

Coming in this morning to the Senate, I listened to the President's week-end address, and the President was obviously putting the best light on his position on the acts of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. COATS. I thank the Chair and my colleague from Texas.

I was deeply concerned that the rhetoric of the President far exceeded the reality of the facts that we are dealing with. The President characterized, on about as many occasions as possible in a 5-minute speech, the Republican effort as an extreme effort.

Now, somewhere in the process here the President's pollsters, focus groups, so forth, have discovered that the American public has an emotional, visceral reaction to the word "extremism." So it seems everything Republicans are attempting to do all year, whether it is a defense bill or whether it is welfare reform or whether it is balancing the budget, is labeled as extremist. He used to say it was right-wing religious extremists. Then, they found out people of faith resented that and that did not go down too well, so now we are down just to the word "extremist."

The President and Vice President just incessantly use the word "extremist." You heard that from the minority leader's speech last evening. I think there must be a reward for those who can use the word more times within each minute of statement because it seems like it is almost every other word.

Now, I ask the American people and I ask my colleagues to examine the rhetoric, and in the light of the reality of the budget, because what Republicans are saying is that with this moral imperative and this staggering debt, we believe it is important to enact the principle of a balanced budget not this year, not next year, not 1999, not by the turn of the century, the new millennium, but by the year 2002.

Over a 7-year period of time, we believe we should make an orderly transition from where we now are to a position where we will not spend more than we take in. And if we do it over a 7-year period of time, it will allow spending to increase at a rate of 22 percent. It will increase over that period of time in expenditures such as Medicare at a rate of 65 percent; that the Medicare increases will go up at a rate of 7.4 percent annually.

One would think, listening to the President and listening to some of our colleagues who oppose that—because they use terms such as "cutting off at the knees," "throwing children out on the street," "denying aid to widows," "turning our backs on the disabled," "gutting the American social com-

pact"—you would think that what Republicans are offering are drastic, drastic cuts in the amount of social welfare and the amount of expenditures on a whole number of programs.

Medicaid increases will go up 43 percent; welfare spending will increase by \$100 billion over this time period.

Republicans find themselves in an unusual position, because a lot of people back home say, "Wait a minute, we thought you were going to do more than that. We thought you were going to cut back." Well, we are slowing the rate of growth, but in no sense can those be characterized as cuts from current expenditures. The spending will continue, but it will continue at a slower rate and over a 7-year period of time. As our economy grows and as expenditures decrease from the standpoint of a lower rate than before, those two lines will cross, and, as certified by the agency that the President asked us to use to certify those numbers, we will reach a balanced budget in 2002.

As I said, we do this not just because it makes good economic sense, but we do this because we believe we have a moral imperative to do so. This is a historic piece of legislation. It allows us in the Congress to leave some legacy to the future, other than monumental debt—a legacy of moral courage and a legacy of responsibility.

We have waited a long time to get to this point. It has been an unusual convergence of events that have led us to this moment. I do not know that we will have another opportunity to do this, and so a vote to keep our word and keep our faith with the next generation is a vote that I hope the President will exercise, as we exercised last evening.

The President, with one stroke of the pen, can address what I believe is the economic imperative but, more importantly, can address the moral imperative. The President can address the issue of whether or not we will keep faith with the next generation. He will address the question of whether or not this generation, this selfish generation, this me-first generation, will finally say, "We have run the course. It has been a disaster for the future of America."

The economic consequences are untold, and it is time that we drew a line and had the courage to do what I think every one of us instinctively knows is right.

Mr. President, I thank you and yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from Indiana. I think he laid out in a lofty and beautiful speech exactly why we are here.

I have read the quote from Thomas Jefferson as well. And, in fact, Thomas Jefferson had said he had really two problems with our Constitution, and it was nagging in the back of his mind.

One of those nagging concerns of Thomas Jefferson was that we did not have a mechanism that would keep Congress from going into debt, because he felt that public debt was not the right of any Congress to make.

The second thing that Thomas Jefferson was concerned about was that we did not have a system to assure rotation in office. Of course, term limitations are still a very powerful issue for us in this Congress over 200 years after the Constitution was ratified, and I think his nagging concerns were two very important ones that I wish he had been able to address.

But then when we look at what the founders of our country did in the Constitution, they are certainly to be commended for the foresight they had in so many areas.

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I would like to talk about this budget impasse, because there is no question that we are at a crossroads in our country. The impasse is over our President and this Congress and our differing views about what course this country should be on. The Congress promised the people a balanced budget, and we are producing on that balanced budget.

We have sent to the President a balanced budget for the first year of a 7-year plan. The President promised in his campaign a balanced budget in 5 years, actually. But when the time came to sign the dotted line to make the hard choices, the President has chosen instead to demur, to talk about politics instead of coming down to the bottom line and working with Congress on a budget that is balanced. He is holding our Government hostage.

Mr. President, why do we have this impasse? There are two things: The balanced budget which we have sent to the President and the resolution that would continue the operation of Government, which is why people are not working in our Government at full staff levels.

We passed a resolution that would continue Government from September 30, when the fiscal year ended, until this week. Now we are in the second resolution. The second resolution has the lower budget figures that are necessary if we are going to balance the budget.

So when we talk about this continuing resolution, it is crucial that we have the lower numbers because we are in the fiscal year. We are in the 1996 fiscal year. We must have the lower spending numbers if we are going to make our 7-year goal, and that is the crucial issue here. The President does not want the lower spending limits because, in fact, the President does not want the balanced budget in 7 years.

Now, he paid lip service to a balanced budget in 7 years. He said publicly that he would agree to a balanced budget in 7 years, but he just will not do what is necessary to get us there, and he has

yet to send us a budget that is balanced at all, not in 10 years, not in 9 years, not in 8 years and not in 7 years.

So because we have this impasse, the people of this country are certainly concerned. There are people who say, "Settle it. Pox on both your houses, settle it."

I just ask people who say, "settle it," do they want us to settle it at the cost of our future security, our future prosperity?

Do they want us to settle it at last year's spending rates so that we cannot possibly meet our goal of a 7-year balanced budget? Do they want us to settle it regardless of the promise that we made in 1994?

Mr. President, I ran on a platform, in 1994, of a balanced budget. I promised the people who voted for me, and I promised everyone whether they voted for me or not, that I would come up here to try to balance the budget, to try for a 7-year balanced budget. The President also, in his campaign, in 1992, promised the people that he would work for a balanced budget. The President made the promise, I made the promise. The difference is, I am keeping my promise.

I think that is the issue here. The people have been promised for 25 years a balanced budget in this country. But the politicians have always walked away from it. And the reason is, they did not have the guts to look at entitlements, and everybody knows entitlements are more than 50 percent of our budget, that they are the toughest of all things to work with. This Congress did something different. This Congress kept the promise by tackling entitlements, by saying that welfare is going on a budget, just like your family budget, just like your small business budget. Welfare is going on a budget.

So we have produced reform of a very important former entitlement. It is an entitlement today, but hopefully if we can do what is right for the long term of this country, it will not be an entitlement. It will be a budget item. And we will have limitations on welfare for able-bodied recipients for the first time in this country since we created the welfare system.

So it is very important that the people understand that we did reform welfare, that we did take on Medicaid entitlements, that we are going to give it to the States so that they can do it without Federal strings, in a more efficient way, that we are going to save the Medicare system from bankruptcy, so that it will be there for our future generations.

Mr. President, we are keeping a promise, and it is not an easy one. It would be more comfortable to just cave. Sure, I would like for everyone to go back to work in Government. I would like to take the easy way out. It would be much more comfortable. But, Mr. President, my constituents did not put their faith in me to take the comfortable, easy way out. My constituents elected me because they believed that I would keep my promise.

I am not going to mortgage the long-term security of this country for a short-term comfort rate. I am not going to do it because the people elected us to represent them, and they sent a powerful message in 1994. They want a balanced budget and they want people who are tough enough to do it.

So I did not get elected to come here and cave to the President, who made the same promise that I did, but is walking away from that promise. I am not going to walk away. I am going to stand here for a balanced budget in 7 years. We are doing it in a responsible way. In fact, a lot of people think we should do it in 5 years. But we are saying, no, we believe 7 years would keep the economy strong at the same time that we are doing what is right for the long term. So we are making the right decision for the short term and the right decision for the long term.

Mr. President, this is a crossroads for our country. As the great "philosopher" Yogi Berra once said, "When you come to a fork in the road, take it." Well, once again, we have a choice of which road to take. We have the choice. Mr. President, the Congress is going to stay on the road that will take this country back to prosperity and stability. We are going to bring back what made this country strong in the first place. Families, the spirit of entrepreneurship, the small businesses, a strong national defense built this country. We won the cold war because we were strong, not because we were weak. And we are going to do what is right, Mr. President, in the short term and the long term. We are not going to walk away from our promises, and I wish the President would do the same.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, apparently, the present occupant of the chair wanted to make some remarks; is that correct?

(Mrs. HUTCHISON assumed the chair.)

Mr. INHOFE. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. EXON. Madam President, we have been trying to go back and forth. As I understand it, my colleague from Oklahoma wishes to make some remarks. I would agree to that. I hope that the Chair will see fit to recognize the Senator from Nebraska after the Senator from Oklahoma has completed his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Nebraska, Senator EXON, following the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

SENDING TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, let me thank both Senators from Nebraska who have been kind enough to allow me to have a little time. I appreciate it very much. I will try to return the favor some time.

Madam President, I have a feeling that this is a historic moment right now, that we may not have any more votes, and we may be leaving all of this up here and going back, hopefully, for the Thanksgiving holidays, in which case I have a couple of comments I want to make. They are not really exactly on the focus of today, but I will also go back and wind up with some thoughts I have on this subject.

There have been some rumors—and I always hate to talk about rumors on the floor of the U.S. Senate—that have come from so many different unrelated sources, and I am concerned that during the period of time that we will be in the Thanksgiving recess, there may be some agreement reached and our troops may be deployed to Bosnia.

This concerns me very much, and this is not a very appropriate time to bring it up. But I do think that we need to get on the record and remind the President that this Senate passed, just 2 days ago, a strong sense-of-the-Senate amendment to the DOD appropriations bill which says that we, Mr. President, want you to come to the Senate and to the House of Representatives for authority to send troops into Bosnia.

It was a very similar situation that the President of the United States at that time, George Bush, faced back in the early nineties when he wanted to send troops to the Persian Gulf. He did not want to come to Congress. He felt it was necessary and that we had vital national interests in the Persian Gulf and we had to go. Yet, he did not want to do that and take a chance of being turned down. So we have a similar situation today.

I can remember talking to one of the generals training over at the 1st Armored Division in Germany. Those are the troops that were going to go to the Persian Gulf. Now he is training the troops that would go to Bosnia. He related to me an experience of sitting and listening to the radio, hoping, and praying that George Bush would take this to Congress to get authority. They did not want to be sending their troops into a hostile area without the American people behind them.

I see exactly the parallel situation here. I certainly hope that the President will come to Congress and not use an opportunity when we might be on recess to deploy troops to Bosnia. Not too long ago, before the Senate Armed Services Committee, we had Secretary Christopher, Secretary Perry, and General Shalikashvili. I asked them the question, after they defined the mission the United States has in Bosnia. The mission was twofold: First, to contain a civil war to the former Yugoslavia, and second, to protect our position in NATO and the integrity of NATO. I felt—and I think several other people who have spoken on this floor feel the same way—that those two missions are not worth the loss of one life.

Shortly before, General Rose—Michael Rose, who is the commanding