

Amendment to the Constitution? It seems to me that the court is drifting farther and farther to the left of center in its drift towards materialism and radical secularism as its opinions serve more and more to inhibit any display of religious belief by the nation's school children. In an effort to ensure a tolerance for all beliefs, the courts are bending too far, in effect, establishing an environment of intolerance rather than tolerance.

Mr. President, we rail, and moan, and gnash our teeth, and wring our hands as we see more and more violence in our schools and a general decline in morals throughout the nation. Is it any wonder? Our nation's leaders are no longer paragons of rectitude. Don't point to them as being the idols of our youth. The institution of marriage is crumbling; the church, more and more, refrains from speaking out boldly on the great moral issues of the day; and God is being driven from the classrooms of our nation's schools by the U.S. Supreme Court's decisions that favor secularism, materialism, and the stifling of any voluntary and free exercise of religion in the public schools. Is it any wonder that more and more parents are determined to send their children to private schools and to religious schools?

Mr. President, George Washington, the Father of our country, our first President, bequeathed to us a clear vision of the importance of religion to morality in our national life, when he said, in his farewell address to the nation in September, 1796: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, George Washington said, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths, which are the instruments of investigations in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. It can't be done. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." I hope the Supreme Court will review those words by our first president, the man who presided over the Constitutional Convention in 1787.

Mr. President, it is not an idle reflection if, while discussing the issue of prayer in the public schools, we contemplate the profundity of Benjamin Franklin's words to the Constitutional Convention on June 28, 1787, when he

made a sobering suggestion that brought the assembly of doubting minds "to a realization that destiny herself sat as guest and witness in this room." The weather had been hot, and the delegates to the Convention were tired and edgy. The debates were seemingly getting nowhere and a melancholy cloud seemed to hover over the Convention. Little progress was being made, and the prevailing winds were those of discouragement, dissension, and despair, when old Dr. Franklin, sitting with the famous double spectacles low on his nose, broke silence; he had said little during these past days. Addressing himself to George Washington in the chair, Franklin, according to Catherine Drinker Bowen, in her book, "Miracle at Philadelphia," reminded the Convention how, at the beginning of the war with England, the Continental Congress had had prayers for Divine protection, and in this very room. "Our prayers, Sir, were heard," said Franklin, "and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle must have observed frequent instances of a Superintending providence in our favor. To that kind Providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful friend? I have lived, Sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—that God governs in the affairs of men."

Bowen, in her magnificent story of the Constitutional Convention, goes on to say that on Dr. Franklin's manuscript of his little speech, "the word God is twice underscored, perhaps as indication to the printer. But whether or no Franklin looked upon the Deity as worthy of three capital letters, his speech was timely." You will read this same speech in Madison's notes.

"If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground unseen by Him," Franklin continued, "was it probable that an empire could arise without his aid? I firmly believe this, and I also believe that without his concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel." Franklin proposed that "henceforth prayers imploring the assistance of heaven and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this Assembly every morning before we proceed to business, and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service."

Roger Sherman at once seconded Franklin's motion. Incidentally, on yesterday, July 16, 1787, the convention adopted the great compromise, without which none of us would be here today. That compromise established two bodies in the legislative branch and provided that each State would be equal in this branch, that we would have votes in this branch. I won't go further, but you might recall it was only yesterday.

But Hamilton and several others, wrote Madison, feared that calling in a

clergymen at so late a stage might lead the public to suspect dissensions in the Convention. Williamson of North Carolina made the frank statement that everyone knew the real reason for not engaging a chaplain: the Convention had no funds. Franklin's motion failed, though Randolph proposed that on the approaching Fourth of July, a sermon be preached at the request of the Convention and that thenceforth prayers be used. In any event, we can all learn a lesson from this episode: God was very much a part of national life at a time when the greatest document of its kind—the Constitution of the United States—was ever written, a time when it was being formed.

Mr. President, I close with words from the Bible, which Franklin aptly used in his speech: "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain."

It would be well, Mr. President, if this Biblical admonition were kept in mind as future cases concerning school prayer come before the courts of the land.

As a matter of fact, this admonition is one on which all three branches of government should reflect. We here in the legislative branch bear some responsibility. Here is where laws are made, and here is where some positive steps could originate on a path toward correcting a court imposed imbalance. The executive branch, too, could play some useful role in that regard. This being an election year, I urge that the Democratic and Republican political Conventions adopt planks—why not—in their respective platforms advocating a Constitutional amendment concerning prayer in schools. Both the Democratic and Republican nominees for President should be urged to support such an amendment.

Both nominees should be urged to speak out on this subject during the campaigns. I intend to urge that both nominees do that.

I thank all Senators and I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I see the distinguished Senator from Colorado is supposed to take over the time. I ask unanimous consent to be yielded 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). Under the previous order, the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, or his designee, has from 2 o'clock until 3 p.m.

Does the Senator from Colorado wish to respond to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ALLARD. I am willing to grant the Senator from South Carolina 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

#### THE DEBT AND TAX CUTS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, in response to my amendment relative to eliminating the tax cut, I ask unanimous consent that my comments of

February 10, this year, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FRAUD

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, if people back home only knew. This whole town is

engaged in the biggest fraud. Tom Brokaw has written that the greatest generation suffered the Depression, won the war, and then came back to lead. They not only won the war but were conscientious about paying for that war and Korea and Vietnam. Lyndon Johnson balanced the budget in 1969.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the record of all the Presidents, since President Truman down through Presi-

dent Clinton, of the deficit and debt, the national debt, and interest costs.

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

HOLLING'S BUDGET REALITIES

President and year	U.S. budget (outlays) (In billions)	Borrowed trust funds (billions)	Unified deficit with trust funds (billions)	Actual deficit without trust funds (billions)	National debt (billions)	Annual increases in spending for interest (billions)
<b>Truman:</b>						
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	
1954	70.9	3.6	-1.2	-4.8	270.8	
<b>Eisenhower:</b>						
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	
1962	106.8	3.2	-7.1	-10.3	302.9	9.1
<b>Kennedy:</b>						
1963	111.3	2.6	-4.8	-7.4	310.3	9.9
1964	118.5	-0.1	-5.9	-5.8	316.1	10.7
<b>Johnson:</b>						
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
1970	195.6	12.3	-2.8	-15.1	380.9	19.3
<b>Nixon:</b>						
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
1975	332.3	4.8	-53.2	-58.0	541.9	32.7
<b>Ford:</b>						
1976	371.8	13.4	-73.7	-87.1	629.0	37.1
1977	409.2	23.7	-53.7	-77.4	706.4	41.9
<b>Carter:</b>						
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
1981	678.2	6.7	-79.0	-85.7	994.8	95.5
<b>Reagan:</b>						
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
1989	1,143.2	114.2	-152.5	-266.7	2,868.3	240.9
<b>Bush:</b>						
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
1993	1,408.2	94.3	-255.0	-349.3	4,351.4	292.5
<b>Clinton:</b>						
1994	1,460.6	89.2	-203.1	-292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,514.6	113.4	-163.9	-277.3	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,453.1	153.5	-107.4	-260.9	5,181.9	344.0
1997	1,601.2	165.9	-21.9	-187.8	5,369.7	355.8
1998	1,651.4	179.0	70.0	-109.0	5,478.7	363.8
1999	1,704.5	250.5	122.7	-127.8	5,606.5	353.5
2000	1,769.0	234.5	176.0	-58.5	5,665.0	362.0
2001	1,839.0	262.0	177.0	-85.0	5,750.0	371.0

\* Historical Tables, Budget of the US Government FY 1998; Beginning in 1962 CBO'S 2001 Economic and Budget Outlook.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, Lyndon Johnson balanced the budget in 1969. At that time, the national debt was \$365 billion with an interest cost of only \$16 billion. Now, under a new generation without the cost of a war, the debt has soared to \$5.6 trillion with annual interest costs of \$365 billion. That is right. We spend \$1 billion a day for nothing. It does not buy any defense, any education, any health care, or highways. Astoundingly, since President Johnson balanced the budget, we have increased spending \$349 billion for nothing.

Early each morning, the Federal Government goes down to the bank and borrows \$1 billion and adds it to the national debt. We have not had a surplus for 30 years. Senator TRENT LOTT, commenting on President Clin-

ton's State of the Union Address, said the talk cost \$1 billion a minute. For an hour-and-a-half talk, that would be \$90 billion a year. Governor George W. Bush's tax cut costs \$90 billion a year. Together, that is \$180 billion. Just think, we can pay for both the Democratic and Republican programs with the money we are spending on interest and still have \$185 billion to pay down the national debt. Instead, the debt increases, interest costs increase, while all in town, all in the Congress, shout: Surplus, surplus, surplus.

Understand the game. Ever since President Johnson's balanced budget, the Government has spent more each year than it has taken in—a deficit. The average deficit for the past 30 years was \$175 billion a year. This is with

both Democratic and Republican Presidents and Democratic and Republican Congresses. Somebody wants to know why the economy is good? If you infuse \$175 billion a year for some 30 years and do not pay for it, it ought to be good.

The trick to calling a deficit a surplus is to have the Government borrow from itself. The Federal Government, like an insurance company, has various funds held in reserve to pay benefits of the program—Social Security, Medicare, military retirement, civilian retirement, unemployment compensation,

highway funds, airport funds, railroad retirement funds.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a list of trust funds looted to balance this budget.

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

	1998	1999	2000
Social Security .....	730	855	1,009
Medicare:			
HI .....	118	154	176
SMI .....	40	27	34
Military Retirement .....	134	141	149
Civilian Retirement .....	461	492	522
Unemployment .....	71	77	85
Highway .....	18	28	31
Airport .....	9	12	13
Railroad Retirement .....	22	24	25
Other .....	53	59	62
Total .....	1,656	1,869	2,106

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, these funds are held in trust for the specific purpose for which the taxes are collected.

Under corporate law, it is a felony to pay off the company debt with the pension fund. But in Washington we pay down the public debt with trust funds, call it a surplus, and they give us the "Good Government" award.

To make it sound correct, we divide the debt in two: The public debt and the private debt. Of course, our Government is public, and the law treats the debt as public without separation. The separation allows Washington politicians to say: We have paid down the public debt and have a surplus. There is no mention, of course, that the Government debt is increased by the same amount that the public debt is decreased. It is like paying off your MasterCard with your Visa card and saying you do not owe anything. Dr. Dan Crippen, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, describes this as "taking from one pocket and putting it in the other."

For years we have been using the trust funds to report a unified budget and a unified deficit. This has led people to believe the Government was reporting net figures. It sounded authentic. But as the unified deficit appeared less and less, the national debt continued to increase. While the unified deficit in 1997 was \$21.9 billion, the actual deficit was \$187.8 billion. In 1998 the unified budget reported a surplus of \$70 billion, but actually there was a deficit of \$109 billion. In 1999 the "unified surplus" was \$124 billion, but the actual deficit was \$127.8 billion.

Now comes the Presidential campaign. Social Security is a hot topic. Both parties are shouting: Save Social Security. Social Security lockbox. The economy is humming, booming. With high employment, the Social Security revenues have increased. It appears that, separate from Social Security, there will be enough trust fund money to compute a surplus. We have reached the millennium—Utopia—enough money to report a surplus without spending Social Security.

Washington jargon now changes. Instead of a "unified budget," the Government now reports an "on-budget" and an "off-budget." This is so we can all call it an on-budget surplus, meaning without Social Security. But to call it an on-budget surplus, the Government spends \$96 billion from the other trust funds.

We ended last year with a deficit of \$128 billion—not a surplus. The President's budget just submitted shows an actual deficit each year for the next 5 years. Instead of paying down the debt, the President shows, on page 420 of his budget, the debt increasing from the year 2000 to the year 2013—\$5.686 trillion to \$6.815 trillion, an increase of \$1.129 trillion.

They are all talking about paying off the debt by 2013, and the actual document they submit shows the debt increasing each year, and over that period an increase of over \$1 trillion.

Each year, Congress spends more than the President's budgets. There is no chance of a surplus with both sides proposing to reduce revenues with a tax cut. But we have a sweetheart deal: The Republicans will call a deficit a surplus, so they can buy the vote with tax cuts; the Democrats will call the deficit a surplus, so they can buy the vote with increased spending. The worst abuse of campaign finance is using the Federal budget to buy votes.

Alan Greenspan could stop this. He could call a deficit a deficit. Instead, appearing before Congress in his confirmation hearing, Greenspan, talking of the Federal budget, stated: "I would fear very much that these huge surpluses . . ." and on and on. We are in real trouble when Greenspan calls huge deficits "huge surpluses." Greenspan thinks his sole role is to protect the financial markets. He does not want the U.S. Government coming into the market borrowing billions to pay its deficit, crowding out private capital, and running up interest costs.

But Congress' job is to not only protect the financial markets but the overall economy. Our job, as the board of directors for the Federal Government, is to make sure the Government pays its bills. In short, our responsibility is to eliminate waste.

The biggest waste of all is to continue to run up the debt with devastating interest costs for nothing. In good times, the least we can do is put this Government on a pay-as-you-go basis. Greenspan's limp admonition to "pay down the debt" is just to cover his backside. He knows better. He should issue a clarion call to stop increasing the debt. While he is raising interest rates to cool the economy, he should categorically oppose tax cuts to stimulate it.

Our only hope is the free press. In the earliest days, Thomas Jefferson observed, given a choice between a free government and a free press, he would choose the latter. Jefferson believed strongly that with the press reporting the truth to the American people, the Government would stay free.

Our problem is that the press and media have joined the conspiracy to defraud. They complain lamely that the Federal budget process is too complicated, so they report "surplus." Complicated it is. But as to being a deficit or a surplus is clear cut; it is not complicated at all. All you need to do is go to the Department of the Treasury's report on public debt. They report the growth in the national debt every day, every minute, on the Internet at "www.publicdebt.treas.gov."

In fact, there is a big illuminated billboard on Sixth Avenue in New York that reports the increase in the debt by the minute. At present, it shows that we are increasing the debt every minute by \$894,000. Think of that—\$894,000 a minute. Of course, increase the debt, and interest costs rise. Already, interest costs exceed the defense budget. Interest costs, like taxes, must be paid. Worse, while regular taxes support defense, and other programs, interest taxes support waste. Running a deficit of over \$100 billion today, any tax cut amounts to an interest tax increase—an increase in waste.

If the American people realized what was going on, they would run us all out of town.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent the Public Debt to the Penny, issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, dated as of last Friday, July 14, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PUBLIC DEBT TO THE PENNY

Current:	
07/14/2000 .....	\$5,666,749,557,909.16
Current month:	Amount
07/13/2000 .....	\$5,666,740,403,750.26
07/12/2000 .....	5,664,141,886,637.91
07/11/2000 .....	5,665,065,032,353.04
07/10/2000 .....	5,662,949,608,628.38
07/07/2000 .....	5,664,950,120,488.65
07/06/2000 .....	5,665,885,115,450.41
07/05/2000 .....	5,663,895,163,292.22
07/03/2000 .....	5,656,715,920,235.71
Prior months:	
06/30/2000 .....	5,685,938,087,296.66
05/31/2000 .....	5,647,169,888,532.25
04/28/2000 .....	5,685,108,228,594.76
03/31/2000 .....	5,773,391,634,682.91
02/29/2000 .....	5,735,333,348,132.58
01/31/2000 .....	5,711,285,168,951.46
12/31/1999 .....	5,676,091,314,225.33
11/30/1999 .....	5,693,600,157,029.08
10/29/1999 .....	5,679,726,662,904.06
Prior fiscal years:	
09/30/1999 .....	5,656,270,901,615.43
09/30/1998 .....	5,526,193,008,897.62
09/30/1997 .....	5,413,146,011,397.34
09/30/1996 .....	5,224,810,939,135.73
09/29/1995 .....	4,973,982,900,709.39
09/30/1994 .....	4,692,749,910,013.32
09/30/1993 .....	4,411,488,883,139.38
09/30/1992 .....	4,064,620,655,521.66
09/30/1991 .....	3,665,303,351,697.03
09/28/1990 .....	3,233,313,451,777.25
09/29/1989 .....	2,857,430,960,187.32
09/30/1988 .....	2,602,337,712,041.16
09/30/1987 .....	2,350,276,890,953.00

Source: Bureau of the Public Debt.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I also ask unanimous consent that the public Interest Expense on the Public Debt Outstanding, issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, be printed in the RECORD.

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

INTEREST EXPENSE ON THE PUBLIC DEBT OUTSTANDING

The monthly Interest Expense represents the interest expense on the *Public Debt Outstanding* as of each month end. The interest expense on the Public Debt includes interest for *Treasury notes and bonds*; foreign and domestic series certificates of indebtedness, notes and bonds; *Savings Bonds*; as well as Government Account Series (GAS), *State and Local Government series (SLGs)*, and other special purpose securities. Amortized discount or premium on bills, notes and bonds is also included in interest expense.

The fiscal year Interest Expense represents the total interest expense on the Public Debt Outstanding for a given fiscal year. This includes the months of October through September.

Fiscal year 2000:	Interest expense
June .....	\$75,884,057,388.85
May .....	26,802,350,934.54
April .....	19,878,902,328.72
March .....	20,889,017,596.95
February .....	20,778,646,308.19
January .....	19,689,955,250.71
December .....	73,267,794,917.58
November .....	25,690,033,589.51
October .....	19,373,192,333.69
Fiscal year total ....	302,253,950,648.74

Available historical data—fiscal year end:	
1999 .....	353,511,471,722.87
1998 .....	363,823,722,920.26
1997 .....	355,795,834,214.66
1996 .....	343,955,076,695.15

1995 .....	332,413,555,030.62
1994 .....	296,277,764,246.26
1993 .....	292,502,219,484.25
1992 .....	292,361,073,070.74
1991 .....	286,021,921,181.04
1990 .....	264,852,544,615.90
1989 .....	240,863,231,535.71

1988 ..... 214,145,028,847.73  
 E-mail your questions and comments about this page.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that table 23 of the mid-session review by the President of the United

States, dated June 26, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 23.—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FINANCING AND DEBT  
 [In billions of dollars]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Financing:</b>													
Unified surplus or deficit (—) .....	211	228	224	236	255	268	286	304	332	364	416	500	547
Off-budget surplus:													
Social Security solvency lock-box:												123	147
Social Security solvency transfers .....												316	335
Other Social Security surplus (including Postal) .....	148	160	176	191	204	226	239	256	273	288	306		
Medicare HI solvency lock-box:													
Medicare solvency transfers .....		31	14						9	21	40	2	4
Other Medicare HI surplus .....	24	29	33	39	40	41	47	46	48	51	57	58	60
On-budget surplus .....	39	9	1	6	10	1	1	1	2	4	14	1	1
Means of financing other than borrowing from the public:													
Premiums paid (—) on buybacks of Treasury securities .....	—5	—2											
Changes in:													
Treasury operating cash balance .....	6	10											
Checks outstanding, deposit funds, etc. ....	—4												2
Seigniorage on coins .....	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	—63	—82
Less: Net financing disbursements:													
Direct loan financing accounts .....	—27	—14	—18	—17	—16	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15
Guaranteed loan financing accounts .....		1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3
Total, means of financing other than borrowing from the public .....	—27	—3	—14	—14	—12	—11	—12	—11	—11	—11	—11	—74	—93
Total, repayment of debt held by the public .....	185	225	210	222	243	257	274	293	321	353	406	426	454
Change in debt held by the public .....	—184	—225	—210	—222	—243	—257	—274	—293	—321	—353	—406	—426	—454
<b>Debt Subject to Statutory Limitation, End of Year:</b>													
Debt issued by Treasury .....	5,529	5,683	5,748	5,809	5,861	5,921	5,982	6,040	6,094	6,146	6,189	6,240	6,525
Adjustment for Treasury debt not subject to limitation and agency debt subject to limitation .....	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15	—15
Adjustment for discount and premium .....	5	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	2	2	2
Total, debt subject to statutory limitation .....	5,519	5,673	5,737	5,798	5,850	5,910	5,971	6,028	6,082	6,134	6,176	6,227	6,511
<b>Debt Outstanding, End of Year:</b>													
Gross Federal debt:													
Debt issued by Treasury .....	5,529	5,683	5,748	5,809	5,861	5,921	5,982	6,040	6,094	6,146	6,189	6,240	6,525
Debt issued by other agencies .....	28	28	27	26	24	22	21	19	19	19	18	18	18
Total, gross Federal debt .....	5,557	5,711	5,774	5,834	5,885	5,943	6,003	6,060	6,113	6,165	6,208	6,259	6,543
Held by:													
Debt securities held as assets by Government accounts .....	2,108	2,487	2,760	3,042	3,335	3,651	3,985	4,334	4,708	5,113	5,561	6,038	6,543
Social Security .....	1,005	1,165	1,341	1,532	1,737	1,963	2,201	2,457	2,729	3,014	3,318	3,692	4,090
Federal employee retirement .....	681	718	756	792	828	864	899	932	965	997	1,027	1,056	1,085
Other .....	422	604	663	718	770	823	885	944	1,014	1,102	1,216	1,290	1,368
Debt securities held as assets by the public .....	3,449	3,224	3,014	2,792	2,550	2,293	2,018	1,726	1,405	1,052	646	220	

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, right to the point. Surplus, surplus, everywhere man cries surplus—paraphrasing Patrick Henry. But there is no surplus.

I know not, of course, what others may say, but as for me, I want to pay down the debt rather than engage in this shabby charade. As a result, the only way to do that and pay down the debt is stop this sweetheart deal of giving a little on spending increases and giving a little again, of course, on tax cuts. We do not have a surplus to divide. That is the point of my particular amendment.

I appreciate the distinguished Senator from Colorado giving me these few moments, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from Colorado.

ELIMINATING THE MARRIAGE PENALTY

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to support eliminating the marriage penalty. I think it is timely that we have some votes scheduled this evening, I understand about 6:15 p.m. By eliminating the marriage penalty, we eliminate one of the most egregious examples of unfairness and complexity in the Tax Code to date. Another example of that would be the death tax or the inheritance tax. We dealt with that issue last week. I am extremely excited that it has

passed the House, passed the Senate, and is now going on to the President for his signature.

Both these taxes are prominent concerns of my constituents, at a time when the tax burden is at record high levels in this country. When we are talking about eliminating the death tax, we are talking about the family business and what happens to a family business after an unexpected death without any estate planning, and how much the Government takes of that estate, forcing the sale. Many times it is a farm or a ranch that has been in the family for many, many generations.

When we talk about the marriage penalty—we are eliminating that unfair burden—we are talking about the family. We are talking about reducing the tax burden. We are talking about fairness and Tax Code simplification.

Just a brief description needs to be made of the marriage penalty. The marriage penalty exists when a married couple, filing a joint tax return, pays higher taxes than if the same couple were not married and were filing as individuals. The penalty varies, depending on the tax bracket in which the couple may find themselves. The example that has been used before is based on an assumption that both spouses are each holding down separate jobs, each earning about \$30,000, in 1999. It is determined they would pay about \$7,655 in Federal income taxes. If these

two individuals were not married and both earned the same amount of money, and had each filed a single tax return, they would pay only \$6,892 in combined tax liability. There is a \$763 difference in tax liability. This is what we refer to when we talk about the marriage tax penalty.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, almost half of all married couples—it figures out to about 22 million—suffered from the marriage tax penalty last year. The average penalty paid by these couples was around \$1,500. In the previous example, the marriage penalty was the result of a higher combined standard deduction for two workers filing as singles than for married couples, and the income tax bracket thresholds for married couples are less than twice the threshold for single taxpayers. We are trying to eliminate this problem.

The best illustration of the real tax burden faced by families is to compare today's tax burden of an average family with the tax burden of a family with average income of four decades ago. The total tax burden for the family today is 39 percent of its income. That is up from 18 percent in 1955. The Federal payroll taxes and State and local taxes have literally doubled the total tax burden faced by families. As a result, the middle-income family today has 25 percent less disposable income than a similar family in 1955.