

Experts tell us that delaying action would require we take even more drastic measures in the future. Not only would such delays be costly, they would leave Americans with less time to prepare themselves for any adjustments to the program. When we consider that Social Security taxes consume approximately one-eighth of an average worker's lifetime income, there is a significant amount of money at stake for every individual. And that could grow, as we said, to one-fifth of all the money that an individual makes.

While Congress cannot change future demographics or merely replace the IOUs it has left sitting in the Social Security Trust Fund, it does hold the power to offer retirement security to all Americans by improving the way the Social Security System will operate in the future. I firmly believe it can be done without breaking the government's covenant with current retirees or leaving those about to enter the program in fiscal limbo. But it will take an innovative approach that breaks from Social Security's "government-knows-best" roots.

We must look to the ingenuity and competitive spirit of the private sector to improve and rejuvenate the program if we are to give future retirees any promise of retirement benefits.

I have often heard today's workers lament they do not think Social Security will be there for them. Forty-six percent of all young people believe in UFOs, says a study by Third Millennium, while just 28 percent think they will ever see a Social Security check. So more kids believe in UFO's than Social Security. Still, it is not too late to change that course and prevent the coming Social Security crisis.

As the national debate goes forward, Congress has the ability to empower workers with the tools to control their own future. If we can learn from our past mistakes and own up to the financial nightmare waiting down the road, we can transform Social Security from a program that threatens financial ruin to one that holds the promise of improved retirement security for generations to come.

We have much work to do and no time to waste, so I urge my colleagues to join me as we begin the transformation.

#### IMF REPLENISHMENT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, yesterday, as we were debating the best way to help our farmers overcome low prices in the Upper Midwest, the Minority Leader appropriately called the IMF "the single best tool available to provide economic stability in Asia, Russia and around the world." Unfortunately, he then went on to blame Republicans for opposition to IMF replenishment.

As one who joined many of my Republican colleagues here in the Senate to actively promote the IMF replenish-

ment and pass the full \$18 billion here as part of the Supplemental, I would take issue with that statement. It was the Republican leadership in the Senate who worked with the Administration to pass the \$18 billion along with a balanced reform package designed to make the IMF work more effectively.

Yes, I have been disappointed that the House has still not acted on this matter. However, just yesterday, \$3.4 billion was reported out of the Appropriations Committee's Foreign Operations Subcommittee, and there are positive statements that the full \$18 billion may be included in the final Foreign Ops bill reported out of the full Committee next week. That was welcome news to those of us who strongly believe the IMF can play a positive role in addressing financial crises all over the world and restore important markets for US products. Now that new loans have been negotiated for Russia, the IMF's reserves are close to depletion. For the first time in many years, it has had to tap into its emergency fund. While I would have preferred the replenishment had been dealt with months ago, the logjam appears to have been broken.

Of course, there is one complicating factor. The funds are attached to the Foreign Operations bill—the appropriations bill that has been stymied by an inability of the House and the White House to work out the Mexico City abortion language which is annually attached to this appropriations bill.

While some may prefer not to have to fight controversial battles on appropriations bills, this is an issue that will not just go away. The sponsor is committed to bringing it up until it can be resolved to his satisfaction. Last year, a revised version, a substantial compromise, was attached to the State Department Reauthorization Conference Report and held up that report because of the veto threat of the President. That effort included a reorganization plan supported by the Administration that had been pursued for several years.

That is still being held up, and the IMF funding will likely be held up as well until the Mexico City issue is settled. The latest Mexico City compromise was a good attempt at solving this dispute. If the President really wants the IMF replenishment, he should exercise the needed leadership to work out the Mexico City language with the House as soon as possible. My colleagues in the minority can do more to help us achieve the replenishment by urging the President to pursue a resolution of Mexico City before any other alternative. I ask the Minority Leader for this assistance.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. DASCHLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. I would ask unanimous consent that Senators HATCH, DASCHLE, LEVIN and MURKOWSKI be rec-

ognized as if in morning business in that order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we were under the unanimous consent agreement that I was to receive recognition after my colleague from Minnesota. I am willing to go along with this if we have unanimous consent that I receive recognition after these colleagues conduct morning business.

Mr. DASCHLE. My apologies to the Senator from Kansas. I had meant to include that we also go back to Senator BROWNBACK at the completion of our presentations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BROWNBACK. With that understanding, no objection.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### THE SECRET SERVICE AND THE "PROTECTIVE FUNCTION" PRIVILEGE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to address the current controversy over whether Secret Service agents and employees should testify before the grand jury convened by the Independent Counsel, Judge Kenneth Starr. At noon today, the Chief Justice of the United States denied the Department of Justice's request for a stay of the order compelling Secret Service agents to comply with subpoenas. Thus, every level of the federal judiciary, including the Supreme Court, has now rejected the arguments advanced by the Department of Justice in support of a judicially-created "protective function" privilege. I sincerely hope that the Service and the Department will abide by these decisions and that the agents will testify truthfully and fully before the grand jury.

In my view, the Secret Service's duty to protect the President does raise legitimate issues about whether agents should receive special privileges before being forced to disclose what they see or hear as a result of being so physically close to the President. However, the Department of Justice has taken these legitimate factual concerns and used them for political reasons to mount a fruitless legal battle to find a court, any court, to concoct this privilege out of thin air. In so doing, at least in my opinion, the Department has squandered its own credibility and acted solely as the defense attorney for the President in his personal legal problems.

The trial judge and the D.C. Circuit have it right: there is no way for a court to conjure up a "protective function" privilege out of whole cloth. The Court of Appeals which rejected the Department's arguments concluded:

We leave to Congress the question whether a protective function privilege is appropriate