

"I am for a balanced budget" and then goes on for another 30 minutes announcing why he cannot, and becoming a defender of those programs which are kind of scare tactics. Some have called it mediscare, and somehow you are going to do away with the benefits. It is not true, of course. We reduce the growth rate from 10.5, to 6.5. We reduce the amounts available per beneficiary that will grow \$4,700 to \$6,700 over this 7-year period.

So they say, "Gosh. This is radical stuff. And you are tearing it all apart." Let me see how radical you think some of this is.

Mandatory Medicare spending will increase each and every year from \$178 billion in 1995 to \$289 billion in the year 2002. That is a 62-percent increase. That is radical reduction? Overall mandatory spending—overall mandatory spending would increase in each and every year from \$739 billion in 1995 to \$1.93 trillion in 2002, a 48-percent increase. Overall, Federal outlay—listen to this—will increase every year from \$1.518 trillion in 1995, what we spend now, to \$1.856 trillion in 2002, a 22-percent increase in total spending. But if you listen to some of the Members of this body, if you listen to the media, draconian cuts are taking place. And we are going to do something about it.

Here is what the minority leader said:

So, if we cannot get the Republicans to come off those extreme positions, then I think we are advantaged in not reaching an agreement.

Mr. President, reaching an agreement is I believe our responsibility. I believe it is the thing that we have to do.

I forgot to mention, of course, that what is going on here is the President has submitted two budgets, and neither of them balance. Neither of them were accepted. Neither of them have gotten any votes in this Senate.

So we have to say, Is there a real effort made to do this? I hope so. I hope so. Collectively, for this country we need to make a move to balance the budget. We have the best chance we have ever had. We are on the way to doing that. We can do it in 7 years. We can do it with real numbers. We can do it, and provide the benefits that need to be provided. We simply need to have the will. Frankly, we need to have the will to come to the snubbing post, and say, "Here is what we need to do."

Now the notion is that it is all pain. Let me tell you it is not. A balanced budget will bring a good deal of stability to this country that will help the markets, that will reduce interest rates so that on your home, as some have suggested, it could be up to \$2,000 a year in savings in interest on a long-term date.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield? Mr. THOMAS. Certainly.

Mr. INHOFE. I have been listening to the Senator from Wyoming. He hit upon something here I do not think people are fully aware of or sensitive to, and that is the effect what we are doing here is having on the markets.

We keep hearing if something happens, that there is an impasse, it is going to have a deteriorating effect. The markets have been very good. Interest rates are low. Things are going very well right now mostly because of the anticipation of the fact we are going to have a balanced budget.

I can remember so well, as the Senator can remember, when we had the discussion on the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, and we lost it by one or two votes and what happened to the markets after that and the devaluation of the dollar against the yen and the mark. The deterioration was unprecedented. And so I would suggest that what the Senator from Wyoming says is true. There is nothing we could do that would enhance the optimistic future of the economy than to go ahead and take this Balanced Budget Act of 1995 and pass it.

I do not think most people are aware, Mr. President, that we have passed a Balanced Budget Act of 1995 which essentially does what the President committed to do during the last continuing resolution. It does provide for a balanced budget, and it uses real numbers, CBO numbers, those numbers that come from the Congressional Budget Office, which the President stood before a joint session of the legislature and said is the most reliable source that we can use, so we can end smoke and mirrors and we can handle what is out there.

The thing that concerns me more than anything else, and I ask the Senator from Wyoming if he agrees, is that we have passed a budget. It does what the American people asked us to do in November of 1994. And the President does not have a budget. So while I am not in on the negotiations, how do you negotiate when you have a budget and the other side does not have one? I wondered if the Senator had figured that out yet.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma asks a difficult question. I do not know, nor am I in on the negotiations. If there is bona fide negotiations, both sides need to put their proposals on the table and find some common ground and there can be some adjustment.

I think the key feature to the Republican proposal to balancing the budget is to have a spending limit. Within that spending limit, there are choices, priorities of how you do that. The key is to be able to have projections out into the future using CBO numbers with the contribution of the OMB and whoever else has knowledge, to have that projection and use the same numbers so that you are not using smoke and mirrors. Most anybody can balance the budget if they find some numbers that show revenues increasing out all the time and then it does not materialize. We have done some of that before. On the contrary, we ought to use the more conservative number so if we are wrong, we will err to have more surplus rather than less and add that to the reduction of the deficit and keep spending down.

So the Senator from Oklahoma is exactly right. If there is going to be bona fide negotiation, you need to come to the table with some ideas. And we are dedicated to doing that. So I hope that we do.

Let me yield the floor so that my friend from Oklahoma may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator for yielding.

## CRITICAL TIMES IN AMERICA

### THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Wyoming. I have to say also that the people of Oklahoma, a lot of times—say you are reading these polls, and people are saying, well, we really do not want to balance the budget yet; let us wait until the President gets back; we do not want to be too harsh. There is a myth that is floating around that we are going to be cutting Medicare when in fact we are saving Medicare, and without our doing that, according to his own board of trustees, Medicare would go under.

I believe that when I go back, as I do every weekend, to Oklahoma and I talk to what I refer to—and it has offended several people in this Chamber—as real people, they tell me that they do not want us to back down. They say that this is our opportunity to have a balanced budget.

I can stand on the floor of this Senate and say in my honest opinion this is the last opportunity probably in my lifetime that we will have to have a balanced budget. And if we cave in now, we are not going to be able to have it. I do not think we will have another chance. And I think the President has every intention of having us cave in because he has a lot of discretionary programs he wants to keep funding. He is holding on to the past with white knuckles, to the last 30 years of reckless spending that has brought us where we are today, and he is trying to use the very sensitive argument that we cannot do this to all these people, that there are all these programs that are going to be cut, which are not going to be cut.

I would say that if you want to make a moral issue out of this, the moral issue is to go ahead with this, with the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, which passed in this Chamber and they passed in the House of Representatives, and get this passed because if we do not do it, we know what we are subjecting our future generations to. Many Members in this body are much younger than I am, and they have young families. I have grandchildren coming up now. One is due any minute now. If we do not change the trend that we established in the 1960's and that has continued until today, a person born today is

going to have to pay 82 percent of his or her lifetime income just to service the Government.

I do not think that is what we want. I know that is not what the American people want. But some people just do not want to change. Some people refuse to look at the elections and the post-election analyses and polls that said very distinctly that the American people in November 1994 voted for a change, a change from the Great Society programs of the 1960's that have been perpetuating themselves and growing ever since then. So I think this is the last chance we have.

This is our last stand. I encourage the negotiators to keep that in mind. I am talking about Republicans and Democrats. It is too important to future generations.

#### U.S. TROOPS IN BOSNIA

It is ironic now that we have two things that are going on that are very, very critical to all of America, not just this budget matter that we have been talking about—and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is right when he draws the attention to the significance of what is going on—but something else is happening, too. My frustration, which I have expressed in the Chamber every day for the last several days, is that while the President is out rejoicing in his new posture of being the international peacemaker in Belfast and other places, time is going by and American troops as we speak are being sent to Bosnia. I can remember serving in the other body at that time and asking the question: You are doing airdrops. How do you know that the stuff you are dropping is going to the good guys instead of the bad guys? And the response in that committee meeting was: "Well, we do not know." There was a hesitation. This was the military talking: "I am not sure that we know who the good guys and the bad guys are."

I think if you take any snapshot in the history of Bosnia over the last 500 years, you could come to the conclusion legitimately that the Serbs are the bad guys or the Croats are the bad guys or even the Moslems are the bad guys. If you look at what has happened in the last week over there, people have been killed, tortured; there have been uprisings. I read from several articles yesterday of the hostile area and what is happening over there.

The mayor of a town not far from where the Senator was when he was over there said, speaking in behalf of the people—we hear a lot of the military, of the three known factions and of the rogue groups that are over there but these are civilians—he says, "We will still fight, and if the multinational force tries to drive us from our homes or take away our right to defend ourselves, there will be no authority on Earth, including the Serbian authorities, that can stop us. We will not

leave, we will not withdraw, and we will not live under Moslem rule."

This is coming from an area that is going to be under Moslem rule if this initial peace accord would take place. And you have another big group, too, not just those who have found happy homes and feel that they ought to be able to stay in those homes. You also have what I have been stating as 3 million, but I know the conservative figure is 2 million, refugees that we can identify in those areas, and they are scattered throughout Bosnia. We have heard from all of the sources—our Embassy people, the military people, U.N. people, Gen. Rupert Smith, the British general who is in charge of the U.N. forces in Bosnia, as we speak—that more than 50 percent of these 2 million refugees, under the plan that we have here, will not be able to return to their homes.

What does a refugee want to do? If you have peace, it means you get to go home. More than half of these will not get to go home. So you are going to have new rogue elements rising up.

Just this morning in the newspapers—I will just read one part of an article here that said, "The worst problem though is likely"—keep in mind this is an article that showed this morning 10 more American soldiers showed up. There are only 10. I understand that is not a very large number. But tomorrow it will be 10 more, the next day 10 more; then larger and larger numbers will be coming because that is the President's plan, as he hides over in Europe and allows more and more of our soldiers to go over to put us in a position where we have to support him to send ground troops in.

The worst problem though is likely to be minefields. There are believed to be millions of mines of all shapes and sizes in the Tuzla region. There are mines everywhere. And neither side has maps. We have to move one centimeter at a time.

This is a quote from the lieutenant colonel who works directly under General Haukland, the Norwegian general that I talked to in Tuzla. He also said that in the past 3 weeks his men have demined nearly 300 yards of road. Heavy snowfall will only complicate the problem. This is the very ground that I stood on 3 weeks ago in the Tuzla area. There are only two Members of Congress who went up into that area, Senator HANK BROWN from Colorado and myself. We stood there. And I can tell you that there are mines there. These reports are accurate. That is where we are going to be having some 25,000 Americans up in that region.

Yesterday we showed a map—and I said, I do not know who did the negotiating for the United States of America—where we ended up with the northeast sector, the most hostile area. But that is where we are. And we are there very clearly today.

So, that is what we are faced with. And I think it is time to draw some other lines, too. I know that the President is over in Europe right now, be-

lieving that we are going to end up being able to vote to support his program.

Let me just serve notice to the U.S. Senate at this time, there are not going to be any free rides on this deal. A lot of people are saying, well, let us have a weak resolution or wait until we have so many troops over there and say we are going to support our troops. Sure we are going to support our troops. But now is when we can make a decision and say, "Mr. President, you are wrong. We do not want you to send ground troops into Bosnia."

There is going to be a recorded vote. We might as well know it. By the way, I went back and did some research just this morning. If you remember back in 1991, when George Bush was President of the United States, George Bush wanted to send troops into the Persian Gulf. We all recognized that we did have strategic interests in the Persian Gulf. Our ability to fight a war was dependent upon our protecting those interests in the Persian Gulf.

There are no strategic interests in Bosnia. But I would like to read some things. I am reading this for one reason; that is, that there was a lunch that took place just a couple days ago where the President talked to the Democrats of this Senate. And the word I got is they are all going to line up, that they all agreed that they would support the President in sending ground troops in.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield for a minute?

Mr. INHOFE. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS. This has been an interesting process. Certainly everyone subscribes to the notion that the President has some authorities—in the case of emergencies and in the case of war. But it seems to me that the Congress also has some responsibilities as representatives of the people. It seems to me what has happened is when we get into these situations, like in Bosnia—it has been going on now for 3 years—and then there comes, "Well, we're going to have a peace agreement, so we can't talk to you about it until we get a peace agreement. We don't want you to get involved here until there's a peace agreement." Then when there is a peace agreement, the answer is, "Well, we've already got a peace agreement, so there's nothing for you to do."

Does it strike the Senator that we are essentially being left out of any decisions, those of us who represent our States?

Mr. INHOFE. That is exactly what is happening. I would respond to the Senator from Wyoming. I am particularly sensitive to this because I serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee. Let us take this out of a partisan realm, because I opposed—it was George Bush, not Bill Clinton, who originally sent troops into Somalia. I was opposed to it at that time. It was supposed to be, as I recall, a 45-day humanitarian mission to open up the routes so we could send humanitarian goods in.

Then, of course, he went out of office. President Clinton came in. And each month—and the Senator from Wyoming will remember this because he and I were both serving in the other body when this happened—each month we sent a resolution to the President saying, bring back our troops from Somalia. We did not have any strategic interest there that related to our Nation's security. And he did not do it. And he did not do it. And he did not do it. It was not until 18 of our Rangers were brutally murdered in Somalia and their corpses dragged through the streets of Mogadishu that the people finally stood up and said, "We have had enough," and we brought them home.

I do not want that to happen in Bosnia. But the Senator is exactly right, the President sends these troops all over the world. Then he comes back for an emergency supplemental. That puts us in the position that, if we do not vote for the emergency supplemental which might violate everything we are trying to do with our budget balancing effort, he will take the amount of money out of the existing military budget, which is already down to the bare bones anyway. We went through this in this Chamber just a few weeks ago, a \$1.4 billion emergency supplemental to take care of all these Haiti and Somalia episodes.

Now there is some talk about the cost of this war in Bosnia. They are trying to say it is between \$1.5 and \$2 billion. The cost figures that I get are far greater than that. There have been many people who have evaluated that and come up with figures from \$4.5 to \$6 billion. So there is a dollar consideration here as well as a human life consideration.

The Senator is exactly right, we are being put in a situation where the people of this Nation cannot be heard in decisions as critical as risking American lives in a war-infested place like Bosnia. We are irrelevant. It does not matter what we say or do. This is what the President apparently is telling us.

But I was going to go back in history to 1991 just for a moment to read some of the arguments that I heard from the other side of the aisle. I repeat again, there are not going to be any free rides on this thing because we are going to have recorded votes. I will not mention the names of all of them because I do not think doing so would serve any useful purpose, but these are mostly in the leadership of the Democrat side, those who I understand are going to be supporting the President in his effort to send 25,000 or more troops into that war-infested area.

"Some argue that we must go"—this is 1991. This is when we had security interests in the Persian Gulf. "Some argue that we must go to prevent a coalition from falling apart. I disagree. The use of American military should not be a substitute for the weakness of any coalition. America is not 911 for every problem." I would say there is no more accurate statement that could describe what has been happening up in Dayton, OH, for the last several weeks.

Here is one here. It says, "The worst-case scenario"—again 1991, Democrats arguing against sending troops into the Persian Gulf. "The worst-case scenario could have us losing thousands and thousands of young Americans. The worst-case scenario could have us bogged down for months and months and maybe years. This is not an easy war to be fought. And this is not a war that ought to be fought."

If there is any war that should not be fought, it is the war in the Balkans. We do not even know who the good guys and the bad guys are. If this were a snapshot in history, 50 years ago it would be the Croats, not the Serbs, that would be the bad guys. And you could go to any other time in history and find that to be true.

This is another prominent Democrat who made this statement on the floor of this body. "I cannot back a policy I believe is ill-advised, when Americans' lives hang in the balance, just for the sake of displaying a united front."

Is that not the argument we have been hearing? We have to have this united front, we have to protect the integrity of NATO at any cost, particularly American lives, at any financial cost. We heard yesterday the distinguished Senator from Alaska talking about that so far we have funded 70 percent of the cost of the efforts over there in the Balkans, and yet we are farther away than anybody else in the alliance.

Here is one that I think is one of the best. It says, "But do these goals"—1991—"qualify as a sufficient reason to suffer the tragic loss of American life, especially before we have exhausted every available alternative? My deep conviction is no, no they do not. I cannot look my 17-year-old son and my 19-year-old daughter in the eye and say, 'Moving Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait, obtaining the necessary oil from the Persian Gulf, protecting our allies or saving jobs is worth your life.' I cannot say that. If at this time I cannot say that to them, how in good conscience can I say it to a mother or a father? How can I say it to a sister or brother?"

I came back from that northeast sector of Bosnia, around the Tuzla area, and I stopped on the way back at the 1st Armored Division training area in Germany, where I think the Senator from Wyoming has been. And he probably talked to some of the troops, as I did.

I went by and had breakfast in the mess hall with these guys and gals who were being trained in that 12-by-6 mile box that they said is supposed to emulate the terrain of Bosnia. It did not look anymore like the terrain of Bosnia than the hill around Washington, DC does. But they are out there training. They are getting good training. They are preparing themselves mentally to be deployed, but they are saying: "We haven't been told yet why we're going."

I think in all fairness to the officials and those officers who are in charge

over there—and I have the utmost respect for General Yates and General Nash—that they themselves do not have a clear understanding of what their mission is.

The President, in his very eloquent, persuasive speech 3 days ago, said we have a clear and concise mission, but he never told us what that mission was. He never told us what the rules of engagement were. I do not think—I suspect—our own troops, the ones over there today, do not really have a well-defined understanding of what our rules of engagement are.

We hear about the conditions under which we can withdraw, like 12 months, a time condition, systemic violations. What is a systemic violation to a corporal out in the field who gets fired upon? Does that firepower come from a Serb element or from a Croatian element, or maybe from one of these rogue elements or a Moslem element? He will not have any way of knowing, and yet that could, in fact, be a systemic violation, because a systemic violation—which they have not yet defined—I have to assume it is something systemic, meaning the entire element is acting as a group—whether it be the Croats, Serbs, or Moslems—and are breaking the peace accord.

Well, I do not think there is any way of determining how that could be enforced.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. INHOFE. I will yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I was struck by your quotation on the necessity to maintain the alliance. I was, as you pointed out, in Bosnia about a month ago. Seven of us went to Sarajevo. We also met in Brussels with the NATO group, and all 16 of the Ambassadors were there, as a matter of fact. Each of them stood up in order and almost as if by pushing a button said, "Why, we just can't do this without the leadership of the United States."

The President is now in Europe. I guess I would say, what would you expect Europeans to do with him there? Of course, they will applaud the United States taking the burden, paying the major part of the bill and the major part of having troops on the ground. I think it is a very thoughtful way of promoting this idea.

We were also struck about this very same question. Here are our U.S. soldiers. They are going in there, according to the plan, to be peacekeepers. So then what happens if you are attacked by an armed group and you respond? The notion is, and I think properly, that you can respond to defend yourself. We asked the general of the European group what happens if there is an organized effort. "Well, then we leave, because we are not there to fight the war."

It is very indecisive in terms of what they do. And I agree with the Senator

that certainly you can say that the goal is well defined but, in fact, it has not been well defined.

Mr. INHOFE. The Senator from Wyoming, since he was in the Sarajevo area, I am sure observed the same thing I did. Keep in mind, this is the area where there has been fighting only in the last week, since this accord, if that is what it is, has been initiated.

The problem that I see over there is that there is no way to define who the other side is in Sarajevo. In Sarajevo, we have a convulsion of parties that have come in and taken up the vacuum that has been left by the pounding of the various dwellings—the single-family dwellings and apartment buildings—in Sarajevo. The true inhabitants of those dwellings, those wonderful people who were there during the winter Olympics, are not there anymore, and the ones who are in there now are refugees. We do not know where they came from. We do not know if they are Serbs, Croats, or any other, perhaps rogue, element. So it makes it that much more difficult.

Before yielding to the Senator from Georgia, let me just make one other comment about something that the Senator from Wyoming said. He used the term "peacekeeping." I suggest to you now that they are not using peacekeeping. If there is ever a classic area for mission creep, this is it, because we have already crept from peacekeeping to peace implementation.

There is a big difference between peacekeeping and peace implementation. Peacekeeping is an assumption that there is peace to keep. We know there is not peace to keep. The President stood and he said the war is over, we are in a cease-fire. I stood in Tuzla and heard areas where the war is not over. There is firing up there. The President has not been there so perhaps he does not know and perhaps his advisers are not adequately advising.

Before we go back to a budget discussion, I want to state again what I stated yesterday. I may be one last Senator standing alone, but I am going to fight with every fiber of my being to stop the President from this obsession he has been living with for a year and a half, and that is to send American troops on the ground in Bosnia.

#### CONCLUSION

I am very concerned with the discussion we were having earlier about what is happening in our budget battle. I guess I will sign off by stating at least my position.

We passed a good bill, the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, through this body and through the other body. It is one that is consistent with the mandates of the election of 1994, and I do believe that we have done a good job.

I certainly encourage the President to use the guidelines he committed to during the last CR—that is, a balanced budget in 7 years using real numbers—and come up with something that is acceptable.

At this point, I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. COVERDELL] is recognized.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator should be aware, under morning business, the Senator has 5 minutes.

Mr. COVERDELL. Unanimous consent is approved for 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

#### PUT THE FISCAL HOUSE OF GOVERNMENT IN ORDER

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I want to respond to the remarks of the good Senator and my colleague from Oklahoma who has closed his remarks by talking about the importance of a balanced budget. Let me take just a minute to frame where we are.

It has been a rigorous year, and both the House and the Senate have now passed a Balanced Budget Act, just before Thanksgiving. This is the first time that this has happened in nearly three decades—a Balanced Budget Act in response to the American people. The American people have said over and over to put the fiscal house of their Government in order, like they have to do at home.

We have done it. We came here with a promise, and we have passed a balanced budget. We are sending it to the President. This balanced budget balances it in 7 years, reforms welfare, saves Medicare and lowers taxes. That is our plan.

There are currently meetings underway with representatives of the Senate and the House and the administration. They have not been productive as yet, because there is no balanced budget proposal from the President.

The President says he is going to veto this first balanced budget that the Congress has sent him. He said, "I will not accept it." That is his prerogative, but my question to the President is this: Where is your plan?

We have done our job. We have made our best faith effort. We have sent a rational and reasonable plan to the President. With all the debate and discussions in Washington, you almost have to step back from it to measure the reasonableness of it because all the financial markets in America are responding positively. The stock market is up. Interest rates are dropping. The people in the real world, the people running businesses and running families all across the land, are responding positively to what we have done.

It is time for the President to tell the country and to tell these conferees what his plan is.

Back when I was in high school, they would say, "The jig is up." We have done our work; we have laid the plan before him. He says it is not acceptable. Give us your plan, Mr. President.

Then we can work the two plans together. But this business of criticizing our plan while you have none of your own cannot go on, and America will not accept it.

Mr. President, I would like to talk just a moment about what our plan does and why it is so reasonable. Take Medicare. The trustees told us that Medicare will go out of business in 6 years—broke, bankrupt. It said that the Congress and the President need to step forward and do something about it. Our balanced budget plan does just that. It expands Medicare because it expands the investment in it over the next 7 years by 65 percent. It grows 65 percent larger under our plan. It takes the solvency of it and expands it from the 6 years that are left and pushes the solvency of the plan out almost a quarter of a century. And it expands the choices people can make about the kind of coverage they want.

We increase Social Security spending 44 percent. We increase the size of Medicaid 65 percent. We increase overall Federal outlays 22 percent. The U.S. economy, we are told, will grow \$32 billion in new disposable income. We will create 6.1 million new jobs. We will have \$66 billion in new purchases and 100,000 new housing starts. Ten million more Americans will be able to purchase their first home. We will lower interest payments on the average family's mortgage by \$1,500 to \$2,000 per year. We will lower the interest payments on their car \$200 per year. We will lower the interest payments on their student loan or the back porch another \$200 a year. Because of the tax credits of \$500 per child, in the average family we are going to add another thousand dollars of disposable income.

The bottom line here is, we are creating new jobs, new businesses, new homes, and we are putting between \$2,000 and \$3,000 of new disposable income on the kitchen table of every average American family. We depend on the family to nurture and grow America, to house America, to educate America. That is where we need to put our resources—on the kitchen tables in Hahira, GA, Denver, CO, or Keokuk, IA. That is where the resources need to be, not sent to Washington and redistributed by a bunch of policy mongers. We will help local government.

In my State alone, the balanced budget amendment will create \$333 million over 7 years—\$333 million; that is a third of a billion dollars—in lower interest payments for the State government of Georgia. In my capital city, Atlanta, we will save \$100 million over 7 years in lower interest payments. That is a boon to a city putting on the Olympics next year, which is pressed from every corner to meet its needs. And \$100 million would be saved. In all, \$29 billion will be saved by local governments over the next 7 years—\$29 billion—because we have balanced our budget.