

would not involve such a significant number of upward of 25,000 United States ground troops?

Mr. President, Senator LEVIN and I recently completed a report for the Senate Armed Services Committee involving the United States military involvement in Somalia. That report, I think, if I may say, should accomplish one thing. It should cause the administration and this Senate to consider more carefully the policy decisions that put men and women who serve in our Armed Forces at risk.

As the father of one of the young Rangers killed in Somalia, Col. Larry Joyce, told the Senate Armed Services Committee in an open hearing, and I quote him:

Too frequently, policymakers are insulated from the misery they create. If they could be with the chaplain who rings a doorbell at 6:20 in the morning to tell a 22-year-old woman she's now a widow, they'd develop their policies more carefully.

That is why I emphasize that the American people need a much stronger voice in this critical decision. And that can only be fulfilled, in my judgment, by a very comprehensive debate here in the U.S. Senate. I hope that President Clinton will actively seek such a debate.

I point out that, very wisely, President Bush, when he was faced with the similar situation in the gulf war, received congressional authorization for the use of force prior to the initiation of that conflict. That debate, though difficult and contentious, was, in my view, one of the finest in the contemporary history of this institution.

The final vote taken after, I think, almost 3 days of debate, was by a narrow margin of five to authorize the President to use force. But the debate and vote served to unite the Congress and, indeed, the American people behind our President.

Fortunately, the casualty level in that conflict was far below the predictions. But had the Congress not been on record in support of the President and the war effort, and had that conflict resulted in greater—there were significant losses—but had there been greater losses, I fear the drumbeat could well have started right here in the Congress to bring our troops home. We need only remember the experience of Somalia.

In calling for this vote, I do not seek to question the President's role as Commander in Chief—in particular, his authority to deploy United States troops in emergency situations, such as we saw in Grenada and Panama, when the circumstances did not allow for a protracted, prior debate in the Congress. That was quite appropriate, and it was that type of action that was contemplated by the Founding Fathers when they wrote into the Constitution the specific roles of the President with respect to being Commander in Chief.

But that is not the case with Bosnia. That war has been going on for 3½ years, since April 1992. We are, at best,

weeks away from a peace agreement. There is plenty of time for the Congress to exercise its constitutional responsibility for such a deployment by thoroughly debating the issue and voting on a resolution.

Although I have traditionally been a supporter of Presidential prerogative in the deployment of United States troops, I have yet to be convinced that this President's plan, President Clinton's plan, for putting this additional contingent of military forces, namely, up to 25,000 ground forces in Bosnia, is the proper option to follow.

I listened carefully to the administration's testimony during the course of our hearing in the Armed Services Committee, but I still cannot identify a vital United States national security interest in Bosnia that justifies putting United States ground troops at risk in that nation. I do not want to see U.S. troops inserted in the middle of a civil war, a civil war which is based on centuries' old religious and ethnic hatreds.

I would like to recount just a personal note. On my last visit, Senator ROBERT KERREY and I went into the Krajina region which, just days before our visit, had been the battleground for Croatian forces driving Serbian forces out, Croatian Serbs having taken that land several years earlier. There was an enclave of Serbs that had been trapped and prevented, in one way or another, from fleeing into Serb territory. We met extensively with these refugees. In one particular meeting, there was a doctor, there was a schoolteacher and there was another very well-educated individual. As hard as we pressed them for answers as to why this conflict exists and continues to exist, they could give no answers to explain why well-educated people have participated all throughout that region—all sides—in barbaric acts which those of us in this country find incomprehensible.

That is my major concern as to why we should not put our troops in there in harm's way. President Clinton has yet to make a convincing case that we should proceed with this deployment.

In my view, the burden of proof on the administration to turn public opinion around is virtually insurmountable. Therefore, it has to be a joint responsibility of the Congress and the President, no matter how definite the President and others may wish to make this commitment at this time. And another thing that concerns me, how the administration can predict, should we go in, that this situation would be of such a nature that we could pull out all of our forces 1 year from today. I just find that incomprehensible.

So, Mr. President, I shall have more to say on this subject in the coming days. I yield the floor and thank my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Under the previous order, the

Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

BLM LANDS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, October 22, which is just around the corner, is a pretty important day in Montana, and I will tell my colleagues why in just a minute. But I will say it is one of the reasons why I am dead set against S. 1031, a bill to transfer the lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management to the States.

Let me say a word about multiple use. When Congress passed the Federal Land Management and Policy Act of 1976, it defined multiple use as "the management of the public lands so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people."

That is what the statute says.

Let me tell you about what it means to Montanans—citizens of a State with nearly 30 million acres of Federal public lands. To many Montanans, it means jobs, jobs from the timber that we harvest, minerals that we mine, oil and gas that we extract, livestock that we graze and city slickers that pay for a week under the big sky with our outfitters and our guides.

And to all Montanans, folks who earn their living off the land and the majority who live and work in towns, these lands represent what we love most about our State. These lands provide recreation, an escape from work, a reminder that we live in the last best place.

It means teaching your kids to hunt like your dad taught you. It means being able to take your family out for a weekend and hike and camp and explore in the most beautiful, pristine places known to man.

Montanans head to the Pryor Mountains hoping to catch a glimpse of the wild horse herds; they float the historical Whitecliffs of the Missouri River; and they fish the blue-ribbon Madison River.

This weekend in particular reminds Montanans of just how lucky we all are to have so much Federal lands available to us. It is the start of the big game hunting season.

Montanans head to the Missouri Breaks in search of trophy mulies, set up their elk camps in the Centennial Mountains, or take a trip to their favorite spot to go antelope hunting, shoot upland game birds, pheasant, or ducks.

Montanans are lucky because these Federal lands are near our homes. Within an hour's drive from any town in Montana, these lands provide full access and outstanding opportunities for a successful hunt. In fact, there were more than 375,000 hunting trips on Montana's BLM lands in 1994.

Just think of that, 375,000 hunting trips on Montana's BLM lands in 1994.

There is, however, a bill pending in the Senate which takes this away from Montanans. It is S. 1031. It directs the

Secretary of the Interior to give all the BLM lands to the States who, in turn, may deal with them as they see fit.

Montana may choose to manage these 8.8 million acres of BLM lands much the same way they are currently managed. Of course, that would mean coming up with the \$34 million in funding that the U.S. Government currently spends each year to manage BLM lands in Montana. Finding an additional \$34 million a year is a real stretch to our State when our total State budget is under \$2 billion a year.

Of course, Montana has other options, as do other States, under this legislation. The State could simply not pay for range improvements, weed control, recreation, and wildlife projects that are currently being paid for and carried out by the BLM.

Montana can also choose to raise some quick revenue by putting these lands on the auction block and selling them to the highest bidder. Sleeping Giant, the Terry Badlands, the Missouri Breaks, Beartrap Canyon, the Pryor Range, the Centennial Mountains sold. Once public lands and streams, then fenced off; "no trespassing" signs put out. This bill takes away what Montanans love most about our State: Open, easy access to public lands to hunt, fish, hike, birdwatch, snowmobile, four-wheel drive.

I want to put my colleagues on notice that S. 1031 is a bad deal. It is bad for Montana. It is bad for the West. It is bad for the Nation. Our public lands are the key to perpetuating our outdoor heritage.

As Teddy Roosevelt said, "The Nation behaves well if it treats the natural resources as assets which it must turn over to the next generation increased, not impaired, in value."

That is what Teddy Roosevelt said. S. 1031 ignores future generations and yanks their inheritance out from under them.

Marion and Rose Coleman of Laurel, MT, recently wrote me and said this:

Please stop S. 1031 for the benefit of the 22 members of our family who love to hunt, fish, and camp on public lands.

I am here today to let Marion and Rose Coleman, and all Montanans, know that I intend to fight this bill every step of the way. It is anti-hunting, anti-Montana.

If it ever reaches the floor in anything close to its present form, it is dead on arrival. That is something I will guarantee my colleagues, and, more importantly, that is something I will guarantee the people of Montana.

Mr. KERREY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE BUDGET

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, Tuesday night in Houston, and last Friday as well, the President of the United States made a comment where he said

specifically, "I had to raise your taxes more than I wanted and cut spending less than I wanted to, which made a lot of you furious."

Well, the comment made those of us who voted for that proposal even more furious than it made, apparently, the audience to which the President was speaking.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has since said that he did not intend to say that the package was bad. He did not intend to mean that he was not proud of the people who voted for it. But he left the unmistakable impression that he would have cut more given the opportunity.

The fact is that, in 1993, Congressman Penny and Congressman KASICH presented \$105 billion in additional spending cuts after the budget deficit reduction bill was passed. I think it has done a tremendous amount of good for the U.S. economy. It did reduce the deficit—as now estimated, by nearly a trillion dollars.

But Congressman Penny and Congressman KASICH, and later myself and Senator BROWN on the Senate side, offered nearly identical proposals to cut over \$100 billion over 5 years, and the administration opposed it. They did not just send a letter about it. They sent various Members up here, saying this was draconian and it was going to hurt—all the things that are mentioned, typically, when a spending cut is made. Maybe this is part of a triangulation strategy that we hear about a lot. But, Mr. President, it is strangulating the confidence that we have in Congress that whatever it is we do is going to continue to enjoy the support of the President.

Now, I do not want to drag it much farther than that. I actually had a very harsh speech that I had written yesterday, and, fortunately, I think both for myself and the President, there was not time to get to the floor to give it. I have calmed down a bit since then. But a larger point needs to be made here, rather than, did the President misstate or not what it was he was trying to do?

Not only did Congressman Penny and Congressman KASICH and Senator BROWN and myself present spending cut proposals, but the President put together a bipartisan entitlement commission, with 32 people on it. Senator Danforth and I chaired that effort. We presented to the President, in 1994, the recommendations of that commission, and those recommendations are what I would like to talk about here today. They still need the full consideration of this body.

Mr. President, it is fairly obvious that this place is still controlled by men. I am a man myself, and so it does not bother me most of the time. But we men behave differently than women in certain things. One of the things women have noticed over the years is that we have a tendency to exaggerate the size of things sometimes. That is,

in fact, occurring in this entire budget debate.

The Republicans get up and talk about this being revolutionary, and we heard Speaker GINGRICH talking about a great revolution, and the Democrats say, no, it is draconian, it is terrible, destructive, and on and on. The American people get kind of confused and wonder what is going on.

Mr. President, these are the facts. We will spend \$1.5 trillion in 1995, the fiscal year ending September 30. At the end of 2002, under the Republican budget resolution, it will be roughly \$1.858 trillion. If you use the Congressional Budget Office baseline, with no change, it is about \$2.1 trillion. So it is some \$240 billion less. That is a lot of money, but hardly what I would put in the category of revolutionary. Nor is it fair to say they are draconian, and on and on.

In some cases, I have had serious disagreements with the way the money is being allocated, but it is a relatively modest change. If you look at the tax revenue generated and total spending over the next 7 years compared to the past 7 years, we will spend nearly \$2.4 trillion more, and we are going to have \$3.2 trillion more in tax revenue—a lot more tax revenue coming in and a lot more money going out as well.

Mr. President, the goal that has been set over and over again by the Republicans in this budget resolution and debate—and last night you heard it again—is that we are going to balance the budget. Yes, that ought to be one goal. There is no question that it is accomplished under this budget resolution. I am for balancing the budget. I would like to be able to vote for the particular resolution that is going to come back to us at some point. In its current form, I will not be able to do it.

Mr. President, there is another goal this budget resolution ought to address, and it was identified by the bipartisan budget commission as more troubling than the budget deficit. That is, as a percentage of our budget, overall entitlements—not to the poor, but to the middle class—overall entitlement growth is at an unsustainable level. Today, it is 64 percent of our budget. In 2002, at the end of this resolution, it will be 74 percent of our budget. In 2008, when my generation—the biggest generation in the history of this country—starts to retire, it will very rapidly go to 100 percent—100 percent, Mr. President. The Federal Government is going to be an ATM machine. Some will say that is fine, let it transfer payments out.

Mr. President, there are things that we appropriate that not only strengthen our economy but improve the quality of life. I made a lot of money as a consequence of my parents helping to build the interstate highway system. And as a consequence of their grandparents doing the GI bill, I have made a lot of money. This country has made investments in the past that have improved the quality of our life. We spend