

should be deciding them. That is what votes are about. Once they have been totally explored, we look forward to making a decision and not to obstruct a decision.

I look forward very much to the continuing efforts on the part of this body to respond to voters, responding to the people in this country in making decisions on major items, in the first opportunity in many years we have had to explore finding ways to do things in a better way.

I think the war on poverty is a good example. It has been going on for what—30 years? Twenty years? The fact of the matter is we are less well off now than we were then in terms of the things that the war on poverty was designed to resolve. It makes it pretty clear, if you want different results, you have to start doing things differently. You cannot expect different results by continuing to do the same thing.

So I look forward to the continued discussion. I look forward to dealing with the issues that the House has dealt with. However the majority here decides to deal with them is fine; I just suggest we come to grips with them, that we move forward, that we do not lose the momentum of an election, that we do not lose the interest and the interest of the American people in taking a look at questions like a balanced budget amendment, like line-item veto, like term limits, like accountability. All of those are issues that really deserve our best attention and final decision.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed as if in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

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

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL IN TAMPA BAY

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate the birth of one of baseball's two newest members, the Tampa Bay Devil Rays. The Tampa Bay community was awarded a franchise last Thursday and will commence play in 1998. This is a very important and welcome, celebrated event for our State and particularly for the 2 million citizens of the Tampa Bay area who have been waiting a long, long time for baseball to come in the summer.

For many years, the Tampa Bay area has been home to spring training baseball, and for many years there has been the hope and expectation that baseball would not terminate as the teams left

to begin the regular season. That expectation will now be soon realized. This comes after many years of effort. The quest for a major league team began in 1977 with the formation of the Pinellas Sports Authority, an organization that has had as its goal to bring a major league franchise to the Tampa Bay area.

Since that time, there have been efforts to secure seven different franchises. In each case, there was the hope and the expectation that the franchise would be relocated to the Tampa Bay area, and then for a variety of reasons that hope was crushed.

The latest attempt occurred several years ago when an actual contract was signed for the relocation of the San Francisco Giants to Tampa Bay, and this contract was subsequently canceled by action of the other major league teams.

During the course of this activity, working with the various series of major league baseball commissioners, the city determined that it was in its interest and would advance its potential as a major league franchise by proceeding to construct a state of the art domed stadium, which has now been completed, which is utilized for other sports activities and which stands ready with modifications and final refinements to be the home to the new Tampa Bay Devil Rays professional team.

In achieving this success, there were many people who were active. I would like to particularly express my appreciation to the managing general partner of the new team, Mr. Vince Naimoli, who, over a period of setbacks and frustrations, remained constant in his commitment to bring major league baseball to Tampa Bay. There have been many officials with the Saint Petersburg city government who have been active in helping to realize this objective.

I should like to recognize Saint Petersburg City Administrator Rick Dodge, who, from the very beginning, has played a crucial role in helping to move toward the completion of the stadium and maintaining a high level of community support behind the effort to receive a major league franchise. He is illustrative of dozens of others—elected officials, city administration officials, and the citizens of Pinellas County—who have worked so hard to bring this to a successful realization.

Madam President, we are proud of the recognition of this awarded franchise to the important position which the State of Florida plays in major league professional athletics. With this award, our State will now have nine major league franchises in baseball, football, basketball, and hockey, second only to California in the number of professional major league teams playing in the State. This is appropriate to the size and rapid growth of our State and its demonstrated support for professional sports.

Madam President, I thank the major league baseball ownership for awarding this franchise to Tampa Bay. They have demonstrated wisdom in doing so because I am confident that this will quickly become one of the strongest franchises in major league baseball. There is a certain degree of optimism in accepting a major league franchise in the context of the current labor-management status, but I am confident well before 1998 we will be playing major league baseball again in America and look forward to the day when the Tampa Bay Devil Rays open their first season.

Madam President, thank you for affording me this opportunity to make these remarks on behalf of the citizens of our State and the event that we have long looked forward to celebrating.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended for 10 additional minutes, and that I be recognized for that period of time.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Chair.

REPORTING OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I rise today to comment on the RECORD made earlier this morning by my distinguished colleague from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI, the chairman of our Budget Committee. Let me say at the outset that I have the highest regard for Senator DOMENICI. He is very conscientious, very hard-working, and very honest in his beliefs and his work in the Senate. So in rising I do not intend to reflect on him, but rather to reflect on Charles Krauthammer's recent article concerning Social Security that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico included in the RECORD.

So there will not be any trouble referring to it, I ask unanimous consent that the article of Charles Krauthammer entitled "Social Security 'Trust Fund' Whopper" of last Friday, March 10 be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 10, 1995]

SOCIAL SECURITY "TRUST FUND" WHOPPER

(By Charles Krauthammer)

Last week, Sens. Kent Conrad and Byron Dorgan managed to (1) kill the balanced budget amendment, (2) deal Republicans their first big defeat since November and (3) make Democrats the heroes of Social Security. A hat trick. How did they do it? By demanding that any balanced budget amendment "take Social Security off the table"—

i.e., not count the current Social Security surplus in calculating the deficit—and thus stop “looting” the Social Security trust fund.

In my 17 years in Washington, this is the single most fraudulent argument I have heard. I don't mean politically fraudulent, which is routine in Washington and a judgment call anyway. I mean logically, demonstrably, mathematically fraudulent, a condition rare even in Washington and not a judgment call at all. Consider:

In 1994 Smith runs up a credit card bill of \$100,000. Worried about his retirement, however, he puts his \$25,000 salary into a retirement account.

Come Dec. 31, Smith has two choices: (a) He can borrow \$75,000 from the bank and “loot” his retirement account to pay off the rest—which Conrad-Dorgan say is unconscionable. Or (b) He can borrow the full \$100,000 to pay off his credit card bill and keep the \$25,000 retirement account sacrosanct—which Conrad-Dorgan say is just swell and maintains a sacred trust and staves off the wolves and would have let them vote for the balanced budget amendment if only those senior-bashing Republicans had just done it their way.

But a child can see that courses (a) and (b) are identical. Either way, Smith is net \$75,000 in debt. The trust money in (b) is a fiction: It consists of 25,000 additionally borrowed dollars. His retirement is exactly as insecure one way or the other. Either way, if he wants to pay himself a pension when he retires, he is going to have to borrow the money.

According to Conrad-Dorgan, however, unless he declares his debt to be \$100,000 rather than \$75,000, he has looted his retirement account. But it matters not a whit what Smith declares his debt to be. It is not his declaration that is looting his retirement. It is his borrowing (and overspending).

Similarly for the federal government. In fiscal 1994, President Clinton crowed that he had reduced the federal deficit to \$200 billion. In fact, what Conrad calls the “operating budget” was about \$250 billion in deficit, but the treasury counted the year's roughly \$50 billion Social Security surplus to make its books read \$200 billion. According to Conrad-Dorgan logic, President Clinton “looted” the Social Security trust fund to the tune of \$50 billion.

Did he? Of course not. If Clinton had declared the deficit to be \$250 billion and not “borrowed” \$50 billion Social Security surplus—which is nothing more than the federal government moving money from its left pocket to its right—would that have made an iota of difference to the status of our debt or of Social Security?

Whether or not you figure Social Security in calculating the federal deficit is merely an accounting device. Government cannot stash the Social Security surplus in a sock. As long as the federal deficit exceeds the Social Security surplus—that is, for the foreseeable future—we are increasing our net debt and making it harder to pay out Social Security (and everything else government does) in the future.

Why? Because the Social Security trust fund—like Smith's retirement account—is a fiction. The Social Security system is pay-as-you-go. The benefits going to old folks today do not come out of a huge vault stuffed with dollar bills on some South Pacific island. Current retirees get paid from the payroll taxes of current workers.

With so many boomers working today, pay-as-you-go produces a cash surplus. That cash does not go into a Pacific island vault either. In a government that runs a deficit, it cannot be saved at all—any more than Smith can really “save” his \$25,000 when he

is running a \$100,000 deficit. The surplus necessarily is used to help pay for current government operations.

And pay-as-you-go will be true around the year 2015, when we boomers begin to retire. The chances of our Social Security benefits being paid out then will depend on the productivity of the economy at the time, which in turn will depend heavily on the drag on the economy exerted by the net debt that we will have accumulated by then.

The best guarantee, in other words, that there will be Social Security benefits available then is to reduce the deficit now. Yet by killing the balanced budget amendment, Conrad-Dorgan destroyed the very mechanism that would force that to happen. The one real effect, therefore, that Conrad-Dorgan will have on Social Security is to jeopardize the government's capacity to keep paying it.

Having done that, Conrad-Dorgan are now posing as the saviors of Social Security from Republican looters. A neat trick. A complete fraud.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, it really disturbed me when I saw our two distinguished Senators from North Dakota, Senator DORGAN and Senator CONRAD, described as being tricky, or outright fraudulent.

It's getting difficult to serve in the Senate. You have the Speaker of the House calling some Senators “liars.” You have some of our colleagues parading in front of the Capitol with a poster containing the pictures of some Senators and a headline at the top saying, “Wanted for flip-flopping.”

But if we want to get past the grandstanding and get to the truth of the matter, what we were trying to do was to keep our word by protecting Social Security. The American people should know that the real flip-floppers are those who voted in 1990 to protect Social Security but were willing to sacrifice it under the language of Section 7 in House Joint Resolution 1.

Charles Krauthammer's Social Security article is, to use his own language, the single most fraudulent article that our friend, Mr. Krauthammer, has written because he equates an individual with a \$100,000 debt with the Government having a \$100,000 debt. He claims that an individual borrowing \$25,000 from a retirement account and borrowing the remaining \$75,000 from the bank is in the same position as the Government borrowing its \$25,000 from the Social Security account and the remaining \$75,000 from the markets. But here's the difference. In borrowing \$25,000 from his retirement, the individual is truly at zero because he has borrowed his own money. In the Government's case, the budget is not balanced because the \$25,000 has been borrowed from future retirees.

Madam President, the Social Security surpluses were planned in 1983 with a special FICA tax to bring in funds in excess of the immediate need. We were not just trying to balance the Social Security budget. There was an affirmative intent that more moneys than were necessary would be collected so that we could build up surpluses and provide for the baby boomers that will retire early in the next century. The

idea of the Greenspan Commission was that a sufficient Social Security reserve or trust be built up so that there would not be a call on general revenues. Of course, what has been happening, Madam President, is that administrations, Congresses, and columnists have all engaged in the deceptive reporting by using the Social Security surpluses to diminish the size of the deficit. This charade does not eliminate the deficit, it merely moves the deficit from the Federal Government over to the Social Security fund.

Of course, this trick does not eliminate the deficit. Already, \$464 billion has been moved—by the year 2000 the Government will owe Social Security \$1 trillion. As a result, the baby boomers, who are presently being taxed to pay for the Social Security of persons who have reached 72 years of age, like this particular Senator, will have to be taxed again to receive their benefits.

In addition, Mr. Krauthammer's claims that the Social Security system is a pay-as-you-go program. But as the record will show, that is not the case. In fact, Senator PATRICK MOYNIHAN and I were the ones who offered an amendment to put Social Security on a pay-as-you-go basis, but that effort was defeated.

Moreover, in 1990 the distinguished former Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator John Heinz, and I, were successful in passing legislation forbidding the use of Social Security trust funds to mask the size of the deficit. It remains on the books as section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act. Thus, I might point out that what Mr. Krauthammer calls a fiction and a fraud is actually a law that was signed by President George Bush on November 5, 1990.

Mr. Krauthammer knows full well the Congress would never have voted the tax increases for Social Security in 1983 if these revenues were to be used to spend on foreign aid, welfare, or the deficit. He disregards the representation by the sponsors of the balanced budget amendment that Social Security trust funds will be protected. He disregards the formal resolution by Senator DOLE, the majority leader, requiring that the Budget Committee demonstrate how the budget can be balanced without using Social Security funds. He disregards the formal statutory law that requires this, and he fails to mention that the two Senators he chastises joined with three others in a formal letter of commitment to vote for the balanced budget amendment if the protection for Social Security were included.

To quote Mr. Krauthammer, “A neat trick. A complete fraud.” That is the trick and that is the fraud that has ensued here within the National Government.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled, “Stop Playing Games With Social Security”

that appeared in the Columbia, SC, "The State" as of yesterday, March 12, 1995.

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

STOP PLAYING GAMES WITH SOCIAL SECURITY
(By Senator Fritz Hollings)

"Nobody, Republican, Democrat, conservative, liberal, moderate, is even thinking about using Social Security to balance the budget."—Sen. Trent Lott, R-Miss., "Face the Nation," Feb. 2

In the recent weeks of floor debate and television interviews, many senators repeatedly pledged not to use Social Security funds to balance the budget.

They even passed an amendment by Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole to instruct the Budget Committee to develop a budget that didn't use Social Security funds but would conform with the constitutional balanced-budget amendment.

In the meantime, while Dole was struggling to pick up one vote to pass the amendment, five Democrats vowed they were ready, willing and able to vote for Social Security. In fact, the night before the vote, the five sent Dole a letter of commitment to vote for the amendment if Social Security were protected.

On March 2, the constitutional amendment failed by one vote. And over that weekend on "Face the Nation" Dole again reaffirmed his intent on Social Security when he said, "We are going to protect Social Security."

If he remains that committed, why did he refuse to put his word on the line in black and white on March 2 and pass a constitutional amendment by at least 70 votes? Because he knew that accepting the five Democratic votes would have cost him an equal number of votes of Republicans determined to spend Social Security surpluses on the deficit.

Dole didn't want to expose his Republican troops or expose the truth. While Republican rhetoric pledged to protect Social Security, Sen. Pete Domenici, chairman of the Budget Committee, and other Republicans were telling Dole that the budget could not be balanced without using Social Security surplus funds.

All of this word-battling—of saying one thing in public and trying to work around it in private—has led Americans to believe that there is a free lunch, that all we have to do to eliminate the deficit is to cut spending. The vote on Social Security exposes this myth.

Republican senators have no real intent on eliminating the deficit; they just want to move it from the federal government to Social Security.

Currently, Section 13.301 of the Budget Enforcement Act prohibits the use of Social Security funds for the deficit. But part of the balanced-budget amendment would repeal current law.

Even with all the promises tendered to correct Social Security with future legislation, any civics student knows you can't amend the Constitution with legislation. That's why the five Democrats—me included—insisted on including Social Security protection in the wording of the constitutional amendment.

Dole's stonewalling against our five votes on the constitutional amendment reveals another harsh truth: \$1.8 trillion in spending cuts is necessary to balance the budget in seven years. But many senators reveal their intent to use Social Security surpluses when they state that only \$1.2 trillion is necessary.

Let's face realities: There won't be enough cuts in entitlements. A jobs program for wel-

fare reform will cost. Savings here are questionable.

You can and should save some on health reform, but slowing the growth of health costs from 10 percent to 5 percent still means increased costs. Social Security won't be cut, and any savings by increasing the age of retirement would be allocated to the trust fund, not the deficit.

Both the GOP's "Contract with America" and President Clinton have called for increases in defense spending. Results: No savings.

Therefore, savings must come from spending freezes and cuts in the domestic discretionary budget.

Coupling these cuts and freezes with a closing of tax loopholes still isn't enough to meet the target of a balanced budget in seven years. That's why Domenici has determined that Social Security funds will have to be used.

But using Social Security won't eliminate the deficit. It simply would increase the amount we owe Social Security. Already we owe \$470 billion to the trust fund. If we keep raiding it, the government will owe Social Security more than \$1 trillion by 2002.

Harsh realities. But there's a fifth and even harsher reality. All of the spending cuts in the world aren't politically attainable now. Domenici knows it's hard to get votes for enough cuts. To his credit, he tried in 1986 with a long list of cuts by President Reagan and the Grace Commission. But he got only 14 votes in the Senate.

Rep. Gerald Solomon, a New York Republican, also tried a list of \$1 trillion in cuts just a year ago in the House. He got only 73 votes of 435.

In addition, the problem of balancing the budget with spending reductions is exacerbated by the "Contract With America's" call for a \$500 billion tax cut.

The reality today is that a combination of cuts, freezes, loophole closings and tax increases must be cobbled together to put us on a glide path to balancing the budget. Now is the time to stop the finger-pointing, the blaming of the other guy. Now is the time to stop dancing around the fire of changes in the process.

It's a pure sham to think that a constitutional balanced-budget amendment will give Congress discipline.

If you put a gun to the head of Congress, it will get more creative. The proof is in the pudding that's being cooked all over town.

Some tout abolishing departments, like Commerce and Education. But their functions would continue somewhere. Others say send everything back to the states. But that way, the states would pick up deficits instead of the federal government.

Of course we know some want to use \$636 billion in Social Security funds. And there's talk of picking up \$150 billion by recomputing the Consumer Price Index and another \$150 billion of re-estimating the growth of Medicare and Medicaid.

There are even those who want one-time savings, like selling the electric power grid or switching to the capital budget system.

In other words, there are people throughout town who are figuring out ways to make the federal budget appear balanced with hardly any cuts. With a balanced-budget amendment, they would be able to play this game for seven years.

Time out!

The gamesmanship, the charade, must stop. If this nonsense goes on for seven years, the United States will be down the tubes.

For all the talk about eliminating the deficit, the debt snowballs. Why? Because we add \$1 billion a day to the debt by borrowing to pay interest.

In January and throughout February, I offered 110 spending cuts or eliminations from domestic discretionary spending. This was worth \$37 billion in the first year and put deficit reduction on the glide path toward a balanced budget by 2002.

But even if these politically impossible cuts were agreed upon, the interest cost on the debt is growing at more than \$40 billion a year.

The United States is in a downward budget spiral and we are meeting ourselves coming around the corner. Like the Queen in "Alice in Wonderland" told Alice: "It takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!"

Let's get past all the shenanigans. Let's include Social Security protection in the balanced-budget amendment. Then we could pass the amendment and get down to the hard work of balancing the budget.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, this article brings right into true focus exactly what is going on.

If, as Mr. Krauthammer says in this particular article, it was just "a fiction", then why not just include this exception in the language of the constitutional amendment?

The distinguished leaders of the legislation willingly accepted an exception for borrowed funds. The distinguished leaders of the balanced budget amendment willingly accepted the provision dealing judicial enforcement in order to pick up the one vote of the Senator from Georgia.

Why, Madam President, did they not accept five votes when all they had to do was put in black and white what they were publicly saying? There are five Senators who are ready, willing, and able to vote for a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget if they include a provision protecting Social Security funds.

The real flip-floppers are those who have abandoned their position taken in 1990 that Social Security funds should not be used in deficit calculations. It is very difficult to get that message out, but we will keep hammering. The distinguished majority leader says that he will continue to bring this up. I look forward to that debate and can likewise promise that this Senator will continue to push for language that excludes Social Security from deficit calculations.

I yield the floor.

EULOGY TO GLEN P. WOODARD

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, Glen P. Woodard, the former vice president and director of community affairs for Winn-Dixie Food Stores, died on January 25, 1995, after an extended illness. As Winn-Dixie's community affairs director, Glen was widely known by food industry leaders and politicians for his handling of legislative and regulatory activities at both the State and national levels.

He moved to Florida at a young age, attending high school there and college at the University of Florida. He served in the U.S. Air Force 306 Bomb Group during World War II. Prior to joining