

have debate, that is the reason we have two parties, that is the reason we vote, to get a sense of direction as to how we want to go.

Some, including the President, and many of the more liberal Members on the other side, support more spending. That is a legitimate point of view, to spend more in the Federal Government, have more programs, have larger Government. I do not happen to agree with that.

My view is that we strengthen this country by having more personal responsibility, by having fewer programs that work better, that are efficient, that, in the case of welfare, are designed to help people who need help, but to help them back into a position to help themselves, not as a permanent establishment.

We have had 40 years where we just generally added to the social programs. If they did not work quite right, we put some more money in them. Now we have an opportunity to examine some of these programs, to see, indeed, that they are accomplishing the purposes for which they were established; to see, indeed, if they are efficient in terms of delivering the services that we pay for; to consider if there is a better way to do it.

This is, after all, a Union of States, and the basic governing unit are the States. They come together in the federation, and the more things, in my view, that the States can do, being closer to the people, the more likely they are to be effective.

So there is a different point of view about that. The President promised a 5-year balanced budget as a candidate 3 years ago. Of course, that has not happened. What did happen, however, was the largest tax increase in the history of this country that still left us with a deficit.

Voters rejected the proposal last year, of course, for the Government takeover of health care.

So where are we now? We have to have a budget that really means something. The President's first budget this year was rejected 99 to zip in this place. The budget that followed was touted as a balanced budget, but CBO indicated that it will be \$200 billion over at the end of the 10-year period and would never balance.

There has to be a little pain in balancing, and it has to be real cuts. It is tough. It is where we are. We have to really come to the snubbing post and say are we going to commit ourselves to doing it and the time is now.

I hope that we get some support and cooperation from the White House and the other side of the aisle. I do not suggest everyone is going to agree. There are, obviously, lots of points of disagreement in how you do this, but the point is that we have to do it.

We have to save Medicare. If you like Medicare, if you want to have a health care program for the elderly, you have to change it. You cannot let it continue to grow at 10 percent a year, un-

less you want to double the contribution that is made to Social Security for part A. That is a fact.

I am a little concerned that as we move toward these decisions in the public arena, making public policy, that we are moving more and more toward sort of merchandising, towards the idea of using fright tactics instead of facts.

I picked up something in the Denver paper the other day on my way back. The Denver paper is not exactly a conservative bulletin, but it asserted the allegation under the Clean Water Act that we are going to dump arsenic in the water supply. Of course we are not going to dump arsenic in the water supply. Those are the kind of things that are being talked about as distortions, and they do not really come to the question of what we do to have a responsible Government, to be able to finance the kinds of programs that really are meaningful over time.

So, Mr. President, I say, again, that we are approaching and involved in, and it is a treat for you and me and my associate from Minnesota in our first year here to be a part of the first time to have a real opportunity to balance the budget, and we have that. I certainly hope our associates in the Senate will cause that to happen.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

A MESSAGE OF HOPE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been told, and we hear over and over again that we have lost the war on words on the Republican side and that this, what has now become known as the "big lie" around the country, is selling; that people are buying the idea that the Republicans are cutting Medicare and giving tax credits and tax relief for the very wealthy.

Of course, this just is not true. I come here with a message of hope this morning, because I really believe that the American people will catch on. We are going to go through the same thing we went through a couple years ago when they were talking about socializing medicine. I am not nearly as distressed as other people are because we have time, time works in our favor, we have logic on our side, and we are seeing some things happening right now that I get really quite excited about.

The other day, I picked up an editorial that was in the Washington Post. Mr. President, we are talking about the Washington Post now. This is not the Limbaugh Letter and this is not the Human Events, this is the Washington Post. Generally, the Washington Post is more liberal on their editorial outlook. If anything, they are more on the Democratic side than the Republican side.

The editorial is called "Medagogues." This is really a kind of neat article. The first paragraph says. I will paraphrase it:

Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole accused the Democrats and their allies yesterday of conducting a campaign based on distortion and fear . . . They're right; that's precisely what the Democrats are doing—it's pretty much all they're doing—and it's—

A crummy idea.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, entitled "Medagogues," printed in the RECORD.

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

MEDAGOGUES

Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole accused the Democrats and their allies yesterday of conducting a campaign based on distortion and fear to block the cuts in projected Medicare spending that are the core of the Republican effort to balance the budget in the next seven years. They're right; that's precisely what the Democrats are doing—it's pretty much all they're doing—and it's crummy stuff.

There's plenty to be said about the proposals the Republicans are making; there's a legitimate debate to be had about what ought to be the future of Medicare and federal aid to the elderly generally. But that's not what the Democrats are engaged in. They're engaged in demagoguery, big time. And it's wrong—as wrong on their part now as it was a year ago when other people did it to them on some of the same health care issues. Then, they were the ones who indignantly complained.

Medicare and Medicaid costs have got to be controlled, as do health care costs in the economy generally. The federal programs represent a double whammy, because they, more than any other factor, account for the budget deficits projected for the years ahead. They are therefore driving up interest costs even as they continue to rise powerfully themselves. But figuring out how to contain them is enormously difficult. More than a fourth of the population depends on the programs for health care; hospitals and other health care institutions depend on them for income; and you cut their costs with care. Politically, Medicare is especially hard to deal with because the elderly—and their children who must help care for them to the extent the government doesn't—are so potent a voting bloc.

The congressional Republicans have founded the skeptics who said they would never attack a program benefiting the broad middle class. They have come up with a plan to cut projected Medicare costs by (depending on whose estimates you believe) anywhere from \$190 billion to \$270 billion over the seven-year period. It's true that they're also proposing a large and indiscriminate tax cut that is a bad idea and that the Medicare cuts would indirectly help to finance. And it's true that their cost-cutting plan would do—in our judgment—some harm as well as good.

But they have a plan. Enough is known about it to say it's credible; it's gutsy and in some respects inventive—and it addresses a genuine problem that is only going to get worse. What the Democrats have instead is a lot of expostulation, TV ads and scare talk. The fight is about "what's going to happen to the senior citizens in this country," Dick Gephardt said yesterday. "The rural hospitals. The community health centers. The teaching hospitals . . ." The Republicans "are going to decimate [Medicare] for a tax break for the wealthiest people, take it right out of the pockets of senior citizens. . . ." The American people "don't want to lose their Medicare. They don't want Medicare costs to be increased by \$1,000 a person. They

don't want to lose the choice of their doctor."

But there isn't any evidence that they would "lose their Medicare" or lose their choice of doctor under the Republican plan. If the program isn't to become less generous over time, how do the Democrats propose to finance it and continue as well to finance the rest of the federal activities they espouse? That's the question. You listen in vain for a real response. It's irresponsible.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this is what is going on around the country. I just feel very strongly that the people are not willing to buy this.

I wish I had a blowup of it, but there is a cartoon that has been sent out, I guess, into all the districts by the Democrat senatorial committee that depicts us as individuals who are trying to cut taxes for the superrich and we are going to be cutting Medicare. The things are just outrageous. It says: "Inhofe feasts on tax cuts for the privileged while children go to bed hungry."

This is something that is, in my opinion, so extreme that the American people are not going to buy it.

It was not long ago, just a little over a year ago, that the Democrats were trying at that time to sell to the American people a program where the Government would run the health care system and discard a health delivery system that has been the most successful system in the history of all nations, of all mankind, and it was one to adopt a program that was similar to what they have in Canada, or the age-old failure in Great Britain or the Scandinavian countries; and that is, all presume that the Government can run things better than the private sector.

We were all so distressed at that time. Keep in mind this is just a year and a half ago. Even the American Medical Association bought a full-page ad in the Wall Street Journal and said they were throwing in the towel, raising the white flag, "We surrender." For a few crumbs, they were willing to give up this system and take Hillary's health care system, and that was only a year and a half ago.

I had an experience a couple weeks ago that drove home to me what a great system we have now. I have a close friend, Mr. President. He is an ear, nose, and throat surgeon in Tulsa, OK, one that has a very, very fine reputation among his peers and nationwide. I was talking to him and shared with him in casual conversation, about 20 years ago, that I lost my sense of smell. He said, "Come around sometime and I will examine you."

I went in and he said, "You need to have surgery." It is called endoscopic nasal surgery. It is a really yucky thing to talk about. But nonetheless, this is 2 weeks ago. Today, I am walking around and I have characterized this, Mr. President, as the most significant non-Christian experience that I have had or change in my life. I now have had this restored, and I have a sense of smell. This could not have happened in any other country, where you have a choice of practitioners to go

to, you have the state of the art and a degree of professionalism that none of the other countries have. It happened to me.

Now, a year and a half ago, we were willing to give that up. And now, if you surveyed the American people, they know that we are making changes, that we need to do something about medical malpractice. They know we are going to come up with medical savings accounts and improve the system we have now. But the Government is not going to take it over.

Well, this is what we are going through right now. By the way, this is, I think, unprecedented for the Washington Post to do. They came out with another editorial, and this was on September 25, called "Medagogues, Cont'd." I will read the last two sentences:

The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare-tax cut connection because it is useful politically. It allows them to attack and to duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it's wrong.

Again, that is what the Washington Post said.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 25, 1995]
MEDAGOGUES, CONT'D

We print today a letter from House minority leader Richard Gephardt, taking exception to an editorial that accused the Democrats of demagoguing on Medicare. The letter itself seems to us to be more of the same. It tells you just about everything the Democrats think about Medicare except how to cut the cost. That aspect of the subject it puts largely out of bounds, on grounds that Medicare is "an insurance program, not a welfare program," and "to slash the program to balance the budget" or presumably for any purpose other than to shore up the trust fund is "not just a threat to . . . seniors, families, hospitals" etc. but "a violation of a sacred trust."

That's bullfeathers, and Mr. Gephardt knows it. Congress has been sticking the budget knife to Medicare on a regular basis for years. Billions of dollars have been cut from the program; both parties have voted for the cutting. Most years the cuts have had nothing to do with the trust funds, which, despite all the rhetoric, both parties understand to be little more than accounting devices and possible warning lights as to program costs. Rather, the goal has been to reduce the deficit. It made sense to turn to Medicare because Medicare is a major part of the problem. It and Medicaid together are now a sixth of the budget and a fourth of all spending for other than interest and defense. If nothing is done those shares are going to rise, particularly as the baby-boomers begin to retire early in the next century.

There are only four choices, none of them pleasant. Congress can let the health care programs continue to drive up the deficit, or it can let them continue to crowd out other programs or it can pay for them with higher taxes. Or it can cut them back.

The Republicans want to cut Medicare. It is a gutsy step. This is not just a middle-class entitlement; the entire society looks to the program, and earlier in the year a lot of the smart money said the Republicans would

never take it on. They have. Mr. Gephardt is right that a lot of their plan is still gauzy. It is not yet clear how tough it will finally be; on alternate days you hear it criticized on grounds that it seeks to cut too much from the program and on grounds that it won't cut all it seeks. Maybe both will turn out to be true; we have no doubt the plan will turn out to have other flaws as well.

They have nonetheless—in our judgment—stepped up to the issue. They have taken a huge political risk just in calling for the cuts they have. What the Democrats have done in turn is confirm the risk. The Republicans are going to take away your Medicare. That's their only message. They have no plan. Mr. Gephardt says they can't offer one because the Republicans would simply pocket the money to finance their tax cut. It's the perfect defense; the Democrats can't do the right thing because the Republicans would then do the wrong one. It's absolutely the case that there ought not be a tax cut, and certainly not the indiscriminate cut the Republicans propose. But that has nothing to do with Medicare. The Democrats have fabricated the Medicare-tax cut connection because it is useful politically. It allows them to attack and to duck responsibility, both at the same time. We think it's wrong.

Mr. INHOFE. Finally, Mr. President, I feel confident that the American people are not going to buy into this lie. I know it is a very short message. I know the Democrats are rejoicing. They think they fooled the American people into thinking that the Republicans are going to cut Medicare in order to have tax cuts. There is no connection, as far as tax cuts are concerned.

I hope that anyone in America that is looking at that and saying "we do not want tax cuts" will stop and remember what happened in 1993. In 1993, President Clinton came out with the largest single tax increase in the history of public finance in America or anyplace in the world. These are not the words of conservative Republican JIM INHOFE. These are the words of a Democrat on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I suggest to you that anybody who was opposed to that major tax increase that we did not need in 1993 ought to be supporting a tax cut. All we are trying to do is repeal a lot of the damage that was done to the American people in 1993. We may not be able to get by with this, until we change the personality in the White House. Nonetheless, we should not connect what we are trying to do to save Medicare with the fact that we would like to have tax relief for the American people—not the superrich, we are talking about the American people and child deductions and that sort of thing.

I feel confident that we are going to be able to sell that message because it is right and honest. We are getting more and more support around the country from liberal editorial boards who are saying: "That is enough; we are not going to perpetrate a lie on the American people such as the Democrat leadership is trying to perform."

You know, it was Winston Churchill who said, "Truth is incontrovertible. Panic may rescind it, ignorance may deride it, malice may destroy it, but there it is."

I think we will find truth and truth will prevail.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

SECURITY—AT ANY COST?

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to talk a little this afternoon not so much about taxes but taxpayers' money and about security.

Mr. President, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue is certainly the most famous residential street address in America. It is, of course, the address of the White House—the crown jewel in a city that attracts 15 million visitors every year.

Part of the excitement for White House guests is discovering that their President lives right alongside a busy street, just like many of them do, that his house has an address, just like theirs does. The mail carrier really does deliver letters each day to 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, just exactly as it happens at every other home, in every other town in America.

The White House is called the People's House because of its close relationship with the American people. It is a familiar place where visitors instantly feel at home.

The city has certainly grown around them, but Pennsylvania Avenue and the White House have actually changed little since 1791, when George Washington gave his approval to Pierre L'Enfant's magnificent city plan. The bold stretch of Pennsylvania Avenue that shoots from the Capitol to the White House links the executive branch to the Legislative, physically and metaphorically.

By the early 1800's, Pennsylvania Avenue had become a busy thoroughfare, bringing people closer to the White House, and closer to their Government.

Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House was a natural place to hold the official ceremonies of a young nation. From there, President Lincoln reviewed troops heading off to battle in 1861. Later, dignitaries would gather on the avenue for inaugural parades.

People who were lost and looking for directions used to pull their carriages up to the front door of the White House to ask for help. By the middle of this century, it was station wagons and tour buses that made their way past the Executive Mansion. Families on vacation, eager for a close-up look at the home of the President, would travel the same route their ancestors might have traveled.

When ordinary citizens could drive past the White House or walk past its gate, well, that said something special about the unique openness that exists between the people and their President.

By 1995, Pennsylvania Avenue—the Main Street of America—had grown up. Over 80 feet wide, the modern, seven-lane thoroughfare was being used by more than 26,000 vehicles every day in the three-block stretch fronting the

White House. That is, until May 20 of this year, when all traffic on Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House came to a halt. In the wake of the tragic bombing in Oklahoma City, and citing a security risk for the President, the Treasury Department shut down three blocks of Pennsylvania Avenue. For the first time in the 195-year-history of the Executive Mansion, the people are no longer allowed to drive past the people's house.

The Secret Service says the street is not actually closed in front of the White House. In the Washington-speak that infects so many here, the roadway is merely restricted to vehicular traffic. Even the President, when he gave the order to close Pennsylvania Avenue, said the decision would not change very much except the traffic patterns in Washington. But a great deal more than that has changed. If you want to experience intense security, try driving to the White House—even as an invited guest, with permission to park on the grounds. A bunker mentality has taken hold.

Massive concrete barriers block Pennsylvania Avenue, keeping out unwanted traffic. The fortress-like effect is compounded by dozens of concrete posts inset into the White House sidewalk.

Police cruisers patrol every intersection.

Vans—engines running, manned by officers with dogs—wait in the parking areas.

Uniformed Secret Service officers guard their new security stations, circulate among the tourists and patrol the White House lawn.

Motorcycle officers and even officers on bicycles are there, too.

If you look carefully, you will see figures on the White House roof itself, binoculars in hand.

Drive into a parking area and you are stopped by armed officers who ask if anyone has given you explosives to carry.

You are told to pull forward, where you are met by another officer, who asks to check your trunk as he puts his bomb-sniffing dog through its paces.

Mr. President, I think it is safe to say that very few visitors feel at home these days at the White House. The openness is gone. The closeness is gone. It has all been replaced with intimidation and fear. The place is secure now—secure as a fortress—but what have we sacrificed for that security?

The cost of trading security for freedom cannot be calculated mathematically, but the cost can indeed be measured in three ways.

First, the knee-jerk closing of a major artery such as Pennsylvania Avenue has had a devastating financial cost for the District of Columbia and its businesses, its commuters, its tourists, its residents. With the avenue closed for three blocks, and several surrounding streets blocked off as well, the people who live, work, and visit here and give life to this city are begin-

ning to feel choked off from it. Nearby businesses and offices are no longer as accessible to employees and clients. Traffic hassles compound the problem. A great deal of parking space has been eliminated. And most troubling is the fact that the President ordered the closing of Pennsylvania Avenue, and the Treasury Department carried it out, without any consultation with the District, without any direct public input from the people this action would most disrupt. Add up the lost parking revenue, the cost of changing street signs and signals, higher Metrobus subsidies, and police overtime, and as of June 30 of this year, the District estimated that closing Pennsylvania Avenue in front of the White House had cost nearly \$750,000. No one is willing to guess how high that figure might be today.

And that does not begin to take into account the other indirect costs of the closing. How has this affected tour bus operators? They can no longer drive their customers—many of whom are strapped for time, or unable to walk the extra three or four blocks—to drive past the White House.

How has this affected the public bus system? In order to provide the same services it offered before the Pennsylvania Avenue shutdown, transit officials estimate they will have to spend up to \$200,000 more every year by adding new buses and new drivers.

How has this affected local businesses and the customers who park nearby? That impact has yet to be calculated.

Mr. President, the people who depend on open access to Pennsylvania Avenue for their livelihoods say they have accepted the present closure, but they are not going along with the idea that the avenue must be blockaded forever. That case has simply not been made, they say. I agree.

The second measure of the cost of this closing is the direct hit it means for the taxpayers. The Federal Government has since repaid the District for some of the \$750,000 in costs but, of course, that means the taxpayers have once again been handed the bill. And there are more bills to come.

At an open house today at the White House Visitor Center, the National Park Service is soliciting public input into the future of this vital stretch of Pennsylvania Avenue. They have devised what they call an "interim beautification plan" for the 1,600-foot strip of the avenue between Lafayette Park and the White House. It involves replacing large sections of the asphalt with grass, replacing the police cruisers at each end of the avenue with guard booths equipped with steel barricades, and replacing the old concrete barriers with new concrete barriers disguised as planters.

"Beautification," if that is what you want to call it, does not come cheaply. Implementing this plan will cost the taxpayers an additional \$1.3 million, and it is only temporary. The proposed