

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having come and gone, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:52 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CLELAND).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the majority leader shortly wishes to make a statement. I see my friend from Missouri is in the Chamber, and a number of other Senators.

Do any of the Senators wish to speak now?

I yield to my friend from Missouri for purposes of a question. Does the Senator wish to speak now?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I have a number of issues to speak about. I wish to speak in relation to a welcoming resolution, and then I have further remarks upon which I wish to expound.

I am happy to accommodate the floor leader's desire. I ask what his intentions are.

Mr. REID. My intention was that we go into a quorum call until the majority leader appears on the floor. But maybe—and does the Senator from Louisiana wish to speak?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Yes. Thank you, I say to the assistant majority leader. I wish to talk about the West Nile virus for a few moments because it is an issue that is so important to Louisiana and many States.

Mr. REID. How long does the Senator wish to speak?

Ms. LANDRIEU. Maybe 10 minutes. But we may not be ready. The House is passing their bill. I am kind of open to the time.

Mr. REID. How long does the Senator from Missouri wish to speak, approximately?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I have one matter that will take 2 minutes and another matter that will take 10 to 15 minutes. And if nothing else is happening, I could go for another 20.

Mr. REID. I am wondering if my two friends, the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Missouri, if the majority leader comes to the floor, would be willing to yield to him for his statement?

Mr. BOND. Pardon?

Mr. REID. I said, if the majority leader appears on the floor, will you be willing to yield to him for a statement?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, of course. I am always happy to accommodate my colleague.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from

Missouri be recognized for up to 20 minutes; and that following that, the Senator from Louisiana be recognized for 10 minutes; and that they both agree, when the majority leader appears, that they will yield to him for his statement.

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

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my good friend, the majority floor leader. My first item should be a non-controversial one.

WELCOMING HER MAJESTY QUEEN SIRIKIT OF THAILAND

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, we are going to be having a visit from a very important leader of a great ally, the Queen of Thailand. Her Majesty Queen Sirikit arrives here in Washington on Friday of this week.

We know that Thailand and the United States have a shared commitment to peace, liberty, democracy, and free enterprise. We are very dependent upon that country for economic trade as well as security. Queen Sirikit has done a remarkable job in leading the way in humanitarian efforts, including in rural Thailand.

Mr. President, we are experiencing a period of national tension as the United States girds itself to confront those nations and those faceless individuals who would threaten our prosperity, our security and, indeed, our very lives. However, in such times of anxiety, it is important that we recall that the globe is populated much more heavily with our friends than with our enemies and that, while we must face those enemies, we should also pause to honor our faithful allies.

With this thought in mind, I take a moment to draw the attention of the Senate to the Government and people of Thailand whose Queen, Her Majesty Queen Sirikit, arrives here in Washington, D.C. on Friday, October 4, 2002.

The United States enjoys a long and constructive relationship with the people of Thailand, dating back to 1833 when the administration of President Andrew Jackson negotiated and signed the Treaty of Amity and Commerce in which the two signatories pledged to establish "a perpetual peace" between them. That treaty, the first such that the United States signed with any Asian nation, commenced a 169-year period of amicable, mutually beneficial relations.

Thailand and the United States enjoyed a shared commitment to peace, liberty, democracy and free enterprise, enabling us to cooperate both in the broadening and the protection of those values. Thailand is one of the only five countries in Asia with whom the United States has a bilateral security agreement. Furthermore, this country has a military assistance agreement with Thailand that was negotiated and signed following the end of the conflict in the Korean peninsula. Each year, our armed forces join with the Thai de-

fense establishment in military maneuvers dubbed "Cobra Gold". These are the largest military exercises involving U.S. forces in the whole of the Asian continent.

We are all aware of, and deeply regret, the pain that many of the Thai people have had to absorb following the recent retreat of many Asian economies. However, after implementing painful but necessary reforms, the Thai economy is clearly bouncing back, with a recovered currency and annual economic growth that could prove to be as high as 5 percent his year. The U.S. remains Thailand's largest export market while Thailand ranks 22nd as a destiny of U.S. exports. This nation has an aggregate investment of almost \$20 billion, while 600 U.S. companies, large and small, are currently doing business there.

But I do not wish to talk solely of general U.S.-Thai relations. I also wish to acquaint the Senate with the splendid humanitarian work of Queen Sirikit, who has worked tirelessly to promote the well being of both Thais and non Thais alike. For the past 46 years she has served as President of the Thai Red Cross Society. In this capacity, she had to address the massive humanitarian problems posed by the influx of 40,000 Cambodian refugees as they flooded across the Thai border to flee the turmoil in their country. Many of those people lived for years in the Khao I Dang Center that she set up to shelter, feed and care for families with small children and unaccompanied orphans.

Her own people have similarly benefited from Her Majesty's close attention. To increase the income of the country's rural families, Her Majesty has initiated many projects, such as the Foundation for the Promotion of Supplementary Occupations and Techniques, better known as the SUPPORT Foundation. This is certainly a model for other developing countries as many are discovering to their cost that the early stages of economic development can often prompt a rush from the land to the city that the nascent urban economy is often unable to bear. If developing nations are to achieve sustainable growth, they will have to emulate Queen Sirikit's attention to the needs of the rural population.

I am by no means the first person to recognize Her Majesty's accomplishments. She has been awarded the prestigious CERES medal by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. Tufts University has honored her with an Honorary Doctorate in Humane Letters in recognition of her work for the rural poor of Thailand. Her care for the health of those same people has won her an Honorary Fellowship from Great Britain's Royal College of Physicians.

I ask my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join me in welcoming Queen Sirikit to the United States. I understand that Her Majesty will preside over an event at the Library of

Congress next Wednesday, October 9 during which the work and activities of the SUPPORT Foundation will also be exhibited and I look forward to seeing many of you there.

I have a resolution that I hope to be able to bring up which will join with the House in extending the welcome of Congress to Her Majesty, the Queen. We look forward to discussing that with the leaders on both sides. And I hope to be able to address that later on.

SENATE INACTION

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I think it is time that we take a look at where we are and determine what is happening in this body. We have not completed an energy bill, a Defense authorization bill, a terrorism reinsurance bill, a homeland security bill, or a bill to provide a prescription drug benefit.

Even though we are beginning the new fiscal year today, this is not a happy occasion. We have not considered a budget on this floor. We have not completed and sent to the President a single 1 of the 13 appropriations bills. I fear that the President's pen may dry up before we send him a bill to sign or veto.

Our distinguished former colleague and leader, Senator Bob Dole, once said:

I do believe we spend a lot of time doing very little, and that may be an understatement.

Meanwhile, there are great needs. Our economy struggles. We have not passed a terrorism risk reinsurance bill that would put our construction industry back to work. We haven't passed an energy bill that could put literally three-quarters of a million people to work in the construction area, in the development of the goods and the products, the pipelines we need to secure our energy future.

The economy is a problem. This summer, the Governor of the State of Missouri announced that Missouri's relative job loss was the highest in the Nation over the past year. There are measures pending before us that have been recommended that we have not passed. Here we are, the first day of the new fiscal year, and we have not yet begun to debate a budget that would be the framework for our appropriations bills. It was to be completed on April 15. We worked on it in the Budget Committee. It was a contentious debate. But we said at the time that the bill that was reported out of the Budget Committee was not one that could pass. Unfortunately, we were correct. It has not even been brought up.

The majority has not even brought up their own budget bill to be amended or to be debated on the floor. Even if the bill is not perfect, we should at least bring it up for debate so we can proceed to get a budget. Since 1976, when the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 first went into effect, this has never happened. This is the first time

the Senate has not seen fit to consider a budget since the Ford administration.

Historically, the budget resolution has been a difficult matter to resolve. On average, it has been adopted late some 40 days. It is never pleasant. I see the distinguished former chairman of the Budget Committee on the floor. He has fought many difficult battles, but he has accomplished the purpose. And we passed a budget so we could pass appropriations bills; so we have some discipline. This one is over 5 months late and counting.

One of the key congressional responsibilities provided for in the Constitution remains unscheduled. Furthermore, as of midnight last night, there are no budget enforcement provisions, no pay-as-you-go requirements, no points of order against overspending. They are all relaxed. As of today, all budget enforcement provisions have expired. I hope nobody will take this as an invitation to break the budget with more directed spending.

On top of this, we have not completed a single appropriations bill, which was supposed to have been completed by midnight last night. We have begun the fiscal year of 2003 with a record of zero for 13—not a very good average. Only three bills have completed Senate consideration in appropriations.

We all know resolving spending matters is always difficult. There is always someone else to blame. But clearly the Senate has not completed its most primary responsibility, which is expressing the will of the public in the form of a budget. I understand in the last 8 weeks we have not completed action and had a rollcall vote to pass a major piece of legislation. We have been on the Interior appropriations bill for 4 weeks. This is week 5.

In this case, we are making no progress because the majority will not permit the Senate to cast a vote on an amendment designed to prevent forest fires from destroying forests and homes and taking human life.

I know members of the Appropriations Committee are ready to bring their bills before the Senate for consideration. The chairman, Senator BYRD, and ranking member, Senator STEVENS, reported all 13 bills out of the Appropriations Committee by the end of July.

The Senator from Maryland, Ms. MIKULSKI, and I are ready to bring our bill to the floor to fund veterans and housing and the environment and space and science and emergency management. Well, it is not there. We go into the new year without any of these bills being passed.

I don't want to be confrontational with those managing the Senate, but this is week 5 on a bill that should have taken 2 days. As someone who has spent a lot of time in my few years working with the majority and minority and with the House and the administration resolving difficult matters of disagreement, I know how difficult it is

to complete spending bills. However, I fear this process is bogged down by design.

Last week, we were told we may have to vote on Saturday. But instead of voting on Saturday, we canceled votes on Friday and Monday. On the Interior bill, western Senators have an amendment to protect their forests and their citizens from fire. But the majority, apparently on behalf of certain interest groups, will not permit the Senate to vote. We should vote. That is our job. We vote up or down. We should vote, win or lose. The whole purpose of this delay, regrettably, is to avoid voting.

What is reprehensible is that the authors of the amendment to prevent devastating, deadly fires—deadly to humans, to forests, property, and wildlife—are not even given an opportunity to get a vote. If we would vote, we could get to the remaining amendment, pass this bill, and move on in the next day or two.

Some are suggesting—this I believe is outrageous—that the sponsors of the amendment should have to pull their amendment so we would not have to vote. We have only cast 227 votes this year. I can't remember any year in my history where we passed so few. But this would be a good time to pass another one. We could cast another vote and pass this bill.

The sponsors of this amendment have had people in their States die. They have had millions of acres of trees, including old-growth trees, habitat, and wildlife ruined, killed by fire, and houses burned. They have a solution on which the Senate should have the courtesy, if not the common sense, to vote. How poorly is the majority leadership willing to treat Senators from these States?

The Senators and their constituents deserve a vote, period. If Senators want to vote against it, then do so. Senator CRAIG has not had the opportunity to slip this provision into a conference report, so he is doing what the Senator is paid to do, which is to offer an amendment up or down and have a vote. Why can't we? Should the sponsors be asked to ignore their burning States and set their amendments aside or should the people preventing a vote decide that the Senate should do what we are paid to do? To me, the answer is obvious.

We have been in session for over 4 weeks. The last 4 weeks, we have cast a whopping 19 votes, many of them on noncontroversial judges. I compliment our colleagues from South Dakota for figuring out a way to protect their State from fire. But I want others to have the same opportunity. I have farmers who want farm aid. The Senator from South Dakota got his vote on farm aid. I voted for it. It was not germane to the bill, it was not relevant to the bill, but I voted for it because it is important to farmers all across the heartland of America.

Why can't the Senators whose States are on fire or threatened to be on fire have a vote? I haven't heard one good