

to the Congress nine separate budget bills. We have one now, like the others, containing, in my opinion, some fairy-tale numbers, some rosy scenarios. They propose economics and delays into the next century when the spending cuts are actually going to take place, when it will be reduced.

Mr. President, 60 percent of the President's spending cuts are in the years 2001 and 2002 when we know, regardless of what happens this year, President Clinton will not be in office.

Spending will increase 25 percent from \$1.5 trillion this year to \$1.9 trillion in the year 2002. Spending will increase 25 percent, and the national debt will rise by more than one-third, from \$4.9 to \$6.5 trillion.

Think about that, Mr. President. From \$4.9 trillion to \$6.5 trillion we are increasing the debt. That is like increasing the balance on your credit card or increasing the overdraft, if your bank holds such an overdraft.

Although the deficit drops to \$158 billion this year under the President's proposed reelection budget, the deficit goes up to \$164 billion next year. This is our annual deficit. This means every year we are spending more than we are generating in revenue. We will spend \$164 billion more than we generate in revenue, yet we mandate the American public balance their checking accounts. The Federal Government goes through a budget process. Everything it needs, beyond what it generates in revenues, it gets by adding to the deficit to the tune now of increasing it from \$4.9 trillion—that is the total accumulated debt that has arisen as a consequence of the debts each year—we are going to increase that up to \$6.5 trillion.

I spent a little bit of time in the banking business before I got in the business of being a Senator from the State of Alaska. Interest costs are, I think, one of the most interesting and underrated considerations in this process, certainly among the more deceptive elements of the President's budget.

This year we are going to spend 14 cents of every \$1 of Federal spending on our \$235 billion interest bill—14 cents out of every \$1 of Federal spending. That costs us \$235 billion. Next year the interest costs are going to rise to \$238 billion. That is about 14.5 percent of the budget.

Interest is like having a horse that eats while you sleep. It continues throughout the night eventually eating faster than you can feed it. Interest does not employ anybody, does not provide any new jobs, and does not pay any taxes in that sense. It has to be addressed if you have debt. The United States has debt.

There is a rather curious process going on here. I will try and wind this up because I see my friend from Tennessee is on the floor as well. But the administration says that by the year 2002, interest costs are only going to be 12 percent of the budget and interest

spending will be down to \$223 billion. How is it possible for debt service costs to go down while the debt goes up from \$4.9 trillion to \$6.5 trillion? Is it lower interest costs? The President assumes flat interest rates at 5 to 10 percent on 10-year notes. So that is not it.

As I said, I used to be a banker. It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that if the size of your debt rises by a third and interest rates are flat, the amount of interest you are going to pay has to go up.

Why does that not happen under President Clinton? I wonder if we have rejected some of the principles of mathematics. The answer, Mr. President, is hidden in the back of the President's budget. I think this deserves the light of day. During the next several years, trust fund surpluses, especially the surpluses in the Social Security trust fund, rise by nearly \$1 trillion. For every \$1 of surplus, the Federal Government issues a special debt note—a debt note—to the trust fund that is not counted as interest under our budget rules. I would ask the Chair why. I am sure the Chair would have the same difficulty in explaining it.

But for every \$1 of that Social Security trust fund, which is going to be somewhere in the area of \$1 trillion, for every \$1 of surplus, the Federal Government issues a special debt note to the trust fund that is not counted as interest under our budget rules. That is \$1 trillion of debt service not counted in the President's budget.

If you counted the interest we will pay the trust fund on the \$1 trillion in new debt we owe the trust fund, as a consequence of that, going into the interest formula, the real interest figure would look more like \$350 billion as interest on the debt in the year 2002 instead of \$225 billion, which is what the administration would have us basically accept or believe in this proposal.

My point is, Mr. President, the administration projects the interest at 14.5 percent, or 14.5 cents on the dollar, when in reality it is 18 percent as a consequence of borrowing from the trust fund.

Mr. President, I will attempt to pursue this after the recess with some charts that I think will more visually show just what is going on here. The American public better be concerned because, as we look at greater portions of our total budget going for interest on the debt, we recognize we are going to have less for social needs and other priorities in our country.

This must come to a halt. It could only come to a halt by adopting a balanced budget. We still have not been able to convince the White House of the realism of a real balanced budget that will actually cut spending.

I thank the Chair and wish the Chair a good day.

Mr. FRIST addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

ORGAN DONOR AWARENESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to bring attention to an issue that is literally an issue of life and death. Mr. President, any one of the Senators here today or any member of our families, whether through accident or misfortune, could find ourselves needing a life-saving organ transplant operation tomorrow. If that should happen, we would be placed on a waiting list to join about 43,000 other Americans who right now, this very second, are waiting their turn—or their death if they never get that turn.

Since 1990, the number of people diagnosed as needing an organ transplant has doubled. Today, every 18 minutes a new name is added to this list of people waiting. By the end of this year, the list of people waiting for a transplant will be over 50,000 people long. But those are just the people that we know about, people who are lucky enough to have made it into the medical system, who have jumped through the financial hurdles of diagnosis and have been recommended to a transplant center.

The real numbers are even more staggering: Approximately 100,000 people—100,000 people—need an organ transplant this very year. Yet, only a small fraction of that 100,000 people will receive a transplant to live or to have a better quality of life.

In fact, every day eight people die because a donor, an organ donor, does not become available. We have 100,000 people that could benefit from transplantation, yet only one in five, about 20,000, will actually receive a transplant.

Why? Is it because donors must be a certain age or race or blood type or physical condition? Is it because of outdated State laws or Federal regulations? Or is it because it is difficult to qualify or to designate one's organs for donation? The answer to all three of those questions is no.

The reason can be summed up in four simple words: lack of public awareness. There are no limits for organ donation for any of the reasons I just mentioned. Every person is potentially a donor. Even those under the age of 18 can sign up with a parent's permission. Yet, tragically, there are only about 5,000 actual donors every year. Experts estimate that organ donation could be increased by 80 percent simply through better public education and awareness.

I began my training to become a heart and lung transplant surgeon 22 years ago. At that time, I could only dream of the science and the technology and the medical know-how that today is routinely used to save people's lives through transplantation or to give people a better quality of life. It is no longer an experimental procedure, but a life-saving, life-improving medical operation that is performed routinely in centers all over this country. Yet, today, for people who need a heart transplant, about one out of four die needlessly, senselessly because an organ donor is not available.

Now I am a U.S. Senator, now in a position to change and help people save lives through public awareness; and that is my goal, to bring public awareness in line with the advances in medical science and technology that we have today.

Together with my colleagues, Senator SIMON, Senator DEWINE, and Senator LEVIN, we have just launched a drive to focus congressional attention on organ transplantation and to encourage every Member of Congress to consider signing up as an organ donor. We ask them to do three things: First, learn the benefits of transplantation; second, consider signing an organ donor card; and third, and probably most importantly, discuss their decision with their next of kin and loved ones.

So far, more than a third of my colleagues in the U.S. Senate have done so, and more are adding their names to this list every day. On the House side, Congressman JOE MOAKLEY of Massachusetts is urging his colleagues to do the same. We must continue to do this because just as our list is growing, so too is that list of children and men and women who are waiting for that transplant procedure.

I want to urge today every one of my Senate colleagues and every Member of the House to perform that heroic, life-saving act, which is selfless, unselfish, and sign an organ donor card to give others a new chance at life. Our goal is 100 percent congressional participation.

The week of April 21 through the 27th is National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week.

That is one month from now. On Tuesday of that week we will be having hearings in the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, dedicated to this issue of public awareness surrounding organ donation, tissue donation, and transplant patients. We can start right here by recognizing that public policy—and we, as legislators—can only do so much. The problem is the shortage of organs. The solution is public awareness. Doing our part, here today, and over the coming months to raise public awareness will go a long way in helping us achieve our policy goals, as well.

The 104th Congress has been unparalleled in the amount of attention that we have been able to focus on the important issues now before our Nation. This is one of them. We have the opportunity to give the most important service you will ever give to fellow Americans. Be a hero. Join the fight, and save a life.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, over the last 30 years, we have greatly improved the environment in the United States. Our air and water in

this country is the cleanest it has been in 40 years. Now we are at a crossroads in environmental policy. We can preserve all of the environmental gains of the past three decades and move forward to assure our children a safer, cleaner, and healthier environment. But we will not be able to do it under the old top-down, command and control solutions from Washington, DC.

This approach is outdated and counterproductive. Rather than advancing our important environmental goals, the Washington bureaucracy and its extremist allies are actually harming the environment. Timber growers have been known to cut trees on the basis of even a rumor that their property might have an endangered species to be listed. Why? In order to avoid having Washington bureaucrats tell them they cannot cut down a tree that they have spent their lifetime harvesting.

In central Texas, the Fish and Wildlife Service originally suggested setting aside an area the size of the State of Rhode Island to protect the golden-cheeked warbler. In order to do that, they told the property owners they could not cut cedar trees. Now, cedar trees have another harmful impact on the people who must have water for our cultivation of lands and to drink, because cedar trees absorb water to a greater extent than most other trees. If you do not cut cedar trees, which our farmers and ranchers are trying to do as much as they can, the water supply dries up, and it affects the water supply of the city of San Antonio and affects the ability of farmers and ranchers to use their land. The size of the area is a ridiculous amount—the size of the State of Rhode Island for one bird, when we could have set aside a reasonable number of acres for its preservation.

In the Texas Panhandle, protecting a bait fish called the Arkansas river shiner may keep both the agricultural producers and municipal utilities from being able to have access to an adequate supply of water, even though there is a thriving population of the Arkansas river shiner in the State of New Mexico. Now, many of my constituents are a little fed up with a Government that gives snakes and salamanders priority over human beings and constitutional rights.

The Endangered Species Act has worked well as a means of focusing attention on the need to preserve plants and animals from extinction. There have been many successes for high-profile species, but the heavyhanded means that are being employed to preserve hundreds of subspecies are increasingly counterproductive. If we cannot rely on the support and cooperation of the people who live with the animals that we want to save, I think those animals' chances of survival are not very good. That is why I am making a priority of reforming the Endangered Species Act. We need to forge a new consensus about saving endangered species and making private

property owners stakeholders, not adversaries in the process.

The Superfund was created to identify and clean up hundreds of hazardous waste sites around the country, but the regulations written in Washington to govern cleanup are so complicated and cumbersome that almost no cleanup is getting done. Only 291, or about 25 percent, of the 1,238 worst hazardous waste sites have actually been cleaned up.

Where is the money going? Billions of dollars have gone into this. The money has gone to lawyers, consultants, and bureaucrats in Washington. That is where the money has gone that should have been going to clean up these hazardous waste sites. Companies contributing to the cleanup have spent 39 percent of their money on lawyers, 20 percent on negotiations, 9 percent on studies, and 15 percent on cleanup.

It is not just business that is being sued. The Catholic Archdiocese of Newark has been sued for a landfill in New Jersey. The archdiocese purchased land to expand its Holy Name Cemetery and inadvertently became potentially responsible for its cleanup. One landfill site in New York has 600 defendants, including an Elks Club, an exercise gym, two nursing homes and a kennel, which has a septic tank that needs to be cleaned.

Something must be done. We must put the money where it will benefit the public and the environment. This waste will go on and on unless we reopen the Superfund law and put some common sense back into it. Hazardous waste sites are local problems. We want to have a voice at the local level to be sure that the waste site in a town is cleaned up and made safe.

Unlike other major environmental laws, it is all handled by Federal bureaucrats, not the State and local representatives. While the lawsuits have gone on for years and years and the consultants and the bureaucrats argue endlessly about how many parts per million is acceptable, our children are at risk.

The Clean Air Act requires States and localities to meet a series of ambitious new pollution reduction targets in the years ahead. Achieving these goals will make the air we breathe cleaner and healthier. But the Washington bureaucrats have not been content just to set the standards. They are also trying to dictate how to achieve the goals, down to the smallest detail. In order to reduce auto pollution, emission testing requirements are part of the Clean Air Act. Rather than allowing States to decide, Federal regulators have been using threats to force States to set up entirely new automobile inspection networks, completely separate from the existing State auto inspection systems, and it is costing our consumers millions of dollars.

What we need to do, Mr. President, is achieve better protection of human health and the environment by regulating smarter. The fact is, businesses—