

price indirectly, and paying dearly, for the price of the mandates.

I replaced a very distinguished former Senator, David Boren, when I was elected to the U.S. Senate this past year. David Boren—he is a Democrat and I am a Republican—was and is today one of my closest friends. I can remember in 1966, Mr. President, we were elected to the State legislature. We came up here, and three of us became very intimate friends: David Boren, myself, and a guy named Ralph Thompson, who is now a Federal judge, whose name has been mentioned very prominently as someone who might be a member of the U.S. Supreme Court someday.

We came up in 1967, almost 30 years ago. What was our mission? On the first trip when we came to Washington, the mission was to protest the mandates of Lady Bird's Highway Beautification Act of 1965.

Lastly—I do not want to go over my time, and I am afraid I am approaching that now—I will say what will happen if we do not do it. What is going to happen if we do not pass this bill that everyone, virtually everyone, in America is for? If we do not do it, it will be done for us. Just to the south of the State of the Senator from Colorado, in New Mexico, in Catron County, in frustration with dealing with the U.S. Forest Service, they enacted the U.S. Constitution as a county ordinance and put the Federal Forest Service on notice to show up at the county supervisors meeting to get permission to impose mandates.

Recently, in Walter Williams' column, he talks about the fact that California has joined Colorado, Missouri, Hawaii, and Illinois in asserting 10th amendment rights demanding that the Federal Government cease and desist all mandates and interferences exceeding those delegated by the Constitution. Similar resolutions have been passed in 12 other States.

Mr. President, that is a total of 17 States. Just nine more States, and that will be a majority of those States. So I will conclude, and say that this is something that we will have to start discussing in a serious vein and actually bringing to a vote. I cannot think of anything that is more significant that we will be dealing with than this issue.

As the Reverend Mark Dever said in his prayer, opening the session today, we want unity of purpose for which we are elected. Without overly dramatizing, I would say we must free our States and counties from the bondage to which they have been subverted.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. CAMPBELL addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, before I make comments, I would like to associate myself with the comments of my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, with whom I have had the privilege of

servicing for the last 8 years here in the U.S. Capitol.

He brings out certainly another example, and we have heard one after another, about the punitive action of the Federal Government in forcing States to comply with unfunded mandates.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. CAMPBELL pertaining to the introduction of S. 234 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). The Senator from Wyoming is recognized to speak for up to 10 minutes.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to comment this morning on an issue that I think is important to us and to this country, and that is the balanced budget amendment. Although we have been discussing over the past several days the unfunded mandates bill, the question of a balanced budget has come up. There is a relationship, and I understand the relationship.

Certainly, if I were a local government official and we were talking about a balanced budget amendment I would want the protection of an unfunded mandate bill so that the Federal Government would not shift the responsibility of payment to local government.

But the balanced budget amendment goes beyond that, it seems to me. It is one of the fundamental changes that needs to take place in the Federal Government so that decisions in the future will be different. If we are really talking about change, some of the procedural changes that are being discussed now need to happen and they need to happen soon.

We have already done the accountability of the Congress. That is excellent. There is no reason why the people here should not live under the same rules that they apply to others. We need a balanced budget amendment to give us some discipline for fiscal responsibility. We need to do that. We need to have a line-item veto. I have had some experience in the House where you have an item that simply does not belong in a bill. It is in the highway bill and it is a museum for Lawrence Welk, but you cannot touch it because the rules do not allow for that to happen. So you need a line-item veto.

We need term limitations. These are the kinds of fundamental changes, but I want to talk today about the balanced budget amendment.

It has to do with shaping the form of the Federal Government over a period of time. It has to do with the question of whether we will have fiscal responsibility or whether we do not. There has been a good deal of dissent on an issue which most people say they are for, and now we find an increasing

number of people who begin to find reasons why they are not for it.

The local Hill paper says: "Balanced Budget Amendment Is a Charade."

I do not believe that. I think that is wrong. Let me talk about some of the issues.

First of all, it is a fundamental question and the question should be divided. The question is: Do you think it is fiscally or morally irresponsible to spend more than you take in? Do you think it is fiscally irresponsible to spend more than you take in? Is it morally irresponsible to shift the debt to our children, grandchildren and their children?

The answer is, yes, of course it is fiscally irresponsible; of course, it is morally irresponsible. That is the basic question. The answer is not, "Yes, it is irresponsible if it doesn't hurt too much," or, "Yes, I would like to do it if it doesn't pinch us a little bit."

The answer is, "Yes, it is irresponsible to continue to do what we have been doing for 40 years." That is the first question.

The second question then is how do you do it? The second question is, over a period of time, how do you do it? It does not matter to me particularly whether it takes 5 years or 7 years or 10 years, if we are on a glide path that holds us toward a balanced budget.

The second one we hear constantly is we do not need an amendment. We now have all the tools that are necessary to do it. The fact is, evidence does not support that. We have not had a balanced budget for 25 years. I think we have had two in 50 years. There is not evidence that this Congress can balance the budget, is willing to balance the budget or does balance the budget and, indeed, we need some discipline to cause that to happen. Talking about it does not cause it to happen.

The Director of OMB on the TV said, "Well, we have all the tools we need." Maybe so, but tell me how well it has worked. It has not worked. So we do need some discipline. We need some discipline to cause the Members of Congress to balance the budget.

Should it have more discussion? I heard the other day, someone said, "Well, it needs to be discussed." It has been discussed for at least 10 years. We voted on it several times. We voted on it in the House; we voted on it in the Senate. It is not a puzzle. It is not a difficult one to decide on the basic issue of whether a Government should be responsible enough to not spend more than it takes in. We have had lots of discussion.

Some say it is a gimmick. Some say it is bumper-sticker politics. Let me tell you something, it works in 48 States. I served in the Wyoming legislature. It works there. We have a constitutional provision that you cannot spend more than you take in. It works. There is no question about whether it works. It is not a gimmick. It provides the kind of discipline to force the

members of the legislature to set priorities, and that is what a legislature is all about. Without that kind of discipline, it does not happen.

It is pretty simple. In the Wyoming legislature, and 48 others, when you get in the appropriations committee, of which I was a member, you say, "Look, we are spending more than we have to spend." You have to make some changes and you do that. It is not mystic; it is not magic. It is just the discipline that causes that to happen.

Some say, "Well, judges will be setting it." Not so. It is not true in the States. The States do not have judges setting budgets. That will not happen.

Some say, "Well, we have to have an outline before we can be for it. We have to know what you are going to cut." There is no way that you know what you are going to cut in 7 years or 10 years.

The first question is, Is it responsible to balance the budget? The second question is, How do you do it?

And if you really believe that it needs to be done, you do it. Raise revenues? Of course. I am not for that, but that is possible. And if you are willing to pay for it, you put a cost-benefit ratio. You can do that. If you are committed to a balanced budget, however, you will find the way.

Those who say, "We do not need the tools, we already have them," they have to do the same thing if they are going to balance the budget. They say, "We are going to balance the budget, we don't need a balanced budget amendment." You have to make the same cuts to do it either way. What is the problem with having discipline? What is the problem with going to the States and saying to the State legislatures, "We have a balanced budget to the Constitution. You have a chance to vote." People want to be involved in government.

The administration says we are already cutting the deficit; we do not need it. The fact is that most of the deficit cut in the last 2 years has been the bookkeeping deficit, and the only real change in policy that has reduced the deficit has been an increase in taxes. The fact is, we spent more last year than we spent the year before. But we raised taxes and we did reduce the deficit, and I am pleased with that. But most of it was a bookkeeping change from the S&L's and Medicaid. Some of it was an increase in taxes. We have not balanced the budget. The projection is the deficit is going back up.

We hear a lot about the cuts that are needed. The fact is, we will be spending substantially more at the end of 7 years than we spend now. It is not a question of cuts. It is a matter of reducing the growth, and that is where we are.

So a balanced budget amendment, it seems to me, is the responsible thing to do. Balancing the budget is the responsible thing to do. If I heard something in this election in 1994 in Wyoming it is, "We want responsible government;

we have too much government; it costs too much," and the balanced budget amendment is the discipline that we need to set priorities.

You have to spend within your budget in your family. You have to spend within your budget in your business and, over time, you have to spend within your budget in your Government, and this will provide the discipline to do it.

We answer the question: Is it morally and fiscally responsible to balance the budget? The answer is yes, and we ought to get on about it.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

MIDDLE-CLASS TAX RELIEF

Mr. GRAMS. Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, yesterday I testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on an issue of great importance to me: The Minnesotans, whom I represent in the U.S. Senate, and every overburdened American taxpayer. The issue is middle-class tax relief.

Two years ago while serving in the House, I introduced the idea of a \$500 per child tax credit in my families-first legislation, coauthored by Congressman TIM HUTCHINSON, of Arkansas.

Our arguments then were simple: Taxes were too high; the burden of tax increases fell disproportionately on the middle class; and big government was forcing more workers out of the working class and into the welfare class.

Consider the facts: Most middle-class American families pay more in Federal taxes than they spend for food, clothing, transportation, insurance, and recreation combined.

Since World War II, Federal income and payroll taxes have increased from 2 to 24 percent of the median income of a family of four. Despite this, while Congressman HUTCHINSON and I were making the case for tax relief, Congress was in the midst of passing the 1993 Clinton tax proposal—the largest tax increase in American history.

Far from providing tax relief for the middle class, the Clinton proposal actually increased their tax burden, making it more difficult for the middle class to care for themselves and for their children. The message from Washington was clear: Give us your money and we will solve all your problems.

But the American voters said "no" to this message in November and delivered one of their own. And that was "let us keep our money."

Today, the arguments for tax relief have not changed. Taxes are still too high, the tax burden still falls too heavily on the middle class. The big difference, however, is that this year—with this Congress—we can do something about it.

We promised tax relief, and now we have to deliver. And as I said in my

testimony yesterday, we have to do it for what country western singer Garth Brooks calls the "hard hat, six-pack, achin'-back, flag-wavin', fun-lovin' crowd," because these are the people who work hard every day, care for their children, pay their bills and finance the growth of big government with their hard-earned tax dollars. For years, they have watched their paychecks grow smaller while Washington grows bigger. And last November they spoke out loud and clear. They voted for change in the way things were done in Washington. They voted for less government and lower taxes. They voted for a balanced budget. And, yes, they voted for a \$500 per child tax credit.

But even now, the old barons of Washington and the long-time defenders of big government still do not get it. They do not understand that every dollar Washington spends is one less dollar that taxpayers can spend. And worst of all, they do not understand that it is not the Government's money to begin with. They just do not get it. But the people do, and that is what counts.

And so what are we going to do about it? Well, the answer is simple: Let the taxpayers keep their money. And the way to begin this process is to pass the families first \$500-per-child tax credit.

The families first tax credit means \$25 billion annually to taxpayers across America—\$500 million to Minnesota alone. And 90 percent of the benefits of the tax relief goes to families making annual incomes of \$60,000 or less.

It is the largest, fairest, most progressive way of providing tax relief for families, and it lives up to our Government and our commitment of reducing the size of the Federal Government. By cutting Government spending to pay for middle-class tax relief, families first is the strongest response that we can send to the American people that we heard their message, that we accept their mandate, and we will deliver on our promises.

Mr. President, what we do in this Congress will be judged by the middle-class Americans who voted for us last November. And, Mr. President, what we do in this Congress, in this Chamber, will determine the makeup of the next Congress. Republicans made a commitment to the taxpayers, and I urge my colleagues to uphold that commitment as we continue to fight for the middle class and as we fight for fairness.

I yield back the floor.

GREENVILLE MIDDLE SCHOOL—A CLASS ACT

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the newspaper USA Today recently initiated an ongoing series of articles spotlighting schools and educational programs in the country that are both innovative and successful.

The first venture to be included in the series was the Builders Club at