

not against doing agricultural authorization. I loved being on the Agriculture Committee. But we should do it in a farm bill and not in an emergency supplemental bill for agriculture. No. 2, the fact is, I think the Senator has received letters from the White House and previous administrations where they said: Senior advisers will recommend that the President veto the bill. Unfortunately, we get those all too often around here.

I think it is very clear that the President and his advisers do not like the way this bill was constructed and would prefer to see us live within the requirements of the budget agreement for the year 2001. I think we can do that, and we should do that. It is the only way I believe we will actually get a bill done this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 102, S. 1246, a bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American farmers:

Tom Harkin, Harry Reid, Jon S. Corzine, Max Baucus, Patty Murray, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Jeff Bingaman, Tim Johnson, Ted Kennedy, Jay Rockefeller, Daniel K. Akaka, Paul Wellstone, Mark Dayton, Maria Cantwell, Benjamin Nelson, Blanche Lincoln, Richard Durbin, Herb Kohl.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under the rule has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1246, a bill to respond to the continuing economic crisis adversely affecting American farmers, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) is necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Dorgan	Lugar
Allard	Durbin	McConnell
Allen	Edwards	Mikulski
Baucus	Enzi	Miller
Bayh	Feingold	Murkowski
Biden	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Graham	Nickles
Breaux	Gramm	Reed
Brownback	Grassley	Reid
Bunning	Hagel	Roberts
Burns	Harkin	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hatch	Santorum
Campbell	Helms	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Hollings	Schumer
Carnahan	Hutchinson	Sessions
Carper	Hutchinson	Shelby
Chafee	Inhofe	Smith (NH)
Cleland	Inouye	Smith (OR)
Clinton	Jeffords	Snowe
Cochran	Johnson	Specter
Collins	Kennedy	Stabenow
Conrad	Kerry	Stevens
Corzine	Kohl	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Landrieu	Thurmond
Daschle	Leahy	Voinovich
Dayton	Levin	Warner
DeWine	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dodd	Lincoln	Wyden
Domenici	Lott	

NAYS—2

Ensign

Gregg

NOT VOTING—3

Bennett McCain Torricelli

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 95, the nays are 2. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the motion to proceed to S. 1246 be adopted and the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; that the Senate resume consideration of the Agriculture supplemental bill, S. 1246, at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, July 31, and that Senator LUGAR be recognized to offer an amendment, the text of the House-passed bill; further, that no cloture motion against the bill, or any amendments, be in order prior to Wednesday, August 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LUGAR. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I simply thank the majority leader for this motion. It sets us off on a constructive path for consideration of this bill, and it offers an opportunity for me to present an amendment, which I am prepared to do. We look forward to working with him. I do not object.

I yield the floor.  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, let me thank the distinguished ranking member and the chairman for their excellent work in getting the Senate to this point. I appreciate very much Senator LUGAR's interest in pursuing this amendment. We will have a good debate on it. We don't know how long the debate will last, but we will certainly leave it to him to make some decision in that regard tomorrow morning.

Tomorrow is Tuesday. We have 4 days within which to do a tremendous amount of work. I ask the cooperation of all of our colleagues. We need to finish this bill, and that will entail, of course, working through some very difficult questions not only with regard to the level of funding but also perhaps the dairy issue and other questions about which I know Senators are concerned. We also have to finish the Transportation bill, and of course, the Export Administration Act expires in August. The distinguished Presiding Officer addressed that point last week. We would like to do HUD-VA. There is a lot to be done.

Tomorrow night our Republican colleagues have an event and we will attempt to accommodate that event tomorrow night. I appreciate very much the minority leader's cooperation in allowing us to move to the bill as quickly as we have. That will at least accelerate the opportunity for debate and hopefully allow us to address some of these questions as quickly as possible. It will be a busy week.

I will say now, so there is no surprise if we are not finished at least with the Export Administration Act, the Transportation bill and the Agriculture supplemental bill by Friday, we will need the weekend and we will need additional days. That is an unfortunate but certainly accurate statement. I am hopeful that will not be necessary, but I want Senators who have traveling plans to take that into account because this work must be done. I thank all of my colleagues.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. I seek recognition in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. This weekend, the New York Times Sunday edition had a front

page story on a proposal by two Members of the House of Representatives concerning the future of Social Security. It is an interesting proposal because the two, JIM KOLBE of Arizona and CHARLIE STENHOLM of Texas, a Republican and Democrat, support the notion of privatizing Social Security, giving people an opportunity to invest some part of their Social Security payroll deduction into some sort of private account.

It is interesting that the Kolbe-Stenholm proposal for privatization is the first complete package I have seen because in that package they have to tell you how they will pay for it. If they want to take 2 percent of the payroll deduction and put it into a private investment, it will have a dramatic impact. Two percent does not sound like much, but it turns out to be a substantial portion of the amount that is dedicated to Social Security. Since Social Security is a pay-as-you-go system, if you are going to dedicate the 2 percent to private investment, you run the risk, or at least have the opportunity to take a look at a lot of other things that need to be done in order to achieve this 2-percent privatization investment.

When you look at the Kolbe and Stenholm proposal and Social Security, a number of things come out very clearly. In order to achieve this privatization, they are calling for an increase in the payroll tax for Social Security, a reduction in the benefits paid for Social Security, an acceleration of the age of 67 years for retirement under Social Security, and a variety of other changes, which means that the Social Security system as we know it will be dramatically changed.

Some critics of the Democrats have said even though you are critical of this commission on Social Security, you have to accept the reality that Social Security is not going to last forever. That is true. Left untouched, Social Security is going to run out of funds. There is no doubt about it.

The report that was given by the President's commission suggests that Social Security would run out of funds in the year 2016. That is not accurate. The right year is 2038. The obvious question is, Should we be concerned today about a system that will run out of funds 37 years from now? I think the answer is yes. The answer is obvious because there are people paying into Social Security today who will need that system 37 years from now, and we should be making changes that we can realistically make, honestly make, that will save Social Security to make certain that it has a longer life.

Each of those changes will involve some pain. There is no doubt about it. But to make those changes today in anticipation of 2038 is a lot more sensible and I think would be more reasonable in terms of its approach. It is painful, too, I might add, politically. But to couple those changes to save and prolong Social Security with this

idea of privatization is what forces my colleagues in the House, Mr. KOLBE and Mr. STENHOLM, to make some drastic changes. They are, as I said, raising the payroll tax on Social Security, reducing the benefits paid, saying to people they cannot claim their Social Security benefits until they reach the age of 67—at an earlier date, I might add—and reducing the cost-of-living adjustment which is given each year under Social Security.

I think what we need to do to go at this honestly is to separate the two issues. We should say to the American people: We are going to set a goal for the life of Social Security. We want to make certain it is adequately funded and solvent for so many years to come. Right now it is to the year 2038. The question is, What do we want to prolong it to—2057, 2058? What would it be? Pick that date, and then say to both the President's commission and those who would come at it from a different perspective: Tell us what you think it would take for us to make sure that Social Security is solvent that extra 20 years. Maybe that is our goal, 20 years beyond its current solvency. Then have each side make their proposal of what it would take to reach that.

Then if some want to come in and add the option of privatization of Social Security, let them also explain how they would pay for that. Where I think the President has made a mistake is creating a commission which is not designed and created to give a longer life to Social Security but is designed instead to create an item on the political agenda of privatization of Social Security.

It comes down to this as well. There is a difference of opinion as to what Social Security is all about. Some view it much like a retirement fund or an investment plan. It certainly has characteristics of that. But more than that, it is an insurance policy. It is known as the social insurance policy for Americans. That puts it in a different perspective. We pay premiums throughout our life for basic insurance. If we live to be 65, so long as we are alive, that payment, of course, gives us the safety net we need in our retirement. Some, though, think it should be viewed as a retirement fund. There have been times when you can make more money in the stock market than the Social Security fund has made, and in that respect they are asking for the privatization of the system. I think we ought to take care.

As appealing as it may be for us to consider the possibility of privatization, you run the very real risk, if the stock market takes a downturn at the time you want to retire, that everything you have saved for is not there when you need it. So the insurance policy aspect of that would be something you would welcome at that moment. Instead, you have been caught in a bad investment.

Many American families, probably most who are listening and following

this debate, have had in the last year a bad experience in the stock market. There was a terrific good-time roll in our economy for about 9 or 10 years with the creation of 22 million new jobs, new housing starts, new businesses, low inflation, a dramatic increase in the Dow Jones index, and a great increase in personal savings from people who were putting money away for retirement. Then at the beginning of last year, a correction started to take place which we are still living through. During that correction, the retirement investment of a lot of people diminished. So if they were counting on this increase in the value of their investment because of the growing stock market, then they have had a rude awakening over the last year.

What if this were all that you had? What if you had made your investment in your fund for retirement, the private investment of your Social Security funds, and the day came for your retirement and you were caught at a bad moment on the stock market, when things were low? That sort of thing worries me because this safety net is very basic. It is tough for a person to survive just on Social Security. To take even a small part of it and to put it into private investment is to run the risk that, while it may increase in value, it may decrease as well.

So I think the President's commission starts with a false assertion about the Social Security trust, its funds, and its solvency. But it also starts with the premise that you have to privatize it as part of giving a longer life to Social Security. My challenge to the commission and to those as well who do not agree with privatization, including myself, is to come up with a proposal to give a longer life to Social Security and put it on the table and say to the American people: This is what we need to do to give a longer life to Social Security. Let the President's commission do the same thing. Then, for those who want to privatize, want to take more money out of Social Security, let them then tell you what the add-on cost would be for privatization. Then let's make the political judgment.

Today we are in this swirl of misinformation, some of it coming from the commission and some of it coming from outside sources. There are some people, of course, who have never liked Social Security. They called it socialism when Franklin Roosevelt came up with this idea. But I think we would all agree—at least I hope we would—that it has been the single most successful social program in America, giving a lot of senior citizens an opportunity they would never have otherwise to retire with dignity and to have a life with their families, to live for a long time without fear they were going to be dependent on their children or the Government for some sort of dole or hand-out. I think this generation has to meet its obligation for the future of Social Security.

I concede changes must be made. The Democrats and Republicans should come together to make those changes. I think when we take a look at the additional cost of privatization as Congressman KOLBE and Congressman STENHOLM say, and find out what it will cost in terms of reducing benefits and raising payroll taxes on Social Security, that it will be quickly rejected. I hope we will do this in an honest and bipartisan fashion and that we address it very quickly. It is never an easy issue to address, but it is certainly one we have an obligation to address as quickly as possible.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### VIRGINIA HOUSE OF BURGESSES

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, on July 30, 1619, in the church at Jamestown, VA, the colonial Governor of Virginia, George Yeardley, called into session a meeting of twenty-two citizens called burgesses, from each of the eleven boroughs subdivisions, of colonial Virginia.

According to one of the participants, Mr. John Pory, "all the Burgesses took their places . . . till a prayer was said by Mr. Burke, the minister," who asked God to "guide and sanctify" the "proceedings to his own glory."

The Speaker then addressed the members of the assembly on their duties as participants. "Our intent," wrote Mr. Pory, was "to establish one equal and uniforme kinde of government over all Virginia."

Thus began, 382 years ago this very day, the first representative, legislative body in American history, the Virginia House of Burgesses.

I do find it ironic that today, when there is so much talk about separation of church and state, that the very first legislative assembly in American history took place in a church. It seems very fitting that the legislative foundations of the world's greatest power, and the world's foremost proponent of liberty and, I might add, religious freedom began in a church.

What a momentous day July 30, 1619 was, not only in American history, but also in world history. Right there in that little church in Jamestown, VA, a colony still struggling to survive, a colony that had been decimated by plagues, disease, hunger, and war, a significant step was taken in the development of representative government.

Think about it, even with all the problems of simply staying alive, these men, driven by that eternal desire to be free and to rule themselves, to be free of the control of kings, emperors,

czars, and other autocrats, had the intellect and the foresight to meet in that church and begin a journey that would eventually lead to the establishment of our republic.

Independence was still more than 150 years away, but the seeds of American democratic thought had been sown. It is probably no coincidence that from the House of Burgesses would come some of the most important champions of American liberty and greatest leaders of the American Revolution, including Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, John Marshall, and Patrick Henry.

For this reason, I want to recognize this very important, if overlooked, day in our American heritage.

#### LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred November 11, 1990 in Seattle, WA. A 23-year-old man was near death from head injuries suffered in an attack by members of a Seattle gang known as the United Blood Nation. The attackers had been targeting gay couples during the night.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

#### THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, at the close of business Friday, July 27, 2001, the Federal debt stood at \$5,736,703,126,894.92, five trillion, seven hundred thirty-six billion, seven hundred three million, one hundred twenty-six thousand, eight hundred ninety-four dollars and ninety-two cents.

One year ago, July 27, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,673,849,000,000, five trillion, six hundred seventy-three billion, eight hundred forty-nine million.

Twenty-five years ago, July 27, 1976, the Federal debt stood at \$620,139,000,000, six hundred twenty billion, one hundred thirty-nine million, which reflects a debt increase of more than \$5 trillion, \$5,116,564,126,894.92, five trillion, one hundred sixteen billion, five hundred sixty-four million, one hundred twenty-six thousand, eight hundred ninety-four dollars and ninety-two cents during the past 25 years.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### HONORING SOUTH DAKOTA CONGRESSIONAL GOLD AWARD RECIPIENTS

• Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to publicly commend an outstanding group of young people from my home State of South Dakota. These fourteen extraordinary students were recently honored with the Congressional Gold Award, a prestigious award given to a very select group of dedicated young people from throughout the Nation.

The Congressional Award program was established by Congress in 1979 to recognize the initiative, achievement, and service of extraordinary young people from across the Nation. The Award was signed into law by President Jimmy Carter, and each president since Carter has renewed the authorizing legislation.

To qualify for the Congressional Gold Award, an individual aged 14 to 23 must complete at least 800 hours of goal-oriented work in four program areas: Volunteer Public Service, Personal Development, Physical Fitness, and Expedition/Exploration. These program areas emphasize each person's capacity to grow and develop as an individual, as well as how each person can selflessly contribute to the happiness and well-being of their community.

South Dakota Congressional Gold Award recipients chose to volunteer their time and talents in many different areas, where they made tremendous contributions. One recipient volunteered at the Veterans Affairs hospital in Ft. Meade, SD. Some awardees became mentors or Girl Scout leaders, while others volunteered at childcare centers, athletic associations, local schools, parks, and even in the South Dakota State Penitentiary. One individual actually established an annual volksmarch in their hometown.

For their outstanding commitment to physical fitness, personal development, exploration, and for committing their hearts and hands to volunteering in their communities, I would like to congratulate the following young South Dakotans for receiving the Congressional Gold Award: Kary Bullock of Ashton; Eric Davies of Whitewood; Nicole Hammer, Janelle Stahl, Kayla Stahl, and Michelle Jilek of Mellette; Ryun Haugaard and Norman Haugaard II of Milbank; Carrie Larson and Jessica Larson of Mitchell; Alexis Malsam of Aberdeen; Andrea McComsey and Tracey Smith of Conde; and Betsy Valnes of Sioux Falls.

I thank these outstanding young people for their immeasurable contributions to their communities, the State of South Dakota, and our Nation. It is because of individuals like these that I have great faith in the continued success and prosperity of our great Nation. These individuals truly serve as an example for all young Americans. •