

spent a career in the military. They were in the military and received a disability. In all of these years, they have only been able to, in effect, draw one pension. That is wrong.

S. 170 permits retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service connected disability to receive military retirement pay while also receiving veterans' disability compensation.

Last year, I along with Senator INOUE, introduced S. 2357, the Armed Forces Concurrent Retirement and Disability Payment Act of 2000. I was extremely disappointed that we did not take the opportunity to correct this long-standing inequity in the 106th Congress.

Out of 100 percent of what we should have done last year, we did 1 percent. We did very little.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Memorial Day is just over one hundred days away. There is no better honor this body could bestow upon our nations veterans who have sacrificed so much, than to pass this legislation before Memorial Day.

We are currently losing over one thousand WWII veterans each day. Every day we delay acting on this legislation means that we have denied fundamental fairness to thousands of men and women. They will never have the ability to enjoy their two well-deserved entitlements.

Given the tax and budget debate we are now in, I am gravely concerned that we will not have the resources that will be needed to properly fund this legislation and honor those who served our nation—our veterans.

President Bush rightfully this week is focusing attention on the U.S. military. It is very important that he do that. I think the way he is approaching things appears to me to be very reasoned. He is saying we are going to keep Clinton's budget in effect this year until we have a chance to really understand what is happening. But he ordered Secretary Rumsfeld to take a close look at it.

One of the things I want him to take a close look at is not only the readiness of the military and what happens to those people who have already served in the military, but I also say that it is very important that everyone recognize we do need and deserve and will have some kind of a tax cut. But we have to be aware of the fact we are basing these proposed tax cuts on uncertain forecasts. We are forecasting 10 years in the future.

A few days ago here in Washington they forecast morning temperatures in the midforties. Most mornings I get up and take a little run. So I was kind of happy that we were going to have a break in the weather. The forecast was it would be kind of warm. I got up, put on shorts and a T-shirt. Out I went. It was 33 degrees. There is a lot of difference between 40 and 33. I was real cold. I say that because people can't forecast very well the weather 1 day ahead. I think we who are depending on

the economists to forecast 10 years ahead must approach this with caution. I know we will do that.

We also have to be sure this tax cut is proper in size. We have to make sure we do not take away from debt reduction and that we take care of Social Security and Medicare.

Also, in addition to these projections, and the size that we are talking about with this tax cut, we want to look at fairness. Are we approaching this in the right way? Is it really appropriate?

This is in the form of a question and not a statement. Is it really appropriate that the top 1 percent and the wealthiest 1 percent get 43 percent of the tax cut? They pay a lot of the taxes—about 20 percent of the taxes. I think there has to be a debate, once we determine the projections, about the size of this tax cut—what we are going to do and how we are going to distribute that?

I was home this past weekend. Most Americans—in fact 80 percent of Americans—pay more in withholding taxes than they do in income taxes.

I also say this: The business community is concerned the tax cuts are not directed toward them but, rather, individuals. We have to make sure the tax cut we come up with is fair. As I said, this Senator supports tax cuts for all Americans. I think we have to make sure these tax cuts protect Social Security and Medicare and that we have some money left over to invest in health, education, and things such as my taking care of veterans.

Of course, for me, the biggest tax cut the American people can get is to recognize if we pay down that debt, everybody gets a tax cut. The magnitude of the tax cut that President Bush is pushing we hope will not eliminate any ability of increased funding for veterans. This is going to cost money, but it is going to cost money that is one of the fairest ways we could spend some of the surplus.

I say to President Bush: We should not leave our veterans behind. I say to Members of this Congress: We should not leave our veterans behind. Our veterans have earned this and now is our chance to honor their service to our Nation in a different way. I will work very hard to ensure that our Nation's veterans receive the dividend of our current surplus. Specifically, we have to have a fiscally responsible tax cut that allows us to protect Social Security, provide a prescription drug benefit, fund education, ensure a strong and stable military, and continue to pay down the debt.

Today, over a million and a half Americans dedicate every minute of their lives to the defense of this Nation. The U.S. military force is unmatched in the history of the world in terms of power, training, and ability, and this Nation is recognized as the world's only superpower, a status which is largely due to the sacrifices our veterans made during this last century. So rather than honoring their

commitment and bravery by fulfilling our obligations, the Federal Government has chosen instead to perpetuate a 110-year-old injustice. Quite simply, this is wrong. It borders on being disgraceful.

I hope everyone within the sound of my voice will join in honoring these veterans who deserve what they have earned. They are not asking for a hand-out. They are asking for what they deserve. They have disabilities. They have fulfilled their commitment in the military and are subject to that retirement.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to my friend from Kansas, how long does he wish to speak?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Five minutes or less because I preside at that point in time.

Mr. REID. Senator BOXER has made a request through me and I ask this of the Chair. I ask unanimous consent that she be allowed to speak at 4:20 p.m. for 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to Senator BOXER speaking for 25 minutes?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. BROWNBACK pertaining to the introduction of S. 315 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

#### SUPPORT FOR THE DEFENDERS OF OUR NATION

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, on July 27, 1920, in a speech before the Republican national convention in Chicago accepting his party's nomination for Vice President, Massachusetts Governor Calvin Coolidge exclaimed, "The nation which forgets its defenders will be itself forgotten." With these striking words, Coolidge chastened the convention delegates to never take lightly the sacrifice of American soldiers, who during World War I, left freedom's shores to defend democracy abroad. Back then, Coolidge recognized that a great country must honor its guardians, lest it be forgotten.

This week, President George W. Bush has come forward under the same banner as Coolidge did in 1920, to declare that America must not forget its defenders. In a speech before the brave men and women of the United States Army's 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Stewart Georgia, President Bush proposed \$5.7 billion in new spending for the soldiers, sailors and airmen of the Armed Forces. Specifically, the President has proposed dedicating \$400 million for across-the-board pay raises, \$1

billion for re-enlistment bonuses, \$3.9 billion for improving military health benefits, and \$400 million to improve military housing. I applaud the President on this brave and honorable proposal.

I find it appalling that before the President announced this proposal many were criticizing his decision to temporarily freeze program spending at last year's appropriated levels. When the President ordered the Secretary of Defense to conduct a thorough review of Pentagon weapons programs before proceeding with any requests for supplemental funds, he was attacked in the press for breaking his campaign promise to "bolster our national defense." I find such assertions to be not only mean-spirited, but also misguided.

Make no mistake, newer and better weapons systems are crucial toward maintaining our national defense. We live in a world where we face real and present hostilities. Rogue nations are becoming increasingly capable of striking America's shores, and I look forward to the debate we will have in the Senate this year about building ballistic missile defense systems, and other "next generation" weapons to counter these terrors. However, I fully realize that without qualified men and women trained in the use and support of these systems, we are merely left with empty threats to counter these real hostilities.

Human beings are the driving force behind our national security. Tanks, ships, and fighter jets do not win wars. Soldiers, sailors, and airmen do. Arlington does not honor the memory of our greatest weapons. Those hallowed grounds are sacred to the memory of the men and women who have laid down their lives using and supporting those weapons. Concern for the individuals who proudly serve our Nation as soldiers should always be our first priority when we debate our national defense policies. By proceeding first to the need of the soldiers ahead of the need for new weapons, President Bush has demonstrated he has his priorities straight and I pledge my support for his proposal in the U.S. Senate.

The bond between a soldier and his nation must be reciprocal. The United States must rely on soldiers to defend against her enemies, and, for over 225 years, these soldiers have never failed. However, we do not always recognize the fact that the favor often goes unreturned. Far too often throughout our history the United States has relied on the defense of the soldier, while failing, in turn, to defend the soldier against their own enemies.

The enemies of our soldiers are low pay, substandard housing, and second class health benefits. No one would deny that all of our citizens are in perpetual need of a good wage, a good home, and good health care, and yet, we often act as if our soldiers are in need of less. Addressing the New York State Legislature in 1775, General George Washington reminded the legis-

lators, "When we assumed the Soldier, we did not lay aside the Citizen." Our citizens, on becoming soldiers, have not left want and need behind. It is our duty to afford them with means to not only survive, but to also thrive. We can afford no less. Freedom is never free.

Mr. President, again, I commend President Bush for coming forward and declaring the need to support the defenders of the Nation. Again, this week, President George Bush came forward under the same banner as Calvin Coolidge did in 1920, to declare that America must not forget its defenders. In a speech given to the Army's 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Stewart, GA, President Bush proposed \$5.7 billion in new spending for the soldiers, sailors, and airmen in the armed services. Specifically, the President has proposed dedicating \$400 million for across-the-board pay raises, \$1 billion for reenlistment bonuses, and other benefits to the men and women in uniform.

I end my comments by saying that this is long overdue. We have several military installations in Kansas. We, unfortunately, have people in our armed forces who are not well paid and not paid near enough for the job they are doing. It is past time for us to step forward and pay our men and women in uniform sufficiently for the work they do.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BROWNBACK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wonder if you would be so kind as to tell me when I am down to 5 minutes remaining in my 25 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will do so.

#### TAX CUTS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, we are faced with a tremendous choice in America, and that is whether we want to continue with policies that led to an 8-year recovery of our economy which was flat on its back and go with those policies of fiscal responsibility and fairness and investment or go back to the days of what was called trickle-down economics, where the very wealthy got the most, the rest of us got very little, the deficits soared, the debt soared, our country was in trouble.

I represent, along with Senator FEINSTEIN, the largest State in the Nation. We have 34 million people. We had a recession that was second to none. It was the worst recession since the Great Depression. It took us a long time to come out of that. We had double-digit unemployment. We had a terrible situation. But because we followed, in this

Government, finally, a policy of fiscal restraint, we got back on our feet and people have done very well. That is why this discussion about the proposed tax cut by our new President, versus the tax cut that will be supported by the Democrats, is such an important conversation.

Last week, President Bush submitted a tax cut plan to the Congress. It was not detailed, but it was a plan. It was like a brochure in which he laid out his vision of a tax cut. He outlined in it a \$1.6 trillion tax cut plan. I have to say, and I hope people will listen, this tax cut is not compassionate and it is not conservative.

We remember when President Bush ran he ran as a compassionate conservative. So we get his very first proposal—actually it wasn't his first. His first one was to interfere with family planning throughout the world and put a gag rule on international family planning groups that help poor women get birth control. But for this purpose, it is certainly his first fiscal policy. It is neither compassionate nor is it conservative. What do I mean by that?

First, it is not compassionate because it benefits the very wealthy instead of the 99 percent, everyone else; that is, those in the middle class, either lower or upper. It helps the very wealthy.

His plan is not conservative because it does not do the smart, conservative thing of being cautious with the projected surplus. I said "projected surplus." As Democratic leader DASCHLE has said, these projections are like the weather forecasts: Don't count on them because they change. They are not dependable. So the conservative thing to do is to have a rainy day fund, if you will.

Let me go into detail on why I say this plan is not compassionate. I have told you it benefits the wealthy. Mr. President, 31 percent of all families with children would receive nothing. If you are among the bottom 20 percent of Americans in terms of income, you get an average cut of \$42. This is the way the tax cut of President Bush breaks down, and you tell me if it is compassionate. If you are in the lowest 20 percent of earners; that is, earning less than \$13,600, you will get an average tax cut of \$42. Let me make that even worse. The income range averages at \$8,600, so at \$8,600 a year, you get back \$42 in your pocket on average.

The next quintile is \$13,600 to \$24,400. That is an average of \$18,800 a year. They get an average tax cut of \$187.

A person earning \$31,000 gets \$453 back. If you earn an average of \$50,000, you get back an average of \$876. Between \$64,000 and \$130,000, you get back \$1,400. Then, if you earn an average of \$163,000, you get \$2,200, approximately. But hold on to your chairs. Hold on to your chairs. If you earn \$319,000 or more—the average income is \$915,000—you get back \$46,000 every year.

So how can anyone say that is compassionate? A person earning \$50,000