

home States, to bring this issue closer to home.

Recently, there has been a lot of publicity about organ donation—publicity specifically about controversial protocols that have been considered to enhance the viability of transplanted organs. I support an informed public dialog on this, or any other medical issue. As this debate continues, however, Mr. President, we have to make sure that we keep our eye on the ball, that we stay focused, and not lose sight of the fact that organ donations save many thousands of lives each year in this country, and that thousands of other Americans are still waiting for this precious gift of life.

Mr. President, together we can build a national consensus to increase the rate of organ donations. Seriously ill Americans who are on these waiting lists should not have to wait so long for a second chance. They should have a second chance. And I look forward to working with all of my colleagues in the Senate and with people across this country to achieve this goal in the months ahead.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I may proceed in morning business for 20 minutes.

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

BUDGET REALITIES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on this past Sunday, the Outlook section of the Washington Post published articles regarding Uncle Sam's red ink. The unfortunate part is that these stories highlight is that debt is nothing new for the United States. While it is making us poor, one article claims that is has made us prosperous.

I rise today to make the point that our debt is not only making us very

poor, it is making us totally inadequate at the governmental level in Washington, DC. All our moneys are being expended for interest costs on the debt rather than active Government.

Specifically, I want to talk about the here and now rather than the next millennium. Dick Morris detailed in his book, Mr. President, that he had counseled President Clinton, running for reelection last year, that the budget deficit was a boring subject. He claimed that nobody was really interested in it and that the President should instead focus on school uniforms and child curfews, family values and everything else.

Mr. President, people are interested in the crushing burden of our federal debt, and to show specifically what concerns them, I have a chart that I would refer to. It is in enlarged fashion. I ask unanimous consent that we have printed in the RECORD at this particular point this one budget document "Hollings' Budget Realities."

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

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES
[In billions of dollars]

President and year	U.S. budget (Outlays)	Borrowed trust funds	Unified deficit with trust funds	Actual deficit without trust funds	National debt	Annual increases in spending for interest
Truman:						
1945	92.7	5.4	-47.6		260.1	
1946	55.2	-5.0	-15.9	-10.9	271.0	
1947	34.5	-9.9	-4.0	+13.9	257.1	
1948	29.8	6.7	11.8	+5.1	252.0	
1949	38.8	1.2	0.6	-0.6	252.6	
1950	42.6	1.2	-3.1	-4.3	256.9	
1951	45.5	4.5	6.1	+1.6	255.3	
1952	67.7	2.3	-1.5	-3.8	259.1	
1953	76.1	0.4	-6.5	-6.9	266.0	
Eisenhower:						
1954	70.9	3.6	-1.2	-4.8	270.8	
1955	68.4	0.6	-3.0	-3.6	274.4	
1956	70.6	2.2	3.9	+1.7	272.7	
1957	76.6	3.0	3.4	+0.4	272.3	
1958	82.4	4.6	-2.8	-7.4	279.7	
1959	92.1	-5.0	-12.8	-7.8	287.5	
1960	92.2	3.3	0.3	-3.0	290.5	
1961	97.7	-1.2	-3.3	-2.1	292.6	
Kennedy:						
1962	106.8	3.2	-7.1	-10.3	302.9	9.1
1963	111.3	2.6	-4.8	-7.4	310.3	9.9
Johnson:						
1964	118.5	-0.1	-5.9	-5.8	316.1	10.7
1965	118.2	4.8	-1.4	-6.2	322.3	11.3
1966	134.5	2.5	-3.7	-6.2	328.5	12.0
1967	157.5	3.3	-8.6	-11.9	340.4	13.4
1968	178.1	3.1	-25.2	-28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	0.3	3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
Nixon:						
1970	195.6	12.3	-2.8	-15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	-23.0	-27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	-23.4	-27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	-14.9	-30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	-6.1	-17.6	483.9	29.3
Ford:						
1975	332.3	4.8	-53.2	-58.0	541.9	32.7
1976	371.8	13.4	-73.7	-87.1	629.0	37.1
Carter:						
1977	409.2	23.7	-53.7	-77.4	706.4	41.9
1978	458.7	11.0	-59.2	-70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	503.5	12.2	-40.7	-52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	-73.8	-79.6	909.1	74.8
Reagan:						
1981	678.2	6.7	-79.0	-85.7	994.8	95.5
1982	745.8	14.5	-128.0	-142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	-207.8	-234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.8	7.6	-185.4	-193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.5	-212.3	-252.8	1,817.5	178.9
1986	990.3	81.9	-221.2	-303.1	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,003.9	75.7	-149.8	-225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.1	100.0	-155.2	-255.2	2,601.3	214.1
Bush:						
1989	1,143.2	114.2	-152.5	-266.7	2,868.3	240.9
1990	1,252.7	117.4	-221.2	-338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,323.8	122.5	-269.4	-391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,380.9	113.2	-290.4	-403.6	4,002.1	292.3
Clinton:						
1993	1,408.2	94.3	-255.0	-349.3	4,351.4	292.5
1994	1,460.6	89.2	-203.1	-292.3	4,643.7	296.3

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES—Continued
[In billions of dollars]

President and year	U.S. budget (Outlays)	Borrowed trust funds	Unified deficit with trust funds	Actual deficit without trust funds	National debt	Annual increases in spending for interest
1995	1,514.6	113.4	-163.9	-277.3	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,560.0	154.0	-107.0	-261.0	5,182.0	344.0
1997	1,632.0	130.0	-124.0	-254.0	5,436.0	360.0

* Historical Tables, *Budget of the US Government FY 1988*; Beginning in 1962 CBO's *1997 Economic and Budget Outlook*—April 15, 1997.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on the matter of the budget realities, I have listed here beside the different Presidents from 1945 right on through President Clinton's first term including estimates for 1997—the different years of the U.S. budget, the actual budget.

Incidentally, these are Congressional Budget Office figures. These are not tricky figures. They are the ones that we all rely upon.

Then I have listed the borrowed trust funds. That is all the trust funds that are borrowed—not just Social Security but the military retirees trust funds, the civil service retirees trust funds—there is still a surplus in the Medicare account—Medicare trust fund, the Federal finance bank, the moneys we have been using from the airport and airways improvement fund, the highway trust fund. You can go right on down the different trust funds that are borrowed.

And then the unified deficit which is the real culprit here in this particular budget fraud. I refer directly to the fraud that occurs when we cannot get the truth out. That is the purpose of my rising again today, to somehow, somewhere, sometime talk the truth because it is not an accurate figure when you say unified. They say, well, that is the net amount in and out. It is not net amount in and out. It is the amount you borrow and you have to replace.

The distinguished Presiding Officer, being a certified public accountant, knows exactly what I am speaking about. If you were trying to use that unified deficit on your return, the borrowed moneys on April 15, they would cart you off to jail. You are not allowed to do that. But we do that in Washington, and then the media, the market, the Government and everyone else continue to cite the unified deficit as a sort of net figure as to what the real deficit is.

On the contrary, the real or actual deficit is listed in the next column with the national debt going up and the annual increase in the amount of spending in order to take care of the interest costs.

So I will be glad to show this particular chart in an enlarged manner. What we have here, Mr. President, is again the Presidents. You have the years. You have the United States budget, the actual budget, the borrowed trust funds, the unified deficit with trust funds. Then the actual deficit without trust funds. That is without the borrowings, what the actual deficit is.

Those are the terms upon which we must speak. If we are going to continue to talk of a unified net kind of deficit, which is not net, the fraud will continue. There is not any question in my mind that taxes are too high. But taxes are too high because of the interest cost on the national debt.

All you need do is go to look at our actual interest costs, let us say, before President Reagan came in, just a few short years ago. The interest costs in 1980, going straight across, are \$74.8 billion. Well, that is \$74.8 or \$75 billion. You now in 1997 have listed \$360 billion. We have increased spending \$285 billion for nothing. You are not getting a road paved. You are not getting a library built. You are not getting research over at the National Cancer Institute. You are not providing for a stronger defense. You are not engaging more in foreign assistance or anything else of that kind. You are getting absolutely nothing for the past profligacy and waste.

Bottom line. The crowd that came to town in 1981, against taxes and against waste, has taxes on automatic pilot, waste on automatic pilot of \$1 billion a day.

Now, let me say that one more time. At \$360 billion—this figure, of course, is the January figure from the Congressional Budget Office, and it does not take into account the recent increase in interest rates by Alan Greenspan and the Federal Reserve. So that is bound to be at least 365.

So we have interest payments, that is, annual increases in spending on interest that total \$1 billion a day. And it has to be paid just like taxes. It is not like increases in other spending which we could forego, but it has to be paid. So that is why I categorically say the crowd that said they were going to come to town in the early 1980's and do away with taxes have put taxes on an automatic pilot of \$1 billion a day.

The crowd that came in town in 1981 and said they were going to be against waste, fraud and abuse—and I was appointed on the Grace Commission, got an award for it and recognition. It was a wonderful instrumentality that went through the Government and tried to cut out all the waste. But we have really increased the waste because we get absolutely nothing for it.

Now, we increased spending since 1980 by \$285 billion. If we had not done that, we would have \$285 billion here for us to sit around in the Senate Chamber and spend or give back to the American people. It would be a wonderful thing. We could get all the highways. We

wouldn't have any ISTEA bill. We could take care of all the demonstration projects you could possibly imagine. We could go ahead with star wars immediately. We could have all these things that they want for education, student loans and everything else. But instead, we are spending the money and not getting anything for it.

That is the cancer that we have in the fiscal affairs of the U.S. Government that is totally obscured by news articles like those that claim to show how debt has made us prosperous, like all we have to do is borrow again and that debt has always been with us.

Well, Mr. President, it has not been with us all the time for the simple reason you can see that when President Reagan came to town—we have it here—the national debt was \$994.8 billion. When President Reagan came to town, after 204 years of history, after 38 Presidents, Republican and Democrat, after the cost of all the wars, the Revolutionary, the War of 1812, the Civil War, the Mexican War, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, the cost of all the wars never gave a national debt of \$1 trillion. It was less than \$1 trillion after 204 years of history. But in 16 years without a war, because the cost of the war in Desert Storm was paid for by the Saudis and others, so in 16 years without the cost of a war, we have gone from less than \$1 trillion to almost \$5.5 trillion. Up, up, and away with the interest costs, interest spending, interest taxes going up, up and away and added to the debt to the tune of \$1 billion a day and we never want to seem to recognize that.

Right to the point, Mr. President. If you take all the deficits from President Truman, the actual deficits and average them out right on down to President Reagan, 25 years, if you took all those deficits, the average would be about \$20 billion a year.

Now, in contrast, take the deficits for the last 16 years without the cost of a war, without the so-called guns and butter, as they say; but rather, with spending cuts of President Reagan for 8 years, spending cuts of President Bush for 4 years, spending cuts of President Clinton, because he brought the deficit down—his 1993 plan included \$500 billion in deficit reduction. Even with all the cuts, we have been giving an average deficit each year to the American people of \$277 billion more in Government than we are willing to pay for. Let us not just talk abstractly about a deficit. We are actually giving away \$277 billion more in Government than we are actually willing to pay for.

Let us go to just last year and the campaign, when both Senator Dole and President Clinton used \$107 billion, the unified deficit figure, like it was net. That was not the case at all. In order to get to a \$107 billion deficit, they had to borrow from all the pension funds. Why not borrow another \$107 billion and call it balanced? The actual deficit was \$261 billion. You could not get that cited or printed in the press. We gave it to them time and time again. We will give it to them again this morning. I defy you to find it in the morning paper or cited in the evening news on TV. They do not want to say what the actual deficit is. They want to use this obscure figure of unified, trying to act like we ought to be encouraged. That is why they are getting together on a budget deal. They will get together on a deal that will obscure truth in budgeting.

This fraud has to stop somehow, somewhere, because it is not a bridge to the next millennium. We are going over a cliff by the year 2000. Our domestic budget is \$266 billion. Our defense budget is \$267 billion. Those two budgets together are slightly over \$500 billion. But you will soon have interest costs exceeding the combined cost of both the domestic and defense budgets. We are not building a bridge, we are digging a hole.

The first order of business, they say, when you are in a hole and you are trying to get out, is stop digging. We continue to dig, and we do it in a dignified fashion around here and praise each other. The President and the Congress have gotten together on a budget agreement and all of that kind of stuff. But watch for the gimmicks in it.

The biggest gimmick that is never talked about is the fact people consistently obscure the actual size of the deficit. To get it down to \$254 billion, we still have to find \$110 billion, that is without any cuts, just continuing what we call current policy. I sat at the budget table today to try to get to a budget now of \$1.632 trillion. That is current policy. That is domestic of \$266 billion, defense of \$267 billion, entitlements of \$859 billion. That is \$1.382 trillion. Just put in the minimal figure \$360 billion, that is \$1.742 trillion. To bring it down, then, to the \$1.632 trillion, I have to find \$110 billion. I have to cut entitlements, domestic, defense combined \$110 billion.

That is my job, conscientiously going to the budget table to sit as a member of the Budget Committee, where I have been since we instituted the budget process in 1974. But, instead of discussing the cuts and how are we going to get on top of this downward spiral of interest costs or interest taxes being increased \$1 billion a day, instead of that, we are getting letters now to do away with the inheritance tax. We are getting letters now to do away with the capital gains tax. We are getting letters now from Steve Forbes and that other crowd: Let's just get a flat tax and do away with the IRS, the Internal

Revenue System, and everything else of that kind.

Mr. President, we ought to understand once and for all that we are engaged in a fraud that continues to be obscured, due to the fourth estate. The fourth estate has taken it on as a religion, almost, of reciting the unified deficit as if it were the actual deficit. The truth of the matter is, the actual deficit is substantially more. It has averaged \$277 billion last year, the year before, and the last 16 years. We have been giving out some \$277 billion in Government that we are not willing to pay for.

We had that Reaganomics. Yes, there is even talk about that—cut taxes and we will get growth, we will grow out of deficits. No mayor in his right mind of a city tries that. No Governor in her right mind has tried that. There was an exception up in New Jersey. Governor Whitman up there said, "Whoa, tax cuts work." But look at the papers last week. She is now doing two things. She is borrowing, raiding the pension funds, just like we are doing in Washington. She has learned from Washington. And she is calling for a bond issue to cover her financial situation. It does not work.

There is no free lunch. Long since, we should have understood it. If I have to come every day and point this out, I will because these facts and figures are not disputable. They are not political. They are not Democratic figures or Republican figures. These are Congressional Budget Office figures. That is the actual debt that has gone to exceed \$5 trillion.

I see from the Presiding Officer that my time is just about up. Let me just say one word. I thank the distinguished Chair and the distinguished Senator from Georgia for indulging me just one second more.

What we have is a fraud on the American public. We have to expose this fraud. We have to speak to truth in budgeting. We have to come up with an actual plan that will eliminate this deficit financing by raiding the trust funds in America.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-LARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LABOR LAW CHANGES BY EXECUTIVE ORDER

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, as many of us in the Congress and in the country began to realize last week, the President and the administration are endeavoring to change 60 years of labor law by edict or decree. I spoke on the floor and reminded the administration

we do not govern by decree in America. We have three branches. A major and fundamental change in labor law must be legislated. The President can sign or veto it, but he cannot write law. That is not a function of the Presidency.

I will probably visit some of these documents in a bit, but published reports show that labor leaders and the administration wrote the law that would essentially squeeze out all non-union subcontractors and employees from doing work on Federal contracts. It is a lot more complicated than that, but that is the bottom line. So this law was written somewhere in the offices of these labor leaders. It is the fundamental construction of what the administration purports will be an Executive order, bypassing the legislative branch and writing law in a very narrow confine.

You know, our forefathers were very careful in the construction of this Government to assure proper airing, thorough venting, debate on all sides. It is not easy to pass laws in America. It is not meant to be easy. The very thing for which this system was constructed was to prevent the very thing we are seeing from the administration.

I would like to begin our discussion on this by sharing with the Senate several letters that I have received from folks back home with regard to this.

Here is a letter dated March 13, 1997, from Large & Gilbert, certified public accountants. They are located in Macon, GA. It says:

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: I am writing this letter to express my outrage regarding comments made by Vice President Gore in a speech to the AFL-CIO in Los Angeles on February 18, 1997. Vice President Gore announced the Administration's plans to change the nation's federal procurement policy through an Executive Order that would encourage union-only project labor agreements.

An Executive Order encouraging union-only PLAs would immediately implement an anti-competitive, protectionist, and discriminatory policy that goes against the basic principles of free market, open competition, and equal opportunity upon which the country was founded.

Greater use of union-only PLAs will threaten job opportunities for the vast majority of America's workers. Union-only agreements discourage bidding by open shop, or merit shop, contractors and limit employment opportunities for workers who do not wish to be represented by a union. Union workers are less than 15 percent of America's work force. This kind of union-favoring tactic discriminates against the majority of American workers who choose not to join a union.

PLAs add significantly to the cost of construction projects, because union labor costs are generally 10 to 20 percent higher than merit shop. Competitive bidding on public projects is in the best interest of all taxpayers because it ensures contracts are awarded based on who will do the best work at the best price, regardless of labor affiliation.

And I might add that Georgia is one of about half the States that is a right-to-work State.

At a time of strict budgetary constraints, PLAs are certainly a step in the wrong direction.