

them to make that request. And I think we have to back off on this side on the size of the tax cut that we are seeking.

But I would hope this, Mr. President—I know there are going to be other speakers, and I know the senior Senator from Massachusetts has some charts prepared, and we are ready for all the evils, to hear about all the evils of the deficit reduction bill that we passed last evening. All right. We are used to that. But I would hope that whoever speaks on this floor will say how he or she is going to reach a zero deficit. It is all right to criticize what we have done. And I suppose you can come up with 35 items of how what we passed last evening was not correct. All right. That is fair game. But in return, I would hope that the critics come up with how they would do it, and in what year, and how and where the savings are going to come from.

Is it going to be a CPI adjustment, or is it going to be keeping the Medicare part B premium at 31.5 percent, or is it going to be a reduction in that, all of which costs money, if you change? How is that individual or those individuals proposing that we reach this zero deficit? I think that is a fair requirement for us to impose on the critics of the plan that we passed last evening.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

#### BUDGET PRIORITIES

Mr. KENNEDY. I am very hopeful that we can reach a satisfactory compromise today on the legislation needed to end this indefensible shutdown of the Federal Government and move on to the real debate over what this controversy is all about.

We all agree on the need to balance the Federal budget. The fundamental issue is not whether or when to balance it, but how to balance it fairly.

President Clinton is right to take a strong stand against the Republican plan. That plan is based on the same old Republican trickle-down ideology of plums for the rich and crumbs for everyone else. The Republican plan is filled to overflowing with tax breaks for the wealthy and give-aways to powerful special interest groups. And to pay for all those give-aways, the Republican plan imposes heavy burdens on senior citizens, students, the needy, the environment, and working families struggling to make ends meet.

The American people did not vote for priorities like that in 1994, and they are not going to vote for priorities like that in 1996.

You cannot judge the Republican book by its title. They call it the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. That soothing title is a fraud. The Republican budget is a scorched-earth scheme that imposes unprecedented sacrifices on senior citizens, students, children, and working families in order to pay for

lavish tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals and corporations in America. It is a program to bash Medicare, slash education, and trash the environment, and it eminently deserves the veto it is about to get.

The Republican budget raids private pension funds, and slams the door of colleges and universities on the sons and daughters of working families. It dumps over a million more children into poverty in the misguided Republican version of welfare reform.

It even raises taxes—yes, raises taxes—on those who can least afford it—the lowest income working Americans.

I hope all those Florida Republicans who are voting in their straw poll today will ask why Senator DOLE and Senator GRAMM want to raise taxes on working Americans. How very Republican—tax breaks for the wealthiest families, and tax increases for working families.

And for the wealthiest families of all, the Republicans leave no stone unturned. All year, Democrats have tried to close the most notorious tax loophole of all—the billionaire's tax loophole. That loophole lets wealthy Americans renounce their American citizenship and evade their fair share of taxes on the massive wealth they have accumulated in America.

It is difficult to imagine a more obscene or less justified loophole. Every time we have challenged it in the Senate, the Senate has voted almost unanimously to close it tight—no ifs, ands, or buts.

But once again, behind closed doors, the Republicans have quietly saved it. The billionaire's tax loophole is alive and well in this Republican bill. Shame on the Republicans for catering to billionaires and clobbering senior citizens on Medicare.

The Republican attack on Medicare is unprincipled and unconscionable. Nothing in their budget better illustrates the harsh and extreme approach the Republicans are taking to the needs of the elderly. Every senior citizen in Florida voting in the straw poll today should vote for "None of the Above" if they care about Medicare.

Under the Republican budget, Medicare is cut \$270 billion over 7 years, three times the amount necessary to protect the Medicare trust fund, in order to finance \$245 billion in new tax breaks for wealthy Americans.

Medicare part B premiums are raised by \$52 billion over the next 7 years, compared to what they would be under current law. Premiums will rise from \$553 this year to \$1,068 by the year 2002. Every senior citizen will pay \$2,240 more than under current law. Elderly couples will pay \$4,480 more.

Senior citizens will be coerced into giving up their own doctor. They will be herded into HMO's or forced to join other private insurance plans. They will lose the current protection that prevents doctors from charging more than Medicare will pay—that change

alone means additional costs to elderly patients of \$5 billion a year.

The Medicare cuts are so deep that they will "jeopardize the ability of hospitals to deliver quality care, not just to those who rely on Medicare and Medicaid, but to all Americans," according to a statement by organizations representing 5,000 hospitals nationwide. Cuts in research and medical education will be devastating to the quality of health care in communities across the Nation.

Medicaid will bear a heavy burden too. It will be cut by \$160 billion over 7 years. By 2002, Medicaid will be cut by a full one-third.

And 4.4 million children will lose coverage; 1.4 million disabled will lose coverage; 920,000 seniors will lose coverage. Guarantees of coverage and services will be eliminated.

Nursing home standards will be weakened, despite a 98 to 1 Senate vote to maintain them. Families will be forced into poverty by high nursing home costs. States will be allowed to recover the cost of nursing care from adult children with incomes in excess of \$36,000 annually. States will be allowed to put liens on the homes of nursing home residents, even if spouses or children are living there, despite a vote by the Senate to eliminate these provisions.

In a shameful giveaway to the pharmaceutical industry, the bipartisan Medicaid drug rebate program is weakened, at a cost to taxpayers and patients of \$1 billion a year, despite a vote by the Senate to preserve this program.

Federal clinical lab standards to ensure the accuracy of medical tests are eliminated.

On education, the Republican budget cuts the Federal investment in education by one third over 7 years. We should be investing more in education, not less. How can every Republican possibly justify an assault like that on education.

Student loans are cut by \$4.9 billion, at a time when student financial need is greater than ever. College costs are rising faster than family income. Grants make up less than one quarter of Federal aid. Student debt is skyrocketing. The average student leaves college owing \$9,000. Many graduate and professional students owe over \$100,000 before they start their first job.

The Republican budget is a triumph of special interests over student interests. It is rigged to funnel over \$100 billion in new business to banks and money-lenders at the expense of colleges and students.

It is hard to find a more vivid or disgraceful example of the prostitution of Republican principles. When profits are at stake, Republicans are more than willing to roll over and sell out free-market competition, and replace it with the heavy hand of a government-guaranteed monopoly.

Under the Republican bill, beginning next year, only 102 colleges will be allowed to participate in direct lending.

1,250 colleges and 1.8 million students already in the program will be forced out of direct lending against their will.

In Massachusetts alone, 32 colleges and universities and almost 100,000 students will be required by law to give up the advantages of direct lending. They will be required to return to the bureaucratic maze of the old guaranteed loan program, where 7,000 lenders and 41 guaranty agencies bury students in redtape. Students at Boston University, MIT Mount Holyoke, Springfield Technical and Community College, and many others, will be forced out of direct lending.

Colleges and universities across the country are outraged at being forced out of one of the most successful reforms in the history of Federal aid to education. And 472 colleges and universities across the country have written urging Congress to reject this arbitrary limit on their ability to choose the loan program that best serves their students.

Over 100 of the colleges that signed the letter are not in direct lending. But they recognize its benefit for their students too. As they put it:

Those of us who represent institutions that are satisfied with the guaranteed student loan program also support the continued availability of the direct loan program to institutions. The competition created by direct lending has induced banks and guarantors to improve the efficiency of their delivery process, and has, for the first time, provided the student loan industry with market-based incentives to provide better service. The guaranteed student loan system has improved more since the phase-in of direct lending two years ago than it did over the more than two decades of existence prior to 1993.

The colleges in direct lending speak first-hand of its benefits for their students—simplified applications, the expedited receipt of funds, the disappearance of the endless lines of students waiting to endorse their checks at registration time, the welcome drop in the number of emergency loans issued to students waiting to hear about their regular loans from their banks, and fewer trips to the financial aid office to clean up redtape.

As these colleges write:

Direct lending has eliminated redundant paperwork, reduced staff time allocated to dealing with thousands of lenders and dozens of guarantors and other intermediaries, and vastly improved our overall aid delivery processes because it seamlessly integrates with other federal aid programs.

The issue does not get much clearer. Colleges and universities across the country are unanimous. The student loan system needs more competition, not less. Banks and guaranty agencies do not deserve this protection. The guaranteed loan program is not a free market program to begin with. The banks and guaranty agencies reap all the profits and take none of the risks, because Uncle Sam is guaranteeing the loans.

Direct lending also saves money for the taxpayer if honest accounting is used. It is a measure of the special in-

terests' power that they have even managed to corrupt the budget scoring process. They persuaded the Republican majority in Congress to include a provision in the budget resolution forcing the Congressional Budget Office to score this issue dishonestly, and thereby show savings to the Federal budget of \$775 million over 7 years capping direct lending at 10 percent. An honest accounting would show that eliminating direct lending costs—costs the Federal Government almost \$1.5 billion. Not only are the Republicans doing the wrong thing, they are actually increasing the deficit to do it. You cannot blame President Clinton for rejecting CBO scoring, when Republicans rig CBO scoring so shamelessly.

It is unconscionable for the Republican majority to use their majority power to undermine education and protect the profits of banks and guaranty agencies. Few issues in this budget debate more clearly demonstrate whose side Democrats are on, and whose side Republicans are on. Democrats are proud to stand with families struggling to educate their children. Republicans are content to cast their lot with the well-connected few, and thumb their nose at colleges and students.

On pensions, protections in current law are weakened to allow a raid of \$20 billion on workers' pension funds by large corporations and corporate raiders. This provision was eliminated from the Senate bill by a 94 to 5 vote, but has now been restored behind Republican closed doors.

On children, the Republican budget slashes essential safety-net programs for low-income children and families by \$82 billion.

The Republican budget slashes essential child care funding and eliminates health and safety protections for children in child care. Many more children will be left home alone and countless others will find themselves in danger.

The Republican budget slashes \$6 billion from school lunch programs. It slashes \$9 billion from benefits that allow one million children with disabilities to continue to live at home with their families.

In page after page of their legislation, Republicans offer an open hand to powerful special interests and the back of their hand to everyone else.

As people learn more and more about the Republicans' agenda, they like it less and less. They understand why this battle is so important. We are talking about fundamental principles and the kind of country we want to be in the years ahead.

It is wrong for the Republicans to slash Medicare in order to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy. It is wrong for Republicans to slash education and raid employee pension funds. It's wrong for Republicans to dismantle the basic bipartisan environmental protections we've enacted to keep the air clean, to keep the water clean, to keep our food safe.

The American people did not vote for priorities like that in 1994—and they

will certainly be voting against priorities like that in 1996.

Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to my friend and colleague from Rhode Island talking about the state of the American economy and who is really serious in this Chamber and which political party has been serious about dealing with the budget of the United States. Of course, he understands very well that when the Republicans came into power in 1980 there was \$460 billion in deficit, and when the Republicans left power in 1992 it was \$4.4 trillion.

All during that period of time the moneys which were actually appropriated by Democratic Congresses was less than was requested by a Republican President. So, we are very glad that our Republican friends want to get serious about the deficit now. But I think as we are talking about this issue, and as we have listened to a President who says that he is committed to a balanced budget, we are also paying attention to a President who initiated a proposal that passed this body without a single vote from the Republicans that has paid off \$600 billion of the deficit, something that has already been done, an achievement and accomplishment, not just particular rhetoric. And there was not a single Republican vote that was for it.

In the last few days we hear our Republican friends chide the President and say, "Well, he really didn't mean it now. And so we're going to try to take care of it." But I have yet to hear one Senator on that side of the aisle say that we wish that was repealed and how they would make up the \$600 billion which has already been paid off on the deficit. They have not talked about that. They have not mentioned that.

All they do is continue along to try and reach the legitimate concerns that the American people have in trying to bring the economic house in order, and very little time is spent, quite frankly, in reviewing how they would do that. And that is basically the issue that is before this body. The Democrats have, under President Clinton, reduced the Federal deficit by \$600 billion. The Republicans have talked about it. And now we have a President that is committed, and all of us are moving toward the balanced budget.

But I want to point out very clearly, Mr. President, that it certainly will not be this way. It certainly will not be this way. It will not be the way of cutting back on the Medicare opportunities for our senior citizens, the \$270 billion that is going to be required to be paid by our senior citizens, with increased out-of-pocket costs for all of our seniors in this country over this period of time, and the \$245 billion in tax breaks.

There is only one tax that has been increased, Mr. President, in this whole proposal, only one tax that has been increased, and it is the earned-income tax credit. And who does that apply to? Does that apply to the billionaires? Oh,

no. The billionaires were taken care of. We voted in here to eliminate the billionaire's tax loophole. For those who do not understand it, it says, if you have been able to accumulate \$3 million or \$4 million or \$5 million or \$600 million, or up to even \$1 billion, or even more, you can escape your payment into the Federal Treasury by renouncing your citizenship, renouncing your citizenship, escape payment, become a Benedict Arnold, escape payment and, what happened? This body went on record by over 92 or 93 Senators that said we ought to close that loophole, no ifs, ands, or buts. We had statements and comments by the members of the Finance Committee that it was going to be closed at the earliest opportunity. Many of us required a vote to make sure that that was going to be done, and members fell over themselves trying to go on record and say, "We are not going to permit that unseemly, unconscionable practice to continue."

And then what happens? You hardly get the doors closed over there in that conference committee, and what comes out? The billionaire's tax loophole; cuts in Medicare for our seniors and the billionaire's tax loophole that will take hundreds of millions, billions of dollars out of the Federal Treasury to benefit a handful of individuals, and you want us to just go behind the screen—"We're for the balanced budget and you're not."

Let us look at what this budget is. You are increasing the taxes on those individuals who are making less than \$35,000, and a giveaway to the billionaires. That is in here—charging our senior citizens, elderly people who are unsure, wondering whether their health care coverage is really going to be there, wondering about all these statements that are being made about Social Security and seeing their cost-of-living adjustment eaten up next year by the premiums that will be advanced under this proposal; cutting back on Social Security, cutting back on the Medicare protections, cutting back on veterans' protections, moving many of our senior citizens out of the fee for service where they know their doctors into these plan programs.

This is a beauty, Mr. President. This is an absolute beauty. Under the current law, we prohibit double billing. What is double billing? Double billing says if the repayment is going to be a certain number of dollars under Medicare, that is what the doctor will take for that particular procedure, paid in full.

But you just look, there are a couple of lines in this Republican budget that says, "That isn't going to be the way it is anymore. That isn't the way it is going to be anymore, Mr. Senior Citizen," who has worked so hard to build this country and make it the great country it is. That is not the way it is going to be anymore. Those doctors can charge you in addition—in addition. We have 70 percent of the seniors

at an income of \$15,000 and 83 percent of them are below \$25,000, who are paying more out of pocket now in terms of health care because we do not cover prescription drugs, we do not cover dental care, we do not cover foot care, we do not cover eye care.

Go into any senior citizen home in any part of the country and ask how many are paying \$50 a month for prescription drugs and see half the hands in the hall go up. That is what is happening out there, eating away at scarce resources. And now those 35 million Americans who participate in Social Security and Medicare are wondering, "Look, they are squeezing me on Social Security; if I am a veteran, they squeeze those benefits; Medicare, they are squeezing benefits and if I get sick and lose all my money and go into a nursing home, they have done something wonderful as well." Instead of the payment in full for the nursing home, they say the nursing home can charge you in addition to that, too. First time. That is what is in this bill. That is what is behind this bill. Make no mistake, those are some of the offensive aspects of this bill. They will raise the funds on senior citizens who are poor to qualify for Medicaid and put a lien on their homes, take their homes away from them.

That is what is in this bill. Just a few words change, just a few sentences change. That is what is in their bill.

No wonder the seniors are frightened. We hear from the other side, "Don't frighten our senior citizens." They ought to know what is in here. That is the kind of assault on senior citizens that is unwarranted and unjustified and you do not have to balance this budget on the backs of the senior citizens. You do not have to.

You are frightening the whole framework of retirement and security of our senior citizens. That is what you are doing.

After a recognition over a long period of time and after Medicare being passed in the mid-1960's, a recognition that our elderly people earn less in their later years and health care needs go up more in their later years, that was true then, it is true now. That may be an old idea, but I daresay it is still a fundamental value for our society.

I would like to see those who want to offer and have the guts to offer an amendment to repeal either the Social Security or Medicare, even though we listened to the two leaders talk about their historic role in opposition to the Medicare programs and how they are hopeful that it will "wither on the vine." Then people say, "Well, you shouldn't scare our senior citizens." Well, you have had the two Republican leaders that have taken such pride in the achievement of this budget and have made that kind of commitment and statement. Of course, they ought to know about it.

Mr. President, there is one other area which I will talk about. You talk about

those workers, you talk about the problem that those workers are facing.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Can I just have a final 5 minutes? I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield myself 4½ minutes, so I know when there are 30 seconds left.

Mr. President, those families working all that period of time now find they are going to have to pay more in taxes. They might have a number of children that may be getting some kind of health care covered under the Medicaid Program. Eighteen million children in that program; 4.5 million of them are going to be dropped from any kind of coverage under these Medicaid cuts. That is what we are talking about in this Republican bill: The raising of the Medicare premiums, the indifference in dropping children from health care coverage, dropping the fundamental commitment for day care for children, cutting even the existing program for day care for children of working families, and then, wonderfully, eliminating the regulations that provide health and safety protection for those children.

I was here when Senator DODD and Senator HATCH worked out that program, with President Bush. It was so interesting. We had strong requirements for protecting children in the bill that came out of our Human Resources Committee. Those strong requirements that had been worked out over a long period of time, in terms of making sure those children are going to be protected in child care, were watered down but still maintained the essential protections for children. That was agreed to in a bipartisan way and passed.

Four weeks later, I offered the same bill with the same standards to be applicable to the military, 94 to 6—94 to 6. We did not hear any question then about too much regulation, too much protection for the sons and daughters of those who are in the military. No, we went ahead and did it.

And now, if any Member of this body goes and visits a child care center on a military base in this country and compares it outside, they are going to find that the ones serving the sons and daughters of our servicemen and women are first rate, and those that are outside do not come up to par.

What is going to happen with the changes in this legislation is you are going to find a deterioration in the protection of children. I cannot wait to hear the first speech from some of those who have been indifferent to this problem say, "Look, that whole program that is supported by the Federal Government is a disaster." That is what is going to happen, and then there will be pressure to cut that back and give more tax breaks to the very wealthy.

Mr. President, I can look at the American worker today, as has been pointed out, and see how their real income has been going down, down, down, over a period of time. What they have done is put something away in terms of savings in their pensions, and then out of the Finance Committee came this ability for corporate raiders to raid pension funds, those pension funds paid in by the employees who sacrificed an increase in their wages, their health benefits so that they would have a secure retirement, and so we brought that up here on the floor of the U.S. Senate, a bipartisan amendment, Senator KASSEBAUM and myself, and others—and Senator MOYNIHAN has been a leader in this area—and we passed it 94-5, to prohibit the corporate raiders from plundering the pension funds. They could not even get the door closed over there in that conference, and they came right on back and opened it up again.

So every worker ought to understand that this is a threat to their own security. Why? Because, again, it is the tax breaks, the \$240 billion tax breaks. So, Mr. President, these are some of the items that are troublesome to many of us. We can work out in a way to try and deal with some corporate welfare and some of the unreasonable increases in terms of our defense and in tightening belts on many of the different programs. I have cosponsored those with Senator MCCAIN and others.

We can get to a balanced budget, but not when you are going to have that kind of cut and slice on working families, parents and their children. That is not what the 1994 election was about, and the 1996 election will be about it. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

#### THE PROMISES OF POWER

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, it is funny, I hear a lot of talk this morning on the floor about compromising with the President on our budget. I say it is funny because he has not officially even received it yet. He says he is going to veto it. But I say, let us give him the opportunity to do that. Let us give him the chance to veto this budget. Let him look in that camera and into the eyes of the American people and tell them he does not want this balanced budget, he does not think Americans deserve it and, what is more, he does not think they should have a tax cut to go along with it, and that money really belongs to Washington to spend.

I might just be a lowly freshman from Minnesota in this body, a plebe by the standards of some of the more senior Members. But I know why I am here: Because I told the people of Minnesota if they would elect me, I would come here and I would work to balance the budget, to reduce the size and the scope of this bloated bureaucracy that we call the Federal Government; and

by doing that we would be able to allow them to keep a little bit more of their own money in the form of a tax cut.

I hear my colleagues on the other side saying how people do not have the money to spend anymore in this country. Well, that follows 30 years of Democratic programs—but, more importantly, 30 years of Democratic tax hikes that have taken that money from our families and sent it to Washington.

Really, what kind of deal has been talked about on the floor here this morning? What kind of deal are the Democrats and the White House talking about? Let me put some of this in perspective. Our budget plan talks about spending \$12 trillion over the next 7 years. The White House and the liberal leadership of the Democrats in the Senate and House want to spend about \$12.5 trillion, at a minimum. Some are willing to work out any kind of agreement today so that we can go home and have a long weekend.

How are we going to tell our taxpayers that we are willing to spend another \$500 billion of their money, collapse on this very important issue, so that can have a long weekend? How do we tell the taxpayers that?

Our budget increases spending on all these programs. Our spending goes up every year. If you listen to those on the other side of the aisle, it is like we are gutting everything that this country has stood for, that somehow this country is going to collapse if we save 5 percent over the next 7 years. By the way, we are only about 1 percent apart on the Medicare, compared to the President's proposal and ours. In your own budgets, if you are making a dollar and they say you can have 99 cents, not a dollar, are you going to say, "I am going to collapse"? We cannot save that 1 percent?

Our budget increases spending on Medicare 64 percent, from \$174 billion this year to nearly \$289 billion in the year 2002—per capita. Everybody that will be on Medicare will be going from about \$4,800 a year to \$6,700 per person a year. That is not a cut. That is not a collapse. That is not solving all the problems or changing the way we do business here in Washington. My colleagues on the other side want to just throw more money at it and take more from the taxpayers and let Washington spend more. Should we agree to more of the same—programs that have failed—just to give them more money to spend?

Where do we get all this money? The Government does not produce any revenues. It only can collect them and disperse them. I am fighting for something that is fair; I am fighting for the taxpayers.

I have been listening to the statements on the floor all morning, and also reading some of the comments in the newspaper following last night's real historic vote on our balanced budget legislation. I found myself then thinking about Abraham Lincoln. This was a man who knew something about

dealing with adversity. He was elected President to lead the Nation through some of the darkest hours. The Civil War had divided the country, pitting neighbor against neighbor, brother against brother. Yet, he found a way then to use the power of the Presidency to inspire the people—not with the harsh rhetoric of hate, but with a vision that something better lay ahead. His words gave people hope to continue fighting for what they believed so strongly was right.

So you know Abraham Lincoln was speaking from the heart, and drawing on the experiences of his own life, when he said, "Nearly all men can stand adversity \* \* \* but if you want to test a man's character, give him power."

I am not one who is quick to edit the words of a President that I admire very much, but after nearly a year service in this Chamber, and especially after the antics we have been subjected to over the last month, I think Abraham Lincoln's words would ring equally true if you changed them slightly to read this way: "Nearly all men can stand adversity\* \* \* but if you want to test a man's character, take away his power."

Nearly every Republican here knows how tough it is to have that power taken away and be forced to serve in the minority. Many colleagues on this side of the aisle have been in the majority only to be shifted to the minority after the 1986 elections. It is tough, it is an adjustment, and it is not a lot of fun. But this year it has led to a lot of irresponsible politicking, and it has all been at the expense of truth and substantive debate.

Mr. President, what would you do if you were walking along and stepped into a pool of quicksand, and before you knew it, you were up to your waist, sinking quickly? At first, you would begin to do a lot of shouting, like we hear from the other side. You probably would not care too much about what you were saying, as long as you said it loudly and were attracting a lot of attention. It did not stop the sinking sensation, of course, but at least you felt like you were doing something.

Finally, a political consultant happens to come along—how convenient. They are brilliant at putting the right "spin" on things. Maybe they will figure a way out for you. "How convincingly can you say 'the Republicans are cutting Medicare and putting senior citizens at grave risk?'" asks the consultant. Well, you are willing to try anything at this point, since the only attention your shouting has gotten you so far were the services of a political consultant.

So you shout it—forget that it is not even close to the truth, and that you do not even really believe what you are saying, but you are fighting for your life here. Anything goes.

I just heard the Senator from Massachusetts say, "It will all depend on 1996. This will lead to the election of