

the limit on how much oil Iraq can sell and making other changes to speed humanitarian deliveries. It is also said to call for revamping UNSCOM, with few details on what that means (evidently not much change is proposed). Saudi Arabia has lobbied for the plan vigorously at three meetings of the Gulf Cooperation Council and two other inter-Arab sessions. It is unusual for Saudi Arabia to be so bold at asserting leadership in the region, and even more unusual for Saudi Arabia to pursue the plan so tenaciously in the face of opposition from those in the region who want to distance themselves from the U.S.—British air strikes. Under the direction of the foreign minister, Prince Saud al-Faysal, the Saudis have successfully brought on board Egypt, which was initially skeptical.

The Saudi initiative underscores the convergence of U.S. and Saudi interests on Iraq. Although Riyadh was widely criticized in the United States for its reluctance to participate in the December air campaign, Saudi policy is in fact closely aligned with Washington's. For instance, the political commentator of the official Saudi news agency wrote, "The Iraqi people deserve and need a revolution" against "the tyrant of Baghdad," whereas in Egypt, another Arab country whose ruler Saddam attacked, the government confined itself to saying "the Iraqi leadership is primarily responsible for the Iraqi people's hardships." The reassertion of leadership in the region by Saudi Arabia, if sustained, would on many issues correspond well with U.S. interests.

Although it is unlikely that the Saudis will be able to convince enough Arab states to support their plan for the January 24 meeting of Arab League foreign ministers to endorse it openly, the United States should lend weight to the Saudi diplomatic effort. The Saudi effort focuses Arab attention on the issue most important for U.S. interests—how to relieve the suffering of the Iraqi people—rather than on the question raised by the French proposal, namely, how to water down inspections so as to win Saddam's assent.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I will ask the administration to take a different tact to tighten, rather than loosen, the Oil-for-Food Program, to veto U.N. plans that allow Saddam to use this money to finance nonhumanitarian purchases, and to strengthen oil interdiction and inspection operations, including adopting something like the "no-fly" zone with a "no-oil" vessel zone. Only by taking these measures can the U.N. finally cripple Saddam's regime and increase energy security for all Americas.

If we cut off Saddam's oil supply, we will bring him to his knees. That is the only way it will happen.

Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to comment on the Department of the Interior's Mineral Management Service proposed oil valuation rule.

Earlier this week, speaking with regard to the Administration's FY 2000 budget, Secretary Babbitt said, "We have met, and talked, and talked, and talked," about the proposed rule. But I submit that the only talking done by MMS has been at industry and at Congress, not with them. Mr. President, the proposed rule by MMS was unfair last year and it remains unfair.

Babbitt has declared that talks are "over" and that MMS is determined to issue its rule in June, when the Congressional moratorium expires.

This is simply unconscionable. The domestic oil industry is on its knees right now. But, again, this action by Interior is symptomatic of Administration attacks on the domestic energy industry.

The federal government should work to save marginal producers, not put them out of business. Yet that is just what Interior is doing by issuing an unfair royalty rule at a time when producers can least afford it.

I would ask Secretary Babbitt the following question: How many royalties can a bankrupt industry pay? I would also ask him if this rule is truly about raising revenue, or is it another Administration scheme to drive petroleum producers out of business. After all, 100 percent of zero is zero.

For the record, Mr. President, I will be speaking to MMS and looking into this flawed royalty rule.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, thank you.

THE PRESIDENT'S FY 2000 BUDGET

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come here today to talk about our Nation's first investment in the next century: the budget for the year 2000. I want to say how great it is that we are turning our attention to the issues that are important to America's families.

When I first came to Washington, DC, the deficit was \$290 billion. We had to make some very tough budget decisions to get the Nation's books back in balance. Now our economy is growing and it is strong. This year, the Office of Management and Budget projects a surplus to be \$79 billion. That is the biggest surplus in American history. It hasn't been easy to get to this point and we still have a lot of work to do.

Now we have to use this opportunity to make critical investments in our Nation's senior citizens and in our children. We have an obligation to ensure the dignity of the previous generation and to prepare the next generation for a successful future. The budget we have before the Senate will help us do that.

This budget keeps our commitment to save Social Security first. It will set aside more than 60 percent of the surplus to extend the solvency of the Social Security trust fund until 2055. And it takes important steps to protect older women who depend on Social Security, but must continue to work to supplement their incomes. This budget will increase their survivor's benefits after the deaths of their husbands and eliminate the earnings limitation.

This budget will strengthen Medicare and provide more stability. It also gives assistance to the elderly and disabled who need long-term care in their families by providing a \$1,000 tax credit.

We have to also make education a top priority. This budget provides des-

perately needed funds to fix our Nation's worn out schools and our over-crowded classrooms. It provides tax credits to help States and local school districts build and renovate public schools, and it continues our commitment to hiring 100,000 new and well-trained teachers. In addition, it provides flexibility at the local level for schools to ensure all children receive a quality education, and it calls for tough new accountability measures to hold schools and teachers to high standards.

This budget is by no means perfect. The funding for educating children with special needs is inadequate, and I will work to address this inequity. The Federal Government has made a commitment to meet 40 percent of the cost of educating disabled children, but we have yet to come close. As we work to improve our schools and raise our academic standards, we must not leave disabled children behind.

I know that as we go through the budget process we will have our disagreements, but I am looking forward to an open discussion of the issues and working together to accomplish a bipartisan agreement that serves the American people well.

This budget provides a real framework for action. I applaud the President's pledge to save Social Security and prepare for the challenges of a new century. Now we must move forward. The clock is ticking. It is time for us to work on the issues and the priorities of America's families.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Ms. COLLINS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, is recognized.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS and Mr. LEVIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 335 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next 60 minutes of morning business be under my control.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, the President has now given us his budget—quite a remarkable document.

I remember when the President came to speak to the joint session and said, "The era of big government is over." There was broad applause—not only in the Chamber but around the country. Now we are confronted—it is not nearly as spot oriented or media driven—but it is sort of the statement: "The era of big government is over" is over. He has taken that pronouncement and absolutely quashed it in this new budget—driven it in the ground never to be seen again. It was a 77-minute speech,

and it outlined 77 new Government spending proposals that amounted to approximately \$5 billion in new Government spending per minute. I am glad the speech wasn't longer.

In the President's budget, according to the New York Times, he proposed 81 separate tax increases totaling \$82 billion over the next 5 years. The effect of that would be to nearly nullify the limited tax reduction that the last Congress finally fashioned with this administration for which there was an enormous celebration on the White House lawn. This would virtually eliminate it.

The administration will describe these as "user fees." That is not new. Both parties have used that. But when you look down at what that means, it is quite interesting, Mr. President:

\$1.1 billion in airline fees. That means all traveling America is going to get a tax increase, if you ever get on an airplane.

Or \$504 million in food inspection fees. Who is going to pay that? Anybody who goes into the grocery store and buys a quarter-pound of ground beef, processed chicken, or milk; in other words, everybody.

Then we have \$200 million in new health care fees on providers and plans and doctors—no, not on providers, health plans, and doctors. That goes to patients. Patients will pay that.

So if you are buying food in the grocery store, if you are part of traveling America, if you have to go see your doctor, to a hospital, you are going to be the recipient of this \$1.1 billion in new taxes.

Now, he said there is tax relief in his budget. Well, the only way an American taxpayer would see one cent of President Clinton's so-called tax relief is if they agree to buy a solar panel or buy an electric car or engage in some other sanctioned Government behavior—this in the face of \$800 billion of non-Social Security surpluses that have been generated by our economy. The direct beneficiary of balanced budgets and financial discipline and disciplined spending has produced a vigorous economy which has produced massive surpluses for the first time in modern history, but this administration could not resist spend, spend, spend and could not find it in any frame to suggest, well, maybe some of this should be returned to the working people of America.

Mr. President, I see that we have been joined by Senator GRAMS of Minnesota to speak on the subject, and I am going to yield up to 10 minutes to Senator GRAMS of Minnesota to continue our presentation on this budget.

Mr. GRAMS. I thank the Senator. I appreciate the Senator from Georgia putting this effort together. I think it gets the information out about what this budget really does and does not entail.

Mr. President, I rise today to make a few observations about the President's millennium budget.

After a brief review, my conclusion is this:

First, in his quest to continue to offer something for everyone, the President's budget offers a lot of smoke and mirrors and a lot of accounting gimmicks.

Secondly, this budget is chock full of new spending, earmarks, and dozens of new ways for Washington to spend the tax dollars earned by working Americans. It is a blueprint for an even bigger federal government.

Thirdly, while I agree that the 62 percent of the projected surplus that belongs to Social Security should be reserved for Social Security, I do not agree with what the President seeks to do with the 38 percent of the surplus that represents tax overpayments.

He chooses to spend the vast majority of it and leaves only pennies on the dollar for very minor, tightly targeted tax relief plan that he was offered in the budget.

His plan is basically only token tax cuts that sound big, but the bottom line is it provides little or no tax relief.

Fourth, he proposes new taxes and user fees and takes tobacco settlement money from the states. Can you believe it—in times of surplus, he actually proposes to raise taxes even higher, and his budget spends the Social Security surplus he claims to wall off.

Finally, the President's budget does not save Social Security from bankruptcy.

Let me be a little more specific.

You don't have to look further than the way in which the President's budget deals with spending caps to determine if this is an honest budget.

As you know, President Clinton has repeatedly broken the statutory spending caps in the past to spend more for new and expanded government programs. Last year alone, the President and the Congress spent over \$22 billion of the surplus for alleged "emergency spending" in the Omnibus spending legislation.

Nearly \$9.3 billion in regular appropriations was shifted into future budgets. In my judgment, both of these efforts broke the caps, and that is why I opposed the Omnibus bill.

Also, I wish that Congress and the President could be as creative in cutting spending and cutting taxes as the President is in finding ways to spend more money for more programs.

According to the CBO, last year's budget—when alleged emergency spending is included—exceeded the spending caps by \$45 billion. Even without counting the emergency spending, we still exceeded the spending caps by \$29 billion.

Last year's irresponsible spending has made the spending caps even tighter for this year. In order to stay within the caps as required by law, we must cut spending by \$28 billion. This would require an approximately 5-percent across-the-board reduction of this year's discretionary spending.

Instead of cutting spending to comply with the law, President Clinton ac-

tually proposes significant spending increases to expand many of the existing programs and create many more new programs. These spending increases total over \$130 billion. Yet the President claims his budget does not break the spending caps.

How can President Clinton have it both ways? How can he have his cake and eat it, too? It is simple. He does it by budget gimmicks.

The President imposes new user fees and raises existing ones by \$21 billion, and then counts these taxes as "negative spending" rather than as revenues.

He also devotes presumed receipts from the state settlements with the tobacco companies and a 55 cents-per-pack federal tax on cigarettes to a variety of programs to avoid the spending caps.

However, it is far from certain these taxes will be accepted by Congress, so what we have is new spending without reasonable offsets.

The President also reclassifies the increased discretionary spending for expanded military retirement benefits, again, as mandatory spending. In addition, President Clinton speeds up the FCC's collection of spectrum auction payments.

Like last year, the President has again shifted some program funding—such as the Northeast multispecies fishery—into so-called "emergency spending" to further bust the budget. And he has severely under-funded some major programs such as Medicare, knowing Congress will restore the funds.

These decisions by the President are troubling. The more I review this budget, the more questions I have about how the President can propose so much new spending and claim that he will not break the budget.

President Clinton proposes to funnel 62 percent of the projected budget surplus which represents the Social Security surplus to the Social Security Trust Funds, 15 percent to Medicare, 12 percent to the so-called Universal Saving Accounts, and another 11 percent to increase other government spending.

The OMB estimates that we would have a \$12 billion on-budget deficit—that is without Social Security excess Surpluses—in FY 2000. This means we don't have any on-budget surplus to spend this year. All of the \$117 billion unified budget surplus is, in fact, Social Security surplus.

I don't know how I can say this more clearly. Despite the President's promise to save Social Security first, he is proposing to spend all of the Social Security surplus.

Moreover, not only has the President manipulated the numbers, but he has also included enormous increases in existing programs and created many new programs, including entitlement programs.

Without counting government user fees, the actual size of the government has reached \$2 trillion, not \$1.8 trillion, as the President claimed in his budget.

I am sure there is much more hidden spending and hidden taxes in this 2,600 page budget.

With all of these spending and tax increases, President Clinton fails to provide any meaningful tax relief for working Americans. His targeted tax cuts reward only a few, with too few dollars. And again, in times of surplus, the President is proposing to raise taxes.

Now, I would like to just show a little cartoon that I brought with me that I think kind of explains this. As the cartoon suggests, President Clinton doesn't want to give any of the non-Social Security surplus to hard-working, overtaxed Americans because he believes he can spend it better on his own priorities. As the cartoon says: It seems we have grossly overcharged you, so let me explain how we intend to spend the money.

When you go to a restaurant and overpay the bill, you expect to get the change back. Here the taxpayers have overpaid, and I think they can rightfully expect that they should get the change back and the surplus should go to the taxpayers and not to the bureaucracies in Washington.

In fact, satisfying the President's spending appetite would squeeze an additional \$80 billion from working Americans as tax increases. So, in times of surpluses, tax increases.

Mr. President, Americans today are taxed at the highest level in history, with nearly 40 percent of a typical family budget going to pay taxes on the Federal, State, and local level.

They tax it when you earn it. Tax it again when you save it. Tax it again when you spend it. Tax it again when you invest it. And tax it yet again when you die.

No wonder Americans feel overtaxed!

But under the President's budget, the Government will collect more taxes from working Americans in the next five years. Total taxes will reach over \$10 trillion. Federal tax revenues will grow faster than spending, consuming 20.7 percent of GDP, a historic high since World War II.

This is wrong. More spending and more Government is not the answer. The answer lies in tax cuts that return power to the taxpayers and leave a little more of their own money in their pocket at the end of the day.

That is why I, along with Senator ROTH, introduced S. 3, the Tax Cuts for All Americans Act, the one bill that will do the most to help America's working families. Our plan will cut the personal tax rate for each American by ten percent across the board.

The broad-based tax cut is simple and fair. It is pro-family and pro-growth. If President Clinton wanted to make a strong statement for working Americans, he should have made this broad-based tax cut the centerpiece of his budget.

My last point is that despite his claim to have made Social Security solvent, and despite the fact that he

will pour general funds into Social Security, Mr. Clinton's budget does not and will not save it. This budget does nothing to address its long-term unfunded liabilities.

In what Chairman Greenspan has called a very "dangerous" approach, it has the Government invest any surpluses in the stock market for Social Security.

In my home state of Minnesota, taxpayers are already expressing their frustration with the notion that, in the case of retirement security, Washington knows best.

Let me quote one thing here. Patrick Garofalo of Apple Valley wrote the following letter in yesterday's St. Paul Pioneer Press:

I am a big boy. I no longer live with my parents. The government trusts me to own a gun.

It trusts me to choose my state and congressional elected officials. It trusts me to make decisions about the welfare of both of my children. If it trusts me to make these important decisions, why does not it trust me to decide how I want to save for my retirement?

Please don't tax me to death while you "help" me. Let me keep my money. I will decide where and with whom to invest my nest egg.

I could not have said it better myself.

Mr. President, the Administration's budget will not meet the challenges of a new millennium but rather lead us down the path of fiscal disaster. Congress can and will do better.

We will produce a budget that preserves and protects the Social Security surplus; we will give the non-Social Security surplus back to taxpayers as major tax relief and debt reduction; we will have a blueprint that leads this nation into the 21st century.

I appreciate the Senator from Georgia yielding me this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, and I now yield up to 5 minutes of our time to the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Georgia. I have just a few brief thoughts on this budget that has been submitted to us. The President's budget says we are going to have about a \$4 trillion surplus over the next 15 years. He has said, and we agree, that we should fix Social Security first. We are going to do that. He believes that we ought to set 62 percent of the surplus aside for fixing Social Security. Again, we agree, because that is about what Social Security receipts are provided.

But when we got his budget message and when we heard his State of the Union, we didn't see a fix to Social Security. We saw new gimmicks, financial gimmicks, borrowing more money. And under this plan that he has presented, while we are supposedly running these surpluses that will amount

to \$4 trillion, we are going to have to raise the debt ceiling within a couple of years because he is issuing more bonds. We are going to borrow our way into solvency for Social Security. Nobody has explained yet how that is going to work. But it is clear that he has not proposed any responsible reform of the Social Security system to make sure it is there. We in Congress are going to have to develop a plan. I believe we will. It is going to take some of the surplus, 62 percent. I think that we must do that because we owe that not only to those who are retired now and those who are about to retire, but to the baby boomers and others coming along who want to see retirement security.

So we have 38 percent. What do we do with the remaining 38 percent of the surplus? I have spent a lot of time. I traveled around the State of Missouri many, many days listening to and talking with people, telling them: We finally got that budget deficit monster slain. What should we do with the surplus we are going to start running? And they had two very strong ideas. They said, No. 1, pay off the debt. We started to pay off the debt. If it hadn't been for the President's having invested some \$20-plus billion in spending last year, we would have paid off \$20 billion more.

Frankly, around this place there is nothing quite so tempting as an unspent surplus. If you don't return it to the taxpayers, it is going to get spent. We already have a historically high tax rate as part of our gross domestic product, the highest it has been since the end of World War II. And we are continuing to take more and more money. We need to have tax relief. That is the other thing that the people of Missouri say: We want tax relief; lower, simpler, flatter taxes.

Small businesses spend 5 percent of what they take in just figuring out how much they are going to have to pay in taxes. That is before they pay taxes. It is too complicated. It is too high. It discourages economic activity. Those who made fun of the capital gains tax relief and objected to it now have to admit that reducing capital gains brought more economic activity and brought a tremendous increase in capital gains revenue. If we give families and small businesses the opportunity to keep some of their money, do you know what? They can spend it better than we can in Washington, and that is what I propose we do.

But the President is not content with a \$4 trillion surplus. He wants to increase Federal Government revenues by raising taxes. And on top of that, he is going to spend it all, he is going to spend more of it, he is going to spend \$100 billion in new spending. He busts the cap. He even raids the tobacco settlements from the States because he has so many good ideas on how to spend it.

Mr. President, I do not believe the people of America want those good ideas. It is unbelievable, \$4 trillion in

surplus yet every dollar of it spent, then more taxes are added. This is a classic example of the Federal "Father Knows Best," requiring the States, localities, and most of all the families, the working men and women in America, to play "Mother May I?"

Let's take a look at education, something I think is a top priority, and the President says it is a top priority, too. It is about that point where we diverge 180 degrees. The President wants to be your local school superintendent. Do you know, we have over 763 Federal education programs. The system is not working now. We have too much Federal bureaucracy, too much Federal red tape. Yesterday the President told the school board members who were in town from school boards all across the country, he said, "Listen to what they are saying in the schools." I have. Do you know what they are saying? Do you know what educators and the administrators and school board members are saying? "We have too much Federal regulation and dictates. We spend too much time on misplaced Federal priorities."

That is why I want, and I think my colleagues want, to return dollars directly to the classroom. Do not run it through the bureaucracy in Washington, DC. Don't even run it through the State bureaucracies. It is the school districts that have to make the decisions. They are the ones that know the kids' names. They are the ones that know the strengths of the kids. They are the ones that know the challenges they face. Let them make the decisions and take the Federal handcuffs off of local educators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 5 minutes has expired.

Mr. BOND. I ask for 1 more minute?

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Missouri.

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

Mr. BOND. One final item I need to get in. Last year, we worked very hard for a Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century, or TEA 21. I led the fight with Chairman JOHN CHAFEE and Chairman JOHN WARNER to make sure we put the trust back in trust fund; that is, we told the American people that we would send back, for highways, the money in the trust fund as it increased. In this budget he proposes more boutique programs. He wants to go back on the promise we made last year. We have great highway needs and there is absolutely no reason to get more Federal programs when it is the States who need to build the highways. We need to start over again on transportation and education and make some sense out of this budget.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Missouri. I now yield up to 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

I wish to join my colleagues in expressing our deep concern at this administration's misleading and potentially damaging budget.

Now that we have finally gotten our fiscal house in order, turning huge deficits into significant surpluses, I am troubled, as a lot of our colleagues are, that the administration is seeking to turn the clock back to the bad old days of tax and spend that got us in financial trouble in the first place.

I think the Senator from Missouri very effectively outlined some of the inadequacies of this budget.

This budget includes \$1.7 trillion in new Government spending, with the potential of trillions more, despite the President's agreement to set budget caps. And despite the President's frequent calls to save Social Security first, it does nothing to save this crucial program.

Finally, this budget includes no significant tax cut for the hard-working American families who brought us out of the age of deficits and into the present age of surplus. With the \$4.5 trillion in anticipated surpluses, this administration could not find—in its budget, or in its heart—the wherewithal to give anything back to the American people, and that, Mr. President, is simply shameful.

I know my colleagues and I will be speaking a great deal in the coming weeks about the need for tax cuts, and I know the Presiding Officer will be one of those speaking often about this topic. But today, I want to focus on one particular aspect of the President's budget that would do great damage to our system of Government and to our States, my State of Michigan in particular.

Last November, 46 States and the tobacco companies reached a settlement in their long-running litigation. The Federal Government neither initiated nor helped the States financially in these suits. Yet now, the Clinton administration wants to divert \$18.9 billion of the settlement to its own uses.

The Federal Health Care Financing Administration, HCFA, wants to seize this money under legislation allowing it to recoup Medicaid overpayments. But no Medicaid moneys were allocated under the tobacco settlement. This seizure is a raw exercise of Federal power, dangerous to our liberties and our form of Government.

In addition, the administration's actions promise costly litigation and first hits those least able to fend for themselves: State Medicaid patients whose funding would be seized by HCFA.

Of course, the administration claims that it will use the State's moneys to benefit everybody. Once again, this administration believes it is better able to spend money than are those actually entitled to it; in this case, the States.

A number of States already have acted in reliance on the tobacco settle-

ment, putting forward proposals that will greatly benefit their constituents. For example, in my State of Michigan, Governor John Engler has proposed to endow a merit award trust fund with Michigan's share of the settlement, at least a portion of that settlement.

Under this program, every Michigan high school graduate who masters reading, writing, math, and science will receive a Michigan merit award, a \$2,500 scholarship that can be used for further study at a Michigan school of that student's choice. Another \$500 would be available for seventh and eighth grade students who pass their State tests, bringing the total available for higher education in Michigan to \$3,000 for students who work hard and learn the basic skills needed to move on to higher education.

We need programs like Michigan's to help kids do well in school and get ahead in life. The Federal Government should be learning from these kinds of programs. It should not be taking money out of the pockets of Michigan's young people to put into the pockets of Washington bureaucrats.

We must protect the rights and the people of our States by seeing to it the tobacco settlement money stays where it belongs and where it will do the most good—in the States.

That, Mr. President, is, in my judgment, one of the many inadequacies in the President's budget. I certainly intend to work very hard here in the months ahead to make sure these tobacco settlement dollars go to the States where the priorities can be set that make the most sense to the people of the States. They are the ones who fought this litigation and won it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAMS). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Michigan, and I now yield up to 10 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia for his time, and I appreciate his organizing this discussion of the President's budget, because it has some very serious problems, even though we are in superb fiscal times now and it appears the President has put forward a budget which will create for us into the future some fiscal problems of an enormous extent. Many of these relate to his so-called "resolution" of the Social Security issue. Let's talk a few numbers to begin with.

What the President has proposed in Social Security does virtually nothing to address the underlying problem of Social Security. The underlying problem of Social Security, of course, is we have the post-war baby boom generation that begins retiring in the year 2008, and that generation is so large in

physical numbers that it overwhelms the capacity of the younger generations to support it. Has the President addressed that? No.

What the President has done is put forward a major accounting gimmick which is, basically, a proposal that has no substantive effect on the underlying problem, but gives them the capacity, through bookkeeping, to claim that they have addressed the problem.

The President has proposed that we take the present surplus, which is projected in the Social Security fund, of about \$2.3 trillion and keep that in the Social Security fund. And then the President has proposed a brand new commitment from the general fund to the Social Security fund, a new bookkeeping entry which amounts to new debt of another \$2.8 trillion. The practical effect of that, of course, is that nothing happens. But the political effect of it is that the President can claim that by making this bookkeeping entry, he is extending the life of the trust fund for another 8 years or so.

Let me try to explain it through this pie chart, because it is a complicated little shell game. It is not a little shell game, it is the biggest shell game ever played in the history of this country, actually.

This is the spending which is projected relative to the surplus over the next 15 years. There is \$2.3 trillion for Social Security in the President's proposal: \$700 billion for Medicare, \$500 billion for new USA accounts, and \$500 billion of new spending items. Notice there is no tax cut in here for Americans. He decided to skip that for the next 15 years, but that is another issue other Members will talk to. Essentially, that is how he spends the \$4.4 trillion surplus, which is projected for the next 15 years.

However, in his accounting process, he also spends another \$2.8 trillion, which is these new notes that he credits to Social Security. Why does he do that? He does it essentially because he wants to claim he has expanded the size of the Social Security trust fund so he can extend this life expectancy out. But this doesn't exist. This is a bookkeeping event. What it does do is it creates a huge new debt which will have to be paid by later generations to the Social Security trust fund.

The practical effect of that debt is that he will be increasing the tax obligations necessary to support the Social Security trust fund as we move into the later years by huge numbers.

Beginning in the year 2025, it will take an extra \$360 billion in order to maintain the trust fund, and this will have to come from the general fund, which means it will have to come through tax increases. This is in order to meet the obligations created by this new \$2.8 trillion bookkeeping entry.

In the year 2035, that number jumps to \$786 billion. That is just 1 year, coming out of the general fund into the Social Security trust fund. The implica-

tions of this are staggering. It moves up to a figure of \$2.07 trillion—that is a 1-year number—in the year 2055. The implication is staggering, because it does two things.

First, it creates this huge pressure on the general fund which inevitably leads to a huge tax increase. Secondly, it creates a whole new dynamic for the Social Security system. The Social Security system has never gone into the general fund in order to support the Social Security system. That is not the concept of the Social Security system. The Social Security system has always been a trust fund. This creates the Social Security fund as a fund that has a drain basically on the general fund.

This all comes down to basically, in my opinion, sham accounting. And you don't have to take my word for it. Ironically, in a spurt of honesty and truth in accounting, the President's submission to the Congress of its budget had this language at page 336. I think it is worth reading.

(The Social Security Trust Fund) balances are available to finance future benefit payments and other trust fund expenditures—but only in a bookkeeping sense. . . .

So somebody at least down at OMB had the integrity to acknowledge what they were actually doing. They were creating a bookkeeping event for the purposes of claiming an extension of the Social Security trust fund.

They do not consist of real economic assets that can be drawn down in the future to fund benefits. Instead, they are claims on the Treasury that, when redeemed, will have to be financed by raising taxes—

Which is the item I pointed out here, the trillion dollars in the year 2045, for example—

borrowing from the public, or reducing benefits or other expenditures. The existence of large trust fund balances, therefore, does not, by itself, have any impact on the Government's ability to pay benefits.

If I had written a critique of what the President proposed, I could not have done a better job. Somebody on his staff had the integrity to truly write the critique, and by mistake, I suspect, they slipped it into the President's budget submission. I am sure they are upset now that it is in there. But it is an accurate statement of what they have done. This is a bookkeeping entry, the practical effect of which will create huge outyear chaos.

Why is that? Common sense tells you why it is. You can't address the problem of the Social Security issue with mirrors. You can't say that a problem that is created by having a huge generation retire is going to be solved by having a bookkeeping event occur in the budgeting processes of the Federal Government. But that is what this President would like us to believe.

In fact, if you look at the President's proposal on Social Security, as he put it forward, it has absolutely no substantive impact on the underlying problem. He first uses this double-counting event, which does nothing—in fact, it potentially aggravates the

problem dramatically in the outyears—and, secondly, suggests we should take the trust fund and invest some portion of it, 15 percent of it, under Federal management in the marketplace, which will create, potentially, havoc, basically a nationalization of our stock market, potentially havoc in our stock portfolios throughout the country, as Chairman Greenspan has correctly pointed out. And then he proposes two specific things to do, both of which cost more money. He proposes we raise the earning limits, which is a good idea; and he proposes we address the problem of elderly women who are at the low-income levels, which is a good idea. But neither of those help the Social Security solvency issue. They actually aggravate the Social Security solvency issue.

So his proposal on Social Security is the largest shell game ever put forward in the history of the world and does absolutely nothing to substantively improve the problems which we have with Social Security as we go into the next 20 to 30 years. And those problems are huge.

A number of us on our side of the aisle—and I notice Senator DOMENICI is here—have put forward proposals which are substantive, which are legitimate, which address the fact that this is a demographic-driven event and which must be addressed. But we can't move forward with our proposals if the President is going to be so irresponsible with his proposal. The fact is his proposal is used primarily for the purposes of pushing another political agenda. Trying to lower the ability of this Congress to address tax cuts is the primary political agenda behind this proposal, in my opinion. It does nothing as a constructive voice on the issue of Social Security and Social Security reform; and thus it is a great disappointment. And I think the White House is going to go back to its drawing board and come back with another idea, another proposal, if it expects the legacy of this President to be a correction of the most significant fiscal policy which faces this country, which is the Social Security crisis in which we are headed.

I thank the Senator from Georgia for his courtesy.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New Hampshire, not only for his presentation today but for all of his work on this great question before the country embraced in Social Security.

I now yield up to 7 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, thank you. And let me thank Senator COVERDELL for chairing the special order today to talk about a very important debate which this country is now just beginning to engage in; and that is, the debate over the Federal budget for the

next fiscal year and for the near future of the next 10 years.

The reason I say it is an important debate—and I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire—if not the most important debate we will become involved in in this decade is that it is long term. What we do in this budget sets a trend line, clearly establishes a standard of performance for how Government operates and how taxpayers are treated in our country.

So for the next few moments I am going to dwell on that, because I can't deal with the specifics of this budget yet, not in the detail that the Senator from New Mexico, who is the chairman of the Budget Committee, is going to in a few moments. He is the expert. He teaches me what is in this budget. And I listen very closely.

But let me tell you, there are some fundamentals that I hope the public will come to recognize as this debate goes on, that within the budget surplus there are two surpluses. About 62 percent of that surplus is generated by Social Security tax, Social Security tax revenue. And that 62 percent the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States agree ought to be dedicated to reforming and strengthening the Social Security system. So if you will, that is surplus I.

There is a second surplus, and that is a surplus that is generated by other taxes, including the taxpayers' income tax. And that represents about 38 percent of the Federal budget. It is on that percentage that this Republican Senate at this moment is proposing, amongst other things, a significant tax cut for the taxpayers of the country.

I am very proud to stand on the floor, along with a lot of my colleagues, and say that a decade and a half ago we began an argument to force our Government to balance its budget. We were told at that time, in the early 1980s, that wasn't going to happen, just wasn't going to happen in my lifetime. In fact, I had an elder statesman in the House—I was serving in the House—after I delivered this House speech on balancing the budget on the floor, tap me on the shoulder, and he said, "Kid, you ain't gonna live long enough to see a federally balanced budget." And then he went on to say, "Why would you want to do it? Look what you can do with Government spending to expand the economy, to create all these neat things." And I looked at him and smiled and said, "To reassure your election."

Well, that was less than 20 years ago. In fact, that was about 14 years ago when that statement was made. And today the budget is balanced. Today we are now arguing over how to spend the potential trillions of dollars of surplus that will be generated by that budget.

When I was arguing the balanced budget idea in the early 1980s, along with a lot of my colleagues, there were some fundamental reasons why we were doing it: No. 1, to control Govern-

ment. Because we saw an all-increasingly expanding, powerful Federal Government as a damper on the rights and freedoms of the citizens of our country. More Government, less freedom; more programs, less control, less opportunity on the part of the average citizen. So that was one of the reasons. The other reason was to turn this economy on.

In all fairness, Mr. President, I don't think any of us ever knew how much you could turn the economy of this country on if you did just two things: If you balanced the Federal budget, that is called fiscal policy, and if you kept monetary policy in line with it; and if you rewarded the workers by allowing them to keep more of their own money called taxes.

We have been able to do all of those things in combination. And what happened? We turned this economy on. We fueled it in a way that was really beyond our imagination.

In fact, a lot of us are looking at this strong economy today and saying, how can it last? Why is it so strong even in light of all the things that are going on around us in a world economy that is dragging it down to some extent.

The reason it is strong is because the Federal budget is balanced, because monetary policy is in line with the Federal Reserve. Now the next step is to keep it strong and even stronger and to take overtaxed American taxpayers and make sure that they keep an ever larger part of their hard-earned money. That is the real difference between what the President proposes and what we are talking about.

Oh, yes, we have the fundamental disagreements on Social Security reform that the Senator from New Hampshire, who is now presiding, has just talked about, and those are fundamental differences. But with that 38 percent that is left, the President plans to spend it all in one form or another. In fact, if you listened to his State of the Union in his budget message, he was like somebody handing out gifts in the form of government programs. A little here and a little there, going to benefit this, going to benefit that, going to expand here, and in the end, the world is going to be a happier place, and the President is going to be a more popular guy. Or so it went.

What he didn't say was that he actually was growing the potential of a Federal debt and deficit in combination again and that he was not offering substantive reform in the long term that would really benefit Social Security recipients, and most importantly, the young people of our country.

There is another premise with Social Security: No matter what we do we are going to protect the elderly. But what we have to do is assure that the young people of our country have a good investment in the future because Social Security today for a young person entering the work force is a lousy investment. There is very little returned for their money. So those are some of the dynamics of the debate at hand.

Mr. President, let me close with this thought—and I believe it sincerely, as somebody who has fought for a balanced budget, as somebody who is proud to see a balanced budget gained, and as somebody who has been very surprised over the strength of an economy that can be generated by the balanced budget and good, sound, monetary policy. It is simply this: I believe the President squanders the reward of a balanced budget. I believe the President squanders the hard work that we have done here to assure that the taxpayers of our country can have back even more of their hard-earned money. He not only squanders it in bad ideas, he squanders it by simply creating a greater liability on future earnings of our government or future taxes by our citizens.

We are standing at the threshold of a unique time in our Nation's history, a true opportunity to fix Social Security, to reform it, and to change it into a positive investment for the young people of our country while still continuing to hold safe and reward the elderly of our country for their hard-earned days, but also to assure long-term economic growth in our country that keeps our work forces working, that keeps our taxpayers happy, and that strengthens our country among other nations in the world.

That is an opportunity that can be accomplished with this budget. That is why I think what we are standing for today is the right direction and course for this country to take.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Idaho. I yield up to 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator DOMENICI of New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank Senator COVERDELL very much. I hope I will not use 10 minutes because there are other Senators here.

Let me say to the distinguished occupant of the Chair, Senator GREGG, I was here when he made his remarks. I think the most salient aspect of those remarks—while I agree with almost all of it—the most salient area can be formulated into a question.

My question is this: For at least 10 years we have been struggling in this land with commission after commission, study group after study group trying to tell us how we could repair Social Security so that it will be available in the next millennium, because of the terrible impact on that Social Security fund, of the actual demographics of America, and the baby boomers hitting pension time. Now, does it seem logical that after all of that discussion that essentially we don't have to do anything to save Social Security?

I asked the question so I can answer it because I believe everybody that is working so hard at it would say the answer is, no; you can't fix Social Security by doing nothing for or to or in any way reform or change it.

Now the only thing the President of the United States did in this budget is make a proposal that will never pass the Congress, that a tiny piece of this so-called surplus that belongs to Social Security be invested in the equities market of America by a government-controlled board, who would be subject to all kinds of pressures that would distort the market of America. I don't say that singularly. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has used far stronger words than these: that it won't work, that it will be detrimental. So in a sense, that is the only thing proposed.

Now, I am going to lower my voice and say, on the other hand, the President is going to say that he transfers some of the surplus of America to the Social Security fund and it is there and thereby it extends the life. But the Senator has so adequately stated, What is being transferred? In the end, what is being transferred is going to result in debts that have to be paid by somebody, some time, because we have neither enhanced Social Security by investing a significant portion in the equities market, nor have we, in any way, if one seeks to reform it otherwise, made any changes to it except to add to it.

Frankly, that is a missed opportunity. I think I might say it is a missed opportunity, perhaps, because of the clamor that we are in today politically.

I think last year the President was on the right track. He had meetings and bipartisan seminars and everybody went. They held one in Albuquerque, NM. And forthrightly, the President used to say to people who opposed investing it in the equities market, in as safe a way as possible, Why should the Social Security trust fund yield so much less to the Social Security recipients than investing in other pension plans? He used to ask that question when people were against investing it. What happened, however, as this budget came rolling through under the political turmoil that exists, the President sent us nothing but some words that say we hope we can work together.

I hope we can, too, because I think if we did it would be a far different proposal than what is in this budget, which is borderline nothing with reference to Social Security.

There are so many other things to talk about, but I am only going to talk about three and do it very quickly. Fellow Republicans, conservatives and moderate conservatives in America, this budget presents the best opportunity for those who think conservatively and Republican and moderately conservative, to present a basic issue that disagrees with the President and those who follow him in the Democratic Party.

My friend from Idaho, it is basically this: When you have a very large overpayment by the taxpayers of America, an unexpected tax burden that yields billions of dollars that were unex-

pected, that we don't need, that are now building up a surplus, what do you do with it? And one approach is to save it. The President says he is being conservative and saving it. But I add to that, saving it so it can be spent. And in some instances, spending it under the President's budget or give it back to the American taxpayers in proportion to how they paid it to us.

That falls simply under the rubric of a tax cut. I have explained it as well as I could as to why the time has arrived. Why is this an opportunity to debate a difference? Because if you don't give it back to the taxpayer, no matter what contortions you go through about transferring it to trust accounts with new IOUs and the like, it is available to be spent, and I am not going to be anymore positive about that, other than to ask another question: Does anyone think that that kind of surplus sitting around is going to really stay sitting around, or is it going to do something else? I submit that the President is on a path to showing us already that it is going to be spent.

My last one—I will do one additional one—is this: Anybody in this Chamber or across this land who has heard the President speak and has heard his budget presented, answer this question for me: Did the President propose spending some of the surplus which he is going to put into Medicare? Did he propose spending it for prescription drugs? Frankly, I surmise that already, among those who are interested, 95 percent would answer that question that he proposed spending it for prescription drugs. But that would be inconsistent with saving it, right? So, as a matter of fact, if you read his speech attentively and listen to two of his witnesses—OMB and Treasury—it is now obvious that he does not propose to spend any of it for prescription drugs.

But isn't it interesting? You put it in the trust fund to make the trust fund more solvent, but then you don't propose that any of it gets spent. That is what is going to happen to the surplus. That is one example—the big surplus, over and above the Social Security surplus. It is going to find niches in this country, special interest groups of all types, small and large, and it is going to be spent.

Now, are we undertaxed? Of course not. We would not have this kind of surplus if we were undertaxed. This surplus indicates what a surplus of this size should indicate, which is that tax receipts are very high. In fact, the total tax receipts of the Federal Government are the highest percentage of the gross domestic product that they have been in 50 years. You can pick pieces of the taxpayers and draw different conclusions for different groups. But essentially it is true that the total tax take is going up as a percentage of our gross domestic product, and that sends a signal: It is time to take a look and make sure you don't spend at that level, because then you move America into a high tax country. Our success is

not as a high tax country; our success is as a low tax country. That is why we are succeeding over and above other countries in the world.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for his presentation this afternoon.

I yield up to 3 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming, Senator THOMAS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have been listening with great attention to what we are talking about. Certainly, there is nothing more important before us now than the budget. We have heard all kinds of explanations, and we will hear many more. We will argue about the allocation over time. But it seems to me, as I think about it, that the idea of a budget is where we really set our priorities.

There is more to a budget than simply the question of where we spend every dollar. What we do with the budget is, we put into reality the things we would like to see in our Government. What size Government would you like to have? What do we do with respect to our working with the State and local governments? How does that fit? What do we do about taxes? Is there something we want to do there? I look at it as really an opportunity for us to, philosophically and from an ideal standpoint, look at why we are here and what it is we want to accomplish.

For those who want a simpler and smaller Government, does this budget do that? I don't think so. This is an increase in size. This is more Government. This is larger.

What if your goal was really to move more and more of the choices and more and more of the responsibility closer to people and State and local governments? Does this budget do that? No, I don't think so.

What if you want to really feel strongly about spending caps and say that this is the way you control spending? Does this budget stay with the caps that we argued so much about just 2 years ago? No, it doesn't do that.

If you had an idea that you would really like to take care of paying down this debt on a dependable program over a period of time, a little bit like, I suppose, a mortgage, and you wanted to do that, does this do that? No, it doesn't.

So I hope that as we go through this whole process—and it will be, unfortunately, almost all of the year—I hope we start with the principles that we would like to see enunciated when we are through. We will have different views. Some people want more Government, more spending and more taxes—a legitimate idea, but not one that I share. I think we do much of that in the budget.

So I hope, Mr. President, that we really take a look at measuring this budget in terms of our values, the reason we came here, the reason we have given to our constituents as to why we

are here. Much of it will be reflected in this budget.

I yield the floor.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, that is going to close the discussion on our side on the President's budget. I am going to yield the remainder of our time at this point to the distinguished Senator from Texas on another matter.

How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. COVERDELL. I yield the remainder of our time to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak as in morning business for up to 30 minutes thereafter, and I further ask that following my remarks Senator GORTON be recognized, followed by Senator GRAHAM of Florida and then followed by Senator BROWNBACK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. GORTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 346 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BROWNBACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as if in morning business for up to 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator has that right.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the Chair.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN SUDAN

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I want to bring to the Senate's attention something that, when I first saw it, I found it just to be unbelievable, that the type of situation that is going on is happening in the world today, in 1999.

I am speaking of what is taking place and the human rights abuses that are occurring in the Sudan today. The northern Sudanese Government is waging a vicious war in the south against its own people, who are suffering extraordinary human rights abuses on a massive scale. Slavery—slavery—and Government-induced famine not only exist but are increasing. It is unpardonable that slavery continues in the modern world today, that in 1999 we have slavery going on in the world. And it does in the Sudan.

It is even more dismaying that this offense against humanity is officially tolerated, even perpetrated, by a national government against its own people. I believe that America has the moral authority and the duty to protest this outrageous practice.

Joined by other Members of Congress, I will be introducing a resolution

which demands the end of slavery in the Sudan. Legislation will also be introduced which challenges the famine-induced practices of the Government. Consider this a modern-day abolitionist movement, inspired by the legacy of some of the great freedom advocates such as Martin Luther King or William Wilberforce who ended the slavery trade in Britain nearly two centuries ago.

Let the facts speak for the victims. There are 1.9 million Sudanese who have died at the hands of their own Government, more people than Bosnia, Rwanda, and Kosovo combined. Over 2 million people have been displaced, driven from their ancient communities—that is nearly 10 percent of the population—and they now wander homeless, without resources, education, or hope for a decent future for their children. This is the largest internally displaced population in Africa. Most alarming, 2.6 million risk starvation this year—this year—because of Government policies deliberately calculated to produce food shortages.

Reportedly, 1998 was the worst famine in 10 years because of the official Government practices of denying food distribution to its own starving people. Experts warn that 1999 will even be worse because of the now weakened condition of the population. How could this happen when so much aid stands waiting for shipment? The answer is because the Government denies humanitarian aid organizations access to famine-stricken areas in the south. They deliberately withhold American-sponsored aid from the starving population to manufacture a famine.

Now, why would a government deliberately starve its own people? They have made starvation a weapon of war to crush those fighting for self-determination and religious freedom. Through this weapon of starvation, they can drive the people into refugee centers, which they cynically call "peace camps," and there break them with humiliating treatment, deprivation, rape, more starvation, and even bombings in peace camps.

The Sudanese people suffer terrible treatment in these so-called peace camps; they are forced to renounce their own deeply held religious beliefs as a condition to being given food. Christians and traditional tribal believers report this is a routine practice.

The U.S. Committee for Refugees issued a report recently which describes the bombing of refugee centers by the Government. The Government bombs these unarmed refugees, the women, the children, the sick, the starving, the elderly, all of whom have taken refuge in these camps as their last resort for food.

Recently, reports on female refugees state that virtually every woman interviewed—virtually every woman interviewed—was raped or nearly raped during induction to the camps. Moreover, young boys in these camps are abducted into the northern cause and used as front-line fodder. These are the so-called peace camps.

Yet the most incredible crime against humanity practiced in the Sudan today is slavery. In 1999, slavery still exists in this world, and it is officially tolerated, even perpetrated, by the National Government against its own people. Tens of thousands of Sudanese presently exist as chattel property, owned by masters who force their captives into hard labor and sexual concubinage. They are branded, beaten, starved, and raped at their master's whim. Forced religious conversion is routine. Christian and tribal traditional believers experience starvation and whippings until they renounce their own personal faiths. All slaves with Christian or African names are given new Arab names by their masters. The girls undergo a terrible practice, lightly referred to as "female circumcision," better described as "female genital mutilation," which is permanently disfiguring, extremely painful, and physically dangerous. Some Moslems also have this act forced upon them.

I asked my personal staff to investigate this situation in September. That trip to the Sudan produced extraordinary photos of children who have been redeemed by John Eibner of Christian Solidarity International.

Mr. Eibner is a modern-day abolitionist, an American who redeems people from slavery for about \$50 a person—50 bucks a person to redeem a slave today. He has rescued over 5,000 people from slavery in the Sudan since 1995. These photos from that trip show some of those redeemed slaves. I want to show those photos to the Senate. These are people my staff went and met with, who have been enslaved in the northern part of Sudan. You can see young children here in this picture who were gathered together, beautiful young children who have suffered the bonds of slavery in 1999. Here is the broader group, and a picture of the group they met with who had all been enslaved.

Then I want to show you these next two pictures up close. This is the face of slavery today in the world, in Sudan. This young boy, approximately the age of my son, was a slave in 1999, in this world today in the Sudan. You can see he is holding his arm out here as they were looking at his arm and his slave brand that he had. We have a closer picture of that brand that this young boy suffered that was put on under his slave master's hand—slavery in the world today. It still goes on. It still goes on. And it is going on in the Sudan.

Both victims and experts report that the slave practice has actually even increased since 1996. It appears that the Sudanese Government employs slavery as a deliberate means of demoralizing the civilian population and fragmenting communities. Slavery is also used to reward government soldiers fighting