

"Instead of taking something that we do not need you are taking something that we do need. I am one of those children that needs those programs."

"We need school lunches because we do not have lunch at home. I do not like you for taking this away."

I could go on and on but will not as time will not allow it.

I will, however, submit these for the record so that others can read them. I wanted to make the point that these are caring, responsible, hard-working individuals who have benefited tremendously from these programs.

These are children who know the only full meal they or many of their friends get is at school. It has been the safety net they need. These letters make that point so much better than I can.

In closing, I want to say that I do not argue that our welfare system is in need of some change. What I do not like is the assumption that every person utilizing these programs is out to take the Government and the taxpayers.

Like so many other issues, the House has gone too far on child nutrition.

Welfare reform merits in-depth, serious consideration and I am anxious to begin that process. I think a little common sense will go a long way on this issue.

However, in the case of child nutrition programs, I am appalled that such little time or consideration was taken before this bill was reported out of committee. We cannot afford to follow the House lead and expect responsible, effective legislation to result.

This legislation affects a group of Americans who are completely unable to come to Congress and speak out. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose the wholesale slashing of child nutrition when the issue comes to the Senate.

I yield the floor.

#### THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT DEBATE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, there was a column in the Washington Post this morning entitled, "More 'Trust Fund' Whoppers" by a columnist named Charles Krauthammer. I felt it necessary to come over and respond to this column. Mr. Krauthammer was upset about a response that Senator CONRAD and I had written to the Washington Post in response to his first column about us that was titled "Social Security 'Trust Fund' Whopper."

His first column was so devoid of facts and reasonable conclusions that we wrote a column back and said, in our part of the country we expect people to tell the whole truth. We did not like what he had done in his first column in which he called our arguments with respect to the constitutional amendment to balance the budget and looting of the trust funds in Social Security to do so as "fraudulent." Now he is upset at the column we wrote back

and so he wrote a second long column, a long-winded column this morning.

As I read that, I was thinking, I come from ranching country in southwestern North Dakota. And occasionally you refer to people as "all hat and no cattle." I thought about that when I finished reading his column this morning. It was hard for me to understand how, with facts so evident, he can reach a conclusion so flawed.

The Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wyoming, also comes from ranching country, and I brought along a piece of cowboy poetry that I thought might describe the difference in perspectives, and the difference, sometimes, is simply that some do not have the capability of understanding the clear perspective. It is sort of described as the difference between tongue and egg in this poem.

A cowboy poet, whose name I do not have, wrote a piece and I thought about this piece as it might apply to the disconnect of logic in Mr. Krauthammer's column. Let me read the piece to you, the poem called "The Disputed Epicure." It is about a cowboy who is queried by a high-born lady.

"What's your favorite cut of beef?"

The high-born lady queried.

Of an old cowboy who long ago  
Had grown, both wise and wearied,  
Of direct infernal questions  
On the ways of cowpoke lore.

So he considered on this question  
That he'd not been asked before.

With rapt anticipation,

On his pause, the lady hung.

Until, at last the cowboy said,

"I'd have to say it's tongue.

Tongue's got flavor, 'n texture,

And nary a bit of bond.

A cinch to cook, I'd put her up

On top there, all alone."

Recoiling, the lady said aghast,

"Surely air, you jest."

The idea is disgusting.

Your grossness I protest.

Eat something from out a cow's mouth?

Your suggestion's crude, I beg."

The cowboy then said softly,

"Don't s'pose you've ate no egg."

Sometimes cowboy poets are able to say simply and clearly what we in politics fumble around to try to express.

I guess this difference between us and Charles Krauthammer is really kind of the tongue and egg difference here. Mr. Krauthammer, in his column today, first is upset that I responded to his first column on the balanced budget amendment and the misuse of the Social Security trust fund by saying on the floor of the Senate that, based on his column, I thought he might qualify as a candidate for O.J.'s defense team. He seems almost unmoved by facts and evidence.

He was upset by that, and, maybe I overreached. It may be I overreached because the column Mr. Krauthammer writes today demonstrates his talent is not in law, his talent truly is in fiction. Let me go through, if I might, the fiction that I see in Mr. Krauthammer's column, and perhaps just briefly review the dispute.

The dispute is that, briefly, in 1983 we had to solve some problems in the

Social Security System. We did that by deciding to save for the long term. We, in fact, forced a national pool of savings so that each year we would raise more money in Social Security than we spent. This year we will raise \$69 billion more than we spend. That surplus in the Social Security System is not an accident. Mr. Krauthammer, in his last column, said this is a pay-as-you-go system. But that is not true. This is not an accident. This is a deliberate strategy to force a national pool of savings in the Social Security trust funds to meet the time when the baby boomers retire after the turn of the century.

Since the surplus began to accumulate it has been used as an offset to show a lower Federal deficit. I do not think there is much dispute about that. And it is also true, and demonstrably true that, since 1983 when I offered the first amendment on the Ways and Means Committee, and time after time after time on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate, I have raised the question, offered the amendments, and objected to the looting the Social Security trust fund or using those moneys to offset against a lower budget deficit because I think it is dishonest budgeting.

Then we had a constitutional amendment brought to the floor of the Senate and the constitutional amendment was written very precisely. It prescribed that by the year 2002, the U.S. budget shall be in balance and it shall be in balance when you use all expenditures and all receipts counting towards that balance. Under that constitutional amendment to balance the budget it would enshrine forever the practice, that I have objected to in recent years, of looting the Social Security trust funds to balance the budget. In fact, the way the constitutional amendment to balance the budget was written, it was clear that is the case. Senator REID offered an amendment to provide that would not happen. That amendment was defeated. So it was clear that is exactly what would happen and we were told, my colleague Senator CONRAD and I, that those who offer this amendment had no intention of using the Social Security trust funds to balance the budget.

But back in that room behind this Chamber we were told by the same people, "Look fellows, let's all be honest. We cannot balance the Federal budget without using the Federal trust funds." Those are direct quotes. Then they gave us handwritten pieces of paper that said we will stop using the trust funds in the year 2012; and then the second piece of paper said we will stop using the trust funds—that they were saying we will not do any time—by the year 2008; in other words, we will stop doing something we claim we are not doing 13 years from now. What twisted sense of logic that is.

Senator CONRAD and I refused to budge. We said we will support the constitutional amendment to balance the budget, but you must guarantee we are not going to enshrine in the Constitution the use of the Social Security trust funds to get there. They refused to do that. We refused to budge.

I happen to think that the Social Security System is important in this country. I happen to think the principles that I was involved with in 1983 when I helped write the Social Security Reform Act were important. I just refused to change the Constitution in a way that would have guaranteed in the next 13 years what I consider the misuse of \$1.3 trillion of Social Security trust funds.

So the Krauthammer column was calling our argument fraudulent. We responded and said Mr. Krauthammer was clearly misinformed. He was offering a misinformed defense of an indefensible practice, some neat trick for a pundit.

Now, there is a new column from Mr. Krauthammer. And I would like to go through just a couple of points in this new column. Mr. Krauthammer, if I can review this column, says a number of things. First, he says that he had checked with our offices because he says he wonders about the sincerity of our charge about looting the Social Security trust funds. He says if we were sincere about that, could we provide evidence that we had complained about that before? Well, yes. He did call our office. My first thought was to respond by telling his assistant: "Do your own research. You make lots of money." But then I thought better of that.

So we sent many examples of what I said on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House—yes, during President Clinton's Presidency and during previous Presidencies—saying this practice is wrong; this practice is dishonest budgeting. So he had the examples. He apparently chose to ignore them or misrepresent them by saying we had not been sincere because we had not complained about that before. Speaking for myself, he knows better than that, and he has an obligation to put that in his column.

Second, he says that Senators CONRAD and DORGAN then accused him of seeking to enshrine a procedure in the Constitution of counting Social Security in calculating the deficit in the Constitution. He said this is pure invention. This balanced budget amendment is entirely silent on the issue. "It is up to Congress to decide whether to count Social Security surpluses in calculating the budget," he says. Oh, really? I am trying to figure out what Mr. Krauthammer is reading. Has he read the proposal before the Congress, the proposal that says in the Constitution, "all revenues and all expenditures" would be counted? Is there some new law school that you can apply to on the back of a matchbook that teaches a different kind of law, one that allows you to misread these proposals?

Well, you know. Some of us believe, especially out in western ranching country, that things mean what they say they mean. If you write it, that is what you mean. If you say it, that is what you mean.

Mr. Krauthammer says no, that is pure invention. Apparently a Washington thought, not one that I subscribe to. The constitutional amendment means what the words in the amendment say it means, and until Mr. Krauthammer wrote this column, I did not think there was any serious dispute about that.

Mr. Krauthammer says, third, until 1969, it was not our practice to use surpluses in calculating the deficit. Only since 1983 have we begun developing a consistent, deliberate strategy of very large surpluses to save for the future. So what counts is after 1983, Mr. Krauthammer would probably know.

In any event, he misses the point on the 1983 amendment. He apparently just missed the whole body of law in which we decided that we would enforce a national pool of savings. Mr. Krauthammer said, you know, the Social Security system is a pay-as-you-go system, and the reason we have all this money is because we have these baby boomers working. False! Wrong! As with a lot of the rest of his column. He knows it. We told him he was wrong, of course. He did not point out in his column that, yes, he had made an error. Had he read the 1983 amendments, he would have known it is not a pay-as-you-go system. It is a system designed now with a tax base to create a deliberate national pool of savings with which to meet our future obligations.

Mr. Krauthammer says the amendment that CONRAD and DORGAN killed would have required a balanced budget by law—it would not be by law, of course. It would have to be by Constitution, unlike other such laws that could not be changed by a movement of truth, by a cowardly Congress. "It would have forced people like CONRAD and DORGAN to stop scaring the electorate and buckle down to the real deficit reduction problem."

I wonder what Mr. Krauthammer would write with respect to buckling down in 1993? We buckled down. In 1993, we passed the deficit reduction package through this Chamber that raised some taxes that were unpopular. I understand that. It cut some spending that was unpopular. I understand that. It was an act to reduce the deficit of over \$500 billion, and the actual experience is over \$600 billion in deficit reduction in 5 years.

Do you know something? We did not even get one accidental vote from the other side of the aisle, Mr. Krauthammer's friends. You would expect somebody to vote wrong by accident now and then. It took every single vote we could muster to win on that issue because it was unpopular, and we knew it. We had the courage to do what was necessary to reduce the deficit. We did not get one single vote from Mr. Krauthammer's friends.

So I say, when Mr. Krauthammer uses words like "cowardice," and so on, he might want to rethink who has exhibited courage in recent years, who has decided that they are willing to do what is unpopular if it is right, in order to help their country.

Well, we will, of course, send another response to try to correct some of the whoppers in Mr. Krauthammer's column. Again, I keep thinking that Mr. Krauthammer must believe that double-entry bookkeeping means you can use the same money twice. Of course, the first accounting course you take tells you that is not what double entry means. You cannot use the same money twice. There are some bookkeepers in America that have done that. They are now doing 4 years of hard tennis in minimum security prisons. You cannot use the same money twice. You cannot do it in businesses, and you cannot do it in the Federal budget.

When I finished reading his column this morning, it reminded me of something Clement Freud's grandson said. Clement Freud's grandson said this: "When you hit someone over the head with a book and get a hollow sound, it does not mean the book was empty."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I ask my friend from North Dakota how much time he would like?

Mr. CONRAD. Ten minutes.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 10 minutes off the bill to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for his courtesy, and I thank my colleague from North Dakota for his discussion of the latest Krauthammer column.

Let me just say that it is very apparent to me why Mr. Krauthammer is a columnist and not an accountant, because he clearly does not get it. He just does not understand why it is wrong to take Social Security trust fund moneys to balance the Federal operating budget. He does not understand why it is wrong to take a dedicated trust fund and use it to pay the other operating expenses of Government. But most people understand why that is wrong. Most people understand that you do not take a trust fund and loot it in order to pay other expenses and then say you have balanced the budget.

Mr. Krauthammer, in his latest work, indicates that the balanced budget amendment is "entirely silent on the issue." The issue he is talking

about is taking trust funds and using them for the other operating expenses of Government. It makes me wonder if Mr. Krauthammer has ever read the amendment that was before this body.

I brought along just one section of the balanced budget amendment that was before this Chamber. It says very clearly. "Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States Government \* \* \* total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States Government."

By definition, this amendment was including the Social Security funds because they are receipts of the U.S. Government. And, of course, Social Security is not contributing to the deficit. Social Security is in surplus.

So, by definition, Social Security surplus moneys would have been used, and used to balance the operating budget of the Federal Government. And those surpluses would have been used to pay other expenses. That is precisely the point.

Mr. President, to say you are balancing the budget when you are using trust fund moneys is a fraud. It reminds me of the Reverend Jim Bakker. Do you remember Rev. Jim Bakker, Jim and Tammy, that used to have the show "PTL" on television? He was an evangelist, a television evangelist. Does anyone know where he has been for the last several years? He has been in a Federal facility in Minnesota. He has been in a Federal jail. He has been there because he raised money for one purpose and used it for another, and that is called fraud.

That is precisely what is happening with the Social Security trust funds. We are taking money from people's paychecks. We are telling them that is going to be used to secure their retirement. We are taking that money and the part that is in surplus is being used to pay for other operating expenses of Government. The trust fund? There is no money in the trust fund. IOU's are in the trust fund, but there is no money there because we have spent it.

We are as guilty of fraud as Rev. Jim Bakker. And at some point the chickens are going to come home to roost in this country. To have put that kind of flawed policy in the Constitution of the United States would have been a profound mistake because then we would have had very little chance to change it.

Let me give an example of what is wrong with the Krauthammer thinking. Let us take a company that is earning \$1 million a year, has \$1 million of income but is spending \$1.5 million a year. That company is experiencing losses of \$500,000.

Now, of course, it could borrow from the retirement funds of its employees and say that it is balancing the budget. That is the kind of approach that apparently Mr. Krauthammer would endorse. I do not think many people in this country would think, if you were earning \$1 million a year as a company and were spending \$1.5 million, and you

were making up the difference by looting the trust fund of your employees, you would balance the budget. But that is the policy that he endorses. That is the policy Mr. Krauthammer thinks makes sense. I think most people would recognize you may have balanced cash against cash, but you have run up a \$500,000 liability. You owe it, and you are going to have to pay it back or you are going to renege on your obligation.

Mr. President, that is what is wrong with the approach we are taking. That is what is wrong with what we would have done if we would have put that principle into the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. Krauthammer apparently belongs to the school of thought which believes that in order to save Social Security we must loot the Social Security trust funds. I do not belong to that school of thought. I think that is a profound mistake.

Mr. Krauthammer has one thing right. One of the threats to Social Security is the debt that we are accumulating in this country. When we spend more than we take in, we are mortgaging the long-term future of this country—no question about it. That is a threat to Social Security just as it is a threat to the economic security of the United States.

There is a second threat. The second threat to Social Security is the raiding of the Social Security trust funds. The reason we are running a surplus now, and the reason we are going to be running surpluses for the next 10 or 15 years is to prepare for the day the baby boom generation retires. That generation, which is twice as large in terms of people who are eligible to receive Social Security as the current generation, is going to put enormous pressure on the system. When we changed the Social Security methodology in 1983, we changed it in order to prepare for the day when the baby boom generation retires. That is why we are running surpluses. That is why those surpluses ought to be preserved.

The notion that the only way to save Social Security is to loot its trust funds is mere nonsense. That is the position Mr. Krauthammer endorses. I think he is entirely wrong in that proposition. I think the people of this country have the common sense to reject that theory. I think by all of the reaction we have received from the balanced budget amendment debate the people of this country recognize we are on a course that cannot be sustained. It ought to be changed. Mr. Krauthammer might want to be a guardian at the gate of the gridlock of the past, the policies of the past. Senator DORGAN and I do not choose to join him in that endeavor. We do not think defending the policies of the past is defensible. There ought to be a change. To have enshrined those failed policies in the Constitution of the United States would have been an insult to the Framers of that document who put together,

after all, a method of operating for this Government that has made us the envy of the world. That document has made this Nation the greatest country in human history. We should not tamper with it lightly. We certainly should not enshrine in it a flawed policy, one that says you have balanced the budget when you have looted trust funds in order to do so. That is not a policy that belongs in the Constitution of the United States.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

#### COMMEMORATING GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate Greek Independence Day—a national day of celebration of Greek and American democracy. Tomorrow, on March 25, 1995, all people of Greek descent will celebrate the 174th anniversary of the beginning of the revolution which freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire.

A historic bond exists between Greece and America, forged by our shared democratic heritage. America is truly indebted to the ancient Greeks for giving the world the first example of direct democracy. As the solid stone of this neoclassically designed building provides a protected place for our own democratic government to flourish, the philosophical and democratic influences of the ancient Greeks provides the inspiration. It is therefore fitting that Members of this Chamber join in paying tribute to the long struggle for freedom that Greece endured.

On March 25, 1821, when Germanos, the archbishop of Patros, proclaimed Greek independence, another link between Greece and the United States was forged. The American revolution served as a model for the Greek struggle for freedom and when the Declaration of Independence, translated into Greek, served as the declaration of the end of the Greek struggle, a circle was completed.

The interconnection between Greek and American democracies lies not only in the philosophical underpinnings of our Government, but in many areas of American life. Percy Bysshe Shelley once said, "We are all Greeks! Our laws, our literature, our religion, our art, have their roots in Greece." The tremendous influence that Greece has had on American life continues today through the activities of the vibrant Greek community in America. In every field—politics, entertainment, business, and education—Greek-Americans continue to contribute to American life.

In particular, I wish to pay a tribute to the Greek-American community in New Jersey. Groups that are leaders in the New Jersey Greek community include: the Greek American Chamber of Commerce of New Jersey, the Greek American Voters League of New Jersey, the Hellenic American Bar Association of New Jersey, the Pan Gregorian Enterprises & Foundation,