

that the chairman of the Governmental Affairs Committee is suggesting that he be given some \$6.8 million to hire some 80 investigators on the issue of investigating campaign irregularities, apparently including the ones that are in the paper about the Democratic National Committee, and more.

It seems to me the first step in dealing with the issue of irregularities in campaigns—and if there are some, they ought to be investigated—the first step would be to give the Federal Election Commission some teeth. Invest a little bit in the Federal Election Commission and give it some teeth, and let them investigate. But if we are going to investigate in Congress, if we are going to have a group of politicians investigating another group of politicians, I don't think we need \$6.8 million to do that. But if they decide to do that, I have a suggestion: Go ahead and rent a truck and back it up to whatever house—the Republican National Committee or the Democratic National Committee—and I hope all of them will encourage their minions to load up all the relevant paper and let people read it to see who did what, who didn't do what and who didn't comply with laws and who did comply with laws.

But it ought to be more than that. The trail of trouble, it seems to me, in campaign financing isn't just in the national committees—and there are some problems in both national committees. One fellow went to jail already earlier this year on the issue on the other side of the aisle. There are plenty of questions on this side of the aisle with respect to the DNC.

Let's find out where the trouble was and correct it. But that is not the only place there is trouble on the campaign trail. Let's also investigate the growth of these 501(c)(3) organizations that some in politics have created to get tax-exempt money and use it in the political system. Let's follow that string wherever that leads.

In my judgment, there are a substantial number of questions that need to be addressed by investigators in that whole range of areas. Once we start down this trail, let's make sure we follow the fresh trail all the way to the end, not just take a look at one little building or another little building. Let's look at all of it.

I say to those who are concerned about it—and I am concerned about it—the first step ought to be for us to come to the floor of the Senate—we could do it this afternoon or early next week—and decide there is too much money in politics and we ought to limit campaign spending.

The Supreme Court says that is hard to do, but there are mechanisms by which we could do it. If Republicans and Democrats decided to create a system in which there were voluntary spending limitations, we would limit spending in campaigns, and we would solve a lot of these problems.

We have some folks trotting around here who think there is not enough

money in politics. They say we spend more money on washing machines and dog food than we do on politics, suggesting somehow that politics is a commercial activity like everything else, just buy and sell.

Our political system is our democracy. It ought not be for sale. What has happened to money in politics is that it has ratcheted up out of control in an exponential way, and it is time for us to put some limits on campaign spending. Let's limit campaign spending, and let's make it stick. There is too much money in politics, and we can do the American democratic system and the American public a real service if we would, on a bipartisan basis, decide to come together and support campaign finance reform that has real and effective spending limits.

Yes, it can be done and it ought to be done today, tomorrow, next week or next month. We do not need \$6 million or 80 investigators to do that. All we need is the will to decide there is too much money in American politics and we ought to limit campaign spending.

Take a look at what has happened with campaign spending relative to the consumer price index in this country. You will see the consumer price index has risen a bit and campaign spending has risen out of sight. There is too much money in politics, and we ought to adopt a bill that the President will sign that limits spending in our political system.

Some won't like that, I suppose. We have one party that spends twice as much as another party. I suppose they would say, "We have a 2-to-1 advantage, so why would we want to do that?"

We ought to do it to clean up the political system. The fact is, there have been abuses on both sides. Any abuse ought to be investigated, and we ought to investigate it thoroughly. Let's not take one little cause of abuses and say, "All right, let's drive our trucks over there and send all our investigators over there." Let's look at all the whole thing. Let's look at 501(c)(3)'s using tax exemption and trying to contravene the law. Let's find out how they have done it, why they have done it, and what laws they have broken. If we are going to have an investigation, we ought to open that investigation, make it aggressive and don't limit the vision.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we are going to have a vote on a constitutional amendment to balance the budget very soon. Some discussion on the floor of the Senate in the last day or so said that those of us who believe that when we put a provision in the Constitution requiring a balanced budget, we ought not enshrine in the Constitution the requirement to use the Social Security trust funds to balance the budget, because we think it is dishonest budgeting. They say, those of us

who believe that, that is an accounting gimmick; just an accounting gimmick, they say.

There are two to three dozen folks over in the House of Representatives now, I am pleased to say, on the Republican side who are saying exactly what some of us have been saying for some long while, that it is not honest budgeting to collect money from paychecks of workers, call it Social Security taxes, tell them we promise we will put it in a trust fund, and then use it as an offset for other revenue so you can claim the budget is in balance when it isn't.

To those who say this is an accounting gimmick, I ask one question: Why is it that when those who want to use this device of misusing Social Security trust funds to balance the budget, why is it when their budget is balanced, the Federal Government will still borrow \$130 billion more that year? Why, if your budget is in balance, is the Federal debt still growing?

The answer: The debt is still growing when those who advocate this practice claim the budget is in balance because the budget is not in balance. It is a ruse. It is a charade. More than that, it is misusing money that if you did it in the private sector, you would be on your way to some minimum security installation, because you can't do it in the private sector.

If you run a business and say to your employees, "I will put money away in a pension program for you, but, by the way, I had a loss in my business this year so I am going to take your pension money and offset it against my loss so I can say to people that I haven't lost any money," what happens to you isn't very pretty, because that is against the law.

That is exactly what is proposed we enshrine in the Constitution, by saying that we should take the Social Security trust funds and declare them revenue with all other revenue and then declare that we have balanced the budget.

In the same year when we declare we have balanced the budget, we will have to increase the debt limit because the debt is still increasing. And when the folks in North Dakota or Wyoming or New Mexico or elsewhere ask us the question, "If you have balanced the budget, why did you have to increase the debt limit?" I want to be around for the answer, because the answer is, the budget was not balanced.

I think fiscal discipline is a pretty good thing. I come from a small town, a small school, a small State. We believe in fiscal discipline. I am pleased I have been one of those who cast votes to reduce the Federal budget. The deficit is down 60 percent in the last 4 years. The last 4 years in a row it has been down. I cast tough votes to do that.

I will continue to do that. I will cast a vote in the coming weeks to support a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. But I will not cast a vote

that puts something in the Constitution that is wrong. And it is fundamentally wrong to suggest that we take that balance of trust funds every year and use it to balance the budget.

In 1983, I was on the House Ways and Means Committee. Mr. Greenspan, at that point, headed a commission to make recommendations on Social Security funding. The commission recommended that we begin to accumulate a pool of savings so that when the baby boomers retire, there will be some money in the Social Security system to pay for their retirement. That is going to be the maximum strain on the Social Security system.

So we began to accumulate a surplus this year. We will collect \$70 billion more in Social Security than we spend from that same system. Why? Because we designed to save that.

I will ask any of my colleagues on the floor whether double-entry book-keeping means you can spend it twice. Can you claim you are saving it when in fact you use it over here with ordinary revenue and claim you use it to balance the budget? The answer is "no". There is no study, no set of studies in this country, that allows you to make that claim.

That is why, when we have a vote on a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, we will vote on two of them. One I will vote for and offer along with colleagues, and one I will oppose. That is the one that says, let us enshrine in the Constitution a practice that I think is fundamentally dishonest budgeting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. DORGAN. I wanted to visit some other issues today. I shall not do that and will wait until next week.

REAUTHORIZATION OF ISTEAL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, one issue I want to visit is the need to reauthorize the ISTEAL program or the highway program in this country. It is important for States like North Dakota.

I notice the Senator from Alaska is on the floor. He will, I am sure, have the same feelings about this that I have. We are large States in land mass, small States in population. We have a need to construct a network of highways still across our States for interstate commerce and for a whole range of needs, but we have a very small tax base with which to do it.

We have seen developed in this discussion who are the donor States and who are the donee States with respect to highway moneys. Well, that is largely irrelevant to me. If they want to ship fresh fruit and frozen fish from Boston to Seattle, do they want to ship them on gravel roads through North Dakota and Wyoming? I do not think so. We want to maintain and develop a National Highway System that works

for everybody. That means that we need, as small States in the debate on this highway system, fairness for the highway needs for our States.

I will just say that as we work through this debate in the coming weeks and months, those of us who come from States like North Dakota and Wyoming and Alaska and others are going to be working very hard to make sure that we are treated fairly in this reauthorization. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alaska.

SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, 105TH CONGRESS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations held its organizational meeting on January 28. Among other business conducted, the Committee approved subcommittee assignments for the 105th Congress. I submit a list of the subcommittees and their membership for the 105th Congress, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBCOMMITTEES

Senator Stevens, as chairman of the Committee, and Senator Byrd, as ranking minority member of the Committee, are ex officio members of all subcommittees of which they are not regular members.

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Senators Cochran,¹ Specter, Bond, Gorton, McConnell, Burns, Bumpers,² Harkin, Kohl, Byrd, Leahy. (6-5).

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, AND JUDICIARY

Senators Gregg,¹ Stevens, Domenici, McConnell, Hutchison, Campbell, Hollings,² Inouye, Bumpers, Lautenberg, Mikulski. (6-5).

DEFENSE

Senators Stevens,¹ Cochran, Specter, Domenici, Bond, McConnell, Shelby, Gregg, Hutchison, Inouye,² Hollings, Byrd, Leahy, Bumpers, Lautenberg, Harkin, Dorgan. (9-8).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Senators Faircloth,¹ Hutchison, Boxer.² (2-1)

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT

Senators Domenici,¹ Cochran, Gorton, McConnell, Bennett, Burns, Craig, Reid,² Byrd, Hollings, Murray, Kohl, Dorgan. (7-6)

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Senators McConnell,¹ Specter, Gregg, Shelby, Bennett, Campbell, Stevens, Leahy,² Inouye, Lautenberg, Harkin, Mikulski, Murray. (7-6)

INTERIOR

Senators Gorton,¹ Stevens, Cochran, Domenici, Burns, Bennett, Gregg, Campbell, Byrd,² Leahy, Bumpers, Hollings, Reid, Dorgan, Boxer. (8-7)

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION

Senators Specter,¹ Cochran, Gorton, Bond, Gregg, Faircloth, Craig, Hutchison, Harkin,² Hollings, Inouye, Bumpers, Reid, Kohl, Murray. (8-7)

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Senators Bennett,¹ Stevens, Craig, Dorgan,² Boxer. (3-2)

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Senators Burns,¹ Hutchison, Faircloth, Craig, Murray,² Reid, Inouye. (4-3)

TRANSPORTATION

Senators Shelby,¹ Domenici, Specter, Bond, Gorton, Bennett, Faircloth, Lautenberg,² Byrd, Mikulski, Reid, Kohl, Murray. (7-6)

TREASURY, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Senators Campbell,¹ Shelby, Faircloth, Kohl,² Mikulski. (3-2)

VA-HUD-INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

Senators Bond,¹ Burns, Stevens, Shelby, Campbell, Craig, Mikulski,² Leahy, Lautenberg, Harkin, Boxer. (6-5)

¹ Subcommittee chairman.

² Ranking minority member.

SUBCOMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

SENATOR STEVENS

Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary
Defense (Chairman)
Foreign Operations
Interior and Related Agencies
Legislative Branch
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies

SENATOR COCHRAN

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies (Chairman)
Defense
Energy and Water Development
Interior and Related Agencies
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies

SENATOR SPECTER

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies
Defense
Foreign Operations
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies (Chairman)
Transportation and Related Agencies

SENATOR DOMENICI

Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary
Defense
Energy and Water Development (Chairman)
Interior and Related Agencies
Transportation and Related Agencies

SENATOR BOND

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies
Defense
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies
Transportation and Related Agencies
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies (Chairman)

SENATOR GORTON

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies
Energy and Water Development
Interior and Related Agencies (Chairman)
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies
Transportation and Related Agencies

SENATOR MCCONNELL

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary
Defense
Energy and Water Development
Foreign Operations (Chairman)

SENATOR BURNS

Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies
Energy and Water Development
Interior and Related Agencies
Military Construction (Chairman)
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies