

agree on the issue of transportation. In Chicago, which I am honored to represent, virtually any radio station will tell you every 10 minutes the state of traffic on the major expressways around Chicago. I am sure the Senator from California can tell the same story. It is getting worse, more congestion, more delays, and more compromise in the quality of life.

We don't want to step away from a Federal contribution to transportation, not only highways but mass transit. Frankly, if we move down the road suggested by Republicans, it would jeopardize it. The same thing is true about crime. It ranks in the top three issues that people worry about. The COPS Program, which Democrats supported along with President Clinton, has created almost 100,000 new police. That brought down the crime rate in America. We want to continue that commitment to making our neighborhoods, streets, and schools safer across America.

Finally, education. I am glad the Senator from California noted this. The Federal contribution to education is relatively small compared to State and local spending, but it is very important. We have shown leadership in the past and we can in the future. It really troubles me to think we are now at a point in our history where, if no law is changed and everything continues as anticipated, we will need to build, on a weekly basis, for the next 10 years—once every week for the next 10 years—a new 1,000-bed prison, every single week for the next 10 years because of the anticipated increase in incarceration.

I think dangerous people should be taken off the street and out of my neighborhood and yours. But I don't believe Americans are genetically inclined to be violent criminals. I think there are things we can do to intervene in lives, particularly at an early stage, to make kids better students and ultimately better citizens. That means investing in education. The Republican plan steps back from that commitment to education, as it does from the commitments to transportation and fighting crime. That is very shortsighted. We will pay for it for many decades to come.

So this debate, some people say, is about a tax break. It is about a lot more. Will the economy keep moving forward? Will we make important decisions so the next generation of Americans is not burdened with paying interest on our old debt, and will we make good on our commitment to American families when it comes to important questions involving transportation, crime, education, and the quality of life?

Mrs. BOXER. Will my friend yield to me for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the Senator from California for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I want to ask him a question about an issue he and I have worked on together for so

many years. It takes us back to when we were in the House together. We served together there for 10 years. That is the issue of health research.

Right now, only one out of every three approved grants is actually being funded. So that means cures for cancer, Parkinson's, AIDS, heart disease, stroke, you name it—the biggest killers—are not being found. In other words—let me repeat—we have one out of every three grants approved by the National Institutes of Health because they are very promising. If some scientist has a theory about how to cure prostate or breast cancer, he may not be able to get it done.

This will be my final question. As he goes through the Republican plan, which leaves virtually zero room, as I read it, for increases in this kind of basic spending, does the Senator not think we are shortchanging American families? When I talk to them, that is what they are scared of most.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from California for her observation. Yes, many years ago when we were on the Budget Committee in the House, we worked together on medical research and dramatically increased the amount of money for it. It was one of the prouder moments serving on Capitol Hill. I have found, as I have gone across Illinois and around the country, that virtually every American family agrees this is an appropriate thing for the Federal Government to do—initiate and sponsor medical research.

A family never feels more helpless than when a disease or illness strikes somebody they love. They pray to God that the person will survive, and that they can find the best doctors. In the back of their minds they are hoping and praying that somewhere somebody is developing a drug or some treatment that can make a difference. And that "somewhere," many times, is the National Institutes of Health in Washington, DC, in the Maryland suburbs nearby.

If we take the Republican approach of cutting dramatically the Federal budget in years to come for a tax break for wealthy people, we jeopardize the possibility that the NIH will have money for this medical research. That is so shortsighted.

It is not only expensive to continue to provide medical care to diseased or ill people, but, frankly, it is inhumane to turn our backs on the fact that so many families need a helping hand. I sincerely hope before this debate ends, we are able to bring Republicans around to the point of view that when we talk about spending on the Democratic side, it is for the basics—transportation, fighting crime, helping education, and medical research. I would take that out for a referendum across this land. I think that is the sensible way to go.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLINGS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina.

REALITIES OF THE BUDGET

Mr. HOLLINGS. I certainly appreciate it. I really appreciate the significance of and the emphasis the distinguished Senator from Illinois and the distinguished Senator from California are exchanging on the floor about the realities of the budget.

Mr. President, some years ago, there was this debate between Walter Lippmann and the famous educator, John Dewey, with relation to how to build a strong democracy. Mr. Lippmann contended the way to have and maintain a strong democracy was to get the best of minds in the various disciplines countrywide—whether in education, housing, foreign relations, financial and fiscal policy, or otherwise—and let them meet around the table and determine the needs of the Nation and the policy thereof; take care of those needs, give it to the politicians, give it to the Congress, and let them enact it. It was John Dewey's contention—no, he said, what we need is the free press to tell the American people the truth. These truths would be reflected through their Representatives on the floor of the national Congress, and the democracy would continue strong.

For 200-some years now, we have had that free press reporting those truths. But, unfortunately, until this morning—until this morning, Mr. President—they have been coconspirators, so to speak, in that they have joined in calling spending increases spending cuts, and calling deficits surpluses. Eureka. I picked up the Washington Post this morning, and on the front page, the right-hand headline, they talk about the shenanigans of emergency spending and calling up the CBO with different economic assumptions—finding \$10 billion. Just go to the phone if you are Chairman of the Budget Committee, call up Mr. Crippen over at CBO and say: Wait a minute. Those economic assumptions we used in the budget resolution—I have different ones. Therefore, give me \$10 billion more. It is similar to calling up a rich uncle.

That is now being exposed in the Wall Street Journal. Of all things, they are talking in the front middle section about national and international news headlines and talking about double accounting and how they give them credit for saving the money and spending it at the same time. There is a whole column by our friend David Rogers on page 24. So, eureka, I found it. We are now breaking through and beginning to speak the truth.

I know the distinguished Chair is very much interested in actual and accurate accounting, and the actual fact is we are running a deficit, the Congressional Budget Office says, of \$103 billion this year, which ends with August and September—just 2 more months after this July, and we will have spent \$103 billion more than we take in; namely, on the deficit.

So, Mr. President, when you hear all of this jargon and plans about surpluses and how they find them and

whatever else, you go to the books and you turn to their reports and you say: Wait a minute now. The President came out in his document here, the CBO report—and I hold in my hand the midsession review, which came out 10

days ago and I said: Wait a minute. Let me find out where they find this surplus.

On the contrary, on page 42, under the heading "Total Gross Federal Debt"—Mr. President, I ask unanimous

consent that this page be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 21.—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FINANCING AND DEBT WITH SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE REFORM¹

[In billions of dollars]

	1998 Actual	Estimates					
		1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
Financing:							
Surplus or deficit(—)	69.2	98.8	137.4	144.1	154.2	165.1	175.0
(On-budget)	—29.9	—24.8					
(Off-budget)	99.2	123.6	137.4	144.1	154.2	165.1	175.0
Means of financing other than borrowing from the public:							
Medicare solvency transfers			4.8	0.3	12.3	5.2	6.9
Changes in: ²							
Treasury operating cash balance	4.7	—6.1					
Checks outstanding, etc. ³	—10.5	—1.6	—1.2				
Deposit fund balances	—0.8	—1.7					
Seigniorage on coins	0.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Less: Net financing disbursements:							
Direct loan financing accounts	—11.5	—25.2	—21.2	—20.1	—19.6	—19.2	—17.7
Guaranteed loan financing accounts	—0.5	1.6	0.9	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.0
Total, means of financing other than borrowing from the public	—18.0	—32.0	—15.8	—17.0	—4.4	—11.2	—7.8
Total, repayment of the debt held by the public	51.3	66.8	121.6	127.1	149.8	154.0	167.2
Change in debt held by the public	—51.3	—66.8	—121.6	—127.1	—149.8	—154.0	—167.2
Debt Outstanding, End of Year:							
Gross Federal debt:							
Debt issued by Treasury	5,449.3	5,586.7	5,675.9	5,754.3	5,840.5	5,924.1	6,006.8
Debt issued by other agencies	29.4	28.6	27.7	26.7	25.7	24.3	23.0
Total, gross Federal debt	5,478.7	5,615.3	5,703.6	5,781.0	5,866.1	5,948.4	6,029.8
Held by:							
Government accounts	1,758.8	1,962.2	2,172.2	2,376.6	2,611.6	2,847.9	3,096.5
The public	3,719.9	3,653.0	3,531.4	3,404.4	3,254.5	3,100.5	2,933.3
Federal Reserve Banks ⁴	458.1						
Other	3,261.7						
Debt Subject to Statutory Limitation, End of Year:							
Debt issued by Treasury	5,449.3	5,586.7	5,675.9	5,754.3	5,840.5	5,924.1	6,006.8
Less: Treasury debt not subject to limitation ⁵	—15.5	—15.5	—15.5	—15.5	—15.5	—15.5	—15.5
Agency debt subject to limitation	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Adjustment for discount and premium ⁶	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5	5.5
Total, debt subject to statutory limitation ⁷	5,439.4	5,576.7	5,665.9	5,744.3	5,830.5	5,914.1	5,996.8

¹ Treasury securities held by the public and zero-coupon bonds held by Government accounts are almost entirely measured at sales price plus amortized discount or less amortized premium. Agency debt is almost entirely measured at face value. Treasury securities in the Government account series are measured at face value less unrealized discount (if any).

² A decrease in the Treasury operating cash balance (which is an asset) is a means of financing the deficit and therefore has a positive sign. An increase in checks outstanding or deposit fund balances (which are liabilities) would also be a means of financing the deficit and therefore would also have a positive sign.

³ Besides checks outstanding, includes accrued interest payable on Treasury debt, miscellaneous liability accounts, allocations of special drawing rights, and as an offset, cash and monetary assets other than the Treasury operating cash balance, miscellaneous asset accounts, and profit on sale of gold.

⁴ Debt held by the Federal Reserve Banks is not estimated for future years.

⁵ Consists primarily of Federal Financing Bank debt.

⁶ Consists of unamortized discount (less premium) on public issues of Treasury notes and bonds and unrealized discount on Government account series securities, except, in both cases, for zero-coupon bonds.

⁷ The statutory debt limits is \$5,950 billion.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Then you see the total gross Federal debt, and you see for the 5-year projection—from the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004—it goes from a debt of \$5.7036 trillion to \$6.298

trillion. That shows the debt going up. And everybody is talking "surplus."

Then I turn over to page 43. This is the President's projection. You can see over the 15 years—not 5 years.

I ask unanimous consent that page 43 be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 22.—FEDERAL DEBT WITH SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE REFORM

[In billions of dollars]

	Estimates										Projections				
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Debt held by the public:															
Debt held by the public, beginning of period	3,653	3,531	3,404	3,255	3,101	2,933	2,744	2,525	2,262	1,964	1,625	1,249	944	637	335
Debt reduction from:															
Off-budget surplus:															
Surplus pending Social Security and Medicare reform	—137	—144	—154	—165	—175	—193	—202	—215	—225	—233	—243	—246	—248	—246	—241
Social Security solvency transfers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—107	—125	—145	—166
Returns on investment of transfers ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—3	—14	—27	—43
Medicare solvency transfers	—5	—0	—12	—5	—7	—10	—29	—59	—83	—113	—142	—67	—68	—65	—58
Less purchase of equities by Social Security trust fund ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	139	172	209
Other financing requirements ²	21	17	17	16	15	13	12	11	9	8	8	8	8	9	9
Total changes	—122	—127	—150	—154	—167	—189	—219	—263	—298	—339	—376	—305	—307	—302	—291
Debt held by the public, end of period	3,531	3,404	3,255	3,101	2,933	2,744	2,525	2,262	1,964	1,625	1,249	944	637	335	44
Less market value of equities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—110	—248	—420	—629
Debt held by the public, less equity holdings, end of period	3,531	3,404	3,255	3,101	2,933	2,744	2,525	2,262	1,964	1,625	1,249	834	388	—85	—585
Debt held by Government accounts:															
Debt held by Government accounts, beginning of period	1,962	2,172	2,377	2,612	2,848	3,096	3,363	3,667	4,012	4,394	4,823	5,299	5,822	6,374	6,949
Increase prior to Social Security reform	205	204	222	230	240	254	271	280	289	299	310	315	318	317	314
Social Security and Medicare solvency transfers	5	0	12	5	7	10	29	59	83	113	142	173	193	210	224
Earnings on solvency transfers invested in Treasury securities	0	0	1	1	2	2	3	6	11	17	25	35	42	48	55
Less purchase of equities by Social Security trust fund ¹	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	—110	—139	—172	—209
Total changes	210	204	235	236	249	266	304	345	382	429	476	523	552	575	593
Debt held by Government accounts, end of period	2,172	2,377	2,612	2,848	3,096	3,363	3,667	4,012	4,394	4,823	5,299	5,822	6,374	6,949	7,543
Plus market value of equities	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	248	420	629
Debt and equities held by Government accounts, end of period	2,172	2,377	2,612	2,848	3,096	3,363	3,667	4,012	4,394	4,823	5,299	5,932	6,623	7,369	8,172

¹ Includes accrued capital gains.

² Primarily credit programs.

Note: Projections for 2010 through 2014 are an OMB extension of detailed agency budget estimates through 2009.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, you see the debt held by government accounts, end of period, \$7.543 trillion, plus up there at the end of the period, the little 44, making an increase of debt to \$7.587 trillion. There is the debt going up from \$5.6 trillion to \$7.6 trillion, an increase of \$2 trillion in the debt.

Everybody is talking "surplus." I wonder where in the world do they get the surplus. We are beginning to see it

in the double accounting in the Wall Street Journal and otherwise.

Let's go to the Congressional Budget Office because my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, talked about a \$2.9 trillion surplus. He is right. In the rhetoric at the very beginning, they talk about a surplus here on page 2—cumulative onbudget surpluses of projected and total, nearly \$1 trillion between 1999 and 2009. During that same period, cumulative off-bud-

et surpluses will total slightly more than \$2 trillion. That is where he finds, I take it, the \$2.9 trillion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD from the Congressional Budget Office report of July 1, page 19.

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

TABLE 10.—CBO BASELINE PROJECTIONS OF INTEREST COSTS AND FEDERAL DEBT

(By fiscal year)

	Actual 1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
NET INTEREST OUTLAYS (BILLIONS OF DOLLARS)												
Interest on Public Debt (Gross interest) ¹	364	356	358	358	350	345	342	338	333	328	323	316
Interest Received by Trust Funds:												
Social Security	-47	-53	-59	-67	-74	-82	-91	-100	-110	-121	-132	-144
Other trust funds ²	-67	-68	-70	-73	-74	-76	-79	-81	-84	-87	-89	-92
Subtotal	-114	-120	-129	-140	-148	-159	-170	-182	-194	-208	-222	-236
Other interest ³	-7	-7	-6	-7	-7	-7	-8	-8	-8	-8	-8	-9
Total	243	229	222	212	194	179	164	148	131	112	92	71
FEDERAL DEBT AT THE END OF THE YEAR (BILLIONS OF DOLLARS)												
Gross Federal Debt	5,479	5,582	5,664	5,721	5,737	5,760	5,770	5,770	5,732	5,675	5,600	5,500
Debt Held by Government Accounts:												
Social Security	730	856	1,003	1,157	1,321	1,493	1,675	1,869	2,075	2,292	2,520	2,755
Other accounts ²	1,029	1,107	1,188	1,267	1,350	1,431	1,510	1,589	1,666	1,743	1,813	1,880
Subtotal	1,759	1,963	2,190	2,425	2,670	2,925	3,185	3,458	3,741	4,035	4,333	4,635
Debt Held by the Public	3,720	3,618	3,473	3,297	3,066	2,835	2,584	2,312	1,992	1,640	1,267	865
Debt Subject to Limit ⁴	5,439	5,543	5,626	5,684	5,700	5,724	5,734	5,736	5,699	5,643	5,568	5,469
FEDERAL DEBT AS A PERCENTAGE OF GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCTS												
Debt Held by the Public	44.3	40.9	37.5	34.2	30.5	27.1	23.7	20.3	16.8	13.2	9.8	6.4

¹ Excludes interest costs of debt issued by agencies other than the Treasury (primarily the Tennessee Valley Authority).

² Mainly Civil Service retirement, Military Retirement, Medicare, unemployment insurance, and the Airport and Airway Trust Fund.

³ Mainly interest on loans to the public.

⁴ Differs from the gross federal debt primarily because most debt issued by agencies other than the Treasury is excluded from the debt limit. The current debt limit is \$5,950 billion.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: Projections of interest and debt assume that discretionary spending will equal the statutory caps on such spending through 2002 and will grow at the rate of inflation thereafter.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I have given the American people, as John Dewey said, "the truth," because you look from 2000 right on through where they talk about the gross Federal debt, and the gross Federal debt starts up from the year 2000 and increases to the year 2004 from \$5.664 trillion to \$6.029 trillion. It is the same for 2004 and 2005.

Yes. I will agree that the Congressional Budget Office shows a diminution, a reduction, in the deficit from the year 2005 to 2009 over the 4-year period. There is a saving or reduction in 2006 of \$38 billion; a reduction in the year 2007 of \$57 billion; a reduction in the year 2008 of \$75 billion; and a reduction in the year 2009 of \$100 billion. So it is a cumulative reduction of \$270 billion.

They talk about a \$2.9 trillion surplus? At best they could talk, under the Congressional Budget Office, about \$270 billion.

The reason they even can find the \$270 billion is the most favorable of circumstances. The most favorable of circumstances is, one, current policy, as they say on one of the pages here. It says that it assumes discretionary spending will equal the statutory caps on such spending through 2002, and will grow at the rate of inflation thereafter.

That is the most favorable circumstance—no increases; just cap the spending, and adjust inflation thereafter for the first 5 years and inflation

thereafter for the next 5 years. It assumes no emergency spending.

We have already seen that they are calling, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois was pointing out, the census an emergency. They have veterans' benefits as an emergency and they have everything else as an emergency. It assumes also that there is no tax cut and that the interest rate stays the same. You have all of these favorable assumptions, and at best, under the Congressional Budget Office, a saving of \$270 billion rather than \$2.9 trillion.

I have been trying my best to get a time to get on this floor. I thank everybody for the simple reason that the best of circumstances here are that, yes, inflation is low; interest rates are down; unemployment is down; employment figures are up. We have the best of circumstances, to President Clinton's credit. Yes, the deficits have been coming down.

Having said that, as Alan Greenspan said earlier in the year, let's stay the course. Let's stay the course and make sure we continue this, if there is ever a time to pay down the bill—I am glad the Senator from Illinois touched on this—the interest costs.

I was a member of the Grace Commission against waste, fraud, and abuse. We created during the 1980s the biggest waste in the world by voting a 25-percent across-the-board tax cut. Here we are about to repeat the crime. That is a crime against common sense.

It is a crime against future generations. There isn't any question about it.

But everybody is talking about a tax cut. Republicans are talking one tax cut. The Democrats are talking, the White House is talking, and everybody is talking tax cut when in reality we don't have any taxes to cut. We don't have any revenues to lose. Everybody knows that. We created the biggest waste in that year. The interest costs are practically \$1 billion a day on the national debt.

On the same page as we have included in the RECORD, page 19, you will see in the 10-year period, from 2000 through 2009, we spend on interest costs—total waste—\$3.441 trillion for nothing over the 10-year period.

They are talking about fanciful surpluses out of the atmosphere that do not exist, and otherwise not talking about the tremendous waste for the crass hypocrisy of this monkeyshine of politics that we have to somehow neutralize the Republican tax cut with our tax cut. Come on. Can't we neutralize ourselves with the truth for a change? We are spending \$3.4 trillion.

I see my distinguished colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, looking. I must have already used up my time.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday on NPR's "Morning Edition," Kevin Phillips, a Republican author and commentator, had some interesting comments, and I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina had an opportunity to hear this Republican commentator discussing the House of Representatives tax cut.

Tax bills often deal with Pie in the Sky. The mind boggling ten-year cuts passed late last week by the House of Representatives however deserve a new term: Pie in Stratosphere.

He points out that the top 1 percent would get 33 percent of the tax cuts; the bottom 60 percent get only 7 percent of the tax cuts.

I thought the last paragraph of this Republican commentator was interesting:

We can fairly call the House legislation the most outrageous tax package in 50 years. It's worse than the 1981 excesses, you have to go back to 1948, when the Republican 80th Congress sent a kindred bill to President Harry Truman. Truman vetoed it, calling the Republicans bloodsuckers, with offices in Wall Street. Not only did he win reelection, but the Democrats recaptured Congress. We'll see if Bill Clinton and Albert Gore have anything resembling Truman's guts.

This is from a Republican commentator. He points out the amount of these tax cuts extending 10 years into the future, by economists who predict these surpluses; economists who can't remember their phone numbers and their home addresses are telling Americans that in 3, 5, 10 years in the future we will have big surpluses. What do we do? The House of Representatives says: Give most of the surpluses back to 1 percent of the people.

A Republican columnist, Kevin Phillips, says it is the most outrageous tax package in the last 50 years.

Can the Senator from South Carolina comment?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I will comment, too, on what the Senator from Illinois discussed about the lockbox and why we can't talk. We couldn't talk about lockbox, and we couldn't get cloture for the simple reason they would not allow my amendments. I gave them notice. I sent a "Dear Colleague" letter to all Senators. I said, No. 1, I will put in a true lockbox. It was worked out with the Social Security Administration. Ken Apfel, who used to work with me when I was chairman of the Budget Committee, is now the Social Security Administrator. The only way to get a true lockbox is to not double the counting and say, I saved it, but then spend it. On the contrary, actually require the Secretary of the Treasury to deposit those amounts each month, place the Treasury bills you have to issue for the debt of Social Security back into the Social Security trust fund.

Somebody says: Wait; what are you going to do with that money? Do ex-

actly what all pension reserves and insurance companies do: Keep it there—what we did for 35 years, from 1935 to 1968, until this changed in 1969. I was going to put a cap on the debt. They think it is a surplus. Say whatever the debt is as of September 30th, in 2 months' time, cap it off. Say that can't be exceeded. Put that limit there and find out who is telling the truth.

They are talking surpluses. I am saying it is deficits. It is debt increases.

Also, cut out the monkeyshine. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico and I had challenged the late Senator Chiles when he was chairman of the Budget Committee and he started using different economic assumptions. We lost on appeal of the ruling of the Chair, but we came around with 301(g) and wrote in the Budget Act that you couldn't have the new economic assumptions different from those in each particular budget resolution. These are the things we wanted to put in with respect to getting truth in budgeting when we passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings back in 1985.

We have gone totally astray—the White House, Republican and Democrat, the news media—until this morning. That is my point. I thank the Wall Street Journal, I thank the Washington Post for finally reporting some of the truths out here. If we can't level with the American people, no wonder they are talking about "what kind" of tax cut. They all want to pay down the debt. When they use the expression, "pay down the debt" or the "public debt," it doesn't pay any debt at all.

Those T bills come due during the next 10 years and are not renewed. In the meantime, while they are not being renewed, the debt is transferred over to Social Security and other trust funds, so we owe Social Security this very minute \$857 billion; by the year 2009, we will owe Social Security \$2.7 trillion. Then they talk not only of surpluses but saving Social Security, how we have extended the life of Social Security, when we have actually bankrupted the blooming program.

Mr. President, \$2.7 trillion by 2009; we get to 2013, when they really need the money, and it will be over \$3 trillion. What Congress will find \$3 trillion to start paying the benefits? This is serious business.

I see the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have one question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ENZI. Reserving the right to object, our side hasn't had 1 minute of debate on this; the other side has used up 45 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for 2 additional minutes so that the senior Senator may answer a question.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Has the Senator heard from his people that they are clamoring for the tax cuts? Has he heard from his people who are earning in the high dollar amounts, and who will benefit from this, that they want the tax cuts?

Someone earning \$800,000 a year is going to get back \$22,000 a year, and someone earning \$30,000 gets back \$100 bucks. Are the phones in his office ringing off the hook with people asking for these tax cuts and to forget about Social Security and Medicare?

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator and will limit my time so the Senator from Wyoming can take the floor.

The answer is, no, the phone is not ringing off the hook. I had this in the campaign for reelection last year. I put in a value-added tax in order to retire the deficit and the debt. Of course, I was called "High Tax Hollings." I said, rather than tax cuts, we ought to get rid of the national debt and the waste of interest costs of \$1 billion a day. I was reelected.

We have the most Republican of all States. South Carolina is the most conservative of all States.

Somehow the truth is coming around to the American people, or at least to the Washington Post and the Wall Street Journal as of this morning. I thank them for that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his comments. As the accountant in the Senate, I appreciate when others join in the debate about the accounting issue, that if there is a surplus, why is the national debt going up? It is a very simple test. It is printed in the RECORD.

It is our duty to be sure there is good accounting around here; that we aren't keeping two sets of books; that we aren't borrowing the best of each world. The articles mentioned, I point out, said everybody is involved in this. The President is even accepting the best of both worlds so that things can be done this year rather than future years when a more accurate surplus shows up.

The best anybody is estimating now is \$3 trillion in surplus. This is supposed to be a true surplus after Social Security. We are almost \$6 trillion in debt. Even if all the surplus went to debt, we would still be \$3 trillion in debt. That is a lot of money.

However, what we are talking about today isn't whether it is true surplus or not. We are not talking about spending down the national debt. We are talking about spending versus tax relief. Taking away from tax relief by the Democrats isn't with the intent of paying down the national debt. It is to put the money into new programs. We already have programs not adequately funded