

thought the leadership provided by the Senator from West Virginia was very important in articulating clearly our desire to have all savings designated for purposes of deficit reduction and nothing else.

I was pleased, as well, that we were able to accommodate the concern that many had about separate enrollment. While this was not a perfect solution, at least we may have a little more practical understanding of how this bill, with its many pieces, would be packaged and sent to the President in a form that may allow us constitutionally to deal with the issue of separate enrollment, if not practically.

I still have some fundamental concerns about the practicality of requiring separate enrollment and separate signatures, about the practicality of, line by line, taking a simple bill and making it as complex as the separate enrollment process will make it.

Clearly, it is a start. It is an effort at compromise. Indeed, I believe that we have accommodated that concern to the extent that it was possible at the end of this debate.

In terms of the constitutionality of this proposal, I think it is important that we approved an amendment ensuring judicial review of the proposal. The courts will now have the ability to assess the constitutionality of this legislation.

The constitutionality of this particular version of line-item veto may be in doubt. But we have a provision in place now that will allow Members to review and to come to some conclusion about the constitutional viability of this legislation at an early date. That, too, in my view, was an improvement in this piece of legislation.

Third, let me say that I think it is very important that everyone understand this bill has a life—a life and a death, frankly. When the year 2000 approaches, we will have a much better understanding of whether or not this worked, whether or not it was practical, certainly whether or not it was constitutional, whether or not we have succeeded in preserving the balance of legislative responsibility between the President and the Congress. So, in the year 2000, knowing all of that, we will be in a much better position to determine whether or not this ought to be extended, whether or not it ought to be given a new life.

So that sunset provision, in my view, was critical to coming to the conclusion I did about this particular piece of legislation. This is not permanent. It is an experiment. It is an opportunity for us to see whether it will work.

Senator BYRD and others have raised some very legitimate concerns, both constitutionally and in many other ways. We will learn, over the course of the next 5 years, whether they need to be addressed, to what degree they should be addressed, and ultimately what if any changes may be necessary prior to the time this legislation is extended for any length of time after the year 2000.

Finally, let me say I am very concerned about the budgetary implications of what we do here. We have had a very vigorous debate on a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, on proposals to lay out a plan by which we achieve a balanced Federal budget by a date certain. We all recognize we have to make some tough decisions about what will be spent, how it will be spent, what if any tax changes we make—ultimately, what conclusions we can make with regard to the difficult, vexing problem we face with regard to the deficit in the oncoming years. If we do not have the tools available to us to make those decisions in a meaningful way, then I fear we will never achieve what we all say we want.

This is a tool. It may be a blunt instrument. It may be a precision tool. We do not know yet. But we do know it ought to give us yet one more opportunity to say with some confidence that, indeed, we are going to get our hands on the budget, our grip on the deficit, in a way that will allow us a greater degree of confidence that indeed we can succeed in these coming years.

It may not be the tool I would have chosen first. It may not be the tool I believe ought to ultimately be preserved in law in perpetuity. But it is a tool that will allow us for the next 5 years to make some effort to do what we desperately need to do, and that is find a way to reduce the deficit, find a meaningful way to assess our expenditures, find a way to ensure that we pass the best possible piece of legislation each and every time it involves spending. That is what this allows us to do, and I am very hopeful that we have made the right decision tonight.

This has been another in an ongoing series of debates about how best to accomplish deficit reduction and a meaningful plan for balancing the budget. I hope that our colleagues can now come together on other issues, as well, especially on that which we have felt all along is needed, if indeed this or anything else is going to work, and that is a budget plan that will accomplish the deficit reduction we need.

There are now 8 days left before the legal deadline, before the Budget Committee must report a budget resolution. There are 23 days prior to the time this body must act on a budget resolution. We tell the American people they need to pay their taxes by April 15. The law also requires that we pass a budget resolution by April 15. That, too, is a tool. That, too, ought to be something that has the priority that the line-item veto had this week.

I am hopeful we still can meet that goal. I am not optimistic. But whether it is April 15 or some time shortly thereafter, let us use that tool as well to achieve what we know we must. We know we must make the tough decisions and it is time we get on with it.

We have made a tough decision tonight. I think, all things considered, it was the right decision.

Again, let me commend those who had a role to play in the debate. It was a good debate, a debate that educated the American people and certainly our colleagues with regard to the implications of this legislation.

I think the Congress has served its role very well. I commend those involved and I now yield the floor.

---

#### RECESS UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate now stands in recess until 9:45 a.m. tomorrow, March 24, 1995.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:05 p.m., recessed until Friday, March 24, 1995, at 9:45 a.m.

---

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 23, 1995:

##### NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

MARY S. FURLONG, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 19, 1999, VICE DANIEL W. CASEY, TERM EXPIRED.

##### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JEFFREY M. LANG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE RUFUS HAWKINS YERXA, RESIGNED.

##### FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD

JEROME A. STRICKER, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL RETIREMENT THRIFT INVESTMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 25, 1998, VICE SHIRLEY CHILTON-O'DELL, TERM EXPIRED.

##### FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION IN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

ROBERT A. KOHN, OF MARYLAND  
JERRY K. MITCHELL, OF MARYLAND

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, AS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

CAROLS F. POZA, OF FLORIDA  
YING PRICE, OF MARYLAND  
ROBERT A. TAFT, OF CONNECTICUT

##### THE JUDICIARY

CARLOS F. LUCERO, OF COLORADO, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT, VICE A NEW POSITION CREATED BY PUBLIC LAW 101-650, APPROVED DECEMBER 1, 1990.

WENONA Y. WHITFIELD, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, VICE WILLIAM L. BEATTY, RETIRED.

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED OFFICERS, ON THE ACTIVE DUTY LIST, FOR PROMOTION TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE U.S. ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 624, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, THE OFFICERS INDICATED BY ASTERISK ARE ALSO NOMINATED FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 531, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

##### JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

##### To be Major

ADAMS, JOHN A., 000-00-0000  
\*ALLEN, NORMAN F., 000-00-0000  
\*BALDWIN, GREGORY T., 000-00-0000  
BARNES, TRACY A., 000-00-0000  
\*BECKER, PETER G., 000-00-0000  
BRENNER-BECK, DRU A., 000-00-0000  
\*BROWN, RICHARD O., I, 000-00-0000  
\*BUTLER, STEVEN E., 000-00-0000