

and it is exciting for me to know that BEN is going to become one of us. I feel very privileged that he has made that choice.

I have asked for a special order this morning to do an analysis following the vote yesterday of the balanced budget amendment and where we stand as a Senate now on the threshold of making a decision as it relates to how we will deal with this issue.

At this time I will yield to the Senator from Oklahoma—whom I know needs to preside in the chair and will in just a few moments—for his comments on this issue. Clearly, while in the House and now here in the Senate, he has been a leader on the issue of the balanced budget amendment, and I yield to the Senator for what time he may use.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator for yielding. This will be very brief, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

A PROFILE OF BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT SUPPORTERS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, before we hear the analysis from the distinguished Senator from Idaho, I want to give you my own analysis. Yesterday on the floor, yesterday afternoon, I reminded the President, I reminded our fellow Members, and hopefully many in America who might be watching that those individuals who were fighting the balanced budget amendment have a very interesting profile, some things in common. I pointed out and documented that all of those 41 individuals who were the cosponsors of the right-to-know amendment to the budget balancing amendment had a very liberal background. Each one of the 41 had either a D or an F rating by the National Taxpayers Union. Each one of the individuals had voted for the very large spending program called President Clinton's tax stimulus program. And each one had voted for the 1993 tax increase which has been characterized as the largest single tax increase in the history of public finance in America or anywhere in the world.

I announced that I suspected that the 33 Democrats who managed to keep from allowing us to have that one more vote to pass a balanced budget amendment yesterday would fit this same profile. I have analyzed this. I did this personally last night and I will give you the results of that.

Of the 33 Democrats—and it only took one to come over to our side and to free the future generations from the shackles they are going to be bound with—all 33 voted on the cloture vote in favor of the tax stimulus program, which was the big spending program. All 33 have a D or an F rating by the National Taxpayers Union. And 31 of the 33—all but 2 of them—voted for the largest single tax increase in the his-

tory of public finance in America or any place in the world.

The bottom line is this. All this talk about Social Security, all this talk about the right to know is bogus. The fact is those individuals did not want to balance the budget. They are big spenders.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished Senator from Idaho is recognized.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for that analysis. Of course, that was the issue yesterday as we debated and finally voted on House Joint Resolution 1. For over 5 weeks we had debated the issue of a balanced budget and why this Government and why the Congress of the United States ought to be held to the constraints of a constitutional amendment requiring us to balance the Federal budget. While there were many arguments from a variety of perspectives, there was one overriding influence that could not be ignored nor could it be denied, and that was, had this issue passed the Senate yesterday, it would have been sent to our 50 States to begin a ratification process that I believe would have moved very rapidly to gain the necessary 38 States to bring about ratification.

In doing that, of course, the Congress knew that would begin a long and very difficult process to move us to a balanced budget by the year 2002, but one the American people now demand and expect from us, and one we know we can accomplish, if we can bring about the discipline but, more importantly, the pressure and the kind of control that a balanced budget amendment to our Constitution would result in.

There are so many who wrung their hands in the argument that this could never be done. But I argue that those who argue that are the many of the past. They are the ones who still are stuck in the idea or the concept that the Federal Government and its programs must manage and control people and direct an economy of a country outside the marketplace. That, of course, is exactly what the Congress of the United States has done for over 30 years, and we have seen results. We have seen the results of a \$34.8 trillion debt that remains totally out of control. We have seen the results of how interest on that debt eroded any ability to spend both in discretionary and entitlement programs and locks us into a straitjacket of program and time and spending.

But something else that is also, I think, reflective of that debate is that those who argue that argue the status quo. They argue government as if it were something static, that it will never change, or that the Senators and the Members of the House who are in-

olved in governing this country will always vote to have exactly the same programs, that we will not eliminate an agency, that we will not reduce or change a priority, and that we will not shift the intent of the governing of this country from one area to another.

That is a very false and phony argument. Certainly it is to the American people because, if there is anything sure about our country, it is change, and it occurs on a constant and daily basis. It is the Government that finds itself incapable of changing. So simply to say we cannot balance the budget because we cannot get there is to clearly argue that it is going to be the same Government and the same kind of budget, and we are going to ramp it up to 3, 4, 5, to 6 percent a year on the average and heading as far as the eye can see in that direction.

Why do I say that? Because that is exactly what President Clinton's budget demonstrated when he presented it here but a few weeks ago. Here is a President who came to town arguing that he must have the largest tax increase in history, and, if we gave it to him, that he would then begin a very progressive approach toward a budget that would bring us to a balanced budget that would bring down the deficit and continue to bring it down. That is what he campaigned on. That is what he promised the American people. That is what he, the President of the United States, promised this Senate and this Congress less than 2 years ago as he argued for and his party gave him the largest tax increase in history. Then in a most cavalier way, as he presented the budget just this year, he not only showed that he would not control the deficit, he said let the Republicans make the cuts. Let us see what they want to do. Let them make the cuts.

Mr. President, that is why we need a balanced budget amendment so that the Executive of this country can be as responsible as the legislative branch of this country, that budgeting becomes a partnership of cooperation where the President, the executive branch, brings about a balanced budget just as much and just as responsibly as the legislative branch of Government must do.

That is, of course, exactly what the constitutional amendment required as we looked at it the other day. That is why five of our colleagues from the other side who had once voted with us turned tail and ran away from their commitment and their pledge to their constituents. I am frustrated by that because they are honorable people. All of us in our pledge to our constituency attempt to honor it, and yet that did not happen yesterday on five very distinct votes. That is too bad.

We hope as we work this issue and continue to work this issue that we can regain the support of those Senators who left us yesterday and left their constituency.

We have several others who want to speak this morning. Before I yield, let me make one other point that I think