

the President, every opportunity to express themselves to the Chief of Staff or to the President.

So I must say, again, it does a real disservice to this dialog and, really, to a factual and honest accounting of what happened on that trip. The President came back on a number of occasions, and I have yet to see anyone else dispute that fact.

I hope that the Speaker would admit that on a number of occasions he had conversations directly relevant to the budget with the President of the United States on the trip and coming back from Israel just last week, in fact, a week ago tonight.

THE DEBT LIMIT

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I also want to address, while I have the floor—I know the Senator from Virginia is seeking recognition—but we have not had the opportunity yet tonight to talk briefly about the debt limit, at least I have not. I know some of my colleagues have addressed the matter.

The President, as you know, vetoed the debt limit bill this afternoon. He did so for good reason. Let there be no doubt, we need to increase the debt limit. We recognize how critical it is that the Government of the United States not go into default.

Let me offer praise for the Secretary of the Treasury for all that he has done to educate, to inform, to bring everyone to a better understanding of the ramifications of default, beginning Wednesday, if nothing is done. As I understand it, there is some hope now that we might be able to have yet another auction to move us back yet perhaps another 3 days. But while the Secretary of the Treasury and the administration appear to be doing virtually everything they can to see that this country does not default, our Republican colleagues, at that moment when they should cooperate and find some way with which to resolve this crisis, have chosen to do just the opposite.

On what ought to be a very simple extension of the debt, our Republican colleagues have added a complete elimination of all the opportunities the Treasury Secretary has to manage the debt, to use short-term tools, to do what every single Treasury Secretary has been able to do for decades. They have sought to strip him of all those responsibilities and opportunities for debt management at the very time he needs them the most. Can you think of anything more irresponsible than that? Anything?

It is just outrageous that, at the time when we ought to be pulling together with a full appreciation of the magnitude of the problems we may face if we go in default, what do our colleagues on the other side of the aisle do but say we are going to make it even harder. We are going to make it even more challenging, create even more problems.

And then, to add insult to injury, they add a provision that we have debated on the floor many, many times regarding what ought to happen on appeals for death row inmates; whether or not we ought to have this legal term "habeas corpus" modified in some way. What in the world does that have to do with dealing with the default this country may find itself in as early as Wednesday?

How is it that anyone can rationalize, anyone can explain, anyone can find any reason why habeas corpus belongs on an emergency debt limit bill?

And then we have had some healthy debates on the Senate floor now for months about regulatory reform. We have had some cloture votes, and in every single case Democrats have said very simply: You give us regulatory reform that does not endanger the public health and safety of Americans, and we are with you. You are going to get a vote with maybe 70, 80, 90 votes. But you offer regulatory reform that endangers the health and safety of Americans, and we are not with you. That issue has not been resolved. We have reached a stalemate until we resolve it, and there have been good-faith efforts on both sides to try to resolve it, good-faith efforts that are going on right now.

So what happens? Our Republican colleagues add the entire regulatory reform language, all of the comprehensive issues relating to the most detailed threats to public health and safety and all the questions we have debated for months now on the debt limit—the debt limit—with no opportunity for debate and no opportunity for amendments. It is a take-it-or-leave-it deal. It is accept this or accept default.

Mr. President, for the life of me, I do not understand. I cannot contemplate what may have motivated our Republican colleagues to do that on this bill.

I will yield to the Senator from Nevada in just a minute, but I want to add the last list. In addition to that, the agencies terminated in this short-term legislation include the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Rural Abandoned Mine Program, Land and Conservation Fund, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the Administrative Conference of the United States—all of that added on top of everything else. Yet, they would like to have the American people believe that this is an emergency, that somehow the President is not cooperating, that somehow all of this has to be done in the context of a continuing resolution, or the debt limit, or it is just not possible.

Mr. President, this is just not the way to legislate. This is not responsible. We know better than this. In our heart of hearts, we know we have to run the country, we have to govern, and we have to do the things necessary to make this country work better. And this is not it.

So I hope at some point before midnight tonight we could come to our senses, and at some point in the next 3 hours we could say, look, let us save these debates for later. Let us conclude that we are going to agree to disagree for as long as it takes to work out the larger issues. Let us admit that this strategy is not going to work, and say that rather than shutting down the Government, rather than bringing this country to a default, we are going to strip them all, we are going to send a clean resolution, we are going to send a clean debt limit, we are going to resolve these matters at another time, and we are going to do the right thing.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WARNER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Is there a 10-minute limit on statements by individual Senators?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. We are operating in morning business.

Mr. WARNER. I think the distinguished minority leader has now used in excess of his 10-minute allocation?

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

Mr. DASCHLE. Who retains the floor, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader has the floor. If he wishes to yield for an inquiry, he has that opportunity.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. WARNER. Parliamentary inquiry: Are not Senators under a 10-minute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is correct.

Mr. DASCHLE. I did not think the parliamentary inquiry was in order if I did not yield time for such an inquiry. Is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator yielding for a question?

Mr. REID. I am asking a question of the leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield for a question.

Mr. REID. I ask the leader. Is it not true that we have 13 different appropriations bills that should pass?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from Nevada is correct. Thirteen appropriations bills, and only five have been passed so far.

Mr. REID. Is not it true that the President has signed only two of those?

Mr. DASCHLE. As I understand it, he has signed two and five have passed.

Mr. REID. Is it not true that we have been waiting for conferences to be completed sometime in some instances for months?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is correct. I would add that in all the time

we have been under this budget process—since 1974—this may be the latest, if not one of the latest dates that Congress has gone prior to the time it has completed its work.

Mr. REID. I also ask this question of the leader. Is it not true that when one of the elements of the Contract With America was sent to us from the House that we in the Senate acted upon that with an amendment and that the Senate adopted regulatory reform? In effect, what it said is, if there is a regulation promulgated to have a financial impact over \$100 million, that there would be the ability for a legislative veto for 45 days, and the regulation would not become effective for 45 days?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is correct. In fact, the Senator from Nevada was the author of the legislation.

Mr. REID. Is it not true that if a regulation was promulgated for less than \$100 million, it would become effective immediately but that we would have the opportunity to in effect veto that within 45 days?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator from Nevada is exactly correct. His memory is perfect.

Mr. REID. Is it not true that amendment was offered by a Republican Senator, Senator NICKLES, and this Senator, and passed by a vote of 100 to nothing?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. Is it not true that took place approximately 5 months ago, and conferees have not been appointed as a result of inactivity of the majority?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. So we in effect have tried to do regulatory reform, have we not, in this body, and we passed comprehensive regulatory "reform," in some people's minds, by a vote of 100 to nothing?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is absolutely correct. We passed a line-item veto, a legislative veto, and we passed a number of issues relating directly to changing the regulations under which Congress must operate, changing the regulations under which we deal with States, and unfunded mandates. We have had a series of regulatory reform measures already passed, unfortunately many of which have not been passed into law as a result of the Republican opposition.

Mr. REID. And, in fact, I say to my friend, is not it also true, I repeat, that we have been waiting for conferees to be appointed on the regulatory reform that passed this body by 100 to nothing for 5 months?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is absolutely right. There has been no consideration of legislation in conference because the conferees have not been appointed.

Mr. REID. I also say to my friend in the form of a question, is it not true that habeas corpus has been debated on this floor not for hours, not for weeks, but for months, if we add up time over the last 3 or 4 years?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is correct. We have had countless hearings and extraordinary debate on the Senate floor. We have had countless amendments offered as alternatives to legislation that passed. This has been an issue that has been hotly debated for not only weeks and months but for years now in prior Congresses.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, the distinguished minority leader, is it not true also that habeas corpus reform is not a partisan issue? Is that not true?

Mr. DASCHLE. That is correct. The Senator from Nevada is correct in stating that there are Democrats and Republicans on both sides of the issue.

Mr. REID. In fact, I say to my friend from South Dakota, is it not true that on occasions this Senator has joined my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for habeas corpus reform?

Mr. DASCHLE. I would have to go back and check the record, but I will take the Senator's word for it.

Mr. REID. I would ask if you can give this Senator, or the people of this country, any reason why on extending the debt limit we would have habeas corpus, regulatory reform, or termination of these agencies—some of which I agree to—but should we not vote those up or down?

Mr. DASCHLE. I think the Senator makes a very good point. The answer can be provided in one word. The word is "coercion." This is the Republican effort to coerce the President to sign legislation that otherwise he would veto; to sign legislation that he philosophically finds at fault; to sign legislation that many of us on this side of the aisle are very uncomfortable with; to sign legislation that has not been resolved in the case of regulatory reform. It is to finish unfinished business that ought not be finished for good reason—because we have not been able to resolve our differences.

So they are putting it in this language in the hope—and it is only a hope, because the President made it very clear today when he vetoed the bill, it is a false hope that somehow we can resolve these issues by loading up a bill as critical as it is, as the debt limit and the continuing resolution are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to remind the Senator from South Dakota that the 10 minutes allotted to him under morning business has expired, and in fact you have controlled the floor for nearly an hour. It would take unanimous consent in order to continue.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Presiding Officer. I appreciate the indulgence of the Senator from Virginia. I know he wishes to speak. I will regain the floor at a later time.

I yield the floor.

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. GEN. JERRY C. HARRISON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Napoleon once said that "An army marches on its stomach." While Napo-

leon was commenting on the need of soldiers to have secure and dependable supply lines, combat arms personnel also require a multitude of other support services to ensure they have the means to accomplish their missions.

In the U.S. Army, a service of 495,000 men and women, one thinks of branches such as quartermaster, transportation, and finance when the role of "support" is mentioned. One support element that is largely unknown outside of Washington, DC, but is critical to the success and readiness of our soldiers, is the Army's Legislative Liaison Office. For the past 3 years, Maj. Gen. Jerry Harrison has headed this office, which represents the Army's interests on Capitol Hill.

Jerry Harrison's 32-year Army career began with his schooling at the U.S. Military Academy, and has included some of the Army's key postings. His assignments brought him to many billets, both here and abroad, and include Germany, Korea, Washington, DC, and Vietnam, where his efforts in defending a firebase earned him a decoration for valor. His career assignments reflect a high level of professional competence and include valuable command time in some very visible positions, perhaps the most prestigious being his tour as commander, 2d Infantry Division Artillery.

As a product of West Point, an institution respected worldwide for its high standards, General Harrison had instilled upon him the importance of education, and throughout his career, he sought additional civilian and military educational opportunities. A commissioned officer in the field artillery, he graduated from the field artillery basic and advanced courses; the infantry officer advanced course; the Command and General Staff College; and earned a master's degree from the Georgia Institute of Technology. He also returned to his alma mater to teach in the department of mechanics.

Mr. President, today's warrior is an individual who is educated, fit, adept at many different tasks, and a patriot. Gen. Jerry Harrison certainly possesses these characteristics. As the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I am pleased to offer him my congratulations on a distinguished career, and I wish him good health and happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

NONESSENTIAL SENATE OPERATIONS

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate in my capacity as chairman of the Rules Committee.

Earlier today the Sergeant at Arms, the Secretary of the Senate, together with the acting staff director of the Rules Committee, addressed the various staff leaders of the Senators. But I wish to place in the RECORD a memorandum prepared by Secretary of the