

is so fundamentally important as we debate a balanced budget amendment and as we continue to work on this issue and as we continue to assure the American people that we will do all within our power to bring down the deficits and to control our debt structure for now and for future generations.

Article V of our Constitution—that is the article that speaks to how we amend the organic document—speaks very clearly about how it gets done. It says that the Congress shall propose an amendment. That is in the first part of article V.

The second part of article V allows the States to petition for the formation of a constitutional convention. Many of us are concerned that a convention is not the right way to go and that the most responsible way is for the Congress of the United States to craft and propose an amendment.

Yesterday, the vote that we cast here was not to pass a balanced budget amendment; it was to propose a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution. And in so doing that, it then would allow the citizens of our country, the State legislatures, or, if they chose, the forming of a convention to debate and ratify the amendment. That action to propose was denied yesterday—not to pass but to propose—to send out to the States, to conform with article V of the Constitution.

In essence, what Senators who opposed that process yesterday did was to say to their citizens, "We will not give you the right to choose, we will not give you the right to look at this issue, to debate it, to understand the process, and to decide whether you want your Government to live under a constitutional requirement for a federally balanced budget." I find that an amazing testimony.

I really would like those Senators to go home and hold a press conference and tell their electorate, "We did not think you were responsible, we did not think you ought to have the right under the Constitution to decide," because that is exactly what they did. That in itself is a tragedy. But more importantly, what this is is a reaffirmation of something with which the American people have known for a long while, and they spoke so clearly about it last November. That was the arrogance of power that resides here on Capitol Hill, this all-knowing knowledge that somehow, if the wisdom does not emanate from Capitol Hill, it is unwise; that somehow the States and those who reside in the States cannot think for themselves, cannot make those judgments. That is absolutely the reverse philosophy from those who founded our country and who wrote the Constitution and who got it ratified. In fact, House Joint Resolution 1 that we voted on yesterday was very much a part of the style and the type of constitutional amendment that a Tom Jefferson would have put in the Constitution because it reflected that attitude

of the power and the right of the individual citizen and the power to the States and the ability of the States to control their central government.

Yesterday, the Senators who opposed this said very clearly under all of the smokescreen and all of the excuses that they gave for not voting for it—there were two fundamental things. They did not believe in the rights of the States to control their central government, and they would not give the citizens of those States the right to choose that option. I think that is profound, and it is sad. But that is the reality of what happened yesterday.

It is very important that the American people understand that message in the coming days and weeks as we work to revisit this issue to gain the necessary 67 votes or the two-thirds votes of this body to propose it and to send it to the States for ratification.

At this time, let me yield to my colleague from Georgia, Senator COVERDELL, who has worked so closely with us on this issue, has worked on a team of Senators who met daily over the course of the last 5 weeks to develop the issue and work with Senator ORRIN HATCH here on the floor, to build the debate. I think it was a remarkable task. I say that because for well over 100 hours and for 5 long weeks we debated this issue, and there was very little dead time, as we call it, or quorum calls because there truly was a message that came through loud and clear from this side of the aisle as to the purpose of a balanced budget amendment, and part of that message was crafted by the Senator from Georgia. I am pleased to yield to him at this time for such time as he might consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

THE PRESIDENT IS NOT LISTENING TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. COVERDELL. Thank you, Mr. President. I commend my colleague from Idaho and the Senator from Utah, Senator HATCH, and also Senator SIMON, who is not present this morning, for the effort over the past 5 weeks they have lent to the effort to create a historical change in the governance and the financial discipline of our country. I was talking with my wife last evening, and I wish Senator SIMON from Illinois was here because she had a chance to watch his address to the Nation immediately following the vote. She said it was most eloquent and even recommended that I get a video of it so that I might see it. I missed it as I was in a press conference.

I was so saddened yesterday about the outcome, the narrow defeat of the opportunity to move forward with the debate in the Nation about constructing an amendment to the Constitution requiring a balanced budget. It reminded me a little of when I was a youngster and the battle in Korea had just begun. Each day I would pick up

the paper and the perimeter would shrink for U.S. forces trying to hold on against the surge of the enemy. Every day was a little more sad, because that perimeter shrunk and shrunk and shrunk until finally it was a very small piece of that Korean Peninsula surrounding the city of Pusan. Lo and behold, the will of the country, the will of the alliance to put back an evil force that would do great damage to the future of the free world ultimately prevailed. I think the analogy will be so here.

I think over these past 30 to 40 years, the Nation has awakened each morning a little more worried about the state of the Union, a union that has pushed away every evil aggressor across and away from our shores but is perilously close to losing the standing of this great democracy because of a lack of domestic will, a lack of a will to take care of our own affairs and pay attention to our own financial health.

Maybe the beginning is in the press conference that will occur in about 8 minutes. Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL came to this Senate on the same day I did but 2 years ago. Both of us saw the revolution coming. The Presiding Officer is a product of that revolution. I think his decision—I have not spoken to him, but it has to be some way affected by the realization of what the American people are asking of policymakers in their Capital City and the entrenched view to stand in the way of the change that America is asking for.

I go back to the President's State of the Union Address. In the President's State of the Union, after the election—and no one has received a greater thrashing than the President in that election—it caused great reflection, supposedly, in the White House, an analysis of what happened here. The President went back and read his speeches from 1992, the new Democrat theory. He wanted to revisit. What went wrong? In that speech, he said, "The American people are not just singing to us, they are shouting at us." How right he was. But he has not heard the shouts. Senator CAMPBELL has heard the shouting, and he is doing something about it. The President has not heard the shouting, and he is standing in the way of what America is seeking.

Yesterday was one of the most important votes ever to be cast in the history of the Senate. We were dealing with the core governance of America, the core document by which we live. We were saying that to secure the future of the Nation, we must have sound financial policy. We must live within our means. We must stop spending money we do not have because we impose a debt on future generations. Every child born today will get either a pink or blue wristband and attached to it will be a \$22,000 mortgage. Unbelievable. Unbelievable that we would consume everything we have—\$5 trillion we do not have, 30 percent of the tax base of the property taxes of the

United States through unfunded mandates, and now we have even taken the practice of spending the livelihood of our children and grandchildren.

The Nation knows this must stop, which is why 80 percent of them said pass a balanced budget amendment, which is why they overturned the Congress last November and sent new majorities here. What did they send them here to do? They sent them here to change the way we do business in Washington. They did their level best to achieve it. Who was in their way? President William Clinton.

The defeat yesterday comes from the White House. There can be no doubt that the amendment would have passed, and it would have passed with 70-plus votes if it had not been for the President's decision to stand in its way. So what we have here is a classic division of the people that sent messengers to Washington to ratify, to honor, to carry out the will of a nation and a President who, in the final analysis, chose to nullify.

Mr. President, as you know, in about 3 minutes a very historic event will occur when Senator BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL—I will put it in this light—affirms and acknowledges and does honor to what he is hearing the American people say. He will have chosen to leave the ranks of those who would nullify, reject, and subject the view of the American people.

It is hard for me to understand how anybody—particularly if you are in the White House as President of this great democracy—could miss what those people are saying out there. Every piece of data you pick up, it is either 7 out of 10 or 8 out of 10, it is overwhelming. This is almost like the last 2 years replayed. Last year, we were in a historic debate again and we were talking about health care. The President puts on the table a program that you could not even read and you could not even put it on a chart, a Government takeover of medicine.

The American people were telling him, in the loudest voice, they did not want him to do that. They were worried about health care reform, but they did not want the Government to take it over. They did not want to be taxed even more. Heavens, they were already working from January to July for the Government before they kept their first dime for their family's dream, so they could not understand what he was doing. By the end of this debate, 85 percent of the American people were saying, "Stop this nonsense. Don't do that." But the President pressed on as if he knew better, he knew more than this Nation of ours.

I am convinced that it was that battle over that great issue that made it so clear to America what they wanted to do in the midterm elections. And that is why there is a new majority in the Senate and that is why there is a new majority in the House, because the President kept trying to press on the country something that they were tell-

ing him in every way they knew how they did not want.

So they picked the elections to tell him. They said, "All right, if you won't listen to us, we're going to change who the players are in that city," and they sent a whole new class of Senators and a whole new class of House Members.

And at the center, at the very epicenter of the message was: Manage the financial affairs of the country. Make our country financially healthy. Pass a balanced budget amendment. The same numbers, another 80 percent of the American public saying, "Do this. Do this."

This makes me step back for a minute and talk about a word that was used frequently over the last 2 years by the President called "gridlock." He kept saying, "Gridlock. We can't get anything done."

Well, I would say to the President that it is one thing to stand here and try to stop something that the people do not want—which is what the Republican conference was doing on health care—it is another thing to stand in front of something that the whole Nation wants to do. That is the dilemma the President finds himself in on this balanced budget amendment.

America lost yesterday. It was not a win-lose situation here in the Senate. We talked about the 33 that voted against it and all those 66 who voted for it. This is not where the winning and losing took place. The losing took place in Keokuk, IA; in Norman, OK; Atlanta, GA; Miami; and Anchorage. The Nation knows, without any equivocation, that we must change the way we manage our financial affairs.

Mr. President, throughout the whole debate, the other side has brought up one red herring after another, one amendment after the other. It was advertised that the effect of these amendments would be to protect somebody—a veteran, a Social Security recipient, a child. It was almost shameful in the manipulation of the language, because, in effect, any set-aside would have made the whole effort moot.

In other words, if you had a balanced budget amendment, except for—it does not matter what name you put on it—then what would have happened from that date forward is every spending proposal that is more than we have would amend the exception. It would have made a nightmare out of whatever area of the law they tried to protect. They were not protecting it. They were putting it in harm's way. Whether it was veterans' or children's programs or Social Security, to set anything aside would have put it right in front of the pressure to spend and spend and spend with abandon. Every spending bill would have amended the exception. And so the whole exercise would have been absolutely moot. There would have been no reason to even go through the debate in the Nation if it was nothing more than a charade.

To those innocent bystanders who looked at that, it may have appeared

as if they were trying to be protected. But I am here to say—and there are many with me—that they were actually being put in harm's way, because it would have been the route by which all spending occurred. It would have made a nightmare of any area of the law that was the set-aside.

Furthermore, I would say this, Mr. President. This Nation—well, let me put it another way, Mr. President, in the form of a rhetorical question. Have any of us ever known an individual or a family or a local community, probably more specifically a business, that was ever able to take care of its employees, its needs, its health, if it was financially crippled? Is Orange County better off today? No. Is a company that is pushed into bankruptcy able to take care of its employees, or are its employees facing a pink slip? Is a family that has spent too much on the credit card, bought a house that was too big, are they going to be able to send their children to college?

Well, obviously the answer is no—no for the individual, no for the family, no for a local community, and no for a business.

It is also true for a nation. No nation—no nation—that is financially destabilized can care for its security, either internationally or domestically. And every citizen of our country who is concerned because they are involved with a Government program, they, more than any other, should ask for and demand a financially healthy country because, without that, we will never be able to take care of the veterans or the children's programs, or an individual on Social Security. First, and foremost, we must be a healthy nation at home.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Georgia for those extremely valuable words and astute observations to the problems we face as a country today as it relates to the issue of our Federal budget, our debt, and how that gets handled and what we intend to do here as a new Congress, as a new Senate, to try to resolve that issue for the American people.

One of the sets of figures that I think comes to mind to me most often as we try to deal with a balanced budget and a resolution of this phenomenal debt structure that we have created over the last 30 years are figures that go like this: \$829,444,000 a day additional debt—additional debt. That is almost the size of my State's entire operating budget for 1 year. We are now just a little over \$1 billion in the State of Idaho. And this is one day's debt for the Federal Government.

That is \$34,560,000 an hour.

I mean, you and I, Mr. President, cannot envision that.

We really cannot comprehend it. In fact, that is part of the problem we suffer from, that we cannot understand the magnitude of the problem that we are creating here on an hourly, daily, monthly basis.

Now I have asked for this special order for 1 hour, so I know that costs \$34 million. But 1 minute is \$576,000, and 1 second is \$9,600. It truly is beyond the ability of this country and our people to understand.

Mr. President, oftentimes we reduce things that we understand to what we can see or envision. We know that a car costs somewhere in the \$20,000 to \$30,000 range today for a certain type, and that houses cost so much. You can drive down the street and say, "Look at that house. That house is about a \$200,000 home, or a \$300,000 home." The average human can comprehend that. They can say, "Boy, I cannot afford that," or "I can," or "That is within our budget."

But can the average human comprehend \$4.8 trillion, and what it takes to generate that or to pay for it? Or to begin to deal with it in a rational way? We cannot, as a country. Yet, every year here, first showing up on the budget sheets that we call the Federal Government, of \$3.2. That is not \$3.20, but that is \$3.2 billion—but it is just \$3.2, just a list of figures. It does not make a lot of sense.

And yesterday, and for the last 5 weeks, we have tried to begin to turn that corner, to bring it under control, to begin to define it, to work with the American people to understand it, and to say to them that this debt structure of over \$18,000 per American citizen is going to get under control because it does mean something and it does have impact.

There has been a variety of approaches to control it. But my colleague, who has just joined me on the floor from Arizona, while he has been an outspoken supporter of the balanced budget amendment and has brought about a lot of the energy behind that in the House and now, of course, here in the Senate as one of our leaders with the team that worked to deal with this issue over the last several weeks, has also focused on spending reductions and spending controls, because that is really what it is all about.

If we balance the Federal budget in 7 years, we have to set a course of spending controls. Stay within our limit, stay within the ability to control, and to meet the target 7 years out in 2002.

At this moment, let me turn to the junior Senator from Colorado, or excuse me, from Arizona, for his comments on this issue and others that he might wish to address.

Mr. KYL. I thank you. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho.

He and I served in the House of Representatives together when he was a leader in the fight for the balanced budget amendment there. He carried that fight right over here to the Senate, and was one of our leaders in at-

tempting to obtain passage of the balanced budget amendment this year. I predict that he will be one of the key figures in securing its passage sooner or later.

It has been a pleasure for me to be of assistance to him and to bring with me from the House of Representatives an idea actually which I brought from my own home State of Arizona to achieve a balanced budget by spending limits rather than by raising taxes. That is what I wish to talk about today.

Mr. President, if I could call time out for a second, the Senator from Idaho mistakenly referred to me as the junior Senator from Colorado for a moment, and I know exactly why. In the background, there was a deafening noise just a moment ago of loud applause for the junior Senator from Colorado, BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, for his declaration that as of today, he is a proud member of the Republican Party, and will be a Member of the Republican Senate cadre. We are looking for a place to put his new desk on this side of this Chamber.

Mr. CRAIG. Will the Senator yield with that? We will find a place to put that desk.

Mr. KYL. And I suspect any others who may wish to join RICHARD SHELBY and BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL in joining us on the Republican side.

Mr. President, we welcome these friends—former Democrats who are now Republicans—not only because they are friends and we need their help, but because their decision to join the Republican Party in both cases, as they said, was, as in Ronald Reagan's old phrase, a decision not to leave the Democratic Party, but because the Democratic Party had really left them.

We have many friends here who proudly serve in the Democratic Party and uphold its traditions. From our point of view, one of those traditions is being willing to spend too much of the taxpayers' money. People like BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL and RICHARD SHELBY and PAUL SIMON from Illinois and others who remain in the Democratic Party have finally said, "We do not want to do that anymore. We have to balance the Federal budget."

It has not been comfortable for a Democrat to support us in that effort. The President of the United States was very much in opposition to the balanced budget amendment, and as the Senator from Georgia said a short while ago, we can probably attribute the defeat of the balanced budget amendment yesterday to the lobbying of the President of the United States. Five or six Democrats who had previously cosponsored and voted for the balanced budget amendment—Democrats—decided this time not to support it.

I think that handful of Democrats in support of the President, obviously, are the ones who will have to answer to the American people when the questions are asked, who defeated the balanced budget amendment.

But today is another day. We have to move on. We are going to move forward as if the balanced budget amendment had passed and as if we are going to balance the budget by the year 2002. We will do it with or without the balanced budget amendment. It will be harder without that constitutional limitation.

Yesterday's defeat of the balanced budget amendment, I suggest, is a call to arms. The ballot was lost, but the war rages on. The balanced budget amendment will ultimately pass—maybe later this year, maybe next year, or perhaps the year after. But it will pass because the American people demand that it pass.

Last fall, a political revolution swept Capitol Hill, a revolution fueled by the American people's anger with the Federal Government out of control, a Federal Government overregulating, overtaxing, and overspending. Although the American people swept new leadership into the Senate and the House of Representatives, yesterday's vote demonstrated that the vestiges of business as usual remain and that another round of housecleaning is yet to come.

I will predict that those who stood in the way of a balanced budget amendment yesterday will not be around when it is brought to a vote in future Congresses. The American people will, as I said, hold them accountable.

Our mission today, with or without the balanced budget amendment, is to immediately begin making the tough choices about what spending to cut and what programs to terminate in order to get the budget to balance by the year 2002. Our responsibility is to put an effective enforcement mechanism into place to force the Congress to begin to prioritize, to separate wants from needs, just like families all across America must do every day.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. KYL pertaining to the introduction of S. 494 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho for yielding this time and, again, for taking a strong leadership role in the effort to get the balanced budget amendment passed and predict that through his leadership eventually we will pass it.

(Mr. GORTON assumed the chair.)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will not make that mistake again of referring to my colleague as the junior Senator from Colorado. I have had the privilege of serving with the Senator from Arizona for a good number of years, both in the House and now in the Senate, and I have always appreciated his leadership and his energy that he puts to the issues that he is dedicated to and certainly the spending limitation program that he has just proposed, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

We will work to prove to our colleagues on the other side that there is a way to balance the Federal budget

and do so in a reasonable fashion without the draconian style arguments or comments that oftentimes come from the other side of the aisle when they find that they are threatened with the concept of a balanced budget. We know that can be done, and we know that there will be tough choices to be made, but it must be done.

I would like, Mr. President, to mention another issue that I guess the word disappointment comes to mind when I think of how it was used over the course of the last several weeks by several of my colleagues. And that was the issue of Social Security.

I am disappointed that every time Social Security is brought up on the floor of the U.S. Senate, it is used as a scare tactic, it is used to frighten dedicated American citizens who believe that their Federal Government has an obligation to them to assist them after they have paid into a system of income assistance known as Social Security, and that somehow there is a devious scheme on the part of some politician in Washington to otherwise change that commitment that is clearly written into the Social Security law.

Mr. President, you and I and the American people know there is no devious scheme, not at all; that you and I and others who serve in the U.S. Senate really serve as the board of directors of Social Security, Inc., if you will. We are the ones charged under the law with the responsibility of managing the Social Security system.

Whether you can argue that it has been managed well or not, the bottom line is it has never failed to meet the obligation that it has to the citizens of this country who have paid into it and find themselves then eligible under the law to receive the benefits of it. Yet, somehow over the last several weeks, those who needed to create a smoke-screen or a shield to back away from their previous support of a balanced budget amendment because of their President's pressure, or for whatever reason, begin to raise the ugly head and the old argument that somehow the other side was manipulating a way to change or destroy the Social Security system.

For the last 3 years, as we have debated the issue of the balanced budget amendment, Senator PAUL SIMON, of Illinois, who has been one of the leaders and certainly the prime sponsor and then the prime cosponsor this year of the balanced budget amendment, we have worked with a fellow by the name of Robert Myers. Robert Myers for years was the chief actuary of the Social Security system of the Social Security Administration from 1947 to 1970 and then a deputy commissioner from 1981 to 1982 and 1982 to 1983. He served as executive director of the National Commission on Social Security Reform—I mean, this man is Mr. Social Security.

I am quoting from a letter of February of this year that he sent to PAUL SIMON, when in essence he says the

Federal debt is the threat to the Social Security system, not the balanced budget amendment. If you do not control the debt, you ruin the Social Security system and what is he saying in essence? He is recognizing the fact that if we bankrupt this country, Social Security checks are not going to go out. There will not be any money, whether it is in a trust fund or whether it is inside the general budget of our country.

The bottom line is if you have a busted government and a busted country, nothing goes out; everybody is equally bankrupt or poor at that moment. The responsibility then of this Congress is to keep a budget under control to move it toward balance, to bring the debt down so we can always honor the commitment of the Social Security system.

Well, it became the trust fund argument: Is it on, is it off? Is it in, is it out? We know from past experience that you manage the system. In 1983, Social Security needed reform and the Congress came together, Democrat and Republican alike, not in the kind of demagoguery that I felt I heard on this floor in the last several weeks, but we came together united as a government to manage and stabilize the system, and we did. Yet day after day, hour after hour, amendment after amendment, it was the ghost of the Social Security system or the mismanagement of it or some devious scheme under a balanced budget amendment to do so, and, Mr. President, that is just false. It is not true and, most importantly, the American people know it is not true.

The Senior Coalition, one of the largest organizations of senior citizens in this country, in a recent national survey—and I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SENIORS COALITION,
Fairfax, VA, March 2, 1995.

Re The American Association of Retired Persons and the Balanced Budget Amendment.

To: All Interested Parties.

From: Kimberly Schuld, Legislative Analyst.

The AARP Commissioned The Wirthlin Group to conduct a survey for them January 25-28, 1995 on a variety of questions pertaining to the BBA. Since then, the AARP and the National Council of Senior Citizens have been twisting the poll's results and methodology to claim that public support for a BBA is low—once Americans are told what the BBA will mean to them.

The key word here is TOLD. The poll utilizes a series of questions designed to lead people to a mis-informed and generally incorrect impression of what the BBA will do. Namely, the line of questioning implies that Social Security and Medicare will face drastic cuts, and state and local taxes will skyrocket as the federal faucet is turned off.

An AARP Press Release announcing the poll results states, " * * * most Americans do not understand the potential impact of the Balanced Budget Amendment and are adamantly opposed to using Social Security and Medicare to reduce the federal deficit."

Quite bluntly, the AARP has effectively provided a political scare campaign for those

members of Congress wishing to avoid facing their constituents with the news that they want to vote against the BBA. We all know the arguments against excluding Social Security from the constitutional amendment, but the AARP has electrified the "third rail" to the political benefit (is it really?) of the White House.

ANALYSIS OF THE AARP/WIRTHLIN POLL

The poll consisted of sixteen questions to 1,000 adults, with a 200 oversample to adults 50 and older. The margin of error is $\pm 2.8\%$ at a 95% confidence level. A copy of the questions is attached.

The poll starts off with a question about the direction of the country and then asks:

"Do you favor or oppose a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution that would require the federal government to balance its budget by the year 2002?"

Favor: 79%

Oppose: 16%

The next question tests how people perceive the budget can be balanced: spending cuts, taxes or both. This is followed by a question on equal percentage across-the-board cuts in every federal program.

The next two questions ask specifically if Social Security and Medicare should be included in across-the-board cuts. As could be expected, the respondents would favor exemptions for both programs. A key element to these two questions (#5 and #6) is the use of the word "exempt". The word "exempt" is not used anywhere in the poll except in relation to Social Security and/or Medicare. This sets up a connection in people's minds that these programs may be in graver danger than other government programs.

Question #7 sets up the respondent for the "truth in budgeting" excuse the Administration has been spinning. When offering people the choice between passing the BBA first, or identifying cuts first, the poll throws in "consequences" associated with cuts. The connotation is that there are going to be dire "consequences" to balancing the budget. This sets up the respondent to answer question #15 (open-ended) with a negative response on how they think the BBA will affect them personally.

Questions #8, #9 and #10 ask about whether respondents think it is necessary to cut Defense, Social Security and Medicare to balance the budget, or whether the budget could be balanced without these programs. As could be expected, the response for cutting Defense is overwhelming compared to SS and Medicare. The group of questions sets up a "good cop/bad cop" scenario in the mind of the respondent whereby they identify Defense as the "bad guy as well as being reminded which parry tends to support Defense. It is also important to remember that at the time this poll was taken, the newspapers and network news broadcasts were full of stories about the Republicans wanting to increase Defense spending in the Contract With America.

Questions #11 and #12 address taxes; their role in the budget balancing process and reform ideas. This also serves to set up negative responses to question #15. In #11, 48% of the people believe there will have to be tax increases to balance the budget. Then in the next question, they are asked to declare a preference for one of a variety of tax cuts. This conflict sets up a negative impression that tax cuts are good and the BBA is bad because there must be tax increases to accomplish its goal.

Question #13 throws together "programs for the poor, foreign aid, and congressional salaries and pensions". Respondents are asked how far these programs COMBINED would go toward balancing the budget if they

were cut. By throwing these widely divergent programs together, the pollsters are setting up the respondent to believe that balancing the budget will mean higher taxes and cuts in taxpayer-financed programs.

Question #14 is the keeper. Respondents are asked if they still support a BBA with the following choices:

Social Security should be kept separate from the rest of the budget and exempted from a BBA because it is self-financed by a payroll tax.

or

Social Security is part of the overall government spending and taxing scenario, thus should be subject to cuts along with the rest of the budget.

The results of this questions dramatically flip the BBA support from question #2:

BBA with SS Exempt: 85%

BBA that cuts SS: 13%

Question #16 now asks:

"Do you favor or oppose the balanced budget amendment, even if it means that your state income taxes and local property taxes would have to be raised to make up for monies the federal government no longer transfers to your state?"

Favor: 38%

Oppose: 60%

This question ends the phone call on a gross mis-interpretation that dire consequences of doom and gloom are on the horizon, all at the voter's expense. This is exactly the type of question that re-reinforces the "angry voter" complex of the middle class family.

These anti-BBA results are achieved by planting the seed of doubt slowly but surely that:

1. It is the intention of BBA supporters to cut Social Security and Medicare.

2. It is the intention of BBA supporters to beef up Defense spending at the expense of everything else.

3. Taxes will inevitably go up with a BBA.

4. A BBA will have a negative direct impact on families "beyond the beltway."

Any time a Senator, Congressman, reporter or lobbyist starts to talk about poll results showing 85% of Americans oppose a BBA unless it exempts Social Security, bear in mind that the spin-meisters achieved this number by forcing the assumption that draconian Social Security cuts are a foregone conclusion.

Leaders from the Republican party, the Democratic party, the Administration and the President himself have all gone to great lengths to state that social security benefits are off the table.

Any member of congress who contends NOW that the new Republican leadership cannot be trusted to keep their hands off Social Security is also implicating their own party leaders and the President of the same un-trustworthiness.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, in a letter to me and others who fought this issue, they polled their constituents and of them a thousand registered voters. That survey showed a confidence level of 95 percent that the Senate was doing the right thing to pass the balanced budget amendment.

When people were asked if they supported the Senate's passage, 79 percent overwhelmingly said yes, but the confidence level—and this was a Wirthlin poll, this was not just a few phone calls, this was a professionally nationally respected polling company—found out that the seniors of America do support a balanced budget amendment. They know of their future and the fu-

ture of their grandchildren, and they want it to be bright. While they want their Social Security check, they do not want to bust the future of the country and the future of their children.

Mr. KYL. Will the Senator yield on that?

Mr. CRAIG. I will be happy to yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, just before the Senator mentioned our children and grandchildren, I was going to make that precise point. I just got through with a statewide campaign. We conducted what we call back yard and living room meetings. In every one of these meetings, the question of the balanced budget amendment came up. Many of them were attended by seniors. I would ask these seniors—frankly, it was a way, Mr. President, of bragging about my two grandchildren.

I would say, "How many of you have children or grandchildren," and most of the hands would go up.

"Well, so do I, I have two beautiful grandchildren," and promised not to talk about them.

But the point I am making is that these seniors love their children and grandchildren more than anything else in the world. And when they talked about the balanced budget amendment and they talked about their needs for Medicare and other expenses that they would have to bear in their remaining years, they always came back to the point that they wanted to leave a better future for their children and grandchildren, and the last thing that they wanted to do was to leave a mountain of debt for these young kids to have to pay, because they instinctively knew that the future for these children and grandchildren will be a lower standard of living than we have enjoyed unless we get the Federal fiscal house in order. And so these senior citizens, consistent with the statistics that the Senator from Idaho has just quoted, to a person, were very much in favor of the Federal Government getting its fiscal house in order. They understood it was not only good for them but it was essential for the people they love most, their children and grandchildren.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Senator from Arizona for making those observations because those are the facts. That is the truth that is shown in survey after survey. The seniors of this country among any socioeconomic group understand the value of balancing budgets. They came through the Great Depression. They know how tough things can be out there when a country and a government is in trouble and an economy has collapsed, and they know that the future of their children and their grandchildren is at stake here. They do not want to see their offspring go through what many of them had to go through, on literally nothing through the course of a good many years because of a country that was in deep financial trouble as a result of a Great Depression.

Now, I am not suggesting that a Great Depression is at hand, but I am telling you that a \$4.8 trillion debt uncontrolled and continuing to mount moves us toward the edge of a day when there will be a phenomenal financial reckoning in our country that could spell difficulties like the kinds that we had in the thirties if we do not resolve the issue now.

Let me yield to my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Will the Senator yield for just an observation?

Mr. CRAIG. Yes.

Mr. COVERDELL. I just came from the press conference where Senator BEN CAMPBELL announced officially that he had joined the ranks of the Republican Party. In his address, he spoke of the financial dismay. One of the key centers of it was the peril that he feared unless something is done, and soon. But as he was leaving—and I wanted to leave this with the Senator—one in the mass of reporters leaned over and said, "Was there any particular event that crystallized your decision?" And he turned to the reporter and he said, "Yes, the balanced budget amendment" result. And so, again, I think we see an American responding to the dilemma that the Senator has characterized this morning. I wanted to pass on that observation.

Mr. CRAIG. I thank the Senator from Georgia for those observations. I have had the privilege of knowing Senator CAMPBELL all of his public life here in Washington. He is a man of tremendous principle, and that kind of comment just does not surprise me at all. He is tremendously dedicated to the issue of a balanced budget amendment, and I know he was terribly frustrated when he saw a good many of his former Democrat colleagues back away from their strong support over the past few years for this issue, and we had discussed this over the last good number of days as he continued in his strong support for a balanced budget amendment.

Mr. President, this is an issue that now rests at the desk of the Senate, I am sure to be revisited again over the course of the next several months as we struggle to try to find a way, absent a balanced budget amendment, to resolve our spending difficulties and establish a course for the Congress in working with the executive branch of Government to bring down our deficits and move us toward a balanced budget.

My guess is that if we do not do that and we do not demonstrate to the American people that we are capable of doing that, we are but a year away or months away from revisiting the balanced budget amendment and passing it and causing the States and the citizens of this country the opportunity to force us to do what we should have done yesterday, and that is to have the will and the resolve to allow the American people to choose whether they wanted a balanced budget amendment to become a part of the organic law of

the land, to become a part of the Constitution.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time assigned to the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN] is recognized for up to 20 minutes.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.
PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Laura Philips, who is an American Institute of Physics Fellow, be allowed floor privileges during morning business on this day.

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

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

THE DEFENSE TECHNOLOGY GAP

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to sound an alarm for my colleagues and my country about a clear and present danger to America's ability to defend itself against foreign enemies in the future.

But first, a look back: throughout history, the time between major changes in the weaponry of war was measured in centuries. Then came the industrial revolution, and ever since the weapons of war have evolved with exponential speed. Now we are in the technology revolution and the pace is so furious that we would fight the gulf war today differently than we did just 4 years ago, simply because weapons—and related tactics—have changed so much.

Nations that first perfect new weapons of war are best-equipped to win wars. Those left behind the curve of change must scramble mightily to catch up—to close the gap—or else their vulnerability will be exploited.

At the beginning of this century there was the dreadnought gap. In 1906, Britain's First Sea Lord, John Fisher, commissioned the H.M.S. *Dreadnought*. It was a technological marvel in its time; bigger, faster, more powerful than any other warship of its kind on the planet.

The Germans, recognizing their vulnerability, built their own dreadnoughts. The English, fearing a dreadnought gap because of Germany's industrial prowess, sped up production and built a total of 15 over the next 6 years. Winston Churchill objected at first, believing there was no dreadnought gap. Indeed, such a gap never materialized. However, Britain's bigger navy provided a key margin for victory in World War I and Churchill, writing in 1928, acknowledged that he "was absolutely wrong in relation to the deep tides of destiny." He learned a lesson that served him and his nation well when the time came to fight the Germans again.

In the middle of this century was the atomic bomb gap. At the end of World War II we were the only nation to have

the atomic bomb. Russia scrambled to catch up, and that led to the so-called missile gap of the late 1950's and early 1960's. Just as Germany and England rushed to build dreadnoughts after 1906, the United States and Russia rushed to build intercontinental ballistic missiles after 1957.

As we approach the end of the century, there is a new gap—a defense technology gap—and it is the gap between the technological capabilities of our military forces and those of any other nation on Earth. The clear and present danger I foresee is the narrowing of that gap in the next 10 to 20 years by virtue of decisions being made under the dome of this great Capitol building today.

The technology gap allowed us to defeat Saddam Hussein handily and deters other despots from acting rashly against us today. Given the threats we are likely to face tomorrow, I believe we must maintain and increase that gap, not let it shrink.

But the closing of the gap began last week when the House of Representatives voted to cut the heart out of crucial new programs designed to advance American technology. Five hundred million dollars were taken out of the Defense Department's technology reinvestment project [TRP] and \$100 million were removed from the related civilian Advanced Technology Program [ATP]. The money is being shifted to pay for military operations in Somalia, Haiti, Iraq, and Bosnia. Additional cuts in the Advanced Research Projects Agency [ARPA], which runs the TRP and other technology programs, are being considered for the 1996 budget.

And just yesterday, a committee of the U.S. Senate cut more than \$300 million from TRP and ATP and millions more from other technology programs in the current 1995 budget.

Some in Congress are cutting military technology to pay for military readiness. What they are really doing is shrinking a real technology margin of victory to close an illusory readiness gap—a gap readiness experts say does not exist.

Closing the defense technology gap is a tragic error we must avert. Disinvestment in military technology is the historical equivalent of Great Britain scuttling its dreadnoughts before World War I or America choosing not to build missiles after Sputnik. Cutting military technology programs is, quite frankly, one of the most thoughtless and harmful courses I have seen Congress contemplate in my 6 years in the Senate.

THE NATURE OF THE FUTURE THREAT

Defense spending must meet not only current needs; it must take into account the national security threats of our future. That future is less predictable than it was during the cold war, when we knew who, where, and how capable our enemy was at all times.

The end of the cold war has given us all hope that democracy and free markets will spread around the globe. And

there have been tremendous success stories to celebrate. But the absence of a single superpower rivalry has also unleashed a stream of aggression and hostility and countless thousands have died in this post-cold-war world at the altar of nationalism, ethnicity, race, religion, and plain, old anarchic terrorism.

Over the short term—5 to 10 years—the United States faces potential threats in the Persian Gulf and the Korean Peninsula. Known and unknowable challengers loom more ominously on a 10-, 15-, and 20-year time horizon. The danger of a revived, nationalistic Russia is clearly a possibility.

Russia is still armed to the teeth, and the latest intelligence tells us it is moving ahead with major modernization programs in its most advanced weapons systems—submarines and aircraft. It is resource rich with a highly educated population. In the hands of a dictatorial government, it could resume a threatening world role once again. That is America's worst nightmare and, as unlikely as it seems to us today, consider how many unlikely changes have occurred in world history in just the last 5 years.

China is taking Russia seriously with a major modernization program for its military forces—a program that could make China a superpower in the next century. In response to the buildup in China, India is quickly developing its military. And Japan, in the next century, may well be forced to do the same. Other nations in the Asian rim have growing economies, are technologically advanced, and thus are capable of emerging as a threat to the stability of that region and to our interests there.

Add terrorist groups, the proliferation of ballistic missile technology, radical fundamentalist movements, despotic regimes, and the potential proliferation of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons to the list, and it is easy to see that the future is fraught with perils for our Nation.

THE TECHNOLOGY DETERRENT

Given those dangers, and given the fact that the United States is the biggest target in sight, how can we best protect ourselves?

Thanks to the lessons of the gulf war, we know a big part of the answer lies in our advanced military technology, which can deter or, if necessary, defeat any challenger, whether it be a superpower, a rogue nation, or a terrorist group.

But we cannot rest on our gulf war laurels, content that today's weapons are enough to protect us for decades to come. Our next adversary, for example, may have access to detailed satellite photographs, making a tactic like General Schwarzkopf's "Hail Mary" movement of troops around Iraqi forces much more difficult. Or the enemy may possess missiles more capable than the Scud. The next gulf war will be far different than the last.