

Is this why we should be getting paid? We should not be getting paid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FORD. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. What is the timeframe now? We had morning business, I think, until 12:30, and then it was extended. I am not sure where we are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To recognize two remaining Senators, the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Montana, after which morning business will be closed.

Mr. FORD. I thought it was those Senators on the floor at the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. FORD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for the transaction of morning business be extended to the hour of 1:30 p.m. today, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

#### GREAT MYTHS: ELVIS LIVES—AND THE PRESIDENT SUPPORTS A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, to the ancient Greek philosophers, the Earth was the centerpoint of the entire universe. We were fixed in one position, while the Sun, Moon and planets revolved around us.

It was, at the very least, an egotistical assumption.

But it held, for about a thousand years, in fact, until Copernicus came along in the 16th century with a radical idea of his own. This Polish monk who moonlighted as an astronomer decided that the Greeks had it completely backward—that the Sun, in fact, was the central heavenly object and that the Earth, Moon, and their planetary cousins orbited around it.

Even though he was dismissed as a heretic at the time, his revolutionary notion eventually changed the course of science forever.

Well, about 350 years have gone by and today, once again, some long-held beliefs about what actually revolves around what are being challenged. And this time, we are talking about the Federal Government.

Over the course of this century, the Federal Government has gradually developed the attitude that it rests at the center of the Nation's political power.

The people exist to service it.

The States exist to service it.

After 40 years of especially excessive growth, everything today seems to revolve around the Federal Government, and the Government has spent billions of dollars, building up trillions of dollars of debt, trying to justify its existence and all the money we have continually poured into it.

That is in spite of the Constitution, and the very protections built into it by the Founding Fathers to keep a bloated, arrogant, intrusive Federal Government from taking hold.

In 1995, this Congress has the revolutionary idea that things worked better back in the old days, that the Federal Government should revolve around the people and the States, not the other way around.

Our commitment to making that fundamental change is the driving force behind our plan to balance the budget by the year 2002. Unfortunately, trying to convince President Clinton that a balanced budget is worth fighting for is what this temporary Government shut-down is all about.

To Congress, a balanced budget within 7 years is nonnegotiable, as it should be. To President Clinton, it is a political poker chip. He promised during his 1992 campaign that he would eliminate the deficit in 5 years.

Since taking office, he has proposed goals ranging from 10 years down to 7, but in the two budget plans he has actually submitted to Congress, the budget never even comes close to balance.

And yet he strode into a news conference yesterday to announce that: "I proposed to Congress a balanced budget, but Congress refused to accept it."

He used the phrase "balance the budget" 16 times in his brief statement, then walked away without facing the tough questions that would have followed, or should have followed, if the press would want to make the President accountable for his statements.

What he neglected to mention is that his so-called balanced budgets were so ridiculously out of balance that they did not get a single vote—Republican or Democrat—when they were brought before this Chamber.

Mr. President, I have received more than 500 telephone calls from my Minnesota constituents over the last 3 days, and the overwhelming majority of them—seven to one—agree with Congress. "Stick by your guns and balance the budget," they are saying.

Mark and Sally Crowell of Burnsville, MN felt so strongly about it that they sent me this fax yesterday—something they said they did on behalf of their four children. The fax says:

If President Clinton doesn't want to balance the budget and wants to shut down the government, we guess we are going to have to put up with it for a while.

They—the Democrats—have had 40 years to get it right and have shown that they have no intention of balancing the budget. Balance it for our children!

Nobody wants a prolonged Government shutdown. Federal workers deserve better than that. The Americans who rely on Government services deserve better than that. Most of all, the taxpayers deserve better than that.

But until we can get past all the campaign rhetoric, threats, and flat-out lies we are hearing from the White House—and until we get a commitment that we will have a balanced budget

within 7 years—I am afraid we are not left with much of a choice.

Mr. President, we have debunked a lot of the world's great myths over the last 350 years:

We now know that the Earth revolves around the Sun, just as Copernicus suggested.

If you sail toward the horizon, you will not fall off the edge of the world.

Man can build a flying machine and even take it to the Moon, which, by the way, is not made out of green cheese after all.

All that is left to prove is that Elvis really is dead and that President Clinton does support a balanced budget.

The first one should be easy, but empty rhetoric aside, it is going to take a lot more evidence than we have seen over the past week to convince Congress and the American people that President Clinton is truly serious about wanting a balanced budget.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

#### A BALANCED BUDGET—SOMETHING Clinton is truly serious about wanting a balanced budget.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, if we are going to be quoting, let us start off with the President. Candidate Clinton said he would balance the budget in 5 years. President Clinton says it cannot be done. Yes, he would embrace a 7-year budget agreement. Now that is not any good anymore. He said he wanted a 10-year plan—I am not real sure—but all with a caveat of, "Yes, I would use and want to use CBO figures," real assumptions. He said that in his State of the Union Address. Now that is off the table.

Basically, what we are saying here is what is on the table: Balance the budget in 7 years using CBO's assumption and real economics. That is all we are asking. I do not think that is too much. It is because we have a very deep feeling and support for education. It is because this side of the aisle is very supportive of and deeply cares for Medicare that we want to save it. We do not stick our head in the sand. Medicare spending will actually go up some 45 percent in the next 7 years, and you say we do not care? Medicaid continues to go up. Welfare continues to go up, even with reform.

And we care for children and grandchildren. Instead of handing them a bill that their country is so far in debt they never will see the bottom—we are spending \$1 billion a day in interest on the national debt now, and to those who would not support a balanced budget, are you saying that you want your benefits now at the expense of your children or your grandchildren? That is the funniest parent I have ever seen, or grandparent.

By not taking the meaningful steps to confront the problems we have now

is irresponsible and, I think, probably one of the great facades that has been cast on the American people.

The message over here has been constant since last year. You can talk about Medicare, welfare, the county fair—I do not care what you want to talk about. Basically, we are talking about a balanced budget. We are talking about something we can hand our children that they can deal with. It is because people ran for public office and made a promise to America that we will balance the budget and now the other side says, "We don't want you to keep your promises."

It is very, very simple. There is nothing, there is nothing, there is just nothing that is not simple about this whole presentation.

So while we are quoting quotes and we see the message, one has been consistent, one has not, because maybe the compass sort of goes awry every now and again. The American people have learned one thing—that they do not want business as usual. In the past couple of months, we have heard a lot about the drastic cuts in Medicare. Well, where did we go to school? In the last 7 years, if we spent \$900 billion in Medicare and in the next 7 years we will spend \$1.6 trillion in Medicare—a 45 percent increase—is that a cut? Not where I went to school. A 45 percent increase by the year 2002, and we still balance the budget. The same goes for Medicaid.

Let us talk about the tax package. Candidate Clinton called for a tax cut for the middle class during the campaign of 1992. And then in 1993 he gave this country a tax package that was the largest tax increase in the history of the country. In Houston, he says: Maybe I raised your taxes a little too much, and I sort of cooled this economy a little too much.

Well, in this package, we are trying to help some families. Seventy-five percent or the tax cuts go to families with children. We care about children. There is a \$500 per child tax credit. There are IRA reforms, and also reforms in estate planning, estate taxes, that keeps farms and ranches and small businesses and families functioning. There is an alternative minimum tax reform that creates jobs and does something about investment, providing an expanding economy.

Let us talk a little bit about those death taxes, those estate taxes. It is a form of double taxation. Capital gains is a form of a—let us call it a voluntary tax. Everybody participates in capital gains. If you own anything that appreciates in value, it is capital gains—anything, such as your home, or whatever, you participate in capital gains. It is a voluntary tax. You do not have to pay it because you do not have to sell. I think that is a lot of difference. When we look at a farm or ranch and everybody says, "Do something for the family farm," this is what you can do; we can let them hang on to it and let the

next generation farm it or ranch it. That is the way it should be.

Let us not be led astray and be quoting different quotes because of the message, and do not shoot the messenger. There has been one consistent message: Now is the time to get our fiscal house in order.

I come here from county government. We had to balance it there. Sometimes it would become tough because maybe you did not get everything covered, but you found a way to get through it. We even lived through an initiative in Montana called I-105. We could not levy any more mills because people were tired of their tax bill.

I will say to those folks who do not want any reforms at all, if you do not think something has to be done over the entitlements, I have a little fellow out here in Springfield, VA, that takes care of my car. If you say to him, "I want to raise your taxes," and he says, "OK, you do it," then I will probably go along with you. Right now, he has all the taxes he can handle, and he is just making \$25,000 a year. He has a couple of kids and wants to pay for a home. I think he needs a part of the American dream, too.

So we do not care? I think we care a lot. We do not care for Medicare? I think we care a lot. We care enough to sacrifice so that we can save it, so that it will be there for my children and their children. That is what this discussion is all about. That is what it is all about.

Let us talk about the package that has been presented. It is a CR, continuing resolution, and it says, Mr. President, agree to a 7-year balanced budget and use CBO figures, real assumptions, and use real economics, and we will put everybody back to work. But this is the time to balance the budget with the least amount of pain.

So it is because we do care that we go through this. Somebody has to step up and take responsibility. Sometimes that gets to be a little tough. We hear a lot of rhetoric, a lot of rhetoric that really inflames the landscape so that no negotiations can take place at all. I do not propose to do that. What I propose to do is the responsible thing. I think this is the responsible thing.

I always go back to what my dad said. Fathers teach us a lot of things about discipline, discipline in the family, discipline in your company, and discipline in your job. I can remember when our first child was born and dad was just a farmer down in Northwest Missouri. I do not see how most kids make it to be good kids anyway because they are being raised by amateurs. But I asked dad, "How tough do you have to be on your kids disciplinewise?" He said, "It all depends how much you love them." I have never forgotten that, and I have never forgotten that in Government either. It all depends on how much we love this country, how much we want to put her on solid footing, to be both the political and economic leader in

this world, because these young people deserve a future, and they cannot do it if they are borrowed up to their eyes.

So this is responsible. This is because we love this country very much. This is the time to do it with the least amount of pain. Let us just do it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAMPBELL). The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

#### A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am reminded that Patrick Henry said, "Peace, peace." Everywhere, men cry 'peace.' But there is no peace." Now the colleagues on the other side of the aisle cry "balanced budget, balanced budget," but there is no balanced budget.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Polls get in the Way of Washington's Work," from this morning's Post and Courier.

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

[From the Post and Courier, Wednesday, Nov. 15, 1995]

#### POLLS GET IN THE WAY OF WASHINGTON'S WORK

(By Sen. Ernest F. Hollings)

The silent scandal that permeates Washington is the pollster charade. As in Newsweek's Conventional Wisdom Watch, today's Washington is based on who's up and who's down in the polls. Everyone—the president, Congress and the media—participates. The result? Nothing gets done and no one really expects anything to get done. Meanwhile, the nation's real needs are ignored. There is no genuine plan to guide us. And plans to put us on a pay-as-you-go basis are simply pollster-driven budget schemes fashioned to get politicians past the next election.

John F. Kennedy started it all 35 years ago in West Virginia. Lou Harris' polls identified hot-button issues of concern and Jack Kennedy played them like a Stradivarius. Political polling immediately became the order of the day. Now even the media wittingly are the engines behind the oppressive reliance on polls. No longer do reporters bow to the who, what, where, when, how and why of fact and accuracy. Instead, they kowtow to pollsters to elicit pithy partisan responses that stem from polls.

The pollster begins each day with "divide and conquer." Voters immediately are divided into age, sex, race, education, working or retired, married or single, veteran or military, city, suburb or rural. No one is considered an American. They have to be Asian-American, African-American, Irish-American.

Division is the pollster mentality, but dissembling is the pollster's art. No pollster has served a day in office. But they'll tell you in a minute that you can't break the Sacred Code of the Pollster. If you want to get—and stay—in office.

Never take a firm position. If you do, you'll divide voters.