be partisan; it will be bipartisan, the way the votes are recorded. And we will act on it.

But, no, repeatedly the Democratic leadership has said, "You cannot bring this bill up unless you take out in advance provisions we object to." Let me tell you what one of those provisions is—in fact, the key one. The conference has language that reverses the President's, in my opinion unconstitutional, act to reverse the Court's decisions on striker replacement. I believe most of the American people agree with the Republicans on this issue. But I say, let us bring it up, offer the amendment and let us vote. But we are being told, no, you cannot even vote on it. So that one strictly resides in the hands of the Senate because they will not allow the bill to be brought up and voted on.

Let me talk about the bills that the President can sign. They include Commerce, and within the Department of Commerce, you have the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Maritime Administration, Federal Communications Commission, the Small Business Administration, and the National Weather Service.

Sign the bill, Mr. President, and all those agencies will be back at work in the morning.

The Justice Department. This includes the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration, Immigration and Naturalization, and Federal prisons. Sign the bill, Mr. President, and put those agencies back to work.

The State Department. We all know what that does.

Veterans Department. If the President will sign the bill on his desk, the veterans' activities will go forward full steam.

Interior Department, including the Forest Service, Indian Health Services, and the Smithsonian. All the President has to do is sign the bill on his desk.

In all of these agencies that I have just been listing, the President has no problem with what is in these bills. He probably wants more spending in each category because that is the construction of the problem. He wants more money spent. Never before in the years I have been in the Senate, or in the Congress, for that matter, have I seen a situation where the President wants to veto appropriations bills because they do not spend enough money.

In the past, Presidents have vetoed appropriations bills because the Congress' insatiable appetite to spend more of the taxpayers' money could not be controlled. Now we have one where the President says, "Send me bills with more spending." It is a unique experience we are having.

Independent agencies: Consumer Product Safety Commission, Environmental Protection Agency, the Federal Emergency Management Administration, National Aeronautics and Space, and the National Science Foundation. All of these independent agencies have funding. We have agreed to language. It is on the President's desk. Sign the bills, Mr. President, and all of these agencies will be put right to work. What are we talking about in terms of the number of employees?

I have here a chart that shows the number of employees we are talking about. Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary involves this number of employees: 194,000 Federal employees; almost 200,000 people. Mr. President, 102,000 at Justice, 25,000 at Commerce, 28,000 that run Judiciary, 25,000 at State Department, 5,800 at SBA, and 8,000 at USIA, for a total of 194,000 Federal employees just affected by Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary.

VA-HUD. NASA has 20,000; National Science Foundation, 2,000; Veterans, 240,000; HUD, 11,000. By the way, I understand about 98 percent of the employees at HUD are considered nonessential—nonessential, 98 percent. There are not a whole lot of the employees that are actually affected by this bill. It would get those back to work, anyway. The Environmental Protection Agency and others, 20,000, for a total of 293,000 affected by the VA-HUD appropriations bill now on President's desk.

The Interior Department, 76,000 employees—seems like an awful lot to me; Indian Health Care, 15,500; Forest Administration, 38,000; Energy Department, 2,300, and 2,000 others, for a total of 133,800. You see part of the problem with the Federal Government: Look how many people you are talking about working for the Federal Government almost 621,000 just affected by these departments.

Interestingly, too, is, why is the President objecting to the Interior appropriations bill? One, I am sure he wants more money. He wants more money for everything, of course. The thing they point to that they object to-get this-the big fight has been over how much timber footage would be allowed to be cut in Alaska in the Tongass area. There has been a long battle over what the agreement should be, but both sides have worked very diligently and reasonable people came up with an agreement between the Senators from Alaska and those in the House that might have some concerns about the number of board feet that is being cut.

Then there is some problem with the Columbia River basin. I do not know exactly what it is, but I emphasize it involves how much timber can be cut in Alaska. Does the President want to shut down the Washington Monument and Carlsbad Caverns because he wants a few hundred thousand less board feet of timber cut in Alaska? Give me a break. The news media are running around and saying, "Oh, the parks are closed down."

Ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues in the Senate, talking about a monument being shut down so terribly trivializes what is at stake here. What we are talking about is trying to control the size of spending of the Federal Government. We are talking about try-

ing to balance the Federal budget. We all know it needs to happen. This is important. You are talking about the Federal Government-what it does, how much to spend, taxes on the people-for the next 7 years. So it is important that we get control of the Federal budget and do it in such a way that more jobs will be created, inflation will stay under control, so that interest rates will fall. We are talking about future generations. We are talking about the future of my son and daughter and the sons and daughters of all of us. Yes, we are talking about my mother, but we are also talking about what will be the situation 7 years from now.

This is big. This is really important. The news media runs around saying, "Oh, the monument is closed." We are talking about billions of dollars. We have those saying, "I cannot get in to the monument." I think that we should be focusing on what we are really trying to accomplish here. This is serious. It is important. It is big. Do not miss the point. The President, with three strokes of the pen today with bills on his desk, can put almost 621,000 Federal employees to work. Should they be working if they are going to get paid? Absolutely, they should.

Mr. President, I emphasize again that the people need to look at what is really happening here. I see the latest wire service story says the President plans to veto today three bills covering Natural Resources, Veterans Affairs, Housing, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State. He says the spending cuts are too large. Yet, if you look at these bills over the next several years or 7 years, they will all go up. They will all go up. Only in Washington when you control the rate of increase is it called a cut.

The President can solve this problem, ladies and gentlemen. It is not the fault of the Congress. Just sign the bills, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEAHY. What is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is conducting morning business until 11:30.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to continue as in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes.

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

VETO PROTECTS OVERTURNING LEGISLATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have listened to the statement of my friend from Mississippi, and I appreciate his rhetoric and his ability to state his position. I think of the expression oft used in summations before the jury, taken in a light most favorable in favor of the opponent. One has to take his statement in the light most favorable to the opponent. The fact of the matter is that the President is right to veto a number of the pieces of legislation before him, not because of a question of spending, but because of a question of legislation being overturned, legislation that was put together by bipartisan majorities over the years.

I use one example. In EPA, one of the bills, basically what the so-called Republican Contract With America has done is cut out the enforcement arm of EPA. They know that they cannot stand up here and pass legislation to repeal our clean water laws. They cannot pass legislation to repeal our clean air laws. Those were laws put together by a majority of Republicans and Democrats working together over the years.

So what do they do? Instead of repealing them, which they cannot do, they simply say we will not enforce them. What they are saving is. "Go ahead and pollute; we don't give a hoot." They have changed the whole idea around. What they are saying, it is the same thing as if they said we will not do away with the law against burglary, but we will not allow you to put any locks on your doors; we will not let you put any guards at your warehouses; we will have no police officers patrol the streets: and we will not answer a call when somebody sees a moving van in the back of your warehouse at 3 o'clock in the morning unloading the warehouse. We will say we have not done away with the laws of burglary, we will just not enforce them.

Back just a few years ago, the Cuyahoga River was on fire because of pollution. That does not occur today. What they are saying, however, is we will not enforce those laws because some of our largest contributors do not like them. We will not enforce the laws that keep the Cuyahoga River or the Wincoski River in Vermont, to keep them clean.

We talk about our children. Our children deserve clean water. Our children deserve clean air. It is certainly going to keep down our health costs. We should not, in the guise of budgetary things, do away with this.

It makes me think, for example, of some of the same—in this new breed, especially in the House, new breed of Republicans, when they spoke of patriotism and honor and flag and everything else, but they passed quickly and quietly in the dark of the night a tax bill which said that if you are one of these billionaires who is willing to stand up and renounce your country, renounce the United States of America, renounce the greatest democracy on Earth, we will give you one hell of a tax break.

Now, Mr. President, it is those things. Somebody once said the Devil is in the details. The Devil is at work in the details of some of these bills. These bills should be talking about our spending priorities. Everybody on this side of the aisle, and I suspect everybody on that side of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, agree that we want to balance the budget in as short a time as possible. But, in doing it, let us not repeal laws that the vast majority of Americans, Republicans or

Democrats, agree on. Let us not repeal our commitment to good education for our children. Let us not repeal our commitment to clean air and clean water under the guise of this. And let us not give away these special tax breaks which say if you stand up and renounce your country we are going to give you a special tax break. That is ridiculous.

We see an example, one person took advantage of this to move down to Belize, because he always liked Belize. However, he said, he gave them some money so they would establish a consulate in his home town in Florida, with the idea he could then still live in Florida and not have to go to Belize, but he would get this multibillion-dollar tax break. Fortunately, the State Department stopped that.

What I suggest is it is time to go back to basics on this. I see people talking across each other. I have said over and over again—I said this this summer-we are not going to pass a Gingrich budget, we are not going to pass a Dole budget, a Daschle budget, a Leahy budget or a Clinton budget. But working together we might pass one. It is going to require the Speaker of the House to stand up to his new freshman class and tell them that we certainly value the experience they have gained in 11 months in office but that there are a lot of others in Government, too, in both parties, who also have experience. Some have even more than 11 months.

It is time to get together. I suggest to them, they may want to look at the dictionary. This is a dictionary and I will read what it says about negotiating. It says to negotiate means:

To arrange for or bring about through conference, discussion and compromise.

If they do not understand the word "compromise," I have that here, too. Compromise means:

A settlement of differences by arbitration or by consent reached by mutual concessions.

Compromise and negotiation does not mean that one side simply says we will walk away from the table unless you agree to everything before we even start our negotiation. Unfortunately that happened last week.

The President of the United States is not going to be ordered by a group of freshman House Republicans—is not going to be ordered to just come in here and give up everything that he believes in and everything he was elected for. The President of the United States, as well as the Democratic leadership in the House and the Senate, have said they will sit down and they are willing to negotiate on every single item. But they are not willing to give away all their points before the negotiation even starts.

When I was in private practice of law I negotiated many, many a case. You come in, each with all your positions intact. Then when you sit down you start dealing out and saying I can give up on this but you can give up on that.

There is an art of compromise involved.

I have served here, twice in the majority, twice in the minority. I have been chairman or ranking member of significant committees and subcommittees. I have gone through a number of committees of conference. Of course you start out with differences. But you sit down. You do not walk away from the table. You sit down to work them out. Most recently in the foreign operations bill we started out with 193 differences with the other body. We negotiated agreements on 192. We have been held up on one, which has become more a difference of polemics and not of substance: of symbols and not substance; of rhetoric and not reality.

What have we come to? This is not the way to run the Government. This is not what people want to see. They want to see our Government run, they want to see our tax dollars well spent. they want to see the budget deficit come down. They would like to see us stop acting like children. They would like to see us get together as men and women elected to run this great country. It is the greatest democracy on Earth. It is the largest economy on Earth, the most powerful nation on Earth, one with worldwide responsibilities as well as responsibilities to our people. Let us come back and make it work.

The President has helped in the way he can, over the weekend, on LIHEAP, emergency heating aid to those in the northern parts of our country like my own State of Vermont, where it is extremely cold. But these are little things. What we need to do is bring together the big things that make it possible so the President does not have to. Why emergency help on something we had all agreed should be done under the regular routine? Let us come together. let us come together on the big issues of Medicare and Medicaid. on nutrition, on education, on defense. We can do it. But we are going to do it only when we learn, when we go back to the dictionary and say compromise is a "settlement of differences * * * by consent reached by mutual concessions." Concessions by Republicans, concessions by Democrats; concessions by the Congress, concessions by the President. It can be done. It is not going to be done if we want to make rhetorical debating points. It can be done if we really believe in upholding our oath of office and helping this country.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO DR. RICHARD HALVERSON

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the life of Dr. Richard Halverson. To many in this body, he was a spiritual leader. To others, he was a counselor. To me, he was both of those and he was also a friend.

I got to know Dick Halverson when he responded to my pleas for help with the Missouri Prayer Breakfast. Despite his hectic schedule, he helped and encouraged me in developing the Missouri Governor's Student Leadership Conference on Faith and Values in Leadership. His display of kindness and love was remarkable. Even more remarkable, however, was that this was not remarkable—it was just the way Dick was.

Dick's legacy will be a lasting one. Words written during his life endure and will serve as inspirational challenges not only to us, but to those yet to be born. A family nurtured by this father, husband, and grandfather will bear a continuing witness to his love. And the countless lives that he touched and influenced and saved help make this world a better place and heaven a more crowded place.

What is the measure of man's life? Richard Halverson knew the answer. A man's life is measured by how much he loves God and how deeply he cares for those that God has put around him. Dick's life was a full one—measured great by any standard of earthly success—counted great by the one opinion that counts. For Dick lived life and lived it abundantly, knowing what was important and what was not. I will miss Dick, but I will also rejoice at all God did through him.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before discussing today's bad news about the Federal debt, how about "another go," as the British put it, with our pop quiz. Remember—one question, one answer.

The question: How many millions of dollars in a trillion? While you are thinking about it, bear in mind that it was the U.S. Congress that ran up the enormous Federal debt that is now about \$11 billion shy of \$5 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business Friday, December 15, the total Federal debt—down to the penny stood at \$4,989,584,833,636.17. Another depressing figure means that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,940.55.

Mr. President, back to our quiz (how many million in a trillion?): There are a million million in a trillion, which means that the Federal Government will shortly owe five million million dollars.

Now who's not in favor of balancing the Federal budget?

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZA-TION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The

clerk will report the pending business. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A conference report to accompany H.R. 1530, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as we continue to debate the conference report on the Department of Defense authorization bill, I want to make just a few opening comments.

As I indicated earlier, it has been long and arduous process, but we have a sound bill that supports our national security and the objectives we set early in the year.

As in every conference there had to be some give and take. I have no doubt that there are provisions in this bill that may be objectionable to some. There are provisions that I would rather not have in a defense bill. However. we must judge this bill as a whole, not by individual provisions. If you make an objective evaluation of the bill, I am confident you will come to the conclusion that all our efforts paid off. We provided for the readiness of the force both for the near term and in the out years. We provided for the welfare of our soldiers and their families. We provided the Department of Defense with the tools to effectively manage and streamline the acquisition of weapons systems and equipment.

Despite our efforts to reach accommodation on all issues with the administration, they have indicated they will oppose the bill. Throughout the day we will address many of the objections and I believe we have a strong case to refute these objections.

I urge my colleagues to come to the floor and participate in this debate. The Senate and the Nation have a great stake in this bill, especially now that our forces are deploying to Bosnia. Mr. President, the House passed this conference report by an overwhelming vote of 269 to 149, I urge the Senate to do no less.

Mr. President, 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. THURMOND. 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. THURMOND. Mr. President, although we have reached agreement with Senator LEAHY on the landmine provision, I would like to respond to remarks made by the Senator from Vermont regarding a provision that would impose a moratorium on landmines that was included in the Senate Defense authorization bill.

When the Senator from Vermont introduced his provision in the Chamber, I, along with Senators NUNN and WAR-NER, raised objections to his provision. The provision would express the sense of the Congress with regard to a treaty review conference on conventional weapons, sanction foreign governments that export antipersonnel landmines, and it would impose a moratorium on the defensive use of antipersonnel landmines by U.S. Armed Forces.

Mr. President, the portion of the provision that caused us such grave concern was that portion that would place a moratorium on U.S. Armed Forces use of antipersonnel landmines for defensive purposes.

Mr. President, the Department of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Department of Justice raised objections to this provision and specifically the portion of the provision that would place a moratorium on the use of antipersonnel landmines by the U.S. Armed Forces for defensive purposes.

Specifically, DOD and the Joint Chiefs of Staff strongly opposed the provision because it would have a detrimental impact on the ability of the military forces to protect themselves and require the removal of mine fields emplaced in demilitarized zones. The Department of Justice opposed the inclusion of this provision because it is their view that it is a serious infringement on the President's authority as Commander in Chief, stating, "* * * the Congress may decide upon the weapons available to the President, it may not dictate how those weapons are to be used in military operations.'

Throughout the conference the House objected to this provision. The Senate defended the provision of the Senator from Vermont. At the same time, there were discussions with the House of the need to obtain a report from the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the impact of a moratorium on the defensive use of antipersonnel and antitank mines. Additionally, the House asked that prior to the implementation of a moratorium, that the Secretary of Defense certify that the moratorium would not adversely affect U.S. military capabilities, and that there were adequate substitutes.

Mr. President, I would point out that the Senator's provision is in the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations conference report. After the foreign operations appropriations conference report was agreed to, with this provision in it, the Senator from Vermont came to me and asked that the committee drop his provision from the Defense bill. Based on his request, the Senate conferees dropped the landmine moratorium provision from the bill. However, the committee retained the report requirement. I do not understand why the Senator from Vermont