

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 privatiza-

tion, 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 add-on 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 borough 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 Con-

gressional 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.●

#### DR. CAROLYN REED

• Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Dr. Carolyn Reed, director of the Hollings Cancer Center at the Medical University of South Carolina. The Post and Courier newspaper in Charleston, SC recently published a profile of Dr. Reed in a special Remarkable Women section. I have the great pleasure of working with Dr. Reed and can attest to the remarkable job she has done since taking the reins as director last year. She is a talented and compassionate surgeon and effective administrator who easily blends these two roles in mapping the Cancer Center's future. Her commitment to offer all South Carolinians state-of-the-art cancer care is unwavering.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Post and Courier (SC), July 25, 2001]

#### SURGEON IS HEAD OF CANCER CENTER

(By Dottie Ashley)

You might think a pall would hang in the air when you enter the office of Dr. Carolyn Reed. She must deal daily with deadly disease in her dual roles as thoracic surgeon and director of the Hollings Cancer Center at MUSC.

But, instead, you can't help but smile.

Occupying one shelf, alongside a volume titled "Thoracic Oncology," is a large green jar with the words "Male Sensitivity Pills" printed on the label.

"I doubt if that endears me to my male colleagues," says Reed with a laugh. Wearing her white doctor's coat over a lilac blouse, she buzzes around the office, filling it with energy and optimism, even when she is viewing results from radiology that reveal a patient has lung cancer.

The surgeon, now 50, who won a thoracic surgical oncology fellowship to the venerable Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center, doesn't beat around the bush.

She's a straight-talking Maine Yankee, and, on this morning, speaking firmly into the telephone to a colleague, says, "This is absurd; the system is making us do unnecessary procedures."

Accustomed to changing the system and cracking glass ceilings, Reed is one of 4,000 practicing cardio-thoracic surgeons in the United States, of which only 2 percent are female.