

detailed understanding of the risks, duration, the nature of forces to be deployed, the command and control arrangements, the funding, and many other aspects of the ingredients of the participation of our forces in implementing any of these treaties involved. There undoubtedly will be a major debate, as occurred in the Senate before President Bush deployed forces in combat against Iraq. Now is not the time for that debate, or for second guessing. Let us let history take its course, certain that the President will, as he has promised, request Congressional support, endorsement, and participation when the details of an accord are reached and when the allies have determined whether and how NATO should implement it.

Mr. President, the President's letter is short. I shall read it into the RECORD.

DEAR ROBERT: Thank you for letter regarding whether or not I will seek Congressional authorization prior to committing United States troops to a NATO implementation force in Bosnia. I welcome the opportunity to set forth my position.

While maintaining the constitutional authorities of the Presidency, I would welcome, encourage and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached.

So, Mr. President, what could be more clear as to the President's intention?

Such an expression of support would be in the national interest. I believe, however, action at this time is premature pending the proximity peace talks to be held in Dayton, Ohio at the end of this month. I hope as the peace talks commence we can continue the process begun in Congressional hearings to brief and consult with Congress so that we secure the widest support possible for peace.

Those hearings have begun. They began in the Armed Services Committee just a few days ago, and the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], who is presently presiding over the Senate with a degree of dignity and grace and skill that is "so rare as a day in June," was present at the hearing, as I was, when we heard testimony.

As you know, our foreign policy works best when we are united in purpose. We have an historic opportunity in Bosnia to change the course of events, to prevent the spread of the conflict and to end the human suffering that has plagued the people of the region for so long. I intend to work with Congress to make this happen.

Thank you again for your words of support.  
Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD not only the President's letter but also my letter addressed to him, and to which I have alluded earlier in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, October 13, 1995.

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: Press reports today quote Secretary of Defense William

Perry as stating that your Administration will not seek Congressional authorization prior to committing United States troops to a NATO peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, although such authorization would be "welcome." If the reports are accurate, I urge you to reconsider this decision and actively seek prior authorization for this mission.

Given the gravity, risks, and costs associated with an extended peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, I think it would be wise to have the support of the American people and Congress behind you. I believe the Congressional majority should share full responsibility, from the outset, for any decision to accept the costs and risks of this proposed operation. As you know, President Bush sought and received the support of Congress and the American people for Operation Desert Storm in Iraq. That support would have been invaluable to him had the initial casualty predictions been realized, or if international contributions had not reimbursed U.S. costs associated with the mission.

Without outlining the risks and benefits of U.S. involvement in Bosnia and gaining the consent and cooperation of Congress in advance, it may well be difficult, if not impossible, to sustain or to pay for such involvement, particularly if factional fighting recurs. Secretary Perry was also quoted in the press as saying that it is "not only a possibility, but likely" that paramilitary groups would target U.S. forces in Bosnia.

I believe you should welcome the opportunity to use your considerable persuasive skills to rally the nation behind you, and that you should ask for the approval of Congress for this proposed mission before it commences. While this effort, of course, risks rejection, a sure political foundation seems essential to carry it over the shoals and storms of difficulties which could possibly confront our forces during an extended period of American military involvement. It should also serve as a signal to those who might consider testing our staying power that a strong measure of bipartisan and popular support underpins it.

As always, I appreciate your thoughtful consideration of my views on matters of this importance to our nation and your Presidency.

With kind regards, I am.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, DC, October 19, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR ROBERT: Thank you for your letter regarding whether or not I will seek Congressional authorization prior to committing United States troops to a NATO implementation force in Bosnia. I welcome the opportunity to set forth my position.

While maintaining the constitutional authorities of the Presidency, I would welcome, encourage and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached. Such an expression of support would be in the national interest. I believe, however, action at this time is premature pending the proximity of peace talks to be held in Dayton, Ohio at the end of this month. I hope as the peace talks commence we can continue the process begun in Congressional hearings to brief and consult with Congress so that we secure the widest support possible for peace.

As you know, our foreign policy works best when we are united in purpose. We have an historic opportunity in Bosnia to change the course of events, to prevent the spread of the conflict and to end the human suffering that has plagued the people of the region for so

long. I intend to work with Congress to make this happen.

Thank you again for your words of support.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I first want to congratulate the Senator from West Virginia on his fine remarks relative to the issue of Bosnia. It is not my purpose to rise on that issue but I would make a comment that I think it is good that the President is willing to come to the Congress for prior authorization, as the Senate is familiar with the sense of the Senate which passed last week which I offered requesting the President to come to the Congress for prior approval.

I also suggest, however, that, if we wait until the agreement is reached on a peace accommodation or a peace accord, we may well be past the time when the Congress can take action effectively; that there has been discussion of the fact that we would have a very short time after a peace agreement has been reached to expect troops to be introduced into the region; in fact, 96 to 100 hours has been the discussion. Obviously, that would give a very short window for the Congress to express its views on whether or not we should be putting American soldiers at risk on the ground in Bosnia.

So I hope that we can take up this subject more substantively before a peace agreement is reached, if it is reached.

#### THE BUDGET

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the remarks made earlier in the day by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SANTORUM, who was addressing the fact that we have heard a great deal from the administration on the issue of their budget, and whether or not they have a budget which reaches a balanced budget.

As we all know, we on the Republican side of the aisle have produced a budget that reaches a balance, is scored by CBO as reaching balance over the next 7 years, and is the first budget to do so in the last 25 years. It is a budget that does this by reforming—and, I think, significantly improving—many of the functions of Government. We end for, example, welfare as an entitlement, and say to people in this country who seek to receive the support of the Government through welfare payments that they are expected to work after a certain amount of time on welfare, and they will only have the right to be on welfare for a period of up to 5 years throughout their lifetime.

It also addresses the issue of Medicaid by returning the authority for managing Medicaid with the dollars to the States, a major step forward in my

opinion. For example, in the State of New Hampshire I know that we will be able to deliver better health care to our indigent, to our people who are in need of health care who qualify for Medicaid, and to the disabled, especially young mothers with children, mothers with young children, and our young men also, in a much more efficient and effective way with probably more dollars in those programs by having the State manage that program at the State level and not having it be a Federal program.

We have in our budget reform improved significantly and strengthened the Medicare Program. In fact, we have taken the Medicare Program—which is on the brink of bankruptcy, according to the Medicare trustees headed in that direction, and will be there by the year 2002, and will begin next year to spend more money than it takes in, and thus starts this death spiral toward bankruptcy—taking that program, reform it, strengthen it, and will be giving our seniors dramatic new choices which they do not have today for alternative forms of health care delivery while retaining their right, preserving their right, to continue in their pre-Medicare delivery system, if they wish it, with their present doctors.

That Medicare reform and strengthening is done in I think a way that is fairly consistent with what is happening in the private sector. It is using the marketplace, saying to the senior citizens of this country, "Listen, you should have the same choices those of us in Congress have. You should not be limited in your ability to choose other types of health care."

So we have put forward plans which I believe are very aggressive, very effective, and very positive in reforming Government, in downsizing the rate of growth of the Federal Government, and in delivering a balanced budget.

Why have we done this? Republicans recognize that, if you do not do something about the problems of this country in the area of the deficit, we are going to be driving this country into bankruptcy.

This chart reflects that fact. The red lines represent entitlement spending; the blue lines discretionary spending; and, the yellow line is interest on the Federal debt. You will note that the green line represents the revenues of the Federal Government. You will see from this chart that, if we continue on our present path with the present rate of growth as a Government, beginning in the year 2010 we will only have enough money as a Government to pay for interest on the Federal debt and entitlement spending. That means all spending such as defense spending, spending on education, and spending on the environment, we will not be able to afford.

Beginning in about the year 2017, we will only have enough money to pay for the entitlement spending of the Federal Government, which means we will

not be able to pay interest on the Federal debt.

What does that mean? That means we end up like Mexico was about a year and a half ago. We will be insolvent as a nation. We will have passed on to our children a country that is essentially bankrupt. It is not fair, not right, not appropriate, and it is not something this Congress is going to allow happen. That is why, as Republicans, we came forward with this rather dramatic idea of balancing the budget, and we delivered on it. We have produced a budget that is in balance.

However, the issue is, has the President done the same thing? Has he been a substantive player in this process? Has he contributed to it? That is the issue raised earlier today by the Senator from Pennsylvania when he suggested a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which would basically allow the other side, if they felt confident in the President's numbers, to put forward the President's budget and say, all right, we stand by the President's budget as an approach to balancing the budget.

I have not heard anyone from the other side of the aisle take up the Senator from Pennsylvania on that issue, and I do not expect we will because, as a practical matter, the President has not come forward with anything that reflects any type of a balanced budget.

CBO, which is the fair arbiter of scoring in this institution, and which the President designated as the fair arbiter of scoring at the beginning of his term in office in his first address to the joint session of the Congress, has calculated that the President's budget as sent up in February was out of balance by at least \$200 billion per year as far as the eye could see, adding \$1 trillion of new debt to the backs of our children over the next 7 years, and that his most recent submission, which was not sent up in budget form but was sent up basically in outline form, is also entirely out of balance and does not accomplish any sort of cloture on the deficit over that same timeframe of 10 years, which he professes as being the period when we should be balancing the budget. And so there is no proposal on the table from this administration which would lead us to a balanced budget.

That gets to the core of the issue. When you hear from the other side of the aisle, as we heard earlier today from the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from California and the Senator from Minnesota, that our budget is insensitive, that we are not caring, that we are dastardly individuals on this side for trying to balance the budget because it impacts this group or that group—many of which representations, by the way, were inaccurate, especially in reference to the WIC Program—but when you hear those allegations, you have to ask yourself, what is the true insensitivity and unfairness in this country today? Is it not really that we as a generation, our generation—I am talking now about the postwar baby-boom genera-

tion, the Bill Clinton generation, of which I happen to be a member—is running up a huge debt for our day-to-day expenses, for expenses which we incur and enjoy the fruits of today but are not willing to pay for today, that we are taking that bill and passing it on to our children?

Is not the true injustice that is occurring today to the people of this country, and especially to the children of this country and to the next generation of this country, that if we continue on our present course we will be the first, the first generation in the history of this great and wonderful country—now, again I am referring to the postwar baby-boom generation—the first generation to pass on less to our children than was passed on to us by our elders.

That is the true insensitivity, and so we have addressed it, and we have addressed it in a very positive way, I believe.

Mr. President, I would simply conclude my remarks by saying that I believe the President of the United States has an obligation to engage in this process substantively rather than politically. He has engaged very well politically. There is no question about that. He has managed to go to almost every interest group in this country, including one group in the Midwest, to this group in the South, to that group in the West, far West, and represent that he is on their side in this budget issue.

I suggest that he come to the Congress and make specific proposals which do lead to a balanced budget rather than proposals which are simply structured for his reelection campaign. If he were to come to this Congress with proposals which would lead to a balanced budget, which were substantive, where he actually put on the table a budget with numbers balanced by CBO, we could close this matter rather quickly and, as a result, pass a better opportunity for a good life to our children, which is our primary obligation as Members of the Senate.

I notice the Senator from Louisiana has some guests present, and I would be happy to pause in my comments and in fact yield back my time so that the Senator from Louisiana can introduce his guests.

Mr. JOHNSTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend.

#### VISIT TO THE SENATE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FIRST LADY OF MONGOLIA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HATFIELD and myself, I would like to introduce to the Senate the distinguished President of Mongolia, President Ochirbat and the First Lady, First Lady Tsevelmaa. Mr. Ochirbat is not only President of Mongolia, but he is generally credited with