

The money makes a lot of people willing to cope with cramped conditions and other problems. Finding private housing at prices they can afford can be difficult for lower-paid soldiers and airmen.

Recent studies, including one done for Offutt late last year, indicated a shortage of rental housing in the area, especially for lower-income residents.

Surprenant, who joined the Air Force in 1987, said housing is an important benefit that makes a military career more attractive.

The money saved by living in military housing allows Mrs. Surprenant to stay at home with Emily. "We think parents should stay home with their kids if they can," Surprenant said.

The Surprenants said they also have found that there are more than just financial benefits to living in base housing.

"In a military community, right away you have something in common with your neighbors," Surprenant said.

Mr. HAGEL. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield my time.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### A CALL TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I call on the American people to use this weekend and Monday to express their views to the Members of the U.S. Senate on whether or not we should have a balanced budget. The American people can influence the vote that we will take next Tuesday at 5:15 p.m. The American people overwhelmingly support a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget because they know, they understand, without this guarantee, without this leverage, it will not happen. So the decision we make next Tuesday is in the hands of the American people. They need to let their Senators know how they feel. If their Senators have said they will be for it, commend them for it. If they have said they are going to vote against it, ask them why. Ask them what is the alternative. Ask them, where is the historical proof that a balanced budget will occur without the constitutional amendment.

If a Senator has switched his vote from a year ago or 2 years ago, or if a Senator has switched his vote from what he said he would do in last year's elections, ask them why. How can you do that? How can you, in 6 months, change your mind on so fundamental an issue?

Mr. President, this is a question of honesty. It is a question of truth in Government. We wonder why people are cynical, why they wonder about us, why they question us. This is exhibit A. When you give your word to your

constituency in your State during the election campaign that you are going to vote for a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget and then 6 months later you say, "Gee whiz, I have learned something new, it is hard to take." These are not new members to government and politics. These are people with experience at the State level, at the Federal level, in the House of Representatives. What is new?

No, this is a question of basic honesty. But the American people can make that difference. If they will get on the phone, if they will call, if they will write, if they will express themselves, they can make sure that this amendment passes next Tuesday.

The press, the Washington press, is saying it is over, they will not get but 66 votes. The fat lady has not sung. This "ain't" over. It is not over until we take the vote. I would hate to be a Senator who votes next Tuesday against this constitutional amendment for a balanced budget, especially if I had said earlier that I was going to do something else.

I am still working on a couple of angles, too. I have been working with the rules of the Congress for 24 years, and I tell my colleagues you are never going to be absolutely sure what I am going to do. If I can find a way to do what I think is right for the American people, I will do it, and I will be innovative. I have a couple of ideas. Believe me, there are a couple of Senators in this Chamber who are sweating right now. I bet they will not be doing any press conferences this weekend. No. That is an age-old strategy when you are in Congress. If you do not want to talk about something you are fixing to do that your constituents do not agree with, you hide. Press availability is not possible. We need to do this.

Now, the argument is made by the President, "Oh, we should just go ahead and balance the budget." I agree. We should have done it last year. The Congress passed a balanced budget. The President vetoed it, just 1 year ago. Why did we not do it the year before, the year before, or the year before? Why haven't we done it for 28 years? Who among us believes we will do it in 2 more years or 4 more years?

I am an optimist. I believe in the positive attitude of men like Ronald Reagan—there is a pony in there somewhere. We will find a way to do this job. But I have not seen any evidence of it yet. I have done my dead-level best to calm down the rhetoric and try to be positive and hold out hope and hold out an olive branch to Members of the Congress on both sides of the aisle and between the two Chambers and with the President. I have said we should work together for the American people. We should get this job done, balance the budget.

Mr. President, you have just been reelected. We have a majority in the Congress. The American people want us to do some things for our children and for the future of our country. I have said

we can do that. We should do that. The President suggested early on in one of our discussions that we should set up a commission for a particular matter—which I will not talk about now—and I said, "You know, Mr. President, you just got reelected, we just got reelected. That is what we are for. We should do the job."

We don't need a commission. Why do we always have to have this deal where we punt it off to commissions where we can see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil. They did it, not us. So let's see what we can do, and then maybe we will talk about a commission.

I said, "Mr. President, please, please, show leadership and show some courage in your budget. Show me that we can do it." And then he sent us his budget. We didn't trash it, cuss it, and throw it out into the street and say it's dead on arrival. We weren't, obviously, happy with it. I took over a day before I had much of anything to say. I actually read it and looked at the numbers, and I called him and I said, "Mr. President, this is not what I hoped for. It is political cover." I understand. We have made it clear that we weren't going to go through the exercise we went through last year. He was afraid, maybe, to take political risks in sending up a budget that really would get us where we needed to go. He felt like, well, we will negotiate a real result. But you can't have shell games and remove home health care from one part of Medicare over to the other, and say, gee, I just magically saved \$50 billion. You can't have triggers and lookbacks and optimistic assumptions and shove all the tough decisions off on the next President. Two-thirds of what would be saved would occur after the year 2000. No, it wasn't adequate, and I expressed my concern about it. But I continue to say that, well, okay, I understand how that can happen.

I am prepared to do my dead-level best to work with the Congress and with the American people and the President to get a balanced budget agreement this year. But I am not going to be a part of a fraud and hold hands with the President, or anybody else, and say, this is it, we got it done, unless it is real. So I think it puts additional pressure on us to have the constitutional amendment. I have been here all these years, in the House and in the Senate, and we have tried. Good men and women have said, yes, we can do this. Jimmy Carter said it; he meant to do it. Ronald Reagan said it; he intended to do it. Congress has said we are going to do it. We had the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings act to force us to do it with a sequestration, but it was a statute. It was only a statute. Guess what happened. One by one, we removed all the hurdles, all the requirements that would have actually gotten us to a balanced budget.

First, we said, oh, gee, we can't have it apply to this or to that program. I remember the negotiations. I was there. We said maybe not this program,

maybe not that program. We started off and we only exempted seven programs. Then, one day, it was 21 programs. And in spite of already exempting 21 programs from an across-the-board cut of sequestration, as it was called, we got up to the "lick log" when we were going to actually have the programs cut across the board. Guess what Congress did. Changed the date. They said, oh, gee, we will move it a year.

Congress will always find a way to avoid the tough decisions, unless it is in that revered document, the Constitution. So we have tried laws, we have had good men and women in Congress and in the Presidencies saying we are to go do it, and we have not done it. It is not easy. It takes courage, like I know the Senator from Connecticut has. He would do what we need to do to encourage growth in the economy. He would step up and cast the tough vote to control the growth in spending in some of these programs—all of these programs.

Everybody has to ante up and kick in. But I haven't seen it. I don't like the idea of amending the Constitution. I voted to do it a few times, and probably if I could take back some of those votes, I would do so. But this is not an insignificant thing. This is our children's future. I have a 29-year-old son, a young entrepreneur who is working hard. He employs 55 people. He sells pizzas. Today, I won't give the label of the pizza, but he is what the American dream is all about. He is out there working hard, making money, creating jobs, and paying a lot of taxes. He figured it out recently. He said, "Dad, I am paying over 50 percent of everything I make in taxes." You know, that is terrible. It is terrible. A young, 29-year-old man, whose work hours usually are the toughest between 5 p.m. and 2 o'clock in the morning. He is having 50 percent of it go to State, local, and Federal Governments.

That is not the American way. I have a 26-year-old daughter, a young professional woman, who works hard and promotes our State of Mississippi, promotes tourism. She does a great job. I am proud of her. But I am saddling that son and daughter with an incredible burden, because I have not been able to help find a way to stop the deficit spending, to control the debt—yes, to reduce the debt of the country, and the \$340 billion in interest on the national debt. Only Social Security exceeds the cost of interest on the national debt. If we don't do something and do it now and do it tough, there will be over another trillion dollars added to the debt by the year 2002.

So I think this is something that is worth amending the Constitution for, because we are talking about the future of the country, the future of our economy, the future of our children and their children. If we don't do it now, who will do it? When will it be done? So we should amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget.

And if we don't, the American people will know truly that we are not serious about it when we say we want to balance the budget.

I have gone back and looked at the arguments over the years—even this year—as to why we should not pass a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. There is no end to the things that have been suggested. Some are absolutely hilarious, and some are purely political. Amendments have said basically that we should not do it until a Republican President submits the balanced budget, or maybe we should say we should not do it until the Democratic President submits the balanced budget. That is ridiculous. Then they said, well, it's because the escape hatch in times of recession or national emergency is too high—three-fifths. We should not have to have 60 votes. Just about everything we do around here takes 60 votes. Just about everything. And if it is easy to get out from under a balanced budget requirement, do you think Congress won't take advantage of that? We are masters. We have done it over and over and over again.

Capital budgeting has been talked about. Oh, they do it in the States. Great. Let us take everything off the budget. Let's take out all the trust funds. I have been an advocate of that on occasion. But it is just a red herring.

Social Security. Oh, that is a good one. We can always rely on Social Security to scare the bejeebers out of folks. So that is a great cover. Oh, yes, if we don't find some special way to deal with the Social Security requirement, oh, this would destroy the system. My mother, 83 years old, bless her heart, counts on Social Security. She knows I am not going to do anything to endanger that for her. I would not do that. If we don't do that, that is what will endanger Social Security.

I could go on. I will speak again next Tuesday to try to help put this thing in a proper perspective from the beginning to the end with a quote from Thomas Jefferson and some modern quotes about why we need to do this and why we should have done it. I wanted to take a few minutes this morning to say to the American people that it is up to them. If they really want this, a way will be found to get one more vote—just one more vote. Is it a Senator from Nevada or South Carolina? Maybe it is a Senator from South Dakota, or maybe even New Jersey. Somewhere, there will be a Senator who will say: This does matter, and I am going to make the difference.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

#### NOMINATION OF ANTHONY LAKE

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I rise this morning to

discuss the status of the President's nomination of Anthony Lake—Tony Lake—to be the Director of Central Intelligence.

Mr. President, I read from the New York Times this morning, which reports in its lead story, "Leaders in the Senate demand FBI files on CIA nominee." I quote from the lead paragraph:

Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee said today that unless he received all of the FBI files on Anthony Lake, he would not hold confirmation hearings for Mr. Lake.

Later, in that same story, the author says:

It is reported that two senior Republican members of the committee, Senators Lugar and Chafee, said today they would probably vote for Mr. Lake, barring some devastating disclosure at the confirmation hearings.

Senator LUGAR, our distinguished colleague and friend from Indiana, says that he strongly disagrees with the demand for the opening of these files and the delay of the hearing. According to Senator LUGAR, "The whole confirmation process becomes more and more outrageous. People feel it is their duty to engage in character assassination or to cause the nominee's defeat, or to discourage and demoralize them. The FBI files are raw files," Mr. LUGAR said. "They may contain rumor, gossip, hearsay, or innuendo. They may be true, they may be false, they may be scandalously defamatory, but they should not be the basis of evaluating someone's character."

Mr. President, I come to the floor to appeal to the leadership of the Intelligence Committee to move forward with the hearing on March 11 and to treat this nominee fairly, because the process is becoming unfair. Every time a hurdle is erected for Mr. Lake and he jumps over it, another one seems to be erected in its place. Continuing with the sports analogy, every time Tony Lake moves the ball toward the goal line, the goal line is pushed back. And the process is beginning to look more like a fishing expedition than like a process of congressional evaluation of a Presidential nominee—one who has served his country with distinction over the course of many years—that is fair and proceeding expeditiously and with a sense of due process.

Mr. President, in speaking about Tony Lake's nomination, I think it is important that I share my belief of what our role is when we advise and consent here in this Senate to nominations of the President. I faced this question early in my time here, in 1989, on several occasions regarding the nominations of President Bush. I supported almost all of them. It seemed to me then, as it does now, that our role here is not to substitute ourselves for the President. The President is elected to make these nominations. I decided that the standard I would impose is not whether I would have nominated this individual. That is what Presidents are elected for. The Senate's role is to advise and consent. I think that means the standard we should follow is to determine whether the President's nominee is within the acceptable range for