peace, and that this opportunity is fragile. We are deeply concerned about the level of P.L.O. compliance; nevertheless, we are heartened by the progress that, thanks in part to MEPFA, has been attained. At the same time, we understand that reducing our country's involvement or cutting aid to the Palestinian Authority, which has committed itself to making peace with Israel, is not now the proper vehicle for expressing our concern. This is why we call upon you to support peace and let the negotiations continue unhindered.

In the voice of our tradition we say, ''One does not have the responsibility to complete the task, but neither is one free to take leave of it.'' We urge you to play your part in helping peace grow strong. Thank you.

Sincerely,

(Signed by over 1,000 American rabbis.)

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend morning business for 15 minutes.

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

RECONCILIATION

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, last Friday in the wee hours of the night there was a total abandonment of any kind of truth in budgeting. There is no better way to express it.

Under this entire charade, once again, we have lied to the American people. There is no question that in those wee hours, Mr. President, that they were trying their dead-level best and finally succeeded in buying off the votes of certain of the Senators with respect to Medicaid.

In order to purchase it, what they did was use Social Security funds. That was a use and violation—not only of the rule but of the law. The rule was called by the distinguished Senator from Florida and the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Senator HARKIN. If you ever want to see distortion, obfuscation, and abandonment of responsibility by the Parliamentarian in the U.S. Senate, I wish you would read that RECORD.

Be that as it may, the Chair would say, I do not know. We will refer to the chairman of the committee, Senator DOMENICI, and say, well, I like what the Chair has ruled. Ruled and on and on and back and forth but no idea of a parliamentary ruling or recognition of the law. That is why I take the floor today.

What really happens is that they constantly are talking about a balanced budget when everybody—both at the White House, the Democratic White House, and the Republican Congress—know that it cannot be done. It cannot be done without increasing taxes.

Here in the extreme, they are talking about decreasing taxes—about tax cuts.

Let me go right to the point here, so I can make a coherent record.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this little two-page summary of budget tables be printed in the RECORD at this particular point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

''Here We Go Again'': Senator Ernest F. Hollings

[In billions of dollars]

Starting in 1995 with:

(a) A deficit of $283.3 billion for 1995:

Outlays	1,530
Trust funds	121.9
Unified deficit	161.4
Real deficit	283.3
Gross interest	336.0

(b) And a debt of $4,927 billion.

How do you balance the budget by:

(a) Increasing spending over revenues $1,801 billion over 7 years?

GOP ''SOLID'', ''NO SMOKE AND MIRRORS'' BUDGET PLAN

[In billions of dollars]

Year	CBO outlays	CBO revenues	Cumulative deficits
1996	1,583	1,355	−228
1997	1,624	1,419	−205
1998	1,663	1,478	−185
1999	1,718	1,549	−169
2000	1,779	1,622	−157
2001	1,819	1,701	−118
2002	1,874	1,884	+10
Total	12,060	11,008	−1,052

(b) And increasing the national debt from $4,927.0 billion to $6,728.0 billion?

DEBT [1]

[In billions of dollars]

Year	National debt	Interest costs
1995	4,927.0	336.0
1996	5,261.7	369.9
1997	5,551.4	381.6
1998	5,821.6	390.9
1999	6,081.1	404.0
2000	6,331.3	416.1
2001	6,575.9	426.8
2002	6,728.0	436.0
Increase 1995–2002	1,801.0	100.0

	1996	2002
[1] Debt off CBO's August baseline includes:		
1. Owed to the trust funds	1,361.8	2,355.7
2. Owed to Government accts	81.9	(2)
3. Owed to additional borrowing	3,794.3	4,372.7
[Note: No ''unified'' debt; just total debt]	5,238.0	6,728.4

[1] Off CBO's August baseline.
[2] Included above.

(c) And increasing mandatory spending for interest costs by $100 billion?

[Deficit in billions of dollars]

How? You don't!

(a) 1996 Budget: Kasich conference report, p. 3	−$108
(b) October 20, 1995, CBO letter from June O'Neill	−$105

—You just fabricate a ''paper balance'' by ''smoke and mirrors'' and borrowing more: Smoke and Mirrors.

(a) Picking up $19 billion by cutting the Consumer Price Index (CPI) by .2 percent—thereby reducing Social Security benefits and increasing taxes by increasing ''bracket creep''.	
(b) With impossible spending cuts:	
Medicare	270
Medicaid	182
Welfare	83
(c) ''Backloading'' the plan:	
—Promising a cut of $347 billion in FY2002 when a cut of $45 billion this year will never materialize.	

[In billions of dollars]

	Outlays	Revenues
(d) By increasing revenues by decreasing revenues (tax cut)		$245
2002 CBO Baseline Budget	1,874	1,884
This assumes:		
(1) Discretionary Freeze Plus Discretionary Cuts (in 2002)		121
(2) Entitlement Cuts and Interest Savings (in 2002)		226
[1996 cuts, $45 B] spending reductions (in 2002)		−$347
Using SS Trust Fund		−115
Total reductions (in 2002)		−462
+Increased borrowing from tax cut		−93
Grand total		−555
(e) By borrowing and increasing the debt (1995–2002)—Includes $636 billion ''embezzlement'' of the Social Security trust fund		1,801

The Real Problem—

Not Medicare—In surplus $147 billion—Paid For

Not Social Security—In surplus $481 Billion—Paid For

But interest costs on the national debt—are now at almost $1 billion a day and are growing faster than any possible spending cuts

—AND both the Republican Congress and Democratic White House as well as the media are afraid to tell the American people the truth: ''A tax increase is necessary.''

—SOLUTION: Spending cuts, spending freezes, tax loophole closings, withholding new programs (Americorps) and a 5 percent value added tax allocated to the deficit and the debt.

''Here We Go Again''—Promised Balanced Budgets

	billion
President Reagan (by fiscal year 1984):	
President Reagan (by fiscal year 1991):	
President Bush (by fiscal year 1995):	
1981 Budget	0
1985 GRH budget	0
1990 budget	+$20.5

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, start in the year 1995; we are going to try to balance the budget. Starting in the year 1995, you start with a deficit of $1.518 trillion in outlays, so you have a deficit here of $283 billion for 1995. And a debt of $4.927 trillion.

If you start with a deficit and a debt of almost $5 trillion and you look at the increased spending over revenues during each of the fiscal years, using Congressional Budget Office figures, you will find that cumulatively, from 1996—and each year is listed in this particular document to 2002—there is an increase of spending of $12.06 trillion over revenues received over each of those years—cumulatively, now, of $11.008 trillion.

So you are spending $1 trillion more than you are taking in over this GOP budget plan. Specifically, you can look at last month. September ended the fiscal year 1995. If you look at the outlays for that year and for this year, 1996, and you see the increase from the $1.530 trillion to $1.583—or a $53 billion increase in spending.

Now we are going to cut spending, balance the budget, cut spending—yet the very first year here we have increased spending $53 billion.

Then you go down to the debt and it is listed there of $1.801 trillion in the debt. And you found out over the 7-year period, you are not only increasing the National debt by $1.8 trillion to a level of $6.728 trillion, but you have increased interest costs on the national debt to $100 billion.

I have listed there what is owed to the trust funds, what is owed to the Government accounts, and what is owed to additional borrowing because, in my limited time, I am trying to talk about the public debt, which is No. 3, ''owed to additional borrowing.'' But we borrow from the trust funds. We owe them, at this particular point, $1.361 trillion. And if we look at the owed to the Government accounts, such as the bank insurance funds, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the credit union share insurance fund, and these other accounts, as of next year, we will owe some $81.9 billion there.

So we are moving deficits from one pocket to the other. We are not eliminating them. And, yes, we are borrowing at the public till, for a total, of course, of, as we have indicated there, a debt of $6.728 trillion.

So the question is, starting in 1995 with a deficit of $283 billion and a debt of $4.9 trillion, and increasing mandatory spending for interest costs by $100 billion, how do you balance the budget that way? Of course, you do not.

Go right to the next list of figures. My authorities are none other than the chairman of the Budget Committee on the House side, Mr. KASICH, because he was the chairman of our budget conference that got up this GOP budget and so-called reconciliation. On page 3 of the conference report by Mr. KASICH, you will find the word ''deficit'' for the year 2002: a $108 billion deficit.

Then you go to the letter last week from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Miss June O'Neill, and find on October 20, she determined a deficit of $105 billion; whether it is $105 or $108—as the old expression goes, continuing deficits as far as the eye can see—it is over $100 billion.

So, if you cannot do it, what do you do? You fabricate a paper balance, by smoke and mirrors and borrowing more. You fabricate a balance. This Senator knows as a member of the Commerce Committee, by simply borrowing again moneys that have already been represented in legislation as having been consumed. In our telecommunications bill, we came up with a budget point of order. We needed to raise some $8 billion so we put in there the auctions of $8 billion.

Now we come again to the Commerce Committee for their reconciliation responsibility of raising $15 billion and we list again the $8 billion that has already been included in the telecommunications bill. Or, go to the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee, struggling and straining under Medicare, trying to find the money, put in what they call a BELT. The BELT says—for example, on the House side they were $35 billion shy. So it is just rhetoric or language to the effect that, with $35 billion, that the next Congress will have to make it up. That is no way to balance the budget, but that is part of the smoke and mirrors.

You can pick up $19 billion as they have with the Consumer Price Index being reduced by .2 percent, thereby reducing, of course, the Social Security benefits and increasing taxes because what you do is hit bracket creep, as they call it. Then you go with the impossible spending cuts of $270 billion in Medicare, $182 billion in Medicaid, and $83 billion in welfare.

Just take the one—welfare. Suppose you are a Governor and you are assigned the welfare responsibility with a traumatic cut. Now you have added responsibilities. What you have to do is start a training program. Two-thirds, of course, of those on welfare are children but the other one-third are those who are unskilled or untrained, generally female adults who have not had the advantage of schooling. So you have to set up schooling and a training program. Thereupon, you institute a hiring or a Government job program of last resort. Then, to get to work, you have to institute, if you please, a child care center because they have to leave the children at home to take the job. And on down the list. You are not going to save that amount, of course, on welfare.

Another way, of course, in subsection C shows backloading the plan, whereby all the real cuts are made in the last 2 years. The last year alone, for example, in the year 2002, they have to cut $347 billion. Here now, we are struggling and are not going to obtain $45 billion this year with the best of intent and the contract and the headlines and everything else and cannot even reach the $45 billion cut. But in the last year under this GOP budget, balanced budget plan, you have to cut $347 billion.

Then of course, you increase your revenues by decreasing revenues. That sounds like double talk but that is the tax cut. You get into this growth argument that we have heard, now, for the last 2 weeks. All we need is a tax cut. It is going to give us growth, growth, just like Reaganomics said back in 1981 that put us into these horrendous deficits, debt and interest costs on automatic pilot. It is going up, up and away, the spending is. That tax cut is $245 billion. Then you look of course at the—and by borrowing from the public and from the trust funds, another $1.8 trillion. And that borrowing includes $636 billion embezzlement from Social Security.

At the present time, we have a $481 billion balance in Social Security. That is not the problem. Under Social Security, it is paid for, for a good 25 to 30 years, easily. Yes, you have $481 billion there and you are going to borrow another $636. At the end of the particular budget plan, 2002, you are going to owe Social Security over $1 trillion.

So, Social Security is not the problem, 25 or 30 years out; Medicare is not the problem here, 7 years out, The problem is now. We have spending on automatic pilot. Interest costs on the national debt—like death, like taxes—cannot be avoided. In fact, treat it as a tax increase, as I do in a sense. What we have is taxes being increased automatically each day $1 billion a day. That is the real problem.

What happens here is both the Republican Congress and the Democratic White House, as well as the media—and I hope they will read this—are afraid to tell the American people the truth: That is, you cannot do it without a tax increase. So, what we need to do is cut spending, freeze spending, tax loopholes closing, withholding on new programs. I had to vote against AmeriCorps. Everybody is for voluntarism. In fact, I was party to the institution of the Peace Corps. We can make that record sometime. But you cannot go into these new programs when you are trying to get rid of the deficit and the debt and decrease spending on automatic pilot. So you need all of that plus, I suggest, a 5-percent value-added tax.

Mr. President, that is the point. We have seen this exercise. In the early 1980's, I went with the Republican leadership and with Senator Howard Baker for a freeze. We could not get it. Then we realized by 1985 that we had—in order to get this deficit and debt down for it was growing by leaps and bounds—to have automatic cuts across the board. We had Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and we looked at it. We said we still need to close the loopholes. In 1986, we got tax reform.

Then, listen to this, in 1990, a bipartisan group of eight Senators, who hate taxes as much as anybody else, got together in the Budget Committee and voted for a value-added tax. Why? Because you cannot balance the budget without all of the above—namely, spending cuts, spending freezes, loophole closings, denying new programs, and a tax increase.

We have heard this thing about balanced budgets. I really regret it because I hear it on the floor. I see it on the screen on my TV about a balanced budget. Those working the discipline know there is no idea of balance the budget. I heard it just 15 years ago. President Reagan presented a budget—the document shows it, and I have it here—that the budget would be balanced by 1984.

Again, under President Reagan, in late 1985 under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings we pledged that balance—and we got awards for this one—that the budget would be balanced by 1991. In 1990—at that time they had gone out to Andrews Air Force Base and vetoed, abolished, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings cuts across the board and put in spending caps. Under that budget—I will show you the document—they said that by 1995, just last month, you would have a $20.5 billion surplus.

Has anyone ever heard the word ''surplus'' in Washington? Balanced budgets by 1984, balanced budgets by 1991, and then, finally, in 1995—we could look at the documents—a surplus of $20.5 billion. Here, instead of a surplus of $20.5 billion, we have a $283.3 billion deficit.

So there it is. ''Here we go again,'' as our fearless leader, President Ronald Reagan, said. ''Here we go again.''

I thank the distinguished Chair.

CHARLAYNE HUNTER-GAULT AND A SENSE OF HISTORY

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to a column in today's Washington Post that is a good remembrance of the early 1960's when black students integrated Southern colleges. In touching remarks, South Carolina native Charlayne Hunter-Gault, public television's national news correspondent, weaves an excellent reflection of the history of the times as she remembers the life of Hamilton Earl Holmes. Together in 1961, Ms. Hunter-Gault and Mr. Holmes became the first two African-American students to attend the University of Georgia.

Back in the early 1960's as the University of Georgia integrated, the State of South Carolina was employing every means to keep Clemson University segregated. We ran out of courts.

But fortunately, we had people like Mr. Holmes and Ms. Hunter-Gault who were willing to show us the way in South Carolina. Their courage and ability to stand up led to Clemson's peaceful admission of Harvey Gantt, the former mayor of Charlotte and a former candidate for U.S. Senate.

With the death of Hamilton Earl Holmes, it is important for us to remember the struggles of the past and to find the courage to move forward—and not fall further into the bitterness of racism and make mistakes of the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Ms. Hunter-Gault's column to be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 31, 1995]

ONE IN A MILLION

(By Charlayne Hunter-Gault)

One of the black men who was not ''one in a million'' at the Million Man March was Hamilton Earl Holmes. But in a real sense, if the purpose was to have black men ''stand up''—and surely no one could have thought that this was the first time that has happened—Hamilton had long since pioneered in standing up. And while there might have been millions cheering him on, for the most part he stood up alone.

It was in the early winter of 1961, when Hamilton Holmes, armed with a court order, walked onto the campus of the University of Georgia and into history as the first black man ever to be admitted and attend classes there in its 170-year history. If he never did anything else in his life, that single act of manly courage in the face of jeers, spitting and rioting would have been enough to qualify him as a ''standup guy.'' but Hamp did that and a lot more. For a major part of his purpose in life was to demonstrate to the world that black men were as good as any men. Not better, but as good as, although there were times in his classes in biology and physics and calculus and all the other courses that an aspiring doctor has to take that he earned a second layer of enmity from his classmates by consistently pushing the curve up to 98 or 99 and often a hundred, leaving the next best grade some 10 points behind.

It was such a performance that led him to be elected to Phi Beta Kappa, a notation that appeared beside his name when he graduated in 1963 as one of two black students in a class of 2,000. Had he not been recovering from surgery on a heart that was as big as the world, but in the end was vulnerable to its pressures, he might have been at the Million Man March with his son, Hamilton Jr. (Chip), at his side. And while his was never the gift of oratory, he could have offered his own quiet but soul-elevating testimony to the strength of black men and to black families. He could surely have given the lie, as he always had, to notions of inferiority and rampant irresponsibility. He could have also provided as well a window into a world that existed not so long ago, one that raised obstacles and inflicted pain on black men that only the most ignorant or callous among us would forget.

Hamp had come from a distinguished black family of doctors and educators and activists who challenged the laws that kept blacks ''in their place,'' starting when Hamp was still in junior high school with the all-white Atlanta golf course. His grandfather, a doctor who lived to be 82, once explained the family philosophy to the writer Calvin Trillin: ''I trained my children from infancy to fear nothing, and I told my grandson the same thing. I told him to be meek. Be meek, but don't look too humble. Because if you look too humble they might think you're afraid, and there's nothing to be afraid about, because the Lord will send his angel to watch over you and you have nothing to fear.''

And Hamp produced a distinguished family. During his 30-year marriage to Marilyn, he had a son who followed in his footsteps, albeit less ceremoniously, to the University of Georgia, graduated and now works in communications, and a daughter. Allison, also a college graduate, who is in banking. Also during those 30 years, he overcame whatever bitterness he had toward the university and became one of its biggest boosters and supporters. This was fairly amazing to me, especially since the two things Hamp wanted most in college were good labs (he had always said he could get the education he needed at Morehouse, the all-black men's college where he had a four-year, all-expenses-paid scholarship, but the university had better facilities) and the opportunity to play football for the Georgia Bulldogs. The officials at Georgia refused to let him play ''for his own safety.'' But when I returned on a visit to Atlanta in the early '80s, one of the biggest ''dawgs'' around was Hamp, who by then had accepted an appointment as a trustee to the Georgia Foundation, the body that oversees university funding. The other day, Charles Knapp, the current president of the university, called Hamilton ''one of our most distinguished graduates.''

In the years since Hamp and I were joined at the hip of history, I have often had occasion to think back to the time when we were fighting in federal court to win the right to attend the university. President Knapp's words sent me back to those days, when the top officials of the university tried to keep Hamp out by testifying in court that he was unqualified, not because he was black. The latter would have been illegal under the 1954 Brown decision, and officials of the state had sworn to resist integration, but only ''by all legal means.'' Hamp might have been able to overlook being called ''nigger,'' but ''unqualified''? The valedictorian of our Turner High School class of 1956? The smartest student in all Atlanta, according to his proud father, Tup. If there was a fighting word to Hamp, it was that ''unqualified.''

And while he was slow to anger and preferred classroom combat to the real thing, he was capable of standing up that way too. Once, when had parked in front of the house of one of the most racist fraternities on campus, and the fraternity guys saw whose car it was, they began to taunt him and make moves that suggested they were prepared to go further. Knowing he had only himself to rely on and understanding the white southern mentality perhaps better than they themselves, Hamp made a quick but deliberate move to open the car door, reached across to the glove compartment and took out something that he immediately placed in his pocket. It was a flashlight, but who knew? Hamp was relying on the prevailing predisposition to embrace every known stereotype of black men, and his instinct proved correct. They backed off in a heartbeat. The irony of the encounter was that the next day, Hamp was summoned to the dean's office and admonished for carrying a gun. The rest of the time, the frat brothers did their dirty deeds in stealth. Like letting the air out of Hamp's tires while he was in class. Early and often.

But Hamp persevered, often finding release in a game of pickup basketball with the brothers from town, who at that point could come to football games but still had to sit in the section reserved for blacks, called the ''crow's nest.'' They were proud of Hamp; and who knows how many of them he inspired—if not to apply to the university then to be all they could be.

If he had been well enough and so inclined, that might have been his message at the Million Man March. He might have dusted off an old speech he made in our senior year, just before he graduated, went on to become the first black student at Emory Medical School and then to a distinguished career as an orthopedic surgeon and teacher.

Back then, in the spring of 1963, he liked to talk about ''The New Negro.'' ''Ours is a competitive society,'' he'd say. ''This is true even more so for the Negro. He must compete not only with other Negroes, but with the white man. In most instances, in competition for jobs and status with whites, the Negro must have more training and be more qualified than his white counterpart if he is to beat him out of a job. If the training and qualifications are equal, nine out of 10 times the job will go to the white man. This is a challenge to us as a race. We must not be content to be equal, education- and training-wise, but we must strive to be superior in order to be given an equal chance. This is something that I have experienced in my short tenure at the University of Georgia. I cannot feel satisfied with just equaling the average grades there. I am striving to be superior in order to be accepted as an equal. If the average is B, then I want an A. The importance of superior training cannot be overemphasized. This is a peculiar situation, I know, but it is reality, and reality is something that we Negroes must learn to live with.''

How much would he have edited that speech for the march? Hamilton Earl Holmes was not there that day to be one in a million, and today we will bury him, one in a million, to be sure, but also one of many millions of black men who have given more than should