

In subsequent years, they proposed to cut education by \$3.9 billion and \$3.1 billion. With the strong leadership of President Clinton, these cuts were never enacted, and Federal funding for education has steadily increased.

Republicans have finally begun to listen to the American people on education. The Senate Republican FY2000 Budget Resolution increases funding for elementary and secondary education by \$2.6 billion over a freeze. But that increase in elementary and secondary education comes at an unacceptable and irresponsible cost. The Republicans proposed a reasonable increase in funding for elementary and secondary education, but at the same time they cut funding for critical programs like Head Start, job training, and aid for college students by at least 10 percent in FY2000 and by more than 20 percent in FY2004.

It is wrong to rob Peter to pay Paul, and it is wrong for the Republicans to propose this irresponsible budget.

It is irresponsible to increase funding for elementary and secondary education programs in order to improve the Nation's public schools and slash funding that helps young children and college students.

It is irresponsible to deny 100,000 children Head Start services that help them to come to school ready to learn.

It is irresponsible to eliminate 73,000 summer jobs and training opportunities for low-income young people.

It is irresponsible to jeopardize funding that helps make college more accessible and affordable for all qualified students.

It is irresponsible to ignore the needs of communities that need help in modernizing their school buildings. Schools across the nation face serious problems of overcrowding. Antiquated facilities are suffering from physical decay, and are not equipped to handle the needs of modern education. Across the country, 14 million children in a third of the nation's schools are learning in substandard buildings. Half the schools have at least one unsatisfactory environmental condition. It will take over \$100 billion just to repair existing facilities nationwide.

It is irresponsible to do nothing to see that key education priorities will be met, such as reducing class size, improving teacher recruitment and training, expanding after-school programs, and ensuring strong accountability for how federal education dollars are spent.

Mr. President, a nation's budget is a reflection of its priorities. The nation's children and families deserve a budget that invests in their priorities—not the priorities of the right wing. Clearly, this Republican budget contains the wrong priorities for the nation's future. It gives priority to large tax cuts for the wealthy, instead of saving Social Security and Medicare, and at the expense of programs for college students, young children, and young adults. I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided budget.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed in morning business for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 20 minutes following the Senator from South Carolina.

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

TRUTH IN BUDGETING

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I remember the day when we had truth in budgeting. I will never forget when we promulgated in 1985, almost 15 years ago, the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act. At that time, we realized that Reaganomics was going up and away with respect to the growth of the debt and the accelerated interest costs upon that debt, not just necessarily the growth of the economy.

We got together on a bipartisan basis and, under the auspices of truth in budgeting, we came to the floor, and even though we had opposition on both sides early on—President Reagan opposed it, certainly over here the majority leader, the whip, and the chairman of the Budget Committee opposed it—on this side of the aisle, on 14 up-or-down votes, we got a majority of the Democrats on the basis of truth in budgeting.

Fifteen years later, we have gone to fraud in budgeting. It is all a political exercise that will bring us later in the year to what one might call a Mexican standoff. Then both sides will probably get together, hopefully, and, since the media will be covering them and they are moving into an election, do some saving of Social Security or at least some paying down of the debt. But I have a bill today, Mr. President, that actually requires us to save Social Security.

Let me mention that, once the government receives the moneys from the payroll tax under section 201 of the Social Security Act, it immediately buys special securities, 30-year T-bills. With those 30-year T-bills, of course, Social Security has the bond, or the IOU, the Government has the money, and obviously they have been spending that money for either increased spending or for tax cuts, but not for any paying down of the debt. The debt continues to go up.

Under section 201 in that particular instance, it is like having two credit cards. You have a Visa card and a MasterCard, and you want to pay off your MasterCard with your Visa card. So you pay down the public debt. Herein, let's say the Visa card is Social Security and the MasterCard is the public debt or Wall Street credit card. That is

the crowd that does not want the sharp elbows of Government coming in and crowding out finance, running up interest costs and disturbing corporate finance.

When you take the Social Security credit card to pay down public debt, it is simply a transaction of increasing your Social Security debt. At the present time, the deficit in Social Security is some \$730 billion in the red.

Mr. President, we did not intend that in 1983. In 1983, what we did was say: We are going to put in an inordinately high payroll tax in order to build up a surplus to take care of the baby boomers in the next generation.

That is exactly what we are not doing. We are crowding around on the floor saying, "Beware, beware, beware, the baby boomers, baby boomers." It is not the baby boomers, it is the adults on the floor of the Senate looting the fund if we keep the money in, as was intended in section 201 of the Social Security Act.

As Mr. Greenspan said, take Social Security outside the unified budget, do not have any unified budget and growth deficit, just have the national debt and the national deficit, one accounting, not two sets of books. That is what we called for. We wrote it into law under President Bush in November 1990. It is constantly disobeyed and is being disobeyed with the two budget proposals of the President and the Republicans now.

President Clinton's budget came to us. And I call it a fraud because everyone else has called it a fraud. What it did was say we are going to hedge a way against this so-called tax cut move on the Republican side politically, so we are going to save Social Security, we are going to take care of Medicare, and pay down the debt. They mean public debt. They know they can easily do that with the Social Security money.

Incidentally, we had a motion on President Clinton's budget in the Budget Committee, so I speak advisedly. The record will show it did not get a single vote, Democratic or Republican, for that President's budget.

Along comes the Republican budget, and you can see exactly what is going on. They are meeting with the candidate for President, Mr. KASICH, who knows better. He is the one, incidentally—I do not know if he is running as a Democrat or a Republican—he said if the 1993 tax increase and spending cut and paring down the size of Government, corporate downsizing, Government downsizing some 300,000—he said if this thing works, "I will change parties." I have not seen the distinguished Congressman recently, but I am waiting to, because I am going to ask him how he is running, as a Republican or Democrat. He promised to change parties and become a Democrat if it worked. It is working.

The Republican budget comes in now and they say, "We have to do better. We have the House and Senate. We

want to take over the White House, so we want to give them a tax cut."

How do they do it? With a fraudulent budget. They go up and above, and my distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee on the Senate side, the Senator from New Mexico, knows better. I have worked with him. We are the two original members since 1974 of the budget process and the Budget Committee.

He comes in and he adds on almost \$800 billion to the debt. In addition to adding to the debt, he comes around and says now, "We are going to direct in reconciliation that the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Finance Committee itself, come out with a tax cut." This is an absolute adulteration and fraud of the budget process. We intended—and it is right in the reconciliation provisions—that if you get to the end of the road—and you are always slightly over—you can increase some revenues here, there, or yonder, or you can cut some spending here, there, or yonder. You reconcile spending and revenue so you do what you say and say what you do to balance items in the budget.

Instead, now the Republicans are going to use reconciliation to cut the revenues. Here we are spending \$100 billion more this fiscal year 1999 than we are taking in. Under current policy, it would be \$90 billion more, but you can see already with this particular monkey shine in the face of reality, there is no chance of a tax cut and having a real budget. We have already come in with caps.

Last year we exceeded the caps by \$12 billion. We exceed the caps \$21 billion this year. Then we come and pass an \$18 billion increase for military pay. That is \$50 billion we ought to be looking for in either increased revenues or spending cuts. Rather, the wonderful Budget Committee, on a partisan basis—the Republican budget is a fraud—comes forward and says, Here it is—and we are amending the reconciliation in this particular process—and sends it to the floor directing the Finance Committee—and the chairman of the Finance Committee, incidentally, the distinguished Senator from Delaware, said: If we do not have a tax cut, it would be highway robbery. We've got money sloshing around up here.

Unfortunately, they also repeal the pay-go rule. This means they will not need an off-set to pay for their tax cut. When we debate the budget this week, the Republicans are going to ram it through the Senate—10 hours, 10 hours, and 10 hours. They can get it through in three days and back up all the roll calls. And they already have it greased on the Republican side to send it through. Instead of a Budget Committee exercising its responsibility to promote fiscal responsibility, this budget here is a fraud and promotes irresponsibility.

To those who say, Mr. President, what are you going to do if you pass the Hollings bill that sets aside the

money in Social Security? It does not just sit there; it earns the highest amount allowed by law, just as it did for 33 years—from 1935 until 1968. The Social Security trust fund was sound. That is a requirement for all corporate endeavors, in that we make it a felony if you try to pay down the company debt with the pension fund.

The distinguished Presiding Officer, he heard me speak of Denny McLain the other afternoon. So I keep harping on it. Here we say in corporate America, if you engage in that kind of nefarious activity, it is a felony, and off you go to jail. But here you get the "Good Government Award." It is totally fraudulent what is going on. Neither side is giving. Both sides are out of reality and they are going merrily down the road as they are with the census, with no reconciliation. But be that as it may, there isn't any question that we can pay down the debt under current policy if we just stay the course.

That was my motion in the Budget Committee. You say, "All that big talk, HOLLINGS. What then would you do?" Look at the particular budget we have. Look at the economy we have. If you were the mayor of a city, if you were the Governor of a State, you would immediately say, "Well, let's stay the course. We don't want to let go of the firemen or the policemen. We don't want to start any new endeavors right now. Let's keep this economy growing."

All we have to do, as Mr. Greenspan finally testified, is do nothing, just hold the line, generally speaking, taking this year's budget for next year. By 2006, by that time, above Social Security surpluses, we would have regular surpluses, true surpluses. And that money could be used to pay down the debt.

I am not for the gamesmanship about public debt and the interest costs going down. That is a story out of the whole cloth. That is not going to happen. Right now, we owe \$730 billion to Social Security. By the year 2013, we will owe Social Security \$3 trillion—\$3 trillion.

We are supposed to have, under the Greenspan Commission report and law as it now stands, \$3 trillion in the bank. I know my distinguished friend from North Dakota is waiting to come here, but I want to make sure we understand the fiscal cancer this country has.

When Lyndon Johnson last balanced the budget, we only had to pay \$16 billion in interest costs on the national debt—today, we pay \$357 billion each year—almost \$1 billion each day. And the interest costs go up, just like the price of energy and gas is going up now, as indicated in the morning paper. If those little interest costs go up, it will be over a billion dollars a day.

With the money we would save in interest costs on the national debt, I could give my Republican friends an \$80 billion tax cut. I could give my Democratic friends \$80 billion in in-

creased spending. I could give Social Security \$80 billion. I could give paying down the debt \$80 billion. That is only \$320 billion. We are going to spend that each year—next year and more. This country has fiscal cancer. That is the state of the Union. And in the best of times that we are all enjoying now, if we cannot get some kind of discipline in reality out of the process here in the Congress, I do not know how we are ever going to save it.

I thank the distinguished Chair and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator is recognized.

SPRING PLANTING LOANS FOR FAMILY FARMERS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the agenda for the Senate this week is to continue on the supplemental appropriations bill. Then at some point this week we will go to the budget bill. My hope is that we will finish work on the supplemental appropriations bill. I understand that we are heading towards a vote tomorrow on cloture on a Kosovo amendment to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill. So we are off on a range of other issues, that being a foreign policy issue. We already had votes on tobacco and tobacco proceeds from the settlement, and so on.

But my hope is that one way or another we will get through the supplemental appropriations bill in order to provide the resources in that legislation for spring planting loans for family farmers. There are not very many weeks until our family farmers will be in the fields, and they need some operating loans to buy the seed and the fuel and to pay the expenses to do spring planting. And we have many farmers in North Dakota who are not, under current circumstances, going to be able to get loans from the Farm Service Agency unless we pass this supplemental bill.

So if we do not pass the supplemental appropriations bill this week, and we go home, then we are not in session the next 2 weeks, we are going to be leaving these farmers in pretty tough circumstances. Then this supplemental has to go through the House, the Senate, and go to the President for his signature. Frankly, the fate of a lot of family farmers rests on our ability to get this done.

Last week, a friend of mine announced that he was quitting farming, which I suppose is not such unusual news these days. A lot of farmers are quitting farming. This friend happens to be Elroy Lindaas, who is a State senator. Elroy is a wonderful fellow. He