

coping with the shutdown, keeping their services available even when faced with lapses in federal funding.

Michigan, for example, has been using its own revenue to make up for the cutoff of federal funds in crucial programs such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) and Medicaid, said John Truscott, a spokesman for Gov. John Engler (R). "We can't fund them forever, but for the next couple of weeks we're okay," Truscott said.

Wisconsin is preparing to use more of its own funds for those two major programs this week but is counting on an eventual reimbursement from the federal government, said James R. Klauser, the state's secretary of administration. He said AFDC and Medicaid payments range between \$25 million and \$40 million a week in Wisconsin. "We look at it every week," he said. "We're comfortable right now."

California is losing more than \$5 million a day in tourism revenue. Officials of Mariposa County, the home of Yosemite National Park, asked Gov. Pete Wilson (R) to declare the county an economic disaster zone, but Wilson turned down the request, saying it exceeded the scope of his authority.

The shutdown also cut into the pensions of about 150,000 retired railroad workers. The retirees, most over 70 years of age, receive a portion of their pension from appropriated funds and the rest from a retirement trust fund. They will lose about two-thirds of an average \$130 monthly payment that is paid directly from the treasury; the rest of their annuity from the railroad trust fund will not be reduced.

Federal agencies, meanwhile, continue to struggle to provide services.

Only two of the 15 employees that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has in Flint, Mich., for example, have been allowed to report to work during the shutdown. That has forced the office to delay opening any bids from families or real estate agents for HUD property. Also, none of the roughly 500 families who have home-purchase loans through the field office have been able to get any help, especially those who are drifting further into delinquency.

"The sense of emergency is much higher now than before," HUD coordinator Gary Levine said. "The three-day shutdown before wasn't so bad. Three weeks is. This is no way to treat the public."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

NEW YEAR'S GREETINGS

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, first, I extend New Year's greetings to all my colleagues and constituents and wish them and their families a healthy new year.

COMING TOGETHER ON PRINCIPLES

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, as we embark on this new year, I think it might do us all well if we were to put aside the rhetoric of confrontation and attempt to come together on some principles that so many have articulated for so long but have failed to really enact. I do believe there might be a handful—and I say a handful—who do not believe there should be a balanced budget. I have not identified anyone. No one has ever told me they are opposed to that, whether they be Democrats or Republicans.

Over the 15 years now that I have been here, I have seen us work, Democrats and Republicans, to attempt to achieve that. I have seen us pass Gramm-Rudman in an attempt to bring about a balanced budget.

On the campaign trail, it is great fodder to say I am for a balanced budget, I want that, and yet when it comes to doing the business of the people, we have failed to do that. We have failed to achieve it. And the reason is because it is not easy. It is difficult. The reason is that because the same people, our constituents, who, on the one hand, say and demand we do the business of the people, as we should, in a responsible manner, that we cut out the wasteful programs, that we reform systems such as the welfare system that certainly needs an overhaul and should be reformed and turned into a workfare system, when it really comes down to implementing what is necessary to achieve a balanced budget, the same people in many cases are the first to come to us and to beseech us to cut spending, but, by the way, there is a good program and it is in education or it is in the arts or it is as it relates to transportation or drug treatment, all of these good programs that are for seniors and do not cut that program.

Everybody has a favorite program. That is without even touching the area of entitlements that people are afraid to even speak to. The fact of the matter is that if you were to reduce or eliminate the spending in all of the discretionary programs, eliminate any of the moneys that we spend on education, any of the money that we spend on the military, on defense, and all of the money that we might spend in housing and urban development, in mass transit, eliminate it all, that unless we begin to curtail the growth in the entitlement programs, begin to reduce that growth in Medicare, in Medicaid, why, then, it makes no sense, we will continue to operate with huge deficits.

That means we are mortgaging the future of our children and their children and future generations. I suggest that that is not responsible. That is an easy way out. That is what has been taking place for far too long.

So as we embark upon this new year, I hope that maybe we will stop being accusatory, one side blaming the other—all of us know that this is not going to be easy—but attempt to come together and to say, how can we moderate the growth in these programs?

I have heard friends of mine, Democrats, indeed, at the White House, the President, Mrs. Clinton, have talked about slowing the growth in these programs. How is it now that that rhetoric has turned so harsh? How is it now that those who attempt to implement the same suggestions that were put forth by the White House in good faith are now accused of attempting to savage senior citizens?

That is inaccurate. It is not fair. Rather than one side or the other being

accusatory, why do we not attempt to build on those things that we agree on? If we agree there is a need to balance the budget, if we agree and we have spoken to doing it within a prescribed period of time, if we have agreed that we would use realistic numbers and not pie in the sky, why do we not begin to do this?

It would seem to me that the people of the United States have every right to be angered at both the administration and the Congress for not resolving these differences in an appropriate fashion by working at it and not by delaying and not by taking extended vacations and not by PR and not by spin doctors, but by coming down honestly to resolve this in a manner that all of us know can and should be done.

So I do not come to the floor for the purposes of blaming one side or the other or pointing a finger toward the administration or saying that all that we have put forth in our balanced budget proposals must be and should be adopted. But certainly within the bounds of those that have been suggested, those suggestions by the administration, and within the bounds that have been put forth by the Congress, there is ample opportunity, there has been and there is now, that if we exert ourselves and exhort ourselves not to try to be one up on the other side, one up so we can aggrandize it and claim credit, then why do we not take a look at what we owe the people?

There are suggestions that make sense. It would call for some collective coming together and some courage to be demonstrated on both sides. The senior Senator from New York, my colleague, Senator MOYNIHAN, has put forth as a suggestion looking at the CPI. The CPI no longer adequately reflects what the true costs are as it relates to goods and products and services and indeed has been estimated as being off by as much as one-third—one-third. We say, what is 1 percent? But 1 percent, if you have a 3-percent increase in the inflation rate, is one-third.

Why not then use legitimate numbers to measure what the cost-of-living increase is, what the cost for the consumer really is? That would take some courage on both parts, on the side of the Republicans and the Republican Congress as well as our colleagues on the Democratic side, and on the side of the White House. But, my gosh, if it is a fact, and if it is true, why do we not come together and say, this is the place to start?

We might be able to save \$150 billion. Imagine that. Why can we not have the good common sense, again, collectively, Democrats and Republicans, both in the Congress and in the administration, the Executive, to say this is something we can agree on? If we do it together, that together we can go forward and say this is the right thing to do, why then, that is what we should be expected to do.

I do not know that it should even take such great courage. But if one