risky, El Dorado for the venturesome outsider.

WHY DO INVESTORS HESITATE BEFORE AFRICA'S NEW OPPORTUNITIES?

Following Ghana's independence, Kwame Nkrumah, its first president and a pioneer of the continent's ultimately disastrous fling with socialism, defined the historical problem, noting the ''paradox'' that Africa's ''earth is rich, yet the products that come from above and below the soil continue to enrich, not Africans predominantly, but groups and individuals who operate to Africa's impoverishment.''

Now, throughout much of the continent, several years of dramatic efforts to remove barriers to trade and investment, trim bureaucracies and rejoin the global economy have mostly swept away the legacy of three decades of Mr. Nkrumah's brand of socialism. Ghana and Uganda are prominent examples, and investment in South Africa can at last be viewed as an investment in the continent as a whole.

Because of these changes, Africa's riches are again up for grabs. But so far, the international business community has largely disappointed the development experts. Mali, for example, can't find a partner to help finance a new power company, even though companies from the United States, Australia and Canada rush to explore for gold and diamonds and oil there. Their hope is for the kind of quick extraction of wealth that led to the continent's early disenchantment with capitalism.

If Africa still requires a more cooperative form of economic involvement, development experts say, it is because the years under socialism did little to alleviate deep social problems that include an undereducated population whose needs grow faster than weak governments can possibly cope with, poor roads and communications, a lack of managerial expertise, and most of all a shortage of capital.

So Africa is in a bind: major foreign private investment in productive new industries is unlikely unless these problems are solved first, but the only sources of help to fix them is overseas.

''People cling to the myth that if only these countries would get their policies right, everything would be okay,'' said James Gustave Speth, the administrator of the United Nations Development Program. ''There is no reason to believe that Africa can't make it, but right now this is a continent that is bleeding and without substantial outside help, there is no hope.''

In addition to cutting debt burden, economists say the West should drop barriers to

goods like textiles that are often entry level transformation industries for developing countries. In this, they say, there could be a payoff for the West as well.

''Aid to Africa is not welfare,'' J. Brian Atwood, the administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, wrote recently in The International Herald Tribune. ''Africa is today what Latin American and Asian markets were a generation ago. It is the last great developing market.'' But what many see as a sensible management of long-term interests collides with political expediency. ''Putting people on their feet is just good business sense'' said Edward V. K. Jaycox, vice president of the World Bank. ''But it is a question of old-fashioned industrial structures in the north, where a lot of people are engaged in activities that they are loath to give up.'' By that he meant something very much like what Mr. Nkrumah used to say: If the West really wants to see an Africa healthy for investment, it should stop raiding the gold veins and diamond mines and open not just its wallets but its markets as well.●

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, today I rise as a proud cosponsor of the constitutional balanced budget amendment, and I urge its adoption. I hope that today, we will be able to enlist the support of the 67 Senators necessary to pass this balanced budget amendment.

The time has come to put an end to out of control Federal spending that has taken money from the private sector—the very sector that creates jobs and economic opportunity for all Americans.

The President's recent budget proposals for next year offer clear evidence of the lack of political will to make the hard choices when it comes to cutting Government spending. I strongly disagree with President Clinton's decision not to fight for further deficit reduction this year.

The American people are crying out for a smaller, more efficient Government. They are concerned about the trends that for too long has put the interests of big Government before the interests of our job-creating private sector. They are irritated by the double standard that exists between how our families are required to balance their checkbooks and how Government is allowed to continue spending despite its deficit accounts.

It's clear, Mr. President. The time has come to heed the will of the people. It is our duty, not only to heed their will, but to act in their best interest. And this amendment is in their best interest.

The President's budget maintains deficits of $200 billion over the next 5 years, and the deficits go up from there. His budget does not take seriously the need for spending restraint—restraint that would put us on a path toward a balanced budget by the year 2002.

In fact, Bill Clinton proposes spending over $1.5 trillion in fiscal year 1995 to over $1.9 trillion in the year 2000. In other words, the only path that the president proposes is one that leads to higher Government spending and ever increasing deficits.

Mr. President, my decision to cosponsor this legislation was not made lightly. The U.S. Constitution is our Nation's most sacred document. Dozens of countries have modeled their constitutions around the principles espoused in ours. Many of the emerging democracies around the world recognize the profound simplicity and timelessness contained in that hallowed document.

Any amendments to the Constitution should be made with care, and with careful consideration of the intended outcome.

I believe the outcome of a balanced budget for our Nation is one of the most important steps we can take to ensure the economic opportunities for prosperity for our children and for our children's children.

As a nation—and as individuals—we are morally bound to pass opportunity and security to the next generation. This is what a balanced budget amendment will help us do. As Thomas Paine has written, no government or group of people has the right to shackle succeeding generations with its obligations. A balanced budget amendment will help us prevent the shackling of future generations.

As chairman of the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee I have outlined a plan to reduce the Federal bureaucracy, eliminate out-dated and wasteful Government programs, and to strengthen Government's ability to better serve the taxpayers.

In January I kicked off a series of hearings on ''Government Reform: Building a Structure for the 21st Century.'' It is my belief that as we move into the 21st century, so should our Government. Innovative technologies should allow us to cut out many layers of management bureaucracy, and reduce Federal employment. Programmatic changes should also occur.

Last month, I released a report that I asked the GAO to examine the current structure of the Federal Government. The GAO examined all budget and Government functions and missions. They did not conduct in-depth analysis, but simply illustrated the complex web and conflicting missions under which agencies are currently operating.

The GAO report confirms that our Federal behemoth must be reformed to meet the needs of all taxpayers for the 21st century. I am convinced that it is through a smaller, smarter Government we will be able to serve Americans into the next century.

Deficit spending can not continue. We can no longer allow waste, inefficiency, and overbearing Government to consume the potential of America's future. I am committed to spending restraint as we move to balance the budget by the year 2002. And I ask my colleagues—and all Americans—to support our efforts.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I would ask that I use part of the leader time accorded to me this morning to make a statement as if in morning business.

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

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we have had 4 weeks of hard-fought and very earnest debate. The issues are serious and the stakes are high. We are proposing to amend our Constitution for only the 28th time now in more than two centuries. The debate has been vigorous. Virtually every Senator has spoken from virtually every perspective. Persuasive arguments have been made by both Democratic and Republican Senators, and I respect the positions which my colleagues have adopted even in those cases where I do not share their position. I recognize that each Senator has reached his or her position with thought and care and the best of motives.

There is something upon which we all agree, and upon which we have agreed since the debate began; that is, the underlying need to reduce the deficit and balance the budget. We need to put the budget on a glidepath to balance, and we are agreed that for the sake of working families and the future economic strength of the Nation we must move toward a balanced budget.

One thing we should all agree upon is that regardless of the outcome of the final vote, we will work together to develop a deficit-reduction package that will put the budget on a glidepath to balance. I stand ready to work with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to achieve that goal.

Now, the question is how best to continue the effort that we have begun throughout this decade, an effort begun in 1991 with a significant deficit reduction proposal, and again in 1993 with $600 billion of additional deficit reduction. The question is can we achieve what we all say we want with the balanced budget proposal before us? The question is how best to achieve a balanced budget using the methods that we have available to us. And where we differ is whether the amendment that is now pending reflects our best effort to amend the Constitution and achieve our goal of a balanced Federal budget.

Amending the Constitution is not a frivolous undertaking. We will not be able to come back next year and fix our drafting mistakes. Many of us have concluded, regretfully, that this is not our best effort. In fact, in our view, our best efforts were rejected. To strengthen the amendment, we offered amendments, but they were defeated essentially along partisan lines, amendments that we felt ought to have been considered more carefully by our colleagues on the other side, amendments like the right-to-know proposal which

laid out the blueprint that we all agree is necessary if, indeed, we are serious about reaching our goal in a short period of time.

In a matter of 7 years, we proclaim today, if we pass this amendment, we will have a balanced Federal budget. But we all recognize privately that, unless we have a blueprint, we simply cannot achieve that goal in any meaningful way without using smoke and mirrors, without a blueprint.

The American people have stated very clearly their desire to see a blueprint, and indeed that is what we tried to offer as we considered this amendment many weeks ago. Some of us suggested that we provide for a capital budget so the Federal budget would work like the budgets of virtually every business, every State, every family in this country. We wanted to preserve the ability to respond to national security or economic emergencies, something that we have attempted to address in amendments as well. We tried to protect against unconstitutional Presidential impoundments and preserve the integrity of Congress' power of the purse. We tried to protect veterans' health programs and pensions.

Finally, we tried to protect Social Security, to make certain that all those commitments we made verbally on the Senate floor and in the media about protecting Social Security would in fact be kept when the amendment became part of the U.S. Constitution. On Social Security alone we had a number of different votes, different ways to make certain that the solemn commitment to protect the money in the trust fund would not be broken by a future Congress. We ran into a stone wall and, as a result, Social Security, despite Republican claims to the contrary, is legally and realistically available for cuts. We know that. And the Social Security trust funds are completely vulnerable to being raided.

Those who support the idea of a balanced budget amendment worked to improve this proposal so that it would be balanced and that we could in conscience vote for it without relying upon those trust funds for the next 7 years. But those efforts, too, were rejected.

We are still committed to balancing the budget. As supporters of this proposal have told television reporters outside the Senate Chamber, passage in this Chamber will not bring the budget one penny closer to real balance. Only we can do that. There is no machine that ultimately is incorporated in this Constitution that will force us to do what we are unable to do today. That is up to us. It is important that we understand that. It is we who must take that responsibility and no one else.

Some will attempt to characterize a vote against this flawed amendment as a vote against balancing the budget, but that is not what this vote is about. As I said, we all agree on the importance of balancing the budget. But this amendment simply does not do the job.

For the past month the Republican majority has been trying to pass their balanced budget amendment and claim a political victory. They have refused to listen to those of us who support an amendment but have had concerns about the language, rejecting our proposals time after time after time. They have refused to listen to the people of this country who have a right to know about how we are going to balance the budget. And, most important, they have refused to join us as we insist on real protection for Social Security, putting their political contract ahead of a solemn contract with the American people.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, leaders' time was reserved?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I will make a motion here in a moment to have the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

I would also indicate, though I did not raise the question last night about rule XIX, I think my colleague from West Virginia came close if not being in violation of rule XIX, which states: ''No Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any form of words impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct remotely unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.'' I would ask that—some of the ''tawdry'' references, ''sleazy'' references, in my view were uncalled for.

This is a very important vote. I believe there are 66 votes for the amendment, Democrats and Republicans. We need 67. Or we need 66, if there are only 99 voting.

I thought a lot about what procedure to follow after we recessed last evening. I thought about the hard work of the Senator from Utah, Senator HATCH; the Senator from Illinois, Senator SIMON; and other Democrats and Republicans who have worked and worked and worked for months and months and weeks and weeks and days and days and hours and hours in an effort to gain the support of 67 of our colleagues.

This must be bipartisan; there are only 53 Republicans. As I said last night, if you want to take a look at total nonpartisanship, take a look at Senator SIMON. He is leaving the Senate. He can do most anything. If he had any political motives, I assume—you can say, in most cases, Members have political motives—but in this case you cannot. He feels strongly about the amendment. We feel strongly about protecting Social Security. We have made a number of suggestions to Members on the other side about protecting Social Security, but it is never quite enough, never quite enough, never quite enough.

I must say, it seems to me to be in the interest—not in our interest—in the interest of the American people; 76 to 80 percent of the American people support the balanced budget amendment. And they could care less whether we voted last night or vote today or tomorrow or next week or the next week. They know the country is in danger of economic collapse unless we do something.

The American people are very sophisticated. They listen to radio. They read the newspapers. They watch television. They watch C–SPAN. This is no time for retreat. This is a time, as far as this Senator is concerned, for all of us who believe in the balanced budget amendment on both sides of the aisle to try to find one more vote—not in some back room deal, as alleged last night by the Senator from West Virginia—but by a recognition that if we do nothing—it probably will not make any difference to us or our families, but what about the 80 percent of the American people out there who want us to balance the budget? They balance their budgets. They balance their budgets in their businesses and in their homes, and they do not understand this business-as-usual attitude in Washington.

We are going to continue to try to find one vote. If we fail on that, then I, when the vote is cast, if it ends up 66, I will change my vote and I will enter a motion to reconsider. That motion to reconsider is not debatable. It can be called up any time by the leader, and I think sometime about next September might be appropriate to reconsider this whole issue. We do not want to do it too quickly, but maybe let it—leave it out there a year. Let us see what happens as we get nearer the election and the American people are a little agitated at Congress, as they should be.

I just suggest if anyone in this Chamber on either side of the aisle can find one more vote—or send someone on vacation, who might be on the other side—we need your help. The American people need your help. This is not a battle—this is a victory—victory for whom? Not for BOB DOLE. Not for PAUL SIMON. Not for LARRY CRAIG. Not for ORRIN HATCH. Not for JIM EXON. This will be a victory for the people. That is what this is all about. Give America back to the people.

Dust off the 10th amendment. Unless the power is reserved to the Federal Government, give it back to the States and give it back to the people.

We are going to continue every way we can to make this happen.

Mr. President, I move the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I only object so as to respond, if I could, using the remainder of my leader time. How much time do I have available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes.

Mr. DOLE. That is all right. Whatever you need.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President let me respond to the distinguished minority leader. I do not know that I have learned all the rules of this place as well as he has, but I thought that a deal was a deal.

I thought in good faith that when we negotiated an agreement which required unanimous consent that a deal was a deal and that our word was our bond. The word that I was given over a week ago was that we would have a vote last night. The vote was not going to be if we had so many votes we keep the deal. The vote was we are going to keep our deal. We will have a vote, and that will be the end of it.

I recognize the right of any Senator to change his vote and make a motion to reconsider. That is always within the prerogative of any Senator. And the majority leader is certainly within his rights to do that. But to say today that we are going to change the rules and that we are going to nullify an agreement that we had in good faith last week makes me wonder whether or not we will ever get another agreement during this Congress. It makes me wonder whether in good faith we can negotiate and come to some arrangement with regard to the consideration of any bill in the future.

So this portends some very serious ramifications, and I hope that we all recognize it. I thought we had a deal. I thought we had an agreement. I thought we were going to go to a vote. If we are not going to go to a vote, if we are going to delay that vote and bring it up some other time, I think it is imperative that we have the notice of the majority leader in advance so all Members can be forewarned.

But I must say that I am deeply disappointed and that this kind of instant rulemaking is unacceptable.

I yield the floor and reserve my right to consider the proposal by the majority leader again.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I am going to modify the proposal to move that the Senate stand in recess until noon on Thursday, March 2.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, at 10:22 a.m., recessed until tomorrow, March 2, 1995, at 12 noon.