

whether or not Bill Gates or his father have added tax benefits. They want to know if they can protect their kids, if they can protect their family with health insurance.

These are the real issues being ignored by this White House. I sincerely hope the Senate will not ignore them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

CRITICAL ISSUES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we have heard some strong views, which, of course, is appropriate for the Senate. That is what we ought to be doing. We will always have a difference of view as to how we approach the problems that confront us. What we ought to do is approach some of those problems rather than stand in disrepair here for another few days and not do anything with the issues. But we will always have a difference of view. That is what it is all about.

It is interesting that the Senator from Illinois talks about a bipartisan solution when we have no bipartisanship at all in this Chamber. There can't be a word, there has not been a word, offered about any of these proposals without criticizing the White House. You can have a different point of view, but you don't always have to criticize the person who has a different point of view than you do.

We have a unique situation. We find ourselves with a difficulty in the Middle East, the challenge of war there. We have a challenge in North Korea as well. We also have an economy that has slumped. We have to do something about that. These are quite different situations than 2 years ago. We have to do some things that are different.

With respect to the economy, we need to do something. All I hear is criticism from the other side. I don't hear a plan. I don't hear any proposal. I don't see anything happening except just criticism.

The fact is, we need to have a plan. The President has put forth a plan. His plan deals with the issue. Should it be altered? Could there be changes? Of course, that is always the case.

The fact is, there is a plan that has three main goals: To encourage consumer spending that will continue to boost the economy; to promote investments by individuals and businesses that will lead to economic growth and job creation; and to deliver critical help to unemployed citizens, which we have already done to some extent and need to continue to do.

The difference in point of view, apparently, as my friend from the other side of the aisle said, is they want to redistribute income and pass out money. That is their plan; \$300 to everyone. And they talk about just doing

it for 1 year. The fact is, what we need to resolve this problem is more investment and more jobs. Mr. President, \$300 doesn't solve a family's problems; \$300 doesn't solve anyone's future. But a job does, and jobs require investment. The President's proposal would speed up the 2001 tax cuts to increase the pace of recovery and job creation, encourage job-creating investments in small and large businesses by ending some of the double taxation and giving other incentives to invest. These are the kinds of things that create jobs, that will help people and provide for unemployed Americans, which we have done to some extent.

They talk about not doing anything immediately. They want to give somebody \$300. Under the President's proposal to speed up tax relief, 2 million taxpayers would receive an average tax cut of over \$1,000 in 2003; 46 million married couples would receive an average tax cut of \$1,700; 34 million families with children would receive an average benefit of \$1,400; 6 million single women with children would receive an average tax cut of over \$500 immediately, this year; 23 million small businesses would receive tax cuts averaging over \$2,000, which would help create more jobs and continue to move in the direction we would like.

There is a chart in today's Washington Times that compares the \$300 with the things the Bush bill would do, and talking about a single person who makes an income of, say, \$50,000, he gets more under the Bush plan. But more importantly, when you have a married couple, they get more like \$1,700 as opposed to \$600 or \$300 each.

So we can have a different view as to how we do this, but two or three things are important. One is we get the facts out there as to what is really going to happen. Two is we have a plan that applies more than just the distribution and redistribution of money, and the other, that would create jobs to stimulate the economy. We have seen what economies can do in terms of deficits. No one hates deficits worse than I. I am probably one of the more conservative spenders here, but I believe when you have a turndown in the economy, you have to do some things differently, particularly when they are coupled with the problems we have overseas. But a strong economy will replace that and we have seen that happen in the past. The best way to deal with the deficit is to have that strong economy and to get it moving again.

Generally, the President's growth and job package provides for a short-term boost for the economy, creates jobs, promotes sustained and long-term economic growth. Accelerating the 2004, 2006 tax rates to 2003 will provide 28 million taxpayers with an average of \$1,100. We don't hear that when we talk about it.

Mr. President, again, I respect the idea that we have different views as to how to deal with problems. I think it is very important that we make sure we

get the facts out and, No. 2, if you disagree with it—and there is a problem as there is here—that there be an alternative, that there be some choices, and not just full-time criticism.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO STEVE YOUNG

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, at this hour in Ohio, final tributes are being paid to Steve Young. I rise this morning on the Senate floor to pay tribute to Steve Young. He is an Ohioan who dedicated his life to keeping our communities safe and free from crime. Steve was well known and a well-respected figure in the law enforcement community; he was elected by his peers to serve as the national President of the Fraternal Order of Police. He held this position until his death from cancer last week, on January 9. Steve was just 49 years old.

Steve Young grew up in Upper Sandusky, OH, and was a graduate of Upper Sandusky High School. He joined the Marion City Police Department in 1976 and spent his entire law enforcement career as an active duty officer in Marion. It was in Marion that Steve first became a member of the FOP, joining lodge 24 in Marion. Steve later went on to serve as President of this local lodge in Marion.

Leadership in the law enforcement community came naturally to Steve as his hard work and dedication earned him the respect and admiration of his peers. Steve went on to become active in the Ohio State Lodge of the FOP and served first as Vice President and then as President of the State FOP, representing Ohio's 24,000 law enforcement officers. Through the Ohio State Lodge, Steve helped to create the Ohio Labor Council. This council created a model for improved labor-management negotiations in police forces—a model that has now been adopted in at least 14 other States.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate, Steve's leadership in the Ohio law enforcement community and his expertise in labor issues earned him a national reputation. In 2001, after serving 4 years as national Vice President, Steve was unanimously elected to serve as the national President of the FOP. In this capacity, Steve represented over 300,000 law enforcement officers nationwide and worked to protect the interests of our Nation's finest. This was, I can tell you, a job that Steve loved and one he did with dignity and pride.

While Steve Young had an incredibly successful career with multiple accomplishments, I also want to take a few moments to discuss my personal connection with Steve. I had the privilege of knowing not just Steve Young the police officer, but also Steve Young the man. Steve was a dear friend for many years. He was someone in whom I had a great deal of trust, and I was fortunate to be able to call on him as a trusted advisor.