



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1995

No. 28

## Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, January 30, 1995)

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

### PRAYER

The guest Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, Jr., of Arlington, VA, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

As we bow in prayer, in anticipation of St. Valentine's Day and of a burdensome schedule, let us reflect upon those we love most: our children and grandchildren.

The story is told about Charles Francis Adams (1807-1886), son of John Quincy Adams and a successful politician, that on a certain day Charles entered these words into his diary: "Went fishing with my son—a day wasted." His son, Brooks Adams (1838-1918) also kept a diary, and on that same day, Brooks made this entry: "Went fishing with my father—the most wonderful day of my life!" (Obtained from Fran Woods, Washington Fly Fishing Club).

Our Heavenly Father, as we consider this "most wonderful, wasted day" of a father spending time with his son, we recall the final words of the Old Testament which declare: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet \* \* \* and he shall turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to their fathers \* \* \*"—Malachi 4:5, 6. And the New Testament which says, "\* \* \* where your treasure is, there will your heart be also."—Matthew 6:21.

Lord, we confess that sometimes we do not treasure our children as we ought, and sometimes our heart is more with our achievements than with our descendants. Often, those we most love, we most neglect.

We pray, therefore, in the midst of demanding schedules, that Thou wouldst graciously turn our hearts to our children and grandchildren, with Valentines of time not wasted.

In the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader is recognized.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, for the information of Members, following the time for the two leaders, which will be reserved, there will be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 1 o'clock with Senators permitted to speak for not to exceed 10 minutes each. At 1 o'clock we will resume consideration of House Joint Resolution 1, the constitutional balanced budget amendment and the pending Reid amendment.

At 5 o'clock today, there will be a rollcall vote on adopting the committee funding resolution, Senate Resolution 73. Further rollcall votes are possible today. We have not made that determination yet. We are trying to get an agreement to have some of those votes tomorrow morning to accommodate some Senators who are necessarily absent. We are not going to accommodate those who are just absent. But there are some necessarily absent. I think we can understand that on Mondays and Fridays we will have votes, and anybody who is not here on Monday and Friday will just take that risk. Certainly they have a right to do that.

I also hope that we can bring to a conclusion the debate on the balanced budget amendment. We have been on it for 2 straight weeks. There has been no effort on this side to slow down the debate. We spent hours and hours and days and days on a couple of amendments. My view is that it is time that we bring this to a conclusion. We would like to do so before late Thursday evening.

So I just suggest to my colleagues that there will be late sessions tomor-

row night, Wednesday night, and Thursday night. We will not be in session on Friday. We will not be in session on next Monday or Tuesday. But we will be in session on next Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, unless the two leaders can reach some agreement on disposition of this, and additional matters.

I thank the Chair.

### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 1 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 10 minutes each.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHELBY). The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized.

### IWO JIMA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise to be one of the first to speak about some things that happened 50 years ago which were a part of our freedom and a part of our history. So I am pleased to do that.

Mr. President, on this date 50 years ago, one of the most powerful armadas ever assembled in American military history prepared to depart Saipan in the Mariana Islands. Their destination was a tiny, 8-square-mile piece of volcanic sand and rock in the Western Pacific—Iwo Jima.

The importance of capturing Iwo Jima was its strategic location, almost midway between Japan and the recently captured Mariana Islands. Since the summer of 1944, the Japanese home

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2533

islands had been reeling from strikes by the new, long-range American B-29 bombers, operating from Saipan and Tinian. Iwo Jima, with its three airfields, would be a vital fighter escort station if captured. In addition, it would serve as a sanctuary for crippled bombers returning from their strikes on Japan.

No American planner contemplating the assault and seizure of this island suggested that taking Iwo Jima would be an easy task. To meet the challenge, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz assembled a veteran Navy-Marine Corps team, which included the largest force of U.S. marines ever committed to a single battle—a force which eventually totaled more than 80,000 men—a majority of whom were veterans of earlier Pacific battles. These troops were arguably the most proficient amphibious force the world had yet seen. On February 13, 1945, this formidable armada of American firepower and might prepared to embark on a mission that would move America one giant step closer to final victory.

I think it is appropriate that we remember those men and women who gave so much to ensure that we could continue to have freedom and peace in this country.

Mr. President, if I may, since there seems to be no one else asking for time, I would like to comment a little on the balanced budget amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

#### THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise, as I have in the past, to support the balanced budget amendment. I believe strongly that it is the right thing to do. I believe strongly that it is the only way that we are going to be able to achieve some kind of financial balance in our Government, to achieve some kind of responsibility for not spending more than we take in.

So I rise to share my impressions of what has gone on here for the past 2 weeks, and apparently at least for another week. I am new to the Senate. I am very pleased and proud, of course, to be here to represent the people of Wyoming. But I am, I must say, a little bit disappointed in the lack of progress that we have made.

It seems to me that, in some instances, we have not really had an in-depth debate of issues, but rather a sort of a slowing of the process, talking about what seems, at least to me, to be peripheral issues often as the method of establishing a rationale for voting "no" on an issue that those who argue against have no intention of voting for at all.

It is fairly easy to examine the status of the record of performance that leads to this issue coming before the Senate which leads to a consideration of the balanced budget amendment. Certainly, history does that. You can-

not change history. You can interpret it, I suppose, and spin it. But the fact is that we have not balanced the budget, this Congress has not balanced the budget for some 26 years. Only four or five times out of 50 years has the budget been balanced. That is not a good record, but it is indeed a record.

Some talk a lot about the efforts that have been made over the last 3 years to do something about the deficit. And, indeed, there has been something done and it has been good. Starting with the last budget of President Bush and on through the next 2 years, there have been some reductions. The fact is, however, that the reductions now are not there. They are not in this budget. They are not proposed for the next year's budget and, indeed, beyond the year 2000, there would not be a reduction in the deficit, but the national debt would continue to grow.

It is also true that much of the reduction was a one-time readjustment in terms of spending on savings and loans, in terms of spending on Medicaid, and what the reduction was, a direct result of what this Congress did, was an increase in taxes. So I am certainly pleased that this deficit has been reduced, but I am not pleased with the fact that it is now scheduled to go up, unless we do something different.

The cost of the imbalance, the cost of these years of not balancing the budget, are extremely high. We have now approximately a \$260 billion line item in this year's budget to pay interest on the debt. If it were not for the interest on the debt, this year's budget would be balanced. But there is an interest of \$260 billion, probably the third largest line item in the budget and continuing to go up.

Spending has gone up every year. When we read about the budget, we often read in our hometown paper that the President makes the cuts. Of course, there are some cuts, but the fact is the total spending continues to go up; this year, 5.5 percent over last year. So we continue to have larger Government, spending goes up.

Fortunately, revenues go up as well. But we have not been able to bring the two together. We have not been able to be responsible, both morally and fiscally, with this budget. Clearly, we need to do something different.

You cannot continue to do the same thing you have been doing over the years and expect there to be a different result.

What is the opposition? Some say, "Don't change the Constitution. The Founders did not draft it that way and we should not change it."

Of course, changing the Constitution is not something we take lightly. The process does not allow for it to be taken lightly. It requires a two-thirds majority of both Houses of this Congress. It requires that it be ratified by the State legislatures and in fact be ratified by the people. The Founders did not include it. However, Thomas

Jefferson said that if he had had the opportunity to make one change, it would have been limiting the amount of debt that the Federal Government could undertake.

The Founders also did not have a \$20,000 per person debt to deal with, which we do now. Each of us in this country has a \$20,000 debt, in terms of the national debt.

The Founders did not have a huge Federal Government to deal with. The Founders, I believe it is fair to say, thought that this would be a federation of States in which the basic spending responsibility, the basic decision-making responsibility for most things in this Government, would be done by the States. They did not envision the kind of Federal Government that we have now.

Some say judges will make the decisions on the budget. I do not think there is a basis for that. Forty-eight States have balanced budgets in their legislatures. My own State of Wyoming has a balanced budget in the constitution that says they shall not borrow more than 1 percent of the value of the revenues. Judges do not do our budget. The legislature knows that they have to bring spending within revenues. And they do it.

Some say it will not work because the States have capital budgets. They do not all have capital budgets. Furthermore, even if you do have a capital budget, like you and I might have and have loans on our homes to pay, we still have to balance between our revenue, our budget, and our debt service. And we do not do that in the Federal Government.

So these arguments really are to define, I think, a philosophy. And there is a basic difference. There is a basic difference in philosophy and it is a legitimate difference. There are those who believe that Government should be big, it should spend more, it should be involved in more activity.

Some of us, including myself, believe that it should be smaller; that it should be limited. Those who seek larger Government would naturally oppose the balanced budget amendment. Those of us who think there should be some control, that Government is too big, that Government is too expensive, believe that a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution is the tool that we need to make it work.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we do move forward. It seems to me that we came here to undertake this task of resolving this question, regardless of the outcome. It seems to me that we do have a responsibility to vote. We have a responsibility to make the decisions. It is not an easy one. People see it differently. There is a legitimate difference of view.

But the idea of just continuing to string it out, I think, is not beneficial for us and is not beneficial for the country. We have to bite the bullet and do it, and I think the time is now.