

past 5 years—even if it was a successful chapter 13 reorganization where the debtor paid off all their creditors.

No. 5. The bill's new reporting, filing and paperwork requirements will make bankruptcy process more onerous than ever before—expensive legal expertise will be more necessary, a burden which low and moderate income families with high debt loads can ill afford. But several sections of the bill create a variety of disincentives for attorneys to represent consumers in bankruptcy. The results of these provisions will be that some attorneys will leave the practice of consumer bankruptcy, and others will have to raise their fees to account for the increased expenses and risks involved. This in turn will lead to more consumers being unable to afford an attorney and either obtaining no relief or falling prey to nonattorney petition preparers who provide services which are usually incompetent and often fraudulent.

No. 6. The means test to determine which debtors can file Chapter 7 bankruptcy—as opposed to Chapter 13—is inflexible and arbitrary. It is based on IRS standards not drafted for bankruptcy purposes that do not take into account individual family needs for expenses like transportation, food and rent. It disadvantages renters and individuals who rely on public transportation and benefits higher income individuals with more property and debt.

CAPITOL HILL POLICE BUDGET

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I also want to very briefly mention another matter since I have the floor. I think the Senate is going to be united. This I hope will be less of a battle than on the horrible bankruptcy bill, credit card company bill, big banker bill. This is the week where we honor law enforcement. I said it last week. I will say it one more time. I say it to the Presiding Officer. I say it to every Senator.

You should, if you get a chance, talk to some of the Capitol Hill police officers at the different stations here on the Senate side. You will be really troubled by how demoralized they feel and also how angry they are. I have never seen anything like this, and I have been here 9½ years. I have never seen anything like this.

Sheila and I are pretty good friends socially and in other ways with some of the police officers. I am sure some of the Senators are. They are just livid. In July, 2 years ago, we lost two fine officers, and after all the concern that was professed, they cannot believe, in light of that and in light of the fact that we do not have two officers on every post where we need two officers just for security reasons for the public, for us—and I would argue just as important for them—that not only are we not living up to that commitment and

doing what we need to do—the Sergeant at Arms on the Senate side, Jim Ziglar, has been terrific on this and Senator BENNETT, the Republican chair of the appropriations legislative subcommittee; his subcommittee has been terrific on this—these police officers cannot believe what the House of Representatives has done.

It is unbelievable. What the House of Representatives has done is to call for fairly dramatic—I don't have the figures. I don't know if the figures are so important. They are calling for dramatic cuts in the budget so we will have hundreds fewer, 400 fewer, police officers.

I will say to some of the Representatives on the House side, and in particular I am going to say it to the Republicans because on this one there seems to be a pretty major party split where the Democrats have expressed a lot of indignation, where Congressman HOYER and Congressman OBEY spoke up rather strongly about this, in all due respect, do we need to wait for this to happen again where we only have two police officers at the memorial post over the weekend, with long lines of people, and one person shows up who is deranged, and those two officers cannot possibly handle that situation when there are all sorts of other people coming through the line, and you have to check baggage and check what people have and you have to be talking to people and keep your eye on so many different people, and it cannot therefore be prevented or avoided, and we lose more? What are you waiting for?

It is absolutely outrageous. I say to the police union, the officers' union, which is a fine union, whatever the union decides to do is what the union decides to do, but I would not blame this union if the police officers do not express clearly their indignation.

I cannot believe this was done. As I said last week, it is one of the most unconscionable, one of the worst things that has been done in the Congress since I have been here. I really believe that.

I say to Senators, when this appropriations bill comes to the floor, I know Senator REID, who is a former Capitol Police officer, and I know I will be out here and others will be, too, with an amendment that will get the funding up. All of us will agree, Republicans and Democrats, that we are in good shape on the Senate side, and I am proud of that.

I say to the Chair, what I would rather not see is two different operations where on the Senate side we have the funding and do what we need to do to make sure these officers are given the resources for their own security, much less the security of the public, and then on the House side, they have a completely different situation.

I wanted to bring this to the attention of my colleagues because we are

going to have a very strong showing on the Senate side. I do not believe it is posturing just to show one is on the side of the police officers. People feel strongly about it in the Senate.

We went through far less than the families of Agent Gibson and Officer Chestnut. We went through a living hell here. We do not want it to happen again. We do not know whether we can prevent it from happening again, but we certainly ought to do everything we can. Cutting 400 police officers is not doing everything we can.

AGRICULTURE CRISIS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, it is interesting the Senator from Kansas is in the chair because I know we are in agreement on this, but I at least want to make the appeal to my colleagues that, for my own part, I believe it is good that in our budget resolution we made allowance for additional funding for help and assistance to farmers. It was somewhere close to \$7 billion.

My hope is we will not do this in the process of an emergency appropriations bill; that we will give care to how we allocate this money, how we get assistance out to farmers. My fear is—and maybe it will be a good arrangement—that if we double AMTA payments and put it into the conference report to accompany the crop insurance bill, we will have lost our opportunity to have hearings in the Ag Committee and have some focus, some substantive discussion, some careful discussion about how we can make sure we target the assistance to those producers that need it the most.

I voted for AMTA payments. I am not intellectually arrogant. I figured, what help we could get the people, get it. I had an uncomfortable feeling that some of the landowners who were not even farmers and some of the largest operators least in need were getting more than they needed. The flip side was the people who needed help the most were not getting it. I do not want an inverse relationship of assistance to need. Some, regarding the AMTA payments, suggest that is what is happening.

At a minimum, I say to my colleagues, we should, between now and the end of June—we have time—have some hearings in the Ag Committee. We should have some careful discussion and deliberation about how we get this assistance out to family farmers. It should be more targeted than the AMTA payments have been. I do not believe it is appropriate, again, to deal with such an important issue and such an important question by putting it into another conference report, this particular one being on crop insurance.

When we went through the budget process and allocated this money, we were making a statement that we did not want to be forced into a situation

of one more time getting emergency funding out there without any deliberation as to how. I thought this meant we were, on the part of the authorization committee, Senator LUGAR's committee, going to have hearings and an opportunity for Senators and people from the countryside to talk about the best way to get this assistance out to the countryside to help the people most in need.

It looks to me, again, that we may be making an end run around that process, and that is a mistake. I speak out for the hearings. I speak out for deliberations. I speak out for doing something about the price crisis other than every year just getting money out to people. Most of the producers in the country would far rather get a decent price. That is a whole other discussion and debate which I hope we will have.

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. GREGG. 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. GREGG. Mr. President, what is the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time between 2 and 3 o'clock shall be under the control of Senator THOMAS from Wyoming, or his designee.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent to proceed as if in morning business for 15 minutes.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, today Gov. George W. Bush set forth some ideas addressing the issue of Social Security. It is my understanding that the Vice President is also going to discuss this issue today, although he has, before today, made a number of comments in this area.

I have spent a considerable amount of my time over the last 7 years I have served in the Senate working on the issue of Social Security, working on it in a bipartisan manner, trying to develop a coalition in this Senate to move toward resolution of what I consider to be one of the most significant public policy matters we have confronting us.

Let me define the problem so we understand what we are working with and what the concerns are. Today, the Social Security system is running a very aggressive surplus. In other words, it is taking in more money than it is paying out. The Social Security system is on a dollar in/dollar out basis. In other words, there is no asset value that is placed somewhere. There are not a set

of dollars saved to pay your Social Security benefit. The dollar raised today pays the benefit that is incurred today. The younger worker who is paying Social Security taxes today is paying for the older worker who is retired today.

We have the baby boom generation working today at its maximum earning capacity, and because we have a larger younger generation than the generation that is retired, we are now running a surplus. In other words, more money is being taken in to pay for the benefits than is being spent on the benefits. That extra money is being borrowed by the Federal Government. It is being used basically to operate the day-to-day activities of the Federal Government. In exchange for that, a note is given back to the Social Security trust fund.

Alternatively, the money is being used to buy down the debt of the Federal Government—the public debt in many instances—and that money is then basically returned to the marketplace in the form of proceeds going into the capital markets because we no longer have the Federal Government borrowing those moneys from the capital markets but, rather, the money is no longer needed by the Federal Government and, therefore, the capital markets are free to create more activity for a stronger capital market.

The problem is, the baby boom generation today is generating the huge surplus in Social Security funds and is going to start retiring in the year 2008. When that generation starts to retire, the demographics of the situation change radically. The Social Security system was always perceived as a pyramid. It was always believed there would be a larger working generation than the retired generation. The retired generation at the top of the pyramid would be smaller and the working generation at the bottom of the pyramid would be larger.

Because the postwar baby boom generation is so large, it is that unique generation that has changed this country in every decade and forced the country to build all sorts of elementary schools in the 1950s and created the disruption to a large degree in the 1960s. It has gone through the pipeline and has changed the system in every generational phase. When that generation retires, we go from a pyramid to almost a rectangle. Instead of having 3.5 people working for every one person retired by the year 2015, we only have two people working for every one person retired. The system comes under a huge strain. The benefits don't change—or there is no plan to change them—and therefore all the folks who are retired have to be supported by a younger generation, which is a smaller generation, but they have to support them again with the tax dollars earned by that generation.

As we look into the future—and we don't have to look very far; it begins in

2008—we see as we head into the second decade of this new century, the next generation, our children and their children are going to be subjected to a huge cost, a huge tax increase, in order to support the retirement of the baby boom generation. This escalates rather dramatically through the year 2045.

There are Members who think something should be done, that we should not pass this huge burden on to the next generation; that we, as a baby boom generation, have an obligation to get ourselves and our Nation ready for the retirement of our generation.

As I said, we worked across the aisle for the last few years to try to develop policies to address this problem. Dramatic progress has been made. There are at least four or five major initiatives in this Senate today which legitimately address the issue of making the Social Security system solvent for 100 years. One of them happens to be one which I worked on with Senator BREAUX, Senator KERREY, Senator THOMPSON, Senator THOMAS, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator ROBB. It is bipartisan and crosses philosophical spectrums.

Our proposal, as scored by the Congressional Budget Office and by the Social Security actuaries, makes the system solvent for the next 100 years. It does it without any tax increase of any significance.

In order to accomplish this type of a change, we have to have comprehensive reform. We cannot do it piecemeal; we have to do the whole system. We can't just simply pick out one point in the system and try to change that and expect to address the system so it becomes solvent, so we do not put a huge burden onto our children's backs in new taxes, or additional tax increases.

We have tried to draw into this debate, to get this process moving, the White House and the President, but we have had singularly little luck in doing that. Regrettably, although this administration has occasionally talked about Social Security reform, and the President in his State of the Union even said this would be one of his primary goals in his waning years in office, it has done virtually nothing and, in fact, has put out proposals that would dramatically cause the situation to deteriorate, especially for the younger generation, in the form of major tax increases.

Today, Governor Bush has put forth a proposal. Regrettably, the response by Vice President GORE, up until today—and I suspect he will not change his tune today—and the response of the White House, has been to essentially take the old time school approach of attacking it in the most demagogic terms, saying the proposal is going to end Social Security; it is going to put at risk recipients who are presently benefiting from Social Security, and that it is a proposal which undermines