Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I commend many of the Senators whose cooperation was important in receiving this agreement.

We started out with a large double-digit list and we are now down to virtually a single-digit list with as many Republican as Democratic amendments. I am very hopeful that we can work through these amendments.

For the information of colleagues, I intend to offer our substitute this evening, and hope we can have a good debate on that. I am sure we can work through many of these, even with time agreements, but I do appreciate the accommodation by many Senators. I appreciated having the opportunity to work through this agreement with the majority leader.

I think this will allow Members to do what we have indicated we would like to do, and that is reach final passage this week.

I appreciate the cooperation of all Senators, and I look forward to the remaining debate on the amendments that have just been listed.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, for his cooperation. I think he is correct. I think it is in a condition now where it can be passed, maybe late tomorrow night if not sometime early Friday.

I would hope following disposition, as I have not yet discussed it with the Democratic leader, one thing we have to do is the self-employed tax matter. Maybe we could start on that Friday. I will discuss that with the minority leader later. I asked Senator PACKWOOD to check with Senator MOYNIHAN to see if they would be available on Friday.

I would ask my colleagues if they have amendments, certainly, this would be a good time to offer amendments because the Democratic leader has indicated later today he will offer the substitute. I urge my colleagues on either side of the aisle if they have amendments, I am certain that the managers would be happy to engage them in debate. Perhaps we can dispose of four or five additional amendments before late afternoon.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S ACCEPTANCE OF YELTSIN INVITATION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, yesterday President Clinton announced his acceptance of Russian President Boris Yeltsin's invitation to participate in Moscow's anniversary of the 50th anniversary of V–E Day.

He has accepted this invitation, despite the fact that I—and many of my colleagues concerned about the foreign policy implications—urged him to seek another time for a summit.

I continue to believe that his participation in this commemoration does not further American interests in Europe and in our relationship with Russia.

First, this commemorative event is morally ambiguous. I recognize the valor and sacrifices of the Russian people in their defense against Nazi aggression. However, it is equally important to remember that the Soviet leaders, through the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact laid the foundation not only for World War II, but also for Soviet hegemony over Eastern Europe during the cold war.

Joseph Stalin unleashed Soviet forces against Poland in collusion with the Nazis, and during the first 2 years of World War II the Soviet Union provided the Nazi Reich with strategic war materials as well as with political and propaganda support.

Moreover, the Soviet Union committed war crimes as brutal as those of the Nazis.

One need only to recall the Soviet's massacre of thousands of Polish officers at Katyn; the deportation to concentration camps and murder of thousands of civilians, including Lithuanians, Estonians, Latvians, Tatars, Chechyns, and others. After World War II, the survivors in Eastern Europe did not benefit from freedom and liberty, but were subjected to the brutal hegemony of the Soviet Union.

If the President persists in going to celebrate the end of World War II in Europe with the Russians, I believe he should at least make some reference to the fact that the United States, as a whole, has not forgotten these, or any, crimes committed during the war.

The second reason why we encouraged the President not to accept this invitation is because the commemoration in Moscow will reinforce the growing nostalgia among some Russians for the Soviet past and its imperial ambitions, not to mention the leader who epitomized all this, Joseph Stalin.

The presence of the President of the United States risks further legitimizing such nostalgia, thereby encouraging Russians to concentrate on reacquiring great power status at a time when Moscow should be directing its efforts and energy inward, toward democratic and market reform.

Third, this invitation arrives in the midst of the war in Chechnya. President Clinton's participation in this celebration will convey American indifference to the atrocities committed against the Chechyn peoples.

Indeed, Moscow's management of the Chechyn autonomy movement is depressingly reminiscent of the policies that Stalin, himself, used to terrorize the peoples incorporated into the former Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I strongly support efforts to deepen American-Russian relations. Indeed, this is especially important today as both nations adjust to the post-cold-war era. However, the symbolism associated with the Moscow celebration makes it a poor forum through which to pursue the type of relationship the United States must have with Russia.

But since President Clinton has made his decision, I hope he will emphasize the following themes in the course of his Moscow meetings:

The President should speak forthrightly to the Russian people, not hiding the fact that America condemns the brutal use of military force against Chechnya. Human rights is an international issue. If Russia avows to be a member of the community of democracies founded upon respect for inalienable human rights, it must live up to those standards.

The President should make clear that America is more interested in the future of Russian democracy than in the fate of a single leader. I hope that President Clinton will spend his time not only with government officials and the leadership of the Russian Duma, but also with Russia's leading supporters of democracy.

This must include members of Russia's beleaguered press and those democratically minded legislators—particularly Sergei Kovalyov, the former Human Rights Commissioner who was most recently relieved of his duties because of his courageous criticism of the Russian Government's Chechnyn policy.

In order for a true strategic partnership to evolve between the United States and Russia, Moscow must abandon hegemonic aspirations, particularly those toward the non-Russian nations of the former Soviet Union.

In this regard, I applaud the President's decision to visit Ukraine. A Kiev summit will be an important signal of America's commitment to assist the consolidation of Ukraine's newly attained independence. In light of Ukraine's intertwined history with Russia, the success of Ukrainian independence and integration into the Western community of nations will be a critical determinant of Russia's evolution into a post-imperial state.

Finally, I hope that the President will emphasize that NATO enlargement will contribute to greater peace and stability in post-cold-war Europe.

By further ensuring stability in Central and Eastern Europe, NATO enlargement should allow Moscow to spend more of its energy on the internal challenges of political and economic reform. I hope that our President will underscore the fact that Moscow cannot and will not have any veto over the future membership of NATO.

Mr. President, although I regret President Clinton's pilgrimage to Moscow, I believe that if these three

themes—human rights, democracy, and rejection of empire—prevail, they will help ensure that the Moscow summit is not an exercise in propitiation, but a realistically constructive undertaking.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE LINE-ITEM VETO ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened to the debate so far on the line-item veto, the proposal which is before the Senate, and I have read the compromise language offered by the majority leader. I would like to commend the majority leader and those who worked with him, long-time supporters of the proposal, and the sponsors. This proposal, as is my assessment at least, is much improved over the previous proposals. This improvement comes from the inclusion of new entitlements and targeted tax breaks along with appropriations spending items.

As I have stated in the past, if the Congress is serious about attacking our annual deficits, it must expand its view beyond discretionary spending. Discretionary spending, Mr. President, accounts in 1995 for 36 percent of the total spending of our Government. The Congress cannot balance the budget, let alone reduce the national debt, by focusing on 36 percent of the total budget.

The proposal before us makes great strides by also including in its purview new entitlements and direct spending. Entitlement spending will make up 49 percent of the budget in 1995.

This proposal also includes targeted tax benefits as being subjected to a Presidential line-item veto. According to the Senate Budget Committee, it was projected that the Treasury will lose $453 billion in revenue through tax expenditures in 1995 alone. That number is twice the size of the projected budget deficit.

At a time when our country is fast approaching the debt ceiling limit of $4.9 trillion, which could occur as early as August, according to the Treasury Department, it is important to send the message that, to attack the deficit, there must be a shared commitment from all sectors of the Federal budget including entitlement spending and tax preferences. I commend the authors of this proposal for this improvement over earlier versions.

Now, while this proposal is greatly improved in some respects, it causes me grave concern in other areas. The point which causes me the greatest concern is the impact of the massive shift of power from the Congress to the executive branch which could occur under this bill.

I might say, Mr. President, it is totally contrary to historic Republicanism. This is some strange new doctrine, to suggest that we have to abdicate responsibility to the Chief Executive of this country. I do not care whether he is a Democrat or a Republican.

While many supporters of this legislation have attempted to address this concern during the debate, I must raise this issue again as I believe it should be of grave concern to all the Members of the Congress, the House, the Senate, Republican and Democrat.

Mr. President, the legislation would actually allow the President of the United States, with the support of only one-third of either body, to eliminate funding for myriad Federal spending, departments, and programs authorized and enacted by the Congress.

Supporters of this proposal continually highlight it as a way to get at the so-called pet projects of interest to individual Members or to individual States. I will point out, as I have done in the past, Members can exercise their rights under the rules to raise objections, offer amendments, and round up votes to defeat such proposals.

Members should identify provisions of appropriations bills and reports that they find objectionable and craft amendments to resolve those objections. Members should also encourage the President to come forward with a rescission proposal pursuant to title X of the Budget Act to strip that funding.

We have that power. We have those tools. It must also be highlighted that the line-item veto can also be used to reduce funding or even eliminate completely, funding for projects and agencies that I doubt few would call congressional pork.

Let me remind you, a President with one-third of either Chamber—hardly a majority—could effectively eliminate funding for an entire agency such as HUD, the Interior Department, the Education Department, the EPA—any Department. While some Members may argue in favor of such a move, I doubt that many of us would call these agencies pet projects. Do not forget, we have had Presidents offer and express a desire to abolish such departments. This is not a hypothetical situation—entire departments. President Reagan wanted to absolutely eliminate the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, and others. And we have heard that from other Presidents. That could happen. With a one-third vote of the House and the Senate, the President would prevail to eliminate entire departments. So do not get this idea that somehow what has been identified as pork here or pork there is the only target we have to worry about.

Now, while these examples may be extreme, a similar scenario was described by a Member during this debate. It was mentioned that on an issue such as ground-based missile defenses, a President may disagree on the line of funding, and this line-item veto would allow the President, with one-third of either Chamber, to simply line out all the funding for such a program.

At a time when many Members have raised concerns about funding levels of the military, are those same Members willing to defer to the judgment of whichever President occupies the White House regarding defense spending levels? The same point can be made regarding housing policy, nutrition programs, or spending to combat crime.

That is an awesome shift of power which some may be willing to relinquish to the executive branch of Government, but I am not. I am not as willing to bestow that type of power on the executive branch. The Framers of the Constitution were very concerned about the abuses of an Executive which possesses too much power. That is why the power to spend was placed in the branch of Government which is most accountable to and representative of each citizen, the Congress of the United States. The purse strings are placed here. In my opinion, the Framers were right on target. There are no sound reasons why the legislative branch should shift such an important constitutionally created responsibility to the Chief Executive.

Perhaps I am burdened by history, either by generation or by being a history buff, but I recall when a President of the United States wanted to usurp the power of the Supreme Court, a third coequal branch of Government. It was not just a little line item in an appropriations bill or a tax bill. He wanted to dominate the Supreme Court. That was called the Court-packing plan of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Thank God, there were enough Democrats at that time to join with the corpus guard of 17 Republicans to block that.

Nevertheless, it is illustrative of the kind of power that is a desire of the Chief Executive that has taken place in our history. Now we are going to say the President of the United States and one-third of the membership of this Congress, you make these vital, and important decisions.

And let us not forget when you had 17 Republicans here at one time in the Senate, and they called it the Cherokee Strip because the Democrats could not all sit on that side. They had a whole row, two rows of Democrats on this side, and the Republicans were huddled down here under Senator Charles McNary from Oregon trying to survive. You can imagine the kind of domination that Franklin Roosevelt had of the Congress that first term and part of the second term. Thank God, we had a Supreme Court. It was the only check and balance we had in our governmental system. That is just history, but it also makes me a little leery about ever handing too much power to any branch of Government.

I would also like to take a moment to explain what separate enrollments of bills would entail. While I understand that many Americans support the concept of a line-item veto, I think it is important to explain what that means in the context of separate enrollment.

Separate enrollment would take individual appropriations bills, as passed