

Mr. President, I am watching history repeat itself. I joined in the opposition to Reaganomics and what Stockman says was the worst mistake we ever made. I joined in the tax increases to try and reverse it. I joined in Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. When they write now, as Senator RUDMAN has, that Senator Hollings wanted a divorce, they should be clear about the facts. Instead of using the automatic cuts as a spear to urge and require fiscal discipline, they started to use it as a shield for fiscal irresponsibility, and I wanted no part in that. I voted for the tax increases here in 1993. At the time, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, "Well, you cannot trust that Washington crowd. If they increase the taxes, that means all they will do is increase the spending." False.

In 1993, we increased taxes and cut spending to the tune of \$500 billion. In direct result, we have an economy with low unemployment, low interest rates, steady growth, and low inflation. And they say that the President is "too clever by half," and is "postponing choices."

Once again, Mr. President, when they say the President did not make any honest try, perhaps we should remember Mr. Volcker's words on the 1993 package:

I don't think there is any doubt that the package was part of an honest effort to reverse the trend of the budget deficit.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry; what is the order of business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRASSLEY). We are in morning business. The Senator from New Mexico has control of the time from 1 o'clock until 3:30.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am disappointed that we could not work out an agreement with the minority that would allow us to complete action on the conference agreement on the budget today. I had hoped we could do that so our distinguished majority leader would have an opportunity before he left the Senate to cast his vote in favor of this budget resolution and a balanced budget by the year 2002. The conference agreement on the 1997 budget resolution was completed last Thursday evening and filed Friday morning. Copies of the conference report have been available since early this morning. The House of Represent-

atives Rules Committee will act this evening to report a rule that will allow the House to act on the conference report tomorrow morning and complete action by noon.

Normally, we would simply call up the conference report, discuss the conference report, since it would not be subject to amendment, yield back the statutory 10 hours of time and vote on final passage. Without consent to the contrary, however, here in the Senate, if we were to act on a conference report before the House has acted, the conference report would be subjected to unlimited recommittal motions, and the minority is aware of this opportunity to subject the Senate, and I say Leader DOLE, to an unlimited number of such motions. Therefore, they have not been willing to grant us consent that would allow us to do what we are going to do tomorrow. Once the House sends us this, we will take it up, and obviously there will be no recommittal motions in order, as I understand it, at that point.

We were trying to get the minority to let us start that process today and perhaps complete this before the leader leaves sometime tomorrow, around 12 or 1 o'clock. It means he will not have a chance to vote on it. It does not mean that there will be anything happen to the budget resolution. I assume we will have his successor Senator voting with us, as we have had him.

I will have more opportunity tomorrow to discuss the significance of this budget resolution and what it does. I might just start with one concept for everybody to understand. On the discretionary appropriations, which has been the subject of an awful lot of debate last year which caused many appropriations bills to be vetoed by the President and caused the closure of Government from time to time during that long process of trying to get appropriations completed, we have resolved our differences between the House and Senate.

We have produced a budget resolution that, essentially, has all of the domestic discretionary programs combined at a freeze—same level as last year, according to the Congressional Budget Office. That is the number that we agreed upon. That means if we take all the riders off those appropriations bills, and I understand that there is some movement in that direction, we can clearly be sending to the President appropriations bills that he ought to sign. Clearly, the American people will understand it very easily. The Republicans do not want to reduce spending. They want to freeze it. They are not out there to close down Government. They just want to say, in a very difficult year, we should freeze the expenditures of the appropriated accounts at last year's level. That is what we will be doing. That is what the appropriations bills are going to reflect in the next 5, 6, 7 weeks.

Hopefully, if we get those done, we can finish our work early or even ahead

of time with reference to the appropriations bills which caused so much commotion last year and so much ill-will and ill-feeling between many people in the country and this various series of vetoes and closures. That will be the essence of the Republican approach. Obviously, big savings come in the entitlement reform programs. We will move those through in due course. Once again, we believe we are on the right path. We will discuss what we think the President's approach to Medicare has been. Clearly, he is playing a major shell game with this big program that the senior citizens need so desperately to have attended by way of reform.

We will get into those details tomorrow. I have not sought approval from any of the leadership here to make this statement, but, frankly, I am very hopeful when we finally get on this budget resolution tomorrow, that even though there are 10 hours of debate equally divided, we will finish tomorrow. No motions are in order, no amendments are in order. I see no reason why we cannot finish it tomorrow, even if we take it up sometime in the middle of the afternoon tomorrow. That ought to be plenty of time to debate it and finish tomorrow to get on with other Senate work.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Senator DOMENICI opened debate on the 1997 budget conference committee report, the agreement that has been ironed out on the differences between the House and the Senate, for presentation to the Senate for final passage, so that the 1997 budget will be behind us and we can start making changes in the programs that will fit these programs into the budget that balances by the year 2002, 6 years from now.

CBO has scored it that way. CBO is a nonpartisan agency that rules on whether or not budgets are balanced and what programs cost and how much income is coming in. They said that this will balance by that time.

The year 2002 is the year that we selected last year to balance the budget by. Our bill was presented to the President last year, and he vetoed it. We are not going to take an extra year to balance the budget when we do it this year. We are going to do it in 6 years now because that is all we have left between now and the year 2002. I hope that my colleagues will vote for that.

In a sense, as the famous baseball player said, "It's *deja vu* all over again." It is kind of that way with the Balanced Budget Act that we are dealing with today, tomorrow and the next day until it is passed. Because last year we worked for 8 months in 13 committees to pass this 1,800-page Balanced Budget Act of 1995. This was a bill that 13 committees worked on to produce