crooks and the con artists and stops them and recovers money for the taxpayers.

We cannot fund that. I just wish somebody could justify that to me. I do not understand it. I guess we are going to be considering a new continuing resolution tomorrow.

I want to take this opportunity today to let my colleagues know that I intend to insist that that continuing resolution provide adequate funding for the Office of Inspector General in the Department of Health and Human Services to fight Medicare fraud, waste, and abuse. If we do not, then it is the crooks and the scam artists who will be smiling as they rip off the taxpayers even further.

I just want to point that out, Mr. President. If there is a continuing resolution and they are going to fund some portions of the Government to go on, this is one portion of the Government that this Senator is not going to let sit there and not be adequately funded. People are talking about cutting Medicare and making our beneficiaries pay more for their monthly premiums to make up for Medicare shortfalls in the future. I say, wait a minute, if the General Accounting Office is saying that up to 10 percent of Medicare money is lost to waste, fraud, and abuse, that is $18 billion a year each year for 7 years. We already have more money than we need right there to make up for the Medicare shortfall that we face.

So this is an important matter and I intend to pursue it. I hope Senators will do so on both sides of the aisle—I do not say this is a partisan issue. I just hope we pay some attention to this issue and make sure the Office of Inspector General is fully funded.

THE 1996 FARM PROGRAM

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I know my colleague from Oklahoma is seeking the floor. I am going to take a few minutes on a different topic. I want to mention how greatly concerned I am that Congress appears to be set to go into recess for a month while the details of the 1996 farm program remain unresolved.

Farmers have been waiting for a long time to know what the program will be for this year. They need to be able to make plans to line up seed, fertilizer, chemicals, and credit. As we all know, and as I know the occupant of the Chair knows from representing his State and the farmers in his State, farming is a very capital-intensive business. Farmers need to know what type of Federal policy they are operating under so they know what they need in terms of capital in order to arrange the credit for this year's expenses.

Second, the farm bill is not just for farmers, it is for everyone. It is for our consumers as well as our farmers. It is for exports. It is for the whole infrastructure of processing, making and distributing our food products in this country. The fact that we do not have a farm bill has broad ramifications.

We should have had a full farm bill debate last year. I know of no one on my side of the aisle who either filibustered or in any way indicated that he or she would filibuster a farm bill. We had some committee meetings last year under the able leadership of the Senator from Indiana, Senator LUGAR. I will be very up front about it. Those on my side of the aisle, the Democrats, proffered a farm bill proposal. We debated it, we voted on it, and we lost. I understand that, but at least we had the opportunity to debate it and vote on it.

Then the majority party, the Republicans, offered their farm bill in committee. We debated it and we voted on it. They won. I have no problems with that. That is the way it ought to be. But then I expected the bill to be brought to the floor of the Senate so that other Senators who have equal interest in agriculture and agriculture policy could have their day to offer amendments, debate the bill, and then pass it. Maybe some of those amendments would have been adopted, maybe some would not have been, but that is the way the Senate should operate.

To this day, we still have not had an agriculture bill on the Senate floor for debate, amendments, and passage. What happened was—I do not cast any broad nets or use any broad brush, but some people in the majority party decided that they would sit down behind closed doors, write a bill, and put it into the massive budget reconciliation bill. Again, there was no realistic opportunity to debate, offer amendments, or to reach compromise and do what is right for rural America and our Nation.

Now I understand someone in the other body is saying that if there is going to be a continuing resolution, he wants to put his version of the farm bill on it. That proposal is basically the same as was put in the budget bill. Well, that is not the version I like. Maybe that is the version that might eventually get through. I do not know for certain, but I do not think so. I do not think it would have the votes to pass. But at least it ought to be debated, and we ought to have a full and fair opportunity to discuss it, vote on it, and amend it. That proposal should not be rushed through as part of a continuing resolution.

Farm policy is too important to be ramrodded through here without adequate time to debate it and amend it. We do not need much time. If we had a day or two to debate a farm bill, I think we could pass it. It probably would not be exactly what I want, but at least we would have our day to debate it, offer some amendments, and maybe we could reach some compromises.

All I can say about that so-called Freedom to Farm Act that the chairman on the other side wants to attach to the continuing resolution is that they ran that up and down the flagpole a number of times last year. It does not have the votes to get through. It cannot pass either the House or the Senate on its own merits.

So on that so-called Freedom to Farm Act, we ought to just say the last rites, move on and try to find some compromises we can work from, and let us do it in a bipartisan fashion.

I have worked on a number of farm bills in the past. At times they have generated a lot of emotional and intellectual debate on farm policy. They have been good debates, some of them pretty tough, but in the end, we fashioned a bipartisan compromise, and we moved on. That is the way we ought to do it again this year.

So, Mr. President, there are steps we can take. It is getting very late in the year to try to fashion some entirely new program. I had hoped that we would have had a new program for this year, but we do not. More and more, it seems the only feasible thing to do appears to be extending the present farm bill for 1 year, and making some immediate changes that we can all agree on—planting flexibility, for example. Both sides agree it is needed. We agreed on that in committee. That is no problem. We can reach agreement on how to deal with the repayment of the 1995 advance deficiency payments. I think both sides agree on working that out. We could do that. So we could resolve those important issues, and at least farmers would know what to expect this year, and they could get on with their business.

If I had my druthers, I would rather we did not have an extension of the 1990 farm bill, but it is too late to do anything markedly different now. So that seems the most likely outcome we are faced with now, to extend the 1990 bill, make a few needed changes that we agree upon and then move on.

Mr. President, I thank you and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

MAJOR CONCERNS

WAR ON DRUGS IN AMERICA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I listened with interest when the Senator from Utah was talking about some of the drug problems that are facing this Nation and that concern all of us deeply. He made a comment that we are all pleased that Barry McCaffrey, if he is confirmed, will be taking over as drug czar to actually do something about it. It is long overdue.

I sat in the other Chamber and listened to the President during his State of the Union Message 2 days ago. He expressed this great concern about the drug problem in America. Yet he has done nothing for the first 3 years about the drug problem.

We did, I guess, have a drug czar, but the number of personnel who were supposed to be participating in the program to address the drug problem in America was cut by 75 percent, from 100 down to 25 people. The amount of money that was spent on the drug problem was actually cut in half.

I hope that Gen. Barry McCaffrey will be confirmed and will come out with a very aggressive drug program. I only regret that we lost 3 years in the battle against drugs in America. Everything that the Senator from Utah said made a lot of sense to me.

PEACEMAKING

I am also concerned about two other things that no one is talking about, Mr. President. One is a statement that was made by the President of the United States, not one time but twice during his State of the Union Message. He said that ''Americans should no longer have to fend for themselves.'' Americans should no longer have to fend for themselves. I got to thinking—and maybe I am making the wrong interpretation on this—but is that not what made America great, what distinguishes us from other countries? If you say that Americans should no longer have to fend for themselves, then that leads you to the incontrovertible conclusion that the Government should take care of us instead. I think, in a subliminal way, that is perhaps what the President was saying.

If I were to single out the thing that bothered me the most about the message—not just the inconsistencies and the talk about the role of Government and the one-liners about large Government coming to an end and all of that—it was the statement that he made that almost went unnoticed regarding a new national policy that our military is no longer to be used to defend America, but for peacemaking.

I have watched this progress, first when we made the commitment into Somalia—and that was not President Clinton, that was actually President Bush that made that decision after he had lost the election and before President Clinton was sworn into office—when our troops were supposed to be there for 45 days. It was not until 18 of our Rangers were killed almost a year later that President Clinton agreed to bring the troops home. Well, that was a concern to me. Haiti was a concern, and Rwanda was, and now, of course, Bosnia is. We had our debate on Bosnia, and now we are going to support our troops all we can. I kept thinking that all these humanitarian gestures were kind of incidental things, or accidents that, well, if there is something that the President seems to think is very significant in a part of the world, we need to get involved because there are human rights violations and murders going on and things that we all find deplorable.

But in his State of the Union Message, he made it national policy for the first time, that our role is now peacemaking throughout the world. This is not some idle remark—it is the President of the United States who is making this statement, in a State of the Union Message which all of the world was watching. If I were sitting out there listening in any number of countries that are having problems right now, I would say, ''Good, we do not have to worry because the good old United States is going to come in and solve our problems.''

Now, with a starved military budget—which in purchasing dollars is less than it was in 1980 when we could not even afford spare parts—we are diluting our force by sending troops around the world on peacekeeping missions. We now have a vetoed Department of Defense authorization bill. In the veto message the President says he is vetoing it because we have money in there to complete our national missile defense system, which I contend is about 85 percent complete today—as if there is something wrong with defending America.

We keep going back and talking about the 1972 ABM Treaty. Mr. President, as you will remember, that treaty was constructed back at a time when our policy was one of mutual assured destruction. The justification was that we had two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the United States, and if we both agreed not to defend ourselves, not to have the capability to knock down missiles as they were coming over to our countries, neither country would attack the other. Well, that was the policy. Frankly, I did not agree with it at the time, but it at least made some sense in that there were two superpowers.

Now we have a totally different environment. The interesting thing about this is that Henry Kissinger, the architect of the ABM Treaty, told me not long ago that it no longer has application today. Today we have a proliferation of threats from places all over the world and it is not isolated in one place. To quote Dr. Kissinger, ''it is nuts to make a virtue out of our vulnerability.'' That is the situation we are in today, which disturbs me so much as a member of the Intelligence Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee. But you do not have to go to those of us who may be accused of being overly concerned about missile attacks on the United States of America. You can go to James Woolsey, former CIA Director, who was appointed not by a Republican President, but by President Clinton. Jim Woolsey said there are between 20 and 25 nations that either are developing or have developed weapons of mass destruction, either chemical, biological, or nuclear, and are working on the means to deliver those warheads.

This is what concerns me because we know right now that the threat is greater than it was during the cold war. During the State of the Union Message, the President said—and he got a rousing ovation—''For the first time, Russian missiles are not pointing at America's children.'' But I can say this: At least when the Russian missiles were pointing at America's children, we knew where they were. Now it could be Iran, Iraq, Syria, North Korea, or China, any number of places. We do not know where they are. But we know there are two dozen countries that are developing the technology and capability of delivering missiles to the United States.

Mr. President, the ABM Treaty stated that it is all right to have a theater missile defense system in place. It is all right if you are in the Sea of Japan and you see two missiles coming out of North Korea, one going toward Japan, which you can shoot down; but if one is going to the United States, you cannot shoot it down because that would violate the ABM Treaty of 1972. I also have contended that the ABM Treaty was between two parties, one party of which no longer exists today.

So I will support the DOD authorization bill, even though I think it was a bad decision to take the national missile defense language out of the bill.

Before somebody comes running in the Chamber and starts talking about star wars and all of these mythical things and making people believe there is not a threat out there, let me just suggest, Mr. President, that I am not talking, even right now, about space-launched missiles to intercept missiles. We are talking now about surface-launched missiles, the technology of which we already have.

Anybody who watched CNN during the Persian Gulf war watched missiles knock down missiles. That is not supernatural; that is not something out of Buck Rogers or Star Wars; that is a technology that works today. We have an investment of $40 billion in the Aegis system, which is about 22 ships that have launching capability. We are trying to spend a little bit more over a 5-year period, approximately $5 billion more, for that capability to reach to the upper tier. That would mean that if a missile were launched from North Korea, taking about 30 minutes to get over here, we would be able to do something about it and knock it down before it came into the United States. Between that and the THAAD missile technology, which is already here, we could upgrade what we already have billions of dollars invested in, and defend America.

I do not understand why this aversion toward defending America keeps coming out of the White House. We know the technology that is here, and we know what the North Koreans are doing. We know the type of missile North Korea is developing is going to be capable of reaching Alaska and Hawaii by the year 2000 and the continental United States by 2002.

I saw something only yesterday that I would like to share.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article in yesterday's New York Times entitled ''As China Threatens Taiwan, It Makes Sure U.S. Listens'' be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Jan. 25, 1996]

AS CHINA THREATENS TAIWAN, IT MAKES SURE U.S. LISTENS

(By Patrick E. Tyler)

BEIJING, JANUARY 23.—The Chinese leadership has sent unusually explicit warnings to the Clinton Administration that China has completed plans for a limited attack on Taiwan that could be mounted in the weeks after Taiwan's President, Lee Tenghui, wins the first democratic balloting for the presidency in March.

The purpose of this saber-rattling is apparently to prod the United States to rein in Taiwan and President Lee, whose push for greater international recognition for the island of 21 million people, has been condemned here as a drive for independence.

While no one familiar with the threats thinks China is on the verge of risking a catastrophic war against Taiwan, some China experts fear that the Taiwan issue has become such a test of national pride for Chinese leaders that the danger of war should be taken seriously.

A senior American official said the Administration has ''no independent confirmation or even credible evidence'' that the Chinese are contemplating an attack, and spoke almost dismissively of the prospect.

''They can fire missiles, but Taiwan has some teeth of its own,'' the official said. ''And does China want to risk that and the international effects?''

The most pointed of the Chinese warnings was conveyed recently through a former Assistant Secretary of Defense, Chas. W. Freeman Jr., who traveled to China this winter or discussions with senior Chinese officials. On Jan. 4, after returning to Washington, Mr. Freeman informed President Clinton's national security adviser, Anthony Lake, that the People's Liberation Army had prepared plans for a missile attack against Taiwan consisting of one conventional missile strike a day for 30 days.

This warning followed similar statements relayed to Administration officials by John W. Lewis, a Stanford University political scientist who meets frequently with senior Chinese military figures here.

These warnings do not mean that an attack on Taiwan is certain or imminent. Instead, a number of China specialists say that China, through ''credible preparations'' for an attack, hopes to intimidate the Taiwanese and to influence American policy toward Taiwan. The goal, these experts say, is to force Taiwan to abandon the campaign initiated by President Lee, including his effort to have Taiwan seated at the United Nations, and to end high-profile visits by President Lee to the United States and to other countries.

If the threats fail to rein in Mr. Lee, however, a number of experts now express the view that China could resort to force, despite the enormous consequences for its economy and for political stability in Asia.

Since last summer, when the White House allowed Mr. Lee to visit the United States, the Chinese leadership has escalated its attacks on the Taiwan leader, accusing him of seeking to ''split the motherland'' and undermine the ''one China'' policy that had been the bedrock of relations between Beijing and its estranged province since 1949.

A Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman, asked to comment on reports that the Chinese military has prepared plans for military action against Taiwan, said he was awaiting a response from his superiors. Last month, a senior ministry official said privately that China's obvious preparations for military action have been intended to head off an unwanted conflict.

''We have been trying to do all we can to avoid a scenario in which we are confronted in the end with no other option but a military one,'' the official said. He said that if China does not succeed in changing Taiwan's course, ''then I am afraid there is going to be a war.''

Mr. Freeman described the most recent warning during a meeting Mr. Lake had called with nongovernmental China specialists.

Participants said that Mr. Freeman's presentation was arresting as he described being told by a Chinese official of the advanced state of military planning. Preparations for a missile attack on Taiwan, he said, and the target selection to carry it out, have been completed and await a final decision by the Politburo in Beijing.

One of the most dramatic moments came when Mr. Freeman quoted a Chinese official as asserting that China could act militarily against Taiwan without fear of intervention by the United States because American leaders ''care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan,'' a statement that Mr. Freeman characterized as an indirect threat by China to use nuclear weapons against the United States.

An account of the White House meeting was provided by some of the participants. Mr. Freeman, reached by telephone, confirmed the gist of his remarks, reiterating that he believes that while ''Beijing clearly prefers negotiation to combat,'' there is a new sense of urgency in Beijing to end Taiwan's quest for ''independent international status.''

Mr. Freeman said that President Lee's behavior ''in the weeks following his re-election will determine'' whether Beijing's Communist Party leaders feel they must act ''by direct military means'' to change his behavior.

In recent months, Mr. Freeman said he has relayed a number of warnings to United States Government officials. ''I have quoted senior Chinese who told me'' that China ''would sacrifice 'millions of men' and 'entire cities' to assure the unity of China and who opined that the United States would not make comparable sacrifices.''

He also asserted that ''some in Beijing may be prepared to engage in nuclear blackmail against the U.S. to ensure that Americans do not obstruct'' efforts by the People's Liberation Army ''to defend the principles of Chinese sovereignty over Taiwan and Chinese national unity.''

Some specialists at the meeting wondered if Mr. Freeman's presentation was too alarmist and suggested that parliamentary elections on Taiwan in December had resulted in losses for the ruling Nationalist Party and that President Lee appeared to be moderating his behavior to avoid a crisis.

''I am not alarmist at this point,'' said one specialist, who would not comment on the substance of the White House meeting. ''I don't think the evidence is developing in that direction.''

Other participants in the White House meeting, who said they would not violate the confidentiality pledge of the private session, separately expressed their concern that a potential military crisis is building in the Taiwan Strait.

''I think there is evidence to suggest that the Chinese are creating at least the option to apply military pressure to Taiwan if they feel that Taiwan is effectively moving out of China's orbit politically,'' said Kenneth Lieberthal, a China scholar at the University of Michigan and an informal adviser to the Administration.

Mr. Lieberthal, who also has traveled to China in recent months, said Beijing has redeployed forces from other parts of the country to the coastal areas facing Taiwan and set up new command structures ''for various kinds of military action against Taiwan.''

''They have done all this in a fashion they know Taiwan can monitor,'' he said, ''so as to become credible on the use of force.''

''I believe there has been no decision to use military force,'' he continued, ''and they recognize that it would be a policy failure for them to have to resort to force; but they have set up the option, they have communicated that in the most credible fashion and, I believe, the danger is that they would exercise it in certain circumstances.''

Several experts cited their concern that actions by Congress in the aftermath of President Lee's expected election could be a critical factor contributing to a military confrontation. If President Lee perceives that he has a strong base of support in the United States Congress and presses forward with his campaign to raise Taiwan's status, the risk of a military crisis is greater, they said. A chief concern is that Congress would seek to invite the Taiwan leader back to the United States as a gesture of American support. A Chinese military leader warned in November that such a step could have ''explosive'' results.

In recent months, American statements on whether United States forces would come to the defense of Taiwan if it came under attack have been deliberately vague so as to deter Beijing through a posture of what the Pentagon calls ''strategic ambiguity.''

Some members of Congress assert that the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 includes an implicit pledge to defend Taiwan if attacked, but Administration officials say that, in the end, the decision would depend on the timing, pretext and nature of Chinese aggression.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in this article, entitled ''As China Threatens Taiwan, It Makes Sure U.S. Listens,'' the Times reporter reports on some ominous information recently passed to the National Security Adviser, Anthony Lake, concerning measures being taken by Beijing to facilitate military action against Taiwan and statements intended to deter the United States from coming to Taipei's assistance.

According to Charles Freeman, former United States Ambassador to China and now an Assistant Secretary of Defense, a Chinese official told him of the advanced state of military planning and that preparations for missile attack on Taiwan and the target selection to carry it out have been completed and await a final decision by the Politburo in Beijing. Freeman reported to Mr. Lake that a Chinese official had asserted that the Chinese could act militarily against Taiwan without fear of intervention by the United States because American leaders ''care more about Los Angeles than they do about Taiwan,'' a statement Mr. Freeman characterized as an indirect threat by China to use nuclear weapons against the United States.

I do not think anyone who is watching what is going on in the world today can miss the threats that come both subliminally and directly from various countries. If those people watched Saddam Hussein during the Persian Gulf war, they know that he would not have hesitated to use this capability on the United States if he had had it. But today we have more than two dozen countries that are developing such a capability.

If I could single out this one thing that I heard from the President's State of the Union Message 2 days ago, this is the most disturbing thing that came out of his message. We can concentrate on the inconsistencies or the statements he made about wanting to have welfare reform, when in fact he vetoed the very bill he says he now wants; and when Americans stood up and applauded when he said he was going to downsize Government, when he, in fact, is increasing the size of Government every day in assigning new tasks and putting more jobs into job programs and into retirement programs and into environmental programs—he mentioned 14 different areas of Government he wanted to increase—in every area except for defense, he wants to increase government.

''Wait a minute,'' he said, ''Now I am very proud to tell you we have 200,000 fewer Government employees than when I took office.'' Let me tell you where the employees came from. They came from the Defense Department. They came from our defense system. If you exclude the defense system, our Government has grown dramatically, whether you talk about the budget or whether you talk about the number of employees. It is very deceptive for the President to say that.

Again, all of that aside, as offensive as that may be to thinking Americans, the thing that has to be looked at is this new role that our military has of peacemaking as opposed to the role of defending America.

I wish that more people in this Senate Chamber had been able to be with me on the days following April 19 in Oklahoma City, in my beautiful State of Oklahoma, where the most devastating terrorist attack, domestic attack, in the history of the world took place. When you saw, as we saw in the Chamber the other day, Richard Dean, who went in there after he himself had gotten out of the building and dragged out three or four other people. The stories of the heroes of that disaster were just incredible. Jennifer Rodgers, the police officer acknowledged during the State of the Union Message—and I appreciate the President doing that—sure, ask Jennifer Rodgers or Richard Dean about the devastation of that bomb in Oklahoma City. That bomb was measured as equal to 1 ton of TNT. The smallest warhead we know of today, nuclear warhead, is equal to 1,000 tons of TNT.

Now, that has to tell you, if you are concerned as we were about what happened in one building and all the tragedy surrounding that, that if you multiply that by 1,000—and I do not care if it is a city in Oklahoma or New York or Washington or anywhere else in the world—that is a pretty huge threat that is out there. It is a very real threat. As yesterday's paper indicates, it is even a greater threat and a more documented threat than it was before. Yet the President has shown no regard for the defense of this country against this threat.

Mr. President, we will have a chance to address this. Yes, we do want to pass the Defense authorization bill even though missile defense has been taken out of it. But we will return to the battle over missile defense, and to this new humanitarian role that our military has, in future debates.

I guess I will conclude with another concern that is not as life-threatening. Of course, we are concerned about the lives that would be lost if we failed to defend ourselves, but in these various humanitarian peacemaking missions that is the new rule of our military, somebody has to ask the question: Who is going to pay for this? We have a President who has taken virtually all of the money out of the military budget that would go into equipment to defend America, and yet we are going to have to come around and pay for all this stuff that is going on in Bosnia and elsewhere.

I picked up something the other day in last week's Defense News that I guess has the solution. Pentagon officials said on January 3 that the budget cuts could come from areas where Congress has increased funding, such as missile defense, to pay the bill for these missions. This is from Pentagon officials. ''Congress increased Clinton's overall budget request by $7 billion in 1996. It is intuitive that any money above the President's request would be reprogrammed to pay for Bosnia,'' one senior Pentagon official said on January 2.

That tells us two things. First of all, the $1.5 billion that the President says it will cost for the humanitarian exercise in Bosnia is grossly understated. It could be up to $7 billion. The studies I have seen show it around $5 billion. I guess we not only are redirecting our military to a new role and that new role is peacemaking, but we are also going to pay for it with the dollars we would otherwise use to defend America. This is wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from Arkansas.

SENATE BUSINESS

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, tomorrow is the drop-dead date for Congress on how we will keep the Government going. In addition, the deadline is fast approaching on honoring the full faith and the credit clause of the Constitution. I say not only to the people of this country but to people all over the world that we intend to honor the debentures you hold, and we will pay you interest for helping us finance our debt.

I have never really felt that when push came to shove, there would be any question about whether or not we would extend and raise the debt ceiling. There still is not. I feel sure this will happen. If it does not happen tomorrow, as it should, it will certainly happen by the last day of February. To do otherwise would be the height of irresponsibility. So I am not really worried about that, and I applaud some of the comments I have seen by Mr. ARMEY and Speaker GINGRICH on that subject.

Now, tomorrow, as I understand it, the Senate will vote on a continuing resolution to keep the Government afloat until March 1. Also, I understand that the continuing resolution will fund most of the programs not covered by enacted appropriations bills at 75 percent of the fiscal year 1995 funding level or the lower of the funding levels provided by the fiscal year 1996 House or Senate appropriations bill, if that level exceeds the 75 percent funding level. However, programs funded pursuant to the HUD–VA bill and State, Justice, Commerce bill, will be funded at the levels provided in their conference reports.

Programs funded pursuant to the third bill on which we have a conference report, namely Interior, as I understand it, are going to be funded instead as if the Interior bill did not have a conference report. All the agencies funded in that bill will have to live on the lower of the House or Senate bill, or 75 percent of what they got in 1995.

Mr. President, tomorrow when the debate on the continuing resolution begins, I hope somebody will be able to tell me why we are treating the programs funded by the Interior appropriations bill differently. I do not like that. I see no reason not to treat Interior the same way we do HUD–VA, and State, Justice, Commerce.

Second, at some point tomorrow there is going to be a motion made by the majority leader to adjourn the U.S. Senate until February 26. I can tell you categorically that I do not intend to vote for that motion. It is almost as unfathomable to me why we would leave here, with all this work undone, until February 26, as it is why we want to shut the Government down all the time around here.

I have been here 21 years and things have happened here in the last 3 months that, in my opinion, are not only unfathomable and unexplainable, but inexcusable. We are supposed to be here to govern. We are not supposed to be here making sure all 100 Senators and all 435 Congressmen, get their way. I think it was Longfellow who said one time: ''You better be careful about what you pray for because you might get it.'' You have 100 Senators here and everybody is saying if I cannot have my way there will be no way. Governing is the art of compromise. There are strong feelings on that side of the aisle and this side of the aisle on hundreds of items.

I did not get my way on the space station or that sucker would have been dead a long time ago. One hundred billion dollars squandered. And we say we need more money for education?

Congress has provided $7 billion more for the Defense Department than the administration requested. ''We don't