

familiar refrain uttered by those who oppose arms control agreements in any form. The treaty's verification regime includes a comprehensive international monitoring system composed of hundreds of seismological, radionuclide, hydroacoustic, and infrasound sensors spread out all over the globe. This network is backed up by the ability of Members to conduct onsite inspections of questionable activities. This combination should be more than sufficient to deter would-be cheaters and, if deterrence fails, catch those who try to violate the treaty's restrictions.

As to the concern that CTBT will erode our nuclear capability, I have 4.5 billion reasons why that will not be the case this year and tens of billions more reasons in subsequent years. Last week, the administration reached an important agreement with our weapons development labs. These labs are staffed by the world's foremost nuclear weapons experts. The labs stated that if they are provided with \$4.5 billion this year and similar amounts in each subsequent year, they will be able to conduct a program that will ensure with a high level of confidence the safety and reliability of the nuclear weapons in our stockpile. In short, the cessation of nuclear testing need not erode our nuclear capability.

The CTBT is an important step down the path toward a safer world. In simple terms, the United States, the country with one of the largest and certainly the most sophisticated nuclear weapons arsenals in the world, has the most to gain from freezing the competition in place. Countries already possessing nuclear weapons will have a difficult time making qualitative and quantitative improvements to their existing arsenals. And as for countries without nuclear weapons, the CTBT will place an additional hurdle in their path if they seek to develop and deploy such weapons.

I do not believe we can rest with the submission, and, hopefully, ratification of this treaty.

Many more challenges face us if we are to reduce to acceptable levels the threat posed by nuclear weapons. For example, despite the fact that the cold war ended years ago, the United States and Russia still maintain at least 3,000 strategic nuclear warheads poised and ready to launch at a moment's notice. As noted by former Senator Sam Nunn, one of the most distinguished and insightful defense experts to ever serve in this Chamber, while this practice may have been necessary in the cold war, "today it represents a dangerous anachronism." Moreover, tens of tons of nuclear materials and thousands of nuclear weapons remain outside international controls.

Tens of thousands of highly trained employees of the Russian nuclear complex, each armed with the ability to design and build nuclear weapons, go unpaid for months at a time. Future security measures must be designed to speak to these concerns as well.

While I will be doing all I can to ensure smooth ratification of the CTBT in the Senate, I will also be attempting to help design measures that speak to these other security problems. Outside experts such as former Senator Nunn, General Lee Butler, the last Commander in Chief of the now-disbanded Strategic Air Command, and Dr. Bruce Blair, a thoughtful arms control expert at the Brookings Institution, have all raised these same concerns and begun to design solutions. It is an important opportunity for the Senate, the Pentagon, and the country to begin to consider them.

At Helsinki, the administration acknowledged its awareness of these problems and indicated a commitment to resolve them. Unfortunately, the administration appears to have put the detailed discussion of many of these measures on hold until START II enters force and the START III negotiations begin. I hope the administration would begin exploring these steps today. The only real linkage between START and these other measures is that they both can enhance our security. There is no reason why United States action in one arena should be held in abeyance until the Russians act in another.

In summary, Mr. President, I look forward to working with the administration and the other supporters of the CTBT in this body to ensure that the merits of this treaty are fully aired. If that happens, I am confident the CTBT will be ratified, and another step will be taken toward turning back the clock that unfortunately began ticking 52 years ago at a place called Trinity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we have spent several days recently and this week talking about campaign finance. I would like to share some of my thoughts. It is one of those issues that have become so complicated and so convoluted that it seems to me it is very difficult for a person to really bring it down to the simple basics, particularly if you haven't listened to all of it.

Proponents of campaign finance reform bills will have you believe this is the top issue and in the interest of Americans, that everyone on Main Street is waiting breathlessly for some significant action that would be more important than tax relief or the balanced budget—no. I think that is not so. When I go back to Wyoming nearly every week, people don't come and talk to me about campaign finance. They want to discuss health care, they want to discuss public lands, they want to discuss taxes.

This is not to say that it is not important, certainly not to say that I am

against finance reform, because I think there should be some thoughtful changes in terms of campaign financing. I just don't believe that it is a catastrophic issue. I don't believe it is an issue that is the most important thing on our agenda as it sometimes is termed.

The steam behind the issue, as a matter of fact, is generally that of enforcing the laws that are now on the books. That is what the hearings were about. That is what brought it up. It is not new laws that are needed—enforce the ones that are now there, not merely adding more to be unenforced.

I am in favor of campaign finance reform. I have been very involved in political systems, as a matter of fact, long before I was ever in elective office, because it seemed to me over a period of years that it is pretty clear that politics and campaigns are how we govern ourselves. That is how you and I in our precincts decide the big issues in terms of government. So I just think we need to make it the kind of a process in which people can be involved, the kind of a process in which the first amendment opportunities to speak are there and are extended to everyone—not just limited to the press.

On the other hand, we can't overlook the defects we saw in the last campaign cycle. The answer, however, is not to marshal the powers of the Federal Government and increase governmental intervention. We can reintroduce principle, we can introduce integrity and serious compliance into this important function of governing ourselves by strengthening and enforcing the reporting and disclosure laws, by limiting the influence of soft money on the national level, by requiring that a majority of the funds in a campaign come from the district in which the election takes place, by banning compulsory contributions.

I don't think we ought to pass a bill just because we want to go through the rhetorical process, just because we want to shift the attention from not adhering to the law to writing new laws.

We are talking about being home, and I hear more than anything else in Wyoming, "Wait a minute, the issue is not new law; the issue is enforcing the laws we have." I think disclosure is the most important of the election issues. In that case, voters can determine where the money comes from to go to a candidate and make their own judgment as to whether or not that is reasonable. It is a simple way to bring our system of privately financed campaigns on track by strengthening and enforcing existing disclosure laws.

Privately financed—I think it is a mistake to move more and more to how the taxpayers finance campaigns. It seems to me that has proven not to be useful. Candidates in parties must offer fuller and more timely disclosure of campaign receipts and spending activities. Reports must be prompt and

early. Now there is a period of time between the last reporting and the election in which donations and contributions are not reported until after the election is over. That is wrong. We ought to change that. Candidates' reports are often late and partial and voters are kept from knowing what they should know about contributions prior to the time of voting. People need to be better informed. We can do that and we should.

Soft money—I am concerned about the increased amount of soft money being spent on a national level. I say again, I was very involved in my party prior to being elected, and I saw us use money of that kind to do things that I thought were useful, and continue to think are useful—party building, voter identification, voter registration, getting people to vote and participate in government. That is what soft money is for.

Unfortunately, the receipts for campaigns have increased some 200 percent from the 1992 Presidential election to the 1996 cycle. That is a little scary. That is a lot. This money is not subject to the kind of disclosure requirements and restrictions in the kind of things that so-called hard money is. Voters have the right to be suspect of this kind of dough, it seems to me, since there are really not stringent accountability standards. We must develop, I think, a contribution limit on soft money. It doesn't need to be small. It can be healthy, but it should not be unlimited, and it should be for party building.

We talk sometimes disdainfully about politics. Politics is how we govern ourselves. That is how you and I who live in our precincts are able to make an impact. I feel very strongly about that.

Fundraising in the district—pretty evident that is the important thing. I support the idea of having at least 50 percent of the money that goes into the campaign come from the district from which the candidate runs.

Now, I am the first to admit—and that is one of the difficulties with all kinds of election controls and election restrictions—there are ways to go around that. In my State there are large companies that run mines, for example, that contribute to campaigns from out-of-state headquarters. They will simply contribute from instate headquarters, and it will be the same money. But, nevertheless it is important. I think there is a great shift of money from one place to another outside of the eligible voters, simply because of interests that are somewhere else, that go to this campaign. I suggest that at least 50 percent come from the area in which the candidates come.

Compulsory dues being used for campaigns I think is a real mistake. Labor unions are the only ones that really are able to do that. I think it certainly ought to be voluntary on the part of the member whether or not those dues are used for that purpose. There are

some polls recently that say that is greatly supported, 4 to 1, by members of unions. I think that is right. They should not be restricted from using their money for that purpose if they choose to, but they need to choose.

Mr. President, in summary, voting is one of the highest privileges of being a citizen. Not only is it a privilege, it is an obligation and a responsibility if we are to have a government of the people, by the people and for the people, then the people must participate, must be given an opportunity to participate.

It is ironic to me, it seems to me we are in a time where we have the technical ability to have more information available to more people than ever in history. Can you imagine what it was like to vote 100 years ago? How much do you think people knew about national elections? Very little, I suspect. Now we know anything that happens in the world, and we know it in 10 minutes. Yet we seem not to have the kind of participation that we really ought to have in a citizen government. That is what we ought to be striving to have as we deal with election finance—voters being responsible, voters fulfilling their obligation, voters being knowledgeable, and voters being able to choose.

One of the real meaningful ways, of course, is that individuals can contribute to that point of view that they support. We should work hard to ensure that campaign system is free of some of its current laws and yet open and free and not governed in every detail by some bureau somewhere that decides what you can say in an ad. Those kind of things are not useful and, indeed in my opinion, move us in the wrong direction.

I hope we continue to work on this issue. I hope we do some things. I hope we stay away from the convoluted notion that we ought to have somebody in some bureaucracy, somewhere, manage all of the election activities. Here again, these kind of things belong in our communities, they belong in our States, they belong in our towns, they belong in our school boards. That is where they ought to be.

I yield the floor.

SETTING GOVERNMENT LIMITS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on two bills that I have introduced aimed at limiting the size of Government and restricting its growth. One reduces the Federal Government by restricting the ability of Congress to spend money, and the other limits Government by sunseting the Internal Revenue Code.

First, I will discuss the Economic Growth and Debt Burden Reduction Act. Although I have only been in Congress a short time, I have reached an inescapable conclusion, and that is that Congress is much better at exercising fiscal recklessness than fiscal restraint. Accordingly, I have authored legislation that specifically restricts

Congress' ability to embark on spending sprees by making it illegal to use excess Government revenues for anything other than debt reduction or tax cuts.

Congress has historically been wholly unable to exercise fiscal restraints when given resources in excess of the current demands of the Government. I believe we need to limit the size of the Government, and this bill forces it to do so.

Mr. President, we are going to soon approach a historic opportunity. For the first time since 1969 we are going to balance the budget. It was the last time we actually had revenues and expenditures equivalent. Now is the time for us to begin this great national debate as to, once you go into balance and you start moving into surplus, how should those surpluses be spent. In other words, whenever revenues exceed expenditures, what should they be spent upon.

We can say go on another spending spree and spend more money, or we can pay the debt down, or we can say we will cut taxes further on an American public that is taxed too heavily.

The bill that I put forward puts it this way: If revenues are projected to exceed the agreement levels, those excess revenues are immediately captured and reserved for tax cuts. If tax cutting legislation is not enacted, the additional revenues revert to deficit or debt reduction. This prevents any unanticipated revenues from being plowed back into higher expenditures and higher spending. And it seems to me that is what the American public wants us to be. They want us to pay down this massive \$5.4 trillion debt—and we get from deficit into debt, start paying the debt down—and if we can't agree on cutting taxes further, then we can apply that immediately and require that it go toward the debt reduction. So we can reduce the mortgage on America, which is on our children. They are going to have to reduce the overall tax burden in this country today, which is about 38 percent of the average two-wage earner, two-child family—a 38-percent tax rate. That is at all levels of government, including Federal, State, and local.

SUNSETTING THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. President, the other bill I introduced would sunset the Internal Revenue Code, except for the section relating to Social Security and Medicare. As my colleagues know, last week, the Senate Finance Committee held hearings on the Internal Revenue Service, and during those hearings, the Congress and the American people heard detailed accounts of endless cases of the IRS's abuse of power.

I believe the IRS needs to be reformed and, more fundamentally, I believe our Tax Code needs to be changed. The current Tax Code, along with the regulations, consists of more than 10 million words. It is impressive in size and oppressive in operation. It is antigrowth, antifamily, and it is not