

to spend more money but from where he believes we should take it.

#### BOSNIA

Mrs. HUTCHISON. The second point I want to make, Mr. President, and it is very much in the forefront right now, and that is the situation where the President has asked for our support to send troops to Bosnia.

Mr. President, I do not think we should send troops to Bosnia, and I do not feel that the President has made the case, made the difference, shown the difference, between a national interest and a national security interest that would warrant the loss of our precious American lives.

Our young American men and women that signed up to be in the military did sign up knowing that they might be put in harm's way. They did that willingly because they believed that they should be able and willing and ready to fight for our freedom, and to protect the freedom and strength of the United States of America.

There is one thing implicit, Mr. President, in that decision. That is that we would have the judgment to send them where our national security interest was at stake. I do not think our national security interest is at stake, Mr. President.

That is why I am so strongly urging that the President reconsider, that the President look at what is happening right now. People talking about changing the agreement in Paris that has been already initiated in Dayton; Serbs talking about not thinking Americans are neutral in this; talking about throwing rocks at Americans when they come in.

Mr. President, can we be thinking of the security of those troops as we are wondering if this is a national security issue that should warrant the loss of their lives? Mr. President, I do not think the case has been made.

I am going to fight it in every way that I can. I think we have other options to support the people of Bosnia. I do want to support those people. They have suffered greatly. I want to help them. There are many ways that we can.

I do not think American troops on the ground should be the only test to show that we are committed to the people of Bosnia. We are committed. We can show it in many other ways.

I want to keep our troops home. I want to save our troops for when there is a security threat to the United States.

We can go out and help the people of the world who are not as fortunate as we are, and we are a generous people and we will do that. But giving our lives in those causes is not what I think is necessary, nor is it the responsible role of Congress to let it happen. I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes in morning business.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, obviously the issue of Bosnia has the attention of America, as it well should because American soldiers are being put in harm's way. We as a nation should equally focus on the issue of these negotiations that are going on between Congress and the President over how we reach a balanced budget, because as our soldiers are in harm's way in the immediate sense, as they move into Bosnia, our Nation is clearly in harm's way as a result of the continued deficits which we run and the fact that we are putting our children's future at risk by presenting them with a nation that is bankrupt if we do not get under control our national debt.

So I think it is important to review where we stand and try to reflect on what the two sides present. Where we stand is that about a week and a half ago, this Nation's Government essentially came to a standstill, stopped, because we could not agree on whether or not we should reach a balanced budget.

The Republicans had put forward a balanced budget bill and we passed it. It says that we should reach a balanced budget in 7 years. That is not an excessively short amount of time. In fact, it is probably too much time. We should probably be reaching a balanced budget sooner. But we agreed to 7 years because we felt that was something that could be attained and which was reasonable.

The administration, the President specifically, had said, over a period of time, they were for a balanced budget also. He said specifically he was for a balanced budget, at one time in 5 years. He had said he was for a balanced budget in 6 years. He had said he was for a balanced budget in 7 years. He had said he was for a balanced budget in 8 years. He had said he was for a balanced budget in 9 years. And he had said he was for a balanced budget in 10 years. We chose 7 years. We thought that was right about in the middle of the different proposals he had put forward and we hoped he would be comfortable with it.

As a result of the closure of the Government, there was an agreement finally reached and the administration has now stated they are committed to balancing the budget in 7 years and that they are committed to doing that using, as an independent scoring agency to determine the fairness and accuracy of the numbers, the Congressional Budget Office. That is a major step forward, obviously, in the process.

It is unfortunate that it took a shutdown of the Government to accomplish that. We, as Republicans, remember, were willing to go forward to reach a balanced budget. We had actually passed the resolution to accomplish that with specifics, without requiring

that the Government be shut down. It was the administration which would not come to the table until there was a Government shutdown, which would not agree to a balanced budget until there was a Government shutdown.

So, as we move into the process of revising the history books, which always seems to occur after events take place, let us remember that Republicans had already committed to a 7-year balanced budget prior to the shutdown and that the shutdown—the outcome of the shutdown was that the administration also agreed to a 7-year balanced budget. So, something was accomplished by the shutdown. It was unfortunate it was necessary. But what was accomplished was that this administration finally settled on a number, 7 years, for a balanced budget. Now we proceed with the negotiations as to how we get there.

I have to say, I have been watching these negotiations, as I suspect many of us have—although we have been distracted, clearly, by the Bosnia situation—and I have become concerned because, while we have put forward a plan, the Republicans have put forward a plan which is very specific and which in real terms accomplishes what is necessary to get this country's fiscal house in order so we will be passing on to our children a nation which is financially solvent rather than a Nation that is bankrupt, we have, as yet, seen nothing from the administration in terms of specifics.

Where is their budget plan that gets us to balance? We have ours on the table—3,000 pages. In fact, the other side of the aisle had great entertainment, making fun of the length of our proposal. It is a lengthy proposal because it is a specific proposal and a real proposal. What we need to see from the administration are specifics as to how they wish to get to a balanced budget. It is very difficult, I suspect, for those negotiating in this process to be negotiating without one side being willing to come forward and say what they are willing to do.

So I think it is incumbent on the folks who follow this process, recognizing we are all a bit distracted, and rightly so, by what is happening in Bosnia and the immediate threat to our American soldiers—but, even in the context of that I think it is incumbent upon all of us in this country to be asking the question, "How does this President intend to get to a balanced budget in 7 years? What are his proposals?"

We saw his budget that he sent up here in June. That was a 10-year budget. It did not get to balance. In fact it had deficits of \$200 billion for the entire 10-year period, each year for the 10-year period. For this administration to get to balance, they must come forward with proposals which slow the rate of Federal spending by approximately \$750 billion over the next 7 years. We have come forward with proposals that do that. Where are the administration proposals?

My sense is that they do not want to come forward with proposals because they are not sincere, to be quite honest. I do not believe they are sincere. If they were sincere they would come forward with these proposals. But the fact that they have not raises serious doubts as to their sincerity in their efforts. I hope I am wrong but, as of right now, I think the facts show I am right. I think the American people should start asking themselves what type of administration, what philosophy of Government allows the executive branch to agree to a 7-year timeframe for reaching a balanced budget but refuses to come forward and define how they are going to get to that balanced budget? What is the philosophy of an administration that does that?

I do not believe it is a philosophy that is sincerely committed to a balanced budget. I believe it is a philosophy that is more involved in the politics of the issue than the substance of the issue. That is the problem. We cannot afford, as a nation, any longer to be involved in the politics. We need to be involved with the substance of the balanced budget. In order to get involved in the substance, we need to have this administration come forward and state specifically how it intends to get to a balanced budget in 7 years. We have done it. The reason we have done it is because we understand that, if this is not accomplished, and not accomplished at this time, at this moment in history where the opportunity is so ripe, that we may not have a chance at any later date to do it again. And, if we do not do it now, if we do not put in place now the decisions that are necessary to change the spending patterns of this Government in the outyears so we reduce its rate of growth—we are not talking about cutting the Federal Government, we are talking about reducing its rate of growth. In fact, in the Medicare area we are talking about adding \$349 billion of new spending to Medicare and allowing it to grow at a rate that actually exceeds what the President projected in one of his budgets that he sent up.

But, if we do not make the changes necessary to reduce the rate of growth in the Federal Government and make those changes now by changing the programs which drive spending, specifically the entitlement programs, then we are going to end up, as a nation, passing on to our children a country that is bankrupt. That is an extremely cynical act to have occur at the time when all the parties have formally stated that they are opposed to having that occur. That is the irony of this. All the parties have now formally stated they are willing to reach a balanced budget. Yet one of the parties has been unwilling to state how it is going to get there. Thus, you have to question their sincerity.

The fact is, if we do not do this now, if we do not make these changes now which accomplish a balanced budget—and we do not have to follow the plan

laid out by the Republicans. We would be happy to see a plan from the other side of the aisle, specifically from the administration, or a joint plan worked out. But we need to have the facts from the administration first and the proposals from the administration first. If we do not follow such a plan and put such a plan in place now, we are not going to be able to accomplish it.

Mr. President, I ask for an additional minute.

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

Mr. GREGG. We are not going to be able to accomplish what is that overriding, absolutely essential goal which is that we get this budget in balance so our children have a nation which is solvent.

So, as we move down this road, recognizing there is a tremendously large amount going on in this world today which distracts the attention of Americans, recognizing our first concern and interest must be for our soldiers who are going into Bosnia, I do hope we will not lose focus on the fact that the future of our children is being decided today on the issue of whether we get to a balanced budget. We are not going to be able to get from here to there unless this administration starts putting forward some honest proposals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

#### COOPERATION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we have been treated in the Senate with a discussion by Senator THOMAS, Senator INHOFE, Senator COVERDELL, Senator ABRAHAM, Senator HUTCHISON, Senator GREGG, and I assume there will be more, who come to the Senate, among other things to question the sincerity of those on the Democratic side, and especially the President, about whether or not we are interested in a balanced budget. In fact, one of the speakers this morning said that he felt that the President was hiding in Europe. I believe that was the term he used, "hiding out" in Europe.

It is not the kind of thoughtful discussion that would advance a spirit of cooperation, to do the right thing for this country, to see a parade of people coming to the floor of the Senate, questioning the sincerity of people on the other side. It is certainly not thoughtful. But, rather, it is thoughtless for anyone to come here and suggest that what the President is doing at this point in Europe—dealing with the issue of peacekeepers in Ireland, and so on—is that the President is hiding out. I did not intend to come to the floor to speak on this issue today.

#### THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have been asked to be one of the negotiators in the budget negotiations. So I and Senator EXON, representing the Democratic side in the budget negotiations,

are spending a lot of time and will spend a great deal of time on this issue. I do not need, nor do I think the President nor anyone else needs, to have their sincerity questioned about whether or not they want a balanced budget. I believe it is in this country's interest to have a balanced budget. I believe that is a goal that represents a legitimate and important goal for this country. It is one goal. There are others.

Do we care and should we do something about making sure we have the best schools in the world? Yes. That is another goal. Do we care that we have clean air and clean water and a decent environment in the country? Yes. That is a third goal. Do we care whether low-income senior citizens have access to health care? Do we care whether children have access to good nutrition? Do we care whether poor children have access to health care? Those are other goals. It is not a case where there is only one goal in this country. We have a number of goals we must meet.

It is true the Republicans put together a plan. It is also true that plan is dead, gone. The President will veto it. There are 34 people who will sustain the veto. And that plan does not exist at that point. Then what is true is Democrats and Republicans sit down at the table and decide together, how do we balance the budget in 7 years? That is going to take a substantial amount of effort and good will. And it is not just how do you balance the budget in 7 years, but it is how do you do that in a responsible way for the long-term interests of this country?

Those who paraded in here this morning had a plan that would balance the budget in 7 years by, among other things, providing—let me give you a couple of little examples—that we repeal most of the alternative minimum tax for corporations so 2,000 corporations will get \$7 million each in tax breaks because of the reduction in the alternative minimum tax. I do not know whether everyone who voted for that knew that was in there. But those who voted for it and believe that should happen do no service to this country. That is not good public policy.

I wonder whether those who voted for this plan they are so proud of understand that what they did was increase the tax incentive for people to close down their plants in America and move their jobs overseas. That is in the plan. It says, by the way, if you do that, we will give you a bigger tax benefit. Just move the American jobs you have overseas and we will give you a benefit. I do not know whether anybody is proud of that or whether they want to come here and boast that was in their plan.

There are a series of very large policy areas that we must address—Medicare, Medicaid, education, environment, and others. On the issue of Medicare, the majority party plan, which is now going to be dead when the President vetoes it, calls for \$270 billion in budget