

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.

I rise in support of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I believe we are still in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. MURKOWSKI pertaining to the introduction of S. 395 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

#### BUTTE'S GLOBAL TRANSPORTATION LINK

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, as I have often said in the Chamber, particularly quite recently in the last couple of weeks, Micron, a semiconductor manufacturing company in Idaho, is selecting a site to build a computer chip manufacturing facility. One of the thirteen locations under consideration around the country is the city of Butte; that is, Butte, MT.

Access to affordable, efficient transportation is vital to the economic viability of any business. We all know that. American semiconductors in particular are the world's best. They need access. Micron sells chips all over the United States, also in countries like Singapore and Taiwan in East Asia and to the United Kingdom and Germany in Europe.

To reach all of these places, a modern company needs top quality transportation. And it may be surprising, but few places in America are better connected to world markets than Butte. Butte is sited at the juncture of two interstates, I-90 and I-15, interstates which respectively tie the east coast and the Great Lakes to the ports in California and Seattle.

This map shows, if you can see it, the two interstates, again I-90 east-west, I-15 north-south, the juncture in Butte, the only place in Montana where interstates cross like that.

Butte also is at the site of the interstates which connect Canada and Denver, Los Angeles, San Diego, Phoenix, and ultimately Mexico City, that is, north-south. It has a top quality, modern airport. It is served by two continental railroads. In this era of consolidation, that is unusual, Mr. President,

but two continental railroads join in Butte; that is, the Union Pacific and the Burlington Northern.

And then we have the port of Montana, obviously, located in Butte. It is one of the Nation's first inland ports. Director of Marketing Bill Fogarty has made the port one of the finest intermodal facilities. Its access to transportation expands the markets for Montana's businesses and products.

#### MONTANA'S TRANSPORTATION HISTORY

Mr. President, all of this is no accident. It is no coincidence. Montanans have always known how important transportation is to a competitive business. As far back as Butte's mining boom and beyond, Montana has a long history of providing transportation options—options such as well-maintained highways, railroads, and airports.

As a testament of Montana's "can do" attitude, get this, camels—yes, camels—were brought to Montana in the summer of 1865 in an attempt to secure an economic and reliable source of transportation—camels back in 1865. And while camels did not prove the best solution to our transportation challenges, we in Montana have managed to integrate virtually all other kinds of transportation into our economy.

Historians cite 1841 as the date the first wagons were driven into Montana from the Southwest. Not long afterward, mule trains were bringing goods into and out of Montana. The mule trains needed roads to cross the rugged frontier, and one of the first routes in the State was authorized by U.S. Secretary of War John Floyd in 1858. The Mullan Military Wagon Road from Fort Walla in Washington to Fort Benton in Montana was constructed to transport troops and was completed in 1860.

I might add, Mr. President, my great grandfather, Henry Sieben, drove wagon trains on that Fort Mullan Trail. In fact, that was his line of business and that is how he got his start in the State of Montana.

By the time the wagon road was finished, the gold mining boom had begun. Discovery of mines in Idaho and Montana meant that we needed a shortcut from the Oregon Trail to the mines.

Well, in the spring of 1863, John Bozeman, a Georgian who migrated to Montana, teamed with a man named John Jacobs to build such a short road that is called the Bozeman Road.

Mr. President, these early roads were nothing like the blacktops we drive on today. In fact, one road was even described by travelers as "50 miles long and 1 inch deep, according to the corroborative evidence of lungs and linen."

But travel by land was not limited to roads. The first railroad to reach Montana Territory was the Utah & Northern, later known as the Union Pacific. This railroad was constructed to link business interests with the rich mineral and agricultural areas in Montana. The Utah & Northern built its first railroad bed in March of 1880. It contin-

ued building until it reached Silver Bow, a few miles west of Butte, on December 21, 1881.

Aviation secured an early place in the transportation system of Montana. Montana's first airline was the National Parks Airlines, which was founded in 1927 and offered service to Butte, Helena, Great Falls, and Salt Lake City.

And I might add there, my grandfather, Fred Sheriff, had a Ford trimotor and founded airports in Montana and worked very hard to get high quality aviation to Montana. Amelia Earhart spent much time in Montana, and I very much remember a photograph of my grandfather and Amelia Earhart when she was in Montana helping us to establish the highest quality aviation in our State.

#### MICRON AND MONTANA TRANSPORTATION

Mr. President, Montana has a long, proud history of efficient and productive transportation, and that history continues today in Butte.

We operate in a global economy these days, however, and the intermodal transportation partnership found in Butte will increase the productivity of Micron and lower the transportation costs to ship their products. This will improve the marketability of Micron's products and make it more competitive throughout the world.

Mr. President, I have been in the Chamber several times now describing the unique virtues of Montana and of Butte. Montana is a vast State. It is a beautiful State. As Micron prepares to make a final decision on the location of its new facility, I would like to end with a quote from an essay by Glenn Law, entitled "More Than Skin Deep." And I quote:

Montana's special gift is space, landscape made personal; space that reaches out to horizons and comes back and gets under your skin. It reaches inward, wraps itself around your soul, incubates and grows. When you finally begin to understand just what it is about Montana that is important to you, it has already taken root in your heart and you'll never be the same.

Mr. President, when Micron comes to Montana, they will understand the meaning of these words. They will never be the same. They will be better. There is no place in the world like Butte, and we look forward to opening our arms, welcoming Micron to Butte.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRIBUTE TO GLEN WOODARD

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, Florida and America have lost a big-hearted