

21 minutes. There were 295 airplanes airborne under Oakland's ARTCC's control at the time of the outage.

A few weeks later, August 22, a power failure at Bay TRACON disabled Oakland's radar system again. Backup radar provided only 85 percent coverage and took 3 to 5 minutes to come on line.

And 3 days later, August 25, 1995, a dual sensor problem disabled Bay TRACON's Oakland radar system.

September 6, the controllers lose power to voice and computer data lines at Oakland ARTCC used to control and track aircraft over the Pacific Ocean.

The next day, September 7, 1995, the main and backup power supply fails at Oakland ARTCC. Power is not restored in time to preserve the data base in the oceanic computer known as ODAPS. Controllers rebuild the data base manually when the computer power is returned. The shutdown lasted 4 hours.

A few days later, September 13, 1995, the Bay TRACON's Oakland radar failed three times when a 26-year-old microwave link malfunctioned. The first failure lasted 32 minutes. The second failure lasted 81 minutes. And the third failure lasted for hours.

Two weeks later, September 25, 1995, an internal power failure at Bay TRACON disabled so-called noncritical systems and caused air-conditioners to go out. Controllers were exposed to 90-degree heat in the control room, computers overheated and failed due to the extreme temperature increase.

October 1, 1995, a power surge at Moffett Field caused a radar site to switch to engine generators. While repairs were being made the next day, the bay area was without a backup system for 7 hours.

October 27, 1995, during the morning inbound rush and foggy conditions, the Bay TRACON computer froze and caused controllers to perform automated functions manually.

November 3, 1995, faulty computer connections forced air traffic controllers in Fremont to track aircraft with a backup system for nearly 48 hours.

November 28, just a few days ago, airport surveillance radar at the Oakland airport goes down for an hour.

Needless to say, it is a miracle that no collisions have occurred. This is the fourth busiest airspace in the Nation. The situation and the growing frequency of outages across the United States are simply disasters waiting to happen.

These examples from the San Francisco Bay area are symptomatic of a nationwide problem. At a time when the private sector is building the most advanced airplanes in the world, the FAA is still using equipment that is over a quarter of a century old.

I realize that resources are an issue. Yet the airport and airways trust fund which funds the FAA has an annual budget of \$12 billion a year. I cannot stress enough the importance of this money translating into new equipment for air traffic control centers across

the country. We cannot continue to function with a system that often fails and leaves the safety of airline passengers in question.

These equipment outages, along with a recent Los Angeles Times report of equipment falling off old aircraft and very nearly landing on human beings, has me very worried about public safety. What concerns me more than these dangers, however, is the FAA's assessment that no lives are at risk.

Given the above list of outages along with reports of equipment nearly killing people as it falls from the sky, I find this extremely difficult to believe. Some action must be taken.

It has been suggested that the FAA could operate more effectively if removed from the Department of Transportation. I am not certain if that is the answer, but it is obvious to me that some dramatic improvements must be made in order to ensure the safety of the flying public.

I would like to offer any necessary and appropriate assistance to facilitate a change in the priorities of the Federal Aviation Administration. I look forward to working with my colleagues toward a solution to this increasingly alarming situation.

Next week I hope to come before the Senate to discuss similar incidents at Los Angeles International Airport. I yield the floor.

PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

#### BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, we had asked last night for a period of a special order this morning to discuss the President's veto of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. Certainly I, and I think a good number of Americans, Mr. President, watched yesterday as this President with grand theater and style worked overtime to cover up the fact that he has not produced a balanced budget and in fact cannot, given his agenda, produce a budget that will be in balance by the year 2002.

Instead, yesterday he accused Republicans of not recognizing the need for education, of not recognizing the need to strengthen and save Medicare. And, of course, that simply is not true and the American public knows it.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1995 that the President vetoed yesterday recognizes the importance of education and does not cut student loans. It recognizes the importance of a sound Medicare system to seniors and strengthens Medicare into the year 2000, by spending nearly an additional \$2,000 per Medicare recipient in the year 2002, compared with 1995. And certainly that is also true of Medicaid, which is returned to the States for greater efficiencies and greater humanity as States deal with applying Medicaid to the truly needy of our society.

Several of us have gathered this morning for the purpose of discussing the President's veto, the benefits of the budget that the President unfortunately vetoed, and the budget situation this Congress and our country finds itself in.

At this time I will yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I think all of us are very concerned about where we go from here, concerned about the President's veto of the first balanced budget proposal that could have succeeded in 30 years. The President cannot continue to veto the will of the American people who list as their top priority balancing the budget.

You say why, why is that a top priority? Not simply because it is good government, not because it is financial and fiscal responsibility, but because they understand, and Wyoming families understand, and do others, that every day the Government fails to balance the budget, more money is taken from their families' futures.

Families are thinking down the road, fortunately. They care about the world their children will inherit and the fact that we are ready to move into a new century, and they ask themselves what kind of a Government will we pass on to our children and our grandchildren? Will it be the one with the credit card maxed out? That is where we are now.

So these families think about what is coming in the future. Unfortunately, the Clinton administration thinks about the next election. Had the President come to the snubbing post and done the right thing, Wyoming families would have saved money. They would have saved \$2,404 per year—these figures were done up by the Heritage Foundation on a State-by-State basis—\$2,400 per year on lower mortgage payments, over \$300 a year due on State and local interest payments, \$500 per year on lower interest payments for student loans. These are for average families in Wyoming.

The State and local governments in Wyoming—we want to transfer some of that responsibility—would have saved \$57 million over 7 years on lower interest rates brought about by balancing the budget.

So the issue of balancing the budget is the most critical one. We have to balance the budget because of the impact it has on families and the benefits that come from it. The deficit is robbing our families' bank accounts. It must be budgeted. And anything else is the wrong thing to do.

The Clinton administration has done less than the responsible thing. I think we have to start talking about that and not let them get by with going to the media and saying, "We're protecting

this and we're protecting that. We can't do this." We have to balance the budget. And this administration has done what I think is the most selfish thing, and that is to play the political game at the expense of American families.

The President has not done anything to bring about real change. In 1993, we had the largest tax increase the world has ever known. But spending continued to go up, and we have not balanced the budget. He has proposed two budgets this year, neither of them balanced. Neither of them got any votes in this Senate. He now proposes to bring up another one today. We will see. But he is going to do it without CBO numbers, without real numbers.

Now, people say, what is CBO? What is OMB? What is the difference? I can tell you what the difference is. CBO is real numbers. You can balance the budget, if you fool with the projections, without really balancing the budget. Raise the projections out here 7 years from now when you are no longer President and it is painless to do it in the meantime. It is also phony. We cannot do that.

We see this leadership in this administration trying to patch the walls of a crumbling welfare state. Talking about the Great Society, we spent \$5 trillion in these welfare programs and they have not worked. You cannot expect different results if you continue to do the same thing. You need real welfare reform. We need to guard and protect Medicare. And we need to think about what kind of country we want as we go into the 21st century. The balanced budget is the way to proceed.

Mr. President, there are a number of principles that need to be followed. First of all, if we are going to have a balanced budget, we have to start with honest numbers. Certainly, you can argue about the projections, but you have to start with real numbers and be willing to make the changes that are necessary to make that balance. You have to reduce Washington spending, which is as important as balancing the budget. You could balance it, I suppose, by raising taxes. But we need to bring down spending. We have to ensure Medicare solvency. We have to make some changes to do that. We have to have real welfare reform. Welfare reform without results is not what we want. We have to change that. We have to put some more power in the people in the States and move government closer to the people, and we must do it now.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT  
AGREEMENT—H.R. 2076

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Alaska, I ask unanimous consent that debate time on the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations conference report, H.R. 2076, be limited to the following: Senator

GREGG, 2 hours; Senator HOLLINGS, 2 hours; Senator BIDEN, 2 hours; Senator BUMPERS, 20 minutes. Further, that following the expiration or the yielding back of the previously mentioned debate time, the Senate vote on the adoption of the conference report with no intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Chair.

Now let me yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alaska, to speak on the President's veto of the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank my colleague from Idaho. I wish the President a good morning.

PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF THE  
BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, yesterday, President Clinton, with a great deal of fanfare and theatrics, vetoed the first balanced budget legislation sent to any President in the last three decades. Think about that a moment, Mr. President. The first balanced budget legislation sent to any President in nearly three decades was vetoed yesterday by President Clinton.

What is the accumulated debt of this country? It is \$4.9 trillion. That occurred as a consequence of prevailing Democratic control of both the House and Senate during those decades.

The veto was very well orchestrated, with the President deciding to use the same pen that the late President Lyndon Johnson used to sign the original Medicare legislation back in 1965. However, in what may be a metaphor for this President, when he put pen to the paper, nothing happened; the pen was out of ink, just as the President is out of ideas and just as Medicare is out of money.

Mr. President, the American public deserves better. Throughout the entire year, Republicans in Congress have worked night and day to develop and pass a real balanced budget along with family tax relief. There were some Democrats who worked with us. And what has the President done this year? Absolutely nothing. He has spoken empty rhetoric about wanting to balance the budget.

Mr. President, there is a difference between wanting and doing. President Clinton has submitted two budgets this year. The first one—think about this—the first one did not receive a single vote, Democrat or Republican, when we voted on it in the Senate, not one single vote, because the President's first budget would have led us to unending deficits and a sea of red ink for the indefinite future.

He came along and said his second budget would balance in 10 years. But like everything else with this President, rhetoric and reality are inconsistent. It is what the polls say that motivates the actions down at the White House.

When the Congressional Budget Office scored the President's second budg-

et, they again found endless annual deficits—in excess of \$200 billion. Now the President says he is going to send us a third budget, and this one will be balanced in 7 years. I am a little cynical simply because I have been there before. I am from Missouri—maybe—when in reality I am from Alaska, but the same point is applicable. After two false starts, I wish to see something real.

I hope the President does send us a balanced budget, but I have had an opportunity this morning for a preview of what we anticipate is his effort, and it does not balance. It simply does not balance. So as a consequence, I fear we are facing a third situation where the President has sent us something that is totally unacceptable.

I hope that the President will be willing to recognize and give the American family the relief they need from taxes. I hope he will give Americans incentives to invest in our future and save. I hope that he would give Americans an opportunity for hope—hope that Government can be downsized, more efficient, more responsive. And I hope he will give America the economic security that will come from allowing oil exploration to proceed in ANWR, which I note in his veto statement he rejected.

On that point, I would like to defer to his veto statement where he suggests, under title V, the opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas threatens a unique, pristine ecosystem in hopes it will generate \$1.3 billion in Federal revenues, revenues based on wishful thinking, and outdated analysis.

Mr. President, the wishful thinking is in the eyes of some of America's environmental community that focuses on this as a cause for membership and a cause of raising dollars at the expense of our national energy security, and at the expense of our jobs and at the expense of American technology.

Geologists have indicated that this area is the most likely area in North America where a major oil discovery could take place. And to suggest the arguments that prevailed against Prudhoe Bay 20 years ago are now being applied to the opening up of ANWR are not realistic is really selling American technology and ingenuity short. This could be the largest single job producer in the United States for the remainder of the century. It could be the largest contributor, if you will, to an increase in tax revenue for the Federal and State governments. The consequence of the President's shortsightedness in dismissing this really underestimates the capability of America's can-do spirit and advanced technology.

Mr. President, I think it is fair to say the American public today is fed up with this lack of leadership. The American public wants a balanced budget