lost their seats because they voted for that bill. The House Members were swept out totally because of that bill. I have said on the floor before and I will repeat it, if that is what it took—no matter how traumatic it is to me that the Democrats lost control and still don't have control of Congress—that it was not too big a price to pay to get our fiscal house in order. And here are the Republicans, again, at the same old stand with the same old economic policy saying, ''We've got to cut taxes.''

What is the tax cut? It is the same old tax cut: 53 percent of it goes to the wealthiest 15 percent of the people in America. If I were rich, I would be a Republican, too. No, I wouldn't. My father would be whirling in his grave if I did a thing like that.

Well, let me give you the bad news. The bad news is, the surplus is not real. It is not a certifiable surplus. Do you know why? Because we still use Social Security in the budget. If we had truth in budgeting around here, where all the trust funds—the Social Security trust fund, the highway trust fund, the airport trust fund, the pension funds—if all of those funds were taken out of the budget, not only would we not be looking at a surplus, we would be looking at a very healthy deficit.

And so as rhapsodic and euphoric as most people are about what we call a surplus for the first time in 30 years, it is not a surplus. There is $100 billion in the budget this year that is money right out of the Social Security trust fund. You take the $100 billion Social Security trust fund out, and you have a healthy $40- to—I don't know what the figure is—somewhere $40-plus billion deficit.

This is no time—we know that Social Security under the present system is going to be totally bankrupt in about the year 2029; and by the year 2013, we are going to be paying out more every year than we take in, which is a far cry from a $100 billion surplus we are getting a year now. I think the Social Security trust fund in about the year 2013 will have over $3 trillion in it—$3 trillion. You think about all that money, but by the year 2029 it will be dead broke, it will be on a pay-as-you-go basis. We will be taking in money one day and paying it out the next. There will be no trust fund.

So when the President said, ''Social Security first,'' he meant that.

What does ''Social Security first'' mean? It means that you do not pay for tax cuts with Social Security trust funds. Right now, if we raid the surplus, we are raiding the Social Security trust fund.

As I said in the beginning, I need about 10 more feet of cord on this thing to say everything I want to say. I just do not speak well unless I have an opportunity to walk up and down this aisle. All I want to say to my brethren on the other side —good friends, people whom I like—and I am not in the business of giving Republicans political advice; they have been doing reasonably well without me. But I will say this: They should know—and they do know it, and I think they had a few defectors over in the House the other day who said, ''I'm not about to go home and face people and tell them that I have just voted for a tax cut for the wealthiest people in America and I did it out of the Social Security trust fund.'' I would love to run against somebody who voted that way. I would do my very best to hammer them into the ground, because it is an honest accusation and it is pointing out to the American people what irresponsible conduct this Congress is capable of engaging in.

So I do not think it is any secret to the Speaker of the House or any of the House Republicans who voted for it. And, quite frankly, I do not think it is going anywhere in the U.S. Senate. And in the unlikely chance it should also pass the Senate, I do not think there is a chance in the world that President Clinton—I do not care how weak he is or how weak he is perceived to be, I can almost give you an ironclad promise he will veto that bill. And I promise you, the veto will not be overridden.

While President Clinton has been a friend of mine for 25 years—I guess longer than anybody in the Senate—he is a friend of mine, I do not deny that, has been; we come from the same State; we share the same political friends at home. I do not have any doubt about his absolute commitment on things like this. I am trusting him completely when he says he will veto the bill, and, as I say, I am going to do everything that I can to make sure it never reaches his desk.

Having said that, let me say one final thing. Madam President, in 1981, Ronald Reagan said he would balance the budget by 1984. Ray Thornton—a former Member of the House, told me his 81-year-old father-in-law said one day somebody told him, ''Ronald Reagan is going to balance the budget by spending more money and cutting taxes''—take in less and spend more. He said, ''What a dynamite idea. I wonder why nobody ever thought of that before.''

The day Ronald Reagan held up his hand and was inaugurated, the national debt was $1 trillion; and 8 years later when he left, it was $3.2 trillion. He managed to triple it in 8 years. But you know something? I voted with the President in 1981, not quite the way he suggested, but I voted for the spending cuts that he proposed and against the tax cuts. FRITZ HOLLINGS and Bill Bradley and I were the only three Senators who voted that way, and we would have balanced the budget in 1984 if everybody had voted that way. But, as you know, everybody did not vote that way.

So what happened was, we wound up doubling defense spending within 4 years after Ronald Reagan was elected President—doubled it within 4 years. That was back when we found out, after throwing all that money at the Pentagon, they we were paying $7,000 for toilet seats and $7,000 for coffee makers—the same thing everybody does when you throw that much money at them.

Madam President, I have said about all I want to say except, I will be lying prostrate at the end of this cord in this aisleway the day that tax cut passes here. I plead with my colleagues, let's do something completely apart from politics. Let's not do something that is as irresponsible as that is. Nobody, I guess, ever lost an election by voting for a tax cut.

People here are getting pretty apprehensive about voting against a so-called marriage penalty. The one thing you never hear is that many married people already have a bonus. There is a marriage penalty for some, but many married people are a lot better off filing joint returns than they are filing as single persons.

I would not mind addressing the problem of what the House did the other day which, I think, amounts to an average of $240 a year. That is about $20 a month. Well, that is not beanbag for some people, but it is not enough to rape and pillage the Social Security trust fund for when those very people we are trying to help are also concerned about that Social Security trust fund being viable when they get to 65 years of age. And you ask them, ''Would you rather be assured that the Social Security trust fund will be there for you when you retire or would you rather have a $20-a-month tax cut?'' Talk about no-brainers.

Madam 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. BUMPERS. 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. BUMPERS. Madam President, as I understood the parliamentary situation, at the hour of 2 p.m. there will be 1½ hours to debate the motion to proceed to the Internet bill. Is my understanding of that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business until 3:30.

Mr. BUMPERS. Until 3:30.

MAIL-ORDER CATALOG SALES

Mr. BUMPERS. Madam President, I rise today to once again address an issue that I have addressed a number of times here in the U.S. Senate. It deals with mail-order catalog sales. Everybody within earshot of my voice knows what I am talking about because when they come home at night and pick their mail up, they will find mail-order catalogs. At my house, the average is about 6 to 10 mail-order catalogs on a daily basis. You can buy anything under the shining sun. If you save all of those catalogs, sooner or later you will

get one to offer you every product that can be bought in any retail house in America.

Now, I have two reasons for my strong feelings about this. No. 1, I was a small town Main Street merchant, as well as a practicing lawyer. Most people don't know it, but I was the only lawyer in town—you are listening to the whole South Franklin Bar Association right now—in a little town of 1,200 to 1,500 people.

When I got out of law school, I knew I wouldn't be able to make a living practicing law so I bought back a business that my father had owned before he and my mother were tragically killed in an automobile accident. I was in law school in Chicago at the time, and 3 years later when I got out of law school, I had no intention of going back to the small town. I had left Arkansas to go to Chicago law school because I didn't think Arkansas was nearly big enough for me. But because of that and the fact that Mrs. Bumpers' family all lived in this little town, we went home and I bought the hardware, furniture and appliance business that my father had owned, hoping that it would sustain me while I built my law practice.

Believe you me, I needed a lot of sustaining while I was building a law practice. People would walk into my office and say, ''Aren't you sort of a lawyer?'' And I would have to grudgingly admit yes, that is exactly what I was—''sort of a lawyer.''

So I speak today as a former retail merchant in a little country town in Arkansas called Charleston. But I also speak as the former Governor of Arkansas where in 1971 I had to raise the income tax because we felt that the sales tax, which is a regressive tax, was already about as high as we could make it.

That was quite an undertaking because some of the wealthy people in my State, many years before, had seen to it that the constitution of Arkansas provided that any tax other than a sales tax would require a 75-percent vote of both houses of the legislature. You think about that. If you wanted to raise the sales tax, which affects working people and poor people more than anybody else, it would only require a 51-percent majority; but if you wanted to raise the income tax, which hit the wealthy people, it required a 75-percent vote. I remember it took nine votes in the Arkansas State Senate before we passed an income tax bill. That bill, which raised the marginal rate from 4 to 7 percent, is the thing that made my State—I don't say this to boast, but every economist and every political scientist will tell you that it is the one thing that made Arkansas fairly stable economically thereafter.

Do you know something? While it is a very volatile thing, I got a lot of hate mail when I was championing it, but I got about 65 percent of the vote next time I ran, which shows that people are not dumb, if you go to them and explain your actions. You can always trust the American people to do the right thing. Winston Churchill once said, ''You can always depend on the American people to do the right thing once they have explored all the other possibilities.''

The truth of the matter is, when you talk sense to the American people, they respond sensibly. So this problem of mail-order catalog houses is simply this: If you wanted to come into my store and buy a $500 refrigerator, the tax on that was 5 percent, or $25. If you want to order that refrigerator from a mail-order catalog house in another State, there is no $25 tax, no tax of any kind. If you want to buy almost anything under the shining sun, from a toboggan to hunting boots, you can find a mail-order catalog that sells those items. A lot of these companies will tell you in their advertising that there is no sales tax. They tell you ''no sales tax,'' even though, actually, 45 of the 50 States in this country have what is called a ''use tax,'' and that applies to out-of-State purchases.

Do you know what the problem with that is? You might say, well, what are you up there shouting and shooting your mouth off about if there is already a use tax in 45 out of 50 States. I will tell you why. It is very simple. The tax is on the purchaser, not the seller. So if I buy that refrigerator and they said ''no sales tax,'' that is a deception.

Arkansas has a use tax, which is a tax on anything brought into the State. But the only problem is, it is on me and I don't even know the tax exists. I promise you—I don't know how many people are within earshot of what I am saying, but I guarantee you that precious few of them know there is a use tax on anything they buy from a mail-order catalog house. They don't know it, so they don't pay it.

Maine has become so frustrated that they have a provision in their income tax return requiring them to multiply .004 or .0004, by your adjusted gross income and send it in. That is to make up for anything you bought out of a mail-order catalog, whether you bought anything or not. I said, in 1995—the last time I offered this amendment—that I think it is very suspect, from a constitutional standpoint, to tax people on mail-order sales when you didn't buy anything. Yet, Maine has been doing that.

A lot of people—for example, Indiana—do a little auditing from time to time. Ten thousand people in Indiana—and 1994 is the latest figures we have—paid some kind of a use tax for buying stuff from mail-order houses in another State. But what they collect is just nothing. In 1994—again, the last year we have figures for—if mail-order catalog houses in this country had collected sales taxes on all the merchandise they sold into these States, they would have paid the States, counties and the cities in the neighborhood of $3 billion. My guess would be that 4 years later, that is in the vicinity of $4 billion-plus, because retail sales have skyrocketed since 1994.

But, look, in 1994—as I say, the last time I debated this subject was in 1995—in 1994, my State lost $19.6 million, California lost $482 million, Illinois lost $233 million. That is the reason the National Governors' Conference, National Conference of Mayors, and the National Association of Municipalities favor my amendment. I have a list of the various organizations that support my amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to have printed in the RECORD a list of organizations that favor my amendment.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE BUMPER'S AMENDMENT

The International Council of Shopping Centers.
Marine Retailers Association of America.
National Home Furnishing Association.
North American Retail Dealers Association.
World Floor Covering Association.
National Conference of State Legislatures.
National Governors' Association.
National League of Cities.
National Association of Counties.
United States Conference of Mayors.
International City/County Management Association.
Council of State Governments.

Mr. BUMPERS. Senator GRAHAM and I are going to offer this amendment, if we get a chance, on this bill.

What brought all of this about? Well, first of all, it was about 1967, the Supreme Court, in a decision commonly referred to as the National Bellas Hess case, a big mail-order house. I forget where they are located. The Supreme Court said: You States, you cities, and you counties may not charge a use tax on mail-order sales coming into your State from another State unless that mail-order house has a physical presence in your State. Eddie Bauer used to be just a mail-order house. Now Eddie Bauer has outlets in just about every State in the Nation.

For example, if you order something out of the Eddie Bauer catalog and you are a Maryland resident, they will charge you sales tax. You can't buy it without paying the sales tax because they have a physical presence in Maryland. But most of these people like Lands' End and L.L. Bean don't have a physical presence in your State and they don't collect sales taxes. But the Supreme Court said in the National Bellas Hess case, you can't charge sales tax or use tax on mail-order sales because it violates the due process clause, and it is a violation of the interstate commerce clause. That sounds like the end of the story.

However, in 1992, the State of North Dakota challenged the Bellas Hess decision. They went to the Supreme Court and said we think the case was wrongly decided, and lo and behold, the Supreme Court agreed with them on 50

percent of it. They said it was no longer a violation of the due process clause for a State to require a mail-order house in another State to collect sales taxes for them. But the Court found that there was still a violation of the interstate commerce clause. The Supreme Court throughout its history has been very, very zealous in making sure that we didn't pass any laws, or that no State passed a law, that interfered with interstate commerce.

In that decision 25 years later, Quill versus North Dakota, the Supreme Court said requiring companies to collect use taxes was still a violation of the interstate commerce clause unless Congress gives the states permission to collect these taxes. So that is what I am attempting to do.

Senator WYDEN is a dear friend, and one of the finest men to ever serve in the U.S. Senate, in my humble opinion. However, his bill prevents the states from passing any taxes on the Internet for a two year period. My amendment would not exempt the Internet. My amendment would make it possible for the states to require out-of-state companies to collect use taxes whether the products were sold over the Internet or via mail order catalog.

I chaired the Small Business Committee for a long time. I made speeches about being a small businessman a lot of times on the floor of the Senate. But you tell me, is it fair for a Main Street merchant to collect sales taxes on every single thing he sells, from a loaf of bread on up, to support the fire department, to support the police, to support the local schools, to support everything under the shining sun in that community, that county, that State—is it fair for a Main Street merchant who is there with the people, contributing to everything that comes down the pike—is it fair to make him collect the sales tax, but his competitors, who are selling $300-plus billion worth of things over the Internet by the year 2002 and over $100 billion a year on mail-order sales, not collect a dime?

I stand corrected. There are a very, very few who do charge sales taxes, just because they are good citizens.

Let me digress a moment to tell you who one of those good citizens is—none other than our distinguished Senator from Utah, Senator BENNETT.

Senator BENNETT and some of his colleagues a few years ago started an office supply business. He told me that as they sat around discussing various aspects of that business and how they were going to form it, and so on, the question came up: What are we going to do about sales taxes? He said they talked about it and they concluded that they would be a lot better citizens and would feel a lot better about it if they just voluntarily collected taxes on all of the office equipment that they sold.

Incidentally, this business has some retail outlets here in Washington and in Maryland. They would now be required to collect the sales tax because they simply have a physical presence. But they did it long before they were a physical presence; at one time they were a pure mail-order house.

Senator BENNETT joined the Small Business Committee when I was chairman of that committee. In a hearing one day, he said, ''Don't let them tell you how complex this is and how difficult it would be for them to collect taxes in every State for every State municipality and every county in the country.'' Senator BENNETT says it is the easiest thing in the world. At the end of the month, they push a button on their computer and the checks go out.

One thing Senator GRAHAM and I would do would be to give companies the option of collecting a blended rate which covers all state and local taxes. By giving the companies this option, we can reduce the burden on remote sellers when local sales taxes vary within a state.

But the point I am trying to make is, Senator BENNETT told me it is not complicated to collect use taxes. When the debate begins on this amendment, if and when it ever does, I hope my colleagues will take stock of the fact that one of their own colleagues says that is a bogus, specious argument.

Madam President, sometimes these mail-order houses say, ''Well, we don't ask for any services. We don't need police protection. We don't need fire protection. Our kids don't go to school in your State. So why should we be penalized and be required to pay taxes when we are not a burden in your community and in your State?''

With these mail-order catalogs, one of the biggest problems States and municipalities particularly have is disposing of the waste in their landfills. You ask them: What is one of the biggest problems you have in your landfills and operating your landfills? They will tell you it is the unbelievable, staggering tonnage of mail-order catalogs. If I throw 10 of them a day away, multiply that by the people of this country who get those things every day, then call your mayors back home and ask them why they are for the Bumpers-Graham proposal. I will tell you exactly why they are for it. They are for it because they have to dispose of that stuff. They are for it because they don't believe it is right to penalize Main Street merchants by making them collect all the taxes and these people mailing things through the mail every day are getting a free ride.

Back to Senator WYDEN. As I said a moment ago, I don't know of any Senator—certainly not many Senators in the Senate—for whom I have as much respect as I have for Senator WYDEN. But I don't agree with his bill either. When you consider the fact that I have been fighting the battle for years—this losing battle, I might add—for years I have been fighting that losing battle with mail-order houses, which have increased their sales to well over $100 billion a year, and the States are getting whacked, because they are not collecting the taxes on it. But I say that is just a pittance compared to Internet sales and what they are going to be 3 years from now.

According to an article in Time magazine—the most comprehensive article I have read was in Time magazine dealing with this very subject of Internet sales. You can buy an automobile on the Internet. You can buy tapes. You can buy movies. You can buy anything on the Internet.

Amazon Books I don't think has ever made a dime, and their stock is just shooting through the roof. What do you think about Main Street bookstores in the country that are paying taxes for the books they sell in Washington, DC, Maryland, and Virginia, but not Amazon? And Amazon sales are soaring.

But the final point I want to make is that sales of merchandise over the Internet, that you would otherwise buy from a Main Street merchant, are calculated by the year 2002, no later than 2003, to be $300 billion. Now, 5 percent of that in sales taxes, which is about the average, is $15 billion a year that the States are not collecting—$15 billion in taxes that the Main Street merchant is not getting, and it is a travesty.

You should never say on the Senate floor, ''I don't think my amendment is going to pass.'' Considering the fact that in 1995 I did not get one single Republican vote, I think it is fair to say I probably ''ain't'' going to pick up a bunch of them next time. But you know something. Somebody asked me one time, ''Why are you quitting? Why are you not running again?'' And I said, ''Because I have tackled too many losing causes. I don't enjoy it. I don't enjoy losing anymore than Notre Dame enjoys losing a football game, and the few victories I get and I have had in the Senate are simply not enough to offset the trauma of the many losses I have sustained.''

And that is not to denigrate anybody. We are all independent here. We think freely. We are supposed to be representing our constituents back home. And I guess most people just look at this differently.

So I may not win this one either, in fact I probably won't. And that does not dampen my enthusiasm for what I am talking about, nor does it dampen the meritorious nature of what I consider a meritorious cause. I am going back to the beginning because I used to be a small town merchant. I had to compete with big companies. I had to compete with mail-order houses even back then, in the 1950s and 1960s. And I did not enjoy a minute of it. I was on the school board. I was president of the chamber of commerce. I was chairman of the annual banquet of the chamber. I was chairman of the Christmas parade. I did all of those things. And yet I had to compete with people who did not have any of those responsibilities and did not contribute one red cent to my hometown or my home State. And

yet for some reason or other, as meritorious as it seems to sound right now, I don't know how other people justify their vote against this when, as I say, the mayors, the Governors, the city councilmen, municipalities, everybody under the shining Sun charged with the responsibility of making their hometown and their home State function, favors mine and Senator GRAHAM's amendment.

Madam 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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE HOUSE-PASSED TAX CUT

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Madam President, I want to speak for a few moments about the action that was taken by the House of Representatives last week in passing a tax cut for the middle-income, hard-working Americans. I commend the House for doing that and hope that the Senate will follow suit. I think it is very important that every year we give the taxpayers back something of what they have worked so hard to earn when we are looking at a surplus. That is, in fact, what we are looking at.

You know, if I had said to my constituents 5 years ago, ''I'm running for the U.S. Senate, and I'm going to balance the Federal budget,'' most of them would have probably smiled benignly and thought, ''Oh, at least she is naive enough to think that she can make a difference.''

Well, in fact, that is exactly what has happened. I did run saying that I wanted to work to balance the budget. I did not promise that I would come to Washington and do it alone, but I did say that this is something I thought our Congress should do. In fact, in the Congress that came in in 1994, we did make the promise and keep the promise that we would balance the Federal budget. In fact, this year, we will see that balanced budget.

So then, of course, the question comes, What are we going to do with the new surplus? Of course, there are lots of ideas. Of what we think is going to be a $1.5 trillion surplus over the next few years, the lion's share should go toward making sure that Social Security is secure—no question about it. But an $80 billion tax cut every year, I think, will stimulate the economy, will do what is right by America, and will correct some inequities that we have found in the Tax Code—the major portion of what the House passed is the bill that I introduced with Senator FAIRCLOTH last year and the year before; and that is to reduce the marriage tax penalty.

In fact, if a policeman who makes about $33,000 a year in Houston, TX, marries a schoolteacher in Pasadena, TX, they have a penalty of $1,000, or a little more; and every person in those income categories in our country has the same. In fact, the average is about $1,400. Now, this is a young couple who gets married that wants to start saving to buy a new house or buy another car, have their nest egg, get started in life. And they get hit with a $1,000 penalty.

That is not what was ever intended. But the Tax Code, because there are more two-income-earner couples now than when the last revision of the Tax Code was passed, in fact, has penalized those two-income-earning couples, many of whom have two incomes because they are trying to make ends meet. So we are taking away a part of their quality of life. So I commend the House for saying it is time to correct that inequity and it is our highest priority. I am pleased that they passed the bill that Senator FAIRCLOTH and I introduced. It is our highest priority.

It will also help ease the burden for small business owners and farmers and ranchers and others who have been able to accumulate something to realize the American dream; and that is, that they would give their children a better start than they had by increasing the inheritance tax—the death tax—exemption to $1 million starting January 1 of next year. I think that is the right thing to do. It will begin to ease the tax on the elderly. I think we should do that.

We have already eased the capital gains tax. I hope we can eliminate that. But, Madam President, I think it is important that we, every year, make a little bit more progress in giving the hard-working Americans more of the money they earn back to them so they can decide how to spend the money for their families rather than having Government decide for them.

I hope the Senate will pass tax cuts. It is a high priority. I think we can have two goals that are very clear: We are going to save Social Security; and we are going to give a little bit of the money people work so hard to earn back to them to get our Government in perspective.

I think it is time that we lowered the opportunities for spending at the Federal level, let the States and local governments have more leeway, have families have better opportunities to spend the money they earn, and to make sure that Social Security is secure. I think those are the right priorities for spending that surplus. I hope the Senate will follow suit.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

TAX CUTS AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DORGAN. Madam President, the subject about which my colleague from Texas just spoke and the subject addressed by a couple of my colleagues earlier today, the question of a proposed tax cut, is one that I think will engender a great deal of debate in the coming weeks, not with respect to the question of whether the American people could use a tax cut or deserve a tax cut, not about whose money it is. The issue, instead, is going to be, that there is an election 5 weeks from tomorrow.

On Saturday of this past weekend, the House of Representatives passed an $80 billion tax cut. And the discussion by many, including those on the other side of the aisle, and by those on the other side of the Capitol, is about what to do with the so-called ''surplus.''

I want to make the point again, as I have made before, that there is not at this point a budget surplus, evidenced by the fact that even though there are those who say there is a budget surplus, the Federal debt will increase this year to next year, and next year to the year after.

Now, why would the Federal debt be increasing if there is a surplus? The answer is, the Federal debt is increasing because there is not a surplus. What is called a surplus, in fact, is the Social Security dedicated funds that are to go into a ''trust'' fund to be used on behalf of future generations.

This chart shows that what is called a surplus can only be called a surplus if you take these Social Security funds and put them over here. Take the Social Security moneys away, and you don't have a surplus in the 5-year budget window. Instead, you are short $130 billion. The point is that, without using the Social Security revenues in the trust fund, there is no surplus.

Now, there have been two arguments made in the last days about this subject. One is we are not using Social Security trust funds; the second is that we are only using 10 percent of the surplus. Those arguments don't mean very much to me. These numbers do not lie.

The Federal debt will increase. To those who argue for this tax cut by saying that there is a surplus, I would simply point to the following fact: the Federal debt will continue to increase because there is no surplus.

We have made enormous progress in tackling this Federal budget deficit. Most people would not have predicted we would have been this successful. And we have very nearly balanced the Federal budget, but not quite. We will have truly and honestly balanced the Federal budget when you can call it ''in balance'' without using the Social Security trust funds, and that is not now the case.

If we here in the Senate debate using Social Security trust funds for this tax cut, we should be honest and call it theft. It will be a theft; yes, theft. It will be a theft to use the trust funds to give a tax cut. If that debate exists, I will offer an amendment to take the word ''trust'' out of the trust fund. Why call it a trust fund if people reach in and grab the money and use it for something else?