

I am not saying, "I told you so." I am just saying, it was so obvious at the time and everyone is on record and the President is on record and John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is on record and Secretary Perry is on record, all of them assuring it was going to be 12 months, and now we know it is not going to be 12 months.

As I said yesterday, we have to serve notice on the administration that when they try to extend that time, we in this Chamber will do everything we can to support our troops who are over there, but they are going to have a fight in keeping our troops over there for an undetermined period of time.

THE BUDGET

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, if I could have just a minute or so more, I want to mention the budget resolution that was passed yesterday. I did not like it. I did not say anything about it at the time. I have to say publicly, on the record, now, the only reason I did support it is I think that is the only way we could have anything at all for defense.

There is a very distinguished House Member from Oklahoma, Congressman WATTS. I think he feels the same way, that this is the only way we can do it. It is not a lean enough budget. It is not one that is as good as I would like. But, nonetheless, we went ahead and passed it.

I think that brings up the other point, and that is our discussion last week on the balanced budget amendment. I do not know how people can have such a change of heart. I think there are six Democrat U.S. Senators who openly supported the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution in 1994, and they voted for it. This is the resolution that they voted for in 1994, Senate Joint Resolution 41, and they turned right around and actively opposed the same exact language in a balanced budget amendment that failed to pass by a couple of votes last week. They tried to say it was different. They said this had the Nunn amendment that addressed judicial review.

I would like to read something into the RECORD, just to make sure no one tries to use that to make people think this is not the same resolution that they voted for 2 years ago and then voted against this last week. This is right out of the RECORD, Senator NUNN speaking. He said:

Mr. President, as I noted last Thursday, adoption of the balanced budget amendment to me is very important, but I also noted that without a limitation on judicial review, a limitation which was accepted during our 1994 debate, when offered by Senator Danforth of Missouri, we could radically alter the balance of powers among the three branches of government that is fundamental to our democracy.

So those Senators that we actively debated with, those very honorable

Senators from West Virginia and North Dakota and Kentucky—these are exactly the same thing. I think maybe it was a mistake that was made. A better way to approach this would be to come up and say, "We did make a mistake, I did not know it was the same thing," and perhaps we would have a chance, still, of passing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Because until we do this, until it is in the Constitution so we do not have any choice, we are going to continue to play this game where we are going to put all of our cuts in the outyears and we are not going to be able to pass a balanced budget.

A balanced budget amendment is the only other way, and I hope those six Senators who voted for and supported a balanced budget amendment in 1994 would reconsider. With those votes, we would be able to pass one and send it to the States for three-fourths of the States to ratify. I have no doubt in my mind they would ratify it in a very short period of time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COVERDELL. I commend the Senator from Oklahoma for bringing up the issue of Bosnia creep. I am not going to talk about it, but I am sure we are going to hear a lot about that in the near term. Not only is the time in which the troops are there being expanded, but the mission is being expanded as well.

If you remember, during all the testimony when that decision was being made, it was a very narrow mission. Now we are talking about chasing down war criminals, expanding the mission significantly, as well as the time.

I have to tell you that I never felt it possible that you could have a 12-month commitment, moving a division like that into an area. It sounded like you would spend the first 6 months getting there and the second 6 months leaving. So I am not surprised by this dilemma that we found ourselves in.

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I want to go back, if we might, to this issue we are confronted with on health care reform. The situation we are in is this. There are three motions that must be approved in order to get the conferees selected, and they are all debatable and can be filibustered. The Senator from Massachusetts has suggested to us that the filibuster would be put into play.

So, in a sense, he is blocking the ability for a conference to come together

and deal with legitimate health care reform.

It has not been mentioned here this morning, but it needs to be mentioned that the administration has a hand in this, too. The administration, for whatever reason—and the Senator from Oklahoma is just as baffled as I—does not like medical savings accounts.

We know that medical savings accounts will lead to an increase of those insured among the young. As the Senator from Texas said, young people sometimes feel immortal, and the cost of health insurance is very high, taxes are high, savings are down and people look for things they can do without. Young people feel, "Well, this is something I can do without."

So by putting a product such as the medical savings account into the marketplace, we know that what will happen is that many of these uninsured will take advantage of this opportunity, this unique product.

The other point I want to make about MSA's is for a large number of people who use them, they will increase their disposable income, because those premiums that are not utilized for health purposes are in the checking account of the person, not somewhere up here in the bowels of the Treasury or in an insurance company's coffers. It is in the family's checking account. So they have access and will have access to financial resources that they can use to pursue their own dreams.

Here we have a situation where the President and First Lady came forward with a massive takeover of medicine by the Government. It would have created the largest entitlement in world history, which I have always found puzzling, because it was right at the same time all of us, including the President, was being told that entitlements are out of control. We have had a report that Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Federal retirement, and the interest only on our debt will consume 100 percent of the U.S. Treasury within a decade. And their response to that was to create a new entitlement, the largest one.

America took a look at that—new entitlement, massive Government spending, new taxes, more intrusion by the Government, more dominance over our lives on very personal matters—and they said, "No, we don't want that." And it went down in flames.

Frankly, there is a lot of conjecture about what the 1994 elections were all about. I, frankly, think it was a referendum on that health takeover by the Government. I think that had as much to do with the change in the Congress. Americans said, "Now, look, we're not for a greater Federal Government. It is already too big."

Then we come to the 104th Congress, and in response to that, recognizing there are issues that need addressing in health care in our country, we put forward a new proposal.

We eliminated job lock to allow workers to move from one job to the

other without losing their insurance. We have addressed the absolutely incredulous situation where an employee who works for a company has their insurance premiums deducted, but if they happen to work for themselves, they cannot. What kind of nonsense is that? So we corrected that.

We created these medical savings accounts so more people would have access to the marketplace of insurance, so that they could save money.

We allow tax deductions for long-term health care, and we fight fraud and abuse. It is a very, very sound proposal that accomplishes the fact of letting more people keep their insurance, more people get their insurance, and we create a friendly workplace for insurance.

There comes the third point. The principal advocates for Government health insurance do not want this to become law, they do not want medical savings accounts—the administration and the Senator from Massachusetts—something that 80 percent of the American public want, so they are going to filibuster it. They are going to block it. I guess they are hoping that maybe fortunes will change and they will have another opportunity to come back and foist that big-Government-health-run program on America again.

These elections do have consequences. I think this proposal that is hung up by the opposition of Senator KENNEDY and the White House is exactly what America is asking for. I think America will take note of blocking this opportunity.

I see, Mr. President, we have been joined by the Senator from Arizona. I believe he has asked for up to 20 minutes. So I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

THE WASHINGTON TAX TRAP

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I received a letter from Jerry Harbin of Phoenix, AZ, one of my constituents. Mr. Harbin works two jobs, his wife works another job, and they earn a modest income between them. The Harbins, who are in their mid-fifties contacted me because they are worried, worried that because so much of their earnings are eaten up by taxes, they have been unable to save for retirement. They are two, among many people, who I hear from every day telling me how difficult their lives are right now and how fearful they are about what the future has in store.

Why is it, Mr. President, that so many families, like the Harbins, are struggling just to keep their heads above water? Why is it that Americans seem to be working harder and working longer, and yet they have less to show for it? Why is it that more people have to take two jobs just to make ends meet?

The answer, I think, can be summarized in three words: The tax trap. The tax trap. It is really very simple to explain. The harder you work, the more taxes Washington makes you pay; the more taxes you have to pay, the longer and harder you have to work. Only Washington ends up with more. As Jerry Harbin put it, people are working themselves into early graves just to pay for Government programs that are not working.

Think about what the tax trap has done to society, to families, to working parents. As another one of my constituents, Mike Barry, of Scottsdale put it, and I quote from a letter:

We have the greatest nation in the world and probably the highest standard of living, and yet because we don't have the willpower and discipline to make the tough decisions to get our "checkbook" in order, we are risking our future and the future of our children.

Mr. President, Americans were once the most optimistic people on Earth, but that seems to be changing. In the America my parents knew, if you worked hard and you played by the rules, you had enough money left over from your paycheck to put something away for the future and still have enough for the little extras in life, and that is what the American dream was all about. It was about making a decent life for ourselves and securing a prospect for a better life for our children.

Why is it, then, for the first time in our Nation's history that an entire generation seems to be losing confidence in the future? It was not that long ago that the largest investment most people ever thought about making was buying a home. If they worked hard and saved, they could buy a house, live the American dream.

But today that dream is out of reach for many families. Many people are now sending more to the tax collector than they spend on food, clothing, and shelter combined. Let me say that again. They are paying more in taxes than they spend on food, shelter, and clothing. There is nothing left over to save for a new home. Some people, like Margaret Bonghi of Phoenix, are really caught in the middle. They cannot afford to buy and they do not qualify for assistance of any kind, and yet they cannot afford to rent either. After taxes, there is nothing left over for her to save.

Here are the figures, Mr. President. In 1948, Federal taxes took about 3 percent of the average family's income. But today, almost half of what people earn goes to the Government in one form or another—half. The tax trap keeps families from buying their own homes. It hurts young people, like 18-year-old Jarrod Wilson in Phoenix, who is very much upset about how much of his earnings are taken by the Government and wasted. He is scared about how much of his paycheck he will be able to keep in years to come.

High taxes are a worry for working women who are trying to balance a ca-

reer with family obligations. Children are put in day care because both parents have to work just to have enough left over after taxes to pay their bills.

For decades, now, Washington has assured people that it can solve every problem with new spending or some kind of new program. It raised taxes, promised more, but few problems were really solved. So it raised taxes again, and the Government grew even bigger. We now have a bureaucracy that includes 160 different job training programs; 240 different education programs; 300 economic development programs; and 500 urban aid programs. Have all of these programs really made Americans better off?

A recent audit of the Labor Department found that about \$305,000 was spent for each participant placed in a training-related employment program in Puerto Rico for about 90 days. The beneficiaries of this program were hired to perform the menial tasks that they had wanted to escape from by participating in the training program in the first place. So the program not only failed to train people for better jobs, it wasted millions in tax dollars that hard-working families could have spent on real needs.

Can Washington really afford all of these programs? It can if it continues to raise people's taxes. President Clinton was not in office 100 days before he proposed the largest tax increase in the Nation's history, taking more of people's hard-earned incomes, again, to expand the size and the scope of the Federal Government.

By comparison, Republicans spent the first 100 days last year trying to cut spending and cut taxes only to have President Clinton veto our balanced budget and tax relief bill in the end.

Did you ever wonder why President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress have been asking people to sacrifice a little more so Washington could spend a little more? Why? Should we not demand that Government be more careful with people's money?

It should not surprise anyone that more and more families find it difficult to make ends meet, that more and more people are forced to live from paycheck to paycheck, and that too many Americans want to put something away for the future but cannot, that almost everyone feels the squeeze from rising prices and higher taxes. Keep in mind that the cost of the Clinton administration's policies to the typical family is \$2,600 a year in higher taxes and lower earnings.

What then is so wrong about asking Government to live within its means so that people can earn more, keep more and do more for themselves and their families? What is wrong with fixing problems that are broken, dismantling programs that are unnecessary and giving the benefit back to working Americans in the form of lower taxes?

I know there are some in Washington who say we cannot afford a tax cut if