

the tribunal to review the issue of indictment, that if we will not act directly in a military sense, that at least we will put those people on notice that what they are doing will not be ignored, and will be subject for criminal prosecution at a later date, by analogy to the Nuremberg war trials. The day of reckoning may come, and those leaders and all those that can be identified will face the death penalty in a court of law for their acts of brutality in Bosnia today.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. First, let me commend my friend from Pennsylvania for his leadership on this issue. I was unaware that the Senate did not yet issue a statement of the denunciation of these kinds of atrocities. I agree with him absolutely that it is time we did so. And I appreciate what he has done here today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might be allowed to proceed as in morning business.

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

TERM LIMITS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, if I may be allowed a moment or two to speak personally, I would like to refer to events that took place in the Senate yesterday and tie them back to my campaign, which is fast fading into memory, but some portions of which are pretty firmly etched in my memory as I am sure is the case with everyone here.

During the campaign, one of the issues that was raised continually by my constituents was the issue of term limits, because they said they had the feeling that the system was so unresponsive back here in Washington that something had to be done structurally to shake it up. Knowing a little bit about the Senate and the way it worked, I suggested to some of my constituents that while we debated the overall issue of term limits, which probably will require a constitutional amendment, there was something else that could be done quickly without a constitutional amendment that could change the character and perhaps free up the way things are done in the Senate. Specifically, I suggested to my constituents that it would be a good thing if we limited the terms of committee chairs in this body so that someone who assumed a committee chair would not assume the posture of divine right in that circumstance and then stay there forever and ever, dispensing whatever favors or power goes along with that assignment.

My constituents liked that and indeed many of them said to me as they came to me in the closing days of the campaign, "We are going to vote for you but we want your personal pledge when you get there you really will

work for significant change in the way business is done."

Of course, as you do in a political campaign, when somebody says that to you, you say, "Why, of course you have my pledge that I really will work to see that that is done."

When I arrived here in January of 1993 and suggested term limits for committee chairs, I found a very interesting circumstance. Among my fellow freshmen Senators, one of whom is on the floor here today, there was great sympathy, there was great agreement: Yes, we need to limit term limits, if you will, the time of committee chairs. Among the freshmen Republicans, we had unanimity on that issue. But there were only six of us. And we were told when you have been here a little longer, when you understand how the system works a little better, you will not be quite so zealous to call for the term limits of committee chairs.

Well, when I went back home, I found myself hoping people did not ask me, "What have you done to carry out your campaign pledge to see to it that there would be some structural reform in the way the Senate does its business?"

When I did get asked, I would say, "I am trying." And then when they pressed for details, I would say, "Well, I am in concert with all my fellow freshmen"—the Republican six, as we became finally, with the addition of KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON—"We are working hard." And my constituents would begin to get that look on their face that says, "Yeah, we heard that before. You're going to try to do something but, in fact, nothing is really going to change, and the longer you are back there, the more you are going to become part of the system and everything is going to stay the way it's always been."

There was another election that took place. The distinguished occupant of the chair was part of that, and instead of 6 Republican freshmen, all of a sudden we had 11 Republican freshmen. And added to the 6, that gave us 17, which constituted a sufficient block of the Republican conference that all of a sudden we were being listened to in ways we had not been when there were just 6 of us.

Mr. President, as you well know, yesterday the Republicans had a marathon session talking about the way things should be structured in the Republican conference. And out of that session came an action which I applaud wholly; that is, the Republicans have agreed to term limit the chairmanship of a Senate standing committee. I wish we could amend the rules of the Senate itself so that it was written into the Senate rules and had the protection of the two-thirds requirement so that it could not be altered, except by a subsequent vote of 67 Senators. I do not think we can do that. I do not think the votes are on the floor to do that.

But I can now, with a clear conscience and a smile on my face, say to my constituents: "I may not have been

able to work successfully to change the rules of the Senate, but I have joined with my colleagues in an effort, successfully, to term limit chairmen, at least those who are Republicans."

If I may be allowed a slightly partisan note, Mr. President, I hope that will be the case for many years to come; that is, that all of the chairs of all of the committees will be Republicans for at least as long as I serve in the body. In that case, our failure to change the Senate rules will not make any difference.

I think the Republican conference needs to be congratulated for taking this step. It demonstrates a willingness to allow those of us who are newcomers more of an opportunity to hold positions of responsibility perhaps sooner than would otherwise be the case. It allows for fresh ideas and fresh approaches to come into the system more openly than would have been the case if we had stayed with the old rule.

There is still much that I would like to do in the name of congressional reform. If I could sit down and write the rules all by myself, I would change a lot of the rules around here, and I have introduced a bill to do that. At the moment, it has only attracted a single cosponsor. That is one of my fellow freshmen. Maybe I could work to get another 10 names or so on it, but I recognize the reality of this place. It is going to take a little more time and maybe, Mr. President, another election or two before we start some of the fundamental restructuring of the Senate rules that I would like to see happen.

But I am delighted that we have not waited for those elections to take place and for that time to come. In the Republican conference, we have moved with dispatch and, I may say, a large majority. I do not want to leave the impression that the decision to term limit committee chairs was a close one and that those of us who are freshmen or sophomores had a difficult time winning a very narrow victory. As we made our case, our more senior brethren, and on occasion sister or two, decided we were right and the vote was not close. The vote was 38 to 15 saying we will, in fact, recognize the call that is out there among the American people to bring the procedures in this body up to date with modern approaches and opening it up so that those who do not want to make a full-time career out of service in the Senate but simply come here for a term or two, will, in fact, still have the opportunity to receive leadership assignments and represent their constituents in that circumstance.

When people talk to me about the overall issue of term limits, I tell them in my case, you do not have to worry about it. At my age, term limits are built in. Some say to me, "Well, look at the senior Senator from South Carolina. Maybe you will be here 20 or 30 years." If that is the case, I will be in my nineties, and I think I would rather

do something else than serve in the Senate at that age.

So, Mr. President, I appreciate the indulgence of the Senate in allowing me to make this comment, allowing me, if you will, to crow a little to my constituents back home over the fact that we have taken this first step that I did pledge to work toward while I was in the election, and express my satisfaction and gratitude to my fellow members of the Republican conference for this decision.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE 1994 ELECTION MANDATE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I sat presiding in the chair listening intently as the Senator from Utah talked about the mandate, as he understood it, when he was elected to the U.S. Senate in 1992.

As one who was elected 2 years later, in 1994, that mandate was not quite the same. It was interesting that those individuals who are talking about term limits did not really address the fact that we have a problem, in that we have the same leadership within each party in the U.S. Senate, as they were concerned about the term limits of individuals serving in the House and in the Senate.

Maybe it is unique to my State of Oklahoma that we had such an intense interest in the fact that people should come here as citizens, serve for a period of time, and then go home and serve under the laws that they passed. It seems as if the term limits debate has become very silent now. I have decided that one reason is that they felt if we had such a turnover, as we had in both Houses of Congress this last time, maybe people do not think that there is a need for term limitation anymore. But I saw a poll that was taken yesterday. I saw the poll that was taken last week, and I was shocked to find out that 72 percent of the American people have very strong feelings about limiting the terms in which Members of the House and Members of the Senate can serve.

I did not expect this because I have heard so many people around the beltway—which is not really real America—say we do not need it anymore because we know now that we can flesh things out and get new blood.

I think that the poll, as it was interpreted, says that people like what happened on November 8, 1994, but they are not real sure that they want to wait 20 years for the same thing to happen again. We are, indeed, better off to

have people here who have been in the real world.

I got to thinking about the arguments, since I was the one who proposed term limits many, many years ago. When I was running for office, I stated I would do everything I could—the same as the Senator from Utah said he would do everything he could—to see to it that the terms of leadership would be limited. I made that same commitment to continue the effort to limit terms.

I observed something when I was first elected to the U.S. House of Representatives. I have to say, Mr. President, that I am a truly blessed individual. I decided 35 years ago, when all my kids were grown and the runt of my litter was out of college and off doing her thing, that I would do what I always wanted to do and run for Congress. That happened in 1986.

When I arrived in Congress, I found something that shocked me. That is, that the prevailing ideas and mentality of those who are in power in Congress was totally alien to what people outside the beltway thought.

For example, I categorize the thinking of Congress, the majority of Congress who are making the decisions, who are setting the agenda, who are carrying on the debate, into four categories, what they really believe. First, in terms of crime, they really believed that punishment was not a deterrent to crime. In the second area, they believed that government, in concert with Congress, can run the lives of the people of America better than people could in the private sector. They believe that the cold war is coming to an end. Of course, subsequently it was ended, and therefore it is not necessary to put more money in our Nation's defense. That money should go into social programs. They felt that deficit spending is not bad public policy.

When we stop to think about those four areas, almost everything, at least that this Member, former Member of the House experienced, found very offensive, fell into one of those four categories. People felt, as far as the deficit is concerned, they said, "Well, we are all right on the deficit. We are not concerned about that. After all, we owe it to ourselves," without realizing everything we are spending today we are borrowing not from anyone who is here in this Chamber today or in the gallery, or even those who may be watching, but the future generations, such as my three grandchildren. They are the ones who will pay for all this fun we are having up here.

Every time we try to cut some of the fat out of government, cut a social program, the people stand up with bleeding hearts and talk about how can we do this to those poor people who need these programs. Right now, we are in the middle of, and we are reminded that all we are trying to do is take the profit out of illegitimacy, and get people more responsible for their own acts.

Insofar as the defense is concerned, I am embarrassed to stand here and say

we are operating with a budget right now that is less than the budget that we are spending on social welfare programs, when we combine State and Federal programs. We are operating on a defense budget that is less than it was in 1980, when we had hollow forces, when we could not afford spare parts. We all remember. It is all in the history. Yet, some believe that the threat that is out there today is greater than the threat that we were facing during the cold war.

At least during the cold war, Mr. President, we could identify who the enemy was. There were two superpowers. So we knew who it was.

Right now, in accordance with comments made not by conservative Republicans, like I am, but by Democrats, Jim Woolsey, who is the Chief Security Adviser to the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, said that we know there are between 20 and 25 nations that have developed or are developing weapons of mass destruction. They are all developing the means to deliver those weapons of mass destruction. We have the Saddam Hussein's and the Qadhafi's, and those out there able and willing to buy technology that is on the market.

Here we are, with a group of people who really believe that there was not any threat out there, when the vast majority of the people of America who voted in the elections in November of 1994 said, "Yes, we need a strong national defense."

Government and its relationship to our lives in 1987, when I first got to the U.S. Congress, the majority of people in leadership really believed that the only thing wrong with America was we did not have enough government regulation. We needed more government regulation. When, in fact, that is exactly what is the problem.

Why did these individuals believe these things? They believed these things because many of them had come straight from the fraternity house to Congress—never been out in the real world, never exposed to real people. So they completely lost touch.

That is what precipitated what I refer to as the revolution of November 8, 1994, when we had the greatest turnover in contemporary history. People finally decided, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, back in the real world, that they wanted to make major changes in government as we know it.

Here we are with the reregulation bill that is right now kind of on high center. All we are trying to do is say to the people who voted in new people in Congress, "Yes, we heard you, loud and clear. We are going to get rid of this overregulated society."

Someone on a radio talk show not long ago, in fact, the No. 1 radio talk show in America, the host said if you want to compete with the Japanese, export our regulations to Japan and we will be competitive with the Japanese.