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Supreme Court Strikes Down Gramm-Rudman Hollings Law to Balance Federal Budget

JANE PAULEY, host:

As we’ve been reporting, there is some uncertainty this morning over the facts of the Gramm Rudman Hollings budget balancing law following Monday’s Supreme Court ruling. Joining us this morning from our Washington newsroom is Oklahoma Congressman Mike Synar, who challenged a key portion of the law and won his point by a 7-2 vote of the High Court. And good morning, Mr. Congressman, you have a smile on your face.

Rep. MIKE SYNAR: Well I’m obviously very excited and humbled by the court’s opinion, Jane because what the court said yesterday was no more gimmicks, no more tricks, no more easy answers, that Congress must do its job and do the job that our founding fathers set out for us which was to perform the duty of setting the priorities of this country and not leaving it up to some bureaucrat running a computer.

PAULEY: Meaning that you and your colleagues will now get to vote on those what previously were going to be mandatory budget cuts. What if you can’t get together? Does that mean no balanced budget by 1991?

SYNAR: No, not at all. In fact, I think we’ve shown a history not only over the last forty years where Congress has brought in every time except for four years of budget under what the President requested but just a week ago we brought in a budget in a bipartisan fashion, which met the Gramm Rudman targets.

PAULEY: Now one of the senators…one of the senators who co-authored, Senator Rudman, was grateful that the court left 95 percent of his law intact but that five percent that they took out, that was the teeth!

SYNAR: That’s correct, that’s like taking the heart out of the body. What we’ve basically done, is put the responsibility for setting the priorities back into the hands of elected officials, putting the monkey back on their back and that’s exactly the way it should be, and that’s the way it was intended to be.

PAULEY: You’re a Democrat but yet that sounds a little like what the President was saying yesterday...
apropos putting budget responsibilities back where it belongs in Congress. You’ve got the monkey on your back too, Mr. Congressman, don’t you?
SYNAR: That’s correct, and that’s exactly the way it should be. That’s where the voters want it to be, that’s why we go to the ballot box every two years so that they can determine whether or not they feel their Congressmen are setting the right priorities. When we have the monkey on our back, the American people are participating in the process. When we don’t, basically we’ve turned that responsibility away from the people and into the hands of the people who are not accountable.
PAULEY: The authors are talking about going back to the drawing board and coming up with a plan that would, for instance, remove the Controller-General from his relationship with Congress, separating him, if you will. Is that plan going to fly?
SYNAR: No, I don’t think it is, Jane. And the reason is that would be a disaster. The GAO or General Accounting Office has been our auditor or accounter, kind of our 60 Minutes, or 20/20 or whatever, to try to make us make government accountable for the people, to keep ‘em honest, as they would say. We’ve used it to work out fraud, abuse and waste, and to move GAO over to the executive branches, is recommended by Phil Gramm, would basically take its independence away and take an investigative arm away from Congress, which I don’t think they want to relinquish.
PAULEY: Well, Representative Synar from Oklahoma, we thank you for joining us this morning.