

baneful foes of republican government. But that jealously to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence therefore it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war, as our interest guided by justice shall counsel.

Why forgo the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world—so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it, for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements (I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy)—I repeat it therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectably defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed—in order to give to trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them—conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied, as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another—that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character—that by such acceptance it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the usual current of the passions or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good, that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism—this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far in the discharge of my official duties I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is that I have at least believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice and by that of your representatives in both houses of Congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the

case, had a right to take—and was bound in duty and interest to take—a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without anything more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions and to progress without interruption to that degree of strength and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations, I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat, in which I promise myself to realize without alloy the sweet enjoyment of partaking in the midst of my fellow citizens the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

COMMENDING SENATOR ISAKSON FOR READING WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCONNELL. First, let me congratulate the Senator from Georgia for

his excellent presentation of George Washington's Farewell Address. It has been an important Senate tradition for many years. I thank him for his reading of that for all of us on this important occasion.

BUDGET CUT DEBATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to start by welcoming everyone back from the recess. It is good to be back. Time away from Washington is an opportunity to step back and measure the priorities of party against those of the people who sent us here to make sure they are properly aligned.

As the two parties reengage this week in a debate about our Nation's finances, it is vital that we focus not on mere partisan advantage but on what is right for the Nation. When it comes to the two choices before us of either maintaining an unsustainable status quo on spending or beginning to cut spending, the choice could not be more clear.

This morning's news brought word that a 47-member panel of some of the Nation's top business economists view government overspending as the top threat to our economy. In other words, a majority of those experts think Washington's inability to live within its means is the single greatest threat to our Nation's economic future. This is not a groundbreaking observation. After all, Americans have been telling lawmakers for more than 2 years that business as usual simply will not cut it anymore. They want us to get our fiscal house in order and to start to create the right conditions for private sector job growth. But today's news is further confirmation of the stakes in the debate over spending and that Democrats in Congress need to rethink the approach they have taken up to now.

The message from the November elections is quite clear: Stop spending money we don't have. Yet Democratic leaders persist in defending budgets that do just that well into the future.

Earlier this month, the President unveiled a 10-year budget for the government. At no point in this 10-year projection would the government spend less than it takes in. It does not even try. Just look at the estimates for this year alone. Unless we start to cut this year's projected spending, Washington will spend more than \$1.5 trillion more than it takes in—\$1.5 trillion more than it takes in this year—about \$350 billion more in red ink than we had last year. That is \$350 billion more in red ink than we had last year. Think about that—a \$350 billion increase in deficit spending over last year after an election in which the voters unambiguously said they want us to cut spending and stop adding debt.

Next year, Democrats in Congress want us to do it again. Once again, they plan to spend more than \$1 trillion more than we take in, and the same pattern the year after that. They want to spend hundreds of billions of

dollars more than we take in. And on and on.

All of this overspending, of course, just adds to our overall debt. When you add it all up, the numbers are truly staggering. As a result of Democratic budgets, the Federal debt 5 years from now is expected to exceed \$20 trillion—5 years from now, \$20 trillion. Interest payments alone on that debt will exceed $\frac{1}{2}$ trillion a year. That is just interest payments on the \$20 trillion debt— $\frac{1}{2}$ trillion a year. Talk about a disconnect.

The American people have spent the last 2 years trying to get their own fiscal houses in order. Millions have lost their jobs. Millions more have lost their homes. Meanwhile, what have the Democrats in Washington been up to? On the day the President was sworn into office, the national debt was \$10.6 trillion. In the 25 months since, it has increased by about \$3.5 trillion. And despite a national uprising over this profligacy and an election that represented a wholesale repudiation of it, here is the President's response: Spend more. He calls it investments.

What about Democratic leaders in Congress? Are they reading the writing on the wall? Until this past weekend, they insisted they could not agree to cut a dime in spending—not a dime. Rather than look for ways the two parties can work together to rein in spending, they looked for ways to marginalize those who are working hard to come up with ways to do it. They called anybody who wanted to cut a dime in spending an extremist. I will tell you what is extreme, Mr. President. What is extreme is \$20 trillion in debt. That is what is extreme. Or $\frac{1}{2}$ trillion in interest payments a year is extreme. Refusing to agree to even try to live within your means is extreme.

Tomorrow, the House will have a vote on a 2-week spending bill. This bill represents an effort to change the culture in Washington. It says: Let's start to change the mentality around here. Let's find \$4 billion that all of us can agree to cut and cut it and continue from that good start. Democratic leaders in Congress have resisted even this up until a few days ago. Now they have started to suggest they might be willing to agree to it. This is progress.

This week, Democrats will have the opportunity to show they have gotten the message. They can show they agree the time has come to change the status quo. Less spending, lower debt, reining in the size and scope of government, that is what is needed. That is how we will create the conditions for private sector job growth.

Democratic leaders in Congress have tried record spending and deficits. What has it gotten us? More than \$3 trillion more in debt and 3 million more jobs lost—\$3 trillion in new debt while we lost 3 million jobs. Democrats have an opportunity this week to show they get it. They have an opportunity to show that the status quo on spend-

ing and debt is no longer an option, to turn a corner. A lot depends on how they respond to that opportunity. Will they continue to see what they can get away with or will they finally concede that the old way of doing business must come to an end?

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 3:30 p.m. today. Senators during that period of time will be able to speak for up to 10 minutes each. At 3:30 p.m., we will move to consideration of S. 23, which is the Patent Reform Act. At 4:30 p.m., the Senate will turn to executive session to consider the nominations of Amy Totenberg, of Georgia, to be a U.S. district judge and Steve C. Jones, of Georgia, to be a U.S. district judge. The time until 5:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled in the usual form. At 5:30 p.m., Senators should expect a voice vote on confirmation of the Totenberg nomination, to be followed by a rollcall vote on confirmation of the Jones nomination. We hope to complete action on the patent reform bill and consider a continuing resolution during this week's session.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period for the transaction of morning business until 3:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPENDING

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about our dilemma in the Federal Government. The American people are watching as we try to deal with our spending issues. I know there is a big debate over the 2-week spending issue, an issue where we are trying