President and his instincts that he will, in fact, ultimately make the correct decision.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 12, a resolution providing for a joint session of Congress, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President on the state of the Union.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) was agreed to.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held tonight, Tuesday, January 28, 2003, at 9 p.m.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

PRAYERS FOR THE PRESIDENT AND THE MEN AND WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first let me join my friend from Utah in sentiments that he expressed at the end of his speech in that we hope and pray for the wisest decision from the President. And we hope and pray for our young men and women who are amassing in the Middle East now.

War, of course, should be the last resort. We still hope that it can be avoided. But if it cannot, we wish them and their families the best and pray for their speedy success.

HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, my reason for coming to the Chamber today is similar to those of many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. We are discussing what we hope the President will speak about tonight, what we want him to speak about, what we expect him to speak about.

Some of my colleagues have talked about areas such as the economy, the environment, education, and health care. I am going to address the issue of homeland security because, as much as we do overseas, we have to make sure our homeland is secure as well.

If, God willing, we were able to just eliminate all of al-Qaida and all of Saddam and his supporters, we would still face a danger from terrorism. Terrorists can strike almost at will in different ways, and our country is not yet secure against them, although I will say we have made some progress, particularly in the areas of air safety and in bioterrorism, since 9/11.

But we have so much more to do. What worries me is that the focus of this administration is almost exclusively on fighting the war on terrorism overseas. To beat the terrorists we need a one-two punch—one, fighting that war overseas, dealing with terrorism overseas; but, two, making our homeland more secure. And there seems to be a rather quaint and quirky notion among many of those in the administration that we can successfully fight the war here at home without spending a nickel. That is just wrong.

The bottom line is if someone were to say to the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, go fight the war in Iraq without any new resources, without any new dollars, he would say: I can't. But that is basically what we are saying to Mr. Tom Ridge and those who work under him.

Time and time again, when Members on both sides of the aisle have done a lot of research and proposed measures that would increase our security here at home, we are told: Well, that's a good idea, but we can't spend any money on it.

That just cannot be. There are so many areas where we lie naked, possible prey, God forbid, to terrorists.

Take our ports. We are far, far behind where we should be in monitoring what comes in on our ships. As we all know, those ships could be filled with deadly devices.

Take our borders. On the northern border, my State has a long and peaceful border with Canada. But, right now, if we pass the budget that was passed in the Senate, there will be fewer Customs inspectors on that northern border than there were on 9/11.

As to the FBI, this new budget that we passed, unfortunately, cuts the number of FBI agents. While the counterterrorism parts of the FBI are increasing, all the other parts are decreasing. It makes no sense to say we are going to make our citizens more secure from a foreign threat and leave them prey to a domestic threat. Bank robberies in my community are going up. It seems logical to assume that one of the reasons for that is that the FBI is not able to do its function under the strained budget that we have given it—to do both functions: fighting terrorism and fighting crime here at home.

As to cyberterrorism, unfortunately, Richard Clark, a brilliant man—the administration's point man on cyber-security—is leaving. But I am sure, as he has told many of you, we are again doing virtually nothing to make ourselves more secure from a deadly virus that might invade one of the very important technological systems that secure our country. And the list goes on and on and on.

As to truck safety, trucks that carry hazardous material, Brazil is doing a far better job in dealing with terrorism there than we are, even though they have not been the focus of terrorist attacks.

As to the rails, in my City of New York, Penn Station has a 1½-mile tunnel that has no egress. God forbid if something terrible happened there. What we have to do is look at all of our weak pressure points in terms of where terrorists would strike and strengthen them.

But this administration, in part because they do not want to spend the dollars necessary—as eager as they are to spend the dollars overseas that are necessary—is not doing the job.

So today we are going to look, as the President speaks, as to what specifically he is going to do to bolster our case in terms of homeland security. We are going to see if the promise that was made—for instance, in the USA Patriot Act, that we triple the number of Border Patrol and Customs agents and immigration authorities at the northern border—will be fulfilled.

We are going to look and see if there are the dollars necessary to update the INS computers, which are notoriously bad, so terrorists cannot slip into the country, and the FBI computers that, again, were so bad that all the signals we had about a plot that was hatched for 9/11 were missed, mainly because the FBI computers were less sophisticated, frankly, than the one my eighth grade, 14-year-old daughter has at our home.

The list goes on and on. And no one expects this administration will clean up every single problem we have in 6 months. But in terms of effort, in terms of focus, in terms of allocation of resources, they are woefully behind.

My good colleague from West Virginia, who has done so much to lead this fight, made a very good point on the homeland security bill. That bill, as you all know, rearranged agencies but did not change what happens within them.

Rearranging agencies does not change things. Moving the Coast Guard over to this new agency is not going to help it patrol 200 miles off the coast as it must do in our post 9/11 world.

When our President tonight gives his speech, we are all going to be looking to see what specifically he will say and