

did not have to. This problem is not going to hit America until probably the midteens when we begin to go negative into the Social Security system. In other words, we will not have the amount of money coming in to pay for benefits. Borrowing will have to start to occur from the Government side to pay off these bonds that are in the Social Security trust fund in order to pay benefits. We will do something at that point in time because the deficit impact will be huge on the United States of America.

Social Security, instead of running \$100 billion surpluses, will be running \$200 billion deficits. Compound that with the growth of Medicare and other things we are seeing, and we will be in a huge deficit situation, which will cause either income taxes to go up, spending on the Government side to go down—which I think is highly unlikely—benefit cuts in Medicare and Social Security, or tax increases for Medicare and Social Security. Any one of those situations puts a burden on future generations either through benefit reductions or tax increases, which I think is breaking the compact that we have had since 1936 with our seniors.

I am hopeful we can find some bipartisan cooperation to look at the problem that is confronting us and say: We have an opportunity to give people hope, to give younger people hope that we can have a better system for them than currently is promised. What is promised for people in their twenties right now is basically 70 cents on the dollar of the benefits that are promised under the system. We can only pay for 70 cents on the dollar. That is what this current system provides.

So when you hear, "We will keep these promises," I understand what keeping the promises means. It means higher taxes for future workers or lower benefits for future retirees. That is what happens if we wait.

So the idea that says there is no problem, understand what that means. That means future generations—whether it is 5 years from now, 10 years from now, 15 years from now—will be hit with higher taxes and lower benefits or some combination of them or maybe one exclusive of the other. But the bottom line is, it is going to impact adversely that generation of workers and that generation of seniors.

We can avoid this problem right now if we allow younger workers the opportunity to put some money away, invest in the American economy, the strength of the American economy, with broad-based index funds that invest in the growth and future of the American economy, which I think we all have high hopes for and believe will be strong going into the future. We believe that is the most responsible way of avoiding this breaking of the compact with future generations, of saying to future generations they will not do as well as other generations of Americans have done under the current system.

So with that, Mr. President, I thank the other side for their indulgence and for the 5 minutes, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next 30 minutes is controlled by the Democratic leader or his designee.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes on the Democratic side as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to reiterate that I am extremely concerned about President Bush's proposed Social Security restructuring, privatization—whatever the code word of the day is—restructuring, which I believe is going to put at real risk the security of all Americans in this country, from our young workers who will be retiring in future decades, to our seniors who are retiring today or who are already retired.

As President Bush's plan has come out, we are realizing what it will do. It will end the guaranteed benefit that is such a critical part of this insurance program today. We also see that it is going to do nothing to fix the long-term issues that face Social Security. Just privatizing and restructuring it is not going to solve those long-term issues.

I am also here today to emphasize the fact that this restructuring or privatization plan is going to add trillions of dollars to our national debt—trillions of dollars when we already have record deficits that future generations will be responsible for. This privatization plan adds trillions of dollars to our national debt.

As President Bush has been traveling around the country to sell his privatization plan, we hear him say:

We have an obligation and a duty to confront problems and not pass them on to future generations.

Well, many of us, on both sides of the aisle, agree with him. We should not create new problems for the next generation to handle. But the trouble is, that is exactly what this President's plan does. It actually adds to the problems of the next generation. It does nothing to solve them.

I think it is time for President Bush to level with the American people about what his program really is. It really is a new recipe for a continuing fall into a black hole of debt. This plan, as the President is proposing, is going to run up \$5 trillion in debt that our generation will not pay for. It is going to fall squarely on the shoulders of our children and our grandchildren.

The President not only wants to gamble away the secure future that retirees count on today, he wants to burden them with a huge new \$5 trillion debt.

Now, there is another point worth making about the President's plan as

well. I keep hearing him say that anyone over 55 will not be affected. Anyone over 55—well, let's be clear. Anyone over 55 will be impacted by this tremendous new debt that is incurred.

President Bush can say he will not cut your benefits now, but how can he guarantee that if we take trillions of dollars from the Social Security trust fund for this privatization plan?

All we have to do, to understand this situation, is to look at the record.

Just last week, we got a budget with the biggest deficit in our Nation's history—4 short years after the budget had the largest surplus in our Nation's history. A few days later, we saw cost estimates for the Medicare prescription drug benefit balloon from the \$400 billion we were told it would cost to now it costing more than \$700 billion.

Now the Bush administration plans to add trillions to our balance sheet by privatizing Social Security. Let's take a look at this chart. It tells the picture clearly. As we see with this chart, there is more red ink in the President's budget than we care to see for years to come. Unfortunately, if his privatization plan goes into effect, massive new debt increases are added in the years after this plan takes effect. The President, as he did with Medicare, likes to talk about the cost of implementation over 10-year periods. What he does not mention is that for 5 years under those projections, the plan is not fully phased in. So rather than considering his already bloated \$700 billion transition projection, let's look at an outside source.

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities says the borrowing numbers we have heard from the administration "are misleadingly low."

They are generated by using a ten-year budget window (2006 to 2015) that includes only five years of the fully phased-in plan. The plan would not be launched until 2009 and not be in full effect until 2011.

Over the first ten years that the plan actually was in effect (2009 to 2018) it would add \$1.4 trillion to the debt. Over the next ten years (2019 to 2028) it would add about \$3.5 trillion more to the debt. All told, the plan would add \$4.9 trillion (14 percent of GDP in 2028) to the debt over the first 20 years.

That is almost \$5 trillion. That money is going to have to come from somewhere, and it is pretty naive to think that huge new borrowing will not affect our current retirees. It is naive to think massive new borrowing won't affect programs such as Medicare or Medicaid that do need our attention. And it is naive to think we will simply go along and pass this massive new problem on to our children and grandchildren.

A story a couple of days ago in the Washington Post was headlined "After Bush Leaves Office, His Budget Costs Balloon." I want to read a few lines from that story.

It warned that "the numbers released in recent days add up to a budgetary landmine that could blow up just as the next president moves into the Oval Office."

Philip G. Joyce, professor of public policy at George Washington University, said in the piece:

It's almost like you've got a budget and you've got a shadow budget coming in behind that's a whole lot more expensive.

And a Republican adviser to one of our colleagues said:

Hopefully some very difficult decisions will be addressed between now and the time we have a new White House resident so that occupant isn't faced with some very expensive chickens coming home to roost. There are some things that we can do, but unfortunately in the political world kicking down the road is often seen as leadership.

That is what kicking down the road is going to give us. That says it all.

This huge new debt is not the only bad part of privatization. In fact, we need to remember this plan that is being put forward does nothing to extend Social Security solvency—not for a year, a day, not for an hour. That is the issue we are trying to solve. The President's plan, at least the part he has been willing to share with us, does not address that. It is an ideological gamble that we in the Senate and those who depend on Social Security today and tomorrow and around the country should not stand for.

Rather than gambling away our security and running up this huge new debt, we should promote personal savings to help every American with their retirement security and we should stop raiding the Social Security trust fund to pay for misguided priorities such as massive tax cuts for the wealthy.

The ideas we have heard from the President are too dangerous for this generation's retirees or those who are to follow. As you can imagine, like all of my colleagues, I have heard a lot about this proposal from my constituents in Washington. I have heard from current retirees, from disabled workers whom we have not even begun to talk about how this plan will affect, and from young people who would supposedly benefit. President Bush would be very surprised by the tremendous number of comments I have been getting and the tone of them. I will share a few.

From a retiree who lives on Whidbey Island:

The administration should be ashamed of its effort to confuse and mislead the hard-working citizens of the United States.

I heard from a 20-something, who supposedly is going to benefit from privatization, who said:

I want Social Security to be left in its current form.

I heard from a 51-year-old self-employed fisherman who said:

My main concern about Social Security is that it survive for my children. The risks are simply too great for the future of our citizens and our country.

I agree with him. This plan is a plan for social insecurity. It is a guaranteed gamble, not a guaranteed benefit. We are going to continue to stand up for future generations, the young people who are following us, against a private

solution that simply will add trillions of dollars in debt to the future generations we are supposedly thinking about here in the Senate. We want to be proud of what we pass along to our children and grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

(The remarks of Mr. AKAKA pertaining to the introduction of S. 393 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allotted 15 minutes of the 30 minutes of the time allotted to myself and the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. CORNYN and Mr. LEAHY pertaining to the introduction of S. 394 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to take a second to convey my appreciation to the Senator from Vermont for his eloquent and I know heartfelt remarks. Today is a good day for open Government in the Senate.

I wish to recognize the leadership of Senator DEWINE for legislation he will be pursuing later today that enhances disclosure of records regarding Nazi war criminals. Senator DEWINE, Senator FEINSTEIN, and I are proud to be cosponsors of the legislation, as is the Senator from Vermont. We are all proud of that effort under the leadership of Senator DEWINE.

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. DURBIN. Mr. 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. Mr. President, how much time is remaining in morning business on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my staff just brought to my attention a publication from the Republican Policy Committee, which our colleague, Senator KYL of Arizona, chairs. It is on their Web site. I found it interesting because it is a description of the Democrat's Social Security plan. What is interesting about this so-called bill, as described by Senator KYL and the Republican Policy Committee, is that it does not exist.

They go on to describe this so-called bill by the Democrats which, according to the Republicans, will require new borrowing or tax increases of \$5.8 trillion between 2018 and 2042. This does not exist. What I hold in my hand and what is on the Republican Policy Committee site is a complete fabrication. There is no truth to this.

It surprises me that my colleagues will reach a point where they would put this into the public discussion—try to—when they know it is not true.

Let's try to recap where we are on the debate about Social Security. It was President Bush who told us we needed to talk about Social Security. It was President Bush who told us we face a crisis, a challenge, a bankruptcy in Social Security. It was the President who said we needed to privatize Social Security. It was the President's leadership who brought us to this point in the discussion. And many of us are still waiting for the President's bill.

The President has spoken about Social Security. Some of his colleagues and friends on the Republican side of the aisle have applauded his suggestions, but as yet we have not seen President Bush's proposal. What we know about it concerns us.

Instead of strengthening Social Security, President Bush's privatization plan will weaken Social Security. Let me be specific.

A memo is released from the White House. It suggests changing the indexing rate for Social Security. That is the rate of inflation and other increases in the outyears. So we put the calculation together. What if you change the index from the wage index to the price index?

We find out that in a few decades, we would be cutting Social Security benefits by 40 percent. President Bush's proposal is to cut Social Security benefits by 40 percent.

How does that strengthen Social Security? It weakens it. For many seniors, it means they are going to be tipped over the edge. They are going to end up with less money from Social Security, despite a lifetime of contributions. So there is the first weakness.

The second weakness is the President wants to take money out of the Social