

stirring comments about the valiant Marines on Iwo Jima. My brother was a Marine officer. I followed not in the Marine Corps but to West Point, so one of us was right.

SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deep concern about the direction that the President is taking the country in terms of our Nation's commitment to providing retirement security to the elderly and income security to the disabled, widows, and survivors. I am speaking, of course, about the President's plan for privatizing Social Security.

President Bush writes in his recently released Economic Report of the President, "The greatest fiscal challenges we face arise from the aging of our society." Yet his annual Economic Report devotes little more than a page and a half to this important subject.

As his Economic Report reveals, the President has no real plan to address the fiscal challenges arising from the retirement of the baby boom generation, let alone a plan to fix Social Security. All the President has is an unaffordable plan to create private retirement accounts, with few specifics and many unanswered questions.

That is not stopping the President from barnstorming the country telling the American people that Social Security is a sinking ship and private accounts are the lifeboats into which we should jump. But the administration is manufacturing a crisis that does not exist in order to dismantle Social Security.

Despite the administration's claims, Social Security will remain solvent for nearly 50 more years. Even after that, Social Security would still be able to pay 70 to 80 percent of benefits. Modest changes to the system would enable Social Security to pay full benefits well beyond the next 50 years.

No other retirement system or Fortune 500 company in the United States can make that same claim. In fact, the weakness of traditional pensions makes Social Security look like the most secure part of our retirement system right now.

To put the problem into perspective, making the Bush administration's four enacted tax cuts permanent would cost three to five times more than the Social Security shortfall over the next 75 years.

For over 60 years, Social Security has provided a dependable and predictable stream of income to retired or disabled workers, their dependents and their survivors. Forty-eight million men, women, and children rely on Social Security benefits each month to help them live with dignity. The benefits are protected from inflation and one cannot outlive them.

Social Security is an insurance program, not an investment plan, and pri-

vate accounts would destroy much of the insurance value of the program. More than one-quarter of Social Security benefits go to survivors and disabled workers and their families, and these benefits would be at risk under the President's proposal.

We all acknowledge the long-term fiscal imbalance of the Social Security trust fund. However, it is equally critical to recognize that the President's private accounts do absolutely nothing to address this imbalance, as a senior administration official recently acknowledged. In fact, diverting payroll tax revenues exacerbates insolvency and accelerates the date of trust fund imbalance.

For obvious reasons, the President has not mentioned this or other facts that are so critical to the Social Security trust fund. His privatization scheme requires cutting benefits by more than 40 percent, even for those who choose not to invest in privatized accounts.

Those choosing a private account could be hit with an additional "privatization tax" of 70 percent or more of the value of their account, which would be deducted from their Social Security benefits upon retirement.

President Bush has urged Congress to fix Social Security for younger workers and not pass on the problem to future generations. However, the President's plan for private accounts would place a huge burden on our children and grandchildren by increasing Federal debt by over \$750 billion in just the next 10 years. This debt would rise to nearly \$5 trillion over the first 20 years that the plan is in place.

The President's private accounts would cut Social Security's funding, weaken the program, and make its financial problems worse, not better. In short, private accounts pose a serious threat to the future economic security of all Americans, particularly the most vulnerable members of our society.

This is why last week I joined 41 of my fellow Democratic senators in calling on the President to publicly and unambiguously abandon his support for private accounts funded with Social Security dollars or cuts in guaranteed benefits.

At a time when our country is saving so little and fewer employers are offering traditional pension plans, Social Security's predictable, inflation-protected benefits that can't be outlived occupy a critical role in ensuring our retirement security.

Before we can roll up our sleeves and delve into the very serious question of shoring up Social Security for all, we must set aside ideology and acknowledge the demographic and fiscal challenges facing this bedrock retirement security program.

I want to work with President Bush to promote personal wealth and saving through investment, but not at the

cost of Social Security. I urge the President to take private accounts off the table so that we might achieve bipartisan agreement to strengthen Social Security for the long-term and enhance the retirement security of all Americans.

I yield the floor.

"MADD AT GM" CAMPAIGN

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I come to the Senate this afternoon in disbelief and sadness and a little anger. I am angry, sad, at the blatant disregard for common sense in a new ad campaign being promoted by a prominent trade association.

The American Beverage Licensees, or ABL, has launched a campaign entitled "MADD at GM"—MADD referencing Mothers Against Driving Drunk, with the aim of stopping the charitable donations General Motors gives to Mothers Against Drunk Driving.

ABL claims that MADD has a "neoprohibitionist agenda." Yes, the neoprohibitionist agenda is what they claim.

They claim that MADD "wants to criminalize social drinking by preventing designated drivers from drinking before they get behind the wheel." Apparently in their world, designated drivers ought to be able to have a few drinks before getting on the road. In most people's world, that defies all common sense.

In honor of MADD's 20th anniversary in 2000, General Motors made a commitment to contribute \$2.5 million over 5 years to MADD to combat underage drinking, for underage drinking prevention, and drunk driving victim assistance, a very laudable goal. I applaud General Motors for doing this. But what has happened is, with General Motors' funding commitment now expired, ABL has seen this as the perfect opportunity to attack General Motors. They are attacking a noble cause, and their attack makes no sense.

ABL's smear campaign against General Motors and MADD has taken many forms—an Internet Web site, print advertisements, TV ads during NASCAR events, and through promotional materials distributed at bars, restaurants, and other ABL member locations throughout the country. I have brought two of these ads with me to the Senate floor this afternoon. Let me show the first ad.

This first advertisement plays off the well-known board game Monopoly. It explicitly states that by purchasing a General Motors car, any American is funding his or her own arrest. How absurd. It suggests that because General Motors supports MADD and MADD is against drinking and driving that somehow General Motors is to blame if you get arrested for being over the legal drinking limit. But last time I checked, in this country we arrest people who have broken the law. And in

this case that is drinking too much before you get behind the wheel.

Let me show the second ad, just as outrageous. This advertisement, again from the MADD at GM campaign, contradicts common sense as much as the first one did. As you can see here, the man in the ad is posing for his mug shot. But instead of holding his arrest number, he is holding a sign stating that his arrest was sponsored by General Motors. That is what it says.

General Motors didn't get this man arrested. Drinking and driving did. The ad further states that General Motors supports the arrest of social drinkers through its charitable donations to MADD. But that isn't the case at all. The simple fact is that if you drink too much and you get in a car and drive, you break the law. It doesn't matter if you label it as social drinking or not; what is wrong is wrong.

This ad says that "MADD spends millions provided by GM to fund their roadblock promotion campaign. They're using your money to arrest you."

That roadblock campaign is a program I strongly support and I know many Members of the Senate support as well. It is also a program that the Traffic Safety and Law Enforcement Campaign bill that Senator LAUTENBERG and I are introducing today would help fund.

Let me show a third ad. This ad, however, is from MADD. In it you can see a note from LT Carl McDonald about his daughter Carlie. It reads:

This is my precious little girl, Carlie. I always told her, "I will love you as long as there are stars in the sky." She would always smile, look up at me and say, "I love you more than there are stars in the universe." These words are now inscribed on her tombstone. At the tender age of five she was killed by a drunk driver—her mother. If you think it can't happen to you—think again. Please don't drink and drive.

This was an ad brought to us by MADD.

The ad has more teeth in it than the other two ads combined. We all know the truth; that is, drinking and driving is deadly. MADD is doing all it can do to help save lives and get drunk drivers off the road.

I think what is so alarming and irritating and makes us all so mad is this campaign that is targeted against MADD, Mothers Against Drunk Drivers, an organization that has done so much good in this country in all 50 States.

I first came in contact with MADD when I was a State senator back in the early 1980s. We had a little boy, a 7-year-old boy by the name of Justin Beason, who was tragically killed by a drunken driver in my home county. As a result, I introduced a bill in our State legislature, a tough drunk-driving bill. I can truthfully say it was through the support of MADD and MADD's members who went to the leg-

islature, lobbied the legislature, testified in front of the State legislature, wrote letters—if it wasn't for MADD, that bill would not have become law.

It is an organization that reminds us every day of the horrible tragedies and about people like Carlie—little children who lose their lives on highways every week because of drivers who were drinking. This organization has been so viciously attacked by this trade organization. It is an organization made up of many parents who have lost children, and many times husbands who have lost wives, and wives who have lost husbands—all to drunk drivers. It is a good organization. It is an organization we should all support. It is an organization of which we should all be proud. Anyone who attacks it, I just don't understand.

Here are some statistics to think about: 69 percent of our youth died in alcohol-related fatalities in the year 2000 involved young drinking drivers. Of the 42,000 people killed in all of the traffic accidents in 2003, 40 percent—well over one-third—were due to alcohol. Further, since MADD's founding in 1980, drunk-driving deaths have dramatically decreased from 26,179 in 1982 to 17,013 in the year 2003. Clearly, MADD and other anti-drunk-driving campaigns are having an impact. We have begun to change the culture in this country. In part, we have corporations such as General Motors to thank having helped MADD in their cause. While deaths due to drunk driving have decreased in large part through the great work of MADD, the job is certainly not finished. As long as people are put into danger because someone got behind the wheel after drinking alcohol, we have work to do. General Motors and MADD are not criminalizing social drinkers, they are working together to simply save lives.

Today, I am introducing six transportation safety bills. I introduced them last year and am doing so again because I want to see them get passed and signed into law and see lives saved. They are commonsense bills that will, in fact, save lives. I think all of us care about keeping our roads safe. That is also why I again commend MADD and General Motors. I also commend the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration for its efforts to keep drunk drivers off the road and its prosafety agenda. They are all doing what is right and what needs to be done to protect our children and our families when they get into a car and get on the road.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, before my colleague goes, I want to once again say to my good friend from Ohio how much I appreciate his leadership. I am a principal cosponsor with my colleague on this very important bill dealing with underage drinking. We have wonderful sponsors in the House as

well, in a bipartisan way, to try to make a difference.

The Senator has laid out very categorically what the facts are, which is that this is a massive problem in this country, and a growing one, unfortunately, with the age of people who are becoming regular users of alcohol dropping all the time. While certainly parents have to do more at the local level, more efforts need to be made. We also think it is incumbent upon us at a national level to be supportive of those efforts, to help provide resources and guidance to try to reverse this trend.

I didn't want my friend to leave the floor without expressing to him my deep sense of gratitude—not only on this issue but on countless other issues affecting families and children. MIKE DEWINE of Ohio has been as good a champion as this body has seen in a long time on these issues. There are very few issues that have given me as much pleasure to work on as issues with children. On behalf of all of us in this country—he represents Ohio well, but in this regard he is making a difference all across the country. On their behalf, I thank him.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for the very kind remarks. Senator DODD has been a real partner on so many issues affecting children. He and I have worked together. Whenever we want to find someone to advocate for children, CHRIS DODD is there. My colleague is always a great champion for children.

On the issue of drinking and driving, underage drinking and highway safety, Senator DODD has been a true champion. I thank my colleague for coming to the floor. Again, I look forward to continuing to work with him in the years ahead.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Ohio, Senator DEWINE, and call attention to an unseemly lobbying effort to discredit one of our Nation's most revered public safety organizations, the Mothers Against Drunk Driving, MADD, and one of our Nation's largest automakers, General Motors.

Each year, General Motors donates money to MADD to support its campaign against drunk driving. In response to this, the alcohol special interest lobby is spending \$10 million to finance a lobbying campaign—or as some might call it, a smear campaign.

This campaign is aimed at scaring and intimidating corporate donors like GM so they will stop giving money to safety organizations like MADD. Apparently the alcohol lobby thinks it is bad for its business to crack down on drunk driving, which kills 17,000 Americans each year and injures over 500,000.

Ten million dollars is not an insignificant amount of money. After all, the Federal Government only spends \$30 million each year on public law enforcement campaigns to educate people

on drunk driving awareness and prevention.

What a shame. Imagine if the alcohol lobby would spend \$10 million to educate people and prevent drunk driving, instead of bullying GM. Many of the customers they lose each year to drunk driving crashes could probably be saved, along with thousands of innocent Americans. That sounds like a much better investment than financing a smear campaign that will cost lives.

I am one of the most ardent opponents of drunk driving in the Senate, and I see the results of the good work we do here to help save the lives of our constituents from the scourge of drunk driving. Over the years, I have battled against the alcohol lobby to pass effective laws to reduce drunk driving.

In 1986 I authored legislation and worked with Senator ELIZABETH DOLE, who was Secretary of the Department of Transportation at the time, to raise the minimum drinking age from 18 to 21. President Reagan signed my bill into law, and MADD officials were there with us. In 2000 Senator DEWINE and I teamed up to get a bill passed establishing .08 blood alcohol concentration level as the nationwide threshold for drunk driving.

These are the kind of smart, common-sense initiatives that MADD supports. And these are the kind of initiatives that save lives. Combined, these two measures are estimated to save some 1,500 lives a year.

Federal public awareness campaigns against drunk driving are also having a tangible impact. We need to step up these program, which is why Senator DEWINE and I will soon introduce a bill to increase funding for this effort. What we don't need is a \$10 million misinformation program from the alcohol industry.

Drunk driving is no joke. It kills and maims thousands of people in American each year, and costs \$9 billion in additional health care and other costs. MADD is trying to stanch the flow of blood on our highways, and they are doing a good job of it. GM, to its credit, supports MADD. They deserve our encouragement, and they deserve for us to stand up against this vicious smear campaign.

I intend to work with Senator DEWINE to let Americans know the truth about the alcohol lobby's smear campaign, to counter the alcohol lobby's lies with the truth, and to fight for legislation that reduces drunk driving and saves lives across our country.

AMENDMENTS TO VARIOUS REGULATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION:

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to give notice to Members and staff of the Senate that the Committee on Rules and Administration ("Committee") has approved amendments to

four Committee regulations. Pursuant to Title V of the Rules of Procedure for the Committee and having provided advance notice of our intention to approve the following amendments to regulations, we hereby approve said amendments effective February 1, 2005.

1. The following regulations are approved as amended:

A. Committee Regulations for Furniture, Accessories and Special Allowances Policy for Senate Office Buildings, as amended by adding, deleting and substituting as follows:

Delete the second sentence in item 5 which reads "However, once modular is chosen for a suite, it shall remain a part of that suite regardless of which Senator occupies the space."

Under Section A in item 5, delete "A." and the words "of funding for this program" and substitute "and the order in which the request is received." Delete Sections B and C in item 5.

Delete item 7.

At the end of second sentence in item 8 add the following: "or through the Senate Furniture web system."

Under Section A in item 8 delete the words "to be transferred to the intended office" at the end of the sentence and substitute "by the Committee on Rules and Administration prior the transfer."

At the end of first sentence in item 9 add the following: "available for viewing through the Senate Furniture web system (<http://senate.aoc.gov>)"

Under Standard Furniture and Accessories, Senators' Suites—

1. Delete "Chairs—Ergonomic (with or without arms)"

2. Delete "Chairs—Folding Chairs"

3. After "Chairs—Conference" add "(with or without arms)"

4. Delete "Chairs—Reception" and substitute "Chairs—Desk (with or without arms)"

5. Delete "Chairs—Reception (without arms)"

6. Delete "Chairs—Secretary"

7. Delete "Coats—Rack"

8. Add "Credenza—(Conference room & Front office only)"

9. Delete "Desk—Secretary" and substitute "Desk—L-Shape"

10. After "Fireplace—Screens" add "(Russell SOB only)"

11. After "Fireplace—Tools" add "(Russell SOB only)"

12. After "Lighting—Ceiling (Chandelier)" delete "Fixtures (Reception and Conference Rooms in Russell SOB only, no more than 2 total)" and add "in Russell SOB only, (Reception Rooms, Conference Rooms and Senator's Personal Office, limited to 3 total)"

13. After "Lighting—Floor Lamps" add "2 per office"

14. Delete "Lighting—Reading Lamps"

15. Delete "Magazine Rack"

16. Delete "Microfilm Cabinets"

17. Delete "Modular Furniture—Limited to Hart SOB for now)"

18. Delete "Partitions—Textures (i.e. wood)"

19. After "Refrigerator—Medium" add "Not to exceed 3 total"

20. Delete "Stand—Smoke (Ashtray)"

21. Delete "Tables—Folding"

22. Delete "Window—Venetian Blinds (2 inch, Russell and Dirksen SOB's only)"

23. Delete "Window—Mini Blinds (Hart SOB only)"

Under Senators' Personal Offices—

1. Delete "(Bathroom)—(Vanity under sink)*"

2. Delete "(Bathroom)—(Cabinet over/next to sink)*"

3. Delete "Chairs—Reception" and add "Chairs—Side (with arms or without arms)"

4. Delete "Chairs—Reception (without arms)"

5. After "Chairs—Overstuffed" add "(Historic)"

6. Delete "Lighting—Reading Light"

7. After "Lighting—Ceiling (Chandelier)" delete "Fixture (Russell SOB only) and add "in Russell SOB only, (Reception Rooms, Conference Rooms and Senator's Personal Office, limited to 3 total)"

8. Delete "TV Cabinet" and add "TV/VRC Cabinet"

9. Delete "VRC Cabinet"

10. Delete "Upholstery Fabric"

11. Delete "Wardrobe"

12. Delete "Window—Curtains or Draperies"

13. Delete "Window—Venetian Blinds (wood or metal)"

14. Delete "Window—Mini Blinds"

15. Delete "* Standard part of building structure"

After heading "For Loan (for Meetings and Related)" add "Functions"

A copy of the Committee Regulations governing Furniture, Accessories and Special Allowances Policy for Senate Office Buildings, as amended, is included as Attachment A.

B. Committee Regulations Governing Senate Travel and Travel Promotional Awards, as amended, by deleting paragraphs five and six in Section II(A)(3)(b) and related Appendix A and substituting as follows:

Travel promotional awards (e.g. free travel, travel discounts, upgrade certificates, coupons, frequent flyer miles, access to carrier club facilities, and other similar travel promotional items ("Travel Awards")) obtained by a Member, officer or employee of the Senate while on official travel may be utilized for personal use at the discretion of the Member or officer pursuant to this section. Travel Awards may be retained and used at the sole discretion of the Member or officer only if the Travel Awards are obtained under the same terms and conditions as those offered to the general public and no favorable treatment is extended on the basis of the Member, officer or employee's position with the Federal Government. Members, officers and employees may only retain Travel Awards for personal use when such Travel Awards have been obtained at no additional cost to the Federal Government. It should be noted that any fees assessed in connection