

the conservation of wildlife. It is incumbent upon us to maintain those forests in the healthiest condition possible.

Unfortunately, throughout the country, and particularly in the intermountain west, forests are in poor shape. Persistent drought, disease, and insect infestation have created stands of dead and dying trees that pose a serious risk of fire. The forest fires that last summer burned thousands of acres of forest throughout the West and claimed the lives of men and women of the Forest Service provide bleak evidence of the problem. If we are to manage national forest ecosystems in ways that provide the services that Americans have come to expect, supply them in a sustainable manner and support the diversity of habitat needed to maintain fish and wildlife, then we must confront the forest health issue squarely.

Senator CRAIG will soon introduce the Federal Lands Act Health Amendments of 1995, which is intended to establish a more deliberate and timely process for dealing with forest health problems. I commend Senator CRAIG for focusing attention on forest health and look forward to continuing our collaborative effort on this issue and on the broader issue of ecosystem management. As a result of the Craig bill and the forthcoming discussions that it will generate, I expect Congress to develop a reasonable and effective response to this problem.

Over the last 2 years, as chairman and ranking member of the Senate Subcommittee on Agricultural Research, Conservation, Forestry, and General Legislation, Senator CRAIG and I held hearings on the management of the Federal lands. The subcommittee held two hearings on ecosystem management, a third on the new appeal process, and a fourth on the issue of forest health.

From those hearings, and through my experiences in working with wildlife managers, members of the timber industry and environmentalists, it has become clear that federally managed forests in some areas of the country suffer from problems related to drought, past mismanagement, and insect infestation and disease. The high incidence of tree mortality and fires in some national forests suggest that we still have much to learn about the causes of these problems and how to manage these complex systems.

The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management should place a higher priority on dealing with forest health problems before they become worse. To do so effectively, several important steps should be undertaken.

First, forest health problems need to be better defined. We must develop a shared vocabulary so that all those interested in maintaining healthy forests can work together in common cause.

Second, scientific research should be conducted to identify problems and evaluate options. Only by relying on

sound scientific data can we hope to proceed in an effective and defensible manner.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, we must set priorities. We must focus our attention on areas of greatest need, while ensuring that other issues are managed to prevent future problems.

And fourth, solutions must be developed and implemented in a timely manner.

Again, I appreciate Senator CRAIG's foresight and diligence in bringing to the attention of Congress the issue of forest health. This is a complicated issue that involves important objectives such as maintaining species habitat, ensuring that insect infestations and diseases are within a natural and healthy range, preventing soil erosion, and safeguarding the overall long-term sustainability of forest ecosystems.

The bill to be introduced by Senator CRAIG provides a valuable framework for addressing these critical issues. It will force Federal agencies to identify lands at risk and take concrete steps to improve forest health on those lands. In the long-run, the public should benefit by management activities taken as a result of this bill.

Senator CRAIG has expressed a desire to move this legislation through the necessary committees as expeditiously as possible. I support this goal, and look forward to participating in Agriculture Committee hearings on the bill. Concern has been raised that the legislation as currently written may provide overly broad discretion to the Federal agencies and that it may in some cases overburden those agencies with new responsibilities at a time when budget cuts hinder their ability to accomplish existing responsibilities. These issues merit further attention. Also, it is my hope that the Senate will examine the question of whether the bill assures sufficient opportunity for deliberation and analysis by the agencies and input by the public.

I look forward to working with Senator CRAIG to examine these questions and to move this bill through the appropriate committees and to the floor this year, so that we can begin to address forest health in a systematic, deliberate, thorough, and effective manner.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

REID AMENDMENT TO THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the amendment to the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that has been offered by the senior Senator from Nevada, Senator REID, and others of us. The purpose of the amendment is to protect the Social Security trust fund from being looted as part of an effort to balance the budget.

Mr. President, I think it is important for people to ask when we are considering a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution: What budget is being balanced? That is what this first chart asks. What budget is being balanced?

In order to answer that question, I think it is helpful to go to the actual language of the balanced budget amendment that is before us. And if you look at the language, it says very clearly:

Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States Government except those derived from borrowing. Total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States Government except for those for repayment of debt principal.

So, Mr. President, it is very clear that what we are dealing with with respect to the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution is that all of the moneys coming into Federal coffers are being jackpotted. They are all being put in the same pot. Whether they are trust funds or not trust funds, it is all being put in the same pot. And then we are going to look at those total receipts and compare it to total outlays.

I prepared this chart. This is kind of the teapot of the Federal Government budget. It shows the revenue that goes into the pot, and the revenues are the individual income taxes that are raised. That provides about 45 percent of the revenue of the Federal Government. All social insurance taxes go into this pot, including the revenue that is taken out of people's paychecks every month that is supposed to be for Social Security. All of that money is going into the pot. Social insurance taxes are about 37 percent of the revenue of the Federal Government. Corporate income taxes go into the pot. That is about 10 percent of the revenue of our Government. All other taxes are 8 percent.

And then we look on the other end of the ledger. We look at what comes out of the spending spout of the Federal Government. And here is the spending breakdown. About 22 percent of the outlays of the Federal Government go for Social Security, 16 percent is interest on the debt, 16 percent for defense, 14 percent for Medicare, 7 percent for Medicaid, and other, 25 percent.

So one can see in the balanced budget amendment that is before us what goes into the pot is all of the revenue and what goes out the spending spout are all of the outlays.

The problem with this balanced budget amendment is that in using all of the Social Security income in counting whether or not you are balancing the budget, Social Security is not contributing to the deficit. Social Security is in surplus. And Social Security is in surplus for a reason. The reason is to prepare for the time when the baby boom generation retires. Because then these Social Security surpluses are going to turn to massive deficits. And

so the reason for accumulating surpluses is to prepare for the time when the baby boomers retire.

The problem is, the money is not being saved. The problem is, under the balanced budget amendment that is before us, we are going to put into the Constitution of the United States that those Social Security surpluses, instead of being saved, will be looted in order to give us a balanced budget or contribute to balancing the budget.

Mr. President, this chart shows, just over the 7 years that the balanced budget amendment is to lead us to a balanced budget, how much of the Social Security surplus will be taken each and every year.

This is the amount of Social Security trust fund money that will be looted in order to balance the budget.

In 1996, \$73 billion of Social Security surplus will be taken. We can see each and every year those surpluses are mounting. They are increasing. Under the terms of the balanced budget amendment that is before this body today, unless it is altered by the Reid amendment, every one of these dollars is going to be taken. Every one of these dollars will be looted in order to contribute to balancing the budget. That is profoundly wrong, Mr. President.

We can see, as I said, \$73 billion of surplus from Social Security in 1996, \$78 billion in 1997, \$84 billion in 1998, \$90 billion in 1999, \$96 billion surplus in the year 2000, \$104 billion of Social Security surplus in the year 2001, and \$111 billion of surplus in the year 2002.

Every nickel of that surplus taken, not to have a fund that is available when the baby boomers retire; but no, every penny taken in order to contribute to balancing the budget.

Mr. President, let me just say that if any chief executive in this country stood up before his board of directors and announced that in order to balance the operating budget of the company, he was intending to loot the retirement funds that were held in trust for his employees, he would be headed for a Federal facility, and it would not be the Congress of the United States.

I said the other day that this amendment, as drafted, the balanced budget amendment before Members, as drafted, would make the Rev. Jim Bakker proud. Remember Rev. Jim Bakker? He went to a Federal facility, the Federal prison. He went to Federal prison for fraud. The fraud he was conducting was to raise money for one purpose and to use it for another. That is precisely what is being contemplated in the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution that is before Members today. That is fraud. It is fraudulent to tell people you are raising money for one reason, namely, to build a trust fund surplus that is available for them when they retire, but on the other hand not to create the surplus at all but to loot the fund and to use it for other spending.

We would be putting in the Constitution of the United States that that is

what would be done. Mr. President, that is so profoundly wrong I cannot even fathom how those who have written this amendment think it ought to be included.

There is not any financial institution in this country that would accept for one moment the notion that we should take trust fund moneys and use them to balance an operating budget.

Mr. President, I showed the surpluses, \$636 billion, that are contemplated under the balanced budget amendment that is before Members today to be used to help balance the budget over the next 7 years. That is a small part of the story. That is just the next 7 years. The real larceny, the real theft, the real fraud, is far in excess of \$636 billion. That is just what will be taken in the next 7 years.

We know Social Security is going to be running surpluses for much longer than the next 7 years. In fact, it will be running surpluses out past the year 2020. When we look at the projected size of the Social Security trust funds out until the time the baby boomers have retired and start to draw down those surpluses, what one sees is simply staggering.

These bars on this chart show the Social Security surplus as it accumulates. It shows by the year 2000, there will be almost \$1 trillion of surplus. By the year 2010, \$2.1 trillion—not million, not billion—trillion. This is real money, 2.1 trillion of surplus; \$2.8 trillion by 2015; \$3 trillion of surplus by the year 2020.

Mr. President, when the baby boomers go to the cupboard to get their surplus, their retirement, they will find the money is all gone. It has all been used. It has all been looted to help balance the rest of the budget of the United States.

This will create a financial catastrophe for the future. That financial catastrophe will be when the baby boomers retire. Having been made a promise, they will find no one can keep the promise, because in order to pay back this money, the tax increases would have to be so draconian, or the cuts in benefits so draconian, that the people of the United States would simply revolt.

Mr. President, this chart shows what has happened in terms of the growth of payroll taxes both for Social Security and Medicare from 1940 out until the present. What one can see is that these regressive taxes have been increased very dramatically over this period of time in order to make these funds supposedly add up.

The problem again, of course, is that these increases, these increased taxes that have been levied on the American people, have been used. And they have been used to balance other parts of the Federal budget. Or at least to reduce the deficit of other parts of the Federal budget.

One reason that this is profoundly unfair is because, in essence, what has happened is people are being taxed on

their payroll, on the amount of their wage earnings, and they are having an increasing amount taken out. They are being told, "We are taking this increasing amount because we have to run a surplus; we have to get ready for the time when those of you who are in the baby boom generation retire." That makes sense.

Unfortunately, what we say and what we do are two completely different things. We are not running surpluses in order to prepare for the time when the baby boomers retire. Instead, we are taking that money, we are taking those surpluses, and we are using it to offset other spending. So, in effect, what we are doing is levying a regressive payroll tax and using part of it, the part that makes up the surplus, to fund the other operations of Government.

In fact, 73 percent of all taxpayers today are paying more in payroll taxes than they are paying in income taxes. I think this may come as a shock to many people. It is true: 73 percent of all taxpayers are paying more Social Security payroll taxes than they are paying in income taxes. They are doing it because we have told them the money is needed to create surpluses to prepare for the time when the baby boomers retire. The fact is that that is not what we are doing. We are taking the Social Security surpluses, we are looting them, in order to reduce the deficit.

Now we have a proposal before Members in the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the organic law of this country, that would take this practice and enshrine it in the Constitution of our country. I cannot think of anything more inappropriate than to put into the Constitution of the United States that we are going to take trust fund surpluses and use them to help balance the operating budget of this country.

Mr. President, I come from a financial background. If anyone, as I was being schooled and taught how to properly manage finances, had told me, "You take trust fund money and you use that to balance other parts of a budget," that person would have been run out of the financial institution because everyone understands that that is absolutely inappropriate.

For Members to put into the Constitution of the United States that we will take trust fund surpluses and use them to balance the other parts of the budget is profoundly wrong. That is the reason the Reid amendment is so important, because it gives Members the chance to protect Social Security trust funds from being looted for other purposes.

Mr. President, I do not know of anything more basic than this concept. I do not know of anything that is more important when we are considering a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution than to make certain the trust fund moneys, Social Security trust fund surpluses, are not looted in

order to balance other parts of the budget.

So, Mr. President, let me just conclude by thanking my colleague, Senator REID from Nevada, for offering this amendment. There are others of us who have joined with him in offering this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho for yielding this time. What is the order of business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business under the current order is until 10:45.

FOREST HEALTH PROTECTION AND RESTORATION ACT

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Forest Health Protection and Restoration Act, to be introduced by Senator CRAIG, myself, and others. This is a bill that is very important to my State of Montana and whose time has come. Forest health and management is paramount to the economic stability and future of Montana and, of course, our neighbors who depend on these renewable resources which support our smaller communities in Idaho and Montana.

For too long, the various land managing agencies in the Federal Government have been telling us that there is not a problem with the health and vitality of our national forests and Federal lands. On January 20, I had a report placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding this very topic. It appears that the Forest Service had requested a report on the state of the health of western forests, and after review decided that the report did not meet the standards that they had desired, changing the report before its publication could reach Congress and the public. It is the intent of this legislation to make the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and all organizations more responsive to the oversight of Congress. I do not think that was the intent of the legislation. I am sure it was not.

This act, the Forest Health Protection and Restoration Act, recognizes the removal of the problems that crept into our forests as essential to the future of our Federal lands. This act acknowledges the plain and simple truth that overgrowth in our forests is a problem that must be faced in our lifetime. The removal of old and heavy undergrowth is essential to sustaining and developing a healthy forest for the future. The purpose of this legislation is to provide for the future through proper management and the authority to adapt a flexible decisionmaking process to our Federal lands for forest health.

We looked at our forests in the northern part of Idaho and the northwestern corner of Montana and advised the Forest Service and land managers years ago that if we did not do something with the biomass that was created by some dead and dying trees—we had a moth up there that killed a lot of trees—if those diseased trees could not be removed from our Federal lands, all we need is a dry year and a high lighting year, and we are going to experience the biggest fire season that we have ever had.

I am here to tell the American people, last summer we had that fire season. There were millions and millions of dollars in fire suppression spent, lives were lost and there was an estimate that there was enough timber lost to build thousands and thousands of homes in this great country, of which we still have a housing shortage.

I joined in sponsorship of this measure so that the citizens of Montana can have an opportunity to address their future. This bill when enacted will provide this chance. No longer will Montanans be at the mercy of the actions and whims of people many miles away, with no vested interest in the forests, lands that they tie up with numerous nuisance lawsuits. Under the powers granted within this measure, we will provide safety to those people under emergency designations that will allow forest management the ability to open, for health reasons, forests to treatments. This legislation will expedite the manner in which resource managers will be allowed to assist in therapy for the forests, which for years, have been left to their own devices, namely fire and disease, for treatment.

Last summer I saw in Montana the results laying in waste and ash, of the disregard that many have for proper forest health. Earlier in the year, during an Appropriations Committee hearing, I warned the leadership of the National Forest Service of the pending disaster waiting to occur in the forests of northwestern Montana. A disaster, which highlighted the occurrences if proper forest health issues were not addressed immediately. During one of the most costly fire seasons in history millions of dollars of taxpayer money was expended, and millions of feet of timber, to were lost to the fires that ravaged our national forests last summer. Lives were lost, private property destroyed or damaged; all because we did not address the need to maintain the health of our national forests.

We cannot return the forests to what they once were, hundreds of years ago before man set foot among the trees. The time has come when we can no longer allow fires to cure the needs of the forests of this country. There are many ills that can attack and destroy the trees and the beauty and health of our publicly owned lands. Nature can and will work to care and clean up the messes that we create, either through our own ignorance or neglect. The implementation of this legislation will

provide us the working tools to begin to look after the future health and welfare of our public lands. The work we are seeking to develop here is not to promote the wholesale depletion of the land, but to allow the country to use and develop a healthy forest using the renewable resources that are at hand.

This piece of legislation is very important to Montana, to the West and the Nation. For under this act we can, and will provide for the future of our national forests and Federal lands. By opening our eyes to the problems that lay among our forests we will see a cleaner, more vibrant and stable forest than we have for years. I ask my fellow Senators to act quickly on this measure and let us repair and rehabilitate the great forests of our country.

I congratulate my friend from Idaho for his work in drafting this piece of legislation because the time has come when we have to look at the way Mother Nature takes care of our forest and the way the forest has to be managed so that those resources can be enjoyed by all of America. We cannot afford another 1988, nor can we afford another 1994 when it comes to saving that great renewable resource that it takes to supply the vast majority of shelter in this country.

So I congratulate my friend from Idaho who has introduced this legislation. I hope that it will be considered in the committee very quickly and brought to this floor and passed out of the Senate for House consideration.

I would like to see this legislation become law this year because we still have diseased forests that are in danger to, yes, yet another year of drought and maybe disease that should be worked on right now. This is a renewable resource. It is a resource that is America's, and we cannot let it just to be wasted away.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before contemplating today's bad news about the Federal debt, let's do that little pop quiz again: How many million dollars are in \$1 trillion? When you arrive at an answer, bear in mind that it was Congress that ran up a debt now exceeding \$4.8 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, February 8, the total Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$4,805,605,149,692.51—meaning that every man, woman, and child in America now owes \$18,242.16 computed on a per capita basis.

Mr. President, again to answer the pop quiz question, How many million in a trillion? there are a million million in a trillion; and you can thank the U.S. Congress for the existing Federal debt exceeding \$4.8 trillion.