

He said we ought to balance the budget in the right way. I agree. I have the right way; he does not have the right way. That is the problem. The right way hardly gets to it. But I do agree we need to get together. There are differences—there are significant differences—in how we do it, and I think it is our responsibility, as trustees for this Government, to find a way to get the kind of agreement that is necessary to balance the budget. We should do that, and we should do it soon.

I think we made great advances the week before last by getting an agreement with the White House, getting an agreement in this Congress that we will balance the budget in 7 years, using real figures, CBO figures.

There are some other words there: We are going to protect the environment, protect Medicare, protect education. I do not know quite what that means. We may have a different view of what "protect" means. None of us wants to do away with those things.

It seems to me one of the real challenges we have, as we move forward with this idea of balancing the budget, which we must do, is we need to start dealing with some facts. It is too easy to roll over into scare tactics in the political response by saying, "Yes, I'm going to protect Medicare." The fact is, you have to make some changes in Medicare if you want it to continue. If you want to have a health program for the elderly over time, you cannot continue to do what we have been doing. So you have to change it. But it is too easy to go to the country and say, "Those Republicans want to do away with Medicare." It is not true. It is just not true.

"We are going to do away with education." Do you know how much the Federal Government contributes to elementary and secondary education? About 5 percent of the total spending. The Senator from New Mexico, who is more knowledgeable than anyone else about the budget, indicated that this budget would have reduced in his State Federal aid by six-tenths of 1 percent, and yet here we are going to gut education.

I was pleased to hear that the Senator wants to balance the budget. The unfortunate part is we hear that all the time and then we go on for another 30 minutes indicating why we cannot do it. The time has come. We have come to the snubbing post. It is time to make the decisions, and I think we will.

I wish we would have passed a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The principal sponsor and advocate is right here on the floor, the Senator from Illinois. I wish we had done that for the discipline that is involved in doing it. It would have said, "Yes, you can argue about how it is done, but you are going to balance the budget because that is the Constitution." It is in the Constitution in my State of Wyoming, and we do it. We do it. We do not talk about it, we do it.

So, Mr. President, I look forward to that. I hope we get with the program in the next 3 weeks. We need to do that. We need to pass the appropriations bills. We need to get this balanced budget bill out. We do not need another delay of Government on the 15th of December. We need to get at the task, and I hope that we do it very soon.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SIMON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I confess I just got in on the tail end of Senator THOMAS' remarks. From what I heard, I agree. I hope we can move quickly, and it illustrates why Senator THOMAS is going to be an asset to the Senate. I was told by a House Member from Illinois, Congressman DICK DURBIN, he said, "You are really going to like the new Senator from Wyoming." I hope I do not get him in trouble in Wyoming saying this now, but I have found that to be the case.

#### BOSNIA

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we have been discussing the Bosnian situation. I was critical of President Bush for not responding right away. I was critical of Bill Clinton when he became President for not responding. I joined those who voted for lifting the arms blockade. But I believe the President is acting in the national interest now, and we have to recognize the great threat to the future of our country in terms of security is no longer nuclear weapons, I am happy to say, it is instability. We are not going to get stability in Bosnia without United States leadership and involvement.

To the credit of the President, Warren Christopher and others, there is a peace agreement, which evolved in Dayton, OH, the Midwest of the United States, and I think it is imperative that we move ahead.

Last night, I was reading the Weekly Standard, Irving Crystal's new magazine. I try to get a diverse readership, and I hope it will not shock him that I am reading his publication. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the lead editorial.

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

[From the Weekly Standard, Dec. 4, 1995]

#### BOSNIA: SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

Bosnian peace diplomacy, brokered by the United States, has passed a significant checkpoint in Dayton, Ohio. Now what? Administration advocates of the new accord oversell its merits. Secretary of State Christopher proclaims the agreement "a victory for all those who believe in a multiethnic democracy in Bosnia-Herzegovina." Another U.S. official calls it a "fantastic deal" for the Bosnian Muslims.

That's saying too much. U.S. policy has never been devoted to reversing all Serbian military encroachments on Bosnian government-held territory. The pact signed in Dayton ratifies most of those Serbian land-grabs—and, in effect, the demonically

ethnicized regional politics that impelled them. The country is to be divided along ethnic lines. Its new central government begins life enfeebled. The agreement's free-movement and resettlement promises appear fanciful.

But what the peace plan can possibly accomplish—a pacification of Balkan brutality sufficiently complete and lengthy to take root—is good enough. And better than much of the surprisingly strident, even cavalier, Republican opposition to the plan allows.

Bob Dole and Newt Gingrich expect the White House to request a non-binding resolution of congressional endorsement for the U.S. peacekeeping deployment required by the Dayton accord. Both men have their legitimate questions about that operation's details and contingencies, and about Balkan diplomacy's ultimate prospects. But they are holding open their options, and seem seriously concerned to maintain, as best they can, a bipartisan and muscular American foreign policy under presidential leadership.

Not so some of their vocal Republican colleagues. Phil Gramm, revealing previously undetected powers of international prognostication, somehow just knows that an American troop presence in Bosnia can only bring total disaster. He has "no confidence" in the president, whom he bitterly mocks with quotes reprinted in every American newspaper. Aside from Dick Lugar, measured and diplomatic as always, the rest of the GOP's presidential contenders are quick to agree. All firmly oppose Bosnian troop deployment. The Republican House of Representatives has already twice voted to defund the troops if it is not first granted the power to block them outright.

If cooler heads are to prevail, they had better open their mouths fast. It is obviously true, as Alan Keyes pointed out in the Florida presidential campaign debate a couple of weeks back, that for Bosnia and the rest of the world "there is a God" and U.S. military forces "are not Him." It is also true that there is a serious case against the troop deployment. Charles Krauthammer makes that case elsewhere in these pages.

But he does so while candidly conceding the damage such a last-minute withdrawal would do—first to American international credibility generally, and also to the NATO-led European security arrangements in which our national interest is inextricably intertwined. We may not be God, but where global security arrangements are concerned, we are the closest thing there is. And the United States would be a niggardly superpower indeed were we to withhold our mastery and muscle when they are asked for and widely expected to help halt horrifying bloodshed in Europe.

We are in Bosnia already. A high-profile regional peace accord, husbanded by American diplomacy, concluded on American soil, and announced in the Rose Garden of the White House, calls for us to go in deeper. To prevent it, at this point, Republicans would be forced to provoke a presidential foreign policy humiliation the likes of which probably have not been seen since the failure of Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. And they would inescapably signal, in the process, that America is badly confused about its global status. And that an American president can no longer reliably serve as representative of his nation before the world.

Such a drastic diminution of presidential authority is dangerous. The Bosnia operation is a judgment call. The strongest case made by Bosnia doves still can't make it anything more than a judgment call. And in

foreign policy judgment calls, prudence dictates a prejudice for presidential prerogative. Mr. Clinton cannot make that argument all by himself. He can and should, as George Bush did before him during the Kuwait crisis, make a strong appeal to the American people that U.S. national interests are at stake—and that he has a reasonable strategy to fulfill them.

Congress, for its part, should hold its hearings and delineate whatever conditions on deployment it believes appropriate. But while they're at it, Republicans should remember why it is they have spent the past 15 years defending presidential leadership in foreign affairs. At the end of the day, the Republican Congress should support the president on Bosnia.

Mr. SIMON. The lead editorial, Mr. President, says: "Bosnia: Support the President." This is a magazine, as the Presiding Officer knows, that is primarily oriented to people of conservative view and primarily to Republicans. The final paragraph says:

Congress, for its part, should hold its hearings and delineate whatever conditions on deployment it believes appropriate. But while they're at it, Republicans should remember why it is they have spent the past 15 years defending Presidential leadership in foreign affairs. At the end of the day, the Republican Congress should support the President on Bosnia.

I was pleased last night, Mr. President, when I heard the interview on CBS, Dan Rather's interview with Senator DOLE. Senator DOLE, obviously, could benefit politically right now by denouncing President Clinton and the move that was made. Senator DOLE, to his credit, did not take that posture. It was a statesmanlike response.

I think insofar as possible—obviously, we all have to make judgments on these things, and I respect those whose judgments differ from me on this—but insofar as possible, we should have bipartisan foreign policy. That does require the President to work with Congress and, frankly, I think more than has been done up to this point by this administration.

But the lessons from Woodrow Wilson are that the executive branch has to work with Congress, but the other lesson is a lesson from right after World War II when we had a Democratic President and a Republican Congress, and President Truman, through General Marshall at the Harvard commencement, suggested the Marshall plan, which we look back upon with great pride.

After that was announced, the first Gallup Poll showed 14 percent of the American public supporting the Marshall plan, a plan that ultimately saved western Europe from communism and helped to bring about the demise of communism in Europe.

In the U.S. Senate there was a Republican Senator by the name of Arthur Vandenberg. The Presiding Officer is nodding as though he remembers that. He is too young to remember when Arthur Vandenberg was a member of this body, but I remember it well. Arthur Vandenberg did not take advantage of the situation but worked

with the President for the best interests of this Nation and the best interests of the world.

I think that is what we have to do at this point, Mr. President. I hope we will. We are going to differ and differ strongly on this thing. That is the way it should be. I hope it will not be on a partisan basis.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:29 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. SNOWE).

Mr. PRESSLER addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

## INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION SUNSET ACT

Mr. PRESSLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of S. 1396, the Interstate Commerce Commission Sunset Act of 1995.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1396) to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for the regulation of surface transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Interstate Commerce Commission Sunset Act of 1995".*

### SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF TITLE 49.

*Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 49, United States Code.*

### SEC. 3. TABLE OF SECTIONS.

*The table of sections for this Act is as follows:*

<i>Section 1. Short title .....</i>	<i>245</i>
<i>Sec. 2. Amendment of title 49 .....</i>	<i>245</i>
<i>Sec. 3. Table of sections .....</i>	<i>245</i>
<b>TITLE I—TERMINATION OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION AND FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION; REPEAL OF OBSOLETE AND UNNECESSARY PROVISIONS OF LAW</b>	<b>251</b>
<b>SUBTITLE A—TERMINATIONS</b>	<b>251</b>
<i>Sec. 101. Agency terminations .....</i>	<i>251</i>
<i>Sec. 102. Savings provisions .....</i>	<i>252</i>
<i>Sec. 103. References to the ICC in other laws .....</i>	<i>254</i>
<i>Sec. 104. Transfer of functions .....</i>	<i>255</i>
<i>Sec. 105. References to the FMC in other laws .....</i>	<i>256</i>
<b>SUBTITLE B—REPEAL OF OBSOLETE, ETC., PROVISIONS</b>	<b>256</b>
<i>Sec. 121. Repeal of provisions .....</i>	<i>256</i>
<i>Sec. 122. Coverage of certain entities under other, unrelated Acts not affected .....</i>	<i>267</i>
<b>TITLE II—INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD</b>	<b>267</b>
<b>SUBTITLE A—ORGANIZATION</b>	<b>267</b>
<i>Sec. 201. Amendment to subchapter I .....</i>	<i>267</i>
<b>"SUBCHAPTER I—ESTABLISHMENT</b>	<b>268</b>
<i>"§10301. Establishment of Transportation Board .....</i>	<i>268</i>
<i>"§10302. Functions .....</i>	<i>272</i>
<i>"§10303. Administrative provisions .....</i>	<i>272</i>
<i>"§10304. Annual report .....</i>	<i>274</i>
<i>Sec. 202. Administrative support ..</i>	<i>275</i>
<i>Sec. 203. Reorganization .....</i>	<i>275</i>
<i>Sec. 204. Transition plan for Federal Maritime Commission functions. ....</i>	<i>275</i>
<b>SUBTITLE B—ADMINISTRATIVE</b>	<b>276</b>
<i>Sec. 211. Powers .....</i>	<i>276</i>
<i>Sec. 212. Commission action .....</i>	<i>277</i>
<i>Sec. 213. Service of notice in Commission proceedings .....</i>	<i>278</i>
<i>Sec. 214. Service of process in court proceedings .....</i>	<i>280</i>
<i>Sec. 215. Study on the authority to collect charges .....</i>	<i>280</i>
<i>Sec. 216. Federal Highway Administration rulemaking .....</i>	<i>281</i>
<b>TITLE III—RAIL AND PIPELINE TRANSPORTATION</b>	<b>281</b>
<i>Sec. 301. General changes in references to Commission, etc .....</i>	<i>281</i>
<i>Sec. 302. Rail transportation policy .....</i>	<i>283</i>
<i>Sec. 303. Definitions .....</i>	<i>283</i>
<i>Sec. 304. General jurisdiction .....</i>	<i>284</i>
<i>Sec. 305. Railroad and water transportation connections and rates .....</i>	<i>285</i>
<i>Sec. 306. Authority to exempt rail carrier and motor carrier transportation .....</i>	<i>285</i>
<i>Sec. 307. Standards for rates, classifications, etc. ....</i>	<i>287</i>
<i>Sec. 308. Standards for rates for rail carriers .....</i>	<i>288</i>
<i>Sec. 309. Authority for carriers to establish rates, classifications, etc .....</i>	<i>289</i>
<i>Sec. 310. Authority for carriers to establish through routes .....</i>	<i>290</i>
<i>Sec. 311. Authority and criteria for prescribed rates, classifications, etc. ....</i>	<i>290</i>
<i>Sec. 312. Authority for prescribed through routes, joint classifications, etc. ....</i>	<i>291</i>
<i>Sec. 313. Antitrust exemption for rate agreements .....</i>	<i>292</i>
<i>Sec. 314. Investigation and suspension of new rail rates, etc. ...</i>	<i>293</i>
<i>Sec. 315. Zone of rail carrier rate flexibility .....</i>	<i>294</i>
<i>Sec. 316. Investigation and suspension of new pipeline carrier rates, etc. ....</i>	<i>297</i>