

that promise? He made the promise because he knew that the American people overwhelmingly are demanding that this city, this town, this Congress balance the budget. But once he got elected, he started listening to speeches like we just heard. We will just keep everything the same. No one will notice.

But the new Congress came here and said that we are going to balance the budget in 7 years. I think, somewhat to their surprise, that is exactly what we are doing. What is more—and he knows this—it is exactly what the American people want us to do. They want us to balance the budget.

Well, first, the President said he was not going to offer any budget at all after this new Congress got here. Then he went back out into the country and found out that the American people did not like that, so he offered a budget. That budget did not receive a single vote in the Senate—from our party or his. It was 99 to 0. No deal. It is not a balanced budget, Mr. President.

So then he came and said, well, I am going to offer a budget that is balanced in 10 years. The Congressional Budget Office, who the President says provide the most reliable numbers we can get, said, "We are sorry, Mr. President, but your budget does not balance in 10 years." In fact, it never balances. The President has been traveling the country back and forth saying he is giving us a budget. "Theirs is 7, mine is 10." But that is just not so. His budget never balances. I know this morning the Senator from Pennsylvania suggested that the other side of the aisle go ahead and introduce that budget if they believe so strongly in it. No one is willing to introduce the budget. Why? Because they know it does not balance. It does not do what the President said.

And then, last week, he said, "Well, maybe I will do one that is 9 years or 8 years." So now we are on about the fifth or seventh reincarnation of the President's budget. It is not really that complicated. It either balances or it does not. The Congressional Budget Office can tell us. It has now told us that the Republican budget will balance in 7 years, just like the American people are asking us to do.

I was fascinated listening to the Senator from Minnesota, because he was talking about students and student loans. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the fact that if America—if their Congress—balances the budget, what happens to students who have to borrow money. Let me tell you what happens. A student that borrowed \$11,000, or the family that had to borrow \$11,000 for that student, if we had balanced budgets, would pay so much less interest for the loan that they would save \$2,000 on the student loan in lower interest payments. If we balance our budgets, interest rates, according to DRI/McGraw, interest rates will drop between 2 and 3 percent. That means that the American families that the Senator from Minnesota is talking

about will save billions. Well, billions gets to be a number that is so big, it is kind of hard to bring down home. But let us say we are talking about an American family that had a \$75,000 home and mortgage. That family, because we balanced the budgets and because we had lower interest rates, would save between \$1,500 and \$1,700 every year. And here you have an average family. The average family income in America is \$40,000. The Government is already taking half of that money between Federal, State, and local, leaving them only half to deal with all their needs, and we can take an act up here that will lower their interest payments on their home \$1,500 to \$2,000.

We have increased their disposable income by 10 percent—increased. There is nothing we could do, there is no Government program, there is no new bureaucracy, no new system taking care of people from Washington that will do so much good for the American family—the average family—than lowering the financial burden on that family, which happens if you balance the budget. It does not happen if you do not balance the budget.

Mr. President, balancing the budget will do more for every American than any Government program we can think of. We will save them \$1,500 on a home mortgage of \$75,000. We will save them \$900 in lower interest rates if they buy a car. We will save them \$2,000 in lower interest rates if they are borrowing money to send students to school.

The American family knows this. That is why 70 to 80 percent of them have been banging on the door of this town saying, "For Heaven's sakes, get your spending under control. Quit taxing us to death. Quit spending money you do not have. Quit spending the future opportunity of our children."

Balancing the budget will produce a rainbow and a nest egg in the checking account of every average family in America. Make no mistake about it. The great burden of running this Government falls on the average American family—not on the rich. You could take all the money the rich produce and you could not run this Government.

In the end, it is the average American that bears the burden—not the poor. It is the average American. The greatest good that we can do for that family is to balance our budget.

Now, Mr. President, several days ago the President admitted—which I was shocked about, but he did—the President said in speaking to a fundraising audience, "I will surprise you, because I think I raised taxes too high in 1993." That is a pretty big mistake, Mr. President.

We raised taxes at a historical level—\$250 billion-some-odd in new taxes—the highest in American history, and now the President says maybe that was a mistake. Not maybe it was a mistake, it was a mistake.

Why did he raise taxes? So that the Federal Government could spend more

so that our deficits would continue to increase, so that interest rates are higher on every family, and they are paying thousands upon thousands of dollars because we do not have a balanced budget.

The President has now said that tax increase was a mistake. We agree with him. What we are saying is we are going to help the President fix that mistake. We are going to lower the economic burden on the American family.

He raised taxes \$255 billion. We are going to lower it \$245 billion. A lot of people try to connect that to the Medicare argument, which is a totally separate thing. The real connection here is between the President's tax increase of 1993 and the Republican tax refund of 1995. He raised them \$255 billion and we are going to lower it \$245 billion.

He said it was a mistake. It was. It has affected the economic stability of every middle-class family. Now we are going to lower it. We are going to help those very American families by lowering the economic pressure on them and relieving them from the pressure that he exacted in 1993.

We are going to balance the budget. We are going to lower interest rates in every American home. We are going to, therefore, expand the economy and therefore people are going to have shorter lines waiting to get a job. We are going to put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work because we balanced this budget.

Mr. President, we are going to reform welfare. Every American knows it needs to be done. Mr. President, we are going to secure Medicare for a quarter of a century. The trustees said it will go bankrupt in 6 years, but we are going to change that and strengthen it and keep it healthy for 25 years, according to the CBO yesterday. We are going to lower the economic burden and pressure on the American family by lowering taxes.

Every one of those things that we are talking about, every one of them, the American people want to have happen. Mr. President, it is time the Congress did what the American people wanted up here.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in morning business?

Mr. BYRD. It does not matter.

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

Mr. BYRD. I did not mean to give the Chair a short answer. I thought my request covered the situation very well.

UNITY ON BOSNIA POLICY

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there has been substantial movement toward a peace agreement among the warring factions in Bosnia, and the President deserves great credit for exercising strong leadership for moving this process forward in the last 2 months. The

conflict has gone on too long, and the horrendous spectacle of ethnic cleansing and prolonged, widespread inhumanity in the Balkans offends and disgusts all civilized society. It is clear that our European partners in NATO have been unable to bring the fighting to a halt and will be unable, Mr. President, to bring a lasting peace in the Balkans without strong American leadership. One might well argue that it is a European problem—and it is—and the European nations should be able to achieve a peaceful settlement without us—and they should. That would be what I think most people would like to see. But that has demonstrably not been the case over the last 2-3 years of carnage in Bosnia. Therefore, the President has taken a strong role in leading our allies to bring the parties to the peace table. A peace agreement has not yet been reached, but negotiations, so-called "proximity talks," will begin at the end of this month of October, in Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. President, Administration officials have testified that the United States should participate in any NATO operation which would implement an accord that is reached among the warring parties. The Secretaries of Defense and State, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have all testified that the operation would be a NATO operation, and that there would be no so-called "dual key" command and control structure which includes a decision-making role by the United Nations. Those command and control arrangements were an abject failure in the U.N. operation in Bosnia over the last several years. The United Nations has tried valiantly to play a peaceful role in Bosnia, but it is clear that up to now there has been no peace to keep and that the ferocity and hatreds which have consumed the Bosnian factions have overwhelmed the ability of the United Nations to operate in a peace-enforcing role there. Therefore, it is appropriate that NATO assume any peacekeeping responsibility, since only the clear promise of overwhelming and swift retaliation against any group or individual that violates a peace accord is necessary for such an accord to work in the environment of the Balkans.

Mr. President, the question has arisen as to what role the Congress will play in determining the policy and possible deployment of American forces to the Balkans in connection with a peace treaty. There is substantial risk of casualties there, in spite of the fact that the purpose of any NATO force would be to police and implement an agreement among the parties. Cease fires in the Balkans have been routinely entered into and they have been just as routinely violated. The parties to the conflict cannot resist, it seems—cannot resist the temptation to take advantage of temporary weaknesses of their opponents to gain more territory or to commit more atrocities. Furthermore, the terrain is treacherous, made more

so by the harshness of winter weather, which is the likely season that this accord will be reached, and, hopefully, such an accord will be reached.

I believe that any President, Democrat or Republican, is on dubious constitutional ground in deploying forces to be at risk abroad without the positive action in support thereof, by the Congress.

We could debate this all we want to debate it. I know we say, on the one hand, any President does not need Congress' approval. On the other hand, there are those who say he needs congressional approval. And there are arguments to be made on both sides. But I think of the wild animals in the forest, the lion, the tiger, the elephant—the wild animals in the forest. At some point or another they have to come to the waterhole. There is a big waterhole in that forest. Some may have to come sooner than others. But eventually they all have to come to the waterhole.

Well, the power of the purse is the waterhole in the constitutional process. The appropriation of money is the waterhole. So we can argue all we want, until we are blue in the face. But in the final analysis, unless that appropriation is there, unless the funds are provided, the use of military forces would automatically have to be cut off, you see. So that is the waterhole. We can argue all we want, but that power of the purse is the most effective power in the whole constitutional system—the power of the purse. That is why I have stood on my feet many, many times in the Senate and argued against shifting that power of the purse to the executive branch.

Well, I will not go further into that at this point. But we should all keep in mind the waterhole. All government agencies have to come down to the waterhole, sooner or later.

Well, only the Congress can fund such operations, and Congress has the sole responsibility, under the Constitution, to raise and maintain land and naval forces. But, aside from this constitutional requirement, from a commonsense political perspective, I think that any President is well advised to gain the prior support of the Congress, and therefore the American people, before committing forces that risk casualties, which will result in the expenditure of substantial sums of money, and which might be employed over a period of rather extended duration. Regardless of the differences between this proposed operation and the American deployment in 1990 to the Middle East to counter the aggression of Iraq against Kuwait, the risks, the costs, and the duration of peace implementation in Bosnia argue for the same need—the same need—for the President to solicit and gain the support of the Congress before going forward. As I wrote to the President on October 13th, I believe he should welcome the opportunity to rally the Nation behind him and ask for the approval of Congress for this proposed

mission. As I stated in that letter, "while this effort, of course, risks rejection, a sure political foundation seems essential to carry it over the shoals and storms of difficulties which could possibly confront our forces during an extended period of American military involvement." In my letter to President Clinton, I encouraged him to seek Congressional support and endorsement of any deployment of U.S. forces to the Balkans which might be required to enforce a peace agreement.

I am pleased to report to my colleagues that the President has responded to my inquiry, and he has responded in a most positive way. He wrote a letter to me, dated October 19, 1995, in which he says that he "would welcome, encourage, and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached."

Promptly after a peace agreement is reached. Let me say that again. He states that he "would welcome, encourage, and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached. Such an expression of support would be in the national interest." Mr. President, I congratulate and commend President Clinton for taking this position. It will require a debate over the detailed plans adopted by the President to lead a NATO deployment, if and when an acceptable peace treaty is reached among the parties.

I emphasize the preliminary nature of these assurances. Delicate negotiations are underway among the parties, with the strong intermediary role played by this Administration and others in the European region. We in this body, in what we do and say, need to be cognizant of the delicacy of this process. It would be unfortunate if Congressional action at this time made that process more difficult. It would be most unfortunate if the peace process were to be derailed by premature action here as to what we would or would not do or should or should not do in the event of an agreement. Let us wait and see what the Administration can accomplish with the parties in the upcoming negotiations.

Given the preliminary nature of this process, I certainly cannot say today what my position will be on an American deployment. The President will have to make a clear case and a strong case, and a convincing case for it, if he desires to employ American forces on the ground in Bosnia. There will be a debate. There will be a thorough examination and understanding as to what the American national interests are in that event. I, personally, will approach such a request for Congressional support with an open mind.

The President goes on in his letter to me to say that "our foreign policy works best when we are united in purpose . . . I intend to work with the Congress to make this happen." Mr. President, there will need to be a very

detailed understanding of the risks, duration, the nature of forces to be deployed, the command and control arrangements, the funding, and many other aspects of the ingredients of the participation of our forces in implementing any of these treaties involved. There undoubtedly will be a major debate, as occurred in the Senate before President Bush deployed forces in combat against Iraq. Now is not the time for that debate, or for second guessing. Let us let history take its course, certain that the President will, as he has promised, request Congressional support, endorsement, and participation when the details of an accord are reached and when the allies have determined whether and how NATO should implement it.

Mr. President, the President's letter is short. I shall read it into the RECORD.

DEAR ROBERT: Thank you for letter regarding whether or not I will seek Congressional authorization prior to committing United States troops to a NATO implementation force in Bosnia. I welcome the opportunity to set forth my position.

While maintaining the constitutional authorities of the Presidency, I would welcome, encourage and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached.

So, Mr. President, what could be more clear as to the President's intention?

Such an expression of support would be in the national interest. I believe, however, action at this time is premature pending the proximity peace talks to be held in Dayton, Ohio at the end of this month. I hope as the peace talks commence we can continue the process begun in Congressional hearings to brief and consult with Congress so that we secure the widest support possible for peace.

Those hearings have begun. They began in the Armed Services Committee just a few days ago, and the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH], who is presently presiding over the Senate with a degree of dignity and grace and skill that is "so rare as a day in June," was present at the hearing, as I was, when we heard testimony.

As you know, our foreign policy works best when we are united in purpose. We have an historic opportunity in Bosnia to change the course of events, to prevent the spread of the conflict and to end the human suffering that has plagued the people of the region for so long. I intend to work with Congress to make this happen.

Thank you again for your words of support.
Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD not only the President's letter but also my letter addressed to him, and to which I have alluded earlier in my remarks.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, October 13, 1995.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: Press reports today quote Secretary of Defense William

Perry as stating that your Administration will not seek Congressional authorization prior to committing United States troops to a NATO peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, although such authorization would be "welcome." If the reports are accurate, I urge you to reconsider this decision and actively seek prior authorization for this mission.

Given the gravity, risks, and costs associated with an extended peacekeeping operation in Bosnia, I think it would be wise to have the support of the American people and Congress behind you. I believe the Congressional majority should share full responsibility, from the outset, for any decision to accept the costs and risks of this proposed operation. As you know, President Bush sought and received the support of Congress and the American people for Operation Desert Storm in Iraq. That support would have been invaluable to him had the initial casualty predictions been realized, or if international contributions had not reimbursed U.S. costs associated with the mission.

Without outlining the risks and benefits of U.S. involvement in Bosnia and gaining the consent and cooperation of Congress in advance, it may well be difficult, if not impossible, to sustain or to pay for such involvement, particularly if factional fighting recurs. Secretary Perry was also quoted in the press as saying that it is "not only a possibility, but likely" that paramilitary groups would target U.S. forces in Bosnia.

I believe you should welcome the opportunity to use your considerable persuasive skills to rally the nation behind you, and that you should ask for the approval of Congress for this proposed mission before it commences. While this effort, of course, risks rejection, a sure political foundation seems essential to carry it over the shoals and storms of difficulties which could possibly confront our forces during an extended period of American military involvement. It should also serve as a signal to those who might consider testing our staying power that a strong measure of bipartisan and popular support underpins it.

As always, I appreciate your thoughtful consideration of my views on matters of this importance to our nation and your Presidency.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, DC, October 19, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ROBERT: Thank you for your letter regarding whether or not I will seek Congressional authorization prior to committing United States troops to a NATO implementation force in Bosnia. I welcome the opportunity to set forth my position.

While maintaining the constitutional authorities of the Presidency, I would welcome, encourage and, at the appropriate time, request an expression of support by Congress promptly after a peace agreement is reached. Such an expression of support would be in the national interest. I believe, however, action at this time is premature pending the proximity of peace talks to be held in Dayton, Ohio at the end of this month. I hope as the peace talks commence we can continue the process begun in Congressional hearings to brief and consult with Congress so that we secure the widest support possible for peace.

As you know, our foreign policy works best when we are united in purpose. We have an historic opportunity in Bosnia to change the course of events, to prevent the spread of the conflict and to end the human suffering that has plagued the people of the region for so

long. I intend to work with Congress to make this happen.

Thank you again for your words of support.

Sincerely,

BILL CLINTON.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I first want to congratulate the Senator from West Virginia on his fine remarks relative to the issue of Bosnia. It is not my purpose to rise on that issue but I would make a comment that I think it is good that the President is willing to come to the Congress for prior authorization, as the Senate is familiar with the sense of the Senate which passed last week which I offered requesting the President to come to the Congress for prior approval.

I also suggest, however, that, if we wait until the agreement is reached on a peace accommodation or a peace accord, we may well be past the time when the Congress can take action effectively; that there has been discussion of the fact that we would have a very short time after a peace agreement has been reached to expect troops to be introduced into the region; in fact, 96 to 100 hours has been the discussion. Obviously, that would give a very short window for the Congress to express its views on whether or not we should be putting American soldiers at risk on the ground in Bosnia.

So I hope that we can take up this subject more substantively before a peace agreement is reached, if it is reached.

THE BUDGET

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the remarks made earlier in the day by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SANTORUM, who was addressing the fact that we have heard a great deal from the administration on the issue of their budget, and whether or not they have a budget which reaches a balanced budget.

As we all know, we on the Republican side of the aisle have produced a budget that reaches a balance, is scored by CBO as reaching balance over the next 7 years, and is the first budget to do so in the last 25 years. It is a budget that does this by reforming—and, I think, significantly improving—many of the functions of Government. We end for, example, welfare as an entitlement, and say to people in this country who seek to receive the support of the Government through welfare payments that they are expected to work after a certain amount of time on welfare, and they will only have the right to be on welfare for a period of up to 5 years throughout their lifetime.

It also addresses the issue of Medicaid by returning the authority for managing Medicaid with the dollars to the States, a major step forward in my