



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE **108th** CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2003

No. 45

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend David K. Stewart, Pastor, First United Methodist Church, Wayne, Michigan, offered the following prayer:

I dedicate this prayer this morning to a dear, dear friend who went to be the with the Lord on Monday, Delynn Roehrs of Beaverton, Michigan, a powerful woman in the Lord. Let us pray.

Dear Father in Heaven, Creator of heaven and Earth, You are the Lord of history. As it says in Daniel 2, when the mystery of King Nebuchadnezzar's dream was revealed to Daniel:

"Praise be to You, God, forever and ever;

"Wisdom and power are Yours.

"You change time and season;

"You set up kings and depose them.

"You give wisdom to the wise and knowledge to the discerning.

"You reveal deep and hidden things;

"You know what lies in darkness, and light dwells with You."

Give us wisdom and power. Make known to us the wisdom we ask of You for our deliberations today. May we know and do Your will.

In conflict, may we be Your instrument of justice and not the object of Your wrath. May we make the effort to live in peace with all.

We pray for wisdom that we might practice frugality and prudence balanced with compassion and vision, that our actions today and in the future will constitute a blessed inheritance for our children and succeeding generations.

This we pray in the name of the Lord, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on

agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BLACKBURN led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 153. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish penalties for aggravated identity theft, and for other purposes.

S. 342. An act to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to make improvements to and reauthorize programs under that Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94-304, as amended by Public Law 99-7, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators as members of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki)

during the One Hundred Eighth Congress—

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK);

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH);

The Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON); and

The Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100-458, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, reappoints William E. Cresswell, of Mississippi, to the Board of Trustees of the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development, for a six-year term, commencing on October 11, 2002.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 68-541, as amended by Public Law 102-246, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Democratic Leader, reappoints John W. Kluge, of New York, as a member of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a term of five years.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-286, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, and after consultation with the Majority Leader, appoints the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK).

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH).

The Senator from Wyoming (Mrs. THOMAS).

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

The Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), Chairman.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2133

INTRODUCING REVEREND DAVID K. STEWART

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our guest chaplain, Pastor Dave Stewart of Wayne, Michigan. Although Pastor Dave is not my constituent, he happens to be the father of my office manager, Liz Yeager.

Pastor Dave is an energetic man who has led a full life. Although he began his working career in public service, he decided to pursue a life in the ministry at age 34. Since then, Pastor Dave has served seven different United Methodist churches throughout Michigan. He is currently the senior pastor at First United Methodist Church of Wayne.

Pastor Dave also has a big heart. Throughout the years he and his wife Ellen, son Kirk and daughter Elizabeth have opened their home to many friends and adopted family. Pastor Dave's faith in the Lord gives him an eternal outlook that encourages him to face each day with energy and joy. This is evident in the way he loves those around him.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my sincere pleasure to have Pastor Dave open the House in prayer.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOZMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our guest chaplain, Pastor Dave Stewart, who is a constituent of mine, from Wayne, Michigan, and I would just like to say he has been a tremendous asset to the community, and it has been an honor to have him here today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The Chair will entertain five 1-minute requests on each side of the aisle.

DIGNITY AND RESPECT

(Mr. PITTS. asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, with the war to disarm Saddam Hussein having begun, our thoughts and prayers are with our troops and all the people of that region, hoping that this brutal tyrant will be disarmed and removed with minimal impact on innocent civilians.

We are seeing the rise of protesters, some of them even protesting against capitalism according to their placards, and although we respect the right of protesters to peacefully protest, and we fight and die to preserve these freedoms, the freedom of speech and religion, press, assembly, as well as to pro-

test, we must remember that our freedoms were not won with poster paint. They were won by the blood of patriots, those willing to sacrifice and risk their lives to give us and preserve our freedoms.

Let us treat each other with dignity and respect even though we disagree, but let us also be grateful to our veterans and those putting their lives in harm's way for their service to our country as they fight to protect and provide freedom for us and others around the world.

HONORING DR. BURTON GRANT

(Mrs. BLACKBURN. asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Burton Grant and the Hope Clinic for Women. In March 1983, a group of concerned citizens in middle Tennessee sought to give the growing number of women who sought abortions another option to an unplanned pregnancy.

Dr. Burton Grant, a well-respected radiation oncologist, led the group in providing a compassionate and viable alternative for women facing one of the most important decisions of their lives.

Today the clinic has helped more than 19,000 women. In the past 2 years, Dr. Grant has enabled this haven of empathy and safety to become a licensed medical facility offering services such as obstetrical ultrasound and pregnancy and STD testing.

The Hope Clinic is a fully fledged alternative to the abortion clinics. Without Dr. Grant's endorsement, his integrity and his impeccable reputation, this clinic would never have reached its full potential as a beacon of hope in the middle Tennessee community.

As the Hope Clinic for Women celebrates its 20th anniversary, it is with deep appreciation that I honor Dr. Grant and his service to the Nation.

HOPE AND PRAY FOR SWIFT SUCCESS

(Mr. McNULTY. asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, today our Nation is at war. I know the pain of war. On August 9, 1970, my brother William F. McNulty, a medical corpsman, was in the fields of Quang Nam Province in Vietnam patching up his buddies when he stepped on a land mine and lost his life. My family has lived with the pain of that loss every day since then, as have the residents of our small community of Green Island, New York.

It would be my hope that no other family would have to endure that kind of pain, but that would be unrealistic. Some will. All I can do today is hope and pray for the swift success of our troops in their noble mission. May they

return home soon and safely, knowing that they have liberated the people of Iraq from a reign of terror which they have endured for more than a quarter of a century.

PRAYER FOR LASTING PEACE

(Mr. HAYWORTH. asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I would join my colleague from New York in the heartfelt prayer that those who have been sent into harm's way will return safely and successfully following the liberation of Iraq, and, Mr. Speaker, I would make this point today as we gather in the people's House.

Honest differences and reasoned dissent are welcome, but no one in camouflage today in the deserts of Kuwait or Iraq recognize bipartisan affiliation, and to those who would come to the floor to attempt to score partisan points in the midst of conflict, I would suggest that mission is sorely mistaken.

We stand as one today, as Americans behind those in military service. We pray for their success, we pray for our Nation, and we pray that, the war is a brutal and nasty business, we hope this war will truly lend and lead to a lasting peace.

□ 1015

UNIFYING VOICE OF THANKSGIVING

(Mr. ANDREWS. asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise as one who supported very strongly the resolution to authorize the use of force in Iraq. I know many patriotic Americans vigorously disagree with that position. I hope out of that vigorous disagreement today will come the unifying voice of thanksgiving because I rise to say thank you to the young men and women, all of whom are volunteers, wearing the uniform of this country. Whether they are directly engaged in the war or not, we should thank you.

To those at home who have been left behind, who will ache with their hearts when they see the empty place at the dinner table, or the arms that cannot hold the young son or daughter, we should say thank you. And to all of the employees, civilian and otherwise, in the private sector who helped to equip, arm and train our forces, we should say thank you.

There is serious disagreement in our country as to which way to go, we all feel strongly, but let us feel even more strongly today in the unity of thanksgiving for those serving the sacrifice of our great country.

THANKING OUR SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN

(Mr. BURNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great service to our Nation being performed by our men and women in uniform. The service men and women of the Third Infantry Division from Ft. Stewart, Georgia, are among those who have been called to duty in order to promote freedom. Following the proud and valiant tradition of their predecessors who earned the names "Iron Fist" and "Rock of the Marne," these men and women are standing at the forefront of our forces deployed in the Persian Gulf region. Their mission is to return liberty to the people of Iraq and to secure freedom and safety to all those under the shadow of Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction.

The Third Infantry Division is the most rapidly deployable armored division in the United States Army. The Third Infantry led the way in our efforts in Iraq 12 years ago. Today, a new group of young Americans wear the division patch and stand in the Kuwaiti sand fighting on behalf of our country.

The men and women not only drive, but and maintain and organize, the tanks, the Howitzers, and the helicopters of the Third Infantry Division representing the highest traditions of the United States Army. As a neighbor of these fine soldiers from Ft. Stewart, I am proud to offer the thanks of the American people whom they are fighting to protect.

SUPPORTING RIGHT TO ASSEMBLE AND PROTEST

(Mrs. JONES, of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of leading the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag on behalf of this Congress. This morning I stand again as a strong patriot. I say on behalf of all of the people of the United States of America, to the military troops across this world who are fighting on our behalf, thank you.

I have said prayers day after day and as late as this morning on their behalf and that of their families. But as a patriot, I still think I have the ability and right to step up and say I think this war is not what we should be engaged in. I support the Presidency, I support the troops, but I also support the right to speak out, to assemble and protest.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the American public and those across the world that there are those of us who believe we should not be engaged in war; but those across the borders working on our behalf, we hold them in high esteem, and pray that they will return home safely.

CONGRATULATING INDIANA TEAMS COMPETING IN MARCH MADNESS

(Ms. CARSON, of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the five Indiana teams competing in March Madness.

Mr. Speaker, for many, this is the best sporting day of the year, the commencement of "March Madness." I rise to congratulate the five teams from the State of Indiana; IUPUI, Butler University, Indiana University, Purdue University, and the University of Notre Dame for their advancement to compete in the NCAA Men's Basketball Championship.

As some of you may know, the NCAA Headquarters and the Hall of Champion is located in my hometown of Indianapolis. I wish to commend Myles Brand on an excellent job as the NCAA president.

The Butler Bulldogs, coached by Todd Lickliter, were winners of the Horizon League's regular-season crown, ending the season with a 25–5 record. This earned them an at-large bid to the tournament. Congratulations of Coach Lickliter and the Bulldog players for their outstanding season. I wish the Bulldogs good luck as they face the No. 5 seed of the East bracket, Mississippi State, this Friday.

Indiana University of Bloomington, IN, the runner-up of last years championship, has also advanced to the NCAA Championship. Congratulations to Coach Mike Davis and the Hoosiers, who will play the 10th seeded Alabama Crimson Tide this Friday.

I wish to extend my heartfelt congratulations to all of the Indiana schools competing in the NCAA tournament. You have made us proud!

I especially want to congratulate IUPUI and Butler University which reside in my hometown of Indianapolis.

Congratulations to Coach Ron Hunter who led the IUPUI Jaguars to a 66–64 victory over the Valparaiso Crusaders, earning an automatic bid to the tournament as champions of the Mid-Continent Conference. I would also like to congratulate the Jaguar players for their excellent performance and wish them luck as they take on the No. 1 seed of the Midwest bracket, Kentucky this Friday.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

A PRAYER FOR PEACE

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today in this troubled world, many of us are moved to prayer and sober reflection. We lift up our voices for the safety of America's sons and daughters bravely executing their orders in the Persian Gulf, for the many innocent civilians who join them in harm's way, for the many patriots for peace in this country, may they express their well-justified concerns in ways that unite more Americans in our shared concern for humanity, rather than acting in ways that reinforce fear and alienation.

Our democracy is stronger when it respects the views of all people.

"I normally, and I still do, support our military and the fine work they are

doing. . . . But I cannot support a failed foreign policy." [House floor speech, April 28, 1999] Those words of the Republican Majority Leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), during the Kosovo military action have never been more appropriate than today.

While many can be certain to take credit for the swift military victory that may ensue, this Administration must also accept responsibility for the cost of conflict in blood, in money, and insecurity to our families. It may take decades to undue the damage to our safety wrought by misguided policies and failed diplomacy.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on approving the Journal and on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

On the Journal, de novo;

H.R. 1307, by the yeas and nays; and H. Res. 132, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 373, nays 49, answered "present" 2, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—373

Abercrombie	Bell	Bono
Ackerman	Bereuter	Boozman
Akin	Berkley	Boswell
Alexander	Berman	Boucher
Andrews	Berry	Boyd
Baca	Biggart	Bradley (NH)
Bachus	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Baird	Bishop (GA)	Brown (SC)
Baker	Bishop (NY)	Brown, Corrine
Ballance	Bishop (UT)	Brown-Waite,
Ballenger	Blackburn	Ginny
Barrett (SC)	Blumenauer	Burgess
Bartlett (MD)	Blunt	Burns
Barton (TX)	Boehert	Burr
Bass	Boehner	Burton (IN)
Beauprez	Bonilla	Calvert
Becerra	Bonner	Camp

Cannon	Hinojosa	Nadler	Tierney	Walsh	Whitfield	Becerra	English	Kolbe
Cantor	Hobson	Napolitano	Toomey	Wamp	Wicker	Bell	Eshoo	Kucinich
Capito	Hoefel	Neal (MA)	Towns	Waters	Wilson (NM)	Bereuter	Etheridge	LaHood
Capps	Hoekstra	Nethercutt	Turner (OH)	Watson	Wilson (SC)	Berkley	Evans	Lampson
Cardin	Holden	Ney	Turner (TX)	Watt	Wolf	Berman	Everett	Langevin
Cardoza	Honda	Northup	Upton	Waxman	Woolsey	Berry	Farr	Lantos
Carson (OK)	Hookey (OR)	Norwood	Van Hollen	Weiner	Wynn	Biggert	Fattah	Larsen (WA)
Carter	Hostettler	Nunes	Velazquez	Weldon (FL)	Young (FL)	Billrakis	Feeney	Larson (CT)
Case	Houghton	Nussle	Vitter	Weldon (PA)		Bishop (GA)	Ferguson	Latham
Castle	Hoyer	Obey	Walden (OR)	Wexler		Bishop (NY)	Filner	LaTourette
Chabot	Hulshof	Ortiz				Bishop (UT)	Flake	Leach
Chocola	Hunter	Osborne				Blackburn	Fletcher	Lee
Clay	Inslee	Ose	Aderholt	Hinchey	Sabo	Blumenauer	Foley	Levin
Clyburn	Isakson	Otter	Allen	Holt	Sanchez, Loretta	Blunt	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Coble	Israel	Owens	Baldwin	Jackson-Lee	Schakowsky	Boehlert	Ford	Lewis (GA)
Cole	Issa	Oxley	Brady (PA)	(TX)	Scott (VA)	Boehner	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Collins	Istook	Pallone	Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Slaughter	Bonilla	Frank (MA)	Linder
Combest	Jackson (IL)	Pascrell	Capuano	Kennedy (MN)	Stark	Bonner	Franks (AZ)	Lipinski
Cooper	Janklow	Pastor	Costello	Kucinich	Strickland	Bono	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Cox	Jefferson	Paul	Crane	Lewis (GA)	Stupak	Boozman	Frost	Lofgren
Cramer	Jenkins	Payne	DeFazio	LoBiondo	Tanner	Boswell	Gallegly	Lowe
Crenshaw	John	Pearce	English	McDermott	Taylor (MS)	Boucher	Garrett (NJ)	Lucas (KY)
Crowley	Johnson (CT)	Pelosi	Filner	McGovern	Thompson (CA)	Boyd	Gerlach	Lucas (OK)
Cubin	Johnson (IL)	Pence	Fossella	Miller, George	Thompson (MS)	Bradley (NH)	Gibbons	Lynch
Culberson	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (PA)	Gutierrez	Moran (KS)	Udall (NM)	Brady (PA)	Gilchrest	Majette
Cummings	Jones (NC)	Petri	Gutknecht	Oberstar	Udall (NM)	Brady (TX)	Gillmor	Maloney
Cunningham	Jones (OH)	Pitts	Hart	Olver	Visclosky	Brown (OH)	Gingrey	Manzullo
Davis (CA)	Kanjorski	Platts	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)	Weller	Brown (SC)	Gonzalez	Markey
Davis (FL)	Kaptur	Pombo	Hefley	Ramstad	Wu	Goode	Marshall	Matheson
Davis (IL)	Keller	Pomeroy				Brown-Waite,	Goodlatte	Gordon
Davis (TN)	Kelly	Porter				Ginny	Goss	McCarthy (MO)
Davis, Jo Ann	Kennedy (RI)	Portman	Carson (IN)	Tancredo		Burgess	Granger	McCarthy (NY)
Davis, Tom	Kildee	Price (NC)				Burns	Graves	McCollum
Deal (GA)	Kilpatrick	Pryce (OH)				Burr	Green (TX)	McCotter
DeGette	Kind	Putnam				Burton (IN)	Green (WI)	McCrery
DeLauro	King (IA)	Quinn	Buyer	Gephardt	Udall (CO)	Calvert	Greenwood	McDermott
DeLay	King (NY)	Radanovich	Conyers	Hyde	Young (AK)	Camp	Grijalva	McGovern
DeMint	Kingston	Rahall	Davis (AL)	Pickering		Cannon	Gutierrez	McHugh
Deutsch	Kirk	Regula	Delahunt	Sanders		Cantor	Gutknecht	McInnis
Diaz-Balart, L.	Klecza	Rehberg				Capito	Hall	McIntyre
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kline	Renzi				Capuano	Harman	McKeon
Dicks	Knollenberg	Reyes				Cardin	Harris	McNulty
Dingell	Kolbe	Reynolds				Cardoza	Hart	Meehan
Doggett	LaHood	Rodriguez				Carson (IN)	Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)
Dooley (CA)	Lampson	Rogers (AL)				Carson (OK)	Hastings (WA)	Meeks (NY)
Doolittle	Langevin	Rogers (KY)				Carter	Hayes	Menendez
Doyle	Lantos	Rogers (MI)				Case	Hayworth	Mica
Dreier	Larsen (WA)	Rohrabacher				Castle	Hefley	Michaud
Duncan	Larson (CT)	Ros-Lehtinen				Chabot	Hensarling	Millender-
Dunn	Latham	Ross				Chocola	Herger	McDonald
Edwards	LaTourette	Rothman				Clay	Hill	Miller (FL)
Ehlers	Leach	Roybal-Allard				Clyburn	Hinchey	Miller (MI)
Emanuel	Lee	Royce				Coble	Hinojosa	Miller (NC)
Emerson	Levin	Ruppersberger				Cole	Hobson	Miller, Gary
Engel	Lewis (CA)	Rush				Collins	Hoefel	Miller, George
Eshoo	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (OH)				Combest	Hoekstra	Mollohan
Etheridge	Linder	Ryan (WI)				Conyers	Holden	Moore
Evans	Lipinski	Ryan (KS)				Cooper	Holt	Moran (KS)
Everett	Lofgren	Sanchez, Linda				Costello	Honda	Moran (VA)
Farr	Lowe	T.				Cox	Hookey (OR)	Murphy
Fattah	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin				Cramer	Hostettler	Murtha
Feeney	Lucas (OK)	Saxton				Crane	Houghton	Musgrave
Ferguson	Lynch	Schiff				Crenshaw	Hoyer	Myrick
Flake	Majette	Schrock				Crowley	Hulshof	Nadler
Fletcher	Maloney	Scott (GA)				Cubin	Hunter	Napolitano
Foley	Manzullo	Sensenbrenner				Culberson	Inslee	Napoliitano
Forbes	Markey	Serrano				Cummings	Isakson	Nethercutt
Ford	Marshall	Sessions				Cunningham	Israel	Ney
Frank (MA)	Matheson	Shadegg				Davis (AL)	Issa	Northup
Franks (AZ)	Matsui	Shaw				Davis (CA)	Istook	Norwood
Frelinghuysen	McCarthy (MO)	Shays				Davis (FL)	Jackson (IL)	Nunes
Frost	McCarthy (NY)	Sherman				Davis (IL)	Jackson-Lee	Nussle
Gallegly	McCollum	Sherwood				Davis (TN)	(TX)	Oberstar
Garrett (NJ)	McCotter	Shimkus				Davis, Jo Ann	Janklow	Obey
Gerlach	McCrery	Shuster				Davis, Tom	Jefferson	Olver
Gibbons	McHugh	Simmons				Deal (GA)	Jenkins	Ortiz
Gilchrest	McInnis	Simpson				DeFazio	John	Osborne
Gillmor	McIntyre	Skelton				DeGette	Johnson (CT)	Ose
Gingrey	McKeon	Smith (MI)				Delahunt	Johnson (IL)	Otter
Gonzalez	McNulty	Smith (NJ)				DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	Owens
Goode	Meehan	Smith (TX)				DeMint	Johnson, Sam	Oxley
Goodlatte	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)				Deutsch	Jones (NC)	Pallone
Gordon	Meeks (NY)	Snyder				Diaz-Balart, L.	Jones (OH)	Pascrell
Goss	Menendez	Solis				Diaz-Balart, M.	Kanjorski	Pastor
Granger	Mica	Souder				Dicks	Kaptur	Paul
Graves	Michaud	Spratt				Dingell	Keller	Payne
Green (TX)	Millender-	Stearns				Doggett	Kelly	Pearce
Green (WI)	McDonald	Stenholm				Dooley (CA)	Kennedy (MN)	Pelosi
Greenwood	Miller (FL)	Sullivan				Doolittle	Kennedy (RI)	Pence
Grijalva	Miller (MI)	Sweeney				Doyle	Kildee	Peterson (MN)
Hall	Miller (NC)	Tauscher				Dreier	Kilpatrick	Peterson (PA)
Harman	Miller, Gary	Tauzin				Duncan	Kind	Petri
Harris	Mollohan	Taylor (NC)				Dunn	King (IA)	Pickering
Hastings (WA)	Moore	Terry				Edwards	King (NY)	Pitts
Hayes	Moran (VA)	Thomas				Ehlers	Kingston	Platts
Hayworth	Murphy	Thornberry				Emanuel	Kirk	Pombo
Hensarling	Murtha	Tiahrt				Emerson	Kline	Pomeroy
Herger	Musgrave	Tiberi				Engel	Knollenberg	Porter
Hill	Myrick							

NAYS—49

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

NOT VOTING—10

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 1041

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the remainder of this series will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

ARMED FORCES TAX FAIRNESS ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1307.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1307, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie	Andrews	Ballance
Ackerman	Baca	Barrett (SC)
Aderholt	Bachus	Bartlett (MD)
Akin	Baird	Barton (TX)
Alexander	Baker	Bass
Allen	Baldwin	Beauprez

Portman	Schiff	Taylor (NC)
Price (NC)	Schrock	Terry
Pryce (OH)	Scott (GA)	Thomas
Putnam	Scott (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Quinn	Sensenbrenner	Thompson (MS)
Radanovich	Serrano	Thornberry
Rahall	Sessions	Tiahrt
Ramstad	Shadegg	Tiberi
Rangel	Shaw	Tierney
Regula	Shays	Toomey
Rehberg	Sherman	Turner (OH)
Renzi	Sherwood	Turner (TX)
Reyes	Shinkus	Udall (NM)
Reynolds	Shuster	Upton
Rodriguez	Simmons	Van Hollen
Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Velazquez
Rogers (KY)	Slaughter	Visclosky
Rogers (MI)	Smith (MI)	Vitter
Rohrabacher	Smith (NJ)	Walden (OR)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Ross	Smith (WA)	Wamp
Rothman	Snyder	Waters
Roybal-Allard	Solis	Watson
Royce	Souder	Watt
Ruppersberger	Spratt	Waxman
Rush	Stark	Weiner
Ryan (OH)	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Ryan (WI)	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)
Ryun (KS)	Strickland	Weller
Sabo	Stupak	Wexler
Sanchez, Linda	Sullivan	Wicker
T.	Sweeney	Wilson (SC)
Sanchez, Loretta	Tancredo	Wolf
Sanders	Tanner	Woolsey
Sandlin	Tauscher	Wu
Saxton	Tauzin	Wynn
Schakowsky	Taylor (MS)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Ballenger	Hyde	Udall (CO)
Buyer	Kleccka	Whitfield
DeLay	Skelton	Wilson (NM)
Gephardt	Towns	Young (AK)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE) (during the vote). Members are advised they have 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1051

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 76, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 76, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 76, I wish to be recorded as voting "yea." Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 76, I was unavoidably detained outside the House Chamber and was unable to cast a vote in favor of H.R. 1307, the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SENSE OF HOUSE THAT NEWDOW V. UNITED STATES CONGRESS IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE SUPREME COURT'S INTERPRETATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND SHOULD BE OVERTURNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 132.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 132, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 7, answered "present" 15, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie	Davis (FL)	Holt
Aderholt	Davis (IL)	Hooley (OR)
Akin	Davis (TN)	Hostettler
Alexander	Davis, Jo Ann	Houghton
Allen	Davis, Tom	Hoyer
Andrews	Deal (GA)	Hulshof
Baca	DeFazio	Hunter
Bachus	DeGette	Inslee
Baird	DeLauro	Isakson
Baker	DeMint	Israel
Baldwin	Deutsch	Issa
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart, L.	Istook
Barrett (SC)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Jackson (IL)
Bartlett (MD)	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Barton (TX)	Dingell	(TX)
Bass	Doggett	Janklow
Beauprez	Dooley (CA)	Jefferson
Becerra	Doolittle	Jenkins
Bell	Doyle	John
Bereuter	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Berkley	Dunn	Johnson (IL)
Berry	Edwards	Johnson, E. B.
Biggert	Ehlers	Johnson, Sam
Bilirakis	Emanuel	Jones (NC)
Bishop (GA)	Emerson	Jones (OH)
Bishop (NY)	Engel	Kanjorski
Bishop (UT)	English	Kaptur
Blackburn	Eshoo	Keller
Blunt	Etheridge	Kelly
Boehlert	Evans	Kennedy (MN)
Boehner	Everett	Kennedy (RI)
Bonner	Farr	Kildee
Bono	Fattah	Kilpatrick
Boozman	Feeney	Kind
Boswell	Ferguson	King (IA)
Boucher	Filner	King (NY)
Boyd	Flake	Kingston
Bradley (NH)	Fletcher	Kirk
Brady (PA)	Foley	Kleccka
Brady (TX)	Forbes	Kline
Brown (OH)	Ford	Knollenberg
Brown (SC)	Fossella	Kolbe
Brown, Corrine	Franks (AZ)	Kucinich
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Ginny	Frost	Lampson
Burgess	Gallegly	Langevin
Burns	Garrett (NJ)	Lantos
Burr	Gerlach	Larsen (WA)
Burton (IN)	Gibbons	Larson (CT)
Calvert	Gilchrest	Latham
Camp	Gillmor	LaTourette
Cannon	Gingrey	Leach
Cantor	Gonzalez	Lee
Capito	Goode	Levin
Capps	Goodlatte	Lewis (CA)
Cardin	Gordon	Lewis (GA)
Cardoza	Goss	Lewis (KY)
Carson (IN)	Granger	Linder
Carson (OK)	Graves	Lipinski
Carter	Green (TX)	LoBiondo
Case	Green (WI)	Lowey
Castle	Greenwood	Lucas (KY)
Chabot	Grijalva	Lucas (OK)
Chocola	Gutierrez	Lynch
Clay	Gutknecht	Majette
Clyburn	Hall	Maloney
Coble	Harman	Manzullo
Cole	Harris	Markey
Combest	Hart	Marshall
Cooper	Hastings (FL)	Matheson
Costello	Hastings (WA)	Matsui
Cramer	Hayes	McCarthy (MO)
Crane	Hayworth	McCarthy (NY)
Crenshaw	Hefley	McCollum
Crowley	Hensarling	McCotter
Cubin	Hill	McCrery
Culberson	Hinojosa	McGovern
Cummings	Hobson	McHugh
Cunningham	Hoeffel	McInnis
Davis (AL)	Hoekstra	McIntyre
Davis (CA)	Holden	McKeon

McNulty	Price (NC)	Solis
Meehan	Pryce (OH)	Souder
Meek (FL)	Putnam	Spratt
Meeks (NY)	Quinn	Stearns
Menendez	Radanovich	Stenholm
Mica	Rahall	Strickland
Michaud	Ramstad	Stupak
Millender-	Rangel	Sullivan
McDonald	Regula	Sweeney
Miller (FL)	Rehberg	Tancredo
Miller (MI)	Reyes	Tanner
Miller (NC)	Reynolds	Tauscher
Miller, Gary	Rodriguez	Tauzin
Mollohan	Rogers (AL)	Taylor (MS)
Moore	Rogers (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Moran (KS)	Rogers (MI)	Terry
Moran (VA)	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Murphy	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)
Murtha	Ross	Thompson (MS)
Musgrave	Rothman	Thornberry
Myrick	Roybal-Allard	Tiahrt
Napolitano	Royce	Tiberi
Neal (MA)	Ruppersberger	Tierney
Nethercutt	Rush	Toomey
Ney	Ryan (OH)	Towns
Northup	Ryan (WI)	Turner (OH)
Norwood	Ryun (KS)	Turner (TX)
Nunes	Sabo	Udall (NM)
Nussle	Sanchez, Loretta	Upton
Oberstar	Sanders	Van Hollen
Obey	Sandlin	Velazquez
Ortiz	Saxton	Visclosky
Osborne	Schiff	Vitter
Ose	Schrock	Walsh
Otter	Scott (GA)	Wamp
Owens	Sensenbrenner	Watson
Oxley	Serrano	Waxman
Pallone	Sessions	Weiner
Pascarell	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Pastor	Shaw	Weldon (PA)
Paul	Shays	Weller
Pearce	Sherman	Wexler
Pelosi	Sherwood	Whitfield
Pence	Shinkus	Wicker
Peterson (MN)	Shuster	Wilson (NM)
Peterson (PA)	Simmons	Wilson (SC)
Petri	Simpson	Wolf
Pickering	Skelton	Woolsey
Pitts	Slaughter	Wu
Platts	Smith (MI)	Wynn
Pombo	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)
Pomeroy	Smith (TX)	
Porter	Smith (WA)	
Portman	Snyder	

NAYS—7

Ackerman	McDermott	Stark
Frank (MA)	Nadler	
Honda	Scott (VA)	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—15

Ballance	Hinchey	Sanchez, Linda
Berman	Lofgren	T.
Blumenauer	Miller, George	Schakowsky
Capuano	Olver	Waters
Conyers	Payne	Watt
Delahunt		

NOT VOTING—12

Bonilla	DeLay	Hyde
Buyer	Dreier	Udall (CO)
Collins	Gephardt	Young (AK)
Cox	Herger	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining to vote.

□ 1059

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY changed her vote from "yea" to "present."

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri changed her vote from "present" to "yea."

Mr. ACKERMAN changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1100

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1230

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR) at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 151 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 151

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed three hours, with two hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Saxton of New Jersey and Representative Stark of California or their designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The amendment in the nature of a substitute specified in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The concurrent resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. No further amendment shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment. All points of order against the amendments printed in the report are waived except that the adoption of a further amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the

conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for further amendment, and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution, as amended, to the House with such further amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to final adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 151 is a structured rule providing 3 hours of general debate with 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution. It further provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute specified in Part A of the Committee on Rules report accompanying the resolution shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole.

The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in Part B of the Committee on Rules report which may be offered only in the order printed in the report. Said amendments may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by an opponent and a proponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report, except that the adoption of a further amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment.

Resolution 151 also provides, upon the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, for a final period of general debate not to exceed 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

Finally, the rule permits the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to offer amendments in the House to achieve mathematical consistency and provides that the concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question of its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, as the House takes up the proposed Federal budget for fiscal year 2004, it does so with two overriding objectives in mind: to successfully complete the war we have just begun in Iraq, and to revitalize our Nation's economy today while building a firm foundation for long-term economic growth.

The budget resolution passed by the Committee on the Budget reflects these realities and does so in a time of extraordinary fiscal strain. The members of the Committee on the Budget are to be commended for completing their work in a timely manner.

This budget resolution, of course, is only the first step in the long process by which Congress sets the Nation's spending and revenue policies. Much hard work remains to be done by the various committees of jurisdiction, and the Committee on the Budget has, in large measure, left those committees the flexibility to make decisions on specific programs and priorities.

Mr. Speaker, make no mistake about it, the challenges before us in this area are great, and we are not alone. State and local governments all across the country are struggling to tighten their belts, and we must do the same thing here in Washington, D.C. Hard choices are inevitable, and no Member is likely to get everything he or she would like to see in this budget resolution, but we must act, and we must act now. All of us learned a painful lesson this last year about the consequences of allowing the budget process to break down.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 95 provides for a Federal budget of \$2.22 trillion, an increase of 2.9 percent or \$62 billion over the current fiscal year. It puts the Nation back on a path to a balanced budget, which would be achieved by the year 2012, 9 years from now, with the projected budget surplus of \$21 billion that year.

Although there will be ample time during general debate to highlight key provisions of the resolution, I am particularly pleased to advise my colleagues that the proposed manager's amendment to the resolution reinstates the reserve fund for Medicare, which puts, in essence, a fence around the \$400 billion to fund Medicare modernization and prescription drug coverage for older Americans.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me remind Members that the budget resolution is only a blueprint in the broadest sense. The details will take shape in coming months, but the sooner we can complete this blueprint and move on to the hard work of enacting its various components, the better off we will be. Neither the war in Iraq nor the urgent work of economic recovery can afford to be hindered simply because the

budget resolution is not perfect in the eyes of every Member of Congress.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying concurrent resolution on the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is something in politics called having a tin ear. That means being totally oblivious to everything around you.

Right now we have troops in the field, a war has begun, and we should be doing everything we can to speak with one voice and achieve national unity. Yet the Republican leadership insists at this moment in bringing to the floor one of the most partisan, divisive issues of the entire year. I question their judgment and their timing. I would hope that we would move fairly quickly today to a resolution supporting our troops in the field. Unfortunately, our Republican friends prefer to have on the floor a matter of high partisanship which will divide this Congress.

Like all of my colleagues, Republicans as well as Democrats, and like the American people themselves, I fully support our troops. I hope and pray that they will accomplish their mission as quickly and safely as possible.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I have argued that we should not be considering this bill today. Republicans have offered a budget that is as partisan as it is divisive, as dishonest as it is dangerous to the country, and, at a time like this, when the United States Congress should be demonstrating its unity to the world, I fear that bringing it to the floor guarantees a divisive debate.

But that is what Republican leaders have done today. And unfortunately, there is no minimizing the differences between the Democratic and Republican budgets. The Democratic budget alternatives offered by the Committee on the Budget ranking member, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), is a responsible plan to strengthen national security and restore economic growth and fiscal responsibility. It tightens Federal spending and balances the budget using honest accounting, but it still meets priorities like defense, education, and health care, and it does more for homeland security than the Republican budget does.

There are two other budget alternatives offered by groups of Democrats: the Blue Dogs on one hand, and the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus on the other. They are worthwhile, and I am glad that they are in order under this rule.

The Republican budget stands in stark contrast, Mr. Speaker. The Republican budget is intellectually dishonest, morally indefensible, and just plain bad for our economy and our Na-

tion. It explodes the deficit and raises the death tax on all Americans. It shortchanges homeland security to pay for tax breaks for millionaires, and it proves once again just how out of touch House Republicans truly are.

At a time which this Nation must come together, Republicans offer a budget that will pull us apart. Simply put, the Republican budget separates Americans into two categories: winners and losers. The winners are the wealthiest few who get hundreds of billions of dollars in tax breaks; the losers are everyone else, the people who have to sacrifice to pay for those tax breaks for the wealthiest few.

To paraphrase Winston Churchill, never have so many been asked to sacrifice for so few.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget skimps on homeland security. It slashes priorities like education and health care. It shortchanges veterans and farmers, and it still explodes the deficits. That is because the Republican budget is a shameless work of fiction. It calls for draconian cuts, cuts in priorities like veterans' benefits, student loans, and law enforcement, and still gives massive tax breaks to the wealthiest. But it requires the tax breaks to be enacted by April 11 and gives Republicans until July 11 to make the spending cuts.

Mr. Speaker, when you get your dessert before you eat your spinach, you never eat your spinach. Any American parent can tell us that, and so can anyone else who has watched the Republican budget charade drive up the deficit over the past few years. As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the foremost proponent of fiscal responsibility in this House, told us yesterday in the Committee on Rules, the tax cuts will be enacted, and the spending cuts will be abandoned, and the deficit will continue to explode.

Why are Republicans foisting this dangerous budget on America and on our economy? Mr. Speaker, for one simple reason: because they stubbornly insist on giving massive tax breaks to the wealthiest few.

They say that to govern is to choose. Well, take a look at the consequences of the choices Republicans have made in this budget. American troops are at war, but Republicans chose to shortchange the veterans who defended this Nation in past years and to give tax breaks to millionaires. That is why the Veterans of Foreign Wars opposes the Republican budget. Republicans chose to slash education, and to give tax breaks to millionaires. They chose to cut health care for children and seniors on Medicaid, and to give tax breaks to millionaires.

□ 1245

They chose to cut assistance to farmers and to give tax breaks to millionaires. That is why the conservative Farm Bureau opposes the Republican budget. Republicans are even shortchanging homeland security; and once

again, they are making sure millionaires get all the tax breaks they want.

Mr. Speaker, despite all these cruel cuts, cuts that touch almost all Americans and their families, this Republican budget still explodes the deficit. All the budget gimmicks and phony accounting in the world, what President Bush once called fuzzy math, cannot hide that truth.

All in all, the Republicans are proposing an economic horror show at a time when Americans are still suffering from the latest Republican recession. Since President Bush took office, 2.5 million Americans have lost their jobs in the private sector, the surplus has gone, and last year's deficit was \$317 billion.

But Republicans refuse to face that fact, so they propose a budget that would actually harm the economy by driving the Nation deeper into debt, raising the debt tax on all Americans and their children, and increasing families' mortgage payments and credit card bills.

Moreover, this Republican budget does not account for how we are going to pay for a war with Iraq that has begun. So yesterday in the Committee on Rules the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the top Democrat on the Committee on Armed Services, offered an amendment to set aside \$20 billion in a contingency fund to begin paying for the war. But Republican leaders refused to allow the House to vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, from veterans and farmers to students and seniors, this budget asks almost everyone in America to sacrifice. Everyone, that is, but the millionaires who get the big tax breaks. That is not just wrong; it is fiscally irresponsible. It is bad for the economy, and it is bad for America.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning, we are one country and we are one Congress, especially when our troops are risking their lives abroad to protect us here at home. I am very disappointed that the Republican budget fails to demonstrate that.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and vote for the Democratic alternative offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and join Democrats in restoring fiscal responsibility and protecting the economy against more of the same failed Republican economic policies.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LINDER), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting House Resolution 151, which provides for the consideration of the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution.

H. Res. 151 is a conventional rule for consideration of the annual budget resolution, and it provides for the consideration of four amendments in the nature of a substitute, including the so-called Blue Dog budget, the Progressive and Black Caucus budget, the Republican Study Committee's budget, and the minority leader's budget.

I want to commend my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), for crafting a budget that understands that we have an obligation to, first and foremost, fund our Armed Forces and protect the people of the United States; second, strengthen the American economy; and, third, maintain our commitment to priorities such as education, health care, welfare reform, while ensuring long-term fiscal responsibility.

To protect the United States, our budget must fund both homeland security and national defense priorities. Since World War II, the United States has been the world leader in freedom and democracy. As this leader, we have the responsibility of defending these principles throughout the world.

Our commitment, however, is sustained through the perseverance and strength of our Nation's military. Without the efforts of these heroes, our Nation could not possibly be the bastion of freedom and democracy it is today. We cannot possibly expect these individuals and our Nation to continue to bear this responsibility without providing the absolute best possible equipment for the task at hand. This budget provides that funding. It allocates funding for the Department of Defense to continue the mission to eliminate terrorism across the world, increases military personnel pay for our Armed Forces, and targets funding to ensure the deployment of our national ballistic missile defense.

In terms of homeland security, I am pleased that our budget provides \$890 million in funding for Project Bioshield to secure vaccines against bioterrorism attacks, \$3.35 billion for first responder training and equipment, and billions more to improve security and assess future threats to our Nation's airports, nuclear power plants, water facilities, and telecommunications networks.

Second, it is clear that our economy remains sluggish and that our budget must stimulate growth and get our fellow Americans back to work. To achieve this, our budget includes President Bush's jobs and economic growth plan, including an accelerated reduction in the marriage penalty, an increase in the child tax credit, and an overall acceleration of all tax rate cuts.

I always welcome this debate because it will speak volumes about the differing opinions on the role of the Federal Government in the lives of the American people. We continue to believe that individuals make much better choices with their money than the government can. At this time, not only

am I certain that the American people will make better choices with their money, but that returning it to them will also help promote investment and increase consumer spending, which will in turn enhance our economy.

In its entirety, our budget is a commonsense plan to provide security for the American people by funding domestic and international security, invigorating the American economy, returning funds to the American people, strengthening Social Security, and reaffirming our recent successful welfare reforms.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule. I urge my colleagues to support the rule so we may begin the debate on the multiple budget options before the House today.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is a time that budgets should reflect our Nation's priorities. This irresponsible budget fails to do that and certainly fails to reflect the priorities of my district. This budget is opposed by the Farm Bureau and by many veterans groups. Why? Because it cuts money to both farmers and veterans. Why does it make those cuts? In order to give tax cuts to people that make over \$300,000 a year.

I do not have any problem with people making over \$300,000 a year. The problem is, we are running a huge deficit. This is not the time to make those kinds of tax cuts. This budget fails our children. Not only does it pass on an incredible amount of debt to future generations; it fails to invest in our future through education. Why does it do this? To give tax cuts to the wealthiest.

This is a bad rule which fails to make in order simple amendments designed to improve it. During committee, I attempted to get more money in for our veterans. This is not the time to cut their health care; this is not the time to cut their compensation.

I also went to the Committee on Rules and I said, we need to address a couple of issues in this budget. Actually, we need to address a lot of them, but I addressed one: homeland security. This is not the time to be chintzy about homeland security; this is a time to make sure our communities and our States have the money they need to secure our future.

I said, this budget needs to provide for IDEA. This is a promise we made 28 years ago to our schools. This budget does not do that. Why does it not do that? Because it wanted to give money to the wealthiest.

The Republican budget is irresponsible. Please vote for the Democratic budget, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, indeed, I am a member of the Budget Committee. It is my first year on this committee and my ninth year on the Appropriations Committee. Certainly I am pleased with the progress that we have made during my 8 years of service in the Congress in terms of what we have been able to do on the budget.

In 1995, a Democrat President came before this Congress and proposed deficits as far as the eye could see: the first decade, deficits of \$200 billion a year; then \$300 billion a year every year after that. We Republicans said that we could do it differently. We said we could make the tough choices, and we enacted a budget resolution in 1995 to say that we would balance the budget in 7 years.

We had a little good luck with the economy, I think in large part because of our tax cuts that we gave to the American people, and we were able to balance the budget in half that time. Now, this day, in 2003, we are facing deficits.

So what happened between those successful days of surpluses and the budget deficit that we are facing right now? The main thing that happened to our budget to put us back into deficits is, frankly, the terrorist attack of 9-11, 2001. That one event, Mr. Speaker, cost us \$80 billion in additional expenditures in one fiscal year alone, and an additional \$200 billion, approximately, in lost revenue. So it is no wonder that that hit to our economy has cost us the surplus, and that we are back into deficits.

Of course, we are experiencing a recession now, and we have to address that, also. It has been another part of this deficit.

But this debate today, as provided for under the rule, Mr. Speaker, will be very instructive. I just want to point out to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that everyone today will want to come down to the floor and decry deficit spending. We will not hear one single Member of this House of Representatives come to the floor today and advocate deficits or say they like deficits.

The big difference in the debate, as provided for under this rule, is how we propose to tackle the problem. Today—this budget debate—is one of the best opportunities to see the differences between the two political parties on this issue. My friend, the gentleman from Georgia who spoke just a few moments ago, is exactly correct on this. It is very instructive because it represents two very different philosophies of spending.

With all due respect, my Democrat friends will present proposals today that say they want to attack the deficit problem by enacting higher taxes and higher spending. I say that with all due respect. It is their political philosophy and it is simply a fact.

On the other hand, the House Republican budget that I support today, presents a plan to balance the Federal

budget in 9 years. How do we do that? We do that the way we always try to do it, by keeping the pressure on to hold down Federal expenditures and the rate of growth of Federal spending, and by boosting the economy by reducing the tax burden on hardworking Americans.

Some people have said that our budget is too austere, that it does not spend enough money. We will have that debate today. But I would like for my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to look at this chart about where spending has been under the 8 years of Republican majorities and where it will go under the budget resolution. This spending trend of non-Social Security mandatory outlays in billions of dollars shows that this very austere budget will still amount to quite an increase in Federal expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, let's not let anyone tell us that we are actually cutting Federal spending in anything we do today. The question is simply, What is the rate of growth and who will grow it at a larger rate? Our budget grows the total Federal budget at a rate of 3.1 percent for next year. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is an adequate figure, considering the fact that we are going to have to spend more money on national defense and that we are in a recession and we need to give the American taxpayer more of their money back in the form of tax cuts to stimulate the economy.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE), on this budget. I thank him for working with me as a new member of the Committee, and certainly I intend to support this budget resolution. I ask each of my colleagues to join in a "yes" vote on the rule and also on the Republican budget proposal.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the preceding speaker asked what were the differences between the surpluses piled up during the second half of the Clinton Presidency and the deficits piled up during the first 2 years of the Bush Presidency.

True, there was a terrible attack on our country, and we have had to pay quite a bit because of the consequences of that. But I would suggest that the \$1 trillion tax cut forced through by the new administration is the main reason why we face the deficits we have today. The \$1 trillion, which primarily benefited the wealthy, forced through by the new administration, is the primary reason why we have the large deficits we have today, rather than the surpluses enjoyed during the Clinton Presidency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

□ 1300

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened and deeply disappointed that this divisive, partisan budget bill is being brought up on a day when we Americans should be coming together to show support for our soldiers and

troops, servicemen and women in Iraq. Young Americans are fighting for our country even as we speak. They are in harm's way and deserve our full attention and support today.

Instead the Republican House leadership has us debating a partisan bill that cuts taxes for the wealthiest Americans who sit safely here at home and astonishingly pays for those tax cuts by cutting benefits to war-wounded veterans.

To do so at any time would be wrong. To do so during the first 4 hours of our war in Iraq is shameful. Is the altar of dividend tax cuts so sacred to our House Republican leadership that it is even willing to cut veterans' benefits by over \$28 billion on the day our future veterans are risking their lives for our country?

Tax cuts for the wealthy, paid for by benefit cuts to veterans, is this the new Republican model for the long time-honored American tradition of shared sacrifice in time of war?

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will pay attention to the words of the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, the honored and distinguished Edward R. Heath, Senior. This is what he said just 3 days ago in his letter to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House.

"Has Congress no shame? Is there no honor left in the hallowed halls of our government, that you choose to dishonor the sacrifices of our Nation's heroes and rob our programs, health care and disability compensation to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy?"

Mr. Heath also went on to say that, Mr. Speaker, this budget dishonors the service of millions of service-connected disabled veterans, including combat-disabled veterans, and seriously erodes the Nation's commitment to care for its defenders.

"I urge you," Commander Heath said to the Speaker, "to reconsider the inequitable and ill-advised course proposed in the committee's partisan budget proposal."

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the sentiments expressed by the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans reflects the values of Americans everywhere.

I understand that in this budget last night or so they made a fig leaf change so that now they are only cutting veterans' benefits by \$28 billion rather than \$30 billion. I think Mr. Heath and our veterans all across this land of ours will recognize that as nothing but a political fig leaf, and that fig leaf will not work.

We ought to be supporting our veterans and servicemen and women today, not cutting their benefits in a divisive debate.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to just briefly respond to the gentleman that just spoke.

In the manager's amendment that we will adopt, when we adopt the rule in

discretionary spending for veterans, we provide a 6.1 percent increase, which has doubled, as my friend from Mississippi said, the overall budget. The mandatory spending in the manager's amendment that we will adopt, that calls for a spending increase of 7.5 percent for our veterans. So we respond to the needs of those that have made our country as free as it is.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that every budget proposal is somewhat partisan, but I hope we would try so that it would not be that.

I congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). I think we are moving in the right direction. First let me just briefly, Mr. Speaker, represent what we have done in terms of veterans' benefits.

Spending has grown 51.7 percent since our first budget in the majority for an average growth of 6.1 percent each year. That is almost three times the rate of inflation representing the dedication, hopefully of both parties, to take care of our veterans.

Let me now talk about the important issue of what we have been doing on spending. As my colleagues can see by this chart, discretionary spending increases have averaged 6.3 percent each year since 1996 and 7.7 percent each year in increased spending since 1998. So we should be concerned with the dramatic growth in spending.

What has this done to the total debt of this country? We are looking at the total debt of this country going to \$10 trillion in the next 10 years. The question, Mr. Speaker, is how do we control the debt? Do we increase taxes to control the debt we are leaving to our kids and our grandkids, or do we do it by cutting back on spending?

This budget that the Republicans are suggesting says let us start holding the line and slow down the increase on spending, and if anybody does not believe there is at least 1 percent of fraud and abuse and waste in government spending, then they are mistaken. As a person that has worked in the administration, I will guarantee my colleagues we can save on percent.

Let us move ahead with this Republican budget. The gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) budget, according to the Committee on the Budget, increases taxes by \$126 to \$128 billion. Even the Blue Dog budget increases taxes by something around \$124 billion between 2006 and 2011. So let us not reduce deficits with tax increases, let us do it with holding a line on spending, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me the time.

We had a well-known Missourian named Mark Twain who once said, "The more you explain it to me, the more I don't understand it."

A few moments ago my friend and colleague from Georgia (Mr. LINDER) spoke about this budget taking care of the military. I have the privilege of serving on the Committee on Armed Services, which is a hard-working and, I might say, very bipartisan committee, but also I might point out, Mr. Speaker, we are at war.

Last night were the opening volleys to bring down Saddam Hussein, and yesterday I appeared before the Committee on Rules to ask for an amendment to recognize the fact that we would soon be at war and would soon have expenses for the aftermath in the country of Iraq.

Sadly, the Committee on Rules did not accept my ability to offer an amendment. I offered an amendment which would establish a \$20 billion reserve fund. This was done back during the initial era of the war on terrorism, and I chose a modest amount, a \$20 billion amount, for this reserve fund because it was estimated that it would cover a 5-month occupation and a 1-month conflict. Hopefully, that will be the case. In all probability, it will be much longer than that.

We have war-related costs, and this budget does not accept the fact or recognize the fact that we need to pay for this war. We are telling the American people, should this budget be passed, that there will be no money, no reserve fund, no dollars, no war-related costs that would help the troops, the ships, the fliers in working toward a victory. It would provide no humanitarian assistance for the inevitable flow of refugees, nothing to establish a transitional government. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, some analysts believe that the American costs could exceed \$100 billion, and yet my amendment was for a mere \$20 billion to recognize reality.

We are in a war. This budget should recognize that. This budget should have allowed an amendment to be offered in that case. The Committee on Rules was wrong not to make my amendment in order. I am saddened by that fact. They failed to include it in this provision, and consequently, Mr. Speaker, I will ask my colleagues in this Chamber to vote against the resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank first the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for leading the effort, as he has in so many times before, to ensure that the minority party is well represented in this rules process.

Of the four amendments made in order under this rule, three of them are Democrat amendments. In fact, each of the Democrat amendments is an amendment in the nature of a substitute, giving the minority the opportunity to make wholesale changes to the budget.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the entire Committee on the Budget for their tireless efforts to make tough decisions and put our budget back on the road to surplus. Under their leadership, the United States will again see surpluses in the Federal budget.

As we begin the disarmament and liberation of Iraq, this budget provides a substantial funding increase for the Armed Forces, funding which will continue to ensure that our brave men and women in uniform remain the best trained and best equipped in the world.

The President and the Committee on the Budget have also correctly identified the need to increase funding for homeland security, including funding for the Nation's first responders. The budget will work to ensure the safety of Americans at home and abroad.

If the budget is accepted today by the House, and I hope it will, we will also send a message to the American people that we are tired of government waste and abuse by requiring Federal dollars be used in the most efficient way to bring safety to the Nation and to perform the government's responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good budget, and it is a fair rule, a very fair rule in fact. I ask my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct the RECORD. It was said here that we raise taxes in our budget proposal. The truth of the matter is we open the proposal to reduce taxes to give hard-working Americans a tax rebate of about \$60 billion. This time it will go to the millions who did not get it the last time and who are likely to spend it and give this economy a boost.

We also provide for expensing of purchases made by small businesses in the year of purchase, and we provide a 50 percent bonus to larger firms. Corporations who make investments in plant equipment this year, 50 percent of it can be written off. That is in our bill.

Furthermore, we take, instead of repealing the estate tax in 2011, we provide for the Pomeroy estate tax provision, which gives Americans immediate estate tax relief. That is a \$33 billion reduction, too.

The only thing we do is freeze the top two brackets, the very highest top brackets. We do not raise them. We simply freeze them in place. They can get the cuts they have gotten today, but until we get the budget back in balance, we would suspend those, but the tax effects, at best, are a wash. We are not raising taxes in our budget resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The gentleman from Wash-

ington (Mr. HASTINGS) has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I would observe it looks like my friend from Texas has more requests for time than I have. So I will reserve my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in 2001 I was 1 of only 28 Democrats to support the President's tax cuts, 1 of 9 to support his economic stimulus package. I will continue to support tax cuts that truly stimulate our economy and spur investment, but I believe that the Republican budget before us today and the sweeping magnitude and breadth and depth of tax cuts to the most affluent at the cost of the most urgent national needs is irresponsible.

The Republican plan allows U.S. troops to go into a war today and then slashes their veterans' benefits by billions when they return tomorrow because their budget needs those billions from veterans to fund a \$90,000 tax cut per millionaire.

Mr. Speaker, I represent some affluent areas. I represent people who are millionaires. They are good, hard-working people, but I cannot imagine a single one of them coming up to me and saying, give me my \$90,000 tax cut today, and I do not care about those soldiers who are fighting for my freedoms and safety in Iraq.

□ 1315

I do not care if they have to go without their veterans benefits tomorrow; I want mine now.

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what this budget does. This budget could eliminate enrollment for 158,000 veterans, necessitate 400,000 fewer hospital-bed days, reduce the number of nurses by 8,700. For veterans, it means longer waits and higher premiums.

The alternative is the moderate Blue Dog budget. It repeals the marriage penalty. It makes estate tax relief immediate and permanent. It accelerates middle-class and small business tax cuts, but it provides for our local first responders. It offers seniors an initial prescription drug benefit. It stays within the President's own discretionary spending levels. It achieves \$2 trillion less debt than the President's plan over 10 years. What it asks is that those who are at the highest tax bracket simply postpone their tax cuts until the war is paid for, until our veterans benefits are secured, until this budget is back on the path towards balance.

Mr. Speaker, for our national security today, for our homeland security today, for our veterans' health and economic security tomorrow, let us pass the moderate Blue Dog budget. Let us not balance this budget on the backs of people fighting on desert fronts.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I listen to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I am amazed at some of the things that they have said today. The gentleman from Mississippi blamed the entire deficit in this budget on September 11. There is no truth in that. The fact of the matter is, if it was not for the tax cut that the Republicans put in place in the last session of Congress, there would not be a deficit.

The deficit is being created primarily because of the constant effort on their part to put in place tax cuts that primarily benefit the very wealthy and special corporate interests. Then I heard the gentleman from Florida say the budget puts us back on the road to surplus. They are creating a deficit, and they are saying they are creating a surplus. There is purposeful activity in creating the deficit by the kinds of tax cuts they put in place and the way they frame this budget.

They are taking a situation where a few years ago we had a surplus that was done on a bipartisan basis under President Clinton with a Republican House and a Democratic Senate; but nonetheless, it was done because we felt we had to balance the budget. Now the opposite is happening. They are creating a huge deficit.

Then another Member on the other side of the aisle said we have to have these tax cuts because we do not want to put all of the burden on the taxpayers. What about our children, grandchildren, and future generations? What about the fact that we are borrowing this money to pay for the deficit from Social Security and Medicare, and that these programs are going to run dry in the future when our children and grandchildren have to deal with the problem? That is the most irresponsible thing I have ever seen.

This is a radical proposal by the Republican leadership here. This is not common sense. This is the most radical budget that I have ever seen in the 15 years that I have been here. They are basically shifting the burden. They are shifting the burden to future generations. It should not be allowed. They should say what they are doing, and they are not.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. I have to say, I am appalled that we even have this bill on the floor today. We are now in the first 24 hours of a war against Iraq, and I think that Congress should present a unified front supporting our men and women in harm's way.

But no, the Republicans decide this is a great time to slip through a budget while people are watching the Iraq situation and may not pay attention to the big tax cuts for the very wealthy, may not pay attention to the cuts in education, veterans benefits, and in

other critical domestic programs. Well, if they want to have this bruising and controversial debate, let us have at it.

First of all, this budget is designed to protect a \$396 billion corporate dividend tax cut that benefits the wealthy. Let us look at the State of Maryland. The average 1 percent of earners in Maryland would get a tax break of \$30,000; 24 percent of couples would get zero. And 43 percent of couples and singles would receive less than \$100 from this tax break. So when the other side says it is a big tax break for the American people, no. It is a big tax break for the very wealthy.

In order to give the wealthy this tax break, what we find out is they cut critical programs. They have cut veterans programs by \$15 billion. That is kind of ironic when we are at war. We are sending men and women into war, and they are cutting benefits to the veterans who have already made that sacrifice. What do they cut? They cut compensation for service-oriented disabilities. They cut burial benefits, Montgomery GI bill benefits, and rehabilitation benefits.

The Democratic budget, on the other hand, provides \$16 billion more than the Republicans for our veterans. Do not let them wave the flag unless they are willing to put some money there. Do not just believe me, believe the veterans organizations. The Disabled American Veterans, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the American Legion have all issued statements opposing the Republican budget.

Then they give us a prescription drug plan on the cheap so they can give a big tax cut to the wealthy. They give \$400 billion for prescription drugs. We give \$528 billion. We keep seniors in Medicare; they say they have to go to an HMO.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are united in our prayers for the success and safety of our men and women in combat. The powers that be have brought to this floor a highly divisive budget resolution. This budget resolution is designed to enrich the rich at the expense of economic growth for all America. It means larger budget deficits, higher interest rates, larger trade deficits. It will take capital out of the private sector and away from business investments while underinvesting in education and infrastructure.

But I rise to address another point, another flaw in this budget resolution; and I will do so with an analogy to a credit card advertisement that we are all familiar with.

Allowing corporations to get out of paying American taxes just by renting a hotel room in the Bahamas, \$4 billion; ending taxes on all dividends, \$385 billion; ending the estate tax even on the largest estates, \$662 billion; knowing Members can pass the entire cost of all of this to future generations, priceless. RepubliCard, it is everything the super rich want it to be.

Also available, the new Deficit Express Card soon with a \$4.2 trillion credit limit. The Deficit Express Card, do not leave the House without it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the House Republican budget resolution. I believe our national budget should be a statement of our country's values. It should reflect the priorities of the American people for good jobs, safe communities, quality education, and access to health care.

Unfortunately, the Republican budget fails to fund these national priorities. The Republican budget has only one clear priority, to fund the President's \$1.6 trillion tax cut. The Republicans fund this tax cut at the expense of the social and economic interests of the American people. Republicans are offering us a budget today that cuts funding for every single domestic priority in order to fund a \$1.6 trillion tax cut that will only help a small percentage of Americans. These tax cuts are even more inappropriate when we consider the fact that our country is engaged in a war that will strain our already weakened financial resources.

Democrats, on the other hand, will be offering a variety of alternative budgets today that reflect the priorities of the American people. We will push for tax provisions that will help the backbone of our economy, small businesses and working families, while providing the necessary resources for quality health care and education for all Americans.

While I do not fully endorse all of the Democratic alternatives, each is far better than the Republican budget resolution. So today Democrats step up to the plate with superior alternatives while Republicans offer a Bush-league budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Republicans have chosen the interest of the elite few over the needs of the many. It is clear where their priorities lie. I urge Members to align their priorities with those of the American people and vote for the Democratic budget resolution.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are ready to proceed to consideration of this rule. The rule lays out three different Democratic alternatives. Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules chose not to make in order some very important amendments, specifically the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). We all support the troops. It is time for us to put our money where our mouth is. Unfortunately, this budget resolution does not provide any money for the ongoing war in Iraq. The Skelton amendment should have been made in order. It is regrettable the other side of the aisle did not give the House the opportunity to do what we all should be doing today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

□ 1330

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and of the budget which will come forward from the Committee on the Budget. This is a wartime budget. Our Nation has been at war since September 11 of 2001. President Bush has made that very clear. And then, of course, last night that war expanded to our challenge of taking on Saddam Hussein.

This rule is a very fair and balanced rule. I see having just walked into the Chamber my good friend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM). His substitute will be made in order. We will have a substitute for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Republican Study Committee. We will have the Progressive Caucus substitute that will be made in order. We will, of course, have the gentleman from South Carolina's (Mr. SPRATT) substitute.

I will say to my friends that not since 1987, that is 16 years ago, have we seen the Committee on Rules under either Republicans or Democrats make in order a provision which allowed for anything other than a complete substitute. And so the rule that we are going to be voting on in just a few minutes follows that 16-year tradition again under both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I totally agree with the concept of the Skelton amendment. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, is one of the most respected Members of this House, and I believe very strongly in what it is that he wants to do here.

We know that once we get this budget behind us, we are going to be dealing with a supplemental appropriations bill. It is no secret at all. It has been talked about as a measure which will range somewhere between 80- and \$100 billion. We know that it will take a great deal of resources to win this war and obviously to rebuild Iraq. It is our hope that we will be able to see a lot of help in that effort, not just from the U.S. taxpayer.

We know that there are tremendous oil resources in Iraq. We also know that the multinational coalition that is now supportive of the President is even larger than the 28-nation coalition that existed under President Bush No. 41 to liberate the people of Kuwait 12 years ago. And so as we see this coalition build to 35, 40 more nations, it is our hope that those nations will join in the rebuilding effort of Iraq.

That is why I believe that the message behind the gentleman from Missouri's very thoughtful amendment, while not made in order under this measure because we make substitute budgets in order, is a message which is important, it has resonated, and I strongly support the idea behind it. I can assure him that we will address this issue.

As we look, Mr. Speaker, at the budget itself, there are so many things that have been said, I do not have any charts showing credit cards or anything like that, but I will say that this is a budget that is focused on the situation that really created the economic challenge that we face over and above the war on terrorism and now our going to war with Saddam Hussein, and that happens to be the issue of economic growth.

The economic downturn began in the last two quarters of the year 2000. I will say that again, Mr. Speaker. The economic downturn began in the last two quarters of the year 2000, before the last Presidential election. Since that time we have been able to put into place President Bush's tax bill. That reduction in the tax burden dealing with issues like encouraging investment, the marriage tax penalty, those sorts of issues, based on the assessment of virtually every economist, mitigated the downturn that we have seen in the economy, meaning that without President Bush's tax plan, the tax reduction measure, the economic downturn would have been much worse than what we have gone through.

We went through two quarters of negative economic growth, meaning an economic recession last year, in 2001, and since that time we have seen growth that is not nearly what it should be. We enjoyed tremendous economic growth following the implementation of our tax measures in the mid to late 1990s, and I am happy to say that we have an opportunity to lay the groundwork for that to happen again. That is why the provision that is provided for in this budget for \$724 billion of tax reductions is a provision which will encourage economic growth.

Why is it that we are going into deficit spending? Well, yes, we have had to increase the spending on the war. Since September 11 we have had to expend over \$100 billion in the war on terrorism alone. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, we have this challenge because of economic growth which is not strong enough. Anyone who looks at what it will take to get us growing the economy again realizes that you do not increase taxes at a time of an economic slowdown; what you do is you cut taxes.

I hope very much that we will be able to maintain and have intact the President's economic growth package, but I have a proposal which I hope we can include with that, and this budget makes provisions for that, which will make the President's package even better. It is a provision which would cut the top

rate on capital gains from 20 percent down to 10 percent prospectively, meaning for new investment. It would say, Mr. Speaker, to people who are considering investing today, who may be waiting on the sidelines, that they would have an opportunity when the new investment that they would embark upon appreciates of having a rate that is cut from 20 percent down to 10 percent, from 35 percent to 20 percent for corporations. That kind of incentive for new investment is just what we need. That is the kind of tax reduction which will provide an important stimulant to the economy.

As we look at the overall quest to ensure that we have funding for a wide range of priorities, including education, including veterans, I have heard people talk about so many of these cuts that we are facing that are going to hurt working Americans and those who are at the lower end of the economic spectrum, and it is just not true.

We are focusing with a provision that we have in this rule on the issue of Medicare. I feel very strongly about the need to address a concern that I have in my State for the reimbursement to hospitals for the disproportionate share on Medicaid funding for the tremendous burden that they have carried. It is my hope that within the guidelines of this budget that we will be able to address those very important priorities that are out there.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very fair rule. I want to praise my colleague from Washington State (Mr. HASTINGS). He has worked day and night on the Committee on Rules. We worked until late last night fashioning this rule, and just the other night he was not able to be in the Committee on Rules because he was working until 1:30 in the morning on this budget in the Committee on the Budget. He is our representative from the Committee on Rules to the Committee on the Budget. He has done a great job in working on the budget, establishing our priorities, recognizing that this is a wartime budget, and at the same time moving us on the road towards economic growth and fiscal responsibility. He has also done a good job in fashioning, putting together and supporting and managing this rule.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rule which allows, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) correctly said, for three options from Democrats to be considered, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus substitute, and the so-called Blue Dog package that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has brought forward. I think it is the right thing for us to do, to have a full airing. We are going to do that.

This is one of the most solemn days in our Nation's history as we have begun this war, but at the same time no better signal could be sent to the rest of the world that the United States of America stands strong and ready and determined to continue with

the greatest experiment in individual liberty known to man, that being the United States of America.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for the kind words that he gave me.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 4 MADE IN ORDER TO H. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H. Con. Res. 95 pursuant to House Resolution 151, the amendment numbered 4 in House Report 108-44 may be considered as modified by the form that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 108-44 offered by Mr. Spratt:

Strike section 204 and insert the following:

SEC. 204. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—In the House, if the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

- (1) for fiscal year 2004: \$39,233,000,000,
- (2) for fiscal year 2005: \$39,998,000,000,
- (3) for fiscal year 2006: \$40,841,000,000,
- (4) for fiscal year 2007: \$41,684,000,000, or
- (5) for fiscal year 2008: \$42,605,000,000,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate budget aggregates and increase the allocation of new budget authority to such committee for fiscal year 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund for the applicable fiscal year caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR OUTLAYS.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations such that the total limitations are in excess of \$38,594,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fis-

cal year for the committee reporting such measure by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

Mr. SPRATT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the modification be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the original request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I rise only to take a moment to thank my colleague and ranking member from South Carolina for his work in trying to conform this important provision within both of our budgets. We may have some disagreement throughout the day here on a number of provisions, but procedurally we usually have an esprit de corps and unanimity. In this instance I will not object. This is an appropriate thing for the gentleman to do. I made a similar manager's amendment at Rules last night, and this allows us to conform the budget, so I will not object.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members have 7 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks with regard to the budget we are about to consider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 95.

□ 1340

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered as having been read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 3 hours, with 2 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 1 hour of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to begin by thanking our staff from the Committee on the Budget. They have worked enormously hard to bring us to this point in time where we are able to come to the floor to talk about the budget. Usually we reserve this to the end of the debate, but I just want to thank them because we are at a very unique time in our history. It requires some difficult choices. It requires us to analyze the situation very carefully. We have good people that work for us in both the majority and minority. I want to thank them for the work that they do. They have been asked to do a job, they do it, they do it well, and we find ourselves on the floor ready to debate the bill on time and ready to debate the budget within the procedure that we laid out at the beginning of the year.

Similarly, we ask young men and women overseas to do a job today. They are doing it in fine fashion. They represent us well. They represent our hopes and our dreams. They represent our freedom. They represent America. We are proud of our troops. We are proud of the job that they do, and we are proud that they do the job without blinking an eye, without any hesitation.

I believe they would ask the same of us here today, that while there are certainly trials and tribulations that confront us around the world today, that we do our work, that we are not distracted by a tyrant in Baghdad, and we are not distracted by terrorism around the world. It would be very easy to be distracted by that. It would be very easy to suggest, let's maybe wait for another day. But I think what America demands is that we continue the work of freedom, we continue the work of democracy. That is what they are fighting for, and that is what we need to do as well.

Mr. Chairman, we are at war. I did not have to practice that part of the speech because we were at war even before last night. We are at war against

international terrorism. The President determined that soon after September 11, 2001. That war continues. The fact that we opened up another front last night and that we will continue to pursue that front should not deter us, and we need to plan for it within our budgets. We need to take that into consideration as we debate this budget here today. So we are debating a wartime budget at a time during very difficult economic challenges and at a time when we face deficits for this foreseeable future.

□ 1345

None of us, at least most of us, do not want deficits. In fact, I said in my very first opening statement at the committee this year that I do not like deficits, I do not want deficits, and I will not pretend to this body, to my colleagues, to the President, to the Senate, or to my constituents at home that deficits do not matter. However, we are faced with that; and all of the yelling and screaming and all of the finger-pointing in the world and all of the things that might go on here today will not change that fact, and in fact no one today is bringing forth a budget that balances today or even this year or even next year.

In fact, none of the budgets before us balance, and there is a reason. Because this did not just happen overnight. While there are some who will come here today and blame and finger-point and suggest that the surpluses disappeared because of tax cuts, I would suggest that there are many reasons, many reasons why we face deficits here today.

It is true that just 2 years ago we faced surpluses and we decided to do something about that. We made a very deliberate decision that when Washington has more resources than it needs to meet those challenges in peace time at that time, that it is appropriate to say let us get the economy going again. Remember where we were, the economy was sluggish. President Bush came into office facing a recession. So we decided we were going to reduce taxes and certainly the tax reduction did reduce the surplus. That is represented by this blue amount.

But spending and the economy took most of the surplus and spending on what? An emergency. September 11, 2001, the emergency facing New York, the emergency facing the Pentagon, the emergency facing the airlines, the emergency facing homeland security. In an appropriate bipartisan response, every one of us came to the floor and said it is time to increase spending for those very appropriate purposes. And in addition to that in a bipartisan way, we came to the floor and said we need to cut taxes even further in order to stimulate the economy because the preattack recession got worse. So cheerfully, as a body, we decided it was time to spend a little bit more, stimulate the economy; and as a result, the tax cut took part of it, the spending

took part of it, but the economic changes, the economy, the gut punch that each one of us faced whether it was home savings, whether it was increased prices around the kitchen table we had to deal with, whether it was just balancing our own budget around our kitchen table with our family, each one of us was affected by what happened in September of 2001, and certainly it affected our budget.

So we can finger-point, and we can talk about the past, and we can talk about Reagan and Clinton and Bush and, I do not know, maybe somebody even mentioned Roosevelt here today. The fact of the matter is that we are in deficit and we have to do something about it. But we do not start behind the eight ball. We build upon some huge amounts of spending.

Let me show what we have been doing the last 10 years around here. Cheerfully, and again oftentimes in a bipartisan way, look at the spending, each year increasing. In 1993 when President Clinton took office, we had a \$1.4 trillion budget. What are we proposing today? \$2.1 trillion, a 50 percent increase just since 1993, 4.5 percent each year. So when people go home and they start talking about how kids are going to be thrown out in the street and education is going to be cut and health care is going to be ruined, please remember that before we even talk about this year's budget, we have been increasing spending steadily during that period of time, and I will tell my colleagues when it really took off. When it really took off was when we got to balance in 1998.

Let me show what I mean by that. If we take the spending that we control every year, called discretionary spending or the spending from the appropriation bills, discretionary spending was holding its own, holding its own as we tried to get to balance since we became the majority, and then at 1998 all of a sudden look at it take off. In 1998 we had about \$511 billion spent on discretionary spending, and just this last year in the bill that we just finished a month ago, we were at \$768 billion, or an average of 7.7 percent each year since we reached balance. So when people talk about how, oh, boy, this cut is going to be tough or there might be ways that this could hurt folks or, boy, there is not a lot of waste, fraud abuse or excess, please remember that we build upon a huge base of spending in discretionary.

Let us look at some of the individual programs. I have heard a lot of talk lately about how Medicare is being devastated by this budget, budgets that were proposed, budgets that we will vote on here today, and budgets that we will consider. Since 1995 when the Republicans took the majority of Congress, we have increased spending for Medicare 56 percent. Was that appropriate? Yes. No one is suggesting it was not, but when people talk about how Medicare is being devastated, it is not because of the spending that Medicare

is in trouble. It is because the way the program operates. I can tell you in Iowa people are very happy with Medicare; so to suggest that all we need to do is add more money into Medicare and everything will be fine does not recognize that Iowa does not get a fair shake from Medicare. Many other States, Wisconsin and others, do not get a fair shake from Medicare. So to suggest that all we need to do is pile more money on to Medicare, do not touch the program, just add more benefits and everything will be fine is sticking our heads in the sand. It will not work. But again we build upon some huge increases.

I have heard Governors suggest that Medicaid is in trouble and how the Federal Government has not done its fair share with regard to Medicaid. Look at the Medicaid budget since we became the majority in 1995. It was \$89 billion of our budget. Today it has increased 77 percent since we became the majority. We have supported the health care for the poor and the disabled in this country to the point now where again we will continue in this budget to increase Medicaid.

Let us look at education because oftentimes education is used in a partisan way to suggest we do not care about children. Education spending under the Republican majority has doubled. It has doubled. Special education has tripled as a result of the Republican majority again as we move into this budget. This is what we build upon. There are accomplishments that we should be proud of. But when people whine and complain and suggest we are not spending enough, can we ask the question, what did we get for this? Which is why last year we said we need some accountability within our system and not just pour more money into it.

I have a number of very important constituents in my district who are veterans who before last night did their part to defend America and give us the ability to stand here today in peace and freedom in this country and debate issues of importance. And what have we done for them? Again, we build upon some important accomplishments. Spending has grown 40 percent since we reached balanced budget, an average of 6.9 percent each year. This budget will continue that trend with a 7 percent increase for veterans healthcare spending.

So let us look at what the budget is going to do. First of all, I want to put it into context. There is no question that we have three important issues as we come to the table today to discuss the budget, and some of these are even bipartisan, believe it or not. Number one is protecting America. There is not a person who is going to come to the floor today who does not feel that that is the most important thing that we do, and I compliment all of the budgets with regard to that issue. When it comes to homeland security, when it comes to national defense, certainly there will always be those who say we

can do more. In fact, there has even been a few who have suggested that there is a lot of waste within the Pentagon, and I would concur with that. But at this time in our history where our men and women are in the battlefields of Kuwait and Iraq and Saudi Arabia, we need to make sure that we support them; and each one of the budgets that comes here today does just that. It also supports homeland security.

The second most important issue that we have is making sure the economy gets growing again, making sure folks have a job. Because while we are going to talk a lot today about the Federal budget, we all know that the most important budget to each and every one of us is the one that I debate with my wife around my kitchen table and that my colleagues may debate with their families around their kitchen table and our constituents debate with their families around their kitchen table when they are trying to figure out how to pay the phone bill and the light bill and the college tuition and buy the clothes for their kids and the washer that breaks down or whatever it might be. That is the budget that matters; and if one does not have a job and if the economy is not growing in their household, it does not matter what we are debating.

Get a fancy chart. It does not matter what the fancy chart says if one's checkbook does not balance. So unless our budget puts as a top priority getting the economy to grow and create jobs, we have failed, in my estimation, and that is why the most important second issue that we put forth today is getting the economy to grow. It used to be a slogan. I remember hearing it a few years back: "It's the economy, stupid." Maybe that was not an appropriate way to say it, but the point of the matter was important. Make sure the economy is taken care of.

The third issue, and it is an important one as we look forward into the future because again I think there is bipartisan support for this as well, and that is fiscal responsibility. We have all given spellbinding speeches about how the government cannot spend more than it takes in. But do my colleagues know what? There are some times when that has to happen, and by and large we agree when those times are. When there is a war, I do not think anybody begrudges anybody to borrow some money to do that. We have got to take care of business, and we will spend anything it takes to make sure we win and our folks have the right equipment and the right training. The second time we do it is when our country is under attack. Homeland security, again, each and every one of us came down here and cast a vote in support of homeland security spending even though it caused deficits. And there is another time we would do it, and that is when we have a recession or an economic downturn, and both parties during their histories have had to make that

challenge. So while we are faced with those challenges, we still want to keep our eye on that fiscal responsibility.

So how do we do it in this budget? We ask a simple thing. We say out of the billions of dollars that we spend around here, do the Members think we could find a penny on the dollar? Most people back home in Iowa tell me I bet we could find a nickel on the dollar. In fact, we have heard amazing stories of people who are deceased getting checks from the Veterans Administration. We have even heard of Social Security recipients who are overseas that we send a check to. We have heard about food stamps that have been stolen. We have heard about all sorts of crazy things involving credit cards at the Pentagon where people have been using it for their own personal expenses.

Tell me there is not a penny on the dollar. Tell me that the earned income tax credit has not been abused. Tell me that Medicare, according to the General Accounting Office, has not had overpayments and erroneous payments. Tell me that at the end of the year bureaucrats do not run in to their boss and say, You know what? We have got extra money in our budget. We had better use it or we are going to lose it. And what we do in this budget is we say each and every committee can find that, and is it not now the time to find it when every State and every family and every business is doing the exact same thing? The Federal Government cannot do that too?

So fiscal responsibility is an important part of it. But we are still going to hear people come to the floor today and talk about deep and devastating, "excruciating" was a word I have heard recently, deep and excruciating cuts. Let me show the Members what our budget does. First of all, total budget, here is our budget. This is where we actually are, and look what happens under the budget. It goes up every single year in total spending. So the total budget is not cut.

Let us look at another area. Let us look at non-Social Security mandatory spending. What is that? That is Medicare and all the other, what we call, entitlements or automatic spending. Does that get cut? Every year it has been going up. Every year under the budget it continues to go up.

□ 1400

All right. Well that is not cut.

Let us look at Medicare maybe, see if Medicare is cut. Under our budget, every year it goes up. In our budget it continues. In fact, we say let us modernize it and put in, for the fourth year in a row, a Republican version of a prescription drug package. We are the only body that has passed one, and we will do it again this year, to make sure we modernize the program and make sure that reimbursements and other modernizations for the Medicare program help ensure its seriousness as a health care delivery program for years into the future. So Medicare is not cut.

Well, all right, let us look at total discretionary spending, which includes defense and homeland security. No, that is not cut. Every year it has gone up. In fact, look what happens here. Huge increases. It looks like it slows down here.

Why does it slow down? Because this is where the budget asks for some relief. It says this first year, outside of defense and homeland security and veterans, we just want to look for a little bit of waste, just a little bit of waste.

If there is a Member of Congress that goes home to tell their constituents that there is not any waste in Washington, I want you to ask them if they have read the volumes of General Accounting Office reports that indicate billions of dollars of waste, or the inspector generals that work for the departments that have identified billions of dollars of waste, or if they have talked to the Congressional Budget Office or held hearings on this in committees, because until they do that, do not tell people that there is not wasteful Washington spending. We know there is. For the first time in quite a while, we go after it.

Are we looking to cut some spending there? Yes. But do not believe that we are going to throw people out on the street. You do not have to do that in order to find the waste within the program. Everybody has heard about the \$500 hammers and the toilet seats in the Pentagon and all those kinds of crazy programs that we hear about all the time. That is what we are asking people to go find, a penny on the dollar. That is not that much to ask, when we are at the same time running the kinds of deficits we find ourselves in.

So protecting America, that is first; getting the economy to grow, that is an important second thing to do; third, let us do it in a fiscally responsible way. I believe if we build on those three functions, without raising taxes, without huge spending increases, I think we can get this under control, support our troops in the Gulf right now and around the world defending our freedom, and do so in a way that is fiscally responsible, and gets us back to balance in a very reasonable time.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague calls this a wartime budget, but everyone should understand there is nothing in this budget to pay for the war in Iraq that is now underway. There is not even anything in this budget to pay for the war against global terrorism which is being waged in places like Afghanistan.

The administration deliberately omitted any provision for those costs in this budget for various reasons. They claim that they could not estimate accurately what those costs are likely to be, but we all know that there will be what we call in this House a supplemental appropriation coming,

and it will run into billions of dollars, maybe 50- to \$100 billion for the war in Iraq itself, and after that the postwar occupation will cost, the CBO says, between \$1.8 billion a month and \$3.8 billion a month.

We have a huge, huge cost item that is not included here. I say that because everyone should understand that there is no surplus left in this budget. My friends, proposing a tax cut now that is as large as the last tax cut we undertook in 2001 will only drive the bottom line of the budget deeper and deeper by the proposals they have made here.

Two years ago, we had the happy circumstance of a budget that was \$5.6 trillion in surplus, or so we were told by our forecasters at the Office of Management and Budget in the Bush administration. Two years later, we open this budget season on a somber note, not just being at war, that is a grave situation, but that \$5.6 trillion surplus, according to the Office of Management and Budget, is gone.

First of all, they said we overstated the surplus by at least \$3.2 billion. The real surplus was not \$5.6. We are now told it is about \$2.4 trillion over the time period 2002 through 2011. Of that \$2.4 trillion, OMB tells us \$2.5 trillion has already been committed, mostly to tax cuts undertaken in 2001, and, to some extent, to defense spending increases and other spending increases. But, in any event, the surplus is gone.

We are actually in deficit as we stand here, and everybody is on notice that every dollar of additional tax reduction that you decree in this budget resolution will go straight to the bottom line. It will go straight into the deficit and add to the deficit, dollar for dollar. Knowing this, there is no way around it. What our Republican colleagues propose is they propose another \$1.35 trillion in tax reductions, tax cuts, which will go straight to the bottom line and add to the deficit.

Here is the situation: This is the first table in CBO's analysis of a couple of weeks ago of the President's budget, which was sent to us about a month ago. Strikingly, if you add from 2002, the first fiscal year that the Bush administration was in office, through 2013, which is the last year in our 10-year budget time frame, the total amount of deficits that the Bush administration's fiscal policies will yield is \$5.158 trillion. That is what they propose to add to this national debt under the Bush administration.

Now, my Republican colleagues, and I will give them part credit, saw this number, and I think they could not stomach it themselves, \$5.158 billion under the Bush administration's fiscal policies. They undertook to provide some offsets. They did not give up the tax cut. No, they went with the full tax cut, or slightly less, but they undertook to come up with some offsets.

The first thing they proposed to do was to tell the Committee on Ways and Means, which has jurisdiction over Medicare, and the Committee on En-

ergy and Commerce, which has jurisdiction over Medicaid, cut \$372 billion out of those two programs.

They have now relented and backed off their own proposal. They reduced the instruction to the Committee on Ways and Means from \$262 billion to about \$62 billion, and they have reduced the instruction to the Committee on Energy and Commerce from \$110 billion to \$107 billion. But both of those cuts could come out of the two health care entitlements that we have in this country that so many people, maybe from 50- to 60 million to 80- to 90 million people, are dependent on. That is what they propose to do.

This budget says a lot about priorities. What happens with the rest of the budget in order to make room for this tax cut?

In saying it is a wartime budget, they attempt to make room in the rest of the budget, at least partially, to offset this enormous tax cut of \$1.350 trillion. What does that mean? That means they cut with abandon, left and right. They cut our young, our children, in terms of education; they cut our seniors in terms of Medicare and Medicaid; and they cut some of the most worthy citizens in our society, the sick and disabled veterans. They put an instruction in this budget, which I cannot believe, and neither can any veterans' organization in America, to cut \$15 billion out of veterans' disability compensation and some \$12 billion to \$13 billion out of veterans' health care facilities. They cut education by \$40 billion below what is necessary just to keep it level with inflation. They cut Medicaid, as I said.

All of this is necessary to accommodate their tax cut. It is not necessary because of the budget circumstances we find ourselves in. This is self-inflicted pain. Yes, it will be painful if these cuts are made, you had better believe it, but they are not necessary. You do not have to make them.

To prove it we have come up with a budget resolution about a better bottom line. We get to a surplus in the year 2010. It takes them until 2012 to get to a surplus. In the process of getting there, we have a lower deficit every year than they do, we accumulate \$851 billion over 10 years less in national debt than they do, and we adequately provide for education. We do not eviscerate Medicare, we do not cut Medicaid, because it is already strained as it is, and we certainly do not cut our veterans in a time of war, or any time, for that matter, by \$30 billion in just mindless cuts.

So there is an alternate way. There is a better budget. It is a fiscally more responsible budget, and it meets the obligations we have. Members of this House today have a stark choice, a clear choice, in terms of values, in terms of fiscal responsibility. The right vote is our budget resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. The Federal budget reflects our priorities. It demonstrates our values, our commitments to those less fortunate in our society, and our ideas for building a better America for our children and our grandchildren.

The Republican budget resolution before us today makes a mockery of these ideals. It would not spur economic growth, it would underfund the country's critical challenges, and it would lead to chronic deficits for the foreseeable future.

Mr. Chairman, I must say I find it incredible that this resolution is before us today. Just last night hostilities began against Iraq. We are asking our men and women in uniform to make incredible sacrifices, including leaving their families behind, to serve their country. Sadly, we worry that some may make the ultimate sacrifice. But where is the sacrifice from those who benefit from these tax cuts? Many of them are the wealthiest in our society. This is shameful.

The Republican resolution embraces the administration's irresponsible tax cut package that will not encourage economic growth, and this country simply cannot afford it. These provisions are ill-considered and so unfair to the vast majority of working American families. They should be rejected.

Mr. Chairman, I say this as one who has often voted for tax cuts, including the last tax bill. I believed then and I believe now there were many excellent provisions in that measure, but we were also in a very different time.

The huge surpluses have morphed into huge deficits, and we are now in a war on terrorism and in Iraq, both of which will have huge mounting costs. The cost of the war in Iraq is not even mentioned in this budget. And our domestic challenges, prescription drugs, education, veterans' health care, are still unmet.

We should not proceed with more tax cuts while we face chronic deficits and critical unmet domestic and international challenges.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say something to my moderate Republican friends. Many of you have spoken convincingly on this floor about the dangers of unchecked deficit spending and the irresponsibility of passing these costs on to our children. We have worked together on countless issues, like funding for schools, protecting our environment and addressing rural health care issues. I know you are all deeply committed to meeting the needs of this country, and doing so in a fiscally responsible manner.

I do not see how you can support this budget. The tax cuts called for in this

budget will bring endless deficits, robbing us of our ability to meet our country's needs now and for the foreseeable future.

We can do better. We need to reject this Republican budget today.

I believe that the Spratt substitute meets the priorities that our country values. The tax cuts are targeted to those which will jump-start our economy. Programs are funded, education and veterans' health care and the environment, that the people of this country need and demand, and this is done in a fiscally responsible manner.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and to vote for and support the Spratt substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Chairman, now that the military campaign to disarm Saddam Hussein has begun, our thoughts and prayers go out to the young men and women in uniform as well as to their families. May they complete their mission quickly and decisively so they can return home soon and safe.

Yet here we are today in this Chamber to consider a fantasy budget. It is ludicrous for the House leadership to move forward with this budget debate by ignoring the issue of the day, Iraq, and the cost of that campaign, merely to lock in huge tax cuts and offer unrealistic spending cuts to health care, education and veterans' services.

□ 1415

We know the proposed Draconian cuts will not happen, but we also know that the President will send an emergency supplemental spending request for Iraq shortly to us and demand that a check be sent back immediately, and it will be, because we all do support our troops during this time.

But this is the classic recipe for exploding budget deficits as far as the eye can see; it's the height of fiscal irresponsibility occurring at exactly the wrong moment during our Nation's history when 80 million of our Americans, the so-called baby boomers, are rapidly approaching retirement age, a demographic time bomb ready to explode. That is why the Republican budget proposal, in effect, constitutes taxation without representation, because it will be our children and our grandchildren who will be asked to pay for this fiscal mess. I couldn't think of doing anything more unfair to them.

As the father of two little boys, I did not come to this Congress to leave a legacy of debt for them or future generations to climb out of. Our Democratic alternative, however, anticipates this demographic time bomb by achieving balance by 2010, while offering an economic stimulus plan now, which is fair, quick, and responsible. It supports our troops, but it also supports our Nation's veterans, our seniors, and our children's education programs.

So I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute. I would call on the leadership in the House to pull their budget resolution so that we can have an honest debate with honest figures, factoring in the cost of the Iraq operation. I encourage my colleagues to support the substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is a failed economic plan.

Fourteen months ago, this body passed a tax cut worth \$1 trillion, a little over \$1 trillion; and the net result has been 2.5 million Americans without work, 4 million Americans without health insurance, nearly \$1 trillion worth of corporate assets have been foreclosed on, and 2 million more Americans have left the middle class for poverty. That is the net economic result and the economic effect felt by America's families.

In this budget resolution, Members of this body will be asked to vote for only 5,000 new units for affordable housing here in America. Yet, 3 weeks from now, 4 weeks from now in the reconstruction budget for Iraq, we will provide 20,000 units in Iraq. This budget calls for no new spending for health care for the uninsured who work full-time in America, yet the Iraqi reconstruction will call for \$13 million, half the population of Iraq, to have basic health care, 100 percent maternity coverage; yet we cut Medicare and Medicaid in this budget resolution. In the area of education, the Iraqi reconstruction calls for 25,000 new schools to be rebuilt, yet we zero out 40 programs here in America.

I will support and work towards the reconstruction and funding for the reconstruction of Iraq because it is the right thing to do after this war when it is over, and we will win it successfully. But I want that same commitment, that same emphasis for here at home. Iraq matters; Illinois matters and the people there.

We need an economic plan that invests in America, our education, our health care, and puts our fiscal house back in order. That is what the proposal from my good colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), has, is an economic plan that is balanced. It seizes the future by investing in the right areas of health care, education, and the environment, puts our fiscal house back in order so we can meet the needs of our retirement and our plans for the future.

What we are about to do today is the wrong choice for America's future. We will be asked in the next 3 weeks to do right by what we need to do in Iraq. Let us be balanced in our approach.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would like to thank

the gentleman for all of his hard work and his leadership during these very trying times.

Mr. Chairman, when we as a House pass a budget, we are outlining our priorities as a House and a Nation. Sadly, this irresponsible budget fails to accurately reflect the priorities of my constituents or of this Nation.

This is an irresponsible budget that passes on our problems and our deficits to our children and our grandchildren while, at the same time, failing to invest in our children and grandchildren by underfunding education.

Last Congress we were all speaking about the importance of children and education. We said, we do not want to leave a child behind, and yet that is exactly what this budget does. We cannot shortchange this priority; we must invest in our children.

This budget also shortchanges our veterans. Our veterans have made great personal sacrifices, and we have a responsibility to serve our retired military personnel, just as they served our country. At a time when we have sent our men and women into harm's way, what better way to honor their service and to show them how valued they are than by treating their predecessors with respect and dignity. Not one soldier who puts his or her life on the line should have to worry about whether he or she will get health care when he or she returns from battle.

Finally, this is a budget that fails to adequately protect our homeland security. Our first responders, our police, our fire, our emergency personnel should be our priority; but they are not a priority in this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for our children, to stand up for our veterans, and to stand up for the safety of our communities. Show us what your priorities are. Support the Spratt amendment and oppose the underlying bill.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, today we have before us one of the most irresponsible budgets I have seen. Republicans have made their priorities crystal clear. Their number one priority in this budget is making room for a \$1.35 trillion tax cut that will benefit the very wealthiest of Americans. They are doing this at the expense of programs that constitute the very safety net of this country and on the backs of hard-working Americans.

This careless Republican budget will have dire ramifications for many. Republicans cut most education programs by 8.3 percent. They reduced the maximum Pell grant award. They do not provide enough money for a meaningful prescription drug benefit. They cut funding for the National Institutes of Health by over \$3 billion, and would reduce Medicaid spending by \$163 billion. This is irresponsible.

To make matters worse, at this very moment, this country is at war. We

have nearly a quarter million servicemembers deployed near Iraq. Despite this, Republicans have proposed \$14.6 billion in cuts to veterans programs. We must stop neglecting the health care needs of our veterans. We promised to eliminate the VA case backlog that is currently at a point near crisis. We must deliver the quality health care that was promised to those who have served to protect American lives and interests around the world.

For far too long, the Federal Government has turned its back on our Nation's veterans and the promises made to them. The cuts proposed in the Republican budget for essential veterans programs are unconscionable. The Democratic alternative addresses the rising demand for veterans health care by providing more funding than the President's budget and the House Republican budget in each of the next 10 years, a total of \$4.3 billion above the President's budget and \$16.2 billion more than the House Republican budget.

It is clear that the Republican budget in no way honors our commitment to the health of our veterans. Today's men and women in the service, today's men and women in uniform, today's men and women in Iraq are tomorrow's veterans. Will the promises we made today be empty tomorrow?

When the government makes promises to ensure the health of our veterans, it ought to keep them. For that reason, we should vote "no" for this Republican budget resolution and "yes" for the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget resolution, the most irresponsible budget in our Nation's history.

The budget is antijobs, antigrowth, antifamilies. It adds almost \$3 trillion to the public debt. It undermines our Nation's savings, investment, growth, jobs, and retirement security, and will do serious long-term damage to our economy, compromising our ability to address the most serious challenges that face us.

And it does this all in the name of \$1.4 trillion in tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and corporations, two-thirds of which would flow to people who have an income above \$350,000. These tax cuts are paid for on the backs of disabled veterans, nutrition programs, children participating in the school lunch program, college loan assistance, \$670 billion in cuts vital to services that people in this country are interested in.

This administration also seriously endangers the public health by starving agencies that are responsible for protecting our environment, funding that is needed in order to enforce our environmental laws. It cuts Superfund cleanup, water quality, clean air, water funding, cuts of \$3.1 billion in all.

This administration continues to undermine the credibility of our environ-

mental statutes by failing to enforce vital environmental requirements. Penalties for violations of environmental laws have decreased precipitously since the Bush administration took office, with the amount of the average penalty dropping by more than half.

Mr. Chairman, asthma is currently the most common chronic disease in children. The EPA conservatively estimates that 15,000 premature deaths occur each year due to the exposure to air pollution. The National Resources Defense Council puts the number at 60,000. That tells us that environmental protection matters, that this budget and these cuts have real consequences for every American family and child. By putting a \$1.4 trillion tax cut ahead of the public health, this budget will have catastrophic effects on pollution enforcement efforts. It does not reflect our values as a Nation and our priorities as a people. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. NUSSE. Mr. Chairman, as I said, we built our budget upon three principles, the first of which is protecting America.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) to discuss that issue.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and commend him for the amazing job he is doing in a difficult situation.

Mr. Chairman, today, of course, our thoughts and our prayers and our admiration are with those young men and women who are in the Middle East, risking their lives to help make us and the rest of the world more secure. We have absolutely the finest military in the world, and I have no doubt that they will make the most of the tools that we help provide them to do their job.

Part of our job today is to begin to work to support them for the fiscal year 2004. Now, that is not an easy thing to do, because obviously, there is a lot going on in the world. We continue to fight the war on terrorism on several different fronts; and of course, we have the military activity in Iraq today.

So for us to predict ahead exactly what the military situation is going to be or what the homeland security situation is going to be in 2004 is not an easy thing to do. But what this budget does is to fully support, completely support the request of the President for defense and homeland security.

Now, it may be that extra funding is required for homeland security or defense when we get there. We have heard folks on the other side talk a lot about supplementals for 2003, but what we are focused on now is what is the appropriate amount in this budget to help keep America secure for 2004, given what we know now.

□ 1430

This budget supports the President. It is important to say that no amount

of money can guarantee absolute safety. I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, that there is sometimes a tendency for us in Congress to spread money around liberally.

However, part of our responsibility, particularly with homeland security, is to make sure that money can be used well and effectively and really makes us safer; not just replacing one dollar with another dollar, but really makes us safer. So that is what this budget tries to do. It tries to advance three important goals with national security: to win the war on terrorism, to protect America's homeland, and to help prepare for future challenges.

First, of course, the war on terrorism is on the forefront of our minds with the operations in Iraq and the continuing efforts to deal with terrorists all around the world. This budget makes a clear commitment supporting the President to make sure that we provide our Nation with the best-trained, best-equipped, most effective military force anywhere in the world.

It allocates \$380 billion for the Department of Defense. That is an increase of \$15 billion over this year. It includes a substantial pay raise for our military. It includes substantial increases for operation and maintenance. It includes substantial increases for the weapons systems we buy. As a matter of fact, it is the highest procurement budget ever in the history of the country. It includes nearly \$10 billion to help us develop and deploy defenses against ballistic missiles.

We have already seen in the Iraq conflict missiles of various ranges, and the threat that that can pose. Of course, there are other places in the world where that is important.

As pointed out, this budget does not include the direct operational costs of military engagement in Iraq because this is the 2004 budget. We will probably have a supplemental to deal with the 2003 costs here, but this is giving us the baseline for 2004.

A second goal is to help protect America's homeland. There is more than \$40 billion here to help do that. It includes things like programs to buy vaccines for smallpox and anthrax and other sorts of biological warfare.

It includes \$1.7 billion to help improve our border safety, which is absolutely critical to homeland security. It continues to put money into the Transportation Security Administration for air travel and other things, to make sure that our air travel and other transportation systems are safe.

It includes \$3.5 billion in first responder training and equipment. There are other programs not included in the \$3.5 billion, for example, in the Department of Justice, in the Centers for Disease Control, that also help local folks be ready to make our country safer. Again, this budget supports the President's request to try to use money smartly to make sure that we are really safer.

Thirdly, it helps to prepare for future challenges. With all that is going on in

the world, we have to remember that there are other challenges ahead. We cannot see them clearly, but we know we have to do the research and development and training and testing and joint exercises for the military that help us prepare for that future day. So there is \$61.8 billion for military research and development.

Overall, Mr. Chairman, for today and tomorrow, this budget helps make America safer.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we, too, fully fund homeland security. By the best of our reckoning, we are providing at least \$24 billion over and above the increase that the President is providing. It is allocated among lots of different functions: community and regional development, the Justice Department. We have identified and also specified in a sense of the Congress that we have \$24 billion there.

In addition, we have put into our budget resolution the stimulus proposal that we made on January 6 of this year. If it were adopted, there would be \$10 billion for the States to undertake homeland security projects in places like seaports, which were woefully underprovided for.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, I would point out to everyone that in doing our budget, we have left a contingency reserve of \$54 billion. It could be used for lots of things; but it could be used, among other things, for homeland defense and for national defense generally, if and when a supplemental comes.

I want to make it clear there is very, very little difference between us when it comes to national security, not at a time like this. We are fully providing for homeland security, and then some, in particular.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for yielding time to me.

I am acutely aware, Mr. Chairman, that we are debating a budget at a time when the attention of this country is diverted thousands of miles abroad. It is a reality that much of what we say here today will be drowned out by the drumbeat of attention around the war.

However, it is my opinion that what we do and say today will not permanently go unnoticed. There will be a time when the attention of our constituents comes back home to the shores of the United States of America. When that time comes, I would submit to my friends on the other side of the aisle, they will not understand what it is that this budget seeks to do.

They will not understand that this budget asks us to cut a quarter billion dollars from Medicare at a time when the health of our seniors requires that Medicare be strengthened and not weakened. They will not understand

cutting \$100 billion from Medicaid at a time when our States are crying out for relief. They will not understand a budget that breaks a promissory note to our children by cutting funding for No Child Left Behind. They will not understand a budget that breaks faith with our veterans in a time of war by cutting \$15 billion for veterans programs. They will not understand a budget that cuts the thread of the safety net at a time when millions of Americans are struggling through economic anxiety.

In short, Mr. Chairman, in a climate when so many of our people would have us do more to relieve their struggle, this budget would have us do less. There are undoubtedly some who think a wartime budget is incapable of being generous to the American people, but I would say in response that the forcefulness of our international will must be matched by the force of our commitment to the needs of our own people.

Our constituents will not reward this body if the reconstruction of another country is allowed to crowd out the pressing need to reconstruct this country and to make it whole.

There are reasoned arguments, Mr. Chairman, on behalf of all the Democratic alternatives today, but I would submit in conclusion that there is no argument that reflects this country's values that can fully be made on behalf of the Republican majority budget today. It is wrong, stunningly wrong, in its lack of ambition for the American people. It is wrong in its lack of compassion for those who are struggling in our society. It is wrong at wartime, just as it is in peacetime.

This budget leaves far too many Americans behind. It leaves far too many Americans, it leaves far too many States, who are struggling to fend for themselves. I would say this, Mr. Chairman: no country can be truly strong when too many of its people are weak. That is the obligation of this Congress today.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, in Washington sometimes people define cuts not as less money than the year before, but as decreases in anticipated increases. The gentleman who just spoke has issued yet a new one, that is, if we used to have a draft of a budget that possibly found some savings, now we can come and claim that as a cut. We are not cutting Medicare; we are increasing it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN) to continue the discussion on national defense.

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his hard work on this budget.

I rise in support of the Republican budget passed by the Committee on the Budget because this budget has the right priorities. Every dollar spent by the Federal Government during these challenging economic times should be very carefully evaluated. When times

are tight, we must prioritize, rooting out waste and abuse of government spending.

This budget holds the total spending increase to 3.1 percent. This is a modest increase that leads back to balance in 9 years. While I believe we could root out even more waste in Federal spending to maintain greater fiscal discipline, this budget takes a responsible step to keep us from passing even more debt to our children and to our grandchildren.

Especially at this time in our Nation's history, we are all too aware that a strong defense is necessary for the survival of our freedom. Key to our defense are the brave men and women who serve in our Armed Forces. We must retain our most experienced personnel and compensate them accordingly. This budget provides \$98.6 billion for pay and benefits. It will allow for pay raises ranging from 2 percent to 6.5 percent, targeted by rank and years of experience.

As we are becoming aware of new threats to the safety here at home, we must ensure that new defenses are developed. This budget meets the President's request for \$9.1 billion for the Missile Defense Agency to begin the development of defenses against long-range ballistic missile threats. This would provide a near-term defense against North Korean missiles.

Why is this critical? North Korea has already threatened our inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency and resumed missile testing. The CIA has reported that the Koreans are working on a missile that could hit the west coast of the United States, and they are widely suspected of beginning the process of taking the spent fuel rods from the reactor to extract plutonium.

It is clear that the need for missile defense is no longer in the realm of hypothetical. Developments like these missiles make a missile defense system critical to ensuring and securing our future. The Republican budget puts us on path to develop a missile defense system for next year.

I urge my colleagues to support this fiscally sound policy and support this particular bill.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his hard work on this budget this year. I know it was a difficult time to have to face the budget restraints at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget on veterans affairs for fiscal year 2004. As a member of both the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on the Budget, I am pleased to lend my support to a budget resolution that fulfills America's promise to her veterans. There are currently 26 million veterans living in this country. This budget clearly reflects our solid commitment to them.

This resolution on the budget accepts the President's increase in funding providing an increase of \$1.6 billion or 6.1 percent over last year. This represents the largest annual increase ever proposed by a President.

The Department of Veterans Affairs operates the largest direct health care delivery system in the country. Managing the large increase in the demands for veterans' health care services has consistently been the Department of Veterans Affairs greatest challenge. This budget meets the challenge as it accepts the President's request of \$25.2 billion, an increase of \$1.3 billion, or an increase of 5.6 percent in funding for veterans health care benefits.

Mr. Chairman, we should not let the other side of the aisle lead us to believe that we are leaving our veterans out. The number one commitment for my service in Congress is to look after the veterans and their families.

To achieve primary care access standards that compliment the quality standards of veterans health care, this budget allows for a sharper focus in the veterans health care system. Waiting times for an appointment at a VA medical clinic are as long as 1 year in some areas. Secretary Principi has pledged that this backlog for medical care will be eliminated by 2004.

Mr. Chairman, let us give the Secretary an opportunity to bring accountability to this organization.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me say to my friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN), that this resolution on the floor calls for \$15 billion in cost reduction of the veterans health care system. It also calls for a \$15 billion decrease in mandatory programs, which means veterans' disability compensation.

We can argue over what is an increase or decrease, but every veterans organization in this town thinks that they are being hit and hit hard by this budget resolution. There is no doubt about it; it is still about a \$28 billion or \$29 billion hit after the minor modification the gentleman made to make this resolution presentable.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the very distinguished ranking Democrat on the Committee on the Budget for his tireless work in putting together a responsible budget.

We did not have a lot to work with, Mr. Chairman, because the other side has already taken nearly \$2 trillion off the table in the tax cuts they have already enacted. That is why we could not come up with a budget that was responsible last year. We have come up with a budget this year that is the best that America can do under the circumstances.

Let me compare the two budgets. In the first place, in our budget, the Democrats achieve a balanced budget

by 2010, 2 years earlier than the Republican budget. More importantly, Republicans incur \$821 billion more of public debt than the Democratic budget. Which is the party of fiscal responsibility?

The Democratic budget has a fair, a fast-acting, and a fiscally responsible stimulus. None of these criteria is true for the Republican so-called economic growth package. In fact, less than 5 percent of the Republican economic growth package even occurs this year, when we are in a recession, when we need the stimulus. It does not happen. Yet our budget costs one-sixth as much as the Republican so-called economic growth package. We have \$136 billion going straight into the economy this year, as opposed to only \$42 billion from the Republican budget.

□ 1445

This is what people want to know. What is the budget going to do for me and my family? How is it going to help me get a job and be able to contribute back to this economy?

The Bipartisan Joint Economic Committee says that, in fact, the Democratic economic stimulus package, at one-sixth the cost, would generate 1,122,000 more jobs; the Republican budget half as much. For one-sixth the cost we generate twice as many jobs.

Many people have talked about the Medicare prescription drug issue. I think as people look at the Republican plan, they are going to see this is not an acceptable plan. We have a plan that, in fact, will provide prescription drug benefits to people who truly need them at a cost they can afford.

The last major area where we have a vastly different budget policy is in what we call nondefense domestic discretionary spending. That is the American people would take the big hit under the Republican budget. The President's budget already cut over \$100 billion from the current services level over the next decade. This budget comes in and doubles that, \$265 billion coming from the current services level right now. What does that mean? Let us go beyond the numbers. Let us look at the faces, the faces of the people that deserve and need help, veterans, poor mothers and kids on Medicaid, students' loans, retirees' pension cuts. This is what we are going to hear about in the debate. This is what is important. Pass the Democrat's budget proposal.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT), a member of the committee.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this budget. The Committee on the Budget has passed a resolution that strikes the balance between the needs and the desires of this House and of the people of this country to provide for a better quality of life for all of us.

Since September 11, we have realized the threat of terrorism, a threat that is

so great and so different than any before us. It knows no boundaries with regard to where it will strike and what time, and it certainly places no value on human life, and today, for that reason, we must step forward and address that threat.

After the vicious attack of September 11, we realized that we had to take immediate action to close the gaps in our homeland defense. We had to unify our efforts from the national to the State, county and local efforts, and this budget resolution takes a long step in getting that job done.

What this resolution does do is fully funds the President's request to defend our Nation against further terrorist attack. What this resolution does do is provide \$41 billion in total homeland security funding.

As part of that effort, what the resolution does is provide in the budget \$3.5 billion in funding. That is a \$3 billion increase to ensure that every first responder is trained and has the equipment necessary to get the job done. More specifically, in the resolution it provides \$500 million in grants to first responders so that they will have the equipment necessary should they have to respond to a terroristic threat, and the bill would also provide \$500 million for State and local law enforcement with regard to terrorism prevention initiatives as well.

Moving closer to home, in New Jersey, we have just 10 miles from Bergen County a nuclear power plant. This resolution provides us with \$619 million in an effort to protect our nuclear power plants across the Nation because we know there are nuclear power plants, if they were ever struck, would have a devastating impact on all citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I would just in closing say that we must move ahead on this resolution. Support this resolution. Protect the quality of life and homeland security for all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the House budget resolution for fiscal year 2004. Last week, in the early morning hours, I along with my fellow colleagues on the House Budget Committee passed a resolution that strikes a balance among America's competing demands, weigh desires against needs and sets a plan to fund programs that improve the quality of life for all Americans.

Since September 11, our country has realized the threat of a new wave of terrorism. A threat so great that it knows no boundary to whom or where it strikes and places no value on human life. And today, we are still at risk to this new and changing threat. This is a war, the likes of which no nation has ever faced before.

To protect our communities and neighborhoods, we must continue to take the necessary steps to develop a national, State, and local strategy for homeland security. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2004 budget that is before us is committed to making our homeland safe.

Homeland security is an important priority and our budget fully funds President Bush's request to defend our Nation against further terrorist attacks. By providing \$41 billion in

total homeland security spending, this budget provides the newly created Department of Homeland Security and related agencies with all the resources necessary to protect our homeland from terrorist attacks.

As part of our continued commitment to America's First Responders, our budget proposes \$3.5 billion—a \$3 billion increase over fiscal year 2003, to ensure every first responder is properly trained and equipped. Mr. Chairman, this budget provides a significant increase for the nearly 3 million State and local First Responders who regularly put their lives on the line day after day to protect the lives of others and make our country safer.

More specifically, we have provided \$500 million in grants to firefighters for health and safety equipment and vehicles as they prepare to respond to possible future terrorist incidents. And we have also included an additional \$500 million for State and local law enforcement terrorism prevention initiatives. Finally, there is \$181 million for the Citizen Corps initiative to engage individuals in helping communities prevent, prepare for and respond to disasters of all kinds, including terrorist attacks.

Our nuclear power plants if struck would also prove devastating to all citizens. This budget provides \$619 million in an effort to protect our nuclear power plants across the country, including Indian Point Nuclear Plant less than 10 miles from Bergen County, NJ.

Mr. Chairman, our budget also provides the Coast Guard with \$5.7 billion—an increase of \$503 million to ensure that they have the adequate resources necessary to better protect our ports, cargo, and coastal areas. Mr. Chairman, when it comes to securing our homeland, the Coast Guard serves a vital and significant mission. In this post-September 11 world, where only 2 percent of the cargo that enters our ports is actually screened, we have created a budget that fully supports our Coast Guard as a component of the National Strategy for Homeland Security.

Specifically, this budget provides \$65 million to deploy six new Maritime Safety and Security Teams to respond to terrorist threats or incidents in domestic ports and waterways and \$20 million to hire additional personnel for search and rescue and shore based command centers.

Mr. Chairman, for all of the cargo that enters the Ports of Newark and Elizabeth, in New Jersey, the third largest in the United States and the premier port on the eastern seaboard, I strongly urge my fellow colleagues in the House to support this budget.

As we continue to be engaged in the newest and most difficult war of the 21st century, it has become a day to day responsibility that we are ready on a permanent basis to protect our country. And we owe it to every national, State, and local homeland security employee, as well as ourselves and our families that we give them the support they need to protect America.

After the vicious attacks of September 11, 2001, we realize we had to take immediate action to close the gaps in our defenses on land, sea and in the air. We had to unify our homeland security efforts under one roof and under one chain of command. To meet the ever changing threat, we had to be able to immediately deploy the men and women of the homeland security department wherever and whenever they were needed.

Mr. Chairman, this budget does just that. There is no doubt in my mind that by working together, demonstrating courage and a strong moral character we will prevail in this war against terror.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to yield blocks of time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for the time, and for his good work on this budget. It is a matter of economic security.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the easiest way that we can ensure economic security to this Nation is to pass a budget that actually balances. The other side will argue that theirs does, but we know that it does not, not unless we use the Social Security Trust Fund to pay down the debt, and that is not really balancing. It is breaking a promise to the American people and raiding a priority to pay for a select tax expenditure.

In this time of sacrifice, we are debating the passage of a budget that increases the debt and takes money away from programs that help our most deserving, our seniors and our veterans.

This budget cuts almost \$107 billion from the Medicaid program and \$62 billion from the Medicare program, and in this time of war, this budget cuts our veterans programs by \$30 billion.

I received a letter today from one of my constituents, Florence Newton from Humboldt County, California, a retired marine, who sent me an article that talks about the 7-month wait for veterans to get an appointment with the VA, and she asks is there not something we can do about this? She describes the situation with one word, unconscionable, and she is right. It is unconscionable that we are slashing these critical programs, and it is even more unconscionable that we are doing so to finance a \$1.6 trillion tax expenditure.

Today, the Blue Dogs will introduce an alternative that does balance the budget and does so without raiding Social Security. It adopts the spending level in the President's budget proposal, reserves money for the Medicare prescription drug program, provides immediate and targeted tax relief to all taxpayers, particularly those middle-class families, and it has \$1.35 trillion less debt than the Republican budget, reducing the amount of money we spend on paying interest on the debt, which currently costs us \$1 billion a day, reducing it by \$250 billion.

It acknowledges the fact that we are a Nation at war. It pays for the war, and it provides funding, \$24 billion for our veterans programs. This means

funding for discretionary veterans programs like the VA Health Care Program, the service-connected disabilities and burial benefits, all of which are cut drastically by the Republican proposal that is on the floor today.

The Blue Dog budget responds to the concerns of constituents like Florence Newton, who are finding our financial affairs and the resulting shortage in services to be unconscionable. I am proud to stand behind the Blue Dog alternative which provides this Nation with the economic certainty it needs in these uncertain times and into the future.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT), a distinguished new Member of the House that spent 20 years on the appropriations committee in Georgia balancing their budget.

(Mr. SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate those kind words that the gentleman had to say.

It is very important for us to understand exactly where we are right now, and let me start by setting the stage of my remarks by sharing with my colleagues the words of William Shakespeare, who said in Julius Caesar, when Julius Caesar was being stabbed, he said, "O, Brutus, yours is the meanest cut of all." That is what these veterans are saying today.

To my friends from the Republican Party and their alternative in their budget, it is the meanest cut of all, to cut our veterans at this time, at this day, at this hour when we are watching television and we see over in the Middle East where our men and women in uniform are putting their lives on the line, and what are we doing here? What is the Republican answer to that, to our military veterans? To cut them by \$15 billion. Indeed, the meanest cut of all.

My colleagues talk about conservative compassionism. I am here to tell my colleagues, this is not conservative compassionism. This is downright conservative meanness. It is mean to cut our military and our veterans, by any amount. They need help.

Fifteen billion dollars is going to eliminate 200,000 of our veterans off the rolls. It is going to fold and close up 400,000 hospital beds. That is meanness. We need to turn it around and follow our Blue Dog coalition budget, which is very responsible. We are not cutting the budget for Veterans Affairs by \$15 billion. No. We are adding to that by \$24 billion. That is what the American people want, and at no time is it better to send the right message.

I conclude my remarks by simply saying, what better time is there to stand and give our veterans respect than at this important moment in our history?

Mr. Chairman, the Nussle budget focuses on fiscally irresponsible tax cuts, while failing to address priorities and commitments to

working families, the elderly, and veteran. What concerns me is that future generations will pay for the deficits created by this budget, while our veteran's will pay now.

On Monday the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Disabled American Veterans called on Congress to scrap proposed budget cuts in disability compensation, pensions, and healthcare to offset the costs of tax breaks and huge spending increases on defense and homeland security.

The Nussle budget cuts approximately \$15.1 billion from veterans programs, of which \$844 is cut from veterans health care programs. This could eliminate enrollment for 168,000 veterans, necessitate 400,000 fewer hospital bed days of care, or reduce the number of nurses by 8,700.

Further, according to the VA's own national data, over 200,000 veterans are waiting 6 months or more just to get in the VA Medical System and it can take over 18 for certain types of specialty treatments.

Our Nation cannot commit men and women to fight overseas while reducing the health care and benefits that our veterans have earned risking their lives serving their country.

It is unbelievable that the Nussle budget cuts funding for veterans' programs to offset the costs of tax cuts for the wealthy.

The Blue Dog budget, which I support, contains \$24 billion more funding for veterans programs than the Nussle budget. It contains \$9 billion more for discretionary veterans programs such as VA health care, and does not require the Veterans Affairs Committee to reduce spending on veterans benefits and other mandatory veterans programs by \$15 billion as the Nussle budget would do.

I support the President and his efforts to oust Saddam Hussein from power. I want to give him as much support as possible to help pay for this conflict. This budget resolution contains no funding for a military conflict with Iraq or the post-conflict occupation and reconstruction costs that will follow.

The costs of the war with Iraq will largely be borne by the United States taxpayer and prudent fiscal policy requires that these costs must be included within the budget resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK), a member of the committee.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for the magnificent job he has done in putting this budget resolution together.

Mr. Chairman, the House Republican budget recognizes that the single most important defense investment we can make is in our military personnel, the men and women of our Armed Forces. That is why our budget includes initiatives to allow the Department of Defense to continue to recruit, train and retain the highest-quality personnel in the world.

Our budget assumes \$98.6 billion for paying benefits. The increase funds a range of military pay increases from 2 percent to 6.5 percent targeted by rank and years of service. This initiative is intended to retain DOD's most experienced personnel. For our Green Berets and other elite units who play a critical role in the war against terrorism,

our budget provides \$4.5 billion, which is a 47 percent increase.

Our budget also provides for full funding of health care benefits for Active Duty members, retirees and their dependents.

Our budget provides for an array of quality-of-life initiatives for our military personnel, including improving military housing. For many years military housing has been one of the trouble spots in the defense budget with inadequate housing and substantial out-of-pocket costs to our service personnel, but our budget continues the efforts that the administration has made over the past 2 years to improve conditions by providing for \$1.2 billion to build and renovate 44 barracks with 13,000 living spaces.

There is \$167 million to construct and modernize seven medical treatment centers and \$87 million for two new elementary schools for dependents, as well as for school renovations.

Our budget also reduces out-of-pocket housing costs from 7.5 percent to 3.5 percent for personnel living in private housing, and last, these costs are scheduled to drop to zero in fiscal year 2005.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD), an esteemed Blue Dog colleague and former first lieutenant with the 101st Airborne in Vietnam.

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget and in support of the Blue Dog alternative. I would like to discuss three major problems with the Republican budget that we have before us.

First of all, I want to talk about Medicaid. I think most of my colleagues have seen this chart. These are reconciliation instructions included in the Republican budget which would require the Committee on Energy and Commerce to cut \$107 billion, \$107 billion over the next decade out of Medicaid.

I have talked to some of my hospital folks and began to ask questions about where these cuts may come from, and they believe that the major portion of those cuts will have to come out of an account we call the disproportionate share for hospitals, that is, DSH payments, which are payments made to our hospitals who are providing the major portion of indigent care.

There are 86 hospitals in Florida which receive DSH payments for a total of \$221 million. Many of those are rural hospitals, 27 of them. All 27 of those rural hospitals in Florida, for the most part, are in financial trouble, and I believe and the hospitals believe that that account will have to be cut by some 80 percent to meet these reconciliation instructions.

If that is not bad enough, let us look at the farm bill that this Congress just enacted last year. We are telling farm-

ers now and consumers, forget what we did last year, let the farm bill debate begin again. This budget requires the House Committee on Agriculture to cut about \$18.6 billion out of programs that were enacted last year in the farm bill. What will be cut? Nutrition programs that provide food for those less fortunate, or will we cut it out of the record low margins that the farmers are getting in the marketplace now?

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, we are trying hard in this country to keep a viable agricultural industry so we can produce our own food and fiber and not put ourselves in the situation that we are in with oil. That is what will happen if we abandon this farm bill.

Third, what we are doing to veterans is not acceptable. Many of my Republican colleagues have said we are just slowing down the growth. That is malarkey. That would be true if the number of people being treated in the veterans hospitals was not going to explode in the next decade, but we know it is. Today, within 24 hours of the time our troops have invaded Iraq, we are standing on the floor with a budget that cuts billions of dollars out of current veterans programs. It is unconscionable. I ask Members to reject the Republican budget and support the Blue Dog budget, which is responsible on the spending side and gets us into balance by 2009.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I have to scratch my head and wonder out loud how, when we increase the veterans budget in our budget 6.1 percent, the other side of the aisle can call that a cut, yet that is what Member after Member comes to the floor and says.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), a member of the Committee on the Budget, to discuss the second important plank of our budget, and that is economic growth and job creation.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORBERRY) and I have spoken about the fact that this budget protects our country, our national defense, and our homeland security. And nothing is more important this afternoon, as this is a very critical time in the Persian Gulf. Our troops are committed, and we are committed to them.

However, this budget meets another challenge, and that is the challenge of strengthening the American economy and creating new jobs. Promoting growth in this economy and getting people back to work is a top priority of ours, and it is reflected in this budget. That is why it provides for policies that create an economic environment for boosting both long-term and short-term growth. In particular, the budget leaves room for President Bush's jobs and economic growth plan to strengthen the economy by providing an immediate stimulus to help struggling

American workers and by laying the groundwork to promote long-term, sustainable growth in our Nation's economy.

A Member on the other side of the aisle called this growth package irresponsible. We do not think it is irresponsible to bolster household finances or encourage consumer spending. We do not think it is irresponsible to promote investment because it leads to job creation, and we do not think it is irresponsible to help the unemployed get back to work. That is what this budget does.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago we passed tax relief that not only put money back in people's pockets, but it slowed an advancing recession that President Bush inherited. The 2001 tax relief plan made that recession the mildest in history, and it created 1.5 million new jobs. Without the leadership this Congress showed on a bipartisan basis and this President showed, the recession and the job loss would have been far worse when America came under attack on September 11, 2001.

Now in this budget we provide for the President's economic growth package which will create new jobs and sustain growth. The plan accelerates the reductions in personal income tax rates, the marriage penalty relief in the 2001 tax cuts. It accelerates the child tax credits from 2001. It increases small business expensing, and it eliminates the unfair double taxation of dividend income.

Experts generally agree that this proposal will boost stock prices dramatically. Some say 7 percent, some say 20 percent. The fact is, we are going to add significantly to the value of our stock market, which helps all of us as Americans, including half of all American families now invested in the market. It helps the economy in general.

Economists also say it is going to lower unemployment rates for the next several years. In fact, the average of private forecasters' estimates show the President's plan will result in more than 1 million new jobs by the end of next year. It goes without saying that America is still dealing with the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks and with the continued uncertainty on the international front, including in Iraq today. Our economy is not performing as it should, and too many Americans are out of work.

This budget resolution is responsive because it helps get the economy going again; and when that happens, revenues grow. It happened in the 1960s under the leadership of President John Kennedy, and it happened in the 1980s with President Reagan's tax relief plan because it was pro-growth.

Here is a chart which indicates the Reagan-era revenues. Look at this, from 1982 until 1989, the dramatic increase in revenues. Again 1960s, 1980s. That is what we are trying to replicate now.

Mr. Chairman, with the growth package, we are also going to be able to be

sure we can afford these tax cuts. I have heard Members say we cannot afford them; it is good to have growth tax packages, but we cannot afford it. This is an interesting chart. This is a static analysis, meaning it shows absolutely no impact of the tax relief, which has countered everything we have seen in history.

When we provide that incentive for job creation, it increases revenue. It helps the budget, but this assumes none of that happens. Just to have the tax relief in place, this is the difference. The red on the chart shows what the budget would be like with the tax relief taken out altogether. No tax relief at all. The green shows the impact of all this pro-growth tax policy, again on a static analysis. As Members can see, it is a very small difference. The tax relief is not crowding out additional spending, it is growing the economy so we can get people back to work and grow our revenues.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to encourage Members on the other side of the aisle to listen to one of their former colleagues, currently a Governor in the State of New Mexico. Bill Richardson, who was also a member of the Clinton cabinet, has a plan for his State that restrains spending; and, yes, it reduces tax. Why? Because he knows it is going to help his State's economy and in the end help in terms of revenues. He has said and he offers this as free advice to his fellow Democrats. He said, "We Democrats need to stop talking about class warfare and distribution of wealth. We need to start talking about economic growth, and reducing taxes puts us on the road to economic growth." I think he is right. I always liked Bill Richardson, and now I know why. Well put.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsible budget because it protects our country and because it grows the economy, gets the economy back on track and creates jobs.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The national chairman of the Disabled American Veterans wrote the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and he said, "Has Congress no shame? Is there no honor left in the hallowed halls of our government that you choose to dishonor the sacrifices of our Nation's heroes and rob our programs, health care and disability compensation, to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy?"

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), who represents a number of veterans at Fort Benning, Georgia.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Blue Dog budget, a fair and balanced alternative to the harsh and misguided priorities of the Republican budget. The Blue Dog budget is fiscally responsible, combining spending restraint and budget enforcement to balance the budget and set us on a path to growth.

The Blue Dog budget is balanced, protects Social Security, contains less debt than the Republican budget, and includes a reserve fund for the war in Iraq.

Make no mistake about it, the Blue Dog budget gives Americans more than the Republican budget, and it does so responsibly. It gives \$10.4 billion more for discretionary programs in fiscal year 2004; \$130 billion more for non-Medicare health care programs, primarily Medicaid; \$30 billion more for education and training programs; more agriculture spending for commodity programs, conservation, crop insurance and nutrition programs; and \$24 billion more for veterans programs than the Republican budget. All this with reasonable and fair tax cuts that cost only half as much as the Republican budget. For example, it speeds up the child tax credit, eliminates the marriage penalty, exempts \$6 million per couple from the death tax, delays cuts for the two highest tax brackets.

The Blue Dog budget helps Americans with substantially less debt than the Republican budget without the deep cuts in important programs that help Americans and strengthen our position in these uncertain economic times. I urge Members to support the Blue Dog budget. It is a better budget. Reject the Republican budget. It is not good for America, and it is especially not good for America today in these uncertain economic times.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, just to respond to the points on the veterans' issues. First of all, we increase discretionary spending 6.1 percent on veterans, we increase the mandatory spending 7 percent, and they call that a cut. They ask us to honor veterans. In fact, in this country we honor veterans so much that we paid 5,500 of them benefits after they were dead. That is how much we honor veterans. That is why we need to look at every program for waste and abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as part of this budget, the President's job and economic growth plan is designed to strengthen the economy and allow Americans to keep more of their own money to spend, save, and invest. And I know my constituents in my district know how to spend their money better than we do in Washington.

The President's plan also calls for speeding up the tax relief passed in 2001 so families get the benefits of those tax cuts today, ending the unfair double taxation on dividends, giving small businesses incentives to grow, and providing help for unemployed Americans.

Let me read some statistics on the President's growth plan that has been dynamically scored. In this budget, the economy would enjoy an annual average of 837,000 new jobs from 2004 to 2013, with 997,000 and 1.03 million jobs in 2004

and 2005 respectively; an annual average of \$69 billion in additional GDP from 2004 through 2013, with an increase of \$84 billion in GDP in 2004 alone; an average of \$120 billion in additional disposable income from 2004 through 2013. And also in 2004 through 2013, if we talk about the dividend plan alone, we are talking about 69 percent in job growth, a 72 percent increase in GDP growth, \$50 billion, and a 64 percent increase in additional disposable income.

Mr. Chairman, this budget is the right budget for the country and this stimulus package is the right package for growth and economic prosperity.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the Committee on Rules for making in order the Blue Dog budget alternative, and I urge Members on the other side of the aisle to take this opportunity to support a responsible budget. By allowing the Blue Dogs to offer our budget substitute, the Republican leadership has finally acknowledged that the House needs to have an honest debate on a sensible alternative to the majority's unrealistic and irresponsible budget resolution.

The Republican budget operates under the fiction that our country can afford a tax cut of \$1.35 trillion as the United States embarks upon a necessary mission to liberate Iraq. The attempt to proceed with new tax cuts during a time of war is without precedent in American history, and for good reason.

The Republican budget resolution does not take into account our country's current economic and military situation. It is stubbornly stuck in the past. In their delusional attempt to provide new tax cuts while fighting a war and simultaneously attempting to balance the budget, the majority will succeed only in a failed attempt to balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's senior citizens, our veterans, our students, our farmers, our economically disadvantaged. How in the world the majority can propose spending cuts in veterans health care during a time of war is beyond me, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Paralyzed Veterans of America share my amazement.

□ 1515

Our good friend indicated that they were doing everything for veterans. It is very funny that the veterans organizations do not agree with it and do not adopt that posture. The Blue Dog substitute will balance the Federal budget in 10 years without relying on the Social Security surplus and without sacrificing our Nation's veterans and our seniors. At the same time, the Blue Dogs provide both immediate and long-term tax relief to American taxpayers. This relief consists largely of an accel-

eration of cuts already scheduled. Further, the Blue Dogs are committed to sticking with the President's overall funding levels for defense and non-defense discretionary spending.

I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join the Blue Dogs in our effort to support the President and support his total funding levels. I urge every Member of the House to support the reasonable, responsible Blue Dog budget alternative.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BONNER), a member of the committee.

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the budget resolution. Let me commend the gentleman from Iowa for his hard work in developing this budget. The product of his effort is bold and innovative, and it deserves our support. Economic growth is the cornerstone of our Republican budget. Too many Americans, too many of my constituents in south Alabama, are struggling to make ends meet. This budget works to grow our economy and to get unemployed Americans back to work.

We assume the President's jobs and economic growth package because it provides an immediate boost to our struggling American workers, and it lays the groundwork for the long-term, sustainable growth of our Nation's economy.

The President's tax cuts were always intended to promote long-term, sustainable growth. Our budget calls for accelerating these tax cuts, because taxpayers and the economy deserve this extra support now. These tax cuts would allow workers to keep more of their hard-earned money to spend as they see fit. With more disposable income, it will be these workers who will propel our economy back to a state of sustained health and growth.

I am particularly glad to note that the 2001 tax cuts would be made permanent, allowing us to avoid a de facto tax increase in the year 2010.

Mr. Chairman, there are plenty of reasons to support this budget. I think one of the most compelling reasons, however, is that it provides the right medicine at the right time to create jobs and get our economy growing again.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Ms. HARMAN. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I am guessing that most Americans are watching events unfold in Iraq on their television sets. These are the events they should be watching, not this debate on a budget that does not even include expenses for the war and the re-

construction effort in Iraq. If I had my way, we would be talking about that war all day today, or if we were debating a budget, we would be debating a wartime budget that called on us to make real sacrifices. That is not what we are doing. We are debating a set of resolutions, the best of which by far is the Blue Dog resolution, and I rise to support it.

I represent smart constituents. They know that money does not grow on trees. They do not want a tax cut, and they are not asking for it. They do not want trillion-dollar budget deficits, and they certainly are not asking for them. Indeed, in contrast to the yawn of a response the administration gave to projected deficits, my constituents understand the serious fiscal consequences of hemorrhaging red ink.

Rather than punt this issue to future generations as the Committee on the Budget proposes, families in my district, like families everywhere, expect Democrats and Republicans to sit down together and make tough choices on what our government can afford now and what we must defer.

That is where the Blue Dogs come in. Frankly, the Blue Dogs are one of the few groups around this place that have the integrity and expertise to present a credible budget alternative. The Blue Dog budget makes reasonable and fiscally prudent assumptions about spending and tax policy and achieves a budget surplus by 2009. It is fair and fiscally responsible, and I am very proud to support it.

The Blue Dogs have long been leaders in the fight for a balanced and fiscally responsible budget. They have made the hard decisions expected of policymakers, and we have the welts to show for it. I urge my colleagues to support the Blue Dog budget proposal which will be offered later in this debate.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER), a member of the committee.

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Chairman, we cannot quantify the cost of our freedom; however, in passing a budget we must calculate the cost of our homeland security and our household security. To fulfil this duty, we are best guided by the verities of our history. A war runs a deficit, and, with determination, we retain our freedom and inevitably regain our prosperity. Truly our Nation's homeland security and household security are best served by budgetary balance born out of fiscal discipline. But sadly there come moments when time connives and fate conspires to preclude us from budgetary balance, and we must sacrifice in the present to strengthen our future.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation has been at war since September 11, a war on terror of which Operation Iraqi Freedom is the most recent theater. It has been, is and will continue to be a struggle of momentous sacrifice, yet we will prevail, and we will prosper.

This budget, which restores us to balance in 9 years, will speed our path to

peace and prosperity. For after each year of this budget, our deficit diminishes, our homeland security increases, and our household security increases. Yes, this is a difficult budget for these difficult times because it is a war budget in a time of war. Mr. Chairman, to preserve and promote our Nation's security, opportunity and prosperity, I urge its passage.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to reiterate my support for the Blue Dog budget, a budget that is balanced, it reduces the debt, and provides a reasonable level of services to our veterans and our seniors. Unlike the majority budget, it does it without robbing from Social Security, Medicare and the veterans programs. I urge everybody on both sides of the aisle to vote for the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL).

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, today in Northampton, Massachusetts, they are having problems funding a homeless shelter for veterans. As we watched the morning headline and the evening newscast, we are struck by the brave commitment of our men and women on the borders of Iraq and perhaps, as I speak, within the borders of Iraq as they prepare for an all-out invasion of Iraq. At a moment like this when we are watching this commitment, it is important to think of the significant and personal sacrifices these brave men and women are making. But at the same time that we are creating hundreds of thousands of new veterans through their distinguished service, the Congress today debates a Republican budget that mandates cuts in veterans programs.

I talk to these folks at the Northampton VA, I meet with them regularly, and they point out there simply is less money every year in the VA for honoring the commitment we made to our soldiers.

I know that the Republicans today through another manager's amendment, only because when they went back to their membership, the membership said to them, "what are you thinking of," that they have added in this amendment a few more dollars in an attempt to ameliorate some of their cuts. But the compelling truth is that this nominal increase will quickly be overcome by more than 2 percent in annual cuts in the years following. According to the Congressional Budget Office, their spending on veterans' health care and benefits is not enough to maintain purchasing power, which simply means real cuts in veterans programs.

As the National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans said of this budget being proposed by the majority Republican Party in this Con-

gress, "This budget dishonors the service of millions of service-connected disabled veterans, including combat-disabled veterans, and seriously erodes the Nation's commitment to care for its defenders."

Stand strong today for the Democratic proposal. Honor the commitment we made to our veterans and vote down this Republican budget proposal.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2003.

AMERICAN LEGION DECLARES SPRATT BUDGET
"BETTER APPROACH"

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Republican budget that will be considered on the floor today cuts discretionary funding for veterans health care below the level needed to maintain purchasing power at the 2003 level by a total of \$14.2 billion over ten years. Their budget also directs the Veterans' Affairs Committee to cut \$14.6 billion from mandatory benefit payments to veterans, including compensation for service-connected disabilities, burial benefits, and veterans education benefits.

Unlike the Republican budget, the Democratic alternative rejects any cuts to veterans' benefits over the next ten years. And it addresses the rising demand for veterans health care by funding veterans' health programs, including medical research and construction, at \$2 billion above the level needed to maintain purchasing power at the 2003 level over the next ten years. For 2004, the Democratic budget provides \$633 million more for veterans programs than the Republican plan, and it provides \$30.3 billion more for veterans than the House Republican budget over ten years. The American Legion calls the Democratic alternative "a much better approach toward reaching a balanced budget".

The four groups—Disabled American Veterans, AMVETS, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars—that assess the needs of veterans and the funding they believe is required to meet those needs, known as The Independent Budget, have reviewed the Republican plan and the Democratic alternative and have concluded that the Democratic alternative "represents a solid step forward in meeting the very real needs of veterans".

I have attached these letters and ask that you give them your attention before you vote on the Budget Resolution today.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr.
Ranking Member.

MARCH 19, 2003.

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET

A BUDGET FOR VETERANS BY VETERANS

Hon. JOHN M. SPRATT, Jr.,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Cannon House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SPRATT: On behalf of the co-authors of the Independent Budget, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, we are writing to offer our appreciation for introducing the Democratic Alternative to the Budget Committee's Budget Resolution, H. Con. Res. 95. Although this Alternative Budget Resolution does not provide all the resources for veterans' health care that we feel are necessary, it does recommend \$1.1 billion in additional discretionary spending in FY 2004, and \$17 billion more over the course of 10 years. In addition, and perhaps most importantly, the Alternative Budget Resolution does not in-

clude the draconian cuts to Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) mandatory programs that are contained in H. Con. Res. 95.

To require deep cuts in VA mandatory programs, \$463 million in FY 2004 and \$15 billion over ten years, that are called for in H. Con. Res. 95 is unconscionable. We do not consider payments to wartime-disabled veterans, pensions to the poorest disabled veterans, burial benefits and G.I. Bill benefits for soldiers returning from Afghanistan to be "fraud, waste and abuse." These would be the very programs directly affected by the Budget Resolution approved by the Committee. In addition, we note that H. Con. Res. 95 provides fewer discretionary dollars in FY 2004 than was recommended by the Administration. We are all on record as recommending close to \$2 billion in additional funding, above the \$1.3 billion recommended by the Administration, for VA health care, and we find it difficult to see how H. Con. Res. 95 can even match the President's inadequate request.

Again, we applaud your efforts to negate the cuts in VA mandatory programs and provide \$1.1 billion in discretionary spending above H. Con. Res. 95 in FY 2004, and \$17 billion more over the course of 10 years. Although not meeting The Independent Budget recommendation for VA health care, the Democratic Alternative Budget Resolution represents a solid step forward in meeting the very real needs of veterans, and those who will soon be veterans.

Sincerely,

RICK JONES,
National Legislative
Director, AMVETS.

JOSEPH A. VIOLANTE,
National Legislative
Director, Disabled
American Veterans.

RICHARD B. FULLER,
National Legislative
Director, Paralyzed
Veterans of America.

DENNIS CULLINAN,
National Legislative
Director, Veterans of
Foreign Wars of the
United States.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2003.

Hon. JAMES A. NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of
Representatives, Cannon House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Legion is deeply troubled by the impact H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004, would have on veterans, especially severely service-connected disabled veterans, and their families. Forced budgetary reductions in mandatory and discretionary funding is not in the best interest of disabled veterans, recently separated veterans, and active-duty service members entitled to certain VA benefits that are funded by mandatory appropriations. Therefore, The American Legion must oppose H. Con. Res. 95 passed by the Committee.

Representative Spratt, the Committee's Ranking Democratic Member, shared with The American Legion and other veterans' service organization the Democratic Alternative. After careful review, The American Legion agrees the alternative is a much better approach toward reaching a balanced budget.

The American Legion is also aware that the Blue Dog Coalition and the Congressional Black Caucus may also offer alternatives as well. Although The American Legion has not seen these proposals, it is clear there is much work to be done before final passage of the Budget Resolution for FY 2004,

especially one that treats earned benefits of American veterans fairly.

Veterans did not cause the budgetary shortfalls and should not be financially penalized in the name of fiscal responsibility. Much has been said that all Americans must be willing to make sacrifices to eliminate the budget deficit—severely service-connected disabled veterans have already made significant, personal sacrifices for their earned entitlements.

Sincerely,

STEVE ROBERTSON,
Director,
National Legislative Commission.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 20, 2003]

CHANGES AT VA VEX ADVOCATES FOR HOMELESS

(By Edward Walsh)

John F. Downing doesn't understand why he was turned down for federal funds.

Eighteen months ago, he took over a successful program that every night provides shelter and counseling to as many as 120 homeless veterans in western Massachusetts. When United Veterans of America, where he is the executive director, applied last year for renewal of a federal grant that subsidizes the cost of half of the 120 beds at the facility, he thought it would sail through. It didn't, leaving Downing angry and perplexed.

"The whole thing is preposterous to us," he said.

Peter H. Dougherty understands why Downing is miffed. As director of homeless programs at the Department of Veterans Affairs, Dougherty is positioned at the other end of the bureaucratic process that decides such matters. But while Dougherty has sympathy for the complaints from Massachusetts, from where he sits in Washington, the VA's program for homeless veterans is doing just fine.

"I don't blame them, but in the meantime thousands more homeless vets are getting service," Dougherty said. Recent research suggests that veterans account for about 23 percent, or 460,000 of the 2 million adults who experience homelessness over the course of a year.

These competing perspectives—one from the nation's capital, the other from Northampton, Mass.—are the result of policy decisions that had nothing to do with the 60 beds that Downing is fighting to preserve. The private facility on the grounds of a VA medical center in Northampton was not so much rejected for renewed federal funding as it fell victim to vastly increased competition for a limited amount of money that the VA made available for the homeless veterans program.

The key step that threatens the federal subsidy to half of the beds at the facility was the VA's decision to merge two programs for homeless veterans into one. Two years ago, the VA received 67 requests for the operating subsidies, known as the "per diem only program," and approved 53 of the applications. The grants provided \$19 per bed per night to help run homeless shelters.

But in the most recent round of awards of operating subsidies, announced in December, 252 private agencies, including United Veterans of America, sought help from the VA, but again only 53 were approved. More than one third of the applicants had previously operated with help from the other VA homeless program that was merged with the per diem only program. There was also a sharp increase in interest in the program, with 125 new agencies for the first time seeking a VA operating subsidy.

More than half of the homeless shelters that applied for renewal of existing VA subsidies were turned down in the latest round. This has led to suspicions among some that

the administration gave preference to shelters run by "faith-based" organizations, furthering President Bush's goal of boosting the role of such organizations. The VA added to this impression by boasting, in its announcement of the new awards, that more than 40 percent of the recipients were faith-based organizations.

But Dougherty and other VA officials deny that faith-based organizations were given any advantage.

"What we're doing is what the administration asked for, and that is to have a level playing field," Dougherty said. When per diem only subsidies were awarded in 2000, faith-based organizations accounted for 35 percent of the recipients, he said.

But the "level playing field" meant that homeless programs already operating with VA subsidies also did not receive any special consideration, although Dougherty said the panels of VA officials who made the selections would be aware if an application was for a renewal and would probably factor that into their decisions.

VA officials defend the decision to merge the two homeless programs. Under the second program, known as Health Care for Homeless Veterans, VA medical facilities contracted with local residential facilities to take in homeless veterans. But officials said that program was more expensive, costing an average of \$39 per day per veteran, than the per diem only subsidies and essentially served the same population.

"We looked to see if there were any distinctions between veterans in both programs," said Gay Koerber, VA's associate chief consultant for health care for homeless veterans. "There was no difference in their health problems, substance abuse problems; they were about the same age. Based on that, it seemed much more cost-effective to shift resources into the per diem program."

Koerber and Dougherty also note that, under a variety of VA programs, the number of beds available continues to grow and that the operating subsidy is scheduled to increase from \$19 to \$26.95 a day. The other 60 beds at the Northampton facility, for example, continue to be supported under a VA program designed to enlarge the number of beds available nationwide.

Downing and others have complained that not a single application from Massachusetts was approved by the VA in the latest round, but, according to Koerber, the agency is helping to operate 247 beds for homeless veterans in the state (not counting the 60 that will lose the subsidy at the end of this month), the fourth-highest total among the 50 states.

All of this is scant comfort to Downing, who views the program from Northampton, not Washington.

"I have a commitment to veterans and to this facility to keep as many people safe and sober as we can," he said. "Our issue has been we don't want to put anybody back on the streets."

MR. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART), a member of the committee.

(Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to commend the gentleman from Iowa on this great budget resolution that adheres to the principles that this Chamber has been speaking about forever, fiscal discipline, tax relief, and job creation. This budget resolution includes President Bush's job growth plan,

which provides immediate help for Americans who are facing very difficult economic times right now, and also lays the groundwork for strong and sustained economic growth in the future. This plan will boost job growth by 2.1 million jobs over the next 3 years. In my home State alone, Florida, it will create 54,000 jobs in 2004, and almost 250,000 jobs will be created over the next 4 years. Small businesses, sometimes an entity that is forgotten so much in these conversations, will receive tax cuts averaging over \$2,000 under this budget, this plan.

The long-term tax incentives will not only help job growth, but it will also create, as I said before, long-term financial security for all Americans in our wonderful country.

I keep hearing about this Blue Dog budget, but this Blue Dog Democratic alternative increases taxes, increases taxes on Americans that are struggling right now to pay their rent, to pay their mortgage, to keep their jobs. It increases taxes to hire more bureaucrats. They may call it a Blue Dog plan, but when you take off the dressing, it is just a dog. Increasing taxes in America in this day and age will do nothing to help the economy. It will slow down economic growth.

That is why this plan, the Republican plan, makes so much sense. It is the right plan for the right time. It is one that will increase jobs, not decrease; that will lower taxes on working Americans, lower taxes on small businesses, not increase taxes to hire more bureaucrats here in Washington.

It is time to bring common sense. This budget does so.

MR. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

MR. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago, we were asked to pass the budget, the Republican budget. We passed it. This is the economic growth over the last few years. We got the lowest economic growth that we have gotten in 50 years. We also have a budget that creates new debt.

This is the surplus and deficit over the past few years. You will notice it under Reagan and Bush; the Clinton budget, which was passed without any Republican help; President Bush came in, and we are back down into deficit.

This is called a wartime budget. Unfortunately, there is no wartime money in the budget.

How bad do deficits have to get?

This is a chart that shows where the interest on the national debt has gone. Interest on the national debt, if the Republicans had not messed up the budget, would have gone to zero by the end of this budget deficit. The red line is the interest on the national debt under the Republican plan. To put it in perspective, the blue line is the entire nondefense discretionary budget. Instead of going to zero, we are going to be spending more on interest on the national debt than we are spending on everything in government.

□ 1530

Because of the deficits we are cutting education. The 12 percent increase over the past few years, this budget is a cut in education. We are talking about cuts not only in the veterans benefits that we had but also cuts in education, cuts in safe and drug-free schools, after-school programs, education for homeless children, vocational education, 28,000 Head Start students not being educated under the Head Start program.

At a time when States are increasing their tuitions, we are cutting Pell grants. We are cutting student loans and school lunches. We are also not funding No Child Left Behind. The President went all over the country talking about No Child Left Behind and the amount of money that was authorized to be spent. Unfortunately, we are not even spending on No Child Left Behind what we spent last year.

Look at the difference in what we are spending. In order to take pay cuts for the wealthy, we have run up a huge debt, cut veterans benefits, cut education. That is the wrong priority. We should fund veterans and education first and then consider tax cuts second. We have got the wrong priorities. Education is the right priority.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Iowa has 11¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from South Carolina has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, that sounds pretty close. It is about as balanced as any of the budgets.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, today as we embark on a new chapter in the war against terror, I want to return to a crucial theme for this budget, which is homeland security. That goes to the heart of national security, and it also goes to the heart of economic security since by far the biggest setback we could have to our economy, for another setback, which would be another major terrorist attack.

This budget includes a substantial increase for the protection of our Nation's infrastructure, \$829 million, for instance, a more than 300 percent increase for the Department of Homeland Security's Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection which will provide new capabilities in the war against terror by mapping intelligence and threat information about the Nation's potential vulnerabilities. That includes \$500 million to assess the Nation's critical infrastructure and to ensure that our highest-priority vulnerabilities are properly addressed. This is important everywhere, including my home State of Louisiana. We have a vast amount of critical infrastructure there, including some of the most active ports in the world and a

large portion of the strategic petroleum reserve, infrastructure that transports a huge percentage of the Nation's oil and gas needs and so much more. Terrorist attacks to any of these facilities would be devastating to my State and, indeed, the entire Nation.

So in this time of war, in this time of threat, providing for our military and protecting our homeland first and foremost are top priorities. This budget does both of those. It protects our economy also as a result, and I urge my fellow Members to support this strong budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Unfortunately, this Republican budget is likely to force the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to slash the pensions of 34,000 Coast Guard retirees and 645,000 railroad retirees and their dependents and cut the relief provided to families of the victims of September 11.

Who in this House believes that we should cut the September 11 Victims' Compensation Fund to finance tax cuts for the rich? As a Nation at war, who believes that the men and women of the Coast Guard protecting our shores, ensuring the safe passage of U.S. Navy ships in the Persian Gulf should be worrying that Congress might cut their retirement?

This budget shows a callous disregard for the families of the victims of September 11, the men and women of the Coast Guard, railroad retirees, as well as the infrastructure needs of this country.

The budget resolution directs the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to cut \$3.7 billion for mandatory programs over the 10 years and to find savings from waste, fraud, and abuse and produce greater efficiency. Those platitudes may make for good rhetoric, but the policies will have devastating effect on the retirees and on the families of the victims of September 11. The Congressional Budget Office says 90 percent of the programs of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's mandatory accounts include the September 11 Victims' Compensation Fund, Coast Guard retirement pay, railroad retirement pensions, and unemployment compensation for railroad workers. Is that where we are supposed to find waste, fraud, and abuse?

The Victims' Compensation Fund makes payments to the victims who were injured and the families of those who were killed in the September 11 attacks. Mr. Chairman, no one in this Chamber can possibly ever forget the tragedy of September 11, and I hope the families are beginning to put their lives back together again. How in good conscience can we retreat from the solemn commitment made on this floor to help them rebuild their lives?

I commit to them that I will oppose this Republican budget plan that will cut their funding. Similarly, the 36,000 Coast Guard officers and their enlisted personnel and the 34,000 Coast Guard retirees, we pledge to them on our side that we will oppose this budget resolution and its cuts in Coast Guard retirement pay.

Coast Guard cutters, as we debate this budget resolution, are on combat patrol with the U.S. Navy, securing the shipping lanes and the safe passage of Navy ships in the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean. At home the Coast Guard continues to protect our shores and our ports. Just this week the Secretary of Homeland Security initiated Operation Liberty Shield, increased security at our ports, protect infrastructure, key assets. The Coast Guard under Operation Liberty Shield is increasing its patrols of waterways, escorts of ferries and cruise ships, sea marshals on board vessels of high interest. We get more out of our investment in the Coast Guard than virtually any other agency of the Federal Government. Why should we make them worry about this Republican effort to cut retirement pay?

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H. Con. Res. 95, the FY2004 Budget Resolution. Regrettably, this Republican Budget is likely to force the Transportation Committee to slash the pensions of 34,000 Coast Guard retirees and 645,000 railroad retirees and their dependents, and cut the relief provided to families of the victims of September 11th. Who in this House believes that we should cut the September 11th Victims' Compensation Fund to finance more tax cuts for the rich? With the Nation now at war, who in this House believes that the men and women of the Coast Guard, who are protecting our shores and ensuring the safe passage of U.S. Navy ships in the Persian Gulf, should be worrying that this Congress may cut their retirement? This Budget displays a callous disregard for the families of the victims of September 11th, the men and women of the Coast Guard, railroad retirees, as well as the infrastructure needs of this country.

Section 201 of the Republican Budget Resolution directs the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure to cut \$3.7 billion from its mandatory programs over the next 10 years. We are told to find these savings from "waste, fraud, and abuse" and to produce greater efficiency in our programs. While these platitudes of "waste, fraud, and abuse" make for good rhetoric, these policies will have a devastating effect on these retirees and the families of the victims of the September 11th attack.

The Congressional Budget Office says that 90 percent of the Transportation Committee's funding of mandatory programs includes these three:

The September 11th Victims' Compensation Fund,

Coast Guard retirement pay; and
Railroad retirement pensions and unemployment compensation for railroad workers.

And this is where we're expected to find "waste, fraud, and abuse"?

The September 11th Victims' Compensation Fund makes payments to the victims who

were injured and the families of those who were killed in the September 11th terrorist attacks. Mr. Chairman, no one in this chamber will forget the tragedy of September 11th. I can only hope that families of the victims of September 11th have begun to put their lives back together. How can we, in good conscience, retreat from our solemn commitment to help them rebuild their lives? I commit to them now that I will oppose this Republican plan that could cut funding from the families of the victims of September 11th.

Similarly, I commit to the men and women of the Coast Guard, both the 36,000 Coast Guard officers and enlisted personnel and the 34,000 Coast Guard retirees, that I will strongly oppose this Republican Budget Resolution and its likely cuts in Coast Guard retired pay.

As we debate this Budget Resolution, Coast Guard cutters are on combat patrol with the U.S. Navy to help secure shipping lands and the safe passage of Navy ships in the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean. At home the Coast Guard continues to protect our shores and ports. On Monday, March 17, the Secretary of Homeland Security initiated Operation LIBERTY SHIELD to increase security at our Nation's borders and protect our critical infrastructure and key assets. Under Operation LIBERTY SHIELD, the Coast Guard is increasing patrols of major U.S. ports and waterways, increasing its escorts of ferries and cruise ships, providing armed Sea Marshals onboard every high interest vessel arriving at or departing from U.S. ports, and enforcing security zones in and around critical infrastructure sites in key ports and petroleum facilities close to large coastal communities. In addition to its military and homeland security missions, the Coast Guard continues its search-and-rescue mission—responding to nearly 37,000 calls and saving 3,654 lives in 2002—and many other missions. The Coast Guard has long been stretched thin, but has always been ready—"Semper Paratus"—to answer the call. I have always maintained that the public gets more out of its investment in the Coast Guard than virtually any other government service. The enlisted men and women and officers of the Coast Guard should not have to worry about this Republican effort to cut their retirement pay.

The Republican Budget Resolution also is likely to result in significant cuts to railroad workers' retirement and unemployment compensation programs. Railroad workers, unlike other workers, are not covered by the Social Security system. They have their own retirement program. Last Congress, the bipartisan leadership of the Transportation Committee, with the strong support of rail unions, railroads, and rail retirees and their dependents, introduced H.R. 1140, a bill to revise the railroad retirement program to restore rail worker benefits and decrease railroad payroll taxes. The House overwhelmingly passed this legislation, by a vote of 383–33, and it became law. Today, the Republican Budget Resolution forces the Transportation Committee to consider changing this Act to cut railroad worker retirement benefits and unemployment compensation. I commit to the 248,000 rail workers and the 645,000 rail retirees and their dependents that I will fight any attempt to roll back the benefits so recently restored to you.

Beyond these devastating cuts required by the reconciliation instructions, this Budget Resolution does little to meet our infrastructure

investment needs. For the reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21), the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee urged the Budget Committee to provide \$50 billion in budget authority for highway, highway safety, and transit programs. In its letter to the Budget Committee, 74 of the 75 Members of the Transportation Committee stated that we must provide this level of funding in FY2004 to maintain our surface transportation systems and have any hope of improving the overall condition of the Nation's highway and transit systems.

Regrettably, this Budget Resolution provides \$39 billion for these programs—little more than the status quo for TEA 21 reauthorization. Through the vigorous efforts of the bipartisan leadership of this Committee, the Resolution also provides a reserve fund that would allow for additional allocations if this or other legislation includes increases in Highway Trust Fund receipts. Although this does provide the Transportation Committee with the opportunity to address this issue at a later date, this Resolution does nothing to address our enormous highway and transit infrastructure needs in the fiscal year ahead.

Moreover, the Republican Resolution cuts the amount of highway and transit funding that actually may be obligated in FY2004 below the CBO baseline. Specifically, the Republican Budget Resolution assumes a cut in the transit program of \$98 million in FY2004 and \$2.5 billion over the next six years. This cut is directly contrary to TEA 21's goal of modal balance. Under TEA 21 we significantly increased transit funding by guaranteeing \$36 billion for transit. As a result of this increased investment, transit ridership has added 1.6 billion riders—more than 900,000 new riders each day—over the last five years. This transit renaissance could be threatened by these cuts in transit funding.

At a time when our Nation's infrastructure faces huge unmet safety and security needs, congestion is crippling our cities, and our economy has lost 2.5 million jobs in the past two years, the Republican Budget Resolution cuts these vital programs that could address infrastructure security needs and congestion problems and create family-wage jobs to grow our economy. Instead, it provides more than \$1 trillion of new tax cuts.

This Budget Resolution reflects more than misplaced priorities. It is an assault on working men and women from the Coast Guard to the Maintenance of Way railroad employees.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the Republican Budget Resolution and urge my colleagues to vote "no".

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), a member of the committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this budget resolution. With America at war and with families having to make tough decisions around their kitchen tables, should we not in Congress at least be expected to make smart decisions to promote economic growth and to take a stand against waste and fraud?

Many across the aisle oppose this budget and attack the tax relief. But,

Mr. Chairman, less than 5 percent of this budget is about tax relief; 95 percent of this budget is about spending, 3 percent more, more, than last year. Unfortunately, much of it continues to be waste and fraud. The Department of Housing and Urban Development made \$2.6 billion in section 8 overpayments, 7 percent of their entire budget just lost. That is enough money to pay the downpayment for 300,000 people to get into their first homes.

The Medicare program paid out \$13.3 billion in 1 year to people who did not even qualify. That is enough money this year to pay one third of the cost of a prescription drug benefit for our seniors.

The list goes on. Social Security pays benefits to dead people. Twenty-three percent of the people having their student loans discharged due to disability actually hold jobs. The National Park Service spent \$800,000 on an outhouse, and it does not even work. In the real world when people lose this much money, they are fired or they go to jail. In Washington it is just an excuse to ask for even more money next year.

Mr. Chairman, there are a thousand ways we can save money in Washington without cutting any needed services and without raising taxes on our hard-working families and our men and women in uniform. People should quit trying to fool the American people into thinking otherwise. If we fail to endorse this budget and just promote even more government spending without reform, we are simply sanctioning fraud. What an insult to the American people.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget and in support of the alternative budget being offered by my colleague from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. Chairman, the 10-year \$5.6 trillion unified budget surplus projected less than 2 years ago is gone, completely gone, thanks in large part to the Bush tax cuts mainly benefiting upper-bracket taxpayers. Now the Republicans offer a budget with over a \$2 trillion deficit for the same 10-year period, \$4.4 trillion if we exclude the Social Security trust fund. That is a fiscal reversal of almost \$8 trillion.

Unfortunately, in the face of the worst fiscal reversal in this Nation's history, the Republicans' response is to propose more of the same failed policies. Finding themselves in a hole, their message seems to be: just keep digging.

The Republicans' budget proposes \$1.3 trillion in new tax cuts, every penny of it funded by increased government debt. The result, Mr. Chairman, is that the Republican budget would provide the worst of both worlds. We

would go over the cliff fiscally, while at the same time radically reducing money available for education, the environment, transportation, healthcare, and law enforcement.

At a time when our veterans are waiting 6 months for an appointment at VA hospitals, the Republican budget would cut compensation for service-connected disabilities and education benefits by \$15 billion and veterans healthcare funding by another \$14 billion over the next 10 years.

As the National Commander of the Disabled American Veterans said in a letter to Speaker HASTERT, "Has Congress no shame? Is there no honor left in the hallowed halls of our government that you choose to dishonor the sacrifices of our Nation's heroes and rob our programs, healthcare and disability compensation, to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy?"

The Republican budget not only fails to fund No Child Left Behind, the bipartisan education program enacted a year ago; it actually would require cuts in school lunch programs and in student loans. The Republicans mandate billions in cuts from appropriated health programs, but do not say where the ax would fall. From major disease research at the National Institutes of Health? From community health centers. There would be \$2.5 billion in cuts required next year alone. From where?

The Republican budget does not even keep up with inflation in funding for homeland security. And what new money is proposed is largely offset by cuts in law enforcement programs on which our police and other first responders have depended in years past. The Democratic alternative provides \$10 billion for the States immediately for homeland security, as provided in our economic stimulus plan. The Republican budget does not contain one dime of this funding.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget has its priorities straight. A fast-acting and effective economic stimulus, a serious prescription drug plan, protection of veterans benefits, prudent investments in education and homeland security, and all of this with \$821 billion less in deficits and debt than the Republican proposal. The Democratic alternative is realistic and responsible, fair and fiscally sound, and I urge colleagues to support it.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I have been looking through my budget, and I cannot find one of the facts that the gentleman just stated. Not one of the cuts he just stated is in my budget document. I have looked through there. I cannot find them. I do not know where the gentleman is coming up with these numbers.

I will say this, though: the person I would like to introduce next to speak basically wrote title II, which is our reconciliation construction regarding waste, fraud, and abuse, asking the committees to go out and look for those instances of waste, fraud, and

abuse, ways that we can find deficiencies within this budget, and that is the very distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE).

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman, for working so hard on this budget. I have had lengthy discussions with him about my concerns for protecting Medicare and veterans. The spending cuts that were in the original budget that we passed out of the Committee on the Budget concerned me deeply. He listened and I am very pleased with the results.

Most Americans agree that Medicare must be reformed. The 38-year-old program benefit package is outdated and actually insufficient for most seniors' needs. The current program lacks much-needed prescription drug coverage, leaving many seniors to choose between food and drugs. I know. I represent many of those seniors. The Republican budget begins the process of reforming the outdated Medicare system. It includes a historic proposal to provide \$400 billion over 10 years to update the Medicare benefits package and also provide a prescription drug benefit. Additionally, I have worked with the committee and the Republican leadership to ensure that Medicare is untouched by across-the-board cuts. The constituents of the fifth congressional district have also expressed a great concern that the veterans healthcare system is broken.

□ 1545

I have constituents in my district who are being forced to wait up to 16 months for an appointment to see a physician, and in some of the counties it is up to 18 months. Last year, in fiscal year 2003, there was a 12 percent increase in the VA medical care funding, yet the waiting times have not substantially improved. The system must be fixed.

Additionally, this budget provides for an increase in veterans' discretionary spending of 6.1 percent over fiscal year 2003, as well as a 7.5 percent increase in mandatory outlays. We are working to ensure that these resources are adequately and geographically spread so that we meet the needs of seniors.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of increasing the spending on veterans' health care and protecting those who have always been willing to protect us. The budget works for seniors, and I urge support.

Cutting 1 cent on the dollar for other agencies in fraud, waste and abuse is very, very achievable. Let us not say that we cannot find the savings. We deserve, for the sake of the taxpayers, to at least try.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, before yielding to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD),

to respond to our distinguished chairman, who wants to know where all these cuts we are alleging come from.

They come from the budget documents. His budget calls on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for example, to reduce spending by \$107,359,000,000. The only thing they can take that out of is the Medicaid program.

He calls on the Committee on Government Reform, which has jurisdiction over the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan and the Civil Service Retirement Plan, to effect cuts in those programs of \$38,319,000,000 to achieve savings.

They are there. If you look at function 550 in this budget, which is the health function, if you look at the level of funding, it is \$2.4 billion below what is necessary to maintain purchasing power. We say "current services." That has got to come out of some of the organizations like NIH who get their funding from this particular function of the budget. It is there. No question about it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, out of respect to the chairman, I know he wants 2 minutes to close, I will just take a minute. I will be very brief.

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I think that sometimes we find ourselves as a body not taken as seriously as we would like to be taken is because of exercises like this. We have heard over and over again from colleagues on one side of the aisle and colleagues on this side.

The Nation is focused on the war we are faced with right now. There is obviously going to be an enormous cost associated with that war.

Second, most people across the country are focused on local and State government challenges. Many State governments are facing enormous budget shortfalls, it has been estimated some \$70 billion in current year shortfalls across the country. That number has grown by 50 percent, Mr. Chairman, in just the last 3 months.

If we are serious about helping States and serious about helping people get back up on their feet, serious about helping this economy move in the right direction, let us be honest. We are not paying for the war, and my friends on the other side of the aisle pretend that they cannot even contemplate a model that can give us scenarios for how much this war will cost. That is disingenuous, it is wrong, and it is unfair to the American people.

Two, you do very little for your hospitals, your schools. People mention Medicare and Medicaid. For those watching at home, that means those hospitals in your States will not get the amounts of money that they need to ensure that people are covered and that people are treated.

For those teachers and those of you who have kids in public schools, that

means that bill we bragged about, the No Child Left Behind Act, we will not have the money to fund it. All of the promises about homeland security, it takes money to pay for these things.

The difference between our budget and theirs is simple: We set a different set of priorities than they have set.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle at the end of day can at least be honest and say to those of us on this side and to the American people that your priorities are vastly and radically different than ours. We believe States should be helped, we believe that the war should be paid for, and we believe we should balance the budget. Your priorities are different, and you owe it to the American people to tell them the truth.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let us just go to the bottom line and look at the differences between the two proposals that will be the chief proposals before the House when we vote tonight on the budget resolutions, the Democratic proposal and the Republican proposal.

As anyone who can see this chart can easily see, under our budget in every year from 2004, next year, through 2013, the Democratic budget has a lower deficit than the Republican budget, and by a significant margin.

What is more, every year our bottom line gets better and better and better, until in the year 2010 we are in unified balance. All accounts included, we have no more deficit by the year 2010. And we do not get there with improbable, unlikely spending cuts of the kind you have heard mentioned on the floor today. We get there with good, solid economics and with complete fairness to things that are important to us. It is a huge difference.

But this tells it all: Over that 10-year period of time, the cumulative difference between us and them, between Republicans and Democrats, between our resolution and their resolution, is \$913 billion less public debt. So as we move from a deficit to a surplus, we accumulate \$913 billion less debt than do the Republicans in their resolution. That is an enormous difference, particularly for anybody who says that deficits matter.

We insist that deficits do matter. This administration has taken a different attitude. The Director of Management and Budget says we should not start hyperventilating over all these deficits. We think they matter. We think in the long run they affect the growth of our economy, they affect jobs and things that matter to people, they affect the interest we have to pay on our national debt.

This is the difference between us and them. By 2010, we are in balance. It takes them until 2012 to get there. Along the way we accumulate \$913 billion less debt. But what is most important is ours is feasible and credible and

probable; theirs is infeasible, unlikely, and, to my way of thinking, unbelievable.

The Republican budget presents us with two choices: We will either have devastating cuts, in which event they may get to balance in 2012, or those cuts will not be achieved, in which event the deficit itself will have done devastating damage.

That is the choice before us, and that is why the Democratic balanced budget resolution is far and away the better choice for everybody in this House.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the very distinguished vice chairman of the Committee on the Budget, to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5½ minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I think if we were honest with each other, we would say we do not like any of our budgets, because we would like them to be balanced today, but that, regrettably, is not possible. But in comparing the budgets, I prefer the budget that we are presenting.

I prefer it because in our budget we are protecting America, we are increasing our defense budget, we are increasing our homeland security budget. In our budget, most importantly, and you do not see it to the extent you need to in our colleagues' budgets, we are strengthening the economy and creating new jobs. In our budget, we are providing fiscal responsibility.

One of the things I found most curious in the debate in the committee last week was that when we added up all the dollars that were spent in amendments offered by our Democratic colleagues, they amounted to over \$1 trillion. Now, they would say to you what they did is they eliminated our tax cuts, and, in some cases, increased taxes to pay for their \$1 trillion of new spending over the next 10 years.

When we came to Washington, a number of us said we wanted to get our country's financial house in order and balance the Federal budget and not grow this government. But what we see in the other budget is a growing of the government.

Mr. Chairman, what is disappointing to me is that when we have seen their amendments, both last week and this week, we have not seen any effort to reduce spending but increase it. And when we see what we do, what we are having to defend, I am embarrassed that it seems so difficult to defend. We have to defend a 1 percent cut in discretionary spending over this year's budget for just 1 year. Then we allow the budget to go up in the second year, we allow it to go up in the third year, we allow it to go up in the fourth year. The logic, though, is if you can make cuts in 1 year, they have benefit in terms of reducing spending for 10 years. I am proud of that.

But when our colleagues talk about the savings we are making, they add up all 10 years and then imply that it happens all in 1 year, or they say we are going to cut 1 percent every year, and we are not allowing the budgets to grow.

We want to slow the growth in the budgets next year, and then we are going to allow them to grow in the second year, allow them to grow in the third year, allow them to grow in the fourth year, allow them to grow in the fifth year, allow them to grow in the sixth year, allow them to grow in the seventh year, allow them to grow in the eighth year, allow them to grow in the ninth year, and allow them to grow in the tenth year.

But we are having to defend a 1-cent-per-dollar cut next year in some programs, but we are not cutting defense, homeland security, Medicare or Social Security, and we have also agreed that veterans' spending is going to go up.

So, for me, I am having a difficult time, because I would have liked our budget to have reduced spending more. But this is what we can agree to.

Now, when we talk about the 1 percent reduction, what we are looking at is waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement. You mean to tell me there is not 1 cent on a dollar of waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement in our government? You could not look at anyone with a straight face and tell them that.

I happen to have served on the Committee on Government Reform, for 16 years. I love that committee. We look at waste, fraud and abuse, and we attempt and are successful in many ways in getting reform. But it is taking too long. We need the authorizers to do a better job of looking at waste, fraud and abuse now, and we need the appropriators to do so as well.

Mr. Chairman, on my desk are hundreds of GAO reports. These are just for a few months. Financial Management Service; Significant Weaknesses In Computer Control Continue. You could save millions of dollars there.

Weak Controls Result In Improper and Wasteful Purchases at FAA. You can save money there.

Medicaid Financial Management: Better Oversight Of State Claims For Federal Reimbursement Needed.

I love this one. Medicare Home Health Care. Payments To Home Health Agencies Are Considerably Higher Than Costs.

U.S. Postal Service: Deteriorating Financial Outlook Increases Need For Transformation. We have got to do those things.

Now, DOD has to be looked at as well, and that is one way we can help pay for all the needs that we have in DOD. Overpayments Continue, And Management And Accounting Issues Remain. Defense Inventory: Control Weaknesses Leave Restricted And Hazardous Excess Property Vulnerable To Improper Use, Loss And Theft.

These are just a few of the hundreds on my desk. This is just GAO. What

about the Inspector General's reports? We could fill up this whole table. This is literally the tip of the iceberg.

So, I am proud of our budget, because it is better than the budget we are seeing, but, Lord knows, it could be even better.

I encourage my colleagues to vote out our budget resolution. Let us get our country's financial house in order, and let us have the needed tax cuts that will generate the economic activity that will grow this economy. We want to protect America, strengthen the economy, and have fiscal responsibility. Our budget does that.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

Is the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) a designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON)?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) will control the time of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

□ 1600

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding the time, and I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the vice chairman, and the Members from both sides for the work that they are doing.

Let us face it. Every one of us can come here and every one of us would do it differently, but I would like to address something that has been talked about quite a bit and lend some perspective.

There was a movie known as the American President, and in it Michael Douglas played the American President, and in it there is a great line. Michael Douglas was being attacked for a very difficult decision he had made as President of the United States. He called a press conference, he stood before the media, and he says, "America has serious problems, and we need serious people to solve them."

So for one second I would like to be a serious person and talk about the fundamental foundation of the beginning of what we must do; that is, the reconciliation language regarding waste, fraud, and abuse.

We have to in America prioritize our spending and slow the growth in that spending, or we are going to spend ourselves into a position that we cannot afford, either our citizens or ourselves. And it is an appropriate first step, as this budget recognizes, to go through these agencies and look for the reduction in the rate of growth, it is a reduction in the rate of growth, and find

that funding wherever possible where there has been waste, where there has been fraud, or where there has been abuse.

And we in this Congress already have set one precedent. There is a program that is off limits, so to speak, in this budget called Medicaid, but when we established the Medicaid program and experienced waste and fraud and abuse in that program, particularly fraud, this Congress, years ago, established that we would offset from the Federal 65 percent match, the amount of money that was found to have been fraudulently spent by the State that administers the program. From the time that was implemented, the rate of fraud went down, which ensured that the money going into Medicaid was going where it should be, and that is to benefit those most in need.

We need to establish the same mechanism in every department of the Federal Government. If there is an accountability for the allowance of waste, for the allowance of fraud, or for abuse, with no consequence in the future, then it will continue. I commend the committee, and I commend the chairman.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

(Mr. STARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, last night, President Bush started the war against Iraq, a war that offends the vast majority of moral and religious groups in the world. Most major religious organizations, the Vatican, Muslim, Buddhists, Jewish, Protestant religious groups, oppose his war on moral grounds. Over 80 percent of the nations in the world oppose the war on ethical and moral grounds.

But now that Bush has created this disaster to cover up his failed diplomatic, social, and economic agenda, it is up to Congress to find ways to support our troops overseas, and support them we must. For President Bush talks the talk of support for our troops while he and Republican leaders fail to walk the walk. In reality, they trash the future lives here at home for our brave servicemen and women today.

How do George Bush and his Republican henchmen mistreat our troops? Well, let me count the ways. They are all outlined in the Republican budget before us today. Even though Bush may lie from time to time, the figures in his budget reveal his true intentions, and here they are.

First, there is no money for our troops to fight this war of his, no money, period. So much for Republican support for our troops.

Second, troops. Watch out if you come home as a veteran, because Bush and his Republican allies are cutting \$15 billion from veterans' benefits, a fine thank you for your service. When you return from war, no health care at the VA hospital? Do not turn to Medicaid or Medicare for help. Bush and his

Republican allies are cutting more than \$160 billion from these vital health care programs as well. These cuts mean over 5 million children will lose their health coverage benefits. Benefits will be reduced by 30 percent for the children lucky enough to remain in Medicaid, which, by the way, may have to drop its prescription drug coverage altogether.

Now, Republicans talk about a Medicare drug benefit, but they do not budget funds to provide it, and a million elderly nursing home residents could be put out on the streets. So much for the parents of our military.

Now, for our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, got kids? Do not look for help from Bush. His budget takes child care away from 30,000 children, kicks 570,000 kids out of after-school programs, eliminates Head Start for 28,000 children, and prevents a half a million poor children from getting free and reduced-price school meals. Even if your kids are lucky enough to get to school, they will be left shortchanged by Bush's \$9.5 billion cut to education that was needed to assure his oft-touted plan to leave no child behind. Clearly, that campaign is history.

Need help with housing when you get back? Too bad. The President cuts housing subsidies for 75,000 families.

Having trouble finding a job in the Bush recession? Sorry. Republicans do nothing in this budget to extend unemployment benefits for those who cannot find jobs. At least his daddy and Ronnie Reagan extended unemployment benefits for over 33 weeks.

Say your war takes a long time and you want to retire when you come home. Forget about Social Security and Medicare. Bush took the money to fund those programs and gave it away as \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts to the very richest Americans, 80 percent of those cuts going to people with incomes over 100 grand a year. The only servicemen and women I know who are making that much are working two night jobs.

So there you have it. The President starts a war to eliminate terror, knowing that it will only increase terrorist attacks at home. He tries to disarm a nation with no proven weapons of mass destruction, and he ignores a far worse threat of North Korea's nuclear weapons. He orders the assassination of an inhumane dictator to cover up the fact that he cannot find bin Laden, and then tells us in Congress to support the troops while he dishonors their very future by giving America's resources away to a small, rich cadre of Republican officeholders and campaign contributors.

Mr. Chairman, you do not praise a person for driving home drunk and avoiding an accident. You do not praise an A grade awarded to a child who cheats to get it. And thus, we should not support the war program of a President which defies every moral and ethical standard set by religious and government leaders around the world.

If you truly want to support and honor our servicemen and women, vote

against this antiveteran, antichild, anti-Christian, "Bush-league" Republican budget.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The Chair would remind all Members that although remarks in debate may level criticism against the policies of the President, still, remarks in debate must avoid personality and, therefore, may not include personal accusations such as lying.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

This is the period of debate where the Joint Economic Committee takes over to discuss the Humphrey-Hawkins period of debate, which is supposed to be about monetary policy. I see from my colleague, the last speaker, we are going to move beyond monetary policy, I guess. So in that spirit, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

(Mr. TERRY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his introduction.

Now, one of the realities that we must recognize as we debate our budget are the realities of today's economy and those facing our municipalities, our cities, and our States, and our families today. The reality is that when we have this economic slowdown, all of those entities that I just mentioned have made tough decisions to cut their budgets. I hear about families doing it all the time. The city of Omaha has done it, the State of Nebraska has done it. But yet when we are in the Federal Government, because we do not have a balanced budget amendment, heck, we just sit there and say, spend, spend more, give away all the money at a time of economic slowdown, at a time when we have to protect American citizens.

So I am proud to stand in support of a budget that recognizes those realities today that face American families, that face our municipalities, that face our States, and make the same tough decisions that they have. I am proud that this budget, the Republican budget, controls spending. Yes, I would like to see it control spending even more. There is a lot of areas of this budget that I, frankly, do not think we are restraining the spending. In fact, I believe that the budget for veterans, actually we are increasing veterans spending under this proposed Republican budget.

But what we are asking for in this budget, we are asking agencies to save taxpayers' money, just as Americans are sitting down at their tables trying to find ways to save money in their family budgets. And our economic growth is contingent upon responsible spending in all sectors of our economy: business, personal spending, and government.

Now, this budget protects the fiscal soundness of our government and in-

corporates cost-cutting provisions that will pay dividends well into the future. Through responsible tax cuts, we are returning the power back to the people.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I was listening to my colleagues say that this was the Joint Economic Committee, and we are supposed to talk about monetary policy, and I want to return us to monetary policy, because I am kind of reflecting back to when I first ran for Congress in 1992. That was the year that deficits were approximately \$130 billion, \$140 billion. All of my Republican opponents, colleagues, economists, everybody at that time was telling me that there was something sinister about budget deficits, and I could not quite understand what their preoccupation was. But I did realize over a period of time that it was projected that the budget deficit for 1993 and 1994 was going to keep going up, and at that time, the maximum budget deficit that anybody was projecting was \$260 billion. It was sacrilegious for anybody to think that we ought to be projecting a \$260 billion budget deficit.

So it is kind of amazing to me now that I could see a Republican budget for the year 2004 project a \$319 billion deficit.

I was talking to a reporter before I came over here and he said, well, are you all talking about war today? I said, no, we are debating the budget. He said, oh, you are talking about money for the war? And I said, no, there is not a dime of money for the war that we are fighting in the budgets that anybody has proposed today, except for the defense spending, which would be there even if we were not fighting a war.

Well, over time I came to understand that when you have those kinds of budget deficits every year accumulating, they keep adding into the national debt, and when you have a national debt, you have to pay interest on that national debt. So to see a Republican budget that in the outyears, 2009, 2010, projects that we will be paying \$250 plus billion in interest only on the national debt, it does not take much for me to understand, well, if I had that \$250 billion in my budget, I could do something with it, like pay for education and health care and things that are important to our country's future.

□ 1615

That is the microbasis that I want to talk about.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, we do not know how much the war is going to cost. The war just got started, and it is not over yet. When we know how long it will have lasted, then we will know how much it

will have cost. Then we will be able to budget for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the majority budget resolution today. Mr. Chairman, I love being in Congress. It is a place of unbounded personalities and unbounded debate and enthusiasm. But today is the first day that I have been called a henchman and anti-Christian all in the same speech, simply because I believe that in this struggling economy that we should speed tax relief to working families, small businesses, and family farms.

Or perhaps it is because I believe that once we set aside the spending, a historic increase in military spending for defense, once we set aside our commitment to our veterans, our commitment to our seniors, and even our commitment to seniors' health care in Medicare, that what is left behind, Mr. Chairman, I suppose I earn those monikers because I believe that we could find one penny out of all of the remaining spending in waste, fraud, and abuse.

I come from a heartland district that serves most of eastern Indiana here in Washington, D.C. One of the maxims that we Hoosiers have endorsed since a Californian rode to the White House on that message in 1980 was that government is too big and it spends too much.

I believe the overwhelming majority of the American people believe that today, from the storied days of the Grace Commission to the present moment, the Republican vision of government has not been a vision of hardship for families or cuts in education. The truth of it has been about meeting our public obligations while sharpening our pencils and trying to serve the interests of taxpayers in the long term.

Those who doubt that the provisions of the Republican budget that call for the finding of one cent out of every dollar, outside defense, homeland security, Medicare, and Social Security, cannot happen ought to look at some research on government spending. According to the GAO, the Federal Government right now cannot account for \$17.3 billion that it spent in 2001.

Also, according to the Government Accounting Office, they are currently refusing to certify the government's own accounting books because, in an almost Enron-like statement, they say the bookkeeping is too poor by the Federal Government to do that.

In fact, the Federal Government made nearly \$20 billion in overpayments on contracts, according to their own records. In department after department we find examples, not always through malfeasance and misfeasance, but oftentimes through mistake and

error and sometimes negligence, we find ample evidence of waste and abuse.

The Republican budget is about taking a penny out of a dollar out of those nonessential programs, because government is too big and does spend too much.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would note that there is \$1.8 billion being cut from the Medicaid contributions to the State of Indiana, which I am sure the previous speaker supports.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who knows all too well what it is to fight in a war with real bullets, unlike the White House and the current Republican administration.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) for giving me this opportunity to address the House in probably the saddest day that I have had in my career, to be a Member of Congress and to not be able to respond to my constituents, and indeed, to so many people in our great Nation, as to how we find ourselves in the situation we do today.

What is even more remarkable is how we can debate putting together a budget and say that we have to wait until the war gets started good or the war is over, and then we will be able to come back and fit it into the budget. It is almost like saying that we would like to give prescription drugs and hospital assistance, but we do not know how many people are going to be sick. We would like to give prisons and cops and security, but we really do not know how many people are going to commit crimes, so wait until it is all over and then trust us, we will come back.

Another problem that I have today is that so many of my colleagues find it very, very difficult to understand that we come together in our hearts, and wanting to make certain that no young person that is in our military today will ever have any reason to challenge that this United States Congress appreciates them for their dedication, their loyalty, and that we are prepared to do anything and everything that we can for them to have the security in knowing that we are all Americans together and nothing, not Republicans and not Democrats, not liberals and not conservatives, is going to breach this bond that we have a constitutional and moral right to have.

I have been involved in a lot of debates as to when American troops should be introduced into harm's way. I was not here when they went into the Dominican Republic. God knows I was not here when they went into Korea. I was not even here when they had a vote on the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

I was here and I heard debate on Kosovo. I was here and heard debate on Haiti and the Persian Gulf. We had Democrat and Republican Presidents, and we had serious differences of opinion. Most of the time, at the conclusion of these debates, we praised each other and expressed support that it was intellectually and politically the right thing for the Republic and a great Nation like ours to do. Nobody accused someone of being unpatriotic because they differed with the President, whether he was Republican or Democrat.

Today I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we are not going to challenge each other as to who loves our country and who respects our flag the most; but we concentrate on the fact that those that are placed in harm's way, they do not have the opportunity to debate which war they support or which war they are against. They do not have the opportunity to make the decisions. When the decision is made, they have to go; and we have to be there for them.

I suspect if the gauge of patriotism was gauged not on how many flags we had stuck on your automobiles but, rather, how patriotic we were in wanting to help the troops, that we would be here and we would be coming here saying how many members of our family have we encouraged to join up and to volunteer and to get involved in this thing, not only to bring democracy to Iraq but to bring democracy to the region.

I would suspect that if we were all as patriotic as sometimes I hear the words said, that we would reflect this not only in the budget, but we would be talking about expanded services for our veterans, for our warriors, for those people who would want to expand and join the Reserves and join the National Guard.

I would suspect that if we did not have this attitude that "we will hold your coat, you go ahead and fight," but we were really saying, we appreciate what you are doing, that we would say, "and when you come home we are not going to treat you just as disabled veterans or sick veterans or veterans without homes, we are going to treat you as the heroes that you are for what you have done for us."

I would find it awkward when my veterans come home from Iraq to tell them that what I was really debating on the floor was how much money could we really take out; that I would be saying what we were trying to do on your behalf would be to have a \$1.5 trillion tax cut because we want to stimulate the economy; that what we were doing was trying to cut back a budget, to cut back health care, to cut back housing.

I would find it difficult to explain how the thought of terrorism would have this Congress so petrified that instead of doing the things that we have been sent down here to do, we are cutting back in spending, we are cutting back in taxes, and we are cutting back

in being those things that we are asking people to fight for, that is, a country where everyone has an opportunity to decent health care, a decent education.

I am going to be just as critical of this President as I can; but more than that, I am going to be just as supportive as this Congress allows me to be supporting those programs that allow them to get back home healthy and safe and to be able to be discharged and knowing that we are going to protect those rights.

I hope when that flag goes up we recognize one thing, that no one has a right to say that someone is less patriotic because they did not support every intrusion that a Congress has made or a President has decided of our men and women into a foreign country.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to point out that veterans spending has increased in this majority budget. Discretionary veterans spending goes up by \$1.6 billion, and mandatory spending goes up by \$2.3 billion, about a \$4 billion increase in veterans spending.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I just want to say, when the Republicans took over the Congress in 1995 and became the majority party, they started working on our budgets. Probably since then almost every single Democrat has voted against every single budget, it is fair to say. It is always because of the seniors, it is because of veterans, it is because of the children, it is because of the teachers, because of education, because save the whales, killing baby seals. It does not matter. If they want to vote no, they find good reasons to vote no.

The reality is that despite all the gloom and doom, here is the Medicaid budget under the Republican majority. It has grown by 76 percent. Here is the transportation budget. Under Republican control, it has grown by 76 percent. Here is the veterans benefits. Under Republican control, it has grown by 51 percent.

Why is that important, Mr. Chairman? Because not one Democrat voted for it. Here they are coming down to the floor saying, we are the champions of this, we are the champions of that, yet they have voted against all the budgets that increase the spending.

Here is Medicare. There is a 56 percent under Republican control, an increase. Where are the Democrat votes? They are voting no on every single budget ever since our majority has taken over.

Here comes another budget. We are going to increase some of these very important areas for our seniors, for our national security, for our homeland security, for our troops overseas. Again,

where are the Democrats? It is the same parade we have been seeing nearly 10 years now: voting no, scaring the people back home, scaring the vulnerable members of our society by saying these budgets do horrible things.

The reality is that the budget takes care of the critical needs of our society. It takes care of defense, it takes care of Social Security, it takes care of homeland security, it takes care of unemployment. Yet the Democrats are focused in on the fact that we are asking some very wasteful government bureaucracy to reduce their budgets by one cent, one penny on the dollar.

We do that routinely to Americans back home. As families, as taxpayers, we often have to cut our budget. I find it unbelievable, and only in this town are people suggesting that bureaucracy cannot find one cent on one dollar outside of these very critical areas.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The Committee resumed its sitting.

□ 1630

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who is fighting Republican efforts to cut \$13 billion in Medicaid funds from the State of New York.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) for yielding me the time and for his leadership.

Today is a solemn day, but as Americans focus on our Armed Forces abroad, here at home we face an unprecedented moment in our budget history. Never before has Congress tried to pay for a war and at the same time pass a massive tax cut. This budget also compromises future economic stability because it is so demographically blind.

If we cannot plan to address the debt now, how are we going to keep our promises to the elderly when the baby-boom generation retires? The fiscal policies of the President enacted by the Republican Congress will impose a massive deficit burden on our children and our grandchildren.

In 2000 we had not only eliminated the deficit, President Bush inherited a surplus of over \$230 billion a year, but now the projected deficit is over \$300 billion for this year alone, and at the

close of fiscal year 2002, the government debt stood at \$6.2 trillion.

The President's own numbers show that were we to enact his programs as proposed, we would grow this debt by \$2.1 trillion from 2002 to 2011, and that is before we begin to account for the war. And we know that former economic adviser to the President, Lawrence Lindsey, estimated the war would cost over \$100 billion.

We have learned that we cannot have guns and butter without negatively affecting the economy, yet the Republican budget pushes ahead with a massive long-term tax cut before we finance the war.

At the same time, they grow the deficit, the Republican budget manages to cut vital programs, including health care, Medicare, Medicaid, housing, school lunches and veterans' benefits. The impact of these Federal cuts will be magnified by the States where budgets are unbalanced, forcing additional reductions in services and local tax increases.

The Republican budget does absolutely nothing to help the States. The Democratic budget does. This irresponsible budget has long-term consequences. I disagree with the administration. Deficits do matter. Over time, the debt will lower economic growth and increase interest rates. The effect will be a hidden tax increase on our constituents in the form of higher interest rates on mortgages, credit cards and car loans.

I urge a no vote on the Republican budget and a yes vote on the responsible Democratic budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM).

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Chairman, we have been through this budget process, and I serve on the Committee on the Budget, and we have worked through a very deliberative process where there can be legitimate disagreement over how we fund these priorities, but the bottom line is this.

This country has suffered a national emergency through September 11. We are engaged in war at this time, and we have come out of a recession that has put tremendous pressures on our revenues, but there are some in this Chamber who think that Washington should be exempt from belt-tightening when every school board, every municipality, every State in America is going through the same process. Just because we print the money does not mean that we should not have to find savings.

There are people on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, who want to work towards a responsible way to save Social Security, to save Medicare. As a young Member of this Congress, I believe we have to think beyond the next election and beyond the next budget to do those kinds of things, but if we cannot find 1 percent savings, then we will never, ever be able to tell the American people that we can take the giant leaps to reform those huge programs.

The gentleman managing the floor for the other side on this debate has labeled some of us in this Chamber as henchmen for supporting our President's crusade to liberate Iraq. He has accused the President of ordering the assassination of Saddam Hussein to cover up for the fact that we have yet to find bin Laden, although we have disrupted al Qaeda. I resent that, Mr. Speaker, and I think that he should take his tongue-in-cheek tirade back to Baghdad where some of his colleagues have trod in the past. It is unacceptable when our young men and women are at war to have those kinds of character assassinations. To label Members of this body as henchmen, to go after the character of our President who has led this Nation through so much, goes above and beyond legitimate disagreement over the priorities that this budget should have, and it is unacceptable, and it should not stand.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I think the previous speaker was a little confused.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) who has been to Baghdad recently and has also served in the military, but also recognizes that the State of Washington is going to lose \$1.7 billion in Medicaid funds if this budget were to pass.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

When the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) heard I was coming over here, he said, are you bringing your walnut shells? Are we playing the shell game again over here? I said, no, I have got a new thing that came from the White House. It is a rubber stamp. It says "official rubber stamp." I approve of everything George Bush does.

Now that is what we have on here on the floor. You are not henchmen. You are just a rubber-stamp bunch.

What is awesome about this day is we are going to war. Maybe that message we just got in here was the war message, I do not know, from the President, but Iraq is a country where 60 percent of the people get their food through the Oil-for-Food Program. We have now told the United Nations take their people out, there is no longer any way to feed 60 percent of the 24 million people in Iraq.

They are your responsibility now. You have taken that on by saying, we are going to bring you democracy. Democracy is a pretty empty thing if you have got an empty stomach. So you are going to have to come up with some money to pay for the food program. There is not one thin dime in here.

My colleagues know that the Lord Jesus Christ went up on the Sermon on the Mount there, and he gave this sermon and said that you should feed the poor. That is in Matthew, Matthew 26, I believe, and my colleagues all know that. All good Christians know that. We are all Christians in this country, are we not? We ought to have some

money in here figuring out how we are going to pay for those people.

It is not just the Iraqis that are going to be in trouble. In Eritrea, the world food program will be out in 2 months. Burundi has enough for another 4 weeks. The beans are gone in Liberia, and by the end of May they will have no cereal. There are 1,000 refugees in Guinea with nothing after August 10.

This is a budget where we put 400- and I do not know how many billions of dollars into the defense budget, but there is not a thin dime in here for the people of Iraq. We are saying, oh, we are bringing in democracy, oh, yes. Those people in Afghanistan learned about our democracy. The first year we did not authorize anything. Then we coughed up \$300 million after a while. The U.N. said they needed \$10 billion. We put in \$300 million. The next year we are about \$270- or \$290-, and we refused to make any long-term commitments. This is a country where we spent \$4.5 billion bombing them, and we can only come up with \$300 million a year to rebuild them. Tell me how the Sermon on the Mount figures into that. Do my colleagues think that is what Jesus would want us to be doing?

The fact is that the President of Afghanistan came over here, Karzai. He went to the White House very shortly ago, last week or the week before, begging for money because he is broke. We gave him \$50 million in OPEC money, but said, by the way, \$35 million has to go to build a hotel.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure how to respond to all that other than just to say I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his leadership. I commend him for taking on the task of restraining spending and making certain that we move back to fiscal responsibility.

With the war on terrorism and our struggling economy, our projected budget deficits are staggering. Throughout our country, State, local, community governments and businesses are cutting their budgets to respond to declining revenues. Americans expect us to do the same.

Only the Federal Government tries to put together a budget where it looks to see how much it is going to spend first and then looks to revenues, and to some Members of this body the Federal Government can never spend enough.

This budget asked certain Federal agencies to find 1 percent in savings in waste, fraud and abuse and efficiencies. It is amazing today that we would have a discussion over an argument over 1 penny in a dollar. There is not an agency in our government, there is not an organization that we have that cannot find 1 percent in waste and efficiency even in good times. In the times that we are in, it is certainly essential that we put forth the effort.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire of the Chair how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has 17½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire of the distinguished gentleman how many speakers he has?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. We have enough speakers to fill up the time. Would the gentleman like us to catch up?

Mr. STARK. Sure.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the majority budget resolution. Some critics across the aisle believe that the only answer to our Nation's challenges is to take a larger slice of the family income pie. This budget works to increase the size of that pie by growing the economy.

At a time of war, it is irresponsible to do anything else, but to get economic growth, to get better jobs, to get better wages, to get families and small businesses to risk their time and their savings on that new software idea, that transmission repair shop, they must have tax relief, and they need real and permanent tax relief.

Our plan does just that. The Democrat plan, more taxes, more waste, more fraud, more spending, more big government.

Mr. Chairman, it is not just faith that we have, but historical evidence that tax relief works. When President Reagan lowered tax rates in the 1980s, real economic growth averaged 3.2 percent a year, and Federal revenues actually increased, increased by 20 percent. President Kennedy reduced tax rates in the 1960s, and we experienced several years of 5 percent economic growth. The same is true of tax relief in the 1920s.

Some of the colleagues across the aisle criticize this budget because they do not believe it grows government fast enough. This budget is growing the government by 3 percent, almost twice the rate of inflation, but more importantly, it helps American families pay for their programs.

Forty-six million married couples would keep \$1,700 more of what they earn. That is enough to pay two mortgage payments. That is a housing program. Thirty-four million families with children would keep an additional \$1,500, enough to purchase a personal computer. That is an education program. Six million single mothers would keep \$541, enough to purchase a month of day care. That is a child care program.

Mr. Chairman, contrary to what our colleagues across the aisle believe with

their budget, we cannot tax our way into prosperity. We cannot spend our way into prosperity. We cannot sue our way into prosperity. We can only grow our way into prosperity.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I would like to tell my colleagues on actually both sides of the aisle that none of us are rubber stamps over here. We are actual human beings and Members of Congress. We do not rubber-stamp what the President wants or does not want us to do.

I would also like to say to my colleagues, and, if I may, to the people of Iraq, we will stay with you to not only feed you in the interim.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair would remind all Members that remarks are to be addressed to the Chair.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, to give a man a fish, he eats a day. To teach a man how to fish, he will eat for the rest of his life, and the oil in Iraq will be used to improve the quality of life for people in Iraq.

□ 1645

Mr. Chairman, this has been one of the best, well-planned operations in the history of the world. It has been open for debate for months and months and months; and, yes, we support our troops in Iraq. The United States Government's major role is to defend this country, but also to ensure that those in need are taken care of: those that are hungry, the sick, the infirm, the homeless, and the children. And what is the government's role as far as the economy is concerned? The government's role as far as the economy is to create a structure that stimulates economic productivity in the private sector. Support the resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, if the enemies of America had a plan to slowly undermine our country and sap our economic vitality, I think it might look a lot like the plan that underlies this resolution. With bombs dropping, missiles flying, and America's brave sons and daughters in the desert preparing to march against the tyrant, Saddam Hussein, the Republican leadership buries its head in the sand, offering a budget that does not even include the costs of this war or the rebuilding and occupation, which may go on for decades, in a land as volatile as the oil beneath it.

I spent more on a cup of coffee this morning than the Republicans have included in this budget for the war—a war that every American is watching and praying about and that is unfolding as we speak.

Of course, the last Republican to estimate the cost of war, the President's top economic adviser, Lawrence Lindsey, was fired for his efforts, even though he gave a low-ball figure of a mere \$200 billion. This represents part of a deliberate strategy by this Administration to hide from the American people the true cost in blood, money, and insecurity of its reckless, new, preemptive-strike policy.

The deliberate choice to ignore the war in this budget is similar to the President's decision to ignore the last war in the budget he just proposed to us. He forgot to include any money for Afghanistan this year, absolutely nothing. Yesterday's priority and headlines, are today's forgotten footnotes.

It is not that the Republican leadership is intentionally harming our people. It is just that they are so blinded by their rigid ideology and lack of new ideas that all they can offer our people in this hour of need is more tax breaks for the few. How else can we explain the recent declaration of the Republican leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), that "nothing is more important in the face of war than cutting taxes."

Today with so many staring death right in the face, is there really nothing more important than cutting taxes?

While our Defense Secretary may deride our traditional allies as "old Europe," some of us yearn for the old America, an America that when it confronted war understood the importance of shared sacrifice from all of our people, that did not say to some, go risk your life in defense of our country, and to the rest, you risk having to get a bigger pocketbook for more tax breaks; an America that did not say, we will borrow all of the money from those who pour in their Social Security and Medicare tax dollars, we will borrow from them in order to grant tax breaks to a few.

This is a Republican leadership that is AWOL on observing the duty to pay for America's needs. It is our children who will suffer from it.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Chairman, today of all days, there is no greater priority than protecting Americans, supporting our troops, and supporting our Commander in Chief. In the face of unprecedented threats to our domestic and international security, this wartime budget ensures that we can win the war on terrorism, and at the same time it protects our homeland from future challenges by providing for the new Department of Homeland Security.

It also strengthens our economic security. By leaving more money in the hands of the people who earn it, we encourage Americans to invest in their families and communities, to create jobs and grow the economy.

Finally, this budget also continues our commitment to our seniors by providing for a prescription drug benefit.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution will defend our Nation. It will grow our economy. It will protect our seniors, and it will place our Nation's budget back on the path of balance. I urge this House to pass this budget resolution.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I find it very surprising that the leaders of the House would schedule this important national debate today during the first 24 hours of the Nation's war against Iraq. We should be standing in respectful solidarity with the brave men and women carrying out this very difficult and dangerous assignment in Iraq.

Yet the budget before us presents two features that leap out as nothing less than bizarre given the military action under way. First, nowhere in the budget is there any cost provided for the waging of this war or the U.S. taxpayer dollars that will be spent in Iraq when we have prevailed, spent to safeguard the democratic transformation of Iraq, spent to safeguard the welfare of the Iraqi people. What will it cost? \$100 billion, \$110 billion, \$120 billion. Nobody knows. We cannot know on the first day of military action, but we all know it is not going to be cheap. It will cost, and it will cost a lot. Yet the budget plan before us which runs deficits for the next 10 years does not reserve a penny for these costs.

The second aspect of this budget is even worse in light of the mission under way in Iraq. \$28 billion is cut over the next 10 years from the budget of veterans affairs. The ultimate impact will be reduce veterans health care services, force cuts in disability benefits for those permanently disabled while serving our Nation's military. Today we have young men and women with their lives on the line. It is wrong, absolutely wrong to cut the health benefits and the disability benefits of those that have served our Nation in the military.

Later today this House is going to consider a resolution of words supporting our troops. Support of words will not provide the health care our veterans need, fund the disability checks of those forced to live with the wounds of battle. Resolutions of support offered while imposing cutbacks in veterans benefits and disability benefits ring hollow, indeed, and, in fact, represent the most hypocritical act I have seen while serving in this Congress. Our Nation's troops deserve so much better. Reject those veterans cuts; reject this budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out, the veterans budget increases in this budget. The discretionary budget increases by 6 percent; the mandatory budget increases by 7 percent. We increase veterans spending in this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) mentioned Jesus Christ in this budget, and I kind of think Jesus Christ would have liked it. In our house we always had a saying, if 10 percent was good enough for God, 10 percent ought to be good enough for the budget; and this budget is going to save millions of Americans billions of dollars over the next 10 years because it puts in place a new, lower 10 percent rate, and that is a good thing when we leave money in the pockets of American taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this budget and am pleased that it includes funding for tax relief by the President. Implementation of the President's economic growth package would create thousands of jobs and reduce taxes for 1.7 million Tennessee taxpayers, many of who are family and small business owners. Indeed, it is important to note without enacting this package, an additional 1.4 million taxpayers will have to pay the alternative minimum tax. This tax was originally enacted in the 1960s to preserve fairness in the code; but over the last 10 years, this tax has started to affect many middle-class families. Over the next 10 years, these families would have to pay more than \$37 billion in extra taxes. I am sure they will not think that is fair, and I am sure they will not be happy with the other side of the aisle who are blocking reform because they do not think we can save even a penny on a dollar of waste, fraud, and abuse in this budget.

The President's growth package raises the exemption level of the AMT to save these taxpayers from these additional costs. Mr. Chairman, I know this House wants to provide tax relief to the families of America, especially in this time of economic uncertainty.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the President and the majority have put us on a budgetary equivalent of automatic pilot. No matter what the Nation faces in emergencies, wars and ups and downs of the economic cycle, only tax cuts for the rich remain stable.

Denials and delusions have taken over the majority. They now tell us that the Bush tax cuts are the only thing that saved us from a worst economy. That must be magic then, because the tax cuts have not gone into effect, only the rebate has and that ought to be called the Democratic tax cut.

This budget cheats each and every other American except wealthy Americans. The only people who have sacrificed for this country since September 10, 2001, were those who died in New York and the Pentagon and those who are now serving as Reservists abroad.

Mr. Chairman, we have to show that we can do more than what this administration has done for the last 2 years, which is to give us 2.5 million jobs lost. We must not approve a budget where the only sacred cows are not citizens, seniors or children, but tax cuts for the wealthy. Vote for the Democratic alternative.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this hour of debate is dedicated to the Joint Economic Committee to talk about the economy, so I would like to spend a few moments to do just that.

Our economy is in trouble. Just in the last month of February, we lost 308,000 jobs. That is one of the sharpest drops in recent history. The unemployment rate at this time stands at 5.8 percent. While this is relatively low by historical standards, it is high by recent history. Unemployment was only 4 percent as recently as the year 2000.

□ 1700

Mr. Chairman, there are three parts of our economy by definition, consumption, investment and government spending. Consumption is relatively high in this country: retail sales, new refinancings on homes, car purchasing. It is why our economy grew at 2.75 percentage points last year. Government spending, even though you would not hear it from the other side, is at an all-time high. Investment on the other hand, Mr. Chairman, has declined in this economy. In fact, investment spending in this economy has declined for eight consecutive quarters, for 2 years.

What are we going to do about it? That is an important question, and that is a question that is addressed and answered in this budget.

Mr. Chairman, there are two schools of thought here in Washington. One school of thought we are seeing on the other side of the aisle is that we just need to spend more money, and that way we will grow the economy. Let me review that for a moment here with this chart, and let me explain why more government spending does not create jobs.

Number one, to spend a dollar the government first must tax or borrow that dollar from an individual or business. Second, that individual or business now has 1 less dollar to spend or invest. Third, the government then spends that dollar. But, fourth, there is no net effect in economic activity. Government spending goes up by a buck, personal private spending goes down by a buck.

What is the alternative vision to that, Mr. Chairman? The alternative vision is to create jobs and promote economic growth by reducing taxes. How does that happen? How does this work? Number one, the higher taxes are, the less incentive there is to work or invest. It is an economic principle that economists from the left and the

right agree upon. For example, an individual will invest more money when their after-tax income on each dollar invested is 80 cents than they would likely invest if their after-tax income is 50 cents. Put another way, if half of your money goes to taxes, you have less of an incentive to work and invest. If more of your money goes into your own pocket, you have a higher incentive effect to work and invest. More investment means more capital to expand, create businesses and to grow jobs. So new and expanded businesses means new jobs. That is why the net effect of reducing taxes in this budget will create jobs.

What kind of tax cuts are we talking about? How many new jobs are we looking at? To give you a quick preview of what Americans are looking at in the President's economic growth package, in the economic growth package that is accommodated in this budget, it is basically this. Under the President's proposal to speed up tax relief, 92 million American taxpayers would receive, on average, tax cuts of over \$1,000 in this year alone. Forty-six million married couples would receive an average tax cut of \$1,716. Thirty-four million families with children would benefit from an average tax cut of \$1,473. Six million single women with children would receive an average tax cut of \$541. Thirteen million elderly taxpayers would receive an average tax cut of \$1,384. Twenty-three million small business owners would receive tax cuts averaging \$2,042. For example, a typical family of four with two income earners earning a combined \$39,000 in income would receive a total of \$1,100 in tax relief and would wipe out their Federal tax liability.

Mr. Chairman, how many jobs is this going to create? This is something that has been a topic of discussion for quite a while this year, and there are a lot of estimates on this point. According to conservative estimates by the Council of Economic Advisers, this plan will generate 2.1 million jobs over the next 3 years. According to other estimates, like the Business Roundtable, they put that figure at about 3 million new jobs at the end of the year. Macroeconomic Policy Advisers from St. Louis estimates that this economic growth package would increase new jobs, create brand new jobs, to the tune of 2 million new jobs by the end of 2004.

This is what it is all about, Mr. Chairman. The reason we went into deficit is because people went from working and paying taxes to getting laid off and collecting unemployment. Sixty-eight percent of the loss of the surplus that occurred last year alone occurred because of this. We realize more spending is necessary to fight the war on terrorism, to win the war in Iraq, but we also realize that if we can get people back to work, the most moral economic policy is getting a person a job. It is becoming good economic policy, it is good fiscal policy, because if a person has a job, they are paying

taxes, and they are bringing more money to the Federal Government.

An issue that often comes around when we are talking about the tax bill is dividends. I would like to shed some light on why we are trying to repeal the double taxation of dividends. It is no secret if you go around this country and talk to manufacturers, talk to farmers, talk to small business men and women, that we are in global competition, that we are under pressure from trade from China, from Mexico, from other areas. One area where our Nation is so uncompetitive is in the area of taxes. When you take a look at how dividends are taxed, it is done basically like this. First a company makes money, and then it pays taxes on that money. Then if it wants to share its earnings with its owners, its shareholders, it passes that on to its shareholders in the form of a dividend. But in this country, that dividend gets taxed again. And so we have double taxation on dividends, which actually looks at about 60 to 70 percent of every dollar moving through our economy.

To put it another way, Mr. Chairman, we tax dividend income higher than any other industrialized country in the world except for Japan. Looking at this chart here, which shows us basically a list of all the industrialized countries in the world, the United States of America taxes dividend income more than any other country except for Japan. I would not want to be Japan because they are entering their second decade of recession right now.

What is accomplished by repealing the double taxation on dividends? Who benefits? This is a discussion that we have heard a lot. Mostly who benefits by repealing the double taxation on dividends are senior citizens. Half of all Americans who receive dividend income are senior citizens, and half of all seniors in America receive dividends. But more than just that. The people who own stocks, half of all households in America own shares in the stock market. People who have pension plans, people who have 401(k) plans, people who have IRAs will benefit from this because by repealing the double tax on dividends, you are increasing the after-tax rate of return on investment. What that means is you are increasing the value of all equities in the stock market. This is why economists from all over the spectrum, liberal and conservative, are telling us that if we repeal the double tax on dividends, we will increase the value of the stock market by anywhere from 7 to 20 percent. Imagine that, a 20 percent increase in the value of stock markets.

Mr. Chairman, we all heard the stories about seniors who have seen their savings portfolio wiped out by the losses in the stock market that have occurred over the last year or two. We have seen the stories where pensioners, where people getting close to retirement have seen their retirement go away to the point they have to go back to work or work longer than they had

planned. If we can do something that would actually improve the value of people's pension funds, IRAs, the stock market, that would be a good thing, I would think.

And so, Mr. Chairman, that is why it is important to do this kind of economic policy. If we repeal the double tax on dividends, not only will we help senior citizens, not only will we help revive the stock market, not only will we help get people their jobs back and grow the economy, but we will also help restore good corporate governance to our Nation's corporations.

One of the reasons why the stock market declined so much in this past year is because of all that corporate malfeasance that occurred. One of the reasons why we have bad decision-making in America's boardrooms is because in our Tax Code is an incentive to actually grow your corporation through borrowing, through debt financing, rather than honestly through equity growth. What I mean when I say that is we give companies a tax break if they borrow and borrow and borrow to grow their companies. And when we go into tough times, like a recession, what happens is these companies go bankrupt. That is one of the reasons why WorldCom, Global Crossing and all of these companies went bankrupt. But if we give companies an incentive to share the wealth with their shareholders, to grow their companies honestly through equity, we can strike a blow for good corporate governance.

For many reasons, this is why this economic growth plan makes sense. The most important reason, Mr. Chairman, why we are trying to pass this budget is, number one, protect our priorities, win the war on terrorism, win the war in Iraq, and get people their jobs back. The best way to get this economy growing is to let people keep more of what they earn and allow businesses to keep more of what they make.

One of the other great provisions in this tax bill is the fact that we lower the small business tax rate down to the level of large corporations. What we do not see that is being offered later in the budgets that are the alternative budgets, the Blue Dog budget, the Spratt budget, is that they raise taxes. They actually raise taxes on small businesses. What we are doing here is recognizing the fact that today, this very day, we are taxing small busi-

nesses at a higher tax rate than we tax large corporations in America. And so what we are simply trying to do is lower the tax rates on small businesses, not below the tax rate that large corporations pay, but down to the tax rate that large corporations pay.

I urge a "yes" vote on this budget, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), who understands that Michigan is going to lose almost \$3 billion in funds for SCHIP and Medicaid under the Republican budget.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the siren song again, but let us look at the facts. First of all, as to veterans, this is undeniable, and I want to read it: The reconciliation instructions in the Republican plan require \$14.6 billion in unspecified reductions in veterans' benefits. This \$14.6 billion cut represents a cut of 3.8 percent in mandatory spending below the levels in current law, and we are doing this on this day.

Secondly, as to the income figures, for families with incomes below \$75,000, they are not going to receive this big boon as stated in terms of the dividend tax cut. They will receive an average tax benefit of \$42. And for the families that are in the middle 20 percent, the average is not in the thousands under the tax cut of the Republicans, but only \$246.

So what has happened here? A party that once said they had the mantle of fiscal responsibility, they are sacrificing that on the altar of irresponsible tax cuts; deficits not as far as the eye can see, but further than the eye can see. In the long run, all will be hurt except the very wealthy as interest rates go up, and, therefore, it impacts on our houses and our cars and everything we buy; in the short run, kids and their education, veterans, as I mentioned, people who need health care, and all of us who need homeland security.

This is an irresponsible budget and digs a deeper and deeper hole of deficits. We have some sound alternatives. Let us vote for them.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). The gentleman from Cali-

fornia (Mr. STARK) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, before I yield a final minute to the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, I would like to use part of my 30 seconds to just suggest to the Chair and thank him for his kind and considerate presiding this afternoon. I know that could only come from a gentleman with whom I served, John Duncan, Sr., for many years the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means. I always say that fruit does not fall very far from the tree. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am going to leave it to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) with the remaining time to discuss again the tax cut. It is too bad we do not talk more about 42 million uninsured Americans and children without education and the things that are being buried by this recent war talk.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is recognized for 1 minute.

(Mr. SPRATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, quickly let me commend to the gentleman's reading an excellent piece of work done by the Joint Economic Committee staff called an Economic Policy Brief, and in particular to page 8, because if you will turn here, we will see that the JEC staff have run these same numbers through several established mathematical economic models, including two that are used prominently by the White House.

According to these models, the Democratic alternative will add 1.6 percentage points to GDP growth in 2003. The Bush alternative, at six times the cost, would yield 1.1 percent growth.

Our proposal would yield or generate 1,122,000 jobs. Theirs, at six times the cost, would generate 600,000 jobs.

If you go down to economy.com, you will find the same results. Our proposal generates, according to their model, 1,150,000 jobs for a \$138 billion impact this year; theirs, for \$726 billion, generates 640,000 jobs.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings.

Today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *108th* CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2003

No. 45

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN E. SUNUNU, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Rev. Charles V. Antonicelli, St. Joseph's Church on Capitol Hill, Washington, DC.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Lord God of power and might, we praise You this day for the life You have given us.

In these difficult days we ask for Your guidance and protection, dear Lord. In a special way, we ask You to protect the men and women of our Armed Forces. Keep them safe from harm and return them to us safely.

In the words of Psalm 40 we pray, "Lord, graciously rescue me! Come quickly to help me, Lord! Put to shame and confound all who seek to take my life. Turn back in disgrace those who desire my ruin. But may all who seek You rejoice and be glad in You."

Heavenly Father, we ask Your blessing on the women and men of this Senate as they are called upon to make difficult decisions which affect many lives. Grant them Your wisdom and compassion.

We ask this in Your holy name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JOHN E. SUNUNU led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 20, 2003.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, section 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN E. SUNUNU, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TED STEVENS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. JOHN E. SUNUNU thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 23, the concurrent budget resolution this morning, with a total of 14½ hours left for debate on the resolution, 6½ hours remaining under the control of the chairman of the Budget Committee and 8 hours remaining under the control of the ranking member.

In view of the military action taking place in Iraq, the Senate will consider today a resolution of support for President Bush and the troops. The final wording on the resolution itself is being worked out by Members on both sides of the aisle.

I had an opportunity to talk to the majority leader a few minutes ago and we discussed the wording of the resolution. By late this morning or early afternoon the specific wording will be worked out.

I envision sufficient time for Senators to speak. A number of Senators have expressed their desire to speak in support of our troops, and we will accommodate that. Senators will be ad-

vised as to the time for this discussion and debate as well as when the vote on the resolution of support will take place later this morning or early afternoon after we have had a time for Members on both sides of the aisle to discuss the appropriate timing for that.

Both today and tomorrow will be very busy. We will complete action on the budget resolution this week. In order to provide adequate time for people to both express their support and at the same time finish the budget resolution this week, we will be in very late tonight, and I would assume tomorrow, and late tomorrow night, and possibly go into Saturday. Again, we will finish the budget resolution this week.

There are currently three amendments pending: The Kyl amendment regarding the estate tax, the Durbin amendment regarding a prescription drug benefit, and the Rockefeller and Collins amendment regarding aid to States. Under the previous order, the votes on these amendments will be stacked to occur at 4 o'clock today. Those votes will be the first votes today. There may be other votes stacked as well depending on what amendments are offered over the course of the morning.

We were here late last tonight. Again, I make the appeal that people file their amendments and talk to the chairman and ranking member, the managers of this important piece of legislation, so we can progress within the time elements that have been laid out, the 14½ hours remaining for debate on the resolution.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. FRIST. Yes, indeed.

Mr. NICKLES. I concur with what the leader said and also with my colleagues both from Nevada and North Dakota. I encourage colleagues if they do have amendments to please share those with us. We have three amendments in the queue. We are happy to look at amendments. We may be able

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4043

to accept some amendments. We may want some modifications and may want to have some substitutes. However, I would like to avoid, if possible, the vote-arama. I don't think it makes the Senate look very good. There are 14½ hours remaining on the resolution. I would like people to have a chance to be able to debate their amendment. Even so, I encourage Senators, if they have amendments, let us look at them before they send their amendments to the desk. We want to be able to look at those amendments on both sides. I encourage colleagues on this side, if they have amendments, the Senator from North Dakota is entitled to look at those amendments. But they can have a chance to debate those amendments, have some debate time throughout the day. I expect we will have a lot of votes today and a lot of votes tomorrow. Colleagues should be aware. Also, they should be prepared, if necessary, to stay on Saturday for a lot of votes. I hope and expect we could conclude either very late tonight or sometime tomorrow but, if necessary, on Saturday.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I say to the majority leader, I think it is inappropriate to proceed with business as usual when a war has begun. That sends the wrong message to the country. It is not what the Senate should be doing.

I am the ranking member of the Budget Committee and I would very much, just as the chairman, like to complete work on the budget resolution quickly. But I have to say that I don't think that is the priority at this moment. At this moment, I think the Senate ought to be talking about events that are unfolding half the world away that have our young men and women at risk and that have us engaged in a military conflict that is enormously consequential to the fight of this Nation.

I understand the resolution is not yet ready. So I think for some time this morning we could be on the schedule we agreed to last night. But I think after that time, to just proceed with debating the budget and talking about pay-go and talking about this amendment and that amendment is going to look awfully strange to the American people when our troops are engaged in battle.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we do have a challenge but we have a challenge to pay appropriate respect for our troops and that is the purpose of having a resolution, which is a joint resolution, for which I pray and hope we have 100-percent support.

During debate on that resolution, I want to give everyone the opportunity to express that support, although I will also say whatever happens over the next several days, and it is likely to go on through next week, there will be ample opportunity, I believe—and I will make ample opportunity over the ensuing weeks—for people to express support.

We have a challenge now that we will finish the budget resolution this week. So we have the budget resolution and we will have this resolution of support and we will be able to do both. I think the budget is very important—how all taxpayer dollars are spent for military, for defense, for homeland security, for education, for health care. That is our responsibility. We have people listening right now, people are at work, working in convenience stores, they are working in banks, they are showing up for work, and there are reporters outside. The Nation's business must keep going.

Our responsibility as Senators is to develop a budget that gives some priorities. We have done a good job to date. To walk away from that responsibility at this point is simply irresponsible. That is why, as majority leader, I say we are going to stay here and we are going to do the Nation's business. That is our responsibility and you will see that fulfilled. We do have the challenge of being able to do both.

I look forward to working with the minority leader and the managers of this particular bill to be able to accomplish that. I am confident we will be able to do that. We have been working on the resolution in support of our troops for several days with the minority leader's staff. We have made real progress. It expresses strong support, I believe, and the sense of this body. We will look forward, hopefully this afternoon, to bringing that to the floor and being able to give that opportunity for people to speak.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 23, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

Pending:

Kyl modified amendment No. 288, to provide financial security to family farm and small business owners by ending the unfair practice of taxing someone at death.

Dorgan amendment No. 294, to provide a meaningful prescription drug benefit in Medicare that is available to all beneficiaries.

Rockefeller amendment No. 275, to express the sense of the Senate concerning State fiscal relief.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I would like the attention of the majority lead-

er, if I could, before he leaves the floor, to say to him nobody is suggesting we walk away from our responsibility to do the budget. But the fact is, that does not have to be done today or tomorrow. We have plenty of time before the budget deadline is reached. That is not until the middle of April.

When we talk about responsibility here, we have no higher responsibility than the defense of this Nation. I tell you, the thing that is on the minds of my constituents, the thing that is on the minds of virtually every American, is not the budget resolution. The thing that is on the minds of the American people today is the fact that we have a quarter of a million troops engaged in a battle that is incredibly consequential to this Nation. I wish to register my strong disagreement with business as usual in the Senate when we are at war.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, let me respond and say there is a difference, I believe, in that I believe we express strong support for our troops, for our Commander in Chief especially; that we can do that and at the same time carry on our responsibility. It is a difference in approach. I guess that is why the last Congress, under other leadership, failed to pass a budget. Look where it got us—where the first 40 days of this particular Congress, we had to clean up a process which was left because of that same prioritization, that a budget is not important. We believe that a budget is important, that it prioritizes the needs of defense, of health care, of education. Thus, under this leadership, we are going to proceed with the budget. We are going to pass that budget resolution. We are not going to delay. Now I am beginning to sense a little bit that we want to delay the budget, put it off a week, a month, a year, or maybe into the next Congress. It is simply not going to happen. We are going to proceed. We have 14½ hours on this budget. We are not going to pay respect to the fact that some people say the budget is just not important now. We believe that budget is important.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, there is no suggestion from this Senator that the budget is not important. I believe it is critically important. Harking back to last year has no relevance to this moment. We are at war, and to spend time in the Senate today on something other than that strikes me as wholly inappropriate.

We are not talking about not getting to the budget. Nobody wants a budget resolution, I think, any more than this Senator. I have spent my entire career in the Senate on the Budget Committee. I want a budget resolution. We are at war and here we are talking about pay-go.

Virtually every American is rivetted on what is happening to this Nation on

the brink of conflict. In fact, we are beyond the brink. It started last night. Our President addressed the Nation at 10:15 last night.

I hope there is a reconsideration because this Senator is going to be extraordinarily disappointed in this Chamber if we are conducting business as usual while this Nation is going to war.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. I yield time to Senator REID.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my concern is this: First, understand, I was the first Democrat to break ranks with the majority at that time to support the first President Bush. I voted this time to support President Bush. I have said good things about the President. I have done my very best to work this budget resolution through.

But I would say to my friend and anyone who is listening—the majority leader has left—it appears to me—and I want the Senator from North Dakota to listen to this—it appears to me that maybe there is a rush to go through the budget because maybe people are going to start asking questions about how much this war is costing. There is not a single penny in this budget that deals with the war, not a penny. Do you think that might be one reason for rushing through this budget? Don't you think we should know the cost of the war?

I will bet right now they have prepared, at the White House, a supplemental emergency appropriations bill for tens of billions of dollars. I have heard it is \$100 billion. Yet we are marching through with the tax cuts to satisfy the wealthy of this country. That is what this budget thing is all about. That is why we are going to work Fridays and Saturdays. I am happy to work Friday and Saturday. I will put my credentials up against anyone as far as moving legislation, including this budget bill. But I ask a question to the ranking member of the Budget Committee: Is there one dollar in this budget that reflects the cost of the war that is going on as we speak?

Before I came here, I watched on television an aircraft carrier. Planes were being catapulted off it, then dropping bombs. Do we know how much that costs? Do we know how much the reconstruction of Iraq is going to cost? Is there a penny in this budget that reflects that?

Mr. CONRAD. The Senator asked the question. There is no money. As the Senator knows, there is no money in this budget for the conflict. There is no money in this budget for the occupation. There is no money in this budget for the reconstruction. There is no money in this budget for humanitarian assistance.

But I think there is a larger question. That is, our troops are now engaged. For us to conduct business as

usual here just strikes me as totally and wholly inappropriate.

I am the ranking member of the Budget Committee. I have been there my entire time in the Senate. I am in my 17th year. For us not to be discussing our Nation at war has the priorities all wrong. Yes, the budget is important. Yes, we ought to do a budget resolution. But we have lots of time to accomplish that. We can do that next week. We completed most of the debate on the budget already, but, unfortunately, a big chunk is missing.

If we want to talk about supporting the troops in the field, we ought to do it tangibly by putting dollars in the budget. There aren't any.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONRAD. I yield.

Mr. REID. Is the Senator telling me and anyone within the sound of my voice that in this huge budget that is now before the Senate, that has tax cuts over \$1 trillion over the next 10 years, for the war in Iraq that is now going on there is not a penny of money for the war in this budget?

Mr. CONRAD. There is not a penny. We have been told the reason there is not a penny is that when the budget was done, operations had not commenced. Well, operations have commenced. The President spoke to the Nation last night and made clear that we are at war.

I hope cooler heads are going to prevail. We need to think very carefully about what we do as an institution when we have a quarter of a million Americans' lives on the line.

What should be the discussion in this Chamber? Should it be the pay-go provisions of the budget? Should it be the reconciliation instructions in the budget resolution? Or should it be the question of war and peace? Should it be the question of supporting our troops in the field? Should it be a question of sending a clear message that our country is united behind our forces, no matter what our positions were on the wisdom of engaging in this conflict? That ought to be the priority we discuss.

I must say I think this is an extraordinary moment, that the suggestion is we just have business as usual in the Senate. I find it totally and wholly inappropriate.

Mr. REID. Could I ask the ranking member of the committee another question? The Senator has stated on at least two occasions this morning that there is not 5 cents in this budget to support the troops for the war that is going on in Iraq. Now we have heard statements for months about we are there to free the Iraqi people, and that we are going to supply food and medicine and everything else necessary to take care of the reconstruction of the country of Iraq. The Senator has heard those questions, has he not?

Mr. CONRAD. Yes.

Mr. REID. Would it not seem to the Senator, as it does to me, that in preparation for reconstructing Iraq there

must be some budget numbers floating around down at the White House somewhere? Would you think that is a fair statement?

Mr. CONRAD. We know there are. We know there are estimates of \$65 to \$95 billion.

Mr. REID. Is there one penny in this budget dealing with the reconstruction of Iraq?

Mr. CONRAD. No, there is nothing for reconstruction. There is nothing for the conflict. There is nothing for any part of it.

Let me say this for the Senator, if I could. We have been told a budget request will come next week for that. That is fine. It just seems to me it ought to be part of the budget. It is an odd circumstance to do a budget but leave a big part of the expenditures out of that budget. But what strikes me even more dramatically, much more dramatically than that, is we are not discussing our troops in the field. We are not discussing the fact we have gone to war.

Now, goodness, the budget is important, but it is not the thing that is on the minds of the American people this morning. What is on the minds of the American people this morning is this Chamber sending a signal of support for our forces. They have been ordered to go into harm's way. We have an obligation to send a signal that we back them. Whatever our position is on the wisdom of this course, that is not the point at the moment. The point at the moment ought to be we support our forces in the field. That ought to be the discussion that is going on in this Chamber, not a discussion of pay-go or reconciliation. That is not to say we don't go to the budget quickly and in a timely way. Absolutely. But goodness—

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield.

Mr. CONRAD. Yes.

Mr. REID. The Senator from Nevada has the largest military airplane fighter training facility for the Air Force in the world, Nellis Air Force Base, with 10,000 people stationed there. I have been there. I have talked to the commanding general of this large force. Hundreds and hundreds of people have left Nellis for the Middle East. People have trained there. They have families in Nevada. Their kids go to school in Nevada. Fallon, 400 miles away, is a very large naval air training center, Fallon Naval Air Station. And there it is the same thing—Top Gun is there. Hundreds and hundreds of people from Fallon are now in the Middle East. That aircraft carrier I watched before I came in here—I can almost guarantee you those people taking off in those airplanes were trained at Fallon. They also have children going to school in Churchill County. They also have wives and husbands who are there waiting for their return.

In addition to that, we have a very large ammunition depot at Hawthorne and it has gotten real busy because they are bringing ammunition out of

there, hauling it to the Middle East. In addition to that, we have large Guard and Reserve components. We have over 1,000 Guard and Reserve people who have been called up and are gone. Their families are gone. Some of them don't know how they are going to make the rental payments, their house payments. What I hear from the Senator from North Dakota is that maybe the Senator from Nevada sometime during the day should give a speech talking about the people in Nevada who have sacrificed to protect my freedom, my family's freedom. Is that what the Senator is saying?

Mr. CONRAD. I think if we would look back in the history of this Chamber, when America goes to war, the Senate turns its attention to that fact, that confrontation, and sends a signal of our support for the troops in the field. That is just the most basic, I would say, of values, that that is what we should be talking about. That is what we should be discussing, and the budget we can talk about later. We can talk about it tomorrow or the next day. But today we ought to be talking about what is going on, what is on the minds of the American people.

I urge my colleagues—I know the leader indicated we would go to a resolution at some point today. That is fine. I would just hope we would go to morning business so people could have a chance to discuss their feelings about our troops in the field.

The Senator has indicated he has large bases in his State. I have large bases in mine. Minot Air Force Base, home to our B-52s, one of just two B-52 bases in the country, Grand Forks Air Force Base, one of the three core tanker bases for the United States, those are the places that are providing the air bridge to Iraq half a world away. We have thousands of troops engaged from North Dakota. We have large components of our National Guard which have been called up as well.

I tell you, I just don't feel comfortable, honestly, talking about the budget on this day at this moment.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CONRAD. The Senator from New York is here. He has an amendment that is relevant to the question, the matter of homeland security. I will yield—how much time does the Senator seek?

Mr. SCHUMER. I would say 30 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 299

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be set aside and I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 299.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be considered as read.

Mr. NICKLES. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Yes.

Mr. NICKLES. I object.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend, he has been told not to offer the amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. I could not hear the Senator.

Mr. REID. There was no one from the majority on the floor when the Senator offered his amendment.

Mr. NICKLES. For the information of my colleague from New York, we would be happy to have—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, for the information of our colleague, it takes unanimous consent. We have amendments that are pending, so we have to set those amendments aside. We wish to review amendments before we do that. I am happy to have my colleague from New York begin discussing his amendment. We will review the amendment at some point. I am sure we will be happy to have the amendment sent to the desk—just not yet.

Mr. SCHUMER. Then I would imagine that we just—the chairman of the Budget Committee was off the floor. We had gotten unanimous consent to put this amendment forward. I take it we should just speak on the amendment.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I do not believe the amendment should be pending.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment has been laid down.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask unanimous consent the amendment be withdrawn.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. I say to my colleague from New York again, just to make sure we understand, we are trying to respect each other as far as management of the bill. I will be happy to work with the Senator on the amendment. I thank my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Chair. This amendment is relevant, of course, to our new circumstances since last night, but I would just want to address my colleagues in the Senate on the circumstances of last night for a few minutes before getting to the amendment, because the President spoke to the

American people. He said hostilities are commenced.

I would just leave three thoughts as we begin on the era of this war. First is a prayer.

First, Mr. President, as I listened to the chaplain from St. Joseph's give the prayer and we said the pledge, I think every one of us who was here felt a renewed depth and meaning to both the prayer and the pledge, given the times we are in.

I would like to just add my prayer. My prayer is a simple one: It is that our military action is swift and decisive, with a minimum of casualties, both military and civilian. And my prayer, of course, goes to the soldiers, first and foremost, who are now in the Iraqi theater. They are continuing a grand American tradition, a tradition where civilians have laid down their jobs and then defended this country when the Commander in Chief thought they should.

I have been to several of the debarkation ceremonies at Fort Drum and Canandaigua, on Long Island, as soldiers have boarded planes to go over to the Middle East. Because so many of our soldiers are now reservists and Army National Guard, they are a little older. They are every bit as trained and seasoned as the enlisted men and women, and I know our generals have complete confidence in them, as I do.

But you see them with their families—not only with their parents, whom we have always seen with our soldiers, but in much greater frequency with their husbands and wives and their children. And we know the butterflies that are in all the stomachs as they prepare to leave. I look in their faces as they leave, and I am humbled and proud of them. My prayers are with them. We all pray for them.

Again, we pray that the military action is swift and decisive and there be very few casualties, both military and civilian. The military, of course, I have spoken of. But I pray there are few civilian casualties. The war we are waging is not a war against the Iraqi people. It is a war aimed at the leadership of Iraq. The average Iraqi citizens—a husband or a wife, a mother or a father, a child, a son or a daughter—have the same loves and cares and worries in many ways that all the rest of the citizens of the world have. We pray that the number of casualties among the civilians is small.

So that is the prayer of which the guest Chaplain from St. Peter's reminded me.

Then we said the pledge to the flag. Our flag is a flag of unity. Now is the time for unity, for all of us to back our soldiers. There have been many different views held, with great passion, on what we should do in Iraq; there is no question about that. Every one of us here, on both sides of the aisle, might have scripted things differently. I, for one, have said I hoped we could get more international support. But if every one of us just said, "Only our

plan, or nothing," we would be paralyzed. I believe Saddam Hussein has to be disarmed and removed from power. That is why I supported the President in his resolution. Now I believe is a time for unity. Now is a time for us to be backing up our troops. Now is a time that the President becomes Commander in Chief and that unity is called for.

I just add one caveat: Freedom is what we are fighting for. Not everyone will feel the call for unity that I think is incumbent upon all of us in this body as leaders of this country, and some will continue to dissent. I hope we respect that dissent. In my State, there are many people whose views are heartfelt. They are different from mine. They are different from yours. They are probably different from the views of most of us in this Chamber. And the right to dissent is what we are fighting for. It is part of this tradition. I hope we are mindful of that, as well.

Then one other thought. As I said, I pray that the military action is swift and decisive and that our victory comes quickly. Let us hope we can sow a wise peace in Iraq as well. Let us hope there can be a democratic Iraq despite the fact there are so many ethnic divisions. Let us hope we can bring democracy to the Middle East, a place starved for freedom, a place starved for individual choice, a place starved for prosperity.

Let us hope the people of the Middle East, the Iraqi people, like everyone else, want to bring stability and a good life to them and their families. The beauty of a democracy is that you can strive to help your family and help yourself and at the same time you help the whole country. Unfortunately, the peoples of the Middle East—many of them—have not been fed a diet of food, clothing, and shelter but have been fed a diet of propaganda and hatred, which dictators often use to feed their people when they cannot provide a system of freedom, democratically and economically, that provides food. Let's hope that can change as well.

So, Mr. President, we are in a new era. I realized this in my city from the time 9/11 happened. I put this flag on, on 9/12, in memory of all those who were then missing and the thousands who proved to be lost, gone. I met their families. I just met with some yesterday. I know the holes in their hearts, the sadness, frustration, and anger they feel. But we cannot forget them. We cannot forget what happened.

I will wear this flag, God willing, this very one, every day for the rest of my life to think of them, to remind me that whatever our views here are, we have to do something to stop the scourge of terrorism, which will grow and grow if we do nothing.

Now, on to the amendment I would like to discuss, I realize it is not pending before us, but it is a relevant amendment. I, like my colleague from North Dakota, like my colleague from Nevada, hope we will have a full discus-

sion about supporting our troops and the impending war. I have had an opportunity to express some of my views. I have limited them because I know the leadership wants to move forward, at least at this point, with this amendment. But this amendment at least has some relevance.

The amendment is one that deals with homeland security. It is an amendment that deals, in my judgment at least, with an unfulfilled need in the budget, the need to protect our homeland.

The whole world has changed since 9/11. We know that. We all have different views, again, as to how we ought to adapt to that change, but we cannot just ignore it. I think that is clear. History teaches us that.

One of the things we have to learn and adjust to do is protect our homeland. You cannot win the war on terror, in my opinion, with just an offense; you need a defense. Like any good sports team, like, say, the Syracuse Orangemen, who are playing in the NCAA, you need a good offense and a good defense.

There has been a great deal of focus on the offense. I do not think there has been enough focus on the defense because terrorists, unfortunately, are going to be with us for a while. The new technology that has blessed our lives and changed our country, that has created a lot of the prosperity we have seen in the last few decades, has an evil underside, and that is that small groups of bad people can use that technology to do huge damage in our homeland, damage we never imagined could be done until 2 years ago. That fact is going to be with us not just for 2 or 3 years, it is going to be with us for decades. And even if, God willing, we were to get rid of al-Qaida, and get rid of Saddam and his cronies who lead Iraq right now, there will be new terrorists who will come up.

We have to protect our homeland. The odds are we will not be able to catch up to every new terrorist group that starts. The sad fact is, you can be in a cave anywhere in this world and if you have a wireless connection to the Internet, you can learn a whole lot about America. Then even a small group united together can do real damage here. So we have to look at every one of our weak pressure points and tighten them up.

You can't just be content to fight a war overseas. To preserve and to protect our country, we must protect it at home. We have to try to think ahead of the terrorists. We have to try to think where they will hit us so that we can prevent that from happening. The list is a long one. There are probably places that no one has even thought of that we are weak in and where we need protection. But we have to do it.

I make one other point. We can't delay. It is a huge undertaking. That is true. The terrorists will look to our weaknesses. That is true. If we strengthen air security, they will look

to rail. If we strengthen rail security, they will look to ports. If we deal with bioterrorism, they will look at cyberterrorism. Because of the information revolution, they have access to everything about America. It is all on the Internet. We will not stop the Internet. So we have to tighten up, and tightening up costs money.

This budget does not acknowledge that reality. That is the fundamental problem. I am honored and privileged to introduce this amendment with my colleague from New York, as well as the help of the ranking member of the Budget Committee, Senator CONRAD, our minority leader Senator DASCHLE, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator BYRD. A large number of our Democratic caucus participated in crafting it.

This budget resolution is the first step, but we are going to continue to fight on the supplemental appropriation that comes up and throughout the year because we believe homeland security is an imperative for America. We believe we have to do something about it, and we can't wait. The horrible feeling that so many of us had on September 12, mostly for the loss and the danger and damage, but also it already came into our minds, what if we had done this, what if we had done that? As we learned more, there were lots more what ifs that were asked. We don't want a second terrorist incident to occur and we are saying "what if" again. This amendment is intended to make the likelihood of those what ifs much lower. It is an attempt to diminish it.

Let me explain what the amendment does. It provides an additional \$88 billion for fiscal years 2003 to 2013 for homeland security over and above the current proposed 2004 budget, including \$5 billion in the immediate 2003 funding for first responders, port, border, and transportation security. That is a limited amount of money, but remember we only have half a year left. We don't want to waste money. We want it spent wisely. We thought this was about the maximum amount in this fiscal year, where everything is just getting started up in homeland security, that people could use.

For 2004, the proposed budget would spend about \$380 billion on defense—I support that, I support our troops—but we are only spending \$37.7 billion on homeland security. We can do better than that. We should do better. I hope this amendment will be a bipartisan one in that regard. It is fully offset, and it provides a little deficit reduction as well.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I am happy to yield to my colleague for the purpose of a question.

Mr. NICKLES. How much of an increase did you have in 2004? I heard \$88 billion over the life of the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. In 2003, it is \$5 billion. In 2004, it is approximately 6.5.

Mr. NICKLES. I have no objection to my colleague sending the amendment to the desk.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be sent to the desk.

Mr. NICKLES. To further clarify for all of our colleagues, we wish to review amendments. That was the problem. I appreciate the cooperation of my colleague.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my friend from Oklahoma. I know that is what he wanted to do. We had brought it to the desk, and I had asked unanimous consent because I thought they had seen it and approved it. I appreciate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER], for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 299.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide immediate assistance to meet pressing homeland security needs by providing funding in 2003 for first responders, port security, bioterrorism preparedness and prevention, border security and transit security, the FBI; to restore the elimination of funding of the COPS program, firefighter equipment grants, Byrne Grants and Local Law enforcement grants; to provide a sustained commitment of resources for homeland security needs without reducing funding to other key domestic law enforcement and public safety priorities; and to reduce the deficit)

On page 3 line 9, increase the amount by \$3,643,000,000.

On page 3 line 10, increase the amount by \$8,681,000,000.

On page 3 line 11, increase the amount by \$13,500,000,000.

On page 3 line 12, increase the amount by \$14,996,000,000.

On page 3 line 13, increase the amount by \$15,892,000,000.

On page 3 line 14, increase the amount by \$16,602,000,000.

On page 3 line 15, increase the amount by \$16,769,000,000.

On page 3 line 16, increase the amount by \$16,853,000,000.

On page 3 line 17, increase the amount by \$16,993,000,000.

On page 3 line 18, increase the amount by \$17,268,000,000.

On page 3 line 19, increase the amount by \$17,314,000,000.

On page 3 line 23, increase the amount by \$3,643,000,000.

On page 4 line 1, increase the amount by \$8,681,000,000.

On page 4 line 2, increase the amount by \$13,500,000,000.

On page 4 line 3, increase the amount by \$14,996,000,000.

On page 4 line 4, increase the amount by \$15,892,000,000.

On page 4 line 5, increase the amount by \$16,602,000,000.

On page 4 line 6, increase the amount by \$16,769,000,000.

On page 4 line 7, increase the amount by \$16,853,000,000.

On page 4 line 8, increase the amount by \$16,993,000,000.

On page 4 line 9, increase the amount by \$17,268,000,000.

On page 4 line 10, increase the amount by \$17,314,000,000.

On page 4 line 14, increase the amount by \$4,987,000,000.

On page 4 line 15, increase the amount by \$6,395,000,000.

On page 4 line 16, increase the amount by \$8,189,000,000.

On page 4 line 17, increase the amount by \$7,316,000,000.

On page 4 line 18, increase the amount by \$7,902,000,000.

On page 4 line 19, increase the amount by \$6,425,000,000.

On page 4 line 20, increase the amount by \$5,927,000,000.

On page 4 line 21, increase the amount by \$5,498,000,000.

On page 4 line 22, increase the amount by \$5,090,000,000.

On page 4 line 23, increase the amount by \$4,344,000,000.

On page 4 line 24, increase the amount by \$3,480,000,000.

On page 5 line 4, increase the amount by \$1,809,000,000.

On page 5 line 5, increase the amount by \$4,210,000,000.

On page 5 line 6, increase the amount by \$6,298,000,000.

On page 5 line 7 increase the amount by \$6,610,000,000.

On page 5 line 8, increase the amount by \$6,577,000,000.

On page 5 line 9, increase the amount by \$6,410,000,000.

On page 5 line 10, increase the amount by \$5,932,000,000.

On page 5 line 11, increase the amount by \$5,382,000,000.

On page 5 line 12, increase the amount by \$4,827,000,000.

On page 5 line 13, increase the amount by \$4,302,000,000.

On page 5 line 14, increase the amount by \$3,618,000,000.

On page 5 line 17, increase the amount by \$1,834,000,000.

On page 5 line 18, increase the amount by \$4,471,000,000.

On page 5 line 19, increase the amount by \$7,202,000,000.

On page 5 line 20, increase the amount by \$8,386,000,000.

On page 5 line 21, increase the amount by \$9,315,000,000.

On page 5 line 22, increase the amount by \$10,192,000,000.

On page 5 line 23, increase the amount by \$10,837,000,000.

On page 5 line 24, increase the amount by \$11,471,000,000.

On page 5 line 25, increase the amount by \$12,166,000,000.

On page 6 line 1, increase the amount by \$12,966,000,000.

On page 6 line 2, increase the amount by \$13,696,000,000.

On page 6 line 5, decrease the amount by \$1,834,000,000.

On page 6 line 6, decrease the amount by \$6,306,000,000.

On page 6 line 7, decrease the amount by \$13,508,000,000.

On page 6 line 8, decrease the amount by \$21,894,000,000.

On page 6 line 8, decrease the amount by \$31,209,000,000.

On page 6 line 10, decrease the amount by \$41,401,000,000.

On page 6 line 11, decrease the amount by \$52,238,000,000.

On page 6 line 12, decrease the amount by \$63,708,000,000.

On page 6 line 13, decrease the amount by \$75,874,000,000.

On page 6 line 14, decrease the amount by \$88,840,000,000.

On page 6 line 15, decrease the amount by \$102,536,000,000.

On page 6 line 18, decrease the amount by \$1,834,000,000.

On page 6 line 19, decrease the amount by \$6,306,000,000.

On page 6 line 20, decrease the amount by \$13,508,000,000.

On page 6 line 21, decrease the amount by \$21,894,000,000.

On page 6 line 22, decrease the amount by \$31,209,000,000.

On page 6 line 23, decrease the amount by \$41,401,000,000.

On page 6 line 24, decrease the amount by \$52,238,000,000.

On page 6 line 25, decrease the amount by \$63,708,000,000.

On page 7 line 1, decrease the amount by \$75,874,000,000.

On page 7 line 2, decrease the amount by \$88,840,000,000.

On page 7 line 3, decrease the amount by \$102,536,000,000.

On page 21 line 19, increase the amount by \$550,000,000.

On page 21 line 20, increase the amount by \$139,000,000.

On page 21 line 23, increase the amount by \$1,125,000,000.

On page 21 line 24, increase the amount by \$631,000,000.

On page 22 line 2, increase the amount by \$1,550,000,000.

On page 22 line 3, increase the amount by \$1,182,000,000.

On page 22 line 6, increase the amount by \$1,550,000,000.

On page 22 line 7, increase the amount by \$1,426,000,000.

On page 22 line 10, increase the amount by \$1,550,000,000.

On page 22 line 11, increase the amount by \$1,529,000,000.

On page 22 line 14, increase the amount by \$1,550,000,000.

On page 22 line 15, increase the amount by \$1,550,000,000.

On page 22 line 18, increase the amount by \$1,550,000,000.

On page 22 line 19, increase the amount by \$1,550,000,000.

On page 22 line 22, increase the amount by \$1,550,000,000.

On page 22 line 23, increase the amount by \$1,550,000,000.

On page 23 line 2, increase the amount by \$1,600,000,000.

On page 23 line 3, increase the amount by \$1,579,000,000.

On page 23 line 6, increase the amount by \$1,650,000,000.

On page 23 line 7, increase the amount by \$1,662,000,000.

On page 23 line 10, increase the amount by \$1,575,000,000.

On page 23 line 11, increase the amount by \$1,624,000,000.

On page 23 line 15, increase the amount by \$3,500,000,000.

On page 23 line 16, increase the amount by \$1,225,000,000.

On page 23 line 19, increase the amount by \$3,262,000,000.

On page 23 line 20, increase the amount by \$2,841,000,000.

On page 23 line 23, increase the amount by \$4,712,000,000.

On page 23 line 24, increase the amount by \$3,790,000,000.

On page 24 line 2, increase the amount by \$4,251,000,000.

On page 24 line 3, increase the amount by \$3,922,000,000.

On page 24 line 6, increase the amount by \$4,490,000,000.

On page 24 line 7, increase the amount by \$4,017,000,000.

On page 24 line 10, increase the amount by \$4,330,000,000.
 On page 24 line 11, increase the amount by \$4,347,000,000.
 On page 24 line 14, increase the amount by \$4,372,000,000.
 On page 24 line 15, increase the amount by \$4,411,000,000.
 On page 24 line 18, increase the amount by \$4,515,000,000.
 On page 24 line 19, increase the amount by \$4,435,000,000.
 On page 24 line 22, increase the amount by \$4,659,000,000.
 On page 24 line 23, increase the amount by \$4,457,000,000.
 On page 25 line 2, increase the amount by \$4,503,000,000.
 On page 25 line 3, increase the amount by \$4,530,000,000.
 On page 25 line 6, increase the amount by \$4,548,000,000.
 On page 25 line 7, increase the amount by \$4,578,000,000.
 On page 27 line 7, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 27 line 8, increase the amount by \$110,000,000.
 On page 27 line 11, increase the amount by \$800,000,000.
 On page 27 line 12, increase the amount by \$366,000,000.
 On page 27 line 15, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 27 line 16, increase the amount by \$589,000,000.
 On page 27 line 19, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 27 line 20, increase the amount by \$605,000,000.
 On page 27 line 23, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 27 line 24, increase the amount by \$515,000,000.
 On page 28 line 2, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28 line 3, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28 line 6, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28 line 7, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28 line 10, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28 line 11, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28 line 14, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28 line 15, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28 line 18, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28 line 19, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.
 On page 28 line 22, increase the amount by \$400,000,000.
 On page 28 line 23, increase the amount by \$478,000,000.
 On page 36 line 11, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.
 On page 36 line 12, increase the amount by \$348,000,000.
 On page 36 line 15, increase the amount by \$1,339,000,000.
 On page 36 line 16, increase the amount by \$503,000,000.
 On page 36 line 19, increase the amount by \$1,880,000,000.
 On page 36 line 20, increase the amount by \$1,190,000,000.
 On page 36 line 23, increase the amount by \$1,902,000,000.
 On page 36 line 24, increase the amount by \$1,544,000,000.
 On page 37 line 2, increase the amount by \$1,921,000,000.
 On page 37 line 3, increase the amount by \$1,885,000,000.

On page 37 line 6, increase the amount by \$1,936,000,000.
 On page 37 line 7, increase the amount by \$1,904,000,000.
 On page 37 line 10, increase the amount by \$1,957,000,000.
 On page 37 line 11, increase the amount by \$1,923,000,000.
 On page 37 line 14, increase the amount by \$1,978,000,000.
 On page 37 line 15, increase the amount by \$1,942,000,000.
 On page 37 line 18, increase the amount by \$2,001,000,000.
 On page 37 line 19, increase the amount by \$1,961,000,000.
 On page 37 line 22, increase the amount by \$2,024,000,000.
 On page 37 line 23, increase the amount by \$1,983,000,000.
 On page 38 line 2, increase the amount by \$1,996,000,000.
 On page 38 line 3, increase the amount by \$1,977,000,000.
 On page 40 line 2, decrease the amount by \$13,000,000.
 On page 40 line 3, decrease the amount by \$13,000,000.
 On page 40 line 6, decrease the amount by \$131,000,000.
 On page 40 line 7, decrease the amount by \$131,000,000.
 On page 40 line 10, decrease the amount by \$453,000,000.
 On page 40 line 11, decrease the amount by \$453,000,000.
 On page 40 line 14, decrease the amount by \$887,000,000.
 On page 40 line 15, decrease the amount by \$887,000,000.
 On page 40 line 18, decrease the amount by \$1,369,000,000.
 On page 40 line 19, decrease the amount by \$1,369,000,000.
 On page 40 line 22, decrease the amount by \$1,891,000,000.
 On page 40 line 23, decrease the amount by \$1,891,000,000.
 On page 41 line 2, decrease the amount by \$2,452,000,000.
 On page 41 line 3, decrease the amount by \$2,452,000,000.
 On page 41 line 6, decrease the amount by \$3,045,000,000.
 On page 41 line 7, decrease the amount by \$3,045,000,000.
 On page 41 line 10, decrease the amount by \$3,670,000,000.
 On page 41 line 11, decrease the amount by \$3,670,000,000.
 On page 41 line 14, decrease the amount by \$4,333,000,000.
 On page 41 line 15, decrease the amount by \$4,333,000,000.
 On page 41 line 18, decrease the amount by \$5,039,000,000.
 On page 41 line 19, decrease the amount by \$5,039,000,000.
 On page 46 line 20, increase the amount by \$5,000,000,000.
 On page 46 line 21, increase the amount by \$1,822,000,000.
 On page 47 line 5, increase the amount by \$6,526,000,000.
 On page 47 line 6, increase the amount by \$4,341,000,000.
 On page 47 line 14, increase the amount by \$8,642,000,000.
 On page 47 line 15, increase the amount by \$6,750,000,000.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the first part of this amendment deals with homeland security. The additional homeland security requirements on every one of our localities are enormous. Just yesterday, the mayor of my city, Mayor Bloomberg, and Secretary

Tom Ridge announced that the administration would be seeking additional funding for homeland security in the next supplemental budget. That is a great first step. I hope there are sufficient resources to deal with the problem, particularly with the first responders who are definitely suffering.

Since September 11, the Congress has worked with the administration in a bipartisan fashion in many ways. I hope this homeland security issue can become a bipartisan one as well. But it does involve spending the dollars necessary. Words alone will not bring the homeland security that our people need.

Let's first go to first responders. I know in New York City, first responders are stretched as far as they can be. Like most other places, we have fiscal problems. So the number, for instance, of police officers is 4,000 lower than it was before. Many other agencies have fewer people working. In all instances, our police, firefighters, being the patriotic people they are, have a high proportion in the reserves, so we are losing people going overseas to fight for us. At the same time, there are huge new responsibilities. For instance, the many bridges and tunnels of New York City, the many buildings, houses of worship have to be guarded more carefully. That takes a huge expense. That is during normal times. In addition to all of those expenses, our police chief, Commissioner Kelly, set up something, with Mayor Bloomberg, called Operation Atlas to deal with wartime. It is another \$5 million a week. The mayor wisely said that he was not going to cut back on security if we didn't get Federal help for it, but it is stretching the people of our city and the first responders of our city. That is true with the brave firefighters. That is true with other first responders. It is true with the hospital staff who have to prepare for, God forbid, a bioterrorist attack. Everywhere we look, there are new needs. It is not just in New York City.

I have an article from yesterday's Rochester Democratic Chronicle, the leading paper in Rochester. It talks about Rochester. It is a middle-size city. It has about 230,000 people in the city, close to a million in the greater metropolitan area—800,000. The city has its own burdens, as does every city. It is on Lake Ontario, which is pretty much ungarded. It is near the Canadian border. It is a little bit east of Lackawanna, which is near Buffalo, where the cell was found.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Rochester Democratic Chronicle,
Mar. 19, 2003]

ROCHESTER AREA PREPARES FOR WAR BY
TIGHTENING SECURITY
(By Michael Wentzel)

The approach of war and a new plan to protect the nation from terrorist attacks means

increased surveillance and awareness in the Rochester area.

With tight security already in place, some said no operational changes would occur following the launch Tuesday of Operation Liberty Shield, the Department of Homeland Security's new defense plan.

But there were additional patrols and checks at the Greater Rochester International Airport. Monroe County will expand water supply inspections. Department of Homeland Security officials began asking more questions at Canadian border crossings.

"We're following the directive of the government to elevate our awareness levels," said Mark Cavanaugh, University of Rochester's director of environmental health and safety. "We're prepared, and we're telling our people to be prepared."

AIRPORT

One of the few visible signs locally of tougher security—roadblocks on the terminal access road at the Greater Rochester International Airport—went up about 4:45 p.m. Tuesday. Security guards will conduct spot checks of vehicles, looking for signs of a terrorist threat, said David Bassett, the federal security director at the airport.

Travelers may also notice more deputies and bomb-sniffing dogs in the terminal and passenger screeners who are more attentive.

Airport director Terrance Slaybaugh said air travelers still need to arrive at least 75 minutes early to clear security at the airport.

Slaybaugh said the county has opted to use Pinkerton security guards, not sheriff's deputies, at the roadblocks because of "manpower, staffing availability, cost." A deputy is to be stationed with the guards while roadblocks are active, he said.

WATER BORDER

Dick Metzger, Monroe County Water Authority's director of production, said security patrols, water supply inspections and water quality sampling will increase.

"We're taking all kinds of efforts to make sure the water quality is proper and the quantity is always going to be there," Metzger said.

The city has a plan to protect reservoirs if there is an increased security threat, said Edward Doherty, city commissioner of environmental sciences. Doherty declined to reveal the details for security reasons.

"Obviously it's something we have to be concerned about, but we don't really see it as a high-level risk," Doherty said.

Officials at City Hall reported no changes in security measures. Monroe County officials also reported no obvious changes in security at their facilities. The county emergency operations center, which might be used to respond to a terrorist threat, has not been activated.

The Department of Homeland Security increased surveillance and monitoring of checkpoints along the New York-Canadian border Tuesday.

As a result, customs and border protection officers will ask more questions of travelers wishing to enter the country, said Janet Rapaport, spokeswoman for Customs and Border Protection, a branch of the Department of Homeland Security. And more agents will patrol the border between major points of entry, she said.

GINNA, KODAK

No new measures were announced at the Ginna nuclear power plant, where security forces have been on heightened alert since Sept. 11, 2001.

"If any changes are recommended by (federal) agencies, we will take appropriate action," the plant's owner, Rochester Gas and Electric Corp., said in a statement.

Eastman Kodak Co., manufactures chemicals at Kodak Park for a variety of uses in photography, radiology and imaging-related businesses. The company "is not at liberty" to discuss security, spokesman Jim Blamphin said, but Kodak has done a complete review and update of all crisis management plans.

FOOD SUPPLY

Concerns about a terrorist attack on agriculture has been around since Sept. 11, 2001.

Wyoming County Sheriff Ronald Ely said deputies are still taking more care to patrol around dairy farms in the wake of milk tampering problems over the past two years.

Wayne County Sheriff Richard Piscioti said patrols are also on alert after the theft of liquid fertilizer from various New York state farms.

Francois Lachance, manager at Star of the West Milling Co. in Churchville, said there is a greater awareness of nonemployees on company property.

Trucks have always been specially sealed before they leave the plant.

UR's researchers who use radioactive materials have been reminded that security is more important now than ever, said Andrew Karam, the university's radiation safety officer. UR has locked more areas and restricted use of keys.

FEDERAL BUILDING

U.S. Marshal Peter Lawrence, whose office is in charge of safe-guarding the Kenneth B. Keating Federal Building on State Street, said nothing new was planned as of Tuesday.

Lawrence said there was nothing in the new security environment that would cause officials to impede lawful, peaceful demonstrations at the federal building, scene of anti-war protests.

CITY SCHOOLS

City school principals Tuesday will meet with school staff to inform them of new security measures and let them know what measures will be taken if the alert is bumped higher.

At the current level, all planned field trips must be reapproved, surveillance is increased, security at after-school activities is increased and principals are required to stay on campus throughout the day.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Chair. Madam President, this article talks about what Rochester has to do. It talks about the airport and how they need new security and are dealing with new security at the airport. It talks about the border.

Again, Rochester is on the border. There is Lake Ontario, but like many cities in the Northeast and Middle West, it shares a border or is close to a border with Canada. It talks about some miles east of Rochester is the Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. It has to be protected. We cannot leave it open the way it was before.

Kodak, the largest employer in Rochester, uses huge amounts of chemicals that are flammable. Rochester is doing what it can to protect Kodak.

The food supply: We have a lot of farming areas in that part of our State, very prosperous, very fertile farms. People are worried, our authorities are worried about the food supply and food tampering. So they are looking at that area.

The Federal building, which houses some judges and other offices and law enforcement, has to be guarded. The

State of my friend from Oklahoma was hit several years ago. We cannot leave our Federal buildings unguarded. We learned our lesson.

City schools: This is just the city government.

We then have the hospitals. We have everything the private sector is doing. This scenario in Rochester is a typical city. It could be any city repeated anywhere in our country.

What help is Rochester getting for all these extra burdens? Rochester is getting virtually no extra help. We know one of three things will happen, none of them good. Either the city, because it does not have the money, will not do everything it can for security—that is the least good choice; security must come first—or other services will be undersupplied and no help.

If you are a citizen in New York City, Rochester, Buffalo, or any other place, you certainly do not want to be made safer from terrorists but be made less safe from the criminals. If you are a citizen, you want to make sure your firefighters know how to deal with terrorism—biological or chemical, God forbid, if it should come—but you do not want to be made less safe from the scourge of fire. That is the second choice.

The third choice is the city does both and then has to raise the property tax, which God knows is high enough.

It seems to me if there were ever a Federal responsibility, it is here for our first responders.

What do we propose to do in this amendment? We propose to support our first responders throughout the country in a measured but important way. The bill provides \$35 billion over the proposed budget plan's funding level for the fiscal years 2003 to 2013 to provide first responder grants to States and localities to be used for hiring, for equipping, for training first responders, as well as covering related overtime costs.

The amendment includes an additional \$3.5 billion for first responder grants for fiscal year 2003 to ensure that cities and States can get needed funds immediately.

On September 11, 2001, we know these first responders in New York City and elsewhere put their lives on the line to serve their country, just as our Armed Forces do. It is a different way, but they are brave and need help, and we should be backing them up just as we back up our soldiers.

Next, in terms of first responders, we restore the cuts to law enforcement and to firefighters. The State and local law enforcement agencies deserve an increased commitment from the Federal Government, and this amendment restores \$10 billion in cuts to State and local law enforcement and fire programs. The COPS Program, which is so important in bringing about security, is restored. The fire program—I see my colleague from Connecticut on the floor. He was instrumental in bringing up the fire program. That is vital.

Byrne grants, that is part of this amendment. All of the Byrne grants are restored, and other areas.

I know there will be individual amendments on this issue. My colleague from New York and I are offering individual amendments on different parts of these issues that will be debated and voted on later. But this amendment has it all in one package. If my colleagues are for helping first responders throughout the country, this amendment is important. We do not just deal with personnel. We deal with equipment. Our police, fire, and emergency workers need new equipment. They have to guard, just as the soldiers do, against biological and chemical weaponry.

Again, the local cupboard is bare. The cities, the States do not have money to do this. Are we going to delay the safety of our citizens for several years, or is the Federal Government going to step up to the plate in terms of its responsibility?

Again, I am delighted that Secretary Ridge announced that the supplemental appropriations will contain new dollars, but how many? Is it enough? Is it similar to this amendment which, as I said, will be drawn tightly but mindful of real needs?

The amendment increases the much needed funding for firefighters, hiring, and equipment, including the FIRE and SAFER Acts, by providing \$11 billion over 10 years. So on first responders, this bill is carefully drawn but does the job. It is certainly adequate, and it is what we need. It is a very fine first start.

I hope we will not repeat the mistake of either not funding these programs or funding them in a small way, mainly by taking money out of existing programs which does not make it any easier for our police departments, our fire departments, or anybody else.

There are other areas that need help in terms of homeland security as well. Our first responders are extremely important, and they get the majority of the money that we have proposed here, but there are lots of Federal responsibilities as well.

Port security, for instance, is an issue that I have become very concerned about and interested in. How could terrorists strike? As I mentioned earlier, they can strike in a myriad of ways, and they are going to look at our weak pressure points. One thing they could do is smuggle something in a ship, in a container that comes by our ports: the worst case scenario, a nuclear bomb.

I have talked long about that dreadful possibility and what we can do about it. My friend from South Carolina, Senator HOLLINGS, has been a leader on this issue in terms of making sure we know what is in the containers and that someone cannot sneak something in. I have been fighting for nuclear detection devices that could be attached to every crane that loads or unloads a container. We need both.

Again, we are underfunding port security rather dramatically. The amendment does these two things on port security, as well as several other things. As we know, in the Budget Act we cannot lay out the specifics but we know it will go a long way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for an additional 10 minutes from my colleague.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield an additional 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank my friend from North Dakota.

So we have an additional \$500 million in 2003, an additional \$625 million in 2004, and we total \$7.8 billion over the 10-year period that we are adding things on.

Right now, only 2 percent of the cargo containers are screened. Not every container is going to be screened. We know some of them are more suspicious than others. But most experts say it has to go up along with our ability to both track containers that come in and then secure them so nobody can come in after we know what is in the container, if it loads, say, in Rotterdam, and then someone sneaks something else in—to make sure that does not happen.

Another issue is rail and transit security. Many of our cities have large tunnels in which terrorists could do some dastardly actions. Our own Penn Station in New York City is a classic example. It is almost a mile of tunnel with no egress, poor ventilation, thousands of people on commuter trains during rush hour going in or going out, from the whole northeast area, not just from New York. We have to do something about that.

We have to do more to deal with truck security. Again, a method of choice of terrorists has been to take hazardous material, place it on a truck and then explode it. Of all places, Brazil has a good system using GPS and assigned routes. They can tell immediately if a truck goes off track, if it is a hazardous material truck. We do not do that. The Brazilians, by the way, have saved money by implementing this because the number of stolen trucks has greatly decreased.

The bottom line is that there are many other places in transportation security that is not air and that is not rail, where we have to be more secure. This amendment proposes a \$5 billion increase for the TSA's budget to start doing these things.

Those of us from Washington State to Maine who share the border with Canada know how unguarded it is. We have been proud of our unguarded border. The Canadian Government does its best to cooperate, but we do not have close to the number of personnel and detection devices that are needed to make the northern border secure. The southern border needs help as well, but not close to the amount that the northern border does. The number of per-

sonnel in my State, which shares several hundred miles of border with Canada, is small and not enough.

We have to do more. The detection devices that have worked rather successfully on the southern border are not installed. Then border security needs other help because of commerce that cities such as Buffalo and Detroit and Seattle-Tacoma have with Canada. We need all kinds of new computer systems so we can check trucks quickly. We want to have both commerce and security, and we can if we provide the dollars.

If the dollars are not provided, you are either going to have weak security or you are going to have to go the old route and try to inspect so many trucks that the traffic is backed up at the border for hours, the economy suffers, and the number of jobs decline. So we have to do that as well.

The amendment provides \$8.2 billion over 10 years for border security, \$450 million in this remaining 6 months of the fiscal year.

The FBI, that is another place where homeland security matters. The FBI was in poor shape in terms of counterterrorism before 9/11. It is trying to move quickly, but it needs more help.

The computer system is still almost laughable. I have had lengthy discussions with Director Mueller. They are trying their best, they are working hard, but we should not have money be a barrier to them doing what they need to do.

Intelligence gathering, we are rearranging those agencies and restructuring them to make the synapse between domestic and foreign intelligence less of a barrier. That is a great idea. It takes dollars. While the leadership says the FBI has all the money they need, go talk to the people in the ranks, they do not think so. So we add an additional billion dollars in funding for the FBI to hire new personnel, particularly analysts and translators, and upgrade critical infrastructure.

Bioterrorism, this is a place where we have made some progress but not enough. Aside from the money our first responders need in terms of local government, in terms of hospitals—we are asking so many hospitals to do the job in terms of bioterrorism. I do not have a problem with that. I do not think there has to be a new Federal agency, but it takes dollars to store the vaccines; to do the training about how to administer the various programs; to do the training, how to spot the illnesses. With bioterrorism, we know early detection is vital. The amendment provides \$5.7 billion for bioterrorism initiatives to improve the public health sector's ability to prepare for disasters and local governments' ability to cover the cost.

Finally, threat assessment and critical infrastructure assessment, the amendment provides a billion dollars so we can know what we are doing and we can stay ahead of other potential

weak pressure points that we do not know about now. Critical infrastructure such as chemical plants and nuclear powerplants and water infrastructure, they need to be protected. We are not sure even how to do it. We have had no blueprint and it is being done differently in different States, with varying degrees of success. The Federal Government has to be more involved. So we provide a billion dollars to conduct an assessment of the relative threat levels in coordination with intelligence and to begin to prepare to protect these areas.

Here, our first responder money will play in because it will not be Federal people who do this. It will be local people. But they need to know what to do.

I will have more to say later, but this is a basic outline of our proposal. There is large help for first responders, \$38 billion over 10 years, an immediate shot in the arm in 2003 and then large funding levels in 2004; help in the other areas where we need help.

We have not covered everything, but we have covered a lot. As we work through the appropriations process, we will hope to refine them.

In conclusion, I ask my colleagues to look at this amendment. I ask them to ask themselves if we have done enough on homeland security. I ask them to answer the infamous "what if" question. How many of us want to be here the morning after, God forbid, another attack on our homeland and say, what if? This amendment prevents that what if. It goes a long way to preventing that what if. I hope it will receive broad and bipartisan support.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from New York, Mrs. CLINTON.

Mrs. CLINTON. I thank the ranking member on the Budget Committee, and I thank my colleague and partner from New York for the Herculean effort he has undertaken on behalf of the cause of homeland security. Senator SCHUMER and I, of course, have been personally impacted by the need for enhanced security in a very horrific way because of the events of September 11 and the ongoing threats posed to New York City and other communities throughout our State where terrorist cells are under surveillance and finally discovered in Lackawanna, NY, where people are arrested in Syracuse, NY, for their likely connections with the funding of organizations that support terrorism. I don't think it is a coincidence or an accident that the two Senators from New York would be standing here in the Senate advocating as strongly as we can for the Schumer-Clinton homeland security amendment to this budget.

Before my words of support to the specifics that the amendment contains, I am somewhat concerned that as we

meet here today, our men and women are in harm's way in the Persian Gulf. I believe we should be suspending action on the budget. We should be focusing in this Chamber, as families and citizens across America are focusing on their television sets, on the Internet, on what is by far the most important issue confronting us: the execution of this war. We hope it will be a decisive and overwhelmingly successful effort accomplished as quickly as possible, with a minimum loss of life. I know the thoughts and prayers of all of us go out to those wearing the military uniform of our Nation and their families, their loved ones, who are praying for them.

I certainly, like all my colleagues, have had the great and high privilege of meeting and being with these young men and women. They are by far the best prepared, equipped, and motivated military in the history of the world. We are all very proud of their skill, their training, and their courage. We should not only continue to do everything possible to support them at this time, but it would be appropriate for us to suspend action on the budget, especially, I must add, because I don't know that we are fully able to debate and pass a budget at this moment in history.

It seems quite odd to me, while we are commenced upon a war, we have no funding for that war in this budget. We have no money for the proposed reconstruction of Iraq that has been discussed in the administration. We have no money for whatever other consequences—intended or unintended—that might flow from the action begun last evening.

Unfortunately, history will judge us harshly, because we are moving forward on parallel tracks to debate and vote on a budget that does not take account of the most overwhelming challenge we are facing. What is wrong with this picture? It makes absolutely no sense. I am stunned that we are, on the one hand, holding our hearts and our breath while we listen and see what is happening thousands of miles away that will have a direct effect not just on the lives of our brave men and women in the military who are fighting this battle, but will have a direct effect on every single American—that we are making decisions without having the information. We are being asked to vote on a budget that does not even pay for this war.

I find this truly unbelievable. But that is the choice of this leadership, and therefore we have to go along as though this were business as usual. Let's just get up and debate a budget that does not even pay for the war that is going on now. I am sorry, I find that hard to explain to myself, and I find it impossible to explain to my constituents.

Then I pick up the Wall Street Journal, and there is an article, apparently sourced from people within the administration, that contracts are being let for the reconstruction of Iraq, and in

it—I am sure Americans would be interested to hear—our Government is to guarantee health care to Iraqis. We are going to guarantee good schools to Iraqi schoolchildren. We are going to build highways. We are going to build powerplants. I don't know that any of us would argue with that noble goal, but we are letting contracts, as we speak, for American businesses to undertake this contracting work.

When are we going to provide for every American? It is certainly not in this budget we are debating. When are we going to provide good schools and the facilities our children deserve? It is not in this budget we are debating. When are we going to make sure we have our transportation needs met in our country, in every part of our country? It is not in this budget we are debating.

Madam President, there are a lot of unanswered questions that deserve an answer. But one of those has to do with this amendment that is currently before the Senate. If you look at this budget, not only are we not even attempting to fund the war, but we do not adequately fund the second front of the war; namely, the threat of terrorism right here on our shores.

We have to cover the costs of this war, and we should be honest about it. There are choices to be made. Apparently this body, under its current leadership, wants to avoid those choices. They do not want the American people to know that coming down the road in a couple of days, or a week at most, there is going to be a supplemental to pay for the war. Will it be \$65 billion, \$95 billion? We do not know. It is going to come to the Senate, and of course we will debate it, but why aren't we being honest with ourselves and with the rest of America? Put the costs of this war in this budget.

The choices we are asking Senators to make are going to have a direct impact on the choices Americans can make. We already know this budget is hurtling us into deficits as far as the eye can see. I have never seen such fiscal irresponsibility passed on to the backs of our children. The young people, 18, 19, 20-year-old soldiers over there fighting for us, are the ones who will pay for this irresponsibility. I find that absolutely unbelievable.

There are a lot of questions to be asked and answered, but certainly among our priorities, if we intend to go forward with this budget which does not account for the war, which does not make the hard choices that Americans have to live with, then certainly we had better make sure we are funding homeland security because the one thing all of the security experts agree on is that, yes, we will win, but we will also reap the whirlwind. There will be additional terrorist activities here at home and on Americans around the world, and we have to be prepared.

These homeland security costs should be not only included but increased because right now they are

being borne by cities and counties and States that are in deficit themselves. They do not have any revenues. The economy is flat. There is no money coming in. They are laying off firefighters. They are closing police stations.

Our hospitals are wondering whether they are going to be able to continue to take in the ambulances that come to the emergency entrance or whether they are going to have to divert them because their funding is under so much pressure.

Yesterday my colleague and I, Senator SCHUMER, met with the mayor of New York. Everybody knows there is not any better prepared city in the world than New York and everybody knows there is not any city under more stress and more potential for terrorism than New York. God bless our firefighters and our police officers and our emergency workers. They are on 12-hour shifts on, 12-hour shifts off. Every time the threat level increases in America as a whole, it goes up even higher in New York.

The operation that New York City has put into effect to try to prevent terrorism, called Operation Atlas, is spending \$5 million a week. We are already cutting \$2.5 billion out of the New York City budget. We are going to have to cut even more, according to the mayor. But what choice do we have? New York is a global city, not only an American city. It is where the United Nations is. It is where so much else happens. Our mayor and our police and fire and other emergency workers are doing a tremendous job, but we cannot continue to shoulder these costs on our own.

Our national security and our homeland security needs should be in this budget. We should be putting into this budget the cost of the war in the Persian Gulf and the cost of defending ourselves in New York and across America.

If we are going forward, business as usual, with a very unusual budget that does not fairly lay out the costs and the choices before the American people, then the very least we can do is, in a bipartisan way, resoundingly pass the Schumer-Clinton amendment. This amendment restores cuts to important traditional first responder programs. It sets aside \$8 billion for each of the next 10 years. And it does something that is desperately needed in this budget when it comes to homeland security: It does not take money away from existing law enforcement and firefighting programs and move it over into another category and say, guess what, we have now provided homeland security. That is the oldest shell game in the world.

This budget cuts the COPS Program, cuts the local law enforcement block grant, cuts the Byrne memorial program, cuts the FIRE Act, cuts the SAFER Act. I don't think we in good conscience can cut the programs that keep the police on the street, the firefighters in the firehouse to do what

they have to do every day, and then turn around and, with their additional responsibilities, claim we have given them the resources for these new burdens and challenges. These resources must come in addition to and not at the expense of these other critically necessary law enforcement and firefighting programs.

As we go through this and look at the specific programs, we have tried to increase the programs that keep the operations going day to day and to provide the additional funding that is necessary. Let me give one example.

In fiscal year 2002, Congress appropriated \$360 million for the FIRE Act. The FIRE Act is a program that assists fire departments in protecting local communities. Those communities may use it for training, equipment, and additional staffing. It has been a Godsend to both professional and volunteer fire departments across New York and across America.

As to the \$360 million appropriated, there are more than \$2 billion in requests from fire departments for this funding—six times the amount appropriated. Yet the proposed budget provides only \$500 million for the FIRE Act for fiscal year 2004. The Schumer-Clinton amendment would add \$250 million, so we could at least try a little harder to meet the legitimate requests of fire departments.

Currently, two-thirds of our Nation's fire departments do not even meet the standards for adequate staffing. I don't think this Congress would ever allow our Army to engage in a war with two-thirds of its divisions understaffed. Incredibly, that is exactly what we are asking our firefighters to do.

This amendment also provides additional funding for bioterrorism preparedness and prevention. The budget provides a mere \$400 million for these critical needs. Even with the funding that we offered last year under the leadership of Senators KENNEDY and FRIST, that is not enough. Many local and State public health departments do not have the facilities or the equipment to perform routine surveillance or epidemiological investigation, or do the lab work to identify any kind of foreign matter. At the same time, we have loaded the burden of the smallpox vaccination effort on top of everything else public health departments are supposed to be doing, again without adequate funding.

I asked at several counties in my State, what are the tradeoffs? That is what happens at the local community. We can have this debate and pretend there are no tradeoffs, that we are not going to pay for the law, that we are going to cut funding for local law enforcement and firefighters and let somebody else worry about it. We will be the Senate that cuts taxes so they have to be raised at the local level or else local communities have to do without essential services.

I asked about the tradeoffs in one county, Onondaga County, where Syra-

cuse is. In order to deal with the smallpox vaccination challenge, they have had to go out and cut all their other programs. They had to cut the Maternal and Child Health Program; they had to cut the women's health examination program; they had to cut the regular examinations and screenings for breast cancer and cervical cancer; they have had to cut pediatric dental visits and preschool and early intervention family services.

Nobody is saying we do not want to be prepared in the horrific event of a smallpox terrorist attack, but don't we also want to take care of our maternal child and health needs? Our children's dental needs? Why are we putting ourselves into making these false choices?

I will tell you why. Because the other side is intent upon this huge tax cut no matter what the war costs, no matter what homeland security needs are, no matter what the choices are. I have to say I am no great historian, but I think history will look back on this moment and will, if not shaking its head and scratching its chin, certainly wonder how on Earth, at a time of an international crisis for America's leadership, we would unilaterally decide to drive our economy and this Government into the deficit ditch.

That is for my friends on the other side of the aisle to answer. I don't have an answer. I find it unbelievable that it is even a question we have to be addressing at this moment in time.

There is much to be done that would at least try to interject some common sense, some reality into this budget. But under any objective assessment of where we stand in the world right now, this budget should be a nonstarter. It should be withdrawn from the floor. Every one of us should be saying: My goodness, we have higher obligations. How can we keep faith with those young men and women who are on the front lines for us? How can we keep faith with those young men and women who are on the front lines at home for us? How can we continue to provide the quality of life and economic opportunity that is expected in our country?

We are in danger of being the first generation of Americans to leave our children worse off than we were. Mark my words, no generation of Americans has ever done that. We are about to do that. We are about to load onto the backs of our children and those lucky enough to have grandchildren the unknowable costs of military actions that may be necessary to protect our freedoms; the unknowable costs of ongoing security to protect us here at home; and the very certain costs of providing quality, affordable health care and quality education and decent transportation—to say nothing of keeping faith with Social Security and Medicare.

This is a very solemn moment, and it is not only solemn because of what is happening in the Persian Gulf; it is solemn because of the extraordinary commitment of this Senate leadership to take action that will not stand the test of time.

But, if we go forward on this budget, I hope we will, in a bipartisan way, not only increase our homeland security amount, but I will be offering a domestic defense fund based on nearly 18 months of work. It would go into the Department of Homeland Security to get money directly to first responders, to put money directly to places of high threat such as New York and Washington, and money into a flexible fund that can be drawn down by communities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 20 minutes.

Mrs. CLINTON. I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mrs. CLINTON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, this domestic defense fund would lift the budget cap for fiscal year 2003 when we finally do get the supplemental that I am sure will be presented to us in the very near future. And it would send a clear message that we are not going to wait on this budget to get money out to our first responders to relieve the necessary costs of our local communities; we are going to try to get that money out when it is needed. Operation Atlas is going on right now in New York City. Operation Liberty Shield is going on right now in America. We can't wait until the end of the year for the ordinary budget process to work to get money out, to make us safer, to give the tools to defend us to our firefighters and our police officers.

This is a solemn time. Not only are my heartfelt feelings and prayers going out to those brave young men and women, but in good conscience I want to be sure we are doing what we should be doing. And with all respect, I don't think we should be doing business as usual. I do not think we should be considering a budget that is as devoid of reality as is this one. That sends a terrible message that here we are making flowery speeches, talking about our prayers and our best wishes for our men and women in uniform, and decimating—decimating—our ability to respond to the inevitable, unpredictable consequences of the action we have commenced. We owe more to the next generation. I hope we will decide to put aside previously existing ideological and partisan positions and come together in this Senate, as we are coming together in this country, on behalf of the military and on behalf of the country they are fighting to defend.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to say that I am proud to be a cosponsor of this vital amendment for more homeland security funding being introduced by Senator SCHUMER. And I come to talk about the necessity of making hard choices.

I know this administration can make hard choices. I know it because in taking military action against Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq, that is precisely what the President has done made a difficult but necessary decision for the sake of America's security.

Unfortunately, I don't see the same willingness to make hard choices here at home, particularly when it comes to our budget and our economy. On Sunday, I saw Vice President CHENEY on Meet the Press and he said something that stuck in my mind. The Vice President was asked why his administration wouldn't reconsider the unaffordable, unfair, and unfocused tax cuts that it pushed through in 2001, not to mention the new tax cuts called for this year, when we have so many other national needs: the cost of military action against Iraq, the cost of rebuilding the Nation after war, the cost of investing in homeland security, just to name three.

His response was telling. He said that Presidents don't have the luxury of doing only one thing at a time, that this administration has many "balls in the air," and that President Bush must tend to the economy even as he works to defend our national security.

I agree with the Vice President on the premise—but could not disagree more strongly on the implication. Yes, Presidents must do more than one thing at a time, and our best Presidents always have. President Lincoln did. President Roosevelt did. President Kennedy did. But by putting the tax cut, which is itself an ineffective prescription for our economic woes, before every other priority, this administration isn't multitasking. It's unitasking. It's sacrificing every other critical mission and priority to one ideological pet project—unfocused, unfair, and irresponsible tax cuts.

As a result, our national cupboard has been raided. We have no resources left to shore up Social Security, pay down the debt, provide our seniors with the prescription drug benefit they need, or invest in the landmark education reform plan we promised our teachers and students. No money left to make smart investments and strategic tax cuts to spur growth. Not even enough money left to pay for homeland security, even though right here at home we are under unprecedented attack from an aggressive, unpredictable, and undeterrable new enemy against which we remain dangerously vulnerable.

The casual question, which might not sound fit for the Senate floor, is: "What gives?"

And the unacceptable answer is: "Nothing gives." Tax cuts that help a select few Americans, tax cuts designed before September 11th, before the prospect of an expensive military action against Iraq and an expensive peace to follow, before Americans started losing jobs in the hundreds of thousands, trump everything else. No, with all these needs and demands, the President

will hold onto his tax cut, come hell or high water.

Mr. President, that is worse than a failure of arithmetic, as President Clinton called it. It is a failure of understanding. A failure of principle. A failure of priorities.

Sadly, this administration has taken to believing that everything in its economic policy is absolute. Everything is extreme. There is no room left for learning. No room for pragmatic adjustment. No room for the critical needs of the American people. Today I want to discuss some of those needs—our urgent domestic defense priorities and how they can and must be paid for in this budget.

Mr. President, America has the greatest military in the world, and that is because we have paid for it. Over the last half century, we have worked together across party lines and every other division to invest in our Armed Forces and the men and women who dedicate their lives to the common defense. We are truly, to recall President Kennedy, willing to pay any price and bear any burden to deter and defeat foreign threats.

If we want the best domestic defenses, we will have to pay for them, too. But consider this. In its budget proposal for next year, the administration recommended a \$19 billion increase in defense spending—an increase I support. But in the very same budget proposal, the administration only called for \$300 million more than they expected spending this year on our homeland defenses, which are far less prepared to protect our people today than the Pentagon is.

This amendment would begin to correct that shortsighted shortfall. In the fiscal year 2003 budget, it would provide \$5 billion above current levels in funding for our first responders, for port security, for bioterrorism preparedness, and for border security. I am supporting more funding both as part of this resolution and in the supplemental when it comes before the Senate—particularly for our first responders.

In fiscal year 2004, Senator SCHUMER's amendment would provide \$6.5 billion over the President's proposal for police, firefighters, and public health professionals, port security, bioterrorism preparedness, border security, transportation security, critical infrastructure protection, and more. All told, this amendment would invest \$88 billion in the urgent domestic defense improvements we need to make between now and 2013—a long-term vision of rising to meet and beat these threats, not shrink from them.

Independently, last month I called for an increased homeland security investment in next year's budget of \$16 billion over the President's proposal, which is what I have concluded is necessary to begin doing all this vital work. So I see this amendment not as a complete number, but as significant progress in the right direction.

Let me talk now about a few of the urgent needs that this amendment will help address.

First, first responders. Just this Monday, I attended the legislative conference of the International Association of Firefighters, and I must say that, though these brave men and women are always ready to take on a challenge and rise to meet danger, our firefighters, police officers, and other first responders are tired. They are tired of lacking the resources to hire new people, get advanced training, and buy state-of-the-art technology, all of which are urgently needed to fight terrorism.

Can't we come together now and get this done?

Mr. President, it is downright irresponsible that the President's budget for next year would provide no new money for first responders. The President's proposal would make the same total \$3.5 billion investment next year as was made this year. And even that is deceptive, because at the same time the budget would slash other funding for local law enforcement and emergency preparedness.

This amendment would restore COPS and other local law enforcement programs in fiscal year 2004. It would provide the money for training, equipment, and qualified personnel. And it would call for \$5 billion in funding this year—in an fiscal year 2003 supplemental the bulk of which would go to our first responders.

There is a real crisis out there. We need to help our police officers, firefighters, emergency medical technicians and other first responders meet it.

I believe the investment we make in our first responders needs to start by passing the SAFER Act, sponsored by my dear friends Senators DODD and WARNER which I am proud to cosponsor. That bill would provide more than \$7.5 billion over 7 years so our communities can hire the firefighters they need. It is critical, it is bipartisan, and it should pass. This budget amendment we are discussing today would provide a good start in fiscal year 2004 for the bill.

But that is just a beginning. First responders need advanced training, specifically in detecting and protecting against chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons. This amendment will provide more of the resources they need to get them that training.

First responders need better equipment. On September 11th, the New Jersey State Police grew so frustrated at their inability to contact New York City authorities that they had to take a boat across the Hudson River and find a police commander at Ground Zero. And as we know, New York City firefighters tragically lost their lives because their communications equipment was not what it needed to be. This amendment will provide the resources to start to get first responders

all over the country the communications equipment they need to prevent similar problems from occurring when they face emergencies.

This amendment gives our local first responders—who are also our first preventers of terrorist attacks—more of the resources they urgently need to guard against terrorism.

As we work to strengthen our local first responders' capabilities, we need to dramatically improve transportation security nationwide. The type of attack we suffered on September 11th was, of course, of a very particular and unexpected nature. In its wake, improving the security of air travel has received substantial attention and substantial funding. And we have made serious progress in the skies.

But just as terrorists constantly change their means and mode of attack, the TSA must broaden its scope of defense—and rapidly. But under the President's proposal and this budget resolution, TSA's appropriation is actually decreased for next year—which will make it difficult to keep pace with their current responsibilities, much less take on new ones. This amendment would give the agency critical resources so that TSA could begin expanding its focus to other critical transportation security needs including roads, rails, bridges, tunnels, and subways.

Let me give you another example—port security. Homeland security experts widely acknowledge that our ports are among the most vulnerable points in our homeland defenses. About 7 million containers arrive at these ports each year, but a tiny percentage are searched. Any one could become a vehicle to smuggle in a dangerous weapon, or even terrorists themselves.

Again, this costs money to fix. The Coast Guard has estimated that it will take \$4.4 billion to improve basic physical security at the Nation's ports, starting with close to \$1 billion the first year.

Yet the administration's budget proposal provided no new money in port security grants—and this budget resolution largely ignores the physical security of our ports. In an effort to jumpstart these vital improvements, I have called for \$1.2 billion in port security grants for fiscal year 2004. This amendment will start moving us toward that goal.

We must also invest more to permanently protect our critical infrastructure—our financial, transportation and communications networks, our energy systems and water supplies, chemical plants and hazardous materials, emergency services and public health systems. Eighty-five percent of these networks and facilities are under the control of the private sector. Though plenty of lip service has been given to this priority by the Department of Homeland Security, actual progress has been exceedingly slow. That's largely a question of leadership, but it's happened in part because the financial commitment has not been forthcoming.

This can't wait. That is why this week I have sent a letter to Homeland Security Secretary Ridge outlining a series of urgent questions I believe he and his Department must answer so that we can begin seeing results, and better protecting our Nation's nervous system, its circulatory system, its respiratory system, and all its vital organs without delay.

Finally, let me address one other crucial area of investment which receives vastly too little funding in this budget resolution—protecting ourselves against biological attack.

Some of the most chilling scenarios posed by homeland security experts are those that envision the use of diseases as weapons. We are depending on our public health network to help prepare for, protect against, and if necessary respond to such assaults. Yet in this budget, our health providers aren't being provided anywhere near adequate resources to do the job as well as they must do it. This amendment will provide a critical infusion to start improving these capabilities.

On the floor today I have only mentioned a discrete set of the gaps we must close to protect the American people. There are many more, and still more gaps we have yet to identify are likely to rear their heads in the months to come.

We are at war against terrorism. Let's not frustrate and condemn to failure those whose job it is to protect us—many of whom risk their lives—by failing to provide them the resources they need to meet and beat the threats.

Whether our protectors work for the Department of Homeland Security or for the local fire department, they deserve not only our gratitude and our respect. They deserve the ability to rise to this challenge, the resources and the tools to do the job. We depend upon them for our safety. Surely they should be able to depend upon us for support.

Let's put the safety of us all before the wallets of the few. Let's invest in our homeland defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I need.

I do feel the need to make comments that when I got up this morning I had no idea I would need to make. I have listened to the debate in the Chamber this morning, and I think there are some corrections that need to be made for my colleagues and the people of America. We have made it sound as if we are debating an emergency supplemental budget. We are not. We are debating the regular budget of the United States of America for the next year, the year that begins October 1, 2004—not yesterday, not today, October 1, 2004. We have been working on this all year because it is the regular budget. It is not the emergency supplemental budget. This is our regular work.

Why are we doing our regular work? We are doing our regular work because

we are expecting America to do its regular work today. Everyone would like to be listening to the radio or the television or picking up the latest news, however they possibly can, but for most of America that is not possible because they are doing their job. They are making America work. They are making sure that the planes are flying, the trains are moving, the trucks are going, the manufacturing is happening.

Why is that important? Because those are the jobs that are providing the materials to keep America safe. Those are the people doing the jobs that help us live our everyday lives and to fight a war. America is not supposed to stop working today. We are not supposed to stop working today. We will do an emergency supplemental budget. I have heard the people here say we should be working on that this minute. How many people here know how long that war is going to go on? By tomorrow we will have a better idea. By Monday we will have an even better idea.

Now, somebody said there is not a penny in this budget for this war. Maybe there should have been a penny in the last budget for this war—the budget that never got done on this floor. That budget should have considered this war.

Well, instead we went ahead and we did an appropriation. But we didn't do the appropriation last October 1 when the statute says we are supposed to have it done. We did not do that until the end of January. We did not get the conference done until February. And the President was not able to sign the bill until February 20. That is when we got last year's work done because we did not do our regular work on the time schedule that we are required—required by statute—to do. The statute says we will finish this budget by April 15. That does not just mean the debate in this Chamber, that means the conference committee and the final approval by April 15. Who knows how long that will take. But we need to do our regular work just as we expect everybody else in this country to do their regular work. It is essential to the operation of this great country.

We will get an emergency supplemental budget. An emergency supplemental budget is different from this budget. This budget is a 10-year budget. We are trying to anticipate the needs of the country for 10 years and put a little plan out there so that we can plan for 10 years. An emergency supplemental bill is for an emergency that is happening at the time of the debate of the emergency. It is supposed to cover it to the best of our ability at that time.

Now, we do not do very well in our budgeting process. We got to spend a lot of time last year getting on corporations in this country for bad accounting. Well, I am the only accountant in the Senate, and I do not think the corporations are the only ones that should have been embarrassed. When I look at this budgeting process, I am de-

lighted I got to be on the Budget Committee this year. I have had comments on the budget before, and there are some changes that need to be made. They can't be made until we do the regular work of passing this regular budget, but there are things on which we need to be working.

Usually budgets are divided into categories. They are not just one type of a budget. There is usually a capital budget, where you plan for the buildings, the maintenance, and the replacement. We do not do that. We do everything as though it were a one-time cost. But that is another topic for another time.

I have talked a lot in this Chamber about the need to reduce the national debt. We do have a national debt, a scary national debt that was scarier before; it will be scarier yet to come. We can see that from what we know about the dollars. But it is important for us—and both sides agree—that we need to balance the budget as soon as we can and we need to pay down the national debt as soon as we can to have better security in this country.

One of the difficulties when we debated the balanced budget constitutional amendment 6 years ago when I first got here—it was the first debate I was in. People will recall that we did not pass a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, that we lost that by one vote. There were some provisions in there for emergencies. This would be one of those emergencies.

But when we are paying down the national debt, it can be done in a rather simple manner if we start with a small amount, plan it into the budget, and then when we reduce that national debt by that amount, just like you make a house payment—and this needs to be done over a 30-year period just like a house payment—when you make that payment, you do not spend the interest you saved.

You add that interest to the payment and make the payment bigger. Then you can start, as with a house payment, with a relatively small amount, and wind up with making a big payment in the end. It is pretty difficult. I would like to have some charts to show that.

But when I have talked about that, and the fact that we could pay off the national debt in a 30-year period, I have also mentioned there are emergencies. Emergencies would work just like a house loan as well. Emergencies would be that second mortgage you have to take out every once in a while. It would not be a 30-year loan plan; it would have to be a short-loan plan, but it would have to be taken care of, too.

On our budgeting, I want to talk about emergencies because another pet peeve of mine with emergencies is, we know in this country every year there will be about \$6 billion spent on emergencies. Some of them are drought, some of them are tornadoes. There are lots of different kinds of disasters that happen in this country.

We do not know where disasters will happen. We cannot prevent disasters

from happening. But we know those disasters are going to cost about \$6 billion. It is something we ought to build into the budget. I am hoping I can sell 51 people on doing that.

War is different. It isn't something we know will happen each and every year. It is something that happens once in a while. We would prefer if it never happened.

There were comments that in this budget there isn't a dime for this war. I have explained why there isn't. But I do want to point out to the people of America, when we sent those troops over there, we sent them with supplies, we sent them with ammunition, we sent them with arms. That is the best equipped army we have ever had in the field in the history of the United States. You cannot send them there without paying for it. So getting them there, having them equipped, having them in a war is included in what we have done.

Now, how long it lasts, and what happens afterwards, we are going to get a supplemental budget on that. But we are not going to get the supplemental budget today. Hopefully, they will hold off a day or two, at least, to see what kind of a war we have over there. Daily, the ability to predict will be better, the ability to predict the expense will be better. That is why we do emergency supplemental budgets.

We just had an amendment that was offered that deals with homeland security and some additional expenses on that. We started putting that in as a specific item this year. We have been doing homeland security for the history of the country, but because of September 11, that became ever more critical and we needed to have a department for homeland security. We escalated homeland security to the point of having its own department with its own security.

Now, for those of my colleagues, or anyone else who might be listening, you will recall we spent an awful lot of time, last year, talking about the need for homeland security. And it got delayed and it got delayed and it got filibustered and it got delayed. And now the side that delayed it is trying to look as if they are the prime homeland security folks. It is not fair.

We can try and outspend each other to try to show we are more dedicated to homeland security than the other side. I think the way the debate has gone in the past shows how that works.

We do have a department for homeland security. The Department of Homeland Security has said what monies they think are needed. That is in the package. As the alerts change, we may get supplementary requests on homeland security. We will have to respond to those. Hopefully, they will not get built into the budget as an every-year expense, just like war.

One of the reasons we budget for war through an emergency supplemental budget is because we do not want it built into the base. We do not want the

American people to anticipate we are going to have war every year, and it is going to be the same cost. That is not good budgeting. The regular budget has the regular items in it that you do on a regular basis. It isn't a war budget. Wars are not done on a regular basis in a regular way for a regular expense, and hopefully they never will.

Now, on homeland security, there were some comments about the need to do more for the cities and the counties and the States. I want to do more for the cities and the counties and the States.

I used to be a mayor. I was the mayor of a boomtown in Wyoming that just about quadrupled in size while I was mayor. There were a lot of things that had to be taken care of, additional sewer, water, streets, basic things, increasing the fire department, increasing the police department. I did not do that on my own. The community did not do it on its own. It had help. It had help from the bottom to the State.

The Feds did not get into it much. That is because every expense in this country is not a Federal expense. Some of the expenses are a local expense. The benefits go to the people at the local level. The people at the local level understand those benefits better. They provide for them, for the most part, themselves. I kind of object to us giving people the impression that we do that.

I know the cities and the counties and the States are hurting out there. We want to work with them to make things as easy as possible. But that should not make the budget the prime spot for bailing everything out. Yes, we have a responsibility. Yes, we need to take care of it. But we talk about these things as though the Federal Government were the prime supplier of everything.

Education is the most important thing after defense. But education is one of those areas where we try to make it look like we do a lot, and like we could do a lot more. And we can. But we used to provide about 7 percent of the money. I think we are up to about 8.6 percent now of the money that is spent for schools. It is really the people paying the taxes to their schools who get the schools. And we add a little bit to it. A lot of it is some new programs we think are pretty fancy and sound good, and we think they will help education.

But with that 8.6 percent that we provide for education, we force more than 50 percent of the paperwork. We keep them so busy doing paperwork, they cannot do the job of working with the kids they ought to be doing.

Now, we tried to change that in the No Child Left Behind legislation. I think we made a good start on it. There is more that we can do. There is more that we will do at the Federal level. But I wish we would not give everybody the impression that the Federal Government provides everything because it leads them to expecting the

Federal Government to provide everything, when, in fact, they ought to be giving themselves more credit for the job they are doing. And looking around their community—I don't care how big of a city you are in, I don't care if you are in New York City—there is still a community, the people you know around you.

I think one of the things that happened with September 11 is that sense of community increased. People suddenly became more interested in their neighbors and helping their neighbors.

There is a tremendous amount that can be done with community. That is where it starts. We are beginning to get the impression that the Federal Government prints the money so the Federal Government can provide all of the money that is necessary. We could, if we wanted to, go broke. So we have to solve the problems at all levels and not immediately escalate every cost to a Federal cost.

The final thing that has been brought up a number of times over the last day, and particularly today, is the economic package the President has suggested. There have been comments that we should not be doing an economic package. Of course, they don't like to call it an economic package. There are no ideas for stimulus coming from the people calling it a tax cut. They don't want to talk about the economic package right now.

Let me tell you what the budget process is. The budget process is where we say what the goals are for the next year for the regular operation of the country—not the emergency, not the war, the regular operation. One of the things we have said is that the economy is down. We need to do whatever we can to boost that economy. It is one of the things we have to worry about. It is one of the things we in Congress have to worry about.

How do you go about doing that? Well, one of the things is to do a budget. A budget is not a vote on the economic package. The budget is the vote on the possibilities we have for the next year. It sets down rules that govern how we will pass legislation the rest of this year. I don't want anybody to get the impression that we are passing an economic package this week. We need to pass the budget so the consideration of an economic package can go on. We need to pass that. But the real debate on the economic package comes when the economic package comes up.

If we chip away at it here and chip away at it there and put it into other things that we think are our priorities, then we have limited the possibilities for a solid economic plan for America. Most of that tactic is designed to get to the rhetoric that the tax cut will go to the rich.

It is a plan to get jobs, and jobs will go to everybody—not just new jobs, but keeping the job they have now. That is really the biggest concern people have. Those who have a job want to make sure they keep it. Those who do not want to make sure they have one.

That is what we want to do with an economic plan. We are trying to figure out the best possible economic plan we can put together. The President has said it needs to be \$726 billion. I think we have \$698 billion in the package, but that is an upper limit, not an actual package, not the final result. What we need to do is pass the regular budget so we can do the regular authorization work and the regular debate so we can get to appropriations by October 1. That is how long of a timeframe we are working on.

Why do we need to work on it now? Why should we, like the rest of America, keep working today? Because we have a job to do that includes this budget, a whole bunch of authorization bills, and then finally 13 appropriations bills. Now 13 appropriations bills normally take us 1 to 2 weeks per bill. So you can see if we are going to have that done by what the statute says, October 1, what the administration is relying on of October 1, we need to be meeting a timeframe right now. Statutorily it says this has to be done by April 15. That is just the budget part. That isn't where we even get to what the dollars per specific item are.

Last year we didn't have a budget. That kept us from getting the authorizations done. That kept us from getting the appropriations done timely. We didn't get them voted on until the end of July. We didn't get them conferenced until February, and we did not get them signed until February 20, which was very shortly after the conference was done. That is the earliest the President could sign them, February 20. People are talking about how No Child Left Behind doesn't have enough money. Well, how would they know whether they have enough money or not? None of it was released until February 20.

We cannot get in that position again. This Budget Committee is determined to make sure we will get it done in a timely manner and that as soon as there is a supplemental budget—and I do hope it is a couple of days into this so there is a better indication of how long it is going to take, what it is going to cost, how much damage has been done over there—then we will seriously look at that supplemental bill. But in the meantime, like the rest of America, I hope we will keep on doing our regular work while they do their regular work, so America and the war can be successful.

I yield the floor and retain the remainder of the time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, having been delegated authority by Senator CONRAD, I yield 20 minutes off the amendment to the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me respond to a few of the things said this morning and also talk generally about

the budget resolution. This budget resolution has been called an economic package, something focusing on jobs. In fact, this budget resolution doesn't add up. It cannot possibly be serious in its attempt to address what is happening and what is wrong in this country.

Let me use one chart to show what kind of a resolution we have before us. Skyrocketing deficits as far as the eye can see, a virtual ocean of red ink as far as the eye can see. I want to ask a question with respect to a budget proposal that comes to the floor at this moment in our history that says our major priority is a long-term permanent tax cut, and the most significant part of that priority is to exempt dividends from taxation. The implication of that, of course, is to say, in terms of our values, let's decide to keep taxing work but exempt investment. So let's tax work but exempt investment. I don't understand that.

But I especially don't understand it when there is a single U.S. soldier in the mountains of Afghanistan or a single U.S. soldier in the sands in Iraq, that we in this country would not say we are prepared to spend whatever is necessary of our tax dollars to support those soldiers. We must do our part.

Yesterday I was in a hearing in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. The Chief of Staff of the Army was testifying, along with the Secretary of the Army. I was asking the various questions my friend and colleague from Wyoming just discussed. What are some of these things going to cost. I fully understand we don't know exactly what is going to happen with respect to Iraq and what that will cost. I don't understand why there are not in this budget provisions to pay for the war on terrorism.

We know that is an ongoing war that began a couple years ago, and it is going to go on for a long while. And you know that the Defense Department is now taking money out of its other accounts in order to cover its costs for a war on terrorism. They know that war will continue in the next fiscal year. But they won't request money for it at this point in the budget before us.

We know that American presence will continue in Afghanistan in the next fiscal year. But the request for money for that will not be in this budget.

You can make a pretty decent case that we don't know what it is going to cost with respect to Iraq.

You cannot make a case that the war on terrorism and the efforts in Afghanistan should not be part of this budget. Of course they should. I understand that sometime—I think it is anticipated in the next 24 hours—we are going to receive a supplemental budget request—I am told it is somewhere in the neighborhood of between \$70 billion and \$100 billion—asking for that amount of additional money. We are told, although that has been put together in the Department of Defense

and elsewhere, they do not intend to show it to us in Congress until we finish our discussions about the Federal budget.

I do not understand that. People keep saying this place should be run like a business. Is this the way you run a business? If a board of directors is making critical financial decisions about the company and you say, Oh, by the way, there is another very big piece out there, \$60 billion to \$70 billion to \$100 billion, but we are not going to tell you what it is, we are not going to send it to you until you have actually completed your budget for next year, that is preposterous. Everyone knows that. It does not make any sense.

We have an economic plan in this country that is just not working. Mr. President, 2.5 million people have lost their jobs in the last couple of years. Our economy is sputtering. What used to be a strong, vibrant, growing economy is now an economy that is sputtering, not doing well at all, with people losing their jobs and budget surpluses turned to budget deficits.

It does not matter that we should spend time here talking about who did what. What matters is we should spend time talking about how do we fix what is wrong and how do we put our country back on track. And on the edge of war with Iraq, we are told in this budget document today, tomorrow, and this weekend apparently, that the highest priority is for us to enact very large permanent tax cuts, the most significant part of which is an exemption for taxes on dividends.

I, for the life of me, do not understand that. Is that doing our part in a national emergency? Is that doing our part? Is that a message to the American soldiers: You go risk your lives, but we will not support you with our tax dollars? What we will do is spend money and charge it, and you come back, having risked your life, and you also inherit the burden of paying the taxes to support it because we would not do it. That is not fair. That is not right. That is not doing our part.

Again, as long as there are soldiers in Afghanistan or soldiers going into Iraq, we ought not be doing this. We ought to put together a budget that adds up.

I just came from a hearing this morning, I say to my colleague from Wyoming, on appropriations for the Forest Service. Does my colleague know what they did to the Forest Service? We had massive problems with forest fires all around the country last year. They are deciding to cut the number of firefighters by much more than one-half. Does anybody think that is justifiable? Of course it is not justifiable. It is gimmicks and games. We do not have any intention of cutting the number of firefighters who fight forest fires in half.

When those fires rage across this country in America's forests, as they have in the last several years, we have a proposal to cut the number of firefighters in the Forest Service in half? I do not understand that. Are Mr. Dan-

iels and those at the OMB with these tiny little pencils and microscopic eyeglasses not able to think at all? Are they the ones everyone says know the cost of everything and the value of nothing? Where on Earth is the value system in proposals such as this? I just do not understand it.

This country, at this moment, owes it to the men and women who are prepared to wage war for America to be honest as we approach these budgets. This budget is not an appropriate budget at all. We have an economy that is in desperate trouble and soldiers about to fight, and we are telling them: Oh, by the way, it is our intention to spend money we do not have on things we do not need and charge you the balance, and, by the way, we have the biggest amount of expenditure that is coming up, but we won't tell anybody what it is because we want to wait until we get the budget done, and then we will get a \$100 billion bill and let you gnash your teeth over that. By the way, a fair amount of that should have been in this budget for the next fiscal year, but we do not want to tell you what that cost is either because in the next fiscal year we will give you another surprise and ask you to pass that on an emergency basis.

That is no way to budget. It is no way to run a business and no way to run a Government, and everybody understands it.

Because my colleague mentioned the No Child Left Behind Act, I cannot help but respond to that issue with respect to budgeting, expenditures, and cost. The basic notion of the President's proposal of no child left behind is accountability. Schools should be accountable for that which they spend to educate America's children. I agree with that. But we passed legislation saying no child left behind with the implied comments of everyone, including the President, that they would fund that which was necessary to make it work. The No Child Left Behind Act was enacted, but the President left the funding behind.

I introduced legislation in the Congress to say there ought to be a moratorium on the deadlines in that legislation until two things happen: One, we have the funding to make that work; and, two, until we see the implementation of that with the flexibility that is necessary, so that we do not have the same template put over a rural school in a small town in Wyoming and North Dakota as is put over a school in an inner city that has different needs. I will give an example.

If you have a great teacher—I mean a great teacher—teaching in his or her minor, who has taught in it for 12 years, does a terrific job, teaches children very well, do we really believe we ought to tell that school district that does not have the money, by the way, that it must hire a teacher in their major to replace a teacher who teaches very well in that teacher's minor and is producing students who are well educated? Is that what we want? Or do we

want basic flexibility? I think we want basic flexibility.

I came from a school with 4 grades, 40 kids, and I graduated in a high school class of 9. If someone came to that high school and said every class taught needs to be taught by the teacher in the teacher's major, that school district does not have anywhere near the capability to make that happen. So we need to make that work, but it will not work with respect to this kind of budget dealing with education. The needs are not meeting the implied promises given when we passed that legislation.

Let me mention a couple of other issues with respect to the economy. I wish, and all Americans wish, this economy were growing, and growing rapidly, expanding so jobs and opportunities would exist for all Americans. That, regrettably, has not been the case.

About 2 years ago, the President proposed a \$1.7 trillion tax cut, and some of us said: Things are good, times are good, we see big budget surpluses in the Federal Government, but we ought to be a bit conservative. Maybe we ought not jump to have permanent tax cuts of \$1.7 trillion over the 10-year period. Maybe what we ought to do is be a bit more conservative and do it incrementally. They said: No, the President wants it this way and had the votes to make it happen. So we did.

What happened after that vote was taken and we had this permanent large tax cut? The first thing that happened was we discovered we were in a recession and less revenue was coming into the Federal Government. Second, on September 11, we had a devastating terrorist attack against our country. Then we had the most significant corporate scandals in a long time. At the same time we were fighting a war against terrorism, the stock market collapsed and the tech bubble burst. All of these came to the same intersection at the same time, dramatically affecting this country's economy.

What was intended to be large budget surpluses in our future became very large budget deficits that are growing and growing worse. What is the response to that, even as we have additional foreign policy challenges, a war with Iraq, very serious problems in North Korea, and a continued war with respect to terrorism and dramatic new needs with respect to homeland security? What is the response? The response by the majority party and the President is to bring the budget to the floor of the Senate and say none of that matters; what matters is we have more large permanent tax cuts. That is not doing our part for national security. It is not doing our part, in my judgment, to support our soldiers.

We would be wise to put together a budget that adds up, one that works, one that invests in the future, and one that says to the American soldiers: You are not the only ones fighting this war. This country is behind you, and we are doing our part.

We are not going to send you off to battle and then bring you home to pay the bill. That ought to be our responsibility. This budget resolution is wrong and everyone knows it.

We are going to have a whole series of votes on choices because, after all, budgets are simply a series of choices. Let me describe, for example, one other choice.

I am going to offer an amendment relating to our country's trade deficit. We not only have the largest budget deficits in history at this moment, we also have the largest trade deficit in history—\$470 billion in 2002.

Every single day, seven days a week, nearly \$1.5 billion more in goods are brought into this country than we ship out. Think of that.

One can make a case on the budget deficit that perhaps that is a deficit we owe to ourselves. One cannot make that case with the trade deficit. That is a deficit we owe to other countries and one that we will inevitably repay with a lower standard of living unless we resolve these trade issues.

We now have a \$103 billion trade deficit with China. So you would think that our government has a good number of people working to address that huge deficit. Guess again. We have just 19 people in the Market Access and Compliance Section at the Department of Commerce, whose job it is to pry open these foreign markets in China that are closed to U.S. producers. We have a \$103 billion trade deficit with China, and we have 19 people working on it. We have a \$70 billion trade deficit with Japan. It has been that way every year as long as we can remember. We have 10 people working down at Market Access and Compliance trying to pry open markets in Japan.

We have a thirteen billion dollar deficit with Korea. We have two and three-fourths people—that is what they say, two and three-fourths, working to deal with trade barriers to U.S. products in the Korean market. I do not know how one gets three-fourths of a person. I guess when you are dealing with trade, the laws of nature don't apply.

With Europe, we have an \$82 billion trade deficit, and only 15 people working on that.

Despite our debate about budgets and all of the mantra and chanting that goes on about economic growth, our country is not going to do well unless we straighten out this trade mess. The manufacturing sector cannot be decimated in the strongest economy on Earth without serious consequences in the long term. Jobs cannot be shipped overseas, as well as factories, and a dismantling of the manufacturing sector, which is exactly what is happening in our country, without having very substantial problems.

The reason I mention all this is I am going to offer an amendment that adds money to Market Access and Compliance, which says: Let us address the trade issues by demanding, by requiring,

and by having the people to fight for the open markets overseas for our producers. We do not do that. We are weak-kneed in this country. We lack backbone and spine to deal with these trade issues.

I will give you a couple of examples. We had trade negotiators negotiate with China. This is an example of a bad agreement. Our trade negotiators negotiated with China and they agreed that after a phase-in of some years, China would be allowed to impose tariffs on U.S. automobiles sold in China 10 times the amount of tariffs that we would impose on any Chinese automobiles sold in the United States. Think of that. Our negotiators agreed to that. I think that is nuts.

How about Korea? Anybody know how many cars we sent to Korea last year? The United States of America shipped 2,800 cars to the country of Korea. How many Korean cars were shipped to the United States? Over 600,000 cars came from Korea to the United States. We shipped 2,800 back. Want to know why? Is it because Koreans do not want to drive American cars? Absolutely not. It is because the Korean Government does not want American cars, so we have one-way trade and that means our jobs are gone and there is this decimation of our manufacturing capacity. It has to stop.

I am going to offer an amendment, and we are going to see if people care about the issue of trade and supporting America's manufacturers. We are going to see who wants to stop this nonsense of shipping jobs overseas so that 14-year-olds can work 14 hours a day and get paid 14 cents an hour so that U.S. workers are told you have to compete with that, and if you cannot compete with it in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Los Angeles, or Fargo, then those jobs are going to be gone permanently. That is not fair trade.

Any budget that we pass is going to be irrelevant in the context of this country's economic problems if it does not address the basic trade imbalance of \$470 billion in one year.

Thirty years ago, we had a \$3 billion trade deficit in one quarter, and it was considered a crisis. These days we cannot get anybody to look at this. But countless people are impacted by it; the people who woke up this morning who did not have to dress for work because their jobs are gone. They had to tell their family: I am a hard worker, I do good work, but my manufacturing plant was moved overseas and I no longer have a job.

Millions of people have experienced that, and they are told by too many in this Congress and too many others who fight for bad trade policies that they have to compete in circumstances where fair competition does not exist.

So I am going to offer an amendment with respect to market access and compliance, saying if we have a \$470 billion trade deficit, we ought to have a lot of folks prying open these foreign markets, and dealing with unfair trade practices.

The fact is, we hardly have anybody working on it. There are a bunch of people going off making goofy agreements on behalf of this country, selling out American farmers and selling out manufacturers because they do not care very much, and then when the agreement is done, even if it is a bad agreement, if there is some ability to enforce it, we do not have anybody who wants to enforce it anyway.

I ask for 5 additional minutes by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 20 minutes.

Mr. REID. By the authority of the ranking member, Senator LAUTENBERG is to be recognized for up to 20 minutes, time off the resolution. Senator NICKLES does not want the amendment offered. It takes unanimous consent to just speak about the amendment.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. REID. That would be fine, but I would like the Senator from New Jersey, who has waited some time to be recognized—Senator ENZI, the Senator is going to be recognized for 5 more minutes, followed by Senator LAUTENBERG to be recognized for up to 20 minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will probably not use all the 5 minutes. I know my colleague wishes to speak.

There are so many other issues of choices, especially bad choices, with respect to these budget resolutions we are discussing.

The budget resolution brought to us from the committee has large, biting, permanent budget deficits. It includes very large tax cuts. At a time when we are asking this country to sacrifice, especially with its sons and daughters, at a time when we are sending America's sons and daughters to war, this Congress is saying we will have our sons and daughters make tough choices, but we will not make tough choices. It is not the fair thing to do. I do not want those soldiers to come back to bear the burden of the costs of a war we would not cover.

A little over a year ago, I was in Afghanistan. I recall visiting on the edge of Afghanistan an old Soviet airbase. I believe it was called Kanabad. At that Soviet airbase, we had soldiers. At that point, there were still a lot of activities in Afghanistan when we fought the Taliban and kicked the Taliban out of Afghanistan. We were then searching for al-Qaida and Osama bin Laden. When I visited that base and spoke to the soldiers, the men and women living in a tent city were walking around in mud up to their ankles, snow, conditions that were not good, but I could see the pride in their eyes. They understood why they were there. They understood what they were doing for their country, and they were proud of it, and this country is proud of them.

They are still in Afghanistan. Fortunately, the fighting does not present

itself these days so much in Afghanistan. We have been remarkably successful in Afghanistan and hopefully we will restore the new government under Mr. Karzai. The fact is, we still have troops in Afghanistan. We are prepared to move troops into Iraq. Some are perhaps there, others perhaps in a day or so. It seems to me our obligation to those, especially the mostly young men and women who have been taken from this country, away from their families, and who said, "let me serve, I will go," who are risking their lives for this country, our obligation is to be talking about the realities of what this country faces. To say to those soldiers the sacrifice is not only yours, it is a national sacrifice.

When someone asks, What do you do for the war, you say I get a dividend tax exemption? We had Warren Buffett come to the Congress a week and a half ago. He is the second richest man in the world. He said: If you provide a tax exemption for dividends, which is in this resolution, I will actually benefit to the tune of about \$400 million a year. He said: But it won't make any sense for the country. It will not help the economy and I don't support it.

Why on Earth would we be doing this when we ought to be supporting our troops? When the troops are doing their part, in my judgment, we must do ours. We should support them with our tax dollars, even as they support us with their lives. That is what these discussions are about.

The reason I decided to speak about this, my colleague said we do not have any idea what any of this costs. Nonsense. We all know better than that. Of course we know what it will cost. We do not know the details. We know what the war against terrorism has cost.

I was told yesterday by the Department of the Army in an open hearing that amount of money to prosecute the war against terrorism has been taken out of the regular accounts because they have not been provided for and they will be in an emergency supplemental, but the war on terrorism is not a temporary event and it ought to be part of the regular budget. We know what is going to happen in Afghanistan. We will have troops there. We know what that will cost. It ought to be part of this budget and planning. We know it will cost some money; it already has in Iraq. But the administration is deliberately at this point deciding not to allow anyone to see those numbers and they will not discuss them until we pass this budget.

Why? I think we understand why. It will be a very big number. It is something we ought to be considering here, in my judgment.

I asked the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Shinseki, about it yesterday. I didn't press him because he got in very hot water a couple weeks ago. The published reports were that there were people in the Pentagon who wanted heads to roll because General Shinseki answered the question, What

is this going to cost? He got in real trouble.

It seems to me we ought to deal with all the facts and come up with a budget that adds up and works.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an amendment I plan to offer when the opportunity presents itself. My amendment establishes a reserve fund for national and homeland security. My amendment is cosponsored by Senators CONRAD and SCHUMER as well.

This budget reminds me of a movie I saw some time ago, not intending to present any humor, but it is precise in what it says: "Show Me The Money." Everyone understood immediately what they were talking about. Here we are, searching for the money to pay for our defense needs and the war with Iraq. It is nowhere to be found.

I was the ranking member of the Budget Committee for several years. There is one thing you learned on that committee, simply wishing for money does not make it appear. This must come as a shock to people who in their regular lives try to set money aside for future expenses such as mortgages or tuition or rent or real estate taxes. We all have to budget for our critical needs.

The war with Iraq has started. We see the pictures of our troops and you wonder how they put up with the heat and the dust, the threat to their lives, the ominous presence, perhaps, of chemicals or biological weapons. There is plenty to think about. But for God's sake, we ought to think here about how we provide the money to prosecute that war. It has to sound strange to people listening to what is said in the Senate this morning.

We have an obligation to tell the American people how much and where the money is going to come from to finance the war and to finance our domestic security needs. At critical moments in history such as this, we ought to be truthful with the American people about what it is we are doing.

The truth is, this budget does not provide the funding to prosecute our war with Iraq. It is a simple equation. We are shortchanging national security spending and the costs of the war in order to protect a tax break, largely for the wealthiest.

I want people to understand. We are going to prosecute the war, and we are going to do it fully, but we ought to tell the truth to the American people about how we are going to pay for it. The money to pay for this war is not provided in any place we look. It is a tax cut that people understand is going to the wealthiest among us. I want everyone to know the money that would be used to prosecute this war is going to go to another priority; that is, a tax cut for the wealthiest. A tax cut that,

as we heard from the Senator from North Dakota, a tax cut people with wealth typically do not need, and I can tell you most of them do not want it when they recognize it comes from the very foundation of our strength in this country.

The Senate GOP plan ignores the cost of war. We are going to look at a supplemental, which is in addition to the budget, that was not planned for. But with less than a wink of an eye, everyone knows the war otherwise will not be prosecuted out of the funds available for the Defense Department. That is what we are looking at. From \$60 billion to \$95 billion is expected to be requested in a supplemental plan. The present Senate budget plan does not provide for any of it.

My friends in the business world are people who run big companies, some of them little companies, but they run organizations and they know how important it is to fund your critical needs.

My amendment corrects a major problem with this budget. My colleagues may not realize that the Senate Republican budget resolution actually cuts defense spending by \$103 billion below the President's request.

We have heard a great deal of talk about patriotism from the other side of the aisle. We have even seen it raised in the ugliest of fashions, in an election where a triple amputee who lost his limbs in Vietnam was accused of lacking patriotism and lost the election. Imagine, a triple amputee, a man left with one arm, the legs are gone, one arm is gone, and he is accused of being unpatriotic. Language flows loosely around here at times.

We have heard a lot about putting national security and homeland first above all, and at times when the defense budget was being prepared it was suggested if you challenged it, if you voiced some concern about it, if you questioned the tactic being used, there was an implied criticism that you were not being loyal, that you might be like the French. Talk is loose here.

I served in another war, a long time ago, and they used to have a slogan "loose lips sink ships." Boy, we would not have a lot of ships afloat here.

When you examine the details of this budget, it is apparent that it is tax cuts for the rich that have the highest priority. In fact, this budget cuts national security funding in order to provide those tax cuts to the wealthy.

I had a business career before I came here. Thank goodness for the American opportunity, we succeeded beyond our wildest dreams. We were three poor kids from working-class families in Patterson, NJ. The company did very well. Today a company that we started employs 40,000 people.

Mr. President, it is obvious that a company with that kind of growth, that kind of success, produced some wealth for the founders. It did. And I can tell you I do not want a tax cut for myself and I don't think people in my position ought to have tax cuts right

now. America has been good enough to us that we do not need the tax cut. We need a strong country. We need a harmonious population where people know they are being treated fairly and that we are not putting everything else aside so we can give a tax cut to people who neither need it and in most cases don't want it.

There are sleight of hand maneuvers in this budget. If you look at the years 2004 through 2008, the Republican budget projects defense spending at the level requested by the President. But in the last 5 years of the budget window, from 2009 through 2013, the Republican budget resolution actually cuts \$103 billion below the levels CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, estimates would be required just to maintain defense spending in real terms at the level the President proposed. During those latter 5 years, where is that missing \$103 billion going? The answer is—I don't want to be repetitive, but this is so hard to understand, so impossible to conceive that we have to say it a lot because it does not get through. But maybe, just maybe, the American people will hear this clearly enough to say:

Hey, listen, I have heard some pretty good presentations this morning.

I am discounting mine. I am talking about others here.

They keep talking about this tax cut for the wealthy.

That is what we are talking about, Mr. and Mrs. American citizen. That is what we are talking about. The tax cut in this bill over 10 years will cost this country \$1.4 trillion.

Are we cutting defense for this tax cut? Whom does that help? Let's look at the facts about the President's tax proposal. Almost half of all tax filers, 49 percent of them, would receive tax cuts of less than \$100. That doesn't do much for people's standard of living.

The average tax cut for the bottom 80 percent of tax filers would be \$226. That is the average tax cut. By contrast, the top 1 percent of tax filers would receive an average tax cut of \$24,100. But those who are at the tippy top, with incomes of more than \$1 million, would get tax cuts averaging \$90,200. That could make a difference in one's standard of living, but not for those folks, they are already living at that scale. That is why I call it skewed towards the wealthy.

As for another part of the tax cut proposal, the dividend tax cut, nearly 70 percent of the benefits would flow to the top 5 percent of our tax filers, and the top 1 percent would receive 46 percent of the benefits—1 percent would receive 46 percent of the benefits, nearly half of the benefit to the top 1 percent.

So the priorities are quite clear: Tax cuts for the wealthy first; national security, when it comes to the money, further down the list. That is just plain wrong.

There is a reason it is being handled that way. I do not suggest lack of pa-

triotism, lack of loyalty, lack of conviction on this war. I just know that in the planning, in the machinations that go toward developing the budget, what happens is someone says: Hey, guys, do you know what happens? If we don't get that tax cut in the total package, we are not going to get it. It is just not going to happen. It's a lot easier to get money for the war, a lot easier to get money for our defense, homeland defense needs. We can get that in supplementals or other places. A tax cut, we had better get that now, while we can.

The President laid out his request for accomplishing these goals. But what did the Senate Republican budget do? It sacrificed funding for national security in order to provide tax cuts for the rich, as I explained. The process took over. To make matters worse, this budget ignores the fact that we have gone to war. Every one of us is glued to the news, whether it is the papers or television or radio or whatever it is; we want to know what is happening with our troops. We worry. We heard about a Black Hawk helicopter that went down. I know I must speak for everybody. We are holding our breath until we learn that those who were carried in that helicopter were rescued.

The White House has told the press that it will happen, that we are going to need the money. Again, I used to be ranking member of the Budget Committee, so I know my colleagues on that committee read the newspaper.

The administration is about to send up a war supplemental request to us of between \$60 and \$95 billion. It is not in the budget, it is supplemental. It is extra. You can make the case pretty easily. It is one thing to make the case because of the need. It is another thing to make the case because you want to put the funds that are available in a lot of rich persons' pockets.

This war and its aftermath will cost a lot of money. Estimates are that the reconstruction of Iraq could cost \$30 billion over 10 years. Every year of Iraqi occupation could cost between \$17 billion and \$46 billion. As far as this budget is concerned, apparently it doesn't see any of it happening. So we ignore the war in the budget, we cut national security spending. Why? Simply because it seems, in the eyes of the administration, the most important agenda is to provide tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans at the cost of other priorities.

My amendment makes it clear that tax cuts should not take priority over every other need. My amendment restores the 2009 through 2013 national security cuts in the budget resolution. The amendment moves \$103 billion in budget authority and \$88 billion in outlays into a reserve fund for national security and homeland security. To offset the cost of this critical reserve fund, my amendment simply goes to the tax cut and reduces it by \$88 billion during the same period, so we can take that cash from the tax cut—again,

most of it going to the wealthiest—and put it into the most vital need we have right now, and that is to make sure that every penny we can put together to make sure our people in the field, those who are fighting, know we will do everything we must by way of financing to make sure they have every tool available, they have all the protections they need. That is where to put the money.

We are faced with a clear choice. My amendment says our Nation's national security is far more important than tax cuts for the wealthy. I hope when we have a chance to present the amendment, my colleagues will support voting for national and homeland security by voting for the amendment.

In the war I fought in a long time ago, we used to talk to the public about what they had to do to prosecute the war, to provide for our defenses.

This poster shows its age by the way the characters are drawn. It says: "BUY WAR BONDS." I think they were \$25 at their least price. It said: Everybody has to kick in. Everybody has to do their share. Do what you can to help us conduct ourselves in our defense as proudly, as forcefully, as we can. That is what it is about.

And here we are ashamed to ask the richest among us to sacrifice their \$90,000 on a \$1 million income? Wait, make more money. Warren Buffet addressed a group of Senators the other day, and he said: I love paying taxes because every time I pay taxes, it means there is more money left in my pocket. Pretty simple. And that is how we ought to face our responsibilities now: Tell the truth to the American people, I say to my colleagues on the other side. Tell the truth about how you plan to use the money that otherwise would currently be available to prosecute the war.

Maybe we would not even have to do a supplemental. There are times when we are mystified by the arguments presented on one side or the other. I am sure that happens with our Republican friends when it is a Democratic proposal. The fact is, these figures that are generated here have been reviewed by the distinguished committees of people who study budgets as a professional thing, as an organizational commitment. They tell us: Look, all you have to do is look at the lines, look at the years.

Right now, everything looks OK. Get out to about 2007, and you see what happens. The President's budget is one thing; in the Senate GOP plan—that is, the budgeteer's, the majority's plan in the Budget Committee—they have something else. They show they cannot meet the President's number.

The tragedy of this kind of a debate is that we have to confront one another. I believe this is a time when the last thing on the list of priorities ought to be tax cuts going largely to the wealthiest among us.

Let's stand up and do what is right. Let's send all that we have right now:

commit it, reserve it, make it such that it cannot be touched anyplace else.

I hope when we have a chance to review the amendment, we will see the thought has prevailed that says: Hey, they could be right on this one. Let's send it all into our defense needs which are so heavy right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina). Who yields time?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, as the daughter of a veteran and the granddaughter of two grandfathers who served in the war, and the mother of two small boys, I want to say how proud I am of the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces in this great country, those who go to the front lines to defend the freedoms and the conveniences we enjoy here every day.

They have done a tremendous job, and they continue to do a tremendous job. I want them to all know that our thoughts and prayers and, more importantly, our pride is with each and every one of them as they perform a mission on our behalf.

I also rise today on behalf of the men and women who serve our Nation as members of the National Guard and Reserves, who are out there today, as well, defending our rights and our freedoms.

I am going to discuss an amendment that I will offer, when the time becomes appropriate, with Senator LANDRIEU, with a tremendous amount of help and background from many other Senators who have worked on this issue, particularly Senator LEAHY—an amendment that will bring members of the National Guard and Reserve into the TRICARE health care program.

Currently, Guard and Reserve families cannot enroll in the TRICARE program unless the Guard or Reserve member is activated with orders lasting over 30 days.

Our amendment would allow members of the Guard and Reserves, as well as their families, to sign up for TRICARE health care coverage at any time regardless of whether the Guard or Reserve is activated.

This amendment is paid for by reducing the size of the proposed tax cut by \$20.3 billion over 10 years. Specifically, these numbers are backed up by a GAO report on this subject that was authorized by the fiscal year 2002 National Defense Authorization Act. And the study was completed in September of 2002. So we have the numbers to back up what we want to do on behalf of these incredible men and women in the National Guard and Reserves, who deserve the support of health care, as do their families.

In recent years, our Nation has increasingly looked to our volunteer reservists and guardsmen for our defense and peacekeeping needs, requiring them to leave their jobs and families in defense of our Nation.

Arkansas has sent over 2,000 Guard and Reserve members to contribute to the war on Iraq and the war on terrorism. They are among over 212,000 Guard and Reserve members who have been activated nationwide.

Given the scope of their sacrifices, I do not think it is too much to ask their fellow Americans to sacrifice as well by accepting a smaller tax cut.

Currently, over 20 percent of this Nation's Guard and Reserve soldiers lack health care coverage when they are not on active duty. That number is much greater in a State such as Arkansas where our overall numbers of uninsured are much greater than the national percentage.

In this time of increased dependence upon the members of our National Guard and Reserves, it is imperative we increase benefits for them and their families for when they are not on active duty.

I also want to acknowledge this amendment only provides funding for this program. It does not begin to detail how the extended TRICARE benefits should be structured. That test would be left up, and should be left up, to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

I am also aware that many Senators have been working, for some time, on the details of how to structure and provide these benefits. I hope my budget amendment will complement their efforts by solely allocating the necessary budget authority to provide these benefits to our Guard and Reserve members.

I look to the leadership of Senators LEAHY and DEWINE and DASCHLE, as well as both the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, to develop the specifics of how these benefits will be provided.

I am also aware that this amendment will only provide an estimate of the cost of providing these benefits. In fact, some estimates state that providing these benefits will cost much less than this amendment would provide. I hope that is the case.

Nonetheless, this Nation's National Guard and Reserve members and their families deserve these benefits now.

I was drawn into this by a recent visit from our National Guard and Reserve units in Arkansas. A human resource officer brought to me the fact that many of these individuals—Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield another 2 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, on a visit with our National Guard and Reserves, a human resource officer came to me and said: Do you realize that when these individuals are called up to active duty, we can't activate them because they have not had the proper medical care? These are individuals who have signed on the dotted line and said they are willing to go and defend this country. Yet in their private lives they cannot afford or have access to the appropriate health care that keeps them at a health care level that we could actually activate them when we need them.

This amendment is just the tip of the iceberg with respect to this Nation's overwhelming amount of uninsured families. Statistics show us that one in five Americans do not have any form of health coverage at all.

Congress must address the larger problem of uninsured families across this Nation, but the absolute least we can do is to provide full coverage to America's National Guard and Reserves and their families.

The time is right. And this is the right policy and the right priority for our men and women serving in the Guard and the Reserves.

Mr. President, I would also like to add Senator PRYOR as a cosponsor to this amendment when we are prepared to offer it.

I say to all those Americans listening, we all must make contributions. It is not too much to ask of our fellow Americans to delay a larger tax cut in order to provide the necessary health care that these individuals need to be called up to serve.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield me 5 minutes to have a colloquy with the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CONRAD. We can have that understanding, and then we will come back to Senator BROWNBACK for a time he desires.

Mr. BROWNBACK. That is acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I listened to the speech of the Senator from Arkansas, talking about the men and women in the armed services. What I want to focus on for a minute is my son. One of my boys married a beautiful young woman and they have two of my grandchildren. I have gotten to know her sister Megan. Megan is a brilliant young woman, graduated Jefferson High School, which is a school for the academically talented, has more merit scholars than any high school in America. She is a graduate of MIT, another great scientific institution. This young woman is now in the gulf, an officer on a destroyer. She is trained to be the person who gives the direction to fire missiles.

Things have changed since the Vietnam war, the Korean conflict, the Second World War. Women are now heavily engaged in actions that are mili-

tary in nature. When we speak of the men and women of the armed services, I can't help but focus on Megan. She is married. Her husband is getting ready to go to medical school. He is here. His wife is in harm's way in the Middle East. My conscience has been quirked by the very fine statement of the Senator from Arkansas when she referred on more than one occasion to the men and women of the armed services because the men and women of our armed services are the Megans of the world. They are standing side by side of the men doing anything that a man can do. I congratulate the Senator for the amendment she will offer and her contribution to the Senate, not only with this amendment but what she does every day.

Mrs. LINCOLN. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his comments.

It is so important for us to realize that these men and women in the Reserves and the National Guard are leaving their families. They are leaving their careers, their jobs. The least we can do is provide for them the ability to provide for their families the kind of health care they need.

One of the most outrageous stories I heard was from our reservists in Arkansas who said: We had to spend unbelievable amounts of money just to get these individuals up to the health care level where we could actually activate them. These are people who have offered themselves and have pledged that they would leave their families, they would leave what they have worked their entire lives to build to go and defend our country. There is absolutely no reason that we cannot provide for them the ability to provide for their families and for themselves the health care they need to be ready when the time comes and we call on them.

I thank the Senator from Nevada. For all of my colleagues listening to this debate, I do not think it is too much to ask for the rest of Americans of what we can do for those being called on more and more to serve this country. That is the National Guard and the Reserves.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Kansas to introduce an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 282

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I want to propose an amendment at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be set aside so I may introduce an amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I would be constrained to object at this point because what we are doing is allowing Members to speak on their amendments on both sides but not actually present their amendments at this point. That has been what we have been doing back and forth all day today, as Members have come and spoken on their amendments but not actually sent them to the desk, with the exception of Senator SCHUMER who had an amendment on homeland security. So I am constrained to object at this

point. The Senator is completely able to go ahead and make his presentation. I would have to object at this point.

Mr. ENZI. It was my understanding that we were going to go back and forth on the introduction. It was our turn to have an introduction of an amendment. That is why we did that. We will wait for the introduction.

Mr. CONRAD. We are trying to go back and forth with respect to speakers and with respect to the opportunity to address amendments, but not formally enter them at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I hope once we are able to present the amendment that it will be accepted. We have floated it by both sides and it has been vetted as well. I hope it will be accepted.

I will be sending an amendment to the desk that will express the sense of Senate that a commission be established to provide a real means of addressing and eliminating Government waste in domestic agencies and programs within agencies. The Federal Government needs such a commission. We don't need one like the ones we have had in the past that don't have any teeth to them, that simply report but there is never a vote taken on what the commission puts forward. This one will be different in that respect. Indeed, at a time of economic uncertainty and of war, it is imperative that the Government demonstrate real fiscal responsibility and accountability in Federal spending. Whether it is corporate America or the U.S. Government, fiscal accountability is paramount.

With the devastating collapses we have had in corporate America, with Enron and WorldCom and others last year, we have seen what happens in the corporate world when fiscal accountability grows lax. Let's take steps now to avoid the same pitfalls at the Federal Government level. Let us ensure public trust by opening the books of Federal domestic agencies and programs within agencies, making changes and reforms where necessary, in order to ensure that hard-earned taxpayer dollars are being spent wisely.

Fiscal accountability is what my amendment to the budget resolution is all about. Over the years we have established many useful measuring sticks for fiscal accountability in Federal spending. The Government Performance Result Act, GPRA, comes to mind. However, what measuring sticks such as GPRA lack is an effective means to implement their useful findings. What this resolution calls for is a commission that would incorporate the Federal Government's existing accountability measuring sticks to perform additional research of its own and provide the Congress with legislation, which we would vote on to either accept or reject as a whole, to implement its recommendations or not to accept them.

In a few days I will be reintroducing bipartisan legislation that creates such a commission. The bipartisan Commission on the Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies, CARFA Act, would fulfill what is addressed by this resolution. It is bipartisan. Senator MILLER from Georgia is a cosponsor, and I hope to add a number of others on this bill in the near term.

I wish to speak for a minute about the CARFA Act. The CARFA Act provides Congress with a viable proven model to eliminate Government waste and inefficiency. It is modeled after the successful Base Realignment and Closure Commission. CARFA will incorporate the findings of past measuring sticks such as GPRA and will give them teeth. This program will focus on domestic discretionary spending. It will not be focused on military or entitlement programs. It is domestic discretionary programs. Where past commissions and reports failed in that they had no real means by which Congress could implement their findings and recommendations, CARFA will succeed.

The scope of review called for by this resolution entails domestic agencies and programs within agencies. I want to emphasize that point. Where BRAC is already in existence and has gone through several rounds in rooting out waste in the Department of Defense and consolidating resources to make them more useful, more viable, CARFA would review Federal domestic agencies and programs within agencies using a narrow set of criteria which should produce significant results and do what BRAC did, consolidating our dollars in more efficient uses in high-priority areas.

Over the proposed commission's 2-year review, the commission focused on two particular areas.

One, duplicative: Where two or more agencies or programs are performing similar functions which can be consolidated or streamlined into a single agency or program, the commission would recommend that the agency or program be realigned. We do not need duplication within the Federal Government.

Second, wasteful or inefficient: Where the commission finds an agency or program to have wasted Federal funds by low-priority spending, it would recommend that such an agency or program be realigned or eliminated.

Three, outdated, irrelevant, or failed programs: We have those within the Federal Government. Where the commission finds that an agency or program has completed its intended purpose—I do not think we ever think about that, that a program actually completes its intended purpose, but it happens and we keep spending in the program—has become irrelevant, or has failed to meet its objectives—it was designed properly in the sense that the people at the time had the best of intentions in the design of the program, but it simply did not work to

meet the needs at that time—and it would recommend the elimination of such an agency or program.

Such a commission, upon completion of its 2-year review, would submit to Congress both its recommendations for the realignment and elimination of domestic agencies and programs, and proposed legislation to implement these recommendations.

The Congress would then consider the commission's proposed legislation in an expedited manner, with input from the committees under whose jurisdiction the affected agencies or programs fall. Following the committee's comment period, the proposed legislation would be brought to the floor of each Chamber for debate and a single vote, up or down, without amendment, one vote.

If we are going to get serious about priority spending during this critical time in our Nation's history, if we want to get the most use out of every taxpayer dollar that comes to Washington, such a commission is clearly needed.

As in any bureaucracy, inefficiency or low-priority use of taxpayer dollars is often a serious threat to the credibility of an agency or a program, much less the legislative bodies that create and sustain them. We must be certain the money we spend is not just allocated in a certain way just because we have historically spent it that way.

I do not know of anything that drives my constituents more nuts than to see wasteful Federal spending or programs that have accomplished their purposes but the money is still being spent. There are people who come up to me and say: I do not mind paying my taxes, but it drives me nuts to see the money poorly spent. If I am going to work hard to earn this money, I want it to be wisely spent. Too often there are examples of that not occurring.

Priorities do change and our spending must change with them. The CARFA Act is crafted to take these changes into account. Whether one is conservative or liberal or in between, surely we can all agree that low-priority use of taxpayer dollars is an unacceptable strain on hard-working Americans and on our economy. It is certainly no way to operate a business. Yet I feel, as do many of my colleagues, that we continually fail to get the most out of every taxpayer dollar that comes to Washington.

Let's change that. CARFA is about maximizing the benefit of all Federal funds. Funds saved through this legislation could be used to pay down the national debt or be channeled to higher congressional priorities.

It is my hope this body will agree to this amendment and then proceed to consider and enact the CARFA Act. Truly, this will provide a real tool at the service of the Federal Government to better prioritize spending and shift funds from less beneficial to more beneficial areas. All of us surely support such a move.

I believe Americans would greatly benefit from such a commission which has the real potential to help us truly root out inefficiency in the Federal Government in such a way that we can more fully realize the benefits of all Federal funds. That is the spirit of this amendment and the CARFA Act.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort, to vote for this amendment, to adopt it as part of the budget resolution and to show support for the CARFA Act of 2003 by becoming original cosponsors of this important legislation.

Mr. President, as we debate the budget, this is exactly what we need to be doing: Finding ways we can prioritize and make sure our spending is efficient.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, as such time I am allowed to offer an amendment, I intend to offer an amendment on behalf of myself and Senator CORZINE. This is an amendment I actually offered in the Budget Committee. I thought we had a good debate on it. It goes to the heart of what is happening at this moment on which so many Americans are focusing and on which so many people in the world are focusing.

This Nation has gone to war with Iraq. Our thoughts are first and foremost with the men and women who serve our country in the Armed Forces. While we debated the wisdom of going to war with Iraq, and I personally have questioned whether it is a good idea, there can be no debate or doubt about the dedication of our troops and devotion to our country or the honor they do us through their sacrifice. We all hope in earnest for a speedy victory and for the safe and quick return of those men and women.

If we fail to prepare in this budget for the fact of this war in Iraq, we will be engaging in wishful thinking. Worse, we will be failing to think at all. The notion that this budget does not provide anything for this enormous undertaking that is occurring is really troubling and really is not what you can call honest budgeting.

I will concede no one is really certain how much the war with Iraq will actually cost, but we can be certain this war will be far from free. In an interview with the Wall Street Journal, the President's former adviser for economic policy, Lawrence Lindsey, estimated the cost of the war would be \$100 billion to \$200 billion. According to the Congressional Budget Office estimates, the initial deployment of troops and equipment would cost about \$14 billion; the first month of combat would cost \$10 billion, and then with each subsequent month of combat costing \$8 billion per month. To return troops and

equipment to their home bases after the war some people believe would cost \$9 billion, and any postwar occupation of Iraq would cost between \$1 billion and \$4 billion, Mr. President, per month—per month.

Using CBO's figures, if we make some ballpark assumptions that active military combat will last for 2½ months and that the following reconstruction and occupation would last another 2 years, we are talking about something between \$69 billion and \$141 billion.

The Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments estimates that the cost of combat from 1 to 6 months would be \$18 billion to \$85 billion, and the cost of reconstruction for 5 years would range from \$25 billion to \$105 billion. Adding all the potential costs identified by the center, it would lead to total cost estimates ranging on the low end from \$129 billion to \$683 billion on the high end.

Plainly, we are talking about a major enterprise, and obviously it is one for which we should budget.

The amendment I offer on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from New Jersey will create a reserve fund to set aside \$100 billion.

That is an amount well within the range of the available estimates I was highlighting in order to fund this military action and reconstruction in Iraq. We pay for this action by reducing the amount that we would budget for cutting taxes in the period covered by the budget resolution—a simple proposition. The amount of \$100 billion would be put in a reserve fund so we can honestly estimate a budget for the war in Iraq, and that would come out of the tax cut that is contemplated.

When we are conducting a war, the budget must reflect it. We cannot blithely go along as if this were a time for business as usual. We should budget responsibly for what is happening right before our eyes.

When I am able to actually offer this amendment, I will strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment. The American people will be extremely supportive, obviously, of our troops in this effort as it is conducted. What they will not understand, though, is if we pretend that this will cost nothing, that we will pass a budget in the midst of this war effort pretending that the war in Iraq will not be an expensive proposition. We owe them that. We owe them honesty at this historical and very significant moment, and we must set aside a reasonable estimate of funds to cover the cost of this enormous undertaking.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. President, I explained earlier why the emergency supplemental was not a part of the regular budget process. I want to share one paragraph from a CRS report:

Based on an examination of previous CRS reviews of funding for wars and other major

military operations, it appears, with one possible exception, that Presidents have not requested and Congress has not provided funding for wars in advance of the start of operations. Rather, administrations have requested funding after operations have begun and Congress has subsequently appropriated money to meet specific documented budget requirements.

I yield the floor, reserving the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I ask for 30 seconds to respond to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CONRAD. Yes. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, in response to the Senator's remarks, the reason these wars were not budgeted for in the past is that they were obviously not foreseen. They occurred after the budget resolution occurred. We have known about this war and the imminent reality of it for some time. We are actually seeing it undertaken as we speak, and we are doing the budget resolution right now. There simply is no hard and fast rule against being honest in budgeting. That is all we are calling for, and this is an appropriate occasion when we can and should budget for the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I salute the Senator from Wisconsin. I think it is absolutely bizarre that we have the budget before us and we have nothing to pay for the war in that budget. The reason given was that operations had not commenced. Well, operations have commenced. And not to set aside funds for the war makes no earthly sense. How can that possibly be defended? We are at war. We have already spent tens of billions of dollars on that conflict, and now to suggest we put our head in the sand and say there is nothing going on defies reality, defies common sense.

I very much hope the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is adopted.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from the State of Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, America is at war. Our priority must be to keep America and Americans safe, both at home and abroad. I look forward to supporting a supplemental budget to pay for the war and to pay for homeland security, and I also voted to reserve the money to do that. That is why I supported the "patriotic pause" that said no tax cuts until we know the cost of the war.

We know Americans are fighting overseas. The U.S. military should know they have the entire Nation behind them to make sure they have the best weapons, the best strategies, and the best support for their families while they are overseas. We also stand up for what America stands for. That means strengthening the safety net for those who need it the most. That

means standing up for America's families.

We also need to recognize that families are hurting. We have a weak economy. People are going into debt to put their kids through school; affordable health insurance. Some families are facing extraordinary challenges because they care for a loved one who has a chronic condition: a parent with Alzheimer's, a child with autism, a son with cerebral palsy, a spouse with multiple sclerosis.

These families struggle every day to take care of their loved ones. They face a tremendous emotional and financial burden. It is not the job of the Federal Government to help them with their emotional burden, but I believe it is the job of the United States of America to help them with their financial responsibility. For those who are giving care, I believe we should give care. I want to give help to those who practice self-help.

Therefore, I will be offering an amendment to provide a tax credit for up to \$5,000 for family caregivers, or those needing care who have caregiving expenses. This would cost \$3.5 billion a year. My tax credit would pay for the prescription drugs, medical bills, or medical management for juvenile diabetics, the medical bills, or other care needed if a person has someone they are caring for with Parkinson's disease. My amendment would help people with multiple chronic conditions. We are not talking about hay fever, though that is disruptive. We are talking about juvenile diabetes. We are talking about autism. We are talking about multiple sclerosis, people who are unable to perform their activities of daily living, who are severely cognitively impaired, or children with such complex medical conditions they require medical management and coordination of care.

Why is this needed? Well, in 2000, over 125 million people had chronic conditions. One in five Americans have multiple chronic conditions. Eighteen million children in this country have chronic physical, developmental, or other conditions that impede their ability to live full lives. Almost 4 million Americans have mental retardation or another severe developmental disability. If the work of family caregivers was replaced with paid services, it would cost the Federal Government close to \$200 billion a year.

Family caregivers face many demands, emotional, physical, and financial stress. They have stresses with their families, with their marriage, the stress of 36-hour days. They pay the high cost of medication, physical therapy, durable medical equipment such as wheelchairs, daycare for children with special needs, and medical bills from care with specialists.

People with serious chronic conditions pay for their health care by either making gradual medical payments over time or using money from savings, mutual funds, or other assets.

Families struggle to make ends meet. Let me give an example. A woman in Potomac, MD, was caring for her husband who had a debilitating neurological disease. There was no treatment or cure. Her husband could no longer talk, walk, or feed himself. The family received no financial help. She worked full time to support his full-time home care. She herself is in her early 60s. She sure could have used that tax credit.

Or as the mother of two children in Parkville, MD, one of her children is a 4-year-old boy with autism. This family has relied on volunteers from local colleges to assist with respite care for their son. This mother has not been able to return to work because of the amount of time needed to care for her two young children. She has two master's degrees in education.

Or like the Maryland woman who cared for a parent with Alzheimer's disease who worked 25 hours per week to pay someone to care for her mother while she worked to have health insurance for herself; saw her own income go from a high of \$40,000 a year to a low of \$6,000 a year. A tax credit could have helped her with home health care and respite care for her mother.

I think my amendment speaks for itself, but I try to speak for the families where we need to give help to those who are practicing self-help.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of organizations supporting this amendment be printed in the RECORD.

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

Who supports BAM's Amendment:

Autism Society of America, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, National Organization for Rare Disorders, Easter Seals, United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Arc of the United States, National Health Council, National Council on the Aging, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Family Voices, National Respite Coalition, National Family Caregivers Association, and the National Alliance for Caregiving.

Ms. MIKULSKI. One of my first milestones in the Senate was the enactment of the Spousal Anti-Impoverishment Act to change the cruel rules of Medicaid so that families would not have to go bankrupt before Medicaid would pay for nursing home care for a spouse. The spouse living in the community could keep the family home, keep a car, and keep some income each month to live on. This has helped one million people.

But this was a down payment. Not much has been done since then except the National Family Caregiver Support Program and long-term care insurance for Federal employees. I was proud to sponsor and work on both of these important measures and a bipartisan basis to get them signed into law.

Now it is time to make the family caregivers who are the backbone of the long term care system in this country a priority in the Federal law books and the tax code.

I urge my colleagues to get behind our Nation's family caregivers and vote for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for her excellent amendment. We appreciate very much her presentation and the thoughtfulness and the energy that she has put into this amendment. I hope my colleagues will pay close attention to what she has offered.

Next, I am going to yield 30 minutes to the senior Senator from South Carolina. Let me say that if there was an award in this body for Mr. Fiscal Responsibility, it would be the senior Senator from South Carolina. In the time I have been in the Senate, nobody has been more serious, more dedicated to balancing budgets, to paying down debt than the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank the leader from North Dakota. He has led our Budget Committee and done an outstanding job. The kudos belong to him for fiscal responsibility, and the responsibility in the position he has as the ranking member, to try to get the group together on a consensus, which is next to impossible, but he does the job.

I have three amendments at the desk, and I understand we are not introducing amendments, so I will address hastily comments on all three.

The first, of course, is the port security amendment for \$1 billion a year for 2 years. It is focused, not Pepto-Bismol homeland security of \$80 billion over 10-some years. I have talked to Senators on both sides of the aisle. They want to finance what we passed unanimously—all 100 Senators—earlier last year for port security.

Right to the point, Osama owns several vessels. His teams landed and blew up the Embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam. His crews were on planes flown into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. He could just as easily have two or three crews get on an Exxon tanker going up the Delaware River to deliver a tankerful of oil, throw the captain overboard and that tanker aground, and that would close down the eastern seaboard for at least 1 year.

I could go into it, but the amendment is worked out and in detail. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the details of the amendment.

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

HOLLINGS SEAPORT SECURITY AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Amendment would add one billion annually, over the next two years, to the Federal Budget. The one billion will be spent as follows:

Maritime Administration (610 million):

450 million—for grants to ports and waterfront facilities to help ensure compliance with federally approved security plans.

150 million—for grants to states, local municipalities and other entities to help comply with Federal area security plans and to

provide grants to responders for port security contingency response.

10 million—to be used in conjunction with the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center to help develop a seaport security training curriculum to provide training to Federal and State law enforcement personnel, and to certify private security personnel working at seaports.

Coast Guard (160 million):

50 million—for port security assessments.

50 million—for the establishment and operation of multi-agency task force to coordinate and evaluate maritime information in order to identify and respond to security threats.

40 million—to help implement the Automated Identification System (AIS) and other tracking systems designed to actively track and monitor vessels operating in U.S. waters.

20 million—for additional Coast Guard port security vessels.

The Border and Transportation Security Directorate (230 million):

100 million—to Customs for the installation of screening equipment, and to be used to help develop new technologies to help develop and prototype screening and detection equipment at U.S. ports.

100 million—to TSA and Customs; 50 million each, to evaluate and implement cargo security programs.

30 million—for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to develop and implement the Transportation Worker ID Card, and to conduct criminal background checks of transportation workers who work in secure areas or who work with sensitive cargo or information.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguish Chair.

The second concerns paying for the war. At the very beginning of this session, the first week of January, I introduced a bill to pay for the war in Iraq. I read a book about the fiscal dilemmas we faced each time there was a war, and I say to my distinguished colleague from Wyoming, each time our leaders paid for the war. During the Civil War they put a tax on dividends. The party of Lincoln did that. In World War I, they went up to a 77 percent marginal tax rate to pay for that war; in World War II, a 94 percent rate; in the Korean war, 91 percent. In Vietnam—that is when President Johnson, who has been abused in history but he is the one who wanted to pay for guns and butter—he balanced the budget, paying for both guns and butter, in 1968 to 1969. That was the last time in the history of this Congress we balanced the budget. We paid for the war in Vietnam.

Now, of course, we come to the war on Iraq. Unlike the Civil War where we had put taxes on dividends, here, there is no tomorrow; like drunken sailors, we come up to this chamber and say we are not going to pay for the war.

My particular measure on the desk is a reserve fund of \$100 billion. Larry Lindsey, the President's former chief economic advisor, said the war will cost between \$100 and \$200 billion, but that is up to the Finance Committee to figure out. You have to put your money where your mouth is. I think a better way to pay is with new money. We cannot just forgo this program or that program. We need a value-added tax of 2

percent dedicated to paying just for that war in Iraq. It would take the IRS a solid year until they fashioned the tax and we could start collecting it. But it is a very enforceable tax. Every industrialized country has had one. We had hearings before the Finance Committee back in the 1980s about a value-added tax. We almost adopted it then.

We ought to get serious and get off the deficit bandwagon we are on now. That is what disturbs me. The Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, says in time of war we run deficits. Then, just the other day, in a speech to the nation, he said that "Americans understand the costs of conflict because we have paid them in the past. War has no certainty except the certainty of sacrifice."

The point is, we must have sacrifice; yet that is not being followed through, by any manner or means, with respect to paying for the war. Now is the time for this body to sober up and realize we are running horrendous deficits.

What we have right now is the certainty of sacrifice, for everyone except the Commander in Chief and us in Congress. What we are saying to that GI going into Iraq tonight is: We hope you don't get hurt. We hope you don't get killed because we want you to hurry back. Why? Because we are going to give you the bill. We are not going to pay for the war. The fellow who fights the war is going to have to pay for the war because we need a tax cut. We are

going to Disney World. We are not going to have any sacrifice.

They are all running around here with flags on their lapels. So I put section 6 into my bill when I introduced it, which says that if members vote against it, they will be prohibited from wearing the flags in their lapels.

Now when the President leads you to deficits by saying, in time of war we can run deficits, we are playing a game. He says that so in the election next year, you can say, "I voted for tax cuts." That is our dilemma.

The other side talks about the need for tax cuts so we can see economic growth and growth and growth; but my third amendment is to stop the tax cuts.

You can see in this budget before the Senate, the only growth we have is in the national debt. It goes from \$6.687 trillion in fiscal year 2003, to \$11.919 trillion in fiscal year 2013. It goes up, up, and away by \$5.2 trillion. I was here when we did not even have a \$1 trillion deficit. President Reagan started this tax cut nonsense with voodoo I, and we immediately had a recession. Dave Stockman wrote in his book "The Triumph of Politics," we should have canceled the tax cut in November 1981, and we did not. He said the President did not do what he should have done.

Then we had voodoo II, the year before last, with President Bush's tax cut. On June 1, 2001, we had surpluses. Then we passed the tax cut, voodoo II,

on June 8, and by July 1 we had a deficit. By September 10, 2001—one day before September 11 we had a deficit. We were in the red by \$99 billion, so don't blame the deficits on September 11.

We were already in deficits, and voodoo II caused it. Now we seem to get no education in the third kick of a mule, so to speak. We are on course just for the pollsters and buying the election next year with more tax cuts. That is why I resist what some members are trying to do by cutting the tax cut down to \$350 billion.

Do you know what that means to this particular Senator? I was with Phil Gramm and Warren Rudman on Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and our particular initiative called for the reduction of the deficit each year by \$35 billion. Here they want me to vote to increase the deficit each year by \$35 billion for 10 years, or \$350 billion.

What will happen is we will pass it in the Senate, it will get over to the conference, they will fix it, it will be back up to \$700 billion-and-something. You will have the votes. You have the majority.

I ask unanimous consent to have "budget realities" printed in the RECORD.

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

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES

Pres. 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 in- creases in spending for interest (billions)
Truman:						
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	
Eisenhower:						
1953	76.1	0.4	-6.5	-6.9	266.0	
1954	70.9	3.6	-1.2	-4.8	270.8	
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	
Kennedy:						
1961	97.7	-1.2	-3.3	-2.1	292.6	
1962	106.8	3.2	-7.1	-10.3	302.9	9.1
Johnson:						
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
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
Nixon:						
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
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
Ford:						
1975	332.3	4.8	-53.2	-58.0	541.9	32.7
1976	371.8	13.4	-73.7	-87.1	629.0	37.1
Carter:						
1977	409.2	23.7	-53.7	-77.4	706.4	41.9
1978	458.7	11.0	-59.2	-70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	504.0	12.2	-40.7	-52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	-73.8	-79.6	909.1	74.8
Reagan:						
1981	678.2	6.7	-79.0	-85.7	994.8	95.5
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	851.9	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	990.5	81.9	-221.2	-303.1	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,004.1	75.7	-149.8	-225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.5	100.0	-155.2	-255.2	2,601.3	214.1
Bush:						
1989	1,143.7	114.2	-152.5	-266.7	2,868.3	240.9

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES—Continued

Pres. 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 in- creases in spending for interest (billions)
1990	1,253.2	117.4	-221.2	-338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,324.4	122.5	-269.4	-391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,381.7	113.2	-290.4	-403.6	4,002.1	292.3
Clinton:						
1993	1,409.5	94.2	-255.1	-349.3	4,351.4	292.5
1994	1,461.9	89.0	-203.3	-292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,515.8	113.3	-164.0	-277.2	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,560.6	153.4	-107.5	-260.9	5,181.9	344.0
1997	1,601.3	165.8	-22.0	-187.8	5,369.7	355.8
1998	1,652.6	178.2	69.2	-109.0	5,478.7	363.8
1999	1,703.0	251.8	124.4	-127.4	5,606.1	353.5
2000	1,789.0	258.9	236.2	-22.7	5,628.8	362.0
Bush:						
2001	1,863.9	268.2	127.1	-141.1	5,769.9	359.5
2002	2,011.0	270.7	-157.8	-428.5	6,198.4	332.5
2003	2,137.0	222.6	246.0	468.6	6,667.0	323.0

Note.—Historical Tables, Budget of the U.S. Government: Beginning in 1962, CBO's The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2004–2013, January 2003.

Mr. HOLLINGS. If you take the years from 1945, from President Truman down through President Ford, 30 years, to 1975, you will find the aggregate total of all deficits at \$358 billion. That is for 30 years, six Presidents, the cost

of World War II, the cost of Korea, the cost of Vietnam. All throughout that and all the deficits, it was only \$358 billion. Last year the deficit was, in 1 year, \$428 billion. Here in my hand is the President's budget. I ask unani-

mous consent to have printed in the RECORD the last page in here, page 332.

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

TABLE S-14.—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FINANCING AND DEBT
[In billions of dollars]

Function	2002 actual	Estimates					
		2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Debt outstanding, end of year:							
Gross Federal debt:							
Debt issued by Treasury	6,171	6,725	7,294	7,811	8,327	8,832	9,363
Debt issued by other agencies	27	27	27	26	26	26	25
Total, gross Federal debt	6,198	6,752	7,321	7,837	8,353	8,858	9,388
Held by:							
Debt held by Government accounts	2,658	2,874	3,155	3,451	3,751	4,061	4,385
Debt held by the public	3,540	3,878	4,166	4,387	4,603	4,797	5,003

Mr. HOLLINGS. On page 332, the President projects we will have a deficit next year of \$569 billion. He says this year we will end up with a \$554 billion deficit. That \$554 billion doesn't include the \$100 billion for Iraq. So you can see we are up around \$600 or \$700 billion.

I used to say Strom Thurmond and I are home free. But I think my newest distinguished colleague from South Carolina will have to pay for it. I will not have to pay for it. I am not worried about it, and everything else like that. We can retire, get our pension, go on home and be quiet. But you cannot do it in good conscience when you come to Government to do the job of the people, and they trust you, they want you to look out for the needs of the country, not the needs of the campaign. That is what we are all engaged in here.

People are giving up their lives for us, for what we believe in, for what we legislate, and for the command we give them to go to war. We ought at least to pay for the war on the one hand. And we ought to ensure the peace economically for our children and grandchildren, not by tax cuts, but somehow, somewhere, to pay for these budgets.

I would like to get Government on a pay-as-you-go basis. I remember when Alan Greenspan went down with a team to President Clinton and he said you are going to have to raise taxes. In 1993 we raised taxes. We cut the spending and we raised taxes on Social Security, we raised taxes on gasoline, we

raised taxes on the highest bracket. And we had 8 years of the finest and strongest economy.

Now we come here and want to sell the idea of tax cuts are going to give growth. We know that with \$428 billion and \$554 billion in deficits, that's really almost a trillion dollars in stimulus, and that is without the cost of the war. What gives here?

We have to sober up and get off this deficit barleycorn we are drinking like drunken sailors around here, like there is no tomorrow, like we don't have to pay for the war. There is no sacrifice for us.

We go to the schoolchildren in America and we say there is one thing certain about war, it is sacrifice. But then we come up with the pollsters and say we have to get reelected so we want to go ahead next year to say we cut taxes.

So there we are. I am not for that \$350 billion compromise or whatever it is. I admire the people who are trying to work out the compromise, but that is totally misleading to the American people, that somehow the burden is too great on estate taxes. We have had people come here, George Soros, Bill Gates, and the others come who are paying the estate taxes. They come and say don't worry about it. That is not really too big a burden.

With respect to dividends, in the market in New York there is a dichotomy, a difference up there with respect to whether or not we ought to lift the taxes on dividends. But if they would

talk about seniors, they would say senior are double taxed on their Social Security. I pay the tax on Social Security and when I receive the benefit, I pay the tax on that Social Security benefit. That is double taxation. Eighty percent of seniors in America depend for the major part of their income on Social Security. So if it's seniors we have in mind we want to look out for, then look out for, not the rich seniors, but the poor seniors, 80 percent of the seniors, because they are not in that top bracket that is worried about estate taxes and everything else of that kind.

I really appreciate the distinguished Senator from North Dakota yielding me this time. I wanted to be able, in a deliberate fashion talk about these amendments, because when we get to that 1 minute a side rule I will not be able to.

I have a very judicious amendment on port security, where we would just fund it for 2 years. We voted 100 to nothing, all Republicans and all Democrats, with respect to port security.

I think we ought to pay for the war. We are not raising the taxes here and we are not telling them how to do it in the Finance Committee. The Budget Committee can't do that. But we can do the amount. And I think we ought not to have any more tax cuts.

I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, with my gratitude. I appreciate it very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the senior Senator from South Carolina for his leadership. One of the people who inspired me to run for the Senate was the Senator from South Carolina. I don't think I have ever told the Senator that. But when the Senator from South Carolina was running for President of the United States, our former Governor, Bill Guy, endorsed Senator HOLLINGS.

Mr. HOLLINGS. My friend.

Mr. CONRAD. Bill Guy was a very close friend of my family and somebody who has been a mentor to me in public service.

Bill Guy was a balanced budget Democrat. He believed in balanced budgets and he believed in fiscal responsibility. He was proud to stand with the Senator from South Carolina during that time of dramatically rising deficits. To him it was a threat to the economic security of the country and he thought the Senator from South Carolina had the best plan.

I think if anybody looks back objectively at that time, one will see in fact the Senator from South Carolina did have the best plan. If it had been adopted at the time we would have avoided much of the debt now facing the country.

Mr. HOLLINGS. If the distinguished Senator will yield, I really am grateful to him. The truth is, more than a balanced budget, we need balanced Senators. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota is just that. He has that even temper in how he approached it, and therefore has been far more effective because I have been wailing and crying without effect for years. But I will continue on, trying my best, thank you very much.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator. And I can only say, I have been completely ineffective at stopping what I think is a rush to deficits and debt and, ultimately, decline.

I believe it is profoundly wrong—profoundly wrong—to run up these budget deficits. Unfortunately, the budget that the President of the United States sent to us and the budget that has come out of the committee will dramatically increase our budget deficits.

As the Senator has indicated, we are going to have a deficit, if the President's budget is adopted, of over \$500 billion this year and will never have a budget deficit below \$400 billion any year for the rest of this decade under the budget the President sent us. Under the budget that has come out of the committee, we will never have a deficit under \$300 billion.

On this chart is the President's budget. One can see we have red ink as far as the eye can see, over \$500 billion this year, over \$400 billion in every year for the rest of this decade.

Here is what happens to the gross Federal debt. The gross Federal debt is going to go from \$6 trillion, in 2002, and is going to reach \$12 trillion by the end

of this budget period. That is the consequence of the President's budget.

What I think should sober us all is that the cost of the President's tax cuts explodes at exactly the time the cost to the Federal Government of the retirement of the baby boom generation explodes—deficits and debt.

These are not my projections. These are official reports of the Congressional Budget Office and the President's own budget documents.

Here is the President's own budget document as shown right here. This is the long-term outlook if the President's policies are adopted. It shows that we are in the sweet spot now. This is where we are now. And although these are record deficits, the biggest in dollar terms we have ever had, if we adopt his policies, it is going to get much worse because, as I indicated, the cost of his tax cuts explodes at the very time the cost of the retirement of the baby boom generation explodes.

That is not a projection. We know baby boomers have been born. They are alive today. They are eligible for Social Security and Medicare. There are going to be 77 million of them—about double the number we have eligible today. That is what we face as a consequence of this budget. I think it will be a significant mistake.

I want to, for a moment, discuss an amendment I will be offering for our colleagues to deal with the promise the Federal Government made on IDEA; that is, the Individuals With Disabilities Act. We made a promise to local governments that the Federal Government would fund 40 percent of the cost. It was a promise we have never kept. As a result, property taxes are higher in every jurisdiction of America.

I will offer an amendment to keep the promise of IDEA, and to pay for it, and to pay for it by reducing the tax cuts that are part of this legislation.

The legislation before us has \$1.4 trillion in tax cuts. The associated interest costs another almost \$300 billion. So the total cost of this tax cut, in this measure, is \$1.7 trillion. The legislation I will offer to keep the promise on IDEA is a fraction of that, a small fraction of that—around \$70 billion over the next 10 years.

The Federal Government made a promise, when the legislation was adopted, that we would fund 40 percent of the cost. My colleagues know that we are only doing about half as much as we promised.

What does that mean? That means the local districts get stuck with the bill. That means pressure is put on local property taxes. In my own State, now the annual property tax is about 2.5 percent of the value of the property. That is a very burdensome tax. In part, it is a result of our not keeping a promise and shoving the burden off on local school districts. That is not something we should do. If we make a commitment, we ought to keep it.

I am going to give our colleagues a chance to keep the promise that was

made on IDEA, and to fund it out of the tax cut. We are still operating under an agreement in which we are discussing amendments but not sending them to the desk at this point. We will do that at an appropriate time. But I wanted to alert my colleagues that I am going to offer an amendment on IDEA. I am going to offer it in a way that is paid for. I am going to offer it in a way that is not at the top end of the range, by any means. It is going to have a cost of between \$70 and \$80 billion over 10 years. We will pay for it by reducing the \$1.4 trillion tax cut.

A budget is about choices. A budget is about priorities. I believe that ought to be a priority for this body and for this country. I believe we ought to keep the promise that was made to local school districts when the legislation was passed. I believe we ought to rejigger the priorities of the budget resolution that is before us, reduce the size of the tax cut, keep the promise of IDEA, and take pressure off local property taxes because that is exactly where the burden is borne when the Federal Government does not keep its promise.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes off the resolution to the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I share Senator CONRAD's desire that we do more for IDEA. Under President Bush, we have done more than ever. We also need reform of IDEA. If we listen to our teachers, principals, and school people, they will tell us that the Federal laws are driving them crazy, undermining their ability to discipline. We need some reform at the same time we put in some additional money. We have a chance to do that this year.

What I want to express my concern about is this manufactured issue about the supplemental and that we cannot proceed with our budget without knowing what the supplemental is going to be. We have a budget law that says we have to have this done by April 15. We cannot sit around here and wait forever.

I would just like to remind everybody how we got here.

Last fall, in this body and the House—we voted 77 to 23 in this Senate to authorize the President of the United States to use force, if he deemed fit, to protect the security of the United States.

After great care and every option being pursued, the President has concluded that we should use force. I am not aware that a single one of those 77 Senators wishes to change their vote.

I also note that at that time the Democrats controlled this body. And at that time, while we voted to authorize the President to act, we debated the

cost. We talked about the cost a great deal. People had all kinds of ideas about the cost. And when we voted to authorize him to act, we knew there would be a cost.

We also knew our budget was not in balance and the effect of the war would be to exacerbate the debt that we had. Nobody had any doubt about that. Nobody has any doubt about that today.

In the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, we voted to proceed with an authorization bill. We will have an authorization bill that sets our spending criteria for next year, with a limit that we pass here. We are going to have a nice increase in the baseline for defense next year, with far greater increases than ever occurred under President Clinton and the Democratic leadership here. Suggesting we are not doing enough for defense—we are having a nice, solid, significant increase. I wish it could be more. In our circumstances, it is the best we can do.

So we know we are going to fund the budget. We are going to fund this war. And we know how we are going to do it; and that is, by a supplemental.

Now, for example, Turkey is still waffling around, to some degree, about whether or not we can come through there in pursuing this war.

There are a lot of uncertainties out there. It is not fair to expect that the President can walk in here today and give us an accurate total about how much this war is going to cost. We certainly ought not to fail to meet our April 15 deadline of passing a budget based on that objection. We are going to fund this war, and we should fund this war completely. We are going to do it by a supplemental. Everybody knows it. It is nothing more than a delaying tactic for them to claim that we should not proceed with the budget until the supplemental is done.

In fact, who knows, we could have a supplemental even after the war is over, but we probably need it sooner so we can make sure our funding stream continues apace.

Historically, we have never budgeted the cost of a war. The Congressional Research Service has done a report. They report:

Presidents have not requested and Congress has not approved funding for wars in advance of the start of operations. Rather, administrations have requested funding after the operations have begun, and Congress has subsequently appropriated money to meet the specific documented budgetary requirements.

It goes on to say:

Congress has provided the executive branch with considerable flexibility in financing military operations in advance of specific congressional action on appropriations.

So this is just an excuse. This is just a political gimmick that we know is going on. We know this supplemental is going to be significant. We have known that from the very beginning. I don't believe we ought to be deterred from completing our statutorily required duty, and that is to produce a budget waiting on this issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time?

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, a little later this afternoon we will consider a resolution supporting the men and women in uniform waging the war with Iraq. Many Members will come and express their sentiments. It is appropriate, and this is the right moment to do it. When the first shot is fired, the political debate should start to take a back seat to our solidarity and commitment to standing behind these men and women who have their lives on the line. We hope this conflict is short lived, that it is successful, and that they come home safe with their mission accomplished. Our thoughts and prayers are not only with them but with the innocent people of Iraq, many of whom have been victims of the terrorism of Saddam Hussein and his repressive regime.

There is another part of this conflict that needs to be addressed. We will also stand with the President, with the administration to provide the money that is necessary to wage the war. There is no doubt about that. This Congress will vote to give the men and women the resources they need to come home safely and quickly. Of course, the question posed to us is, How will you pay for it?

It is ironic that we are debating a budget resolution today that contains zero for the war in Iraq. I am sure many people are puzzled when they step back and reflect. We have known the troop buildup was expensive. We know the war itself is expensive, perhaps the cost of occupation afterwards. Why don't we budget for this? Why don't we plan for it? Some have said: We don't appropriate money for possibilities. We appropriate money for real needs.

This is a real need. We have to be honest. We have allies in this effort, primarily Great Britain, but there aren't many countries, if any, coming forward with troops in the field or money to pay for the cost of this undertaking. That is why I come today in support of an amendment which will be offered later by Senator RUSS FEINGOLD of Wisconsin. It is an important amendment because basically what Senator FEINGOLD is saying is, over the

next 10 years we will be setting aside \$10 billion a year to pay for the cost of the war in Iraq; \$100 billion is not an unreasonable pricetag. The lowest pricetag we have had for the war is about \$26 billion, and the most expensive is way beyond Senator FEINGOLD's suggested amendment.

I am not suggesting we won't appropriate this money; we will. But we should at this point do not only the patriotic thing but the responsible thing and set aside the money we will need to pay for the war.

If we don't, I can tell you what is going to happen. It is going to go into a tax cut proposed by the President for the wealthiest people in this country. What is more important, that we meet our obligation to our men and women in uniform not just with rhetoric but with a pledge of money to pay for the resources they need to win or that we provide a tax cut for the wealthiest people in America? That should not even be a choice at this moment.

We have to remember we are spending about \$700 million a month right now on the war on terrorism. I commend the efforts of the Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, during the Clinton administration to have the Defense Department budget for ongoing contingencies such as the conflict in Bosnia and the no-fly zones in Iraq. These were ongoing conflicts with expected costs that were not budgeted, and the Senator from Alaska insisted on honest budgeting. That is what the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. FEINGOLD, is insisting today.

The administration may send up a supplemental appropriation bill as early as next week. That really begs the question, Why does the White House refuse to send up estimates of the cost of the war this week and insist that we pass this budget resolution without one penny for the war in Iraq?

To a lot of people who are watching the debate, this may seem like some procedural hassle over accounting techniques. It is more. If we don't set aside the funds for the war in Iraq, those funds will come out of programs for education and health care and critical domestic needs. I will support the amendment by the Senator from Wisconsin, but I hope all those who stand in solidarity with America's troops in Iraq will also stand in solidarity when it comes to honest budgeting to pay for the cost of the war so that our men and women in uniform can be successful and come home safely and as quickly as possible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, would the Senator mind if Senator BROWNBACK sent his amendment to the desk? He was ready to offer the amendment last night and did not. He has already spoken on the amendment. We

agreed to allow Senator SCHUMER to send his amendment to the desk. Can we send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. CONRAD. I would if we can get agreement to send Senator FEINGOLD's amendment as well.

Mr. NICKLES. I have not looked at it. Let me look at his amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Why don't we do that, and if we can get agreement on that, we will be happy to agree to Senator BROWBACK sending his amendment to the desk as well.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, Senator BROWBACK has an amendment. I believe it is at the desk. I ask unanimous consent we set aside the pending amendment for consideration of the Brownback amendment, and following that, I ask consent to set aside the Brownback amendment to have the Feingold amendment be considered.

Mr. CONRAD. Reserving the right to object, what will that do to the sequence of votes? We would not want the Schumer amendment to lose its position; that we would vote on that prior to the Brownback amendment.

Mr. NICKLES. That is correct. There is also a Cochran amendment that will be offered as an alternative to the Schumer amendment. I would like to have that voted on adjacent to the Schumer amendment, but we have not sent that to the desk yet. The Schumer amendment is in the queue. This would put the Brownback amendment in the queue, and it would also put the Feingold amendment in the queue.

At some point, I will be asking consent for Senator COCHRAN's amendment, and I will ask consent to have it considered adjacent to the Schumer amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Fair enough.

Mr. NICKLES. For the time being, I am asking consent for the Brownback amendment to be considered and then the Feingold amendment. I understand from the Parliamentarian he has two amendments. I am not sure which one the Senator requested to be sent to the desk.

Mr. CONRAD. It would be the amendment which Senator FEINGOLD discussed, which is the amendment for a \$100 billion war reserve fund so that the war is paid for and the resources are available in this budget.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 282

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Brownback amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWBACK], for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. CORNYN, proposes an amendment numbered 282.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that a commission be established to review the efficiency of Federal agencies)

On page 79, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 308. FEDERAL AGENCY REVIEW COMMISSION.

It is the sense of the Senate that a commission should be established to review Federal domestic agencies, and programs within such agencies, with the express purpose of providing Congress with recommendations, and legislation to implement those recommendations, to realign or eliminate government agencies and programs that are duplicative, wasteful, inefficient, outdated, or irrelevant, or have failed to accomplish their intended purpose.

AMENDMENT NO. 270

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will now report the Feingold amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. FEINGOLD], for himself and Mr. CORZINE, proposes an amendment numbered 270.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: to set aside a reserve fund for possible military action and reconstruction in Iraq)

(a) FEDERAL REVENUES.—

- (1) On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (2) On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (3) On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (4) On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (5) On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (6) On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (7) On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (8) On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (9) On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$10 billion; and
- (10) On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$10 billion.

(b) AMOUNTS BY WHICH REVENUES SHOULD BE CHANGED.—

- (1) On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (2) On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (3) On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (4) On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (5) On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (6) On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (7) On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (8) On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$10 billion;
- (9) On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$10 billion; and
- (10) On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$10 billion.

(c) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—

- (1) On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000;
- (2) On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by \$713,000,000;
- (3) On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by \$1,329,000,000;
- (4) On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by \$1,973,000,000;
- (5) On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$2,627,000,000;
- (6) On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by \$3,320,000,000;

(7) On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by \$4,052,000,000;

(8) On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by \$4,816,000,000;

(9) On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by \$5,619,000,000; and

(10) On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by \$6,465,000,000.

(d) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—

(1) On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000;

(2) On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by \$713,000,000;

(3) On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by \$1,329,000,000;

(4) On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by \$1,973,000,000;

(5) On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by \$2,627,000,000;

(6) On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by \$3,320,000,000;

(7) On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by \$4,052,000,000;

(8) On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by \$4,816,000,000;

(9) On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by \$5,619,000,000; and

(10) On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by \$6,465,000,000.

(e) DEFICITS.—

(1) On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$10,181,000,000;

(2) On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$10,713,000,000;

(3) On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$11,329,000,000;

(4) On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$11,973,000,000;

(5) On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$12,627,000,000;

(6) On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$13,320,000,000;

(7) On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$14,052,000,000;

(8) On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$14,816,000,000;

(9) On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$15,619,000,000; and

(10) On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$16,465,000,000.

(f) PUBLIC DEBT.—

(1) On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by \$10,181,000,000;

(2) On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by \$20,894,000,000;

(3) On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by \$32,223,000,000;

(4) On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by \$44,196,000,000;

(5) On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by \$56,823,000,000;

(6) On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by \$70,143,000,000;

(7) On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by \$84,195,000,000;

(8) On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by \$99,011,000,000;

(9) On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by \$114,630,000,000; and

(10) On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by \$131,095,000,000.

(g) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—

(1) On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by \$10,181,000,000;

(2) On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by \$20,894,000,000;

(3) On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by \$32,223,000,000;

(4) On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by \$44,196,000,000;

(5) On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by \$56,823,000,000;

(6) On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by \$70,143,000,000;

(7) On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by \$84,195,000,000;

(8) On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by \$99,011,000,000;

(9) On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by \$114,630,000,000; and

(10) On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by \$131,095,000,000.

(h) NET INTEREST.—

(1) On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000;

(2) On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by \$181,000,000;

(3) On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by \$713,000,000;

(4) On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by \$713,000,000;

(5) On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by \$1,329,000,000;

(6) On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by \$1,329,000,000;

(7) On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by \$1,973,000,000;

(8) On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by \$1,973,000,000;

(9) On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by \$2,627,000,000;

(10) On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by \$2,627,000,000;

(11) On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by \$3,320,000,000;

(12) On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by \$3,320,000,000;

(13) On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by \$4,052,000,000;

(14) On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by \$4,052,000,000;

(15) On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by \$4,816,000,000;

(16) On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by \$4,816,000,000;

(17) On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by \$5,619,000,000;

(18) On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by \$5,619,000,000;

(19) On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by \$6,465,000,000; and

(20) On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by \$6,465,000,000.

(i) RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.—On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by \$100 billion.

(j) RESERVE FUND.—At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . RESERVE FUND FOR POSSIBLE MILITARY ACTION AND RECONSTRUCTION IN IRAQ.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Upon the favorable reporting of legislation by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate making discretionary appropriations in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution for expenses for possible military action and reconstruction in Iraq in fiscal years 2003 through 2013, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may, in consultation with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the appropriate committee, revise the level of total new budget authority and outlays, the functional totals, allocations, discretionary spending limits, and levels of deficits and debt in this resolution by up to \$100 billion in budget authority and outlays.

(b) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(c) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(d) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement au-

thority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate; and

(2) the Chairman of that Committee may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

Mr. NICKLES. Parliamentary inquiry. How much time—

Mr. CONRAD. What was that last request, if I can inquire? I missed that last request.

Mr. NICKLES. I am inquiring how much time I have left on the resolution.

Mr. CONRAD. Before that.

Mr. NICKLES. I asked that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. CONRAD. Both have been dispensed with?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both amendments are pending.

Mr. NICKLES. We set aside the Brownback amendment, and now the Feingold amendment is the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I inquire of the Parliamentarian, how much time do I have remaining on the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five hours and 45 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. I yield back the remainder of my time on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time is yielded back.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I think it is good we have a few more amendments in the queue. I ask Senator NICKLES and the staff to review the other amendments and maybe we can get those lined up. We will improve the operations if we can get those lined up. I thank the chairman for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, first, there has now been agreement on a resolution with respect to Iraq. At least we had a caucus and there is agreement on the wording of the resolution. I hope very much we get on with that sometime soon.

I personally think it is surrealistic to be talking about other issues and not talking about Iraq. I hope when we get on to the discussion of the war with Iraq, not for the purpose of delay, because we could dispense with that discussion hopefully throughout the day and perhaps tomorrow morning go back to the budget and complete the budget by early next week, which is long in advance of when we need to finish it, but to have our country at war and not be discussing that when the resolution has now been completed strikes many of us as incongruous.

With that said, we are still on the budget. Let me go to the question of the amendment I have already announced I will send to the desk.

The amendment I will be offering is on funding IDEA. We see that in 2002 and 2003, we enacted \$2.5 billion. Full funding for that period would be \$24.4 billion. When we say "full funding," that is not really full funding. That is

funding the commitment the Federal Government made to provide 40 percent of the cost of that legislation, a commitment that we have never kept. As a result, we forced up local property taxes all across the country.

The budget that has come before us in 2002 is far short of meeting the Federal commitment in 2003 and in 2004.

The chairman of the committee has indicated they increased IDEA—and they did, that is absolutely correct—by \$1 billion. That is a move in the right direction, and we applaud it. But we are still so far below what we promised when we passed the legislation. I say to my colleagues, when the Federal Government tells the States and all these local units all across the country, we are passing this legislation and as part of the bargain we will fund 40 percent of it—40 percent—and then we never come anywhere close, that is not a good way for the Federal Government to do business. That damages our credibility and it also forces local jurisdictions to raise local property taxes.

The budget we have before us on education is the smallest increase we have seen in 8 years. There are increases, absolutely; that is true. There is an increase. Our colleagues on the other side like to concentrate on those areas that have increases. They often do not say they have funded many of those increases with corresponding cuts. The overall increase is \$1.1 billion, and that is by far the lowest increase for education in 8 years.

My own strong belief is education is the priority. After defending the Nation, which is our No. 1 priority—that is our No. 1 responsibility—I believe education is right at the head of the line. Maybe I believe that because I was raised by my grandparents.

My grandmother was a schoolteacher, and my grandfather, who only had an eighth grade education, had profound respect for education. Certainly my grandmother did. She drummed it into all of our heads: If you want to make the most of your opportunity in life, get the best education you can.

My grandparents were deadly serious about it. They were so serious. They were middle-income people, but they made sure they set aside funds to help every one of their grandchildren, 13 grandchildren, get an advanced degree. Not just a college degree, but every single one an advanced degree because they saw education as the way to open the door to opportunity. That is what we ought to be doing with our education funding. This budget doesn't do it. This budget puts the priority, the overwhelming priority, on tax cuts. Of the money above baseline in this budget, 74 percent is for tax cuts; 74 percent of the money above the baseline.

That is above the normal spending and the normal taxes. Seventy-four percent of the change above baseline is for tax cuts. That is the priority in this budget. I do not think that is the right priority.

I hope my colleagues will give serious consideration to this amendment. It costs \$73 billion over 10 years, and it is paid for by reducing the \$1.4 trillion tax cut by a like amount.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONRAD. I will yield to the Senator from Nevada. As I do, let me say how much I appreciate the partnership of the Senator from Nevada in this endeavor of working on a budget resolution. His patience and willingness to work with others to try to accomplish legislative results are legendary in the Chamber. We appreciate very much his hard work.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to speak while there is not a lot of activity on the Senate floor because it will become hectic. There are a few hours remaining on this resolution, and then we have the Iraq resolution, which will be forthcoming soon.

I speak for the entire Democratic caucus about our ranking member on the Budget Committee. He is a very modest man. He and I came to the Senate together. His parents were killed in an automobile accident caused by a drunk driver. He was raised by his grandparents. His parents and his grandparents must be smiling broadly now to see the contribution he has made to our country. The biggest contribution he has made is allowing the Democratic Senators with whom he has served to better understand the fiscal situation of this country at any given time.

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized as the person in the Senate who knows the numbers. He believes very strongly that deficit spending is bad, that the debt that was in existence when he came to the Senate had to be downsized, and working with the prior administration, that was accomplished. In fact, the debt was being paid down. These past months, he has also articulated so well how it is not good for the country to again have these huge deficits.

So I again say on behalf of the entire Democratic caucus how much we all appreciate the work, the guidance, and the direction the Senator from North Dakota has given us. As a result of the education I have received from him about the financial matters of this country, I better understand what is going on in the economy of this country. I extend my appreciation to the Senator for that education.

One of the areas I was totally naive about was the agricultural problems of this country. There are a number of Senators who come from agricultural States. I have learned to listen to and admire the direction I have received from other Senators on both sides of the aisle regarding agriculture, but no one has done more to educate me on issues relating to the American farmer than the Senator from North Dakota.

I have received rewards in recent years for voting with American farmers. In Nevada, we do not have a lot of agriculture. We produce quite a bit of

alfalfa just simply because the growing season is so long. We grow a lot of onions. We are the largest producer of white onions in the United States, but basically our agricultural output is very small.

So for me to be part of the army to move forward to protect the family farm is something that I have learned from the Senator from North Dakota.

For these and many others reasons, while there is a little bit of down time, I want to let the Senator know how much I appreciate his friendship and his leadership on the issues of fiscal constraint, the general economy of this Nation and the world, agriculture, and so many other things on which his great mind has been able to assist me in being able to be a better Senator.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his kind remarks.

I will take this moment to alert our colleagues, who may be listening back in their offices, of the circumstance we face. The other side now has yielded back all of their time. We are down to some 5 hours—might I inquire of the Chair how much time we have on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Five hours 9 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. Five hours 9 minutes. I thank the Chair. So we have just over 5 hours remaining. I alert my colleagues and their staffs that if they have amendments they want to offer, this is their chance. Time is going to run out, and then we will vote on the amendments that are pending at the time until we have disposed of all of those amendments. So if people want to have a chance to debate and discuss their amendments, time is running out. This is their chance. I urge my colleagues to take advantage of that opportunity.

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.

Mr. CONRAD. 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. CONRAD. Mr. President, in these moments while we are asking colleagues to come to the floor to offer their amendments—and I understand a Senator is on his way to the floor—I also understand we may be turning to the resolution on Iraq at 2. Instead of having this time wasted, I thought I would review, from my perspective, what has happened to our budget condition over the last several years, where we are headed, and why it alarms me so much.

My colleagues will recall that 2 years ago we were told there were going to be \$5.6 trillion of surpluses over the next decade. It was in that context that President Bush sent Congress a budget that had a \$1.7 trillion or \$1.8 trillion tax cut. He said at the time that he

would only be taking 1 of every 4 surplus dollars for tax reduction, and he said he would still be able to fund a strong buildup for national defense, that he would be able to fund the priorities of education and health care, that he would be able to have a maximum paydown of the national debt, in fact he would be able to virtually eliminate the national debt, and that he would also be able to protect the trust funds of Social Security and Medicare.

Unfortunately, that proved to be overly optimistic. Many warned at that time that it was unwise to be betting on a 10-year forecast, that you cannot count on a 10-year forecast. You cannot bet the ranch on the revenue coming in as anticipated.

We all know what has happened. With the tax cut implemented at the time, with the economic slowdown, with the attack on America, with the additional tax cuts proposed by the President because now he has proposed an additional \$1.6 trillion of tax cuts, and with the associated interest costs, the total cost of those tax cuts would be \$1.96 trillion. When that is put together, we are back in the deficit ditch and by over \$2 trillion.

Where did the money go? Over this period, most of it went to the tax cuts, both those that had been implemented and those proposed. The second biggest chunk of the money, 27 percent, went to additional spending as a result of the attack on the country. Virtually all of this has increased defense spending and additional homeland security spending. The next biggest chunk is revenue coming in below expectations not related to the tax cut—in other words, the total revenue below what we would have had without the tax cuts and without the overestimations of revenue.

The revenue change is 64 percent, but only about two-thirds of that is from the tax cut. The other is from the models not predicting accurately what revenue would be raised for various levels of economic activity. The smallest sliver, the smallest part, is the economic downturn.

Most alarming is the long-term outlook. The long-term outlook, according to the President's own analysis, from his analytical perspectives, page 43 of his budget document, shows what happens if we implement the President's proposals for spending and tax cuts.

What one sees should alarm everyone. It shows these are the good times with respect to deficits. The deficits we are running now are record amounts. We have never had a budget deficit over \$290 billion, even including Social Security, not over \$370 billion. This year we will have a budget deficit of over \$500 billion.

This chart shows—and again it is from the President's own analysis—the situation will get much worse as the baby boom generation starts to retire because they will put pressure, of

course, on Medicare and Social Security, programs for which they are eligible, programs on which they are counting, and we are going to have over 75 million people who are in that baby boom generation. That will double the number of people eligible for those programs.

Look what happens then. If we adopt the President's policy, his tax cuts, and his spending policy, when the baby boom generation retires, according to the President's own documents, the deficits absolutely explode.

Is this a course we should be on? I don't think so. This is a course for deficits and debt that is utterly unsustainable. This is a course that I believe, and I predict today, will lead to dramatic cuts in Medicare, in Social Security, and in virtually every other part of the Government.

I am the first to acknowledge there are items in the Government we should cut. There is waste in Government, there is fraud in Government, there is abuse in Government, no question about that. But we have been hunting waste, fraud, and abuse a long time, and we will need to continue that, and we will need to do a much better job of it because where we are headed is totally unsustainable.

If anyone doubts this will lead to massive cuts in Medicare and Social Security, look at the House budget resolution. It proposes \$470 billion of cuts in mandatory programs. That is Medicare and that is Medicaid. It proposes another over \$200 billion of cuts in domestic discretionary programs that are not defense related.

The course we are on is a disaster for this country, of mounting deficit, of mounting debt, right before the baby boom generation retires. And this is the sweet spot because right now the trust funds, especially the Social Security trust fund, are generating billions of dollars. This year alone there are \$160 billion of surplus and we are taking every dime of it under the President's proposal and using it to pay for tax cuts and other expenses of Government.

Some people say that does not matter; the trust fund is still whole because it is being credited with the amount of money coming in. It is true, the trust fund is being credited. It is also true that the only way those pledges, those IOUs are going to be paid back, is if we have sufficient resources to do so at the time those bonds come due. That depends on the size of the economy. That depends on the strength of the economy. That depends on the economic growth we experience between now and then. This is something upon which many agree. That is a fundamental truth that our ability to redeem those obligations depends on the size of the economy, depends on how good a job we have done growing the economy in the interval.

That goes to the question, How do we best secure economic growth? This is where we have a profound difference.

Many on our side believe it is best done by providing a stimulus to the economy now, and the stimulus can be either tax cuts or additional spending. Either one of them provides stimulus. There are many economic models that suggest spending is actually somewhat superior to a tax cut because all of the spending dollars go into the economy. When you do a tax cut, some of the dollars go into the economy but some are saved.

To the extent they are saved, that does not provide immediate stimulus.

Our friends on the other side believe the most effective way is tax cuts, that tax cuts will encourage greater economic activity. I say to them, on a factual basis, it is clear spending and tax cuts, either one, stimulate the economy.

All of that has to be in a context. The context is, What is the long-term balance of revenues and expenditures? When you have an imbalance, when you are spending more than you are taking in, you run deficits. Deficits over time have a negative effect on the economy. Why? Because when you run budget deficits, the Federal Government has to borrow money. When the Federal Government borrows money, it is in competition with the private sector for borrowing money and that puts upward pressure on interest rates, especially at a time of economic growth.

We have looked at what the President calls a growth package. Not only have we looked at it but economists we respect have looked at it and they have concluded, and many of us have concluded, it does not promote growth. It will actually inhibit growth. Why? Because the tax cuts are not paid for. They are not paid for by spending reductions under the President's plan. They are paid for by borrowing the money. That means increasing the deficit, increasing the debt.

It is the dead weight of those deficits and debt that are harmful to economic growth. I say harmful, because to the extent you run budget deficits, that reduces the pool of societal savings, that reduces the pool of money available for investment, and you have to have investment to grow.

Many believe the President's plan is not a plan of economic growth, that it is a plan that will hurt economic growth because it will explode deficits and debt. That is not the only problem with the President's plan. It will force choices in the future that will require deep cuts in Medicare, in Social Security, in funding for education, in funding for law enforcement because there is no other possible outcome when, if you adopt the President's plan, you run deficits of this magnitude.

This is not Kent Conrad's chart or the Democrats' chart; this is the President's chart.

What he says is: If you adopt my policies, you never escape from deficit. And the deficits, once we get past this period when the trust funds of Social Security and Medicare are producing

surpluses and those trust funds turn cash negative, which will happen in the next decade, the deficits will explode. The debt will explode and a future Congress and a future President will then face truly difficult choices.

I thank my colleagues for their patience in listening to this. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I notice the two leaders are here. 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. I ask unanimous consent with respect to amendment No. 294, that the names be reversed and Senator GRAHAM of Florida appear first as the one proposing the amendment with Senator DORGAN.

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

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, the Democratic leader and I have been in discussion on a resolution in support of the President and the Armed Forces of the United States. We are now prepared to offer that resolution and allow the full Senate to express its support.

As people have watched the course of today, we are all aware that there is a lot of activity going on in Iraq as we speak and we believe it is very important that Members be given appropriate time to express that support and thus believe this resolution is a wonderful way for us to send a signal, today, of that support.

I know a number of Members will come to the floor to express that support over the next couple of hours. They will be making brief remarks. Over the course of the coming days, we will have ample opportunity to expand upon those remarks. Senators, clearly, will want to speak on the resolution, but I do want to encourage people to keep their remarks short so we can eventually get to the vote as early today as possible to express that support with the full support of the Senate.

We have talked back and forth as to whether we need specific time limits, in terms of how much time to spend on this particular resolution. We have

agreed not to have strict time limits because we do want to give everybody that opportunity. But we have agreed we will have a vote on this resolution of support for our troops today. Again, it is imperative, I believe, that the Senate express its support today through this resolution.

We will resume the budget resolution following the conclusion of the resolution of support. There are about 5 hours, I believe, remaining on the budget resolution; therefore, we will finish that resolution this week and we will talk a little bit more back and forth in a few minutes about what our expectations are for later tonight and tomorrow.

I know the managers on both sides of the aisle have encouraged Members to submit their amendments. I hope Senators are listening and working with the chairman and ranking member so we can have an orderly process. Although we have all tried on both sides to avoid a vote-athon, there is going to be a vote-athon tomorrow. But we want to have an orderly process. To do that, we want to make sure we have those amendments this afternoon so we can go through and prioritize and then be able to plan for tomorrow.

Before I formally call up the resolution, I yield to the Democratic leader for his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me simply add that it is our hope we can have a vote at about the time that the votes have been called this afternoon. We have a cluster of votes on the budget resolution that will be voted upon at around 4 o'clock. My hope would be that we could have a vote on this resolution as we have those votes as well, providing an opportunity for Senators on both sides. I assume time will be controlled by Senators Warner and Levin or their designees and that we will alternate back and forth until that time. Senators, then, would have the opportunity to continue to express themselves after these votes, either on the resolution supporting our troops or in support of amendments that will be offered during the vote-athon beginning tomorrow.

I think this is as reasonable and as prudent a way possible with which to address the challenges that we face as we close out this week. We have worked in good faith on both sides in drafting a resolution that I hope will enjoy unanimous support within the Senate. I think it deserves that depth and breadth of support. I am proud to be a cosponsor.

I think if we can accommodate the need to address the resolution, as the distinguished majority leader has suggested, if everybody keeps their remarks relatively brief, we will have ample time as the days unfold to come back and express ourselves again.

I hope to set the example. With that, I am going to yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. I thank the Democratic leader because all of us know we are trying to accomplish a lot this week. We have been able to work together in an orderly way thus far this week. It will get increasingly hectic over the next 48 hours. We have an orderly process which would mean the resolution will be introduced now. Over the next several hours we will have ample opportunity for people to make their initial remarks of support. We have a series of votes that begins at 4 o'clock today. As the distinguished Democratic leader said, our intention is to follow those votes with this vote on the resolution for support.

Following whenever that vote is—and again I encourage our colleagues to keep remarks short so we can get to that vote because that is the real signal that we send out from the Senate once we actually vote on that resolution—following that resolution we will come back to the budget and continue the excellent debate, focusing on various amendments today and tonight. We will be here late tonight. There has been time yielded back, from our side, to facilitate that process.

I think what we would like to do—it really depends on how the afternoon and night goes—is to begin the series of votes after all time is exhausted, which would be sometime late tomorrow morning. Again, I do not know exactly what the time would be like. And then it really depends on how many votes we have as part of the so-called vote-arama. It is our intention to finish this budget this week.

As I said this morning, if it is Thursday, Friday, or Saturday, it is important, we all believe, to complete this budget this week.

That is a rough outline of how we would like to see things play over the next 48 hours.

COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT AND THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, with that, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the resolution which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 95) commending the President and the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will keep my opening remarks short, as well, to restate the support that the resolution addresses very directly, which is, support for the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, for our troops, for the military families, for the civilian families, in support of our military.

The President has ordered the first salvos in Operation Iraqi Freedom. It

was a moment that all of us had hoped to be able to avoid. We prayed for peace. We worked for peace. But the Iraqi regime chose a different destiny.

Now our mission is clear: to use the full might of the American military to disarm Saddam Hussein and liberate the Iraqi people from his oppressive rule.

American warships and planes have been employed to attack enemy targets throughout Iraq, and hundreds of thousands of American troops are fighting their way across the Iraqi border. Our men and women in uniform are in harm's way. They are engaged in battle as we speak. We all pray for their safety and for their success.

I am confident of their victory, and I am confident it will come at the earliest possible moment. Ours is the best equipped, the best trained military in the world. They know they have a job to do. They know how to do it, and they know how to do it with extraordinary skill. And as they do, they have the full support of this body and the American people behind them.

I also applaud the President of the United States, who has shown bold leadership and strong leadership and visionary leadership over the last several months. Our prayers are with him. Through tremendous diplomacy, he has assembled more than 30 countries to join us in this cause. We are grateful for his leadership and the support of our allies.

And to the families of our men and women in uniform, I know they are concerned about the safety of their loved ones. The President and Congress are concerned, too. We are doing all we can to ensure your loved ones return home as quickly and as safely as possible. America is grateful for your sacrifice.

This war is justified by our own laws, by international laws, and by the laws of nature, which state all people are created equal and with a right to live in liberty.

Let there be no mistake, we are defending our own liberty. We have already seen what terrorists can do with the combined power of only three jet aircraft. We are now at war so we will not ever see what terrorists will do if supplied with weapons of mass destruction by Saddam Hussein.

We also fight to liberate the Iraqi people. For those in Iraq who have suffered daily terror from this oppressive tyrant, for those who have survived torture and imprisonment, for those who have watched family members die in agony from chemical weapons, their moment of freedom is near.

For those who will defend this dying regime, the moment of reckoning has come.

Mr. President, I welcome the strong bipartisan support that this resolution has and will receive. It is an honor to stand here side by side with my colleague, the Democratic leader, to send a clear message to those brave Americans who are risking their lives for us

on the battlefield: Our prayers are with you. Godspeed toward victory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished majority leader for his remarks and for the leadership he has shown as we have come to the floor on this historic occasion.

Last night, the President announced to the Nation that the disarmament campaign against Iraq had begun.

It is the duty of the Senate to address our most solemn decisions now as a nation. As a veteran, I know there is no more important or grave decision than whether we send our sons and daughters into armed conflict.

Once our President makes the decision to commit to the use of force, the Congress has always come together to speak with one voice, for one purpose: to support the efforts of our troops, and to pray for their courage, their success, and their safe and quick return home.

With pride and resolve, we do so again today.

We may have had differences of opinion about what brought us to this point, but the President of the United States is the Commander in Chief, and today we unite behind him as well.

Saddam Hussein is a menace to his own people, and a threat to the peace and stability of the entire region.

As our soldiers risk their own lives to secure the lives and liberty of others, we pledge to repay their courage by guaranteeing that we will spare no resource and no effort to ensure that nothing stands between them and victory.

Recently, within the last couple of weeks, I visited Sturgis, SD, the home of the members of the 109th Engineering Battalion. Its members had just been mobilized and sent to the Persian Gulf.

As American families have done since the birth of our Nation when our country has been called to war, fathers and mothers said goodbye to their children in uniform, and sons and daughters watched as their parents left home for battlefields.

Once again, the families of our troops are left with prayers, and hopes, and the pride that the men and women they love are serving their country and serving the cause of peace and liberty.

One thousand members of the 28th Bomb Wing from Ellsworth Air Force Base in my home State are engaged in the Persian Gulf today. Several thousand more South Dakotans have been activated in what is now the most robust callup in our State's history. We are proud to have one of the highest proportions of deployed troops in the country. It makes sense that so many South Dakotans have volunteered to serve. We are a State of small towns and old neighbors. And when you grow up in a small town, you learn early that your future is bound to those around you. You learn early that if you do not do your part, someone else has to pick up the slack. And you learn

early that all we value about our homes and our lives cannot be created or maintained by leaving the work to someone else.

Soldiers and sailors, airmen and marines, go into battle today driven by that wisdom. As they begin the dangerous work of disarming Saddam Hussein and liberating the people of Iraq, their courage rides on the values of small towns and old neighbors. Our country—generation after generation—has been defended by the same willingness to sacrifice.

Today, our bravest men and women are called upon to carry forward the proud tradition of the American Armed Forces. They are making a more peaceful world for all children—for their own and for the children of Iraq.

History will long remember their service. They have our support, our devotion, and our gratitude.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time on our side be managed by Senator WARNER.

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

The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I announce that the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee, Senator LEVIN, will be our manager. I ask unanimous consent that the time between now and the time the votes are cast on the amendments pending be divided equally.

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

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, before our distinguished leaders depart the floor, I wish to say as one Senator, I am very proud that the differences have been reconciled and that this resolution bears both of your distinguished names and that we will strive to have unity in this Chamber and to have a very constructive and clear debate as a message to the men and women of the armed forces, their families and, indeed, the whole world.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator from Virginia will yield, I want to add a similar thought. I wish all of our troops could see the two of you standing together here. I had no doubt we would unite in support of our troops when the time came, and that is exactly what is happening. This picture is a very eloquent statement about the unity of the Congress once we are committed to combat.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed under the time allocated to the distinguished majority leader, which I am privileged to manage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I recognize that I have the opportunity to work on this debate with my distinguished colleague, Senator LEVIN. We

have served together, now, this is our 25th year on the Senate Armed Services Committee. I say to my colleague, I know of no debate of greater significance than the one we are about to undertake at a critical hour not only in the history of the United States but the history of the world.

It would be helpful if I were to undertake to read the resolution that is at the desk that hopefully will be voted on by the Senate in a very short period of time after all Senators have had the opportunity to express themselves.

The resolution is entitled "Commending the President and the Armed Forces of the United States of America," submitted by Senators FRIST, DASCHLE, WARNER and LEVIN.

Whereas Saddam Hussein has failed to comply with United Nations Security Council resolutions 678, 686, 687, 688, 707, 715, 949, 1051, 1060, 1115, 1134, 1137, 1154, 1194, 1205, 1284, and 1441;

The most historic of all, in my judgment, resolution 1441, which received the unanimous vote of all Security Council members, 15—

Whereas the military action now underway against Iraq is lawful and fully authorized by the Congress in Sec. 3(a) of Public Law 107-243, which passed the Senate on October 10, 2002, by a vote of 77-23, and which passed the House of Representatives on that same date by a vote of 296-133;

Whereas more than 225,000 men and women of the United States Armed Forces are now involved in conflict against Iraq;

Whereas over 200,000 members of the Reserves and National Guard have been called to active duty for the conflict against Iraq and other purposes; and

Whereas the Congress and the American people have the greatest pride in the men and women of the United States Armed Forces, and the civilian personnel supporting them, and strongly support them in their efforts;

Now therefore be it Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, that Congress—

(1) commends and supports the efforts and leadership of the President, as Commander in Chief, in the conflict against Iraq;

(2) commends, and expresses the gratitude of the Nation to all members of the United States Armed Forces (whether on active duty, in the National Guard, or in the Reserves) and the civilian employees who support their efforts, as well as the men and women of civilian national security agencies who are participating in the military operations in the Persian Gulf region, for their professional excellence, dedicated patriotism and exemplary bravery;

(3) commends and expresses the gratitude of the Nation to the family members of soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and civilians serving in operations against Iraq who have borne the burden of sacrifice and separation from their loved ones;

(4) expresses its deep condolences to the families of brave Americans who have lost their lives in this noble undertaking, over many years, against Iraq;

(5) joins all Americans in remembering those who lost their lives during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm in 1991, those still missing from that conflict, including Captain Scott Speicher, USN, and the thousands of Americans who have lost their lives in terrorist attacks over the years, and in the Global War in Terrorism; and

(6) expresses sincere gratitude to British Prime Minister Tony Blair and his government for their courageous and steadfast support, as well as gratitude to other allied nations for their military support, logistical support, and other assistance in the campaign against Saddam Hussein's regime.

Mr. President, today in Iraq, in Afghanistan, on the high seas, at the far corners of the world, and here at home, our forces, active duty and reserve components alike, are confronting the oppression, tyranny, and terrorism that plagues and threatens the world and our Nation. I am so enormously proud of our military and their leaders who fashioned a force unlike any the world has ever known, a force capable of delivering overwhelming might anytime, anywhere, if necessary.

Just weeks ago my distinguished colleague, Senator LEVIN, and I, together with Senator ROBERTS and Senator ROCKEFELLER, were privileged to visit many of these troops in that region, Qatar, Kuwait, and other areas. A disciplined force this is, able to employ measured steps in an honorable and decent manner to ensure that everything possible is done to provide for the humanitarian and security needs of an innocent people, the people of Iraq. Truly the force has never seen an opportunity such as this, and it is under the command not only of our President but of officers of the United States, Great Britain, Australia, and indeed more.

A decision to commit our sons and daughters to combat is never an easy one. Clearly, our President anguished over this decision. I was privileged to meet with him, with the leadership here just days ago. Clearly, he showed his steadfastness, his courage, his wisdom, his very balanced thinking, as he conducted himself with the advice of others, to reach this decision, which he did last night.

We in the Congress debated this solemn responsibility to authorize the use of force last October. We took our constitutional responsibility seriously. We thoroughly examined the circumstances and voted overwhelmingly, 77 to 23, to authorize the Commander in Chief to use military force if, and only if, he determined that all diplomatic efforts to peacefully disarm Saddam Hussein's Iraqi regime had been fulfilled. I personally think he did that and did it brilliantly.

Those efforts, unfortunately, did not result in a Security Council resolution of unity, as it did with 15 votes in October.

The Security Council became deadlocked for reasons we all know. It is important to note, however, that our President expended extraordinary efforts to bring this clear and growing threat to the attention of the United Nations and to try to build that consensus for a unified way to proceed.

The United Nations was unable to step up to its responsibilities of enforcing its own mandates largely because of the intransigence of a very few nations to block any form of meaningful enforcement of these U.N. Security

Council resolutions. The failure of the United Nations to step up to its responsibilities is most unfortunate, for the United Nations at this time in its long history of over 50 years is facing a challenge unlike any before, with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, particularly those of nuclear weapons on the Korean peninsula, Iran, and other areas of the world. This could have been their finest hour.

Our President has stepped up to his responsibilities to protect the American people from a grave and growing threat to our national security. Ultimately, the President's constitutional responsibility is to the American people. He made the determination that Saddam Hussein, armed with weapons of mass destruction, is an imminent threat to the security of the people of this Nation and, indeed, other nations.

His most sacred responsibility is to protect the American people. The Congress, as a coequal branch of Government, has fulfilled, in my judgment, its constitutional responsibilities by giving the President the authority he needs to do so.

Now the effort has begun to liberate Iraq, restore a secure environment, and ultimately bring a lasting peace with justice and representative democratic principles to a land that has known little peace throughout its history. Our forces are capable of helping Iraqis realize this dream. I have no doubt our forces will conduct themselves in a very responsible way. Our forces, supported by countless civilian employees and by families and loved ones back home, and joined by forces and support from many other nations—over 30, Mr. President—as a coalition to liberate Iraq, will prevail.

We are all hopeful that this operation can be conducted with minimum loss of life, with minimum casualties, with minimum destruction and hardship. We must await that outcome. We must be prepared, however, for a broad and concerted effort that may take longer and involve more sacrifice than some have predicted. We cannot and will not waiver from our resolve to bring freedom and hope to this troubled Nation and to rid the world of this threat to regional and global security.

I, again, salute our men and women in uniform, their families, and those who support them in this noble effort. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield as much time as Senator REID needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today in the Senate—it does not happen very often—we speak with one voice. Now that the military effort to disarm Saddam Hussein and remove his brutal regime from power has started, it is important that we, the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, express our unified support for our troops.

I personally am very proud of the Nevada sons and daughters who have been

deployed to the Middle East as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Nevada has, I believe, the finest military aviation training facilities in the world. That is not something that is just provincial in nature. We have the great Nellis Air Force Base and the Fallon Naval Air Station, plus we have the Indian Springs Air Force Base where the drones are kept, where people train with those unmanned vehicles.

Nellis Air Force Base has a special place in my heart because Bill Nellis was from my hometown of Searchlight, NV, a very small town in size and the number of people who live there. Bill Nellis served in World War II and became a hero. His body now lies in a military cemetery in Belgium, but all of us in Nevada know where Nellis Air Force Base got its name. His family is still there and very proud of the fact that this great training facility for the Air Force is named after Bill Nellis of Searchlight.

The Fallon Naval Air Station is also where we train aviators. These two bases—to show the size of the State of Nevada—are 400 miles apart. One is the premier training facility for our Air Force, and the other, Fallon naval air training facility, is a premier training facility for our naval pilots—Top Gun. It is a rural community 65 miles out of Reno, NV.

These pilots—hundreds from Nellis and other personnel critical to our mission in Iraq—are right now serving on the front lines. Hundreds who trained at Fallon are there also.

When I see those Navy fighters taking off on carriers in the gulf, as I did this morning before I came to work, there is no question in my mind that they were trained at Fallon.

Nevada's Guard and Reserve troops are also playing a significant role, more than 1,000 from Nevada's Guard and Reserve. Nevada's percentage of Guard and Reserve callups and deployments is one of the highest in the Nation. This is, of course, a hardship to the communities, the cities, and the towns from where they come. It is a hardship on the employers and families they leave behind.

I also recognize the honor that is associated with this hardship and this sacrifice. Our Guard units, for example, have a specially train unit to handle prisoners of war. They have been called up. They also have one of the only Blackhawk-equipped medical evacuation teams. It is understandable why they have been called up. There are many other specialties that are needed in the gulf, and Secretary Rumsfeld has called them up. They are heroes. They are talented.

There are other heroes in Nevada, and they are the families who remain behind. Children who are going to school in Nevada have mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters half a world away and hoping and praying they come home but not really knowing if that, in fact, will happen.

The sacrifice that many of these families are making so our forces will prevail cannot be overstated. In many cases, the lead income earner or main caretaker is in the desert right now either pursuing Saddam Hussein or maybe even trying to track down al-Qaida operatives.

I try but I am not sure I fully understand the hardship the families are enduring. This Congress and communities all over America stand with the families and will help in any way we can until their loved ones return. We pray for the safe and speedy return of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines.

We understand as a Congress that war entails risk; that the American military is the best fighting force ever assembled.

I have to take a pause here and commend and applaud the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee who have worked together as partners for many years now developing the military that is now serving in the Middle East. They are two fine Senators. There are no two men in the Senate for whom I have more respect than the distinguished Senator from Virginia and my longtime friend, the Senator from Michigan. I had the pleasure and honor of coming to Congress with his brother. I have said this to Senator LEVIN on a number of occasions. The first time I ever met CARL LEVIN, I said: I came to Washington with your brother, Sandy.

He said: Yes, Sandy is my brother, but he is also my best friend.

This is the kind of man we have working with us in the minority. I again commend and applaud the two of them.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment? I remember so well when we had last year's authorization bill on the floor. The distinguished Senator from Michigan and I time and again sought Senator REID's assistance to keep that bill going, to reconcile issues such as health care, current receipts, the BRAC process, and other very strong issues. So the Senator has been a full honorary member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. REID. I thank my friend from Virginia. As I said, we in Congress understand the risks that war entails. The American military, as I have said before—parting a little off the subject by complimenting my two friends—is the best fighting force ever assembled. We owe a lot of that to these two men. I am confident that the men and women of our armed services, with the help of British and Australian soldiers, will bring about a decisive victory. Let us hope this can be achieved swiftly and with minimal casualties.

Mr. President, I will do everything in my power to ensure that Congress fully funds and supports the needs of our troops as this conflict proceeds.

As American troops are engaged in war in Iraq, as well as elsewhere around the world, in our ongoing war against terrorists, and defending our

interests and allies, we think also of previous generations who served our Nation faithfully and proudly to protect American lives, liberties and values. To all of our veterans, in Nevada and around the country, I say, "Thank you for your service." And I reassure you that I will continue to make sure our Nation honors our commitment to you.

We are so fortunate to live in a Nation that promises fundamental freedom like the freedom of speech and freedom of belief. Those who have served in the United States Armed Forces in past years and those who serve today have fought to guarantee the rights we hold dear. Thanks to their service and sacrifice, Americans can express opinions even if they disagree with the Government without fear of being harassed, arrested, tortured or murdered. This is a fundamental difference that separates our American democracy from regimes like the Taliban which we ousted from Afghanistan or dictators like Saddam Hussein whom we will remove from Iraq.

So we all appreciate, value and will fight to defend the right of all of us—American citizens and those of us in public service—to speak freely. Regardless of whether Americans agree or disagree with the decision to go to war or how the administration has conducted its foreign policy, we share patriotic feelings. That is what patriotism is about. And I want our troops to know that we all support them completely.

Americans also stand united with our Commander-in-Chief, President George Bush, as he leads the Nation through this difficult period. I will continue to support his efforts to build and strengthen our coalition to assist with post-war reconstruction in Iraq.

But today let me re-emphasize that we stand united, and we speak with one voice, in supporting our troops and working for the swift and decisive defeat of Saddam Hussein. I am confident more peaceful times lie ahead. Certainly, peace and freedom lie on the horizon for the Iraqi people.

Mr. LEVIN. Before the Senator from Nevada leaves, I add my thanks to him not just for his very kind words but, as Senator WARNER said, for his absolutely invaluable leadership on this floor year after year. We were able to get a bill passed last year, in good measure, because of his ability to get us to the point where we could resolve differences among Members to get to votes. One particular instance that I hope the Senator will always be remembered for—at least he will in our minds, I know—is his leadership to make sure that the veterans who are disabled are able to get a disability pension, particularly if they are severely disabled, at the same time they get a retirement benefit.

The absurd result that we had veterans who were severely disabled who lost their disability benefit at the same time their pension became available to

them was wrong. It was corrected by this Senate, in large measure because of the leadership of Senator REID. That is one of the many monuments to his leadership that hopefully will be remembered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may consume to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. I rise to join my colleagues in support of this resolution. I commend the President and our troops, including civilians and national security personnel. I believe it is important, once the conflict has begun, that there be full support for our troops in the field.

Resolutions were passed by both this body and the House of Representatives by overwhelming majorities. I respect those who have disagreed with the action of the Congress and with the action of the President, however, once the Nation moves forward under our constitutional process, where in a representative democracy the Congress votes and authorizes the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces to move ahead, we should support this action.

It is regrettable there was not a united UN because had that been done, I think it might have been possible to back Saddam Hussein down. I had an opportunity to meet with Saddam Hussein for more than an hour back in 1990, and while he is venal and brutal, I do not think he is insane or suicidal. However, the international dance and delay was such that he thought he could wear us down.

Once the United States had more than 200,000 troops in the field, we were constrained by weather factors and our personnel were threatened by chemical and biological attacks, and so we simply had to move. Every action on Saddam's part was a delay. So whether there was agreement or disagreement up to this point, now is the time for unified American action.

This resolution commends Prime Minister Tony Blair and his government, and I believe the coalition of the willing will be doing the work really of the entire free world. It is our hope and expectation that the efforts will be swift and the casualties will be held to a minimum. With success I hope that those who have dissented in the United Nations will come forward because victory will be ours on the battlefield. However, that is not sufficient. Iraq must be rebuilt and our international alliances must be reinstated.

This is the first step today, by having a strong vote, hopefully a unanimous vote, in supporting our troops and supporting the action of the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. President, last month a number of us were fortunate enough to visit our troops in Kuwait, Qatar, and other places in the area. As Senator WARNER said, he, Senator ROBERTS, Senator ROCKEFELLER, and I had that opportunity. What an extraordinarily dedicated, and motivated professional group of men and women they are; what representatives of America and the values that we stand for they are; how well trained and equipped they are; how extraordinarily high their morale was and is; and how determined this Congress is, I know now, to give them our total support.

In the course of that visit, I met with a group of about 20 Marines from Michigan at Camp Commando. One young Marine asked me what was going on back home with the antiwar demonstrations. I could tell by the demeanor of the other Marines, both men and women, that this was a matter on the minds of a number of them.

I told them that those demonstrating back home were carrying out and exercising a right which is something we all cherish. As a matter of fact, they were exercising the very freedoms that our Armed Forces have protected throughout our history. I told them we had a vigorous debate in the Senate last fall about the wisdom of initiating an attack against Saddam Hussein if we were unable to persuade the world community, acting through the United Nations, to authorize and support such an attack. I told them that, in the end, a majority of both Houses of the Congress voted to authorize the President to use military force with or without that explicit authority of the United Nations.

I told them that our democracy functions through debate and decision, and that the decision to give the President this authority was democratically arrived at. Finally and most importantly, I told these Marines I was confident that, after the debate in Congress about the wisdom of instituting an attack without the support of the world community through the United Nations, if hostilities should start, those who have such different views will come together and will rally behind them and give them the full support they deserve.

My prediction that we would come together if hostilities ever began, despite differences over the wisdom of the policy of proceeding without U.N. authority, has now come true.

We stand here together, shoulder to shoulder, whichever side of that particular issue we voted on, to support the men and women who are now in harm's way. We saw just a very visual and visible example of that a few minutes ago when the majority and Democratic leaders literally stood shoulder to shoulder here in the well of the Senate as they both presented a resolution of support of our troops and then indicated they were going to work hard for its passage.

The visit we had was quite an extraordinary visit. The men and women

we visited understood fully what we were telling them about the nobility of this system of government of ours and how they represented that nobility by putting their lives on the line. I am pleased to have helped draft this resolution. I am pleased to add my voice and my vote to it.

The hostilities have begun. The democratic debate has occurred. The men and women of our Armed Forces have the unified support of the Nation they love and for which they willingly serve and for which they risk their all. To them I can only say they are in the prayers of every American and that we all hope for a speedy conclusion to this war with the minimal number of casualties and that they return home to their loved ones as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield such time as our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma may require.

I might also say Senators ENSIGN, BURNS, the Presiding Officer Senator ALEXANDER, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, and Senator ALLARD, we are looking forward to their coming to the floor, in that sequence, on our side. We will alternate with my colleague. I alert my colleagues, this debate is moving right along and we are anxious to keep it going.

Mr. LEVIN. I similarly indicate Senator BINGAMAN and then Senator BILL NELSON would be recognized on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for a moment let me build on something the distinguished Senator from Michigan said talking about our troops. Having been on the Senate Armed Services Committee and having been chairman of the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness for a number of years, I have had a chance to talk to troops all over the world in all kinds of circumstances. Never have I seen such a commitment as is out there right now by these young troops.

I remember not long ago I was at a hospital where they were sending injured from Afghanistan. Without exception, each one of the injured troops—some sailors, some marines, some airmen, some Army—all said they were anxious to get back to their units. One young lady, whose name was Stennis—I remember her name because she was on the USS *Stennis*—a young sailor, she who got tangled up in a refueling line. It pulled her off to a free fall all the way down into the ocean, crushing both of her lungs. She was a very small person. She made it. She lived. She was in the hospital. Her words were these: I want to get well to get back to my units, and I want to make a career out of the U.S. Navy.

When I look at our distinguished chairman of the committee, Senator WARNER, who was Secretary of the Navy, I can assure you we have never had sailors more committed than we have today. That is what is happening right now.

I am pleased we are beyond the point of talking about objections. There are three major objections that various individuals are trying to voice. One was: We cannot do anything without allies. We are glad to realize we have allies. We have some 45 nations supporting us in this effort to get rid of this terrorist, Saddam Hussein. But even if we weren't, we remember Grenada, Panama, we remember 1986 when Ronald Reagan was President and when Qadhafi had blown up a building, killing some of our soldiers. We did not have overflight permission, and President Reagan sent in F-111s and pounded Libya, and we have not heard from Qadhafi since.

The smoking gun argument, we all understand that what we are faced with, with Saddam Hussein—not Iraq, but Saddam Hussein—is an ability to do things that would not maybe kill 100 or 200 people but maybe a million people. Rich Butler, probably the most revered of the former weapons inspectors, said one warhead like they have in Iraq filled with 140 liters of VX gas could kill a million people. We have to reprogram ourselves and think in those terms.

If you did need a smoking gun—which we did not have to have—if you did, last night we learned there are smoking guns. He had denied he had the very missiles he sent over and used last night.

The last argument was there had to be a link with Osama bin Laden. We have to again reprogram ourselves because what we are dealing with now is a terrorist. This is not a war on Iraq, it is a liberation of the Iraqi people who have been oppressed and tortured for decades. There is a war involved. It is not a war on Iraq, it is a war against terrorism. This war was declared by our President at 8:30 in the evening on the fateful September 11. He said this is a war on terrorism. You go after the biggest terrorists.

A lot of people do not think of Saddam Hussein as a terrorist, but if you measure the severity of terrorism by the number of people someone has tortured or murdered, certainly no one can hold a candle to Saddam Hussein. In 1983, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International documented that he executed 8,000 of his own Kurdish citizens aged 13 and older. In 1985, it is reported they executed 315 children between the ages of 8 and 17. In 1988—we all remember this very well because that is when he set a record. We believe it is an all-time record that holds to this day. He murdered, in one day, 5,000 of his own citizens using a chemical that produces the most torturous kind of death, where your eyeballs are fried and your lungs are actually fried. There was mustard gas and other chemicals. That was in 1988. Then they talked about the 60 villages—Human Rights Watch—attacked with mustard gas. Women, children, it did not make any difference.

In 1990, Amnesty International listed 38 new methods of torture used by Saddam Hussein including mock execution, piercing of the hands with electric drills, electric shocks, sexual abuse, lowering the victims into baths of acid.

Then in 1999, at a peaceful demonstration, security forces fired into a crowd of protesters, killing hundreds of civilians, including women and children. In the year 2000, they were looking for a new way to punish those who might be suspected of saying something about Saddam Hussein. They had been sending them into prison, but the prisons were full, so the new method was to pull the tongue out and tear the tongue off.

In 1991, with a person I think very highly of, we made the first trip into Kuwait. It was so close after the war was over that they did not know the war was over and the fires were still going in the oil fields. The guns were still being fired. Alexander Haig, I, and a guy named Sauda Saba who was the Ambassador from Kuwait to the United States of America, we went in there to see what it was like. Sauda Saba had his 7-year-old daughter with him. He was of royalty. We went to their house where we found out that Saddam Hussein had used his house as one of the headquarters. We went through the house and found that the young 7-year-old girl's bedroom had been used as a torture chamber. We found body parts and hair stuck to the walls.

I don't believe there is a terrorist anywhere who could be more dangerous than Saddam Hussein. That is what this is all about. This is not a war on Iraq, it is the liberation of the people of Iraq. I honestly believe the dancing in the streets after Afghanistan will not hold a candle to the dancing in the streets we will see not just in Baghdad, but in all the oppressed surrounding nations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to Senator BINGAMAN.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague from Michigan yielding me 3 minutes to speak briefly on this issue.

War in Iraq is underway. It is appropriate that we in the Senate suspend our other work to observe the start of this very serious undertaking. I am very glad to support the resolution the majority leader and the Democratic leader have come together on in stating our solidarity with our servicemen and servicewomen.

We want the brave men and women who wear the American uniform and who have been sent to this region on behalf of our country to know they have the complete, unwavering support of the Senate.

I also state my sincere hope, and the sincere hope, I am sure, of all of us, that this conflict will be short lived and that our mission will be accom-

plished with the fewest possible casualties to our countrymen and to the non-combatants in Iraq.

Prior to the announcement by President Bush on Monday that he had determined to begin a military action this week, many of us expressed our disagreement with the policy and action of the President. In my case, and I am sure in all cases, those opinions were honestly arrived at and were strongly felt. But at this point, now with the war having begun, our focus needs to be on prevailing in this conflict. None of us doubts that we will in fact prevail. I join with all other Senators in the fervent hope that the war will be short, the lives lost on both sides will be few. I further hope that out of this we will arrive at a just and peaceful and prosperous future for the Iraqi people and for the region and for the entire world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. At this time I yield as much time to Senator ENSIGN as he may require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for yielding time. I appreciate his great service to this country leading that important committee.

I rise today to talk about the situation in Iraq. There are some people to pay tribute to. It is important that we as Senators show our troops what they mean to us. It is important that all Americans show the people in uniform how much we appreciate what they are doing, and also to show their families how much we appreciate what they are doing.

I want to start by sharing a thought about a great leader who has shown what it means, in the face of adversity, to lead our country through a difficult time. That leader is our President, George W. Bush. I am very proud that he is, indeed, our Commander-in-Chief at this time. I have heard from so many service men and women how proud they are right now, not only to be Americans, but proud that he is our Commander-in-Chief during this difficult time—not only for the war on Iraq, but for the global war on terrorism, which we are still engaged in and probably will be for some time.

I also want to say thank you as an American to a great friend; somebody who is defining what it means to be a statesman. That is Tony Blair from Great Britain. Tony Blair obviously leads the equivalent of what would be a different party than mine. But Tony Blair has shown, in the face of incredible public opposition, and especially opposition within his own party, what it means to stand up and be a leader. Leaders are expected to lead, and Tony Blair and George W. Bush are doing exactly that right now.

I also thank and take pride in Nellis Air Force Base and the people sta-

tioned there, and the people stationed at Fallon Naval Air Station, and also the Nevada National Guard, all of whom have sent people to the Middle East to engage in this conflict. We as Nevadans say thank you for their service, and take great pride in that they are over there, serving our country and protecting our people.

I also think it is appropriate for us, whenever possible, as Americans, to adopt the families of our service men and women. Back in 1991 my brother-in-law was sent over to the Persian Gulf. He was stationed in Bahrain during the Persian Gulf war. I remember it was a very stressful time for my sister because she could not have any contact with him. She had no idea where he was, what he was doing. It was incredibly difficult for her, as it was for many other families. That is what a lot of families of our service men and women are going through right now, the uncertainty of whether their loved ones are going to be coming home or not. We all in this country need to wrap our arms around them and also lift them up in prayer, when we rise in the morning or go to bed at night, when we get on our knees and look to the Almighty.

There is no question that America has the finest military in the entire world. Nobody's military might is anywhere close to what we have today. But I remind all Americans that no matter how strong our military is, without divine providence—as the entire history of our country has recognized—without divine providence, it doesn't matter how superior your military is. That is not enough to prevail in a war. As Abraham Lincoln said during the Civil War, when asked which side of the conflict God was on, he replied: I don't know. I just want to try to be on God's side.

I think it would be easy for us as Americans to be arrogant and proud and boastful about how great we are and how right we think we are. I think the appropriate approach is for us to go and pray we are right, and look to what the morals are that we stand for and the principles on which this country was founded. If we apply those principles, those principles that I believe were handed down by the Almighty, then we will be on His side.

I believe we are in a just cause. It is time we stand up and support the men and women in uniform and do everything we can as individuals to let them know, while they are there, that they are in our thoughts and our prayers. And then, when they come home, we should never, ever again allow what happened in this country when our troops came home from Vietnam. Whenever our troops come home from now on, they should be celebrated, held high as heroes, because we owe our very freedoms to the sacrifices they are willing to make.

I stand with other Senators today to say to our troops: Thank you. Godspeed. And God bless.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for his remarks, most particularly the concluding remarks about that period during Vietnam. It was my privilege to serve along with the men and women in that period as Secretary of the Navy. I remember so well how they were received back home, in sharp contrast to the generation in which I had a modest association in World War II. With open arms were they welcomed home. I share your sentiments.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 5 minutes to Senator BILL NELSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I have gone around to the National Guard units that have been activated in my State of Florida, and I have gone to the Reserve units, merely representing our grateful Nation. These people have gone off to war, seeing tearful spouses, with the uncertainty of their economic future. And that economic uncertainty is not only from their standpoint as a guard or reservist, but it is also from their employer's standpoint. And yet we see a unity and a coming together that is part of the strength of the character of us as a people.

It is with profound gratitude and humility that I express my support for this resolution for a fighting force of men and women who are not only in the military all over the world but who are civilian as well.

In fact, some of our civilian agencies today were in Iraq, prior to the military units arriving there, along with other clandestine military units performing enormous intelligence functions for us. It is a profound gratefulness that this Nation expresses to our military and civilians.

I particularly wish to call to the attention of the Senate paragraph (5). Paragraph (5) of the resolution states that Congress:

Joins all Americans in remembering those who lost their lives during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm in 1991, still those missing from that conflict, including Captain Scott Speicher, United States Navy, and the thousands of Americans who have lost their lives in terrorist attacks over the years, and in the Global War on terrorism. . . .

I take the time to call paragraph (5) to the attention of the Senate because of CPT Scott Speicher, the first American pilot shot down on the first night of the gulf war. Through a series of mistakes, we said he was dead. He was listed as "killed in action."

Years later, the Department of Defense changed his status to "missing in action." And years later, the Department of Defense changed his status to "missing, captured," which is "POW."

I have seen the early evidence, which has been made public, that a defector, who was corroborated—indeed, he passed a lie detector test, as well as being corroborated on other evidence—

actually drove Speicher from near the crash site to a place near a hospital, and picked him out of a lineup of photographs.

I have seen more recent information from a variety of sources that leads me to believe that Scott Speicher is alive. That opinion, by the way, is shared by my colleague, Senator PAT ROBERTS of Kansas, now the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, who has been, along with former Senator Bob Smith, unrelenting—all of us—in the pursuit of a clarification on the status of Scott Speicher.

It is my opinion he is alive. So we have gone to our commanders, and they have assured us, we have gone to the civilian agencies, and they have assured us: Scott Speicher is at the top of their list of priorities as we are now going into Iraq, to go and find him.

And, oh, what a day that would be, if he is alive, and if America can correct the mistake that our DOD made and bring that American pilot home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. On my time, Mr. President, I commend my colleague, a strong member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Senator PAT ROBERTS, likewise, who is on our committee, and Senator SMITH, a former member of the committee.

These three Senators have involved our committee in this as well. And, I think, heretofore, the Intelligence Committee has taken a very active role.

Senator LEVIN and I are both appreciative of their efforts on this issue on behalf of the committee. We thank them.

I yield such time to the Senator from Montana as he may require.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield, just for a unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator has concluded, Senator KENNEDY then be recognized for 6 minutes.

Let me add my thanks also to Senator NELSON of Florida for the incredible tenacity he has shown supporting Captain Speicher.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Massachusetts will be recognized for 6 minutes following the Senator from Montana.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Virginia. Yes, we have been conversing and friends ever since the day I got here, he being an old forest firefighter in Montana when he was younger, and his hair was dark. He was a dashing young man on an adventure West.

We have also discussed this subject a lot of times in private conversations. Whether it has been on the Big Horn

River or on a golf course, I have always enjoyed those discussions.

I gave much thought on what I was going to say today. The Senator and I also shared the same uniform, the U.S. Marine Corps, at different times however. He was a good deal ahead of me.

We know what goes through the minds of the young men and women who are confronted with war. Of all the options we have in the world, war is the absolute last one. For our young men and women over there, they have to carry the responsibility.

But the real weight may be on the shoulders of our Commander in Chief and on the Prime Minister of England, Mr. Blair, for they have stood strong for what is right.

We can also call this the commitment of America. It is a commitment to our history. Looking in our history books, we see man can be ruled by many things, by weapons, by sheer military power, by biological weapons, and chemical weapons.

But 9/11 taught us something else, that we can be ruled by fear. Fear is still the greatest motivator of man. Americans have always accepted a certain level of risk for freedom. Sometimes we have accepted a high level of risk for freedom. And we are called upon to do that again. It is not a great option, but it is one that America has assumed the responsibility of since the birth of this country over 200 years ago.

Mr. President, 9/11 proved that we can be ruled by fear. Even a sniper in the Washington area was a reminder that, again, we are curtailed and ruled by fear. It was by only one person, that person not known. But this one is known.

We commend the President. We pray for our troops as they carry out a great tradition. Diplomatically, the timing is never right. It is never right. But I would say this: We could kick this can down the road. Maybe we could have kicked the can down the road in 1940. Would we have forgotten Pearl Harbor as fast as we think some people have forgotten the Twin Towers? No matter what we do, some generation of America is going to have to deal with this cruel man.

We stand in support. We stand in prayer for those who lead, those who commit, and those who do.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the hour of 4 o'clock, at which time the votes begin on the budget resolution, is fast approaching. I have several Senators indicating a desire to speak on my side. I ask them to limit their remarks now to about 3½ minutes, thereabouts. I think the Senator from Massachusetts should be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the best of America—our men and women in uniform—are now in harm's way in a

distant land. Our prayers go with them in the skies and mountains and deserts and cities of Iraq. Fathers and sons—mothers and daughters—brothers and sisters—friends and neighbors and fellow Americans—they are all our heroes. So many are still in the dawn of life as they risk their lives for our country and our ideals. We pray for the success of their mission and their quick and safe return to their families and to a proud and to a grateful nation.

Many Americans, including many of us in Congress, opposed this war. But today and throughout this conflict, we are united in support of the men and women of our Armed Forces. We pledge to do all we can to support them.

We honor them for their patriotism, their courage, their willingness to endure hardship and sacrifice and to give the last full measure of devotion to the country they love and the country that loves them. In the eloquent words of the Navy Hymn:

O Trinity of love and power!
Our brethren shield in danger's hour;
From rock to tempest, fire and foe,
Protect them wheresoe'er they go.

Our thoughts and our heartfelt prayers are also with our President, as he makes the difficult decisions that will determine the course and success of the war that now begins. May God's wisdom guide our President and protect him in the days that lie ahead.

In Massachusetts, we especially honor and remember the thousands of men and women on active duty from communities throughout our state who are now at war, and the thousands as well who have been activated from the Reserve and the National Guard—from the Barnes and The Otis Air National Guard Bases, from the Westover Air Reserve Base, from Camp Edwards, from the Devens Reserve Forces Training Area, from so many other places in our State. We pray for them all, and we admire them for their dedication to our country and their brave service.

President Bush spoke for all Americans last night in expressing support for our forces. He is right to prepare our country for what may be a long and difficult struggle, and he is right to do his best to safeguard the innocent people of Iraq. We join our President in pledging our commitment to victory—to disarm Saddam and to bring freedom and opportunity to all the people of Iraq.

In Congress, we will do all we can to give our servicemen and women the complete and full support they must have in order to prevail in this war and come safely home. We will do all we can to care for their families while they are apart. We will do all we can to protect the American people on the home front. We will do all we can to help the people of Iraq, and enable them to rebuild and renew their ancient land and rejoin the family of nations. And we will continue in the years to come to do all we can here at home to uphold the same great fundamental values for which our troops are

now risking their lives—for opportunity and hope—for liberty and justice for all.

In his great poem, "Abraham Lincoln Walks at Midnight," Vachel Lindsay wrote:

It is portentous, and a thing of state,
That here at midnight, in our little town
A mourning figure walks, and will not rest,
Near the old court-house pacing up and down,

Or by his homestead, or in shadowed yards
He lingers where his children used to play,
Or through the market, on the well-worn stones

He stalks until the dawn-stars burn away.

A bronzed, lank man! His suit of ancient black,

A famous high top-hat and plain worn shawl
Make him the quaint great figure that men love,

The prairie-lawyer, master of us all.

He cannot sleep upon his hillside now.

He is among us—as in times before!

And we who toss and lie awake for long
Breathe deep, and start, to see him pass the door.

His head is bowed. He thinks on men and kings.

Yea, when the sick world cries, how can he sleep?

Too many peasants fight, they know not why,

Too many homesteads in black terror weep.

The sins of all the war-lords burn his heart.
He sees the dreadnaughts scouring every main.

He carries on his shawl-wrapped shoulders now

The bitterness, the folly and the pain.

He cannot rest until a spirit-dawn
Shall come—the shining hope of Europe free;
The league of sober folk, the Workers' Earth,
Bringing long peace to Cornland, Alp and Sea.

It breaks his heart that kings must murder still.

That all his hours of travail here for men
Seem yet in vain. And who will bring white peace

That he may sleep upon his hill again?

I withhold the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I ask the Senator if he could limit his remarks to about 3½ minutes.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Senator. Last night, most Americans stayed up late watching for news of the war. Most Senators did, too. This morning, many Americans got up and said a little prayer for the men and women who will be fighting overseas for our country. I suspect most Senators did as well.

Today, most Americans went about their jobs and the Senate did, too, but our discussions about the budget and our everyday jobs seem a little less important today compared to what our men and women overseas and our Commander in Chief are doing. We pause today to try to show in a united voice the same respect for our President and

our men and women who are fighting overseas and our civilians who are involved, to show the same respect for them that they show for our country. The President has shown real courage. He has told us news we really don't want to hear, and he has been calm. He has used restraint, and he has been determined. But today, we think especially of our Armed Forces.

Tennesseans have a rich history of serving in the armed services. We are the Volunteer State. We earned that name in the War of 1812, in the Mexican War and ever since, and the tradition continues today. Twenty thousand men and women from Fort Campbell have been deployed in the vicinity of Iraq, and another thousand active duty military personnel from across the State as well. More than 4,000 Tennesseans from more than 80 Reserve and National Guard units have been called up. They come from units like the 134th Air Refueling Wing from McGhee Tyson; K company, 3rd Battalion, 23rd Marines in Memphis; and the 3397th U.S. Army Garrison of Chattanooga. They are protecting us from a great threat, and we are grateful to them.

I hope and trust that we speak with a united voice, not just for this one day. I think of Larry Joyce, who sought me out in Chicago in 1995. He was a Vietnam veteran. His son Casey was killed in Somalia while serving in our armed services. He wanted to make sure that I or anyone else who might serve in public life remembered the lessons of Vietnam and Somalia. They were these: First, have a clear objective. Second, have more than enough force to win. And third, have the stomach to see any military action we undertake all the way through to the end.

Mr. President, we have a clear objective. By 77 to 23, we voted to give the President the authority he exercises today. We would disarm Saddam Hussein, liberate Iraq, and help rebuild a strong democratic Iraq.

No. 2, we have more than sufficient force to win, maybe more force than has ever been assembled in a military action.

The question that remains is whether we, not our armed services, but whether we in the Congress and the American people have what we did not have in Vietnam and what we did not have in Somalia, which is the stomach to see our mission all the way through to the end.

I rise today to join in expressing bipartisan support to our President and our Armed Forces and to hope and trust that we will have the stomach to see this mission all the way through to the end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as an original cosponsor of the resolution.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for yielding time. I was on the floor as we began the session this morning. We had the prayer and the pledge, and of course this morning the prayer, by the pastor of St. Joseph's in our neighborhood here in Washington, and the pledge had renewed and deep meaning.

In terms of the prayer, I pray, too, Mr. President. I pray that our military action in Iraq is swift, is decisive, is successful, and I pray that the number of casualties, both military and civilian, is small.

I am deeply grateful—we all are deeply grateful—to the soldiers who are overseas. I spoke to departing guardsmen and enlisted men throughout my State of New York, in Canandaigua, Fort Drum, and on Long Island. When I addressed them, I had a lump in my throat because of their sacrifice, their bravery, their humanity, and because so many of them were there with their families before they were getting on planes to go to the Middle East.

They are part of a grand tradition, a tradition of young men and young women who are willing to sacrifice for the rest of us, and we pray for them. I think all Americans join in that prayer.

We have so many different views on the issues of the day and on the action in Iraq, but what always happens in this country in time of war is unity and prayer for our fighting men and women occur, and I believe that is what is happening now in this country.

One last point. I have been asked by so many of my fellow New Yorkers what should they do, being that we have been in the epicenter of terrorism. I say to my fellow New Yorkers, first, you cannot be too careful. If there is anything untoward, report it to authorities. Second, our intelligence, our ability to deal with al-Qaida and other terrorist groups, has vastly improved since September 10, 2001, and I believe New Yorkers should continue to go about their duties, their jobs, their businesses, their daily lives. I gave the advice to my wife and daughters who live in New York City to continue going about their life, and I give that advice to all New Yorkers as well.

Again, we hope and pray for a quick, decisive, successful military action in Iraq and for minimal casualties, military and civilian.

I yield whatever time I have remaining to my colleague from Michigan.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I am proud to rise in support of the resolution supporting our troops.

America is now at war. My thoughts are with our troops. Our men and women in uniform have my steadfast support. They have my respect, my admiration, and my gratitude.

Americans have differences over the path that led us to war. Yet Americans are united in support of our men and women in uniform. Each and every member of our military is part of the American family. Their service is a tremendous sacrifice and great risk. These are ordinary men and women called on to act in an extraordinary way. Whatever their nation asks them to do, they will do with bravery, fortitude, and gallantry. All Americans owe them a debt of gratitude.

The military doesn't just need our thanks; they need our help. We must support them not only with words, but with deeds. That means ensuring that our troops have the best training and equipment. That means standing up for military families. They are facing long separations and terrible worries about the safety of their loved ones. They shouldn't also be facing financial worries. So while we are talking about tax cuts for Joe Billionaire, let's not forget GI Joe and Jane.

I believe the war started the right way: targeting Saddam Hussein and members of his regime in their bunkers. Saddam Hussein is our enemy, not the people of Iraq.

Let's not forget why we are at this point: The fault lies squarely with Saddam Hussein. Saddam is dangerous and duplicitous. As part of the gulf war cease-fire agreement, he committed to destroy his weapons of mass destruction. For the past twelve years, Saddam Hussein has ignored UN resolutions by rebuilding his illegal weapons programs. Resolution 1441 gave Saddam Hussein a final opportunity to destroy any prohibited weapons of mass destruction or missiles; to fully report on Iraq's weapons of mass destruction programs; and to cooperate with inspectors to verify compliance.

I have consistently called for robust multinational action to disarm Iraq. Saddam Hussein is a danger to the world, so the world should share the burden of confronting the Iraqi threat. I appreciate the help and support of other nations, including Great Britain, Australia, and Poland. Other countries are allowing access to territory and airspace, providing logistical and intelligence support, or playing other non-combat roles.

America must continue diplomacy, even as we continue the war, to expand the coalition of the willing to share the burden of war and to share the responsibility and the economic cost of rebuilding Iraq.

Now that America is at war, our troops must know: I am on their side. The American people are on their side. The thoughts and prayers of the American people are with the men and women of our military, and with their families.

God bless our troops, and God bless America.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, with the commencement of engagement by U.S. military forces in Iraq, we stand united in support of the men and

women of our Armed Forces. These young men and women representing the best of America are entering into harm's way in a distant land. Whatever our differences on policy, we speak with one voice in supporting our troops. I have no doubt that our military forces will be successful, although we do not now know how quickly or at what cost.

As do all Marylanders, indeed all Americans, I pray for the safety of our troops and join my colleagues in pledging to them our commitment for the necessary resources and support.

These brave men and women and their families are in our thoughts and in our prayers. We wish them Godspeed, and their prompt and safe return to our shores.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, my thoughts and prayers are with Iowa families who have loved ones serving their country in the Middle East. When faced with the difficult and sometimes terrible duty of war, the men and women of our armed services have never let us down. We have the best trained soldiers, the best technology, and the best military commanders in the world. I have full confidence in their performance. My hope is for a swift conclusion and a lasting peace in the entire region. It is also my deep hope that innocent civilians in Iraq and the rest of the Middle East suffer a minimum of harm.

I know the views in the country have been divided as to the need for and the wisdom of this war. Right now, we need to support the men and women who are serving this country. This war and the reconstruction work that follows will not be easy and many of our troops may bravely face risks. They are doing their duty and sacrificing for our security. We need to keep them all in our thoughts and prayers and be fully behind them. That is something on which we can all agree.

Right now, over 3,200 Iowans are serving: 2,200 in the National Guard, 1,760 are overseas, and over 1,000 in our Reserves here and abroad. We are proud of our Iowa, that Iowans are protecting our homeland.

In my home State of Iowa, I know there have been some concerns about our vulnerable areas in this time of Washington. I want Iowans to know I will be working with my fellow Senators to ensure our homeland is protected. As our Governor, Tom Vilsack, said today, it will take the resources of our Federal Government to keep our communities safe. I intend to work to make sure Iowans and all Americans have the protections we need here at home.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for the tens of thousands of brave Americans who are risking their lives at this very hour in a distant land to try to bring some peace and stability to a nation that has been ravaged by a dictator.

Late last night the President of the United States ordered United States

forces to begin attacks on Iraqi installations. There are currently almost 300,000 American service men and women in the Persian Gulf region. Several thousand are from my State of Connecticut, and they are doing their part. There are 1,500 members of the Connecticut National Guard, of which I was a member. It seems like hundreds of years ago, but I was a member of that National Guard in my home State. There are 750 deployed to the Middle East, and another 750 activated to participate in homeland security and related responsibilities. The results are 530 sons and daughters serving in the Army who are active members and reservists, 310 in the Air Force, and dozens of police officers and firefighters called to active duty, putting additional pressures on the homeland security issues.

I thank each and every one of them for their service to our State, to our country, and for freedom. I say to them I am proud and honored to represent them in the Senate.

As is always the case, these young men and women stand ready to obey the orders of the Commander in Chief to take up arms and risk their lives in the defense of all Americans and the values of freedom, liberty, and democracy. I greatly admire the courage and professionalism of our service men and women who are now engaged in this dangerous conflict far away from their homes and their loved ones.

Americans stand as one in support of these brave individuals. I express my gratitude to the family members of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and members of the Coast Guard. They, more than anyone, understand the sacrifices involved in the service of our Nation.

War is a treacherous endeavor and we all pray for their safe return. I am confident in the days and weeks ahead America and the U.S. Congress will continue to provide our service men and women the support they deserve and they may need.

Last fall, I supported President Bush's decision to go to the United Nations and seek the support of the U.N. members to resolve the threat posed by Iraqi weapons of mass destruction and supported the deployment of U.S. weapons inspectors to Iraq to verify peaceful disarmament. I wanted the diplomatic efforts to succeed. I believe President Bush did, as well. Unfortunately, Saddam Hussein obviously did not.

While there may have been differing opinions on some aspects of our policy toward Iraq, there has been no disagreement that Saddam Hussein is anything but a cruel and murderous tyrant. At a very critical juncture Saddam Hussein chose to impede the work of the inspectors and at every fork of the road he squandered opportunities for peaceful disarmament presented by the international community. Time has run out and we thus find ourselves in this situation.

My hope is as we begin the reconstruction process, it will be a sense of

cooperation internationally on reconstruction. We cannot do this alone. We have to reach out even to those we have had disagreements with to help rebuild Iraq and build the peace and stability of the region. That is critically important for America's security for the 21st century.

I regret we did not have more time to discuss this and express our views and thoughts. I do not minimize the importance of the budget debate, but this discussion would trump any discussion of a budget issue. Unfortunately, that time is not allocated.

Saddam Hussein must bear full responsibility for what is about to befall him. He brought it upon himself. I have no sympathy for his plight. The real tragedy is that others may have to suffer for his sins although I am confident that American soldiers will make every effort, use every means of intelligence, and employ all available technology to minimize civilian casualties.

Would that Saddam Hussein had shown the same regard for his people that our forces will. His record has been the opposite. This murderous tyrant has routinely had his own people tortured, raped, beaten, and executed. In 1988, he ordered the use of chemical weapons against the Iraqi people, killing 5,000 men, women, and children in a single day. Now, he may be ordering his elite troops to use the city of Baghdad as a fortress a human fortress endangering the lives of countless Iraqi civilians.

It is my hope that United States military action will not only free the world of the dangers posed by Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction, but provide an opportunity for the Iraqi people to free themselves from 30 years of tyranny and oppression, to begin a new chapter in the history of their country.

The current military action may only last a few days or a few weeks. But in the end, I have no doubt that our American service men and women will prevail in this conflict. However, after we emerge successfully from our military conflict with Saddam Hussein, another challenge will face us the task of establishing a free and stable Iraq. In many ways this is an even more important battle than the one currently ongoing in the deserts of Iraq. And it is a battle that we should not "wage" alone. An international coalition of friends, allies, and U.N. humanitarian organizations must be mobilized to share the costs and responsibility for providing humanitarian relief to the Iraqi people, and the larger and more complex reconstruction of Iraqi society.

The United States is not the only nation that has a stake in rebuilding Iraq. The entire world has a huge stake in getting this right. For only an Iraq that is strong, free, and democratic—only an Iraq that respects the rights of all its citizens only an Iraq that respects the territorial integrity of its neighbors can be counted on to con-

tribute to building a Middle East that is stable and prosperous. That is why I am confident that whatever our past differences may have been, our friends and allies at the United Nations will join with us in this effort.

Once again let me express my thanks to the American men and women who have put themselves at risk for each one of us. Let me also thank the service members from other nations who have joined with our forces in this endeavor. And let me offer one more prayer for their swift and safe return home once their mission is complete.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues and all of America in expressing pride in and gratitude to our men and women in uniform. With one voice this Congress honors our troops, and with one mind we pray for their safe return.

Last night, as we all watched from the safety of our living rooms, our military went to war. Our soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen have left their home country and their home fires to face unknown danger and even death. We cannot be proud enough of these courageous men and women who fight for freedom in Iraq. We cannot be grateful enough to these Americans who are willing to risk their lives for our security.

We have so many people to thank today: our Active Duty forces who have made it their life work to protect and defend us; our citizen soldiers, the Reserves, and the National Guard who have left jobs in offices and on factory floors, kissed children and spouses goodbye, and donned the uniform of our armed services; our troops' families who daily endure the hardships of military life and today worry and wait for their loved ones to come home.

In my State of Wisconsin we have had over 2,200 men and women called up for service in the National Guard and an additional 1,357 mobilized from the Reserves, more people than at any time since the Berlin crisis.

I make special mention of them because they trained in relative anonymity during times of peace. It is only in times of conflict that communities discover how many of their friends and neighbors serve their country quietly, year in and year out. In times of crises they are notable at their absence at scout meetings, church pews, and parent-teacher conferences.

Last Monday I was fortunate enough to observe the 1158 transportation company at Beloit, WI, as they bravely headed off, leaving behind spouses, children, families, and friends. These soldiers had little time to put their affairs in order before being ordered into harm's way. But there were no complaints and no grumbling.

The families I met were concerned about the future, were ready to deal with the personal and financial difficulties.

I was struck to see young children bravely saying goodbye to their parents, without knowing what the future

might bring. These youngsters did not ask for this war and did not understand it, but they, too, are making sacrifices for our security. Our soldiers are ready and willing to do their duty. They understand better than anyone else that freedom is not free. They are ready to pay that price today and every day.

Our soldiers represent the best of the American people and American ideals. While many of us will talk about patriotism and service today, no words can do justice to the burden they have chosen to bear.

So our hearts, our prayers, and our deepest gratitude go out to them today.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. The President has announced that military operations to disarm and liberate Iraq have begun. For those of us who have taken an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution, entering into war is one of the most somber moments we face.

When the President sends our troops to battle, the stakes are unmistakably clear: our courageous troops are preparing to risk everything so that our society can continue to live in freedom. At a time like this, our Nation should come together as one to support our troops in battle, and to support the Commander in Chief.

This military action responds to the growing threat to America and our allies posed by Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction. Here at home and around the world, we have debated how best to disarm Saddam. After 12 years of diplomacy, and 17 different U.N. resolutions, Saddam remains a serious threat to the peace and stability of the region, and to the safety of Americans and our allies.

I, like most of my colleagues, believed we could not live with this threat to America's security. And so I voted last October to give the President authority to make one final attempt to disarm Saddam through the U.N.—to give diplomacy one last chance to work—and to resort to forcible disarmament if that failed.

Five months after we passed our congressional resolution, and 4 months after the U.N. Security Council unanimously passed resolution 1441, Saddam has still refused to disarm.

Now the President has decided, drawing on the authority granted him by the Constitution, by the Congress, and by a series of U.N. resolutions, to send our troops into battle—to forcibly disarm Iraq, end Saddam's rule of terror, and allow the oppressed Iraqi people to have a better life.

And it is our responsibility, here in America, to come together to show our troops, who are fighting to protect our freedoms, that they have all our support, and that we are praying for a quick and successful campaign.

I had the opportunity to visit our troops last month in Kuwait, Qatar, and Afghanistan, and had the privilege to meet our fine young West Virginians serving there. I am always impressed by the commitment and profes-

sionalism of our Armed Forces—the brave enlisted men and women who have dedicated their skills and energy to safeguarding America's vital national interests, the officer corps who have honed the most awesome fighting machine the world has ever seen, and the reservists and national guardsmen who willingly disrupt their civilian lives when their country needs them.

To witness their dedication and skill, and their willingness to risk everything to defend the greater good of our Nation, is to be reminded, just as we learned on that fateful September 11, that heroes still walk among us. The Americans who have volunteered to serve in our Nation's Armed Forces are some of the finest individuals our society produces, and we are all in their debt.

We West Virginians have always been particularly proud that while we are a small State, we contribute a significant share of America's Armed Forces. I have here a list of the West Virginia Reserve and National Guard units that have been called up for service overseas in the past 2 years. I realize I can't read the entire list, but I would like to note that it encompasses 28 units based in West Virginia and nearly 2500 servicemembers, as well as thousands of Active Duty servicemembers who hail from West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to have this list printed in the RECORD.

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

WEST VIRGINIA NATIONAL GUARD & RESERVE
UNITS MOBILIZED SINCE SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

1. 157th Military Police Company, Martinsburg, WV, 124 personnel.
2. 152nd Military Police Detachment, Moorefield, WV, 45 personnel.
3. 1257th Transportation Company, Huntington, WV, 167 personnel.
4. 463rd Engineer Battalion Detachment 2, Wheeling, WV, 50 personnel.
5. 554th Adjutant General Company, Ripley, WV, 18 personnel.
6. 111th Engineer Group Headquarters, Headquarters Company, St. Albans, 88 personnel.
7. 119th Engineer Company, Clarksburg, WV, 159 personnel.
8. Detachment 1 1st Battalion 80th Regiment 3rd Brigade, Kingwood, WV, 32 personnel.
9. Army National Guard Special Operations Detachment E, Moorefield, WV, 27 personnel.
10. Army National Guard Special Operation Detachment 3, Charleston, WV, 1 personnel.
11. Special Operations Detachment, Europe Forward 2, Kingwood, WV, 1 personnel.
12. State Area Command West Virginia Detachment 6, Charles Town, WV, 1 personnel.
13. State Area Command West Virginia Army National Guard Headquarters, Charleston, WV, 1 personnel.
14. 1092nd Engineer Battalion, Parkersburg, WV, 522 personnel.
15. 1863rd Transportation Company, Oak Hill, WV, 68 personnel.
16. 156th Military Police Department, Monaville, WV, 45 personnel.
17. 261st Ordnance Company 1st Platoon Medical Lift, Charleston, WV, 44 personnel.
18. 261st Ordnance Company Detachment 1 Ammunition Modular, Kenova, WV, 12 personnel.

19. 261st Ordnance Company Detachment 2, Kenova, WV, 12 personnel.

20. 321st Ordnance Battalion Headquarters Headquarters Company, Charleston, WV, 52 personnel.

21. 363rd Military Police Company Combat Support Group, Grafton, WV, 180 personnel.

22. 459th Engineer Company Heavy Boat Detachment 1, Bridgeport, WV, 10 personnel.

23. 459th Engineer Company Detachment 3, Bridgeport, WV, 173 personnel.

24. 304th Military Police Company, Bluefield, WV 180 personnel.

25. 351st Ordnance Company, Romney, WV, 153 personnel.

26. 811th Ordnance Company, Rainelle, WV, 118 personnel.

27. 2nd Division Special Forces Battalion 19th Special Forces Group 1st Special Forces, Camp Dawson, WV, 9 personnel.

28. 300th Chemical Company, Morgantown, WV, 113 personnel.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. A war will always involve risk and uncertainty. That is especially the case when we are dealing with a dangerous dictator like Saddam Hussein, who has used illegal weapons before, and who knows that in this instance, war will not end until he is removed.

We should never be over-confident, and must go into this knowing that our troops will face real risks. But we can take heart that never, in the history of mankind, have there been Armed Forces better prepared to meet the challenges that come their way.

In skill, in technological sophistication, and in fighting spirit, our troops continue to set new benchmarks the world has never seen. Never in modern history has there been a fighting force so clearly superior to all its competitors.

We now stand at an important threshold in our Nation's history, and our national security. The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction has altered America's security forever. Before 2001, we believed that we could only be threatened by another superpower—and the demise of the Soviet Union made us think that threats to America's homeland had more or less vanished. On September 11, we learned how wrong we were.

In the coming years, the spread of weapons of mass destruction—to rogue governments, and to terrorist groups in the developing world—will be America's most important national security challenge. And increasingly, the focus of our diplomacy and defense alliances will shift away from our traditional focus on Europe to respond to these emerging threats from developing countries in Asia, in Africa, and even in Latin America.

Indeed, that is already the case today: besides Iraq, the biggest security threats currently facing America aren't major power rivalries but illegal proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by states such as North Korea and Iran. This threat isn't unique to the United States—but our global leadership role makes us a particularly tempting target for the disaffected and resentful.

We cannot allow foreign terrorist or rogue states to threaten our society

with weapons of mass destruction. Terrorism and proliferation can be stopped, but to do so will require a concerted, sustained strategy, rather than ad hoc, relative efforts.

And it will require broad international support—the kind that helped us win the cold war—rather than working alone, or begin dismissive of our allies because they haven't yet recognized the magnitude of the shared threat.

War is always a tragedy. To put human lives at risk—both military and civilian—can only be considered when all other reasonable options have failed.

And in that regard, the significance of this conflict is not just in disarming Iraq. While that is the primary goal, this mission also demonstrates to the world that the spread of weapons of mass destruction is such a grave threat to our security that we Americans are prepared to use the full force of our military—our fine and brave men and women in uniform—to stop it.

And we are joined in that understanding by the British, and the Australians, and the poles, and many, many allies around the world.

Perhaps some other countries haven't reached that understanding yet. Or they continue to believe the diplomatic processes developed for a cold war environment must be maintained at all costs. But this new threat must be addressed.

If our troops find chemicals or biological weapons in Iraq—and I am confident they will—it will demonstrate to the skeptics around the world that we were right about the threat, and that we had to take action before these illegal weapons were used. And I hold out great hope that a swift victory in Iraq will pave the way for the U.S. and our allies to come together around a strategy to deal with the spread of weapons of mass destruction elsewhere.

I hope, too, that a swift victory in Iraq will provide an opportunity for the U.S. and our allies to come together to support the reconstruction and rehabilitation of Iraq. As the President has said, we bear no ill-will to the Iraqi people, only to the brutal and corrupt regime that governs them. The reconstruction of Iraq will be a long, costly complicated task, but a vital one—for it will ensure that Iraqis, now and in the future, will understand that America and its allies have come as liberators, not conquerors.

Those are longer-term concerns, and we will have to attend to them. For now, though, we must focus on the task at hand, which is the prompt, safe and humane execution of the military operation the President has commenced.

I join my fellow West Virginians in telling our troops they have our support, our gratitude, and our prayers. They represent the best of our society, and we know they will perform in a manner that makes us all proud.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today with America at war against

the dictatorship of Saddam Hussein, to vote in favor of the concurrent resolution introduced by my colleagues, commending the President and America's Armed Forces.

This is a moment of utmost seriousness and solemnity, without doubt the most critical time of my decade in the Senate.

During this difficult time, America and the world must know that this Chamber stands firmly united behind our men and women in harm's way, men and women willing to make the ultimate sacrifice in defense of our liberties and our lives. Our hopes and our prayers are with them and their families.

I would also like to recognize those now engaged in combat from my home State of California.

More than 102,000 Californians have been sent to the gulf from every branch of the military—Army, Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard, and Marines, along with 13,000 reservists. This is the largest number of Americans from any State fighting in this war.

And while many people in California are opposed to this war, I would urge all of them to unite behind these courageous men and women and their families here at home.

I have had questions about how we got to this point. I would have done it a different way, and I will have more to say about that at the appropriate time.

But now, as we unite behind our military and our Commander in Chief, the United States must be prepared for the long term. Winning the war will mark but the first step.

Once the shooting stops and the dust clears, we must be equally committed to winning the peace in Iraq, and to see that longstanding ethnic rivalries not be allowed to surface. Failure to do so would, at the very least, negate any military success.

This means, of course, that the United States must take the lead in rebuilding the Iraqi nation, in stabilizing its new government, in providing interim security to prevent the emergence of tribal hostilities, and to see that Iraq is no longer a producer of weapons of mass destruction.

Winning the peace in Iraq is absolutely critical. Indeed, winning the peace means: reducing the likelihood of a possible clash of civilizations, pitting the United States and our allies against the Muslim world; reducing the incidence of renewed terrorist attacks, both here and abroad; increasing the chances of achieving lasting peace in the Middle East—of resolving the Israeli-Palestinian crisis; allowing us to recommit ourselves to the still uncertain future of Afghanistan and the government of Hamid Karzai; and ensuring that the United States will persevere, sooner rather than later, in the overall war on terror.

So, as the courageous men and women of the American military set out to remove Saddam Hussein from power, risking their very lives for us

and the liberties we must never take for granted, the focus of our thoughts and our prayers are with them.

We wish them every success and a speedy return home to their families. For those that may fall in battle and pay the highest price, however, their sacrifice must never be forgotten.

And the best way to honor them is by winning the peace in Iraq—by helping the Iraqi people rebuild their lives, and by demonstrating to Muslims everywhere that the United States, while a powerful nation, is also motivated by a sincere desire to one day see the entire world safe, prosperous, and free.

This, after all, is what this conflict is all about, and why we must prevail.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, as this conflict begins, all of us pray for a swift and decisive victory, and the safety of our brave men and women in battle.

North Dakota has sent thousands of sons and daughters to wage this fight at home and abroad, including more National Guard members per capita than any other State.

Along with the men and women from the airbases in Minot and Grand Forks, North Dakotans will bear a heavy burden in this conflict.

I know they will be strong. I pray they will be safe.

I have great confidence that the fourteen B-52s deployed from Minot Air Force Base and their crews will turn in a brilliant performance, once again demonstrating the awesome power and effectiveness of these reliable planes and their expert crews. B-52s made a huge contribution to our success in Afghanistan, helping to turn the tide quickly against the terrorists. They were decisive in the last gulf war, and I know they will again play a key role.

The Grand Forks base is operating at a greater tempo than at any time in its history, flying its massive tankers and providing the air bridge that allows our forces to operate against an enemy halfway around the world.

Our National Guard members have been called up to bases inside the United States, ready to support operations on the ground, and we hope, the operations that will be necessary after a victory. The Guard units have been drawn from Fargo, Bismarck, Grand Forks, Edgeley, Grafton, Rugby, Wishek, Cando, Carrington, Mayville, Oakes, and Wahpeton. There is hardly a town in my State that has not seen at least one of its citizens called up to serve. They have left their jobs and their families to do their duty in defense of the Nation.

I could not be more proud of the tremendous contribution the men and women of my State are making, their dedication and their patriotism.

I had hoped for a peaceful solution, but today we are at war. Like all Americans, my thoughts and prayers will be with our troops and our allies in the difficult hours to come. My greatest hope is that the conflict will be settled quickly, with minimal loss of life,

and that stability will be restored to the region.

As the conflict continues, I stand with my colleagues united behind our troops here at home and overseas. With my family and my colleagues I pray for the men and women who now stand in harm's way. May they be granted a swift victory, and may the sacrifices of this war lead to a safer and more peaceful world.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, On Monday, March 17, the attention of the world was focused on Washington, DC and the White House. The President was about to speak to the Nation about Saddam Hussein and the refusal of the Government of Iraq to live up to its signed agreements and the resolutions of the United Nations to eliminate their stock of weapons of mass destruction. In the 15 or so minutes that followed, our President made clear his determination to take action and resolve the situation in Iraq. He said he was going to end forever the evil presence of a dictator in Iraq who had done nothing during his reign but abuse his power as he pursued his dreams of glory and increased power and prestige while showing little regard for the health and welfare of his own people.

As the President spoke with passion and conviction on the need to rid the world of Hussein's dictatorship, he cut through the rhetoric and the misleading positions and promises that had been so often heard during the past few years. He made it clear that this was an ultimatum of more than words—action was sure to follow if his words were left unheeded. He did everything he could to make it abundantly clear to Saddam Hussein and the people of the world that such evil would not be allowed to stand. He stated a final deadline.

Soon after he spoke, the movement of our troops intensified as an international coalition took up their positions surrounding Iraq as we all waited for Saddam Hussein's response. There could be only one acceptable response to the President's message. Saddam had to leave Iraq, relinquish his power, and take his sons and family with him. Anything less would be unacceptable.

Now we have our answer. A deadline has been set which has come and gone. In response our troops are now advancing into Iraq and heading for its capital of Baghdad. A series of events that began years ago with our defense of Kuwait will now end where it must—with the removal of Saddam Hussein and an end to his brutal dictatorship.

As our troops head further into Iraq, they will be heading into unknown dangers and trouble that cannot be accurately predicted, though they have been trained and will be prepared for it.

Will Saddam Hussein try to use chemical weapons to prolong his hold on power? What has he hidden from the team of inspectors that he may now want to unleash? These and so many other questions will be in the minds of our troops as they come closer and

closer to Iraq's capital city. The rewards that will come with our success will be great. But, as we know from our past experiences, the sacrifices that may lie ahead may be equally as great.

War is a very dangerous business and Wyoming is no stranger to the kind of sacrifice it sometimes requires from those who serve in our military. Down through the years, the people of Wyoming have always answered the call to protect and preserve the peace and answer the threat of any enemy of our Nation, wherever it has led them. Many paid the ultimate price.

In 1991, when Saddam Hussein decided to attack Kuwait and drain that country of its supplies and resources, our Armed Forces were there to respond to the cry for help that came from Kuwait.

Joining in as part of that effort was one of Wyoming's own, Manuel Davila. Manuel was a brave young man, a father, and a nice guy who had a kind word for everyone he met. He was the kind of person you would want on your side if there were tough times ahead. There were tough times on the horizon as this battle began and we were fortunate to have brave men and women like Manuel on our side.

I watched Manuel grow up because he came from my home town. He loved his life and he loved Wyoming. But he loved freedom more. When he was called on to bring the freedoms he loved to people he had never met, he did not hesitate. He traded his beloved blue skies and mountaintops of Wyoming for the flat dessert and skies darkened by Saddam Hussein's desperate attempts to delay the end of his occupation by setting every oil well he could on fire. He traded the sweet smell of Wyoming's clean mountain air for the use of a gas mask and the threat of exposure to the Iraqi war machine's stock of gas and chemical weapons.

Sadly, he was one who didn't come home from that war. But he did leave behind a legacy of standing up for what you believe in, keeping your word, and never allowing evil to win by failing to act or by doing so little in response it was as if you did nothing at all.

Then came September 11, and another round of attacks by a madman fueled by hatred and a mad desire for power. Once again we looked to our sons and daughters to respond and to end the threat of terrorism once and for all. The bravest and best of Wyoming and many other States were soon on the front lines, ready to put their training into action. As they did, one of the first lost was Jonn J. Edmunds, a young man from Cheyenne, who was killed as our Nation took action against those who supported and planned the terrorist attacks of that terrible day.

Now, as we stand here together in prayerful support of our Armed Forces, I have no doubt that Manuel and Jonn and all the others who have served so bravely in our military over the years would be proud of their comrades and

their liberation of Iraq which is finally at hand.

Soon Iraq will be welcomed back into the family of nations and the rights so cherished by our Nation and our people will be part of the daily routine in Iraq, too. By our actions we are showing the world that the rights with which we are endowed by our Creator, the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which are a part of our own Declaration of Independence, were intended to be claimed not just by the people of our own Nation. They are to be rightfully claimed by people all over the world as well.

As we wait for today's news from Iraq, we are fully aware of the seriousness of the challenge that lies before us—its difficulty and its magnitude. For the first time since I was a young boy we are facing an enemy who is faceless and nameless and may have operatives who sympathize with him who may strike us on our own soil. With the exception of Pearl Harbor, we have never faced that kind of a threat in our lives. September 11 changed that and we must now all be more vigilant for in a very real sense we are all part of the war effort—just as we were in the days of World War II.

As the effort to remove the tyranny of Saddam Hussein continues, the fate of both our nations hangs in the balance. The degree of our success in what we set out to do and the aftermath as we work to bring a lasting peace to Iraq will speak volumes to the world about our ability to walk our talk.

When this war is over and Iraq is free, we will have sent a message to all those who would deny their people the basic rights of human existence. The world will no longer tolerate their abuse of power and their refusal to acknowledge or respond to the needs of their people. We will also have ended the regime of a dictator and eliminated his stock of weapons of mass destruction. We will have taken a strong, decisive action which will help to increase the security of our Nation and the world.

Ronald Reagan once said that "Some people live an entire lifetime and wonder if they have ever made a difference in the world. The marines don't have that problem."

Neither does the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Coast Guard or the Merchant Marine. Through their brave and courageous actions on behalf of the people of Iraq, they will do for that country what they did for the people of Kuwait. They will give them their country and their lives back. They will give them the chance to dream again about a better future for their children. They will give those who live under oppression around the world a real reason to hope that someday things will be better for them in their own country.

We all know what brave, remarkable people our soldiers are. They don't see any limits to what they can do because they will never quit until the job is done and the war is won. We owe them

each a debt we will never be able to repay. We can never forget that it is because of them—and not us—that the rights enumerated in our Constitution are guaranteed. Whether it is freedom of religion, the press, or freedom of speech, it has always been the efforts of our soldiers that have provided us with a platform from which to speak, and the ability to exercise these and all our rights. Even those who have spoken out against their efforts have our soldiers to thank for their right to do.

Tonight, when we spend those last few minutes tucking our children into bed, I hope we all take a moment to comfort our children and our grandchildren, and to assure them that things will be all right someday soon. Make sure they know they can sleep peacefully tonight and in the nights to come, because the brave men and women of this Nation, our sons and daughters—and perhaps their own sisters and brothers—are ever vigilant, on guard and have taken a stand on our behalf. We can take a great deal of pride in them all.

As a member of the Senate, I have always been very proud of the way we come together whenever we are faced by a threat, or forced to use our nation's military to answer an attack or address a wrong. As our young men and women head into battle, I know I won't be the only one who will bow his head to pray.

May God bless and protect the men and women of our Armed Forces. May He watch over the Iraqi people and keep them safe from harm as we fight to liberate their country and bring them freedom and peace—a just peace that will recognize their rights and ensure that they have food, medicine, and the essentials of life that have been denied them for too long. May our victory be swift so their wait for relief will not be long. And may all our loved ones return home safely, and in peace.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues and the Nation in a strong and unequivocal expression of support for the courageous men and women of the United States military, who now defend America's values in the Persian Gulf.

This expression is far more than a personal expression. It is an expression of the feelings of the people of New Jersey—many who are mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, and spouses of those in harm's way. For all of us, these brave individuals are in our hearts and prayers.

Mr. President, today our Nation is united. United in support for our Nation's military. United in appreciation for the bravery and sacrifice of our service men and women, and their loved ones. United in our unshakable commitment to victory, a victory, with the grace of God, that will be achieved with maximum speed and minimum casualties.

Mr. President, we Americans obviously had our differences as we moved on the path that got us to this point.

There are many reservations I could express and people more thoughtful than myself have done so. But in our democracy, there is a time for differences and a time for debate. That said, there comes a time to end debate and unite. That time is now. That unity is without regard to party, ideology, or philosophy. We all stand together as members of the great American family.

Mr. President, the United States military is unrivaled in its power and its competence. In that strength, I am confident that we will succeed in our mission. A mission to free the Iraqi people. A mission to help ensure that our Nation can live in peace, without the threat of weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of madmen and terrorists.

So, Mr. President, on behalf of all New Jerseyans and in company with all Americans, let me again express my deep appreciation to the courageous Americans who are putting their lives on the line, and for their loved ones. They are America's heroes. Their Nation will support them every step of the way until the day comes, as we pray it will, when these hostilities are complete.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, today, our hearts and prayers go out to those people in the Armed Forces who are fighting the war in Iraq. This morning, I put on this orange ribbon I wore when I was Governor of the State of Ohio during Desert Storm. I am going to continue to wear it during the war in Iraq to remind me and others that our men and women are in harm's way, and I will continue to wear it until they return.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, as we stand here today on the Senate floor, America's finest citizens and the world's greatest military men and women have been called upon in the cause of disarming Saddam Hussein.

These are Americans who willingly serve this country, who knowingly place themselves in harm's way to defend our Nation, and who are ready to do the jobs for which they have trained. These men and women in the Armed Services and intelligence community are unmatched in their professionalism and skill, and I have no doubt that they will prevail.

As I said on the House floor in 1991, on behalf of the authorization of what would become Operation Desert Storm, "the magnitude of the vote I now face is greater than any other I have or likely will cast." I was proven wrong on October 9, when I cast a vote of equal gravity and solemnity, authorizing the President to use force in the disarmament of Saddam Hussein.

In the days since that vote, while President Bush pursued a course of diplomacy, Saddam Hussein instead pursued a course of deceit. Under the terms of UN Resolution 1441, approved unanimously by the Security Council, Hussein determined the course upon which we have now embarked by refus-

ing to fully and immediately disarm. Armed conflict was not the hope of anyone among us. Now that it regrettably has become a necessary reality, we stand united in support of our troops who once again will be on the vanguard in service to freedom and the protection of all those nations that embrace this noble ideal.

I have had the great privilege to meet countless soldiers, sailors, airmen and women, and veterans during my quarter-century tenure in Congress. We are grateful because we know that they are the bulwark behind which we stand, and against which our enemies strain. And we are in awe because we cannot fully comprehend their ability to so completely substitute the concept of "self" with the virtue of selflessness.

Today, the realities of war weigh heavily on our hearts, and the focus of all our prayers is now with our men and women in uniform. In the protection of freedom, the disarming of Saddam Hussein, and the liberation of the people of Iraq, American sons and daughters may well make the ultimate sacrifice. That they would undertake that risk for our Nation and the world overwhelms the words available to honor their extraordinary spirit and courage.

The best we can hope to do is to come together, behind our Commander in Chief and all of our troops, with nothing but the greatest pride in their courage and the strongest support for their mission. A freed Iraq, a world free of the tyranny of Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction, and a menacing cloud lifted from the heartland of a troubled region—none of these would be possible without those men and women who put their lives at risk for the greater good.

It is for them that we pass this resolution and pray for safe return. May God bless all those who wear the uniform of our armed forces, and my God bless the United States of America.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, as a citizen, Senator, and former marine, my hopes and prayers are with the troops and their families. I returned just a few weeks ago from the Persian Gulf and will be going back as soon as possible. I went to the region to assess whether the war fighters in the field were armed with the best intelligence possible to fight and win a battle against Saddam Hussein. Take my word for it, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are ready. They will take care of business consistent with American values. They will take care of each other. When they return, they will receive the accolades of a grateful nation.

The operation in Iraq is a component of the war against terrorism. We depend on our men and women in uniform to keep the terror plotters and operators far off our shores, away from our families, communities, and our Nation. That is quite a responsibility. I can not imagine a more important mission.

I support the resolution under consideration, and I am pleased it mentions those who have yet to return home from the original conflict in 1991, most notably Navy Captain Scott Speicher. I am also pleased that colleagues have come to the chamber not to argue about Iraq, rather to proclaim support for our service personnel.

The debate ended last October while a 77-to-23 vote to permit a military option, should one be needed, in the case of the Baghdad regime. In passing H.J. Res. 114, Congress specifically authorized the President to "use the Armed Forces of the United States in order to—(1) defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and (2) enforce all relevant United Nations Council resolutions regarding Iraq." This action was, of course, in addition to the Iraq Liberation Act, which Congress passed and President Clinton signed into law October 31, 1988. That act clearly states the United States should foster regime change in Iraq. The House passed that bill by a vote of 360 to 38, with 157 Democrats joining 202 Republicans. Lastly, on November 8, 2002, the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 1441 which gave Iraq one last opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations.

A few months later, the Director of Central Intelligence declared "Iraq has in place an active effort to deceive the UN inspectors and deny them access. This effort is directed by the highest levels of the Iraqi regime. Baghdad has given clear directions to its operational forces to hide banned materials in their possession." Let's be candid on the issue of compliance. The truth is that no amount of U-2 surveillance flights nor increase in the number of inspectors would have solved the problem of Saddam Hussein and weapons of mass destruction. Now I don't want war. Nobody wants war. The fact is, however, we are already at war. Over the last two decades, 5,700 Americans have lost their lives as a result of the kind of terrorist activity Saddam Hussein supports. I recall that the Marine Barracks in Lebanon, Pan Am 103, Khobar Towers, the embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, the USS *Cole*, and of course, September 11, 2001. Only after the latter tragedy, did we begin to fight back.

So I say to our troops and their families, thank you and I support you. You are freedom's best hope.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to express, on behalf of Washington State, our prayers and thoughts for the men and women of the United States armed forces that have now been called to duty in service of their country.

I am proud to join my colleagues in the Senate and Americans throughout the country to come together to support our troops and pray that their mission is completed quickly, effectively, and with minimal casualties.

America's deepest hope is for a swift conclusion to this war to liberate Iraq

and protect the world from its weapons of mass destruction.

In Washington State, we are proud to be the home to thousands of troops from our State that are currently serving our country in this conflict.

The men and women of the U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*, homeported in Everett, WA, have been deployed in the region since last summer and are a critical element of our efforts as a launching stage for air operations, including 50 missions over Southern Iraq just yesterday.

Air operations will depend heavily on tanker aircraft, many of which are based in Spokane, WA's Fairchild Air Force Base. And almost all air missions will be dependent upon the critical support of EA-6 radar jammers and P-3 aircraft, many of which are based in Naval Air Station Whidbey Island in Oak Harbor, WA.

In the ground operations, troops from Fort Lewis, near Tacoma, WA, will be providing critical infantry support. And cargo planes from McChord Air Force Base, also near Tacoma, have and will continue to be crucial in providing transportation support.

We also recognize the important sacrifices being made by the National Guard and reserve units in our State that have been activated, leaving jobs and livelihoods behind to serve the call to duty.

And let us not forget the parents, wives, husbands, friends and children of the men and women of our armed forces, whose support—in the face of fear and anxiety—is admirable and inspirational.

We are enormously proud of our fellow Washingtonians that are serving the Nation. Along with men and women from all 50 States serving in the military, these brave and courageous Americans have volunteered to put their lives on the line to defend the security of our country and the stability of our world.

Our prayers are with them, and we look forward to their speedy success and return home.

I have tremendous confidence in the men and women of our armed services to bring this conflict to a successful conclusion.

Yet, this support for the effort is accompanied by a deep sense of anxiety and concern.

Nobody wants war.

The death, destruction and misery of war are things that we should never ignore and we cannot forget. When our troops are called to defend our Nation and international peace, we do so with a heavy heart but strong confidence that we will prevail.

In reaching our objective of disarmament, we must not forget the plight of the Iraqi people.

Iraqi civilians have been victims of a brutal, harsh and inhumane dictator that has not only stripped away political liberty and free expression, but has combined the tactics of torture, deprivation and murder to maintain his terrible regime.

We must soberly recognize that the Iraqi people will be innocent victims of this conflict, and we must remain dedicated to doing everything in our power to ensure their safety and, ultimately, liberation.

Importantly, this dedication must extend beyond military success. We, in this Chamber, must recognize that the prospect of creating a stable, post-Saddam Iraq will be a huge, expensive and politically volatile endeavor.

This will not be easy, especially given the historic rivalries among Iraq's Kurdish, Shiite and Sunni population.

However, whatever the costs and whatever the commitment, we owe it to ourselves and the world to ensure that the liberation of Iraq our troops are fighting for is not wasted away by a failed post-war strategy.

Our troops are answering the call of duty.

As our hearts go out to their families and loved ones, we are a Nation that is profoundly grateful for their courage, dedication and sense of mission.

We know that our troops will meet the challenge that they have been given.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I rise in support of S. Res. 95, which commends our Armed Forces.

The war with Iraq is underway. I regret that diplomatic efforts to disarm Saddam Hussein have failed. I regret that diplomatic efforts to build a broader coalition of nations willing to join us in military action have also fallen short.

But the task force before us now is to pledge our unqualified support for our courageous young men and women on the battlefield; to do whatever is needed to ensure they have every advantage now that the fighting has commenced.

I was in the Army during World War II and served in Europe. As a veteran, I know how important it is for our Air Force personnel; and our soldiers and sailors to know that we feel close to them and they are constantly in our thoughts.

Winston Churchill said: "We shall not escape our dangers by recoiling from them." So we send our young men and women in uniform—each one a volunteer—to Iraq and to other distant places such as Afghanistan.

They fight to protect us, and they fight to free other people they don't know from cruelty and savage oppression.

Our troops are the best trained and best equipped in history. We have no doubt that they will prevail in their mission to oust Iraq's brutal dictator, eliminate Iraq's dangerous arsenal, and make the world a safer place.

War may be necessary, and war may be right. But it is never good. So we hope that this campaign to rid the world of Saddam Hussein and his murderous cohorts will be quick and decisive. We hope that there will be little collateral damage and as few casualties as possible, both among our troops and

among innocent Iraqi noncombatants. We hope that our brave young men and women in uniform will return home to their families safely, and as soon as possible.

Once we win the war in Iraq, we will have to secure the peace. That will be the best way we can honor our troops.

Even as we engage in the fighting today, we have to start planning for what comes tomorrow. That will require a steadfastness of purpose equal to what our troops are displaying as we speak. The task will not be easy. All people, all nations have the same tendency: we judge ourselves by our intentions; we judge others by their actions. We know that our intentions are noble; many others, however—including some of our long-standing allies—only see our actions and they condemn them. It is imperative that once the shooting stops, we do whatever is necessary to build a free, open, and democratic Iraq at peace with itself, its neighbors, and the world.

So, no matter the length of the battle, no matter how demanding the war, we face some years of concerted effort after the guns have fallen silent. We have to be prepared to lead the world in peace with the same vigor and purpose as our troops are currently demonstrating. I'm certain America is up to the task and we will prove to the world that our intentions are honorable.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, last night, President Bush ordered America's military to disarm Saddam Hussein, eliminate his weapons of mass destruction, and liberate the oppressed people of Iraq. The American people stand united behind the Commander-in-Chief and the men and women who defend our Nation.

For 12 years, the United States and a broad coalition of nations exhausted diplomatic means to contain and undermine Saddam Hussein's dangerous and tyrannical regime in order to end the threat posed by his pursuit of weapons of mass destruction. For 12 years, patient diplomacy yielded only persistent Iraqi intransigence and disobedience of international law. For 12 years, Saddam Hussein flagrantly violated United Nations Security Council Resolutions, making a mockery of that body by feverishly continuing his pursuit of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons.

We have made every effort to avoid war, but diplomacy has finally run its course. Those who suggest that the United States is to balance for the failure of diplomatic efforts to disarm Hussein could not be further from the truth. The responsibility for this war rests squarely on the shoulders of Saddam Hussein, a ruthless tyrant whose disregard for the edicts of the United Nations is matched only by his disregard for the lives and interests of his own people.

It is clear that Saddam Hussein does not understand the language of diplomacy, but only the language of mili-

tary force. What the United Nations failed to accomplish with 12 years of toothless diplomacy, the United States and a broad coalition of allied nations must now accomplish with just application of military force. On Monday, President Bush noted succinctly: "The United Nations Security Council has not lived up to its responsibilities, so we will rise to ours."

Truly, we must not let the world's most dangerous dictators acquire the world's most dangerous weapons. Unless tyrants like Hussein are disarmed, deterred, or destroyed, the use of weapons of mass murder against the United States and our allies is not a question of if, but of when. As President Bush said to the Nation last night, "We will meet that threat now with our Army, Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard and Marines, so that we do not have to meet it later with armies of firefighters and police and doctors on the streets of our cities."

From Afghanistan and Albania to the United Kingdom and Uzbekistan, governments throughout the world have publicly committed to providing substantive support, military and otherwise, to our efforts to disarm Hussein by force. Many other nations have quietly offered material support for our efforts to liberate the oppressed people of Iraq. Indeed, this multilateral coalition is larger than that formed in support of Operation Desert Storm during the 1991 Persian Gulf War. The members of this broad coalition, many of which have suffered under oppressive authorization rule in the past, understand the danger of living at the mercy of tyrannical regimes that threaten peace and stability with weapons of mass murder.

Like all Americans, I hope and pray for the safety of our troops who fight so that we may remain free. I am proud to represent tens of thousands of Kentuckians who will participate in military operations overseas, as well as the thousands of Kentuckians in the National Guard and Reserves who have been activated to play critical roles in defending our homeland. My thoughts and prayers are with them and their families. These Kentuckians, led by the 101st Airborne, Air Assault, division based at Fort Campbell, KY, will defend our freedom and security with honor and dignity.

Just as our ongoing operations in the war against terrorism will require patience and perseverance, so too will this effort to liberate the Iraqi people. But we are resolved as a nation to carry out our mission in support of peace, stability, and freedom. We are certain that our cause is just, and necessary. As our military fights to protect America, to disarm Hussein, and to provide security in an unstable region, the liberation of the people of Iraq draws near. Unique in its place in the world, the United States does not fight wars of empire and expansionism. Rather, we fight for the protection of our liberty, and for the liberty of oth-

ers. And just as in France in 1944, or Afghanistan in 2001, long-oppressed civilians—who have suffered under the brutal reign of Saddam Hussein—will soon experience the benevolence of the American people and their own inalienable right to live in freedom.

I am grateful for President Bush's steady leadership as Commander-in-Chief, and I have no doubt that our military men and women are the finest in the world and will defend our Nation with skill, precision, courage, and honor. May God bless America. And may He bless our soldiers in harm's way.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as our Nation is engaged in confrontation with Saddam Hussein and his Iraqi-regime, I join with my colleagues in offering my gratitude and support for our troops, both here and overseas.

None of us desire the use of force. Yet, as history has repeatedly taught us, the failure to confront a menacing tyranny today can lead to far greater devastation tomorrow. Had British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain stood fast against Nazi Germany's 1938 demand to dismember Czechoslovakia in exchange for "peace in our time," the lives of 50 million people could have been saved.

I salute the brave men and women of the U.S. Armed Forces who are willing to place their lives on the line to protect our freedoms. My thoughts and prayers are with the friends and families who remain behind, praying their loved ones not be harmed.

The dangers facing our troops are many. Will the Iraqi army quickly surrender? Will chemical and biological weapons be used? How long will this military campaign take? In addition, our service members must contend with the scorching heat of the desert; the blinding conditions of sand storms; and the logistical nightmares of crossing the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers.

We can feel better knowing our troops are prepared for all contingencies and have been trained to meet whatever challenges Saddam and his regime may throw their way.

Our troops hail from all fifty States; our territories and insular possessions. Every Member of Congress is impacted.

During the first Gulf War in 1991, one Alaskan was killed: Sergeant David Douthit, a 24-year-old from Soldotna. Alaskans are currently participating in Northern and Southern Watch, enforcing the no-fly zones in Iraq. They are in Afghanistan for Operation Enduring Freedom. They are in South Korea participating in the annual Foal Eagle military exercises.

Unit 210 of the Kulis Air National Guard in Alaska has been activated and is awaiting deployment to the Middle East as part of an elite rescue squad. This is a group of everyday Americans—bankers, economists, and teachers—who are serving their Nation at a time of war. May no harm come to them.

There is no question that Saddam Hussein is a brutal dictator. He has

killed thousands of his own people. He has used chemical weapons against the Kurdish population. He imprisons and tortures political opponents and subjects Iraqi citizens to beatings, starvation, mutilation and rape.

As the President put it when declaring the 4-hour deadline, the day of liberation for the Iraqi people is near.

American troops are in Iraq to secure our Nation from the threat posed by Saddam Hussein. He repeatedly failed to disarm and chose to ignore his obligations to the international community. The time has come for him to leave.

An enormous burden is now placed on the shoulders of our Armed Forces. Together, with allies from over 40 member nations who are supporting this effort, we seek to eliminate the weapons and facilities that Saddam should have destroyed 12 years ago. Now, we will finally ensure that the United States and our allies do not face the threat of chemical, biological or nuclear attack from those who would seek to harm us.

Like so many who came before them, these brave men and women are placing their lives on the line to secure our freedom and protect our ideals and liberties. They have my undying thanks and support.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. Res. 95. As the United States and her allies begin the campaign to defend the world against the tyrannical rule of Iraq's dictator Saddam Hussein, we must all rally behind our Commander in Chief and Old Glory.

The military action underway in Iraq is both just and lawful. We must rise and stand for humanity and help liberate the Iraqi people. After months of deception and noncompliance from the Iraqi regime about their weapons of mass destruction, the United States and over 30 allies decided to take military action to enforce United Nations resolution 1441 and disarm Saddam. Along with an overwhelming bipartisan majority of my colleagues in the Senate, I voted in favor of authorizing this use of force last fall.

The brave men and women of our Armed Forces come from all across our great Nation, but I wish to specifically recognize the vital role that Kentucky is playing in this noble effort to disarm Saddam. I am confident that the 101st Airborne Screaming Eagles, 5th Special Forces Group, and 160th Special Operations Aviation Regiment will continue to make Fort Campbell, KY, and our great Nation proud.

Thousands of our soldiers now in the Middle East completed vital and comprehensive training at Fort Knox. Fort Knox is the Home of Mounted Warfare where tank training is performed and perfected. These soldiers who trained at Fort Knox in mostly Abrams tanks are now on the front lines against the Iraqi Republican Guard. I guarantee our tank soldiers will prevail.

Also, our men and women at the Bluegrass Army Depot in Richmond, KY, continue to make sure that our

troops have the munitions they need to defeat the enemy. Thousands of enlisted and reserve troops from Kentucky have answered their Nation's call to duty. From the Bluegrass Army Depot, they load munitions onto trains which end up in guns and the weapons systems of our ground forces and air power. They are helping freedom ring throughout the world.

It is also important to thank our civilian workforce on our military bases and those who indirectly support the military and war effort. They play a key role in ensuring our installations are maintained and our soldiers are housed and fed and given the support they need to secure our freedoms. Their work and contribution must not be overlooked.

This resolution reinforces that now is the time for America to be united and show our unconditional support for our troops and their mission. Freedom and democracy do not come easy and our soldiers are willing to sacrifice even their own lives to ensure that future generations will have the opportunity to embrace such concepts as liberty and human rights and lead the world to more peaceful and secure days.

We all hope and pray our troops come back safely and quickly after successfully disarming Saddam's brutal regime and liberating the Iraqi people. The cause of our military and allies is noble and just. Our thoughts and prayers are also with the family and loved ones of our soldiers. God bless them all.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, yesterday our mission to disarm the Iraqi regime began. It is my hope that our actions will deliver the people of Iraq from a brutal dictator and help bring peace and stability to a volatile region.

Our commanders in the field have developed an operations plan that will maximize the power of our forces, and I have no doubts about their capabilities to successfully achieve their military objectives.

I commend the President for promptly addressing the Nation last night. It is important that he continues to keep Congress and the public informed of our military actions and the status of our mission. And I agree with his assessment that we should not view this war in terms of timetables. To speculate at this point would be counterproductive. Rather, we should view this conflict in terms of meeting our strategic and tactical goals.

As a Senator and member of the Armed Services Committee, I stand ready to work with my colleagues and the President to provide any and all support possible to ensure the success of our military forces conducting these operations.

Our Nation is a nation of diverse views, ideologies, and opinions. We might not all agree on how or why we arrived at this point; nonetheless, we must come together as a country and support those service men and women who are currently risking life and limb.

As we stand here today, over 300,000 United States military personnel, in-

cluding a number of Arkansans, are forward deployed in Iraq, Kuwait, Afghanistan, Turkey, and the waters and skies all around the world and at bases around the country. They put themselves in harm's way not for personal aggrandizement or advancement, but for immense love of country, liberty, and family. If they can hear me today, I say be assured, for the American people are behind you.

When appearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee a few weeks ago, GEN John Keane, Vice Chief of Staff for the U.S. Army, testified to the courage of our military personnel. He said when asked what their greatest challenge was, his division commanders replied "keeping our soldiers from being too brave." We owe these men and women overseas and at home not only our gratitude, but also our very existence as the only country on Earth committed to promoting and spreading the ideals of democracy. Our military has kept us safe for over 200 years. We cannot thank them enough.

Just as we should thank our military overseas and at home, we should thank our first responders that protect our hometowns. Firefighters, police, and health care personnel risk their lives and sacrifice precious time with their families every day to keep us safe from those who would try to do us harm. Their commitment and contributions to national security and homeland security should not be forgotten.

Mr. President, I urge all Americans to pray for our troops, their families, and our President as we defend our Nation and the world from those that seek to do us harm.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, last October, I voted against the resolution authorizing the use of force in Iraq and believe it was right that, in recent months, the country debated the wisdom of using military action against Iraq at this time. But the commencement of military action unites us as we focus on our ongoing support for our troops. I am confident in their abilities and I hope for their safe and quick return to their families. Even more so now that this action has begun, my thoughts, and the thoughts of all Americans, are with our service men and women, and with their families.

I am pleased that the Senate is taking this opportunity to formally go on record in support of our brave men and women in uniform with this resolution.

The dedicated men and women of our military spend time away from their homes and families in different parts of the country and the world, and, too often, are placed into harm's way in order to protect the American people and our way of life. We owe them a huge debt of gratitude for their selfless service.

The war in Iraq and the fight against terrorism are turning upside down the lives of tens of thousands of Active Duty, National Guard, and Reserve personnel and their families. These men and women seek to do their duty to our

country and honor commitments to their families, and, in the case of the National Guard and Reserves, to their employers. As of March 19, more than 212,000 National Guard and Reserve personnel were on Active Duty.

Some Wisconsinites are facing the latest in a series of multiple activations and deployments for family members. Others are seeing their loved ones off on their first deployment. All of these families share in the worry and concern about what awaits their relatives and hope, as we do, for their swift and safe return.

We owe it to our military personnel and their families to do everything that we can to support them in this difficult time. I will continue to work to ensure that our troops and their families have the resources that they need, both to combat our adversaries and to provide for their families, during this tumultuous time and when they return home.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong and unconditional support for our troops currently engaged in disarming Iraq. As the war continues to progress, I have every confidence in their capabilities, their courage, and their patriotism. I am pleased to support the resolution before us, and believe it will send a message to all the world that the Congress is united in support of our young men and women in the Gulf.

On many occasions in recent months, this institution has debated the threat posed by Saddam Hussein and Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. Individual Senators have made honest arguments expressing widely differing points of view on this issue. Now that our troops are engaged against the forces of Saddam Hussein, however, we must speak with one voice.

It is my hope and expectation that this war will be short, and that our victory will be decisive. Our military is the best-equipped and best-trained force that the world has ever seen. As Maine's representative on the Senate Armed Services Committee, it has been my privilege to work side-by-side with military leaders to ensure that this is the case. If there is any message we could send to members of the Iraqi military, it would be to express the futility of resistance. The President has been clear, that we come not as conquerors, but as liberators. Our military superiority is overwhelming, and our forces will not stop until Iraq is disarmed.

Of course, there is very little certainty in combat. In the fog of war, there are innumerable factors that might affect the course of battle. Our leadership has worked to anticipate and prepare for whatever eventualities might develop. I suspect in the coming days we will be receiving conflicting reports, confusing media accounts, and distorted descriptions of the battlefield. However, one thing should be unmistakable . . . our troops will receive whatever support they need to bring

this conflict to a rapid and successful end.

We also need to send a message to other forces in this world that seek to do us harm. They might believe that, because so many of our forces are engaged in the Middle East, we have left ourselves vulnerable. The administration has moved the Homeland Security Advisory to Orange, indicating that we are at high risk of terrorist attack. Gordon England, the Deputy Secretary of Homeland Security, has assured me that our Nation is taking almost unprecedented steps to protect our critical infrastructure, to identify potential terrorist threats, and to secure potential targets. Certainly, we do have some difficult days ahead.

However, we are working to deter, detect, and, if necessary, respond decisively to any terrorist attack.

I also want to say a word to the families of those men and women currently in harm's way in the Middle East. They truly carry a heavy burden, and I want to express my personal and heartfelt appreciation for the sacrifices that they make. No war comes without cost. While our military leaders will do everything they can to minimize the danger our troops will face, there is still much risk and danger. To the wives, husbands, children, and parents of troops, I thank you for your bravery and your strength. You and your loved ones deserve our admiration, our respect, and our appreciation.

When I came to the Senate over 6 years ago, I could not have imagined this moment. We lived in a different world then. In the coming months, we will debate how we came to this conflict, and how we need to proceed. Historians will study this period in our history every closely. There will be time to place this war in its proper context. Today, however, as our troops stand in harm's way, I only want to show my unwavering support for our troops, thank them for their service, and express my hope for their safe return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first, may I inquire of the Presiding Officer the amount of time in control of the Senator from Virginia and the amount of time in control of the Senator from Michigan?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has 9 minutes 13 seconds. The Senator from Michigan has 18 minutes 1 second.

Mr. WARNER. Senator LEVIN and I have now sought to advise our leadership on the ever-growing number of Senators anxious to speak. They, I presume, will consider how we will add more time to this debate now or during another period. I wish to put Senators on notice that we have the Senator from Texas, Mrs. HUTCHISON, awaiting recognition, followed by the Senator from Colorado, Mr. ALLARD, and then the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN.

I am going to do the very best I can to get the time to accommodate these

Senators, and I see other Senators present on my side.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

I thank my friend for working to accommodate as many Senators who would like to speak. I do not think it is necessary for us to make long speeches—3, 4, 5 minutes—but I do believe it is very important and we have a responsibility to do so. To the extent the Senator from Virginia and the Senator from Michigan can work together to add some time, it would be most appreciated.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the Senator from Virginia—has the Senator been yielded to already?

Mr. WARNER. The Senator from Texas is to be recognized next.

Mr. LEVIN. Will the Senator from Texas yield for an inquiry?

Mr. WARNER. I have to ask it be on your time.

Mr. LEVIN. On my time. I have the following Senators on our side who are here and indicated they wish to speak: Senator DORGAN, Senator DAYTON, Senator REED who is in the cloakroom, Senator BOXER, Senator BAUCUS, Senator BYRD. So there is no way we are going to be able to complete even the people who are here, much less additional people who wish to speak and who come to the floor, and still have a vote on this resolution immediately after the three votes that are currently scheduled.

So I join my good friend from Virginia in asking the leadership as to how they wish us to address this problem at this time.

I have 19 minutes left before 4 o'clock—how many minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventeen minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. Seventeen minutes. If I talk longer, it will be 16 minutes. I have 17 minutes before the first vote begins, but there is no time set on the resolution itself we are debating; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. If the leadership can give us guidance in how they want to handle this.

Mr. WARNER. I join in that request. I also have Senator COLEMAN, Senator HATCH, the Senator from Alaska, the Senator from North Carolina, and the number is growing.

Mr. BYRD. Will the distinguished Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WARNER. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Would it be possible to move the 4 o'clock vote, say, to 4:30 in order to get these speeches ahead of the vote? It could be included in the series of votes.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I say to our distinguished colleague from West Virginia, both Senator LEVIN and I have put that to our respective leadership.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, this resolution we are talking about today is for those brave men and women who are in harms way as we speak, close to midnight their time, far across the oceans. America's thoughts and prayers are with each and every one of them—Active Duty, Reserve, Guard, Americans, and our loyal allies.

September 11, 2001, was a brutal wake-up call for our Nation, one that our President refuses to ignore. By disarming and liberating Iraq, these troops are working to prevent a 9/11 with a weapon of mass destruction. Today we are entering a new phase in the campaign to root out terrorism wherever it is bred.

How did we get to this point? In 1993, terrorists bombed the World Trade Center, killing 6 people, wounding more than 1,000.

In 1996, terrorists bombed the U.S. military living quarters at Khobar Towers, Saudi Arabia, killing 19 brave Americans and wounding scores more.

In 1998, followers of Osama bin Laden attacked U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, killing and wounding hundreds.

In 2000, bin Laden followers attacked the *USS Cole* in a harbor in Yemen, killing 17 sailors and wounding 39 more.

But sadly, it took 4 hijacked airplanes being turned into weapons of mass destruction and the loss of nearly 3,000 lives for us to respond, and this time the terrorists and those who harbor them will know the United States of America is resolved to preserve our freedom.

Our President will not waiver. Congress will not waiver in our support of our President and our troops.

There are those in this world who hate America and what it stands for. They despise our love for freedom, our passion for democracy, and our tolerance of other religions and beliefs. Their hatred led them to recklessly kill thousands of innocent civilians in our country and abroad.

September 11 brought a sea change in our national security strategy. We now know that deterrence alone is not enough. Our new strategy in this new kind of war articulates a policy of preemption. It is when we fail to act or fail to lead that our enemies strike.

The President has said we will not give Saddam Hussein the opportunity to attack. The Iraqi dictator seeks to make weapons of mass destruction, and those weapons would find their way into the hands of terrorists. So coalition forces from our allied nations are on the ground with us in Iraq, and we commend them for their bravery and their unwavering loyalty to our Nation and their pursuit of freedom.

For 12 long years, Saddam Hussein has treated the world with lies and contempt. Diplomacy, sanctions, and 17 U.N. resolutions failed to do the job. His brutal campaign for decades against his neighbors, his own people, and the world is coming to an end as

we speak because brave men and women are doing the job for us.

The men and women on the front lines in Iraq, the anxious families waiting back home, and the thousands of National Guard and Reserve forces who have been called to duty must count on the American public to stand by their side until the very end. We will not fail them.

In Congress, we must ensure our Armed Forces have every resource necessary for a swift and successful campaign. We will not fail to provide. It is our duty, as the beacon of freedom for the world, to ensure that Saddam Hussein's brutal reign comes to an end. This is our tribute to those in the past who fought for the liberty we enjoy, and it is our commitment to pass the torch of freedom to future generations. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I anticipate that we will soon have a unanimous consent request about timing, but until that is finished might I suggest that the Senator from Michigan recognize another of his speakers.

Mr. DASCHLE. If I could just interject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Perhaps I can at least describe what we are anticipating as the unanimous consent request. I think we are about ready to propound it. There have been a number of Senators who have indicated to the two managers that they wish to address the resolution. We are prepared to accommodate all of those requests. We would then ask for unanimous consent that the votes that are currently scheduled for 4 be moved back to 5 to accommodate the additional time allocated for discussion of the resolution. At that point, we would then vote on the amendments, in addition to the resolution.

Following those votes, we would still allow Senators to speak, either to the resolution in support of the troops or to the resolution relating to the budget in both amendment as well as in general comment, so that throughout the evening Senators could still be accommodated to speak to the resolutions, either one.

I hope that we could entertain a unanimous consent request that all those speeches which are made on the resolution in support of the troops appear in the RECORD prior to the vote so that the RECORD will read appropriately. That would be our intent, and I would hope that all Senators would be prepared to accommodate that request.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I have before me a proposed unanimous consent request. I will now make that request.

I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the adoption of this resolution occur at the hour of 5 today; provided further that debate between 4 and 5 be

equally divided as provided earlier. Further, I ask that the previously scheduled stacked votes occur beginning immediately following the vote on the adoption of this resolution, S. Con. Res. 26, with no amendments in order to the resolution or preamble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the votes Senators be recognized for purposes of making additional statements; that the time throughout the evening be equally divided and that their speeches appear in the RECORD prior to the vote cast on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, I will recommend that the distinguished Democratic leader's unanimous consent be accepted, but I would like to speak with my leader before agreeing to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that on my side, the following Senators have indicated the desire to speak. I will be in the Chamber to accommodate them as best I can within the 30 minutes that I have remaining: Senators ALLARD, MCCAIN, COLEMAN, HATCH, STEVENS, DOLE, DOMENICI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I will read the list of Senators on this side so that everyone will know who will be speaking before the vote on the resolution under the unanimous consent that was just adopted, and then who would come afterwards with their statements on the resolution being put in the RECORD before that: Senator DORGAN would be recognized for 5 minutes, Senator DAYTON for 5 minutes, Senator JACK REED for 5 minutes, Senator BOXER for 6 minutes, Senator BAUCUS for 7 minutes, Senator BYRD for 15 minutes. If my math is correct, all of those could be accommodated prior to the vote at 5.

I notice the Parliamentarian has been adding up those numbers, and I am wondering if my math is correct.

After the vote, if my math is correct, Senator LANDRIEU and Senator BIDEN would then be recognized on this side, and any other Democrats who wish to speak can come after the resolution, after those two Senators.

Is the Senator correct that all of those I named up to Senator BYRD could be accommodated with the times indicated prior to the vote at 5?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator allocated 43 minutes, which appears to fit within the timeframe now allowed.

Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, America makes no more difficult decision than that which asks its sons and daughters to go to war, and those who are in harm's way as we speak need to know that our country is united in support of them. Our thoughts and prayers go to those soldiers who have answered the call for our country. Our thoughts and prayers go to their families.

In my State, we have two Air Force bases, international guard. We have the highest rate of deployment. Almost 30 percent of all Guard and Reserves are now deployed in North Dakota under a callup. I am enormously proud of what they are contributing to this country and to its national defense. They and their families need to understand our united support for them.

To the people of Iraq, we need to say that we have no quarrel with the people of Iraq, and we pray also for the safety of those innocent noncombatants inside the country of Iraq.

I wish with all my heart that the people of free nations, working through the United Nations, would have been able to find a diplomatic solution to require the disarmament of Saddam Hussein, but that was not possible. So our Nation now will take action to disarm this dictator.

In the sometimes lonely and dark hours when America is challenged, I think of the words of Thomas Wolfe in his great novel. He talked about the peculiar quality of the American soul. He said Americans have an indestructible belief, a quenchless hope, a boundless optimism, that something good is sure to happen.

Let us hope and pray through this conflict something good will happen. As we do, let us express our profound gratitude for those who nurture, protect, and risk their lives for freedom. It will be and should be left to another day to talk about what should have been done a decade or two ago, what could have been done long ago to avoid this intersection of war and strife.

The question is, How do we, in the free world, prevent the emergence of more dictators, tyrants, and terrorists who threaten America's liberty? That is a long and difficult discussion for other days.

For today, all of us from every philosophy in every corner of our country say to those in harm's way and who serve our country: We are proud of you; America is united in support of what you are doing.

I yield the floor and I retain the remainder of my time.

Mr. WARNER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, last night at 10:15 p.m. eastern standard time, President Bush announced to the Nation that the war to rid Iraq of weapons of mass destruction had begun. It was a solemn moment that reminded us that diplomacy was no longer an option.

I recall the President's comments that you cannot have peace when you

have to deal with a leader who is not peaceful.

It also meant the men and women of our Armed Forces were now going to be committed to battle. The resolution before the Senate commands and supports the efforts and leadership of the President as Commander in Chief in the conflict against Iraq. The resolution recognizes the contribution of our defense forces and expresses support for the thousands of soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coast guardsmen who have been mobilized, deployed, and are now fighting to defend the security of our Nation. I strongly support the resolution and believe it deserves the Senate's unanimous support.

Today our Nation demands much of our military. Our forces continue to fight in Afghanistan, assist forces in Yemen, Djibouti, and Georgia, and defend our homeland. Now they have taken on a new mission, the liberation of Iraq.

Despite many hardships, our military members have extended forward and embraced our country's call to arms. Over the last month, 5,000 soldiers from Fort Carson, CO, have been sent to confront Iraqi oppression and terrorism. The soldiers have embraced their duty and are now serving their country with pride and determination. We cannot forget the valuable contribution of reservists and National Guardsmen. Many of these service men and women have left their careers and their families to answer our Nation's call to arms. Over 3,000 Coloradans in the Reserves and National Guard have extended forward and they have responded with determination. They are committed to defending our Nation and deserve our support. We ought to recognize their employers who have recognized at the workplace that they are dedicated to protecting freedom in America and are making sacrifices while their workforce serves this country overseas.

We should not forget the families of our men and women in uniform. They have watched as their loved ones were sent overseas to defend our country. They made sacrifices and deserve our support as they fight and make sacrifices for freedom.

Today our men and women in uniform are in harm's way. They are fighting for the safety and security of all Americans. I believe it is imperative we express our support for their efforts. I ask for God's blessing for America.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 5 minutes to Senator DAYTON.

Mr. DAYTON. Winston Churchill once advised:

In War: Resolution. In Defeat: Defiance. In Victory: Magnanimity. In Peace: Good Will.

I add to that, before war, honest debate.

That fundamental right of the first amendment to debate, to agree and disagree is the difference between our democracy and Saddam Hussein's dictatorship. The measure of our free country is not how well our country toler-

ates agreement but, rather, how well they accept disagreement.

Now, however, the time for this debate is passed. Our country is at war and our Armed Forces are fighting life-and-death battles against Iraqi troops. The President has made that momentous decision, and I will support him, his military command, and the brave American troops who are carrying out his orders.

In war: Resolution. Let us in the Senate resolve to provide whatever is needed to win the war as quickly and decisively as possible and then replenish our military arsenals so we quickly regain our great strength to protect and defend our country again.

In victory: Magnanimity. There is no question that our Armed Forces will win this war for our country, for the Iraqi people and for, I pray, the ultimate benefit of the world. I pray the courageous Americans who will win that victory, many of them young men and women less than half our age, may return safely home.

Let us who are at home now begin the practice of magnanimity, magnanimity toward the people of Iraq who did not take up arms against us, magnanimity toward their past suffering and future needs.

Occupation is not magnanimous; the Marshall Plan was magnanimous. We have the obligation and the opportunity to be magnanimous and generous toward the people of Iraq and Afghanistan. In doing so, we can showcase our way of life, our economic and technical know-how, and our humanity. We should match each year the increase in our military spending with that same increase in an international recovery fund. Both are key to our national security.

In peace: Good will. Our leaders must become again the lead practitioners and worldwide promoters of good will. They can allow themselves no more derisive and destructive reactions to whoever does not see our way, not to the leaders and people of other nations, not to the leaders and representatives of the international organizations, not to our fellow American citizens.

We must resume our leadership of the world on the path toward international security, prosperity, peace, and good will. That is our greatest challenge. That must be our ultimate victory.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield 3½ minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, this is a profound moment in all our lives. Words are inadequate, so I will be brief. It is an honor to speak right after my friend and colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, and to join with him in support of our men and women on the front lines, in support of the President's decision to commence military action to disarm Iraq.

In this Chamber it is often said the foreign policy debate ends at the water's edge. This resolution makes clear

that debate on the use of force in Iraq ends with the firing of the first weapon. I support our troops and military families to the utmost, praying for their safety, and working with them to achieve the mission our Commander in Chief has given them.

This situation represents a balance of risks. War is always costly in human terms on all sides. But the threats of terrorism, mass destruction, are also real. The dangerous nature of the world we now live in was brought home to us by the events of September 11. That reality requires us to act decisively when we are threatened, rather than simply to wait and hope for the best. I agree with the President that it is better to send soldiers into battle than to send police, ambulance drivers, and firefighters to the site of future terrorist attacks.

My firm belief is that our Nation is blessed with responsible, principled leadership. Our military is as courageous as it is capable. Our goals in this conflict are both clear and just. Now we are committed and we must carry on our duty to the end.

It has been said that courage is fear that has said its prayers. May we all offer our support and praise to our troops, military leaders, and our President until the dangerous days are over. Our hearts and prayers are with all the women and men in harm's way in the Middle East today, and with their families.

I ran across this quotation from Thomas Paine from his pamphlet *Common Sense*, written in 1776:

These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly; it is dearness only that gives every thing its value. Heaven knows how to put a proper price on its goods; and it would be strange indeed if so celestial an article as Freedom should not be highly rated.

No one wanted this to come to war. But it is here. I am proud to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in support of our men and women, in support of our Commander in Chief, in support of our families. Our prayers are with all of them.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to Senator REED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, once again, America has placed its fate and its future in the hands of young American fighting men and fighting women. Both our future and our faith could not be in stronger, more decent, and more qualified hands. We are here today, united in our support for these extraordinary soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and Coastguardsmen, all of them superbly trained, faithful to their uniforms, and

also faithful to those who served before them—an unbroken legacy of courage and commitment to this Nation.

I take a moment to recognize particularly those many individuals from my State of Rhode Island. First, the thousands who are serving on active duty in units in all of our services, and then, also, our National Guard and Reserve forces, because in this conflict the National Guard and Reserve are playing a critical role. Rhode Island has 648 Guard men and women and Reserve members who are stationed throughout the globe.

Many members of the National Guard 143rd Airlift Wing Security Forces and Communications have been deployed to Southwest Asia. They have been joined by the Air National Guard's 281st Combat Communications Group, the Air National Guard's 282nd Combat Communications Squadron and the Air National Guard's 102nd Information Warfare Squadron. The Guard 143rd Airlift Wing Aerial Port Squadron is in Turkey and members of the Rhode Island Air National Guard headquarters are in Kyrgyzstan and Turkey.

Rhode Islanders are also protecting the homefront while war is waged in the Middle East. The Army National Guard's 1207th Transportation Company is at Fort Dix, New Jersey. The Army National Guard's 118th Military Police Battalion, 119th Military Police Company, and 115th Military Police Company are at Fort Drum, New York. And the Marine Reserves, General Support Motor Transport Company and the Army National Guard's 1st Battalion, 103rd Field Artillery Brigade are providing security in Rhode Island.

All of these men and women have been called to the colors, have responded, and will serve magnificently.

The battle has begun. The battle will be pursued vigorously to a complete victory. I have every confidence in that. Part of my confidence stems from the privilege of having served with the leaders of our Army who, today, are commanding the forces that are sent against Iraq. Both as classmates and contemporaries at West Point, I had the privilege of knowing GEN Chuck Swannack who commands the 82nd; Dave Petraeus, the 101st Commander; and also General Hagenbeck, who commanded the 10th so well in Afghanistan.

I know because these men are superb professionals, because they are committed to getting the job done and making sure their soldiers come home. We will be successful.

Today, we are united in our support and our admiration for the forces who serve this country so well.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. WARNER. I yield 4½ minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the war to disarm Saddam Hussein and liberate the Iraqi people has begun. Many Americans feel we have waited a long time for this just war to come; many feel we haven't waited long enough.

But the Iraqi people have waited for far too long, suffered for far too long and the world has for too long failed to come to grips with the consequences of Saddam Hussein's acquisition of an arsenal of terror. The wait is over; the liberation of the Iraqi people is underway; and the world is witnessing the end of one of the most horrible regimes in modern history, and with it the end of the threat Iraq has for too long posed to its people, its neighbors, and the world.

There has been no rush to war. That the United States exhausted diplomacy is evident in both the 12-year history of our dealings with Iraq since the first Gulf War and the 6 month effort at the Security Council to build consensus on the need to disarm Iraq. There will be plenty of time to discuss the American diplomatic campaign that preceded the war once military action is over. There is no cause to do so today. We stand united in our support for our armed forces and confident in the swift victory that we pray will be theirs.

One of America's finest traditions is our ability to draw together in support of our men and women in uniform when they are actively engaged in the defense of our freedom. American forces in the Iraq theater fight not for narrow interests or for reasons of national pride. American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines are engaged in combat today so that our people do not live in a world in which tyrants armed with weapons of horror hold free nations hostage, and in doing so threaten freedom itself.

Our armed forces fight to disarm and destroy a regime that has proven not only that it will continue to stockpile weapons of mass destruction, but that it will use them. Our military fights to uphold the demands of the United Nations Security Council for Iraq's disarmament, even though some in that body shirk their own obligations to hold Iraq to account for its defiance. Our men and women fight so that the Iraqi people no longer live in terror but have cause to believe, as Americans believe, that liberty's blessings are not the prerogative of a lucky few, but the inalienable right of all mankind.

The liberty we cherish, and in which we want all people to share, has a price. Young Americans are paying it tonight in Iraq—not out of any grand design for empire, not for oil, not out of dislike for the Iraqi people, but for love—love of America, love for her founding principles, love for her way of life, and love for the greatness that history has judged to be hers not because of riches or power, but because of her abiding commitment to the cause of human freedom.

America is great not because of what she has done for herself, but because of what she has done for others. In another age, we helped liberate Europe from Hitler's tyranny, and ended Japanese imperialism in Asia. In extraordinary acts of generosity, we helped rebuild Europe and Japan and transform

former enemies into the closest of allies. I believe the liberation of Iraq will be judged by history to be of similar nobility.

Many of us remember parents and grandparents who served in the Second World War as our "greatest generation." Another generation of heroes is being forged from the ruins of the attacks of September 11th. Just as Pearl Harbor opened the eyes of America to the grave peril beyond her shores, so have the terrorists who attacked us roused in America the conviction that we will never again suffer such infamy.

Nearly a century ago, President Woodrow Wilson issued a rousing call to make the world safe for democracy. Americans, and the world, did not rise to the challenge, and the bloodiest century in the history of humanity ensued. The President has ordered American forces into action in Iraq to help make America, and the world, safe from another such century, when tyrants are empowered by technology to inflict the sort of devastation from which free nations might not recover—a capability that puts freedom itself in peril. America, the greatest of free nations, will not take that risk.

I wish American forces in Iraq every hope for rapid victory. They fight for love of freedom—a love which is invincible. The world is better for their courage and dedication. Victory will be ours—and all honor will be theirs. God bless them and may humanity honor their sacrifice.

Mr. WARNER. We go to the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from California.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, may I address the Senate with regard to the remaining speakers on my side of the aisle to alert them? We have next the Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, followed by the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH, the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, the Senator from Arizona, Mr. KYL, the Senator from North Carolina, Mrs. DOLE, and the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, as military action begins in Iraq, I send my strong support, as a Senator, as a mother, as a grandmother, to our sons and daughters who are carrying out the mission asked of them.

Military personnel from my State of California are a lead contributor in this effort. They include marines from Camp Pendleton and Twentynine Palms, carrier groups from San Diego, and Air Force personnel from Travis Air Force Base.

There are many more soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines from throughout California serving us today, including 6,100 Guard and reservists who have recently been activated. Thousands of California families are impacted.

From my seat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have followed the issue of Iraq very closely. And for the past several months, my view was that we should build a worldwide coalition to disarm Iraq, a worldwide coalition that would truly be partners in name, in action, and in cost-sharing. That is why I was so proud to support Senator LEVIN's resolution to authorize force with the backing of the United Nations. While this amendment was defeated in the Senate, I believe it called attention to the importance of working with a large coalition of allies.

As one who has recently voted twice to give a President—a Republican President and a Democratic President—the right to use force, I believe war should always be the last resort. I voted to give President Bush the authority to go to war against al-Qaida, and for President Clinton to use military force against Slobodan Milosevic.

In this case, in Iraq, I supported intrusive inspections backed by a united coalition as the best way to achieve Iraqi disarmament. While the U.N. inspectors asked to continue their work, that was not to be. So that debate is behind us. I do want to say, the need to work with our allies in postwar Iraq is very important because we want to lift—we want to lift—the physical burden off the shoulders of our men and women and share that burden. And we want to, of course, try to share the cost burden as well.

Like all Americans, I hope and I pray that hostilities end soon and that casualties are minimal. And like all Americans, I very much hope that democracy in Iraq will take root. Last night, I saw an interview with a young man who is a soldier in the Army, and he was as eloquent on this same point as any statement I had ever heard, eloquent in his simplicity, in expressing his hope for this mission.

Congress is supporting our troops from the minute they went in. I believe one way we can demonstrate that is to ensure that the lives of both parents of dual-military families with small children are not unnecessarily put at risk. I raised this issue with the Secretary of Defense in February, and I am awaiting a response from him. Senator BEN NELSON is also working on this issue as well as other quality-of-life issues for our military. We must be mindful of the impact on a child when both parents are put in harm's way. I believe we can make sure they are not both placed in harm's way. I will work to make sure of that.

I also intend to work to provide additional funding for four important programs.

First, we need to increase funding for impact aid programs to help school districts with military families. Our children of military families need attention now. They must have attention now. And we are not fulfilling our responsibility to our military families if those children do not get help.

Gandhi once said: If there is to be peace in the world, it must begin with

the children. So we must never, ever forget the children. We have heard from many military families struggling to pay for daycare and other expenses who have one family member deployed from home. We have heard from them that they are having a very hard time.

Next, I think we need to help with homeland defense. Clearly, everyone has told us—from the CIA to the FBI to Secretary Ridge—that the probability has now greatly increased that we will be facing more problems here at home. That is why I am supporting the Schumer amendment, when we get back to the budget, to reimburse our States for this burden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Governor of California, pointing out these incredible expenses the States are having because of firefighters and police and emergency workers working overtime.

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

GOVERNOR GRAY DAVIS,
March 20, 2003.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate, Hart Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: I understand that the United States Senate may take up an amendment tomorrow to the Fiscal Year 2004 Budget Resolution to substantially increase funding for state and local first responders. As you are aware, an increase in funding is critical to our efforts to protect Californians and I appreciate your support for these efforts.

As Governor, my first job is to provide for the safety of all Californians. Thanks to our first responders, Californians are safer than at any time since September 10, 2001. For 18 months, California has been hard at work preparing for all emergency contingencies.

As you know, since September 11th, the state has spent hundreds of millions of additional dollars to prepare for and prevent a terrorist attack. Even in the best of times, this is a burden that would require a strong federal partnership; in the face of the fiscal problems that states across the nation now face, that partnership is critical to state and local first responder preparedness.

Governors across the nation are extremely disappointed that the dollars for first responder activities we expected this year are not forthcoming. With passage of this homeland security amendment to the Budget Resolution, Congress can ensure that funding for equipment and training for those in the front lines of this battle is robust in the next fiscal year.

Governors, Democrats and Republicans alike, have worked hard to protect and safeguard their residents against terrorist attacks—but we need a strong federal partnership to fully realize this goal.

Thank you for all your work toward ensuring the safety of all Americans.

Sincerely,

GRAY DAVIS.

Mrs. BOXER. And last, Mr. President, I hope we will be able to work on the development of a missile defense system for our airplanes, our commercial airplanes, which are facing the danger of shoulder-fired missiles.

Many people throughout California have asked me, what can they do to

support our troops? The Department of Defense has provided some excellent ideas that can be accessed on the official DOD Web site, DefenseLINK. I think it would be good for those who want to do something now to get on that Web site. We have a link on our Web site as well. The ideas are there on how to send a virtual thank-you card to our troops, how to provide them with telephone calling cards. These are things that will make their lives much better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 6 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask for 15 seconds, if I might.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield the Senator 15 additional seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, let's do everything we can for our troops and everything we can to protect our homeland. And let us all pray for our men and women in uniform, and for their families, and for wisdom for all those who send them forward into battle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield 2 to 3 minutes to our distinguished colleague from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will be brief.

I am proud to stand here with this former marine, my great friend from Virginia, Senator WARNER, as I recall the phrase, "From the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli."

I believe the President has the authority. We all pledged, ourselves, when we were sworn into Federal office, to defend this country against enemies foreign and domestic.

He has taken action—firm action—to protect us against enemies. The freedom of Iraq, the freedom of the people of Iraq, is the goal of this effort we are undertaking. But it is being done by free men and women—young women, young men of this generation. They have talked about our generation being the Greatest Generation. These young men and women are all volunteers. They have gone out there in harm's way to protect us and to carry out their pledge to the people of the United States. I support them for that.

I only add one comment. I keep hearing people talk about overtime, and getting money to pay people here who are working so long and working overtime in cities and various functions. Those men and women over there are not getting paid overtime.

I think it is time we started thinking about some voluntarism in the United States right here at home, volunteers to help this country get through this period. When our men and women are over there, they are volunteers, they are not getting any extra pay for what they are doing.

I think we should recognize the concept that every one of us should volunteer more of our time to help our country in this period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 7 minutes to Senator BAUCUS.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a minute for purposes of recognition of the Senator from Mississippi, who wishes to put a statement in the Record?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that back in my State of Mississippi, our legislature is in session, and our State senate has adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 605, under the leadership of our Lieutenant Governor, as presiding officer of that body, Amy Tuck. And the president pro tempore is Travis Little.

The operative clauses are:

That we do hereby declare our complete support for and our great pride in the Armed Forces of the United States, particularly the men and women from the State of Mississippi, both in the Middle East and elsewhere, who are participating in and supporting military operations. . . .

And it goes on to say:

That we do hereby express our support of President George W. Bush and the President's cabinet for their courage and decision to remove Saddam Hussein from power.

There are whereas clauses in another part of that resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 605

Whereas, events in Iraq have reached the final days of decision, and at the direction of the President of the United States, the Armed Forces of the United States are poised to launch military operations with our allies against Saddam Hussein and his forces in Iraq; and

Whereas, among the forces participating in this mobilization under Operation Enduring Freedom are many members of the regular United States Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, Coast Guard, Reserves and National Guard who are residents or natives of the State of Mississippi who are being deployed, including 182 female and 2,056 male soldiers in the Mississippi Army and Air National Guard already deployed, with a total number of 3,662 dependents recorded for those deployed; and

Whereas, the dictatorship of Iraq has continued to develop weapons of mass destruction in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1441; the dictator, Saddam Hussein, has demonstrated a willingness to use weapons of mass destruction against neighboring nations and the citizens of Iraq. Saddam Hussein threatens the Middle East and the global economy with the threat to use weapons of mass destruction; and

Whereas, the United States of America has the sovereign authority to use force in assuring its own national security. Recognizing the threat to our country, the United States Congress voted overwhelmingly last year to support the use of force against Iraq, and that duty falls to President George W. Bush

as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces; and

Whereas, Mississippians understand the costs of conflict because we have paid them in the past, and we again accept that responsibility. The men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States will be the guardians of civilization as we know it. War has no certainty except the certainty of sacrifice, yet the only way to reduce the harm and duration of war is to apply the full force and might of our military; and

Whereas, it is our earnest prayer that the job be done well and swiftly and that the return home to family and friends be safe and soon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi, (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we do hereby declare our complete support for and our great pride in the Armed Forces of the United States, particularly the men and women from the State of Mississippi, both in the Middle East and elsewhere, who are participating in and supporting military operations against Saddam Hussein and his forces in Iraq, and we pray for the quick and successful conclusion of their important mission and for their safe and sound return home; be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby express our support of President George W. Bush and the President's cabinet for their courage and decision to remove Saddam Hussein from power; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Major General James H. Lipscomb III-Mississippi National Guard, the Commanding General-American Military Forces-Operation Enduring Freedom and to members of Mississippi's congressional delegation, and be made available to the Capitol Press Corps.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Montana.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska, Mr. STEVENS, be added as a cosponsor of the pending resolution.

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

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. This is a solemn day for our Nation. I rise today to add my voice to the chorus of support and prayers that are being sent from this Chamber to our brave and heroic troops in the deserts of Iraq. The men and women who are serving the country on the front lines are sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, and mothers and fathers. Their heroic military service is helping bring an end to a brutal regime and reducing terrorist threats by stopping those who provide assistance to terrorist operations. I know they will be successful in their mission.

While many differences of opinion were expressed about the way this war came to be, the time for debate has ended. We now remain steadfast in support of our troops. And we must look to tomorrow and the massive rebuilding that will be needed following military actions. It is important that we continue to work with our allies to build a stronger coalition of support. We will need our friends in the coming days and weeks.

And we must also focus on providing our troops with all the assistance and

resources they need. With that in mind, I would like to take a moment to urge support of the "Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act of 2003." The House passed this important bill today. And it passed smoothly out of the Finance Committee weeks ago. It very much ties in with the remarks of the Senator from Alaska, that our valiant men and women overseas don't get overtime pay. And the very least we can do is voluntary work and other ways to help our troops this bill fits into that suggestion.

In this time of war, I can think of nothing more appropriate than passing a bill that is dedicated to providing assistance to those who serve in our armed forces. In addition, our bill encourages more women and men across the country to join our armed forces.

There are many, many brave men and women from my state of Montana who are playing a pivotal role in Iraq. Following the events of September 11, members of the 120th Fighter Wing of the Montana Air National Guard were called to secure the skies of the no-fly zone over Iraq. Their bravery will once again be seen in the current operation.

I want to help members of 120th Fighter Wing, and every other member of our armed forces. We can do this by passing the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act.

Let me describe some of the key provisions.

Under our current tax code, if a member of the armed forces dies while on active duty, the federal government pays the surviving spouse a small death benefit of \$6,000. The entire amount should be excluded from taxable income. However, because of a glitch in the law, only half is excluded. Our legislation corrects this by excluding the entire \$6,000 payment.

Just last week, one of our soldiers from Montana, Private First Class Stryder Stoutenburg, was tragically killed during a Blackhawk helicopter crash. A native of Missoula, Private First Class Stoutenburg was only 18 years old. His mother will receive the death benefit payment, but will be taxed on half of it. She has already lost so much. It is unfair to also take away part of the small compensation she is receiving.

Another provision of this bill would ensure that military members who are frequently required to move from town to town and country to country, are not punished with capital gains taxes when they sell their homes. Under current law, an individual must live in their house for 2 of 5 years in order to qualify for capital gains taxes exclusion. This isn't feasible for many in the armed forces and our bill would eliminate the 2-year requirement.

A third provision seeks to take a financial burden off of our men and women who serve in the National Guard and the Reserves. Many reservists must travel away from home for weekend drills and wind up spending a substantial amount of money for overnight travel and lodging.

In fact, for many of our younger, more junior reservists, the expenses exceed their take home pay for the weekend. Our bill would allow them to deduct these expenses from their taxes, even if the expenses do not exceed the 2 percent floor.

In addition to providing financial assistance, this bill will not add to the deficit since it's completely offset in two ways. First, we improve the collection of unpaid taxes from people who have renounced their American citizenship in order to avoid future U.S. taxes. Second, we extend certain IRS user fees. These are modest, sensible changes. In fact, in the case of expatriates, the offset seems especially timely.

There is no better time than today to pass legislation that will allow our military personnel to fight for our country, not have to fight the tax code. I know that the thoughts of every single Member of Congress go out to the troops who are risking their lives. We pray for their fast and safe return home. I'm hopeful for quick passage of this bill that will provide needed tax relief for our troops.

I thank Members who contributed to the development of the bill: Senators LEVIN and WARNER of the Armed Services Committee, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator JOHNSON, Senator HARKIN. And especially I thank Chairman GRASSLEY of the Finance Committee who I have enjoyed working with and who, once again, in this case has helped us to develop an important piece of bipartisan tax legislation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending resolution be considered as a Senate resolution.

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

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I recognize the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for a period of 3 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. If the Senator from New Mexico would yield for a request, I ask unanimous consent that after the Senator from New Mexico has completed, Senator BYRD then be recognized for 15 minutes.

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

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask the Senator from Montana if he would place the Senator from New Mexico's name on the various military and veterans bills.

Mr. BAUCUS. I make that request.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, today is a day, as I see it, to be thankful, to have hope, and to pray. I stand before the Senate thankful for our freedom and for the thousands of American young men and women, husbands and wives, sons and daughters, who are volunteers in the U.S. military, especially for those who are serving in combat in Iraq. I thank each of them for their service and for volunteering to protect us and to protect freedom in faraway lands.

I think it is also important to thank their parents, their grandparents, and their spouses for their sacrifice as they wait for their loved ones who are overseas giving of themselves to save the world from a tyrant in possession of weapons of mass destruction. These brave men and women are there to protect us and protect the neighbors of Iraq from the scourge of a tyrant who has violated international rules and failed to disarm. Our men and women, joined by others from around the world, will see to it that he is disarmed. In doing that, they will be doing a very important duty, and they will be giving us the most important gift we can have, to be contributors to freedom in that part of the world and in our own country for the future.

Last night, airplanes from Holloman Air Force Base, NM, were the planes that did the initial strikes on Baghdad. They were far away from their home in Holloman Air Force Base, NM. They are the F-117 stealth fighters. They have been joined in that theater of war by men and women from our two other military bases, the air bases at Cannon and Kirtland. They are also joined by units of the New Mexico National Guard and Reserve.

On behalf of all of those military personnel, their relatives and friends, as one of their Senators from New Mexico, I thank them. I congratulate them for their willingness to fight for freedom and for the generosity of being volunteers to keep America safe and free.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, Senator BYRD graciously agreed to yield 2 of his 15 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota. It will be very clear to the body as to why that was such an important and gracious act on the part of Senator BYRD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I thank Senator LEVIN and my colleague, Senator BYRD.

Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the men and women serving in our Armed Forces in the war on Iraq. I join with my colleagues in the Senate and with the American people in conveying our gratitude to each of them for their willingness to courageously serve our Nation.

Now that the war has begun, it is time for all Americans to come together to support our military. While we had hoped a diplomatic solution could be found so that we could avoid the use of force, it now appears that military action is imminent. I will do all that I can to assure that our troops have the resources they need to complete their mission quickly, efficiently, and with as little loss of life as possible.

Be they active duty or members of the National Guard or Reserves, our Armed Forces are the best equipped,

best trained fighting force in the history of the world. Despite our pre-paredness, this may not be a quick and easy war. The Iraqi Army, if it chooses to fight, remains a formidable force. But let there be no doubt that our military will achieve its mission. We will disarm Saddam Hussein. We will end his brutal dictatorship, and we will liberate the Iraqi people.

We should not forget that we are fighting this war not only to ensure that Saddam Hussein never again is able to use weapons of mass destruction, but also to give the 22 million Iraqi people the chance to build a democracy and to live in freedom. Our goals are noble, and the actions of our military are just.

Finally, to the families whose sons and daughters, fathers and mothers have been deployed to the Middle East, I want to say that you and your loved ones are in our prayers. As a father with a son serving as a sergeant in the 101st Airborne, now in the Iraqi theater, I understand the mix of pride and fear that family members are feeling at this time. I wear my blue star with pride. They should find comfort in the fact that they are not alone; our entire Nation is with them during these difficult moments.

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to address the Senate on this timely and important matter and to offer my thanks, prayers, and gratitude to our Armed Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I can think of no one in this body who is more appropriate to bring this debate to a close, or near to a close, than Senator JOHNSON of South Dakota whose son is serving with such honor and distinction and who brings such pride to his family. I thank the Senator for sharing with us the emotions I know he feels at this very moment as a father.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, may I also join my colleague and express how grateful we are he came to the floor with a great sense of emotion and humility and, the final sentence with which he concluded, his pride in his son. I commend the Senator.

I should note that the son of a member of the senior staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee, COL Chuck Alsup, who is with me in the Chamber, leaves today as a military man to join the forces in the gulf.

We will have the Senator from North Carolina address us for 2½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. DOLE. I thank the Chair. To date, nearly 40,000 men and women from North Carolina's military bases have been deployed for duty in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Last month, as a new member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I visited three of our military installations in North Carolina. I have always had the greatest respect and admiration for the brave men and women who

dedicate their lives to defending our freedoms. It was particularly important to me to visit our armed forces personnel at this critical moment in our history and to tell them how much I appreciate what they do for us, for our country, each and every day.

At Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, at Cherry Point Marine Corps Air Station, and at Fort Bragg, I was moved by the dedication, the commitment, the patriotism of the members of our armed forces and their families. They make me proud and thankful to be an American.

In a recent interview, my husband, Bob, was asked about his service in World War II—about being part of “the Greatest Generation.” He responded that it is the men and women of our military today who are the greatest generation. I agree with him completely. We have the best equipped, most capable, most courageous military force in the world.

I remember my first day, 12 years ago, as president of the American Red Cross, walking into my new office to find a letter from Colin Powell, then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. One of the oldest Red Cross assistance programs, the Armed Forces Emergency Services, was in jeopardy due to a lack of donor interest. I promised Colin Powell right then and there that we would do whatever it took to preserve that program for our men and women in uniform—and we did.

Many people do not realize that wherever our military goes, the Red Cross goes with them to provide support and services, delivering 4,000 emergency messages a day to our military men and women. On that first day on my job, during the Persian Gulf war, our thoughts and prayers were with the Red Cross and our armed forces.

Shortly after the war ended, I traveled to the Persian Gulf to thank the Red Crossers for their work and to deliver humanitarian aid to Kuwait. Even now, I can clearly recall the horror of Saddam Hussein's occupation of that country—oil fields burning, a hospital where scores of children had died because doctors and nurses fled the country to escape the horrors of Saddam Hussein and his forces. I put a call out, right then and there, for doctors and nurses to come to Kuwait through Red Cross sponsorship—and about 50 American medical personnel responded immediately.

Saddam Hussein is a dangerous man who continues to pose a threat to the region's stability, to his own people, and to the American people through his sponsorship of terror. Right now, he's passing weapons of mass destruction to Iraqi troops—weapons he claimed not to have. He would gladly pass these weapons to terrorists to use against America.

President Bush exhausted every option before resorting to military force.

It is time to free the people of Iraq from Saddam Hussein's terror, to remove his weapons of mass destruction, to help Iraq establish democracy.

I have the highest confidence in our Armed Forces, and I know they will complete the mission they are called to accomplish. As we go forward, my thoughts and prayers will constantly be with our Commander in Chief, with these men and women and their families, with the Iraqi people, and with all those on the front lines of this war.

May God bless them all, and may God bless this great land of the free and home of the brave—America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. I grant the Senator from Utah 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am pleased to stand here and support our young men and women in the Middle East and the efforts they are making to defend our Nation and, of course, defend against terrorism and to end the intolerant behavior and leadership of Saddam Hussein.

Last night we began a war that will end Saddam Hussein's threat to his own people, to the Middle East, and to this country. It was a time we chose, and a historic moment for the United States, the Middle East, and the world.

Today, as we vote in support of S. Res. 95, our prayers go with our brave soldiers, marines, airmen, and sailors. I am proud to say that this includes over 3,000 of my fellow Utahns.

Every attempt was made to find a diplomatic way to disarm Iraq, to make Iraq comply with commitments it began to violate shortly after the first gulf war in 1991. And so, in many ways, the war with Iraq never ended in 1991. A condition of ending the conflict was full and transparent disarmament, and Saddam Hussein has never—never—complied with that condition. Iraq never complied, over a decade of insistence by the international community, over a decade of frustrated inspections regimes, over a decade of resolutions by the United Nations, all of which have been ignored by Iraq. All of them. Throughout this time, the United States has worked with the United Nations. We supported all 17 resolutions. We supported not just what was written, but was intended. We supported not just the words, but the actions they demanded. We wanted resolutions with resolve.

As I said, I believe this administration made every attempt to find a solution without resorting to force. Every attempt, that is, except a commitment to perpetuating the dangerous belief that force would never be an option. Another nation, France, declared that it would veto any resolution requiring the use of force now. That nation did so, arguing it rejected the “logic of war.” I have read the history of Saddam Hussein and his dictatorship in Iraq. I have concluded that Saddam Hussein has never—never—changed his behavior unless confronted with the threat of force. For France to reject the “logic of war” in trying to compel

Saddam Hussein's disarmament, it was willfully ignoring this fundamental fact of Saddam Hussein. France is ignoring history; it is ignoring logic.

President Bush said on Monday night that "we are now acting because the risks of inaction would be far greater." I support the President, and I support this rationale.

In Saddam Hussein's Iraq, there remain unaccounted vast amounts of chemical and biological weapons. This is a fact documented, not by some hawks in or out of the U.S. Government but by the international community. In Saddam Hussein, there is a long and established history of association with, and support for, terrorists. All those within reach of a television or newspaper saw, within the past weeks, Palestinian terrorist groups doling out Saddam's largesse. Saddam has trained terrorists, funded suicide operations, and allowed members of al-Qaida to live in his tightly controlled Iraq.

Some opponents of the President's policy have suggested that he failed to make the case that Saddam Hussein caused the attacks on September 11. These critics are disingenuous: The administration has never made this claim. It has asserted, and I believe them, that elements of al-Qaida have been in Iraq since September 11. As we learn more, I also believe that the history of al-Qaida will reveal a long association with Saddam Hussein's Iraq, going back years, and being developed in Iraq, Sudan and Pakistan.

I have said this before. Association is not causation, I know. But when it comes to regimes hiding weapons of mass destruction and harboring terrorist organizations dedicated to our doom, I say this: Association is reason enough for alarm, reason enough for action. The President said it clearly last on Monday night:

Responding to such enemies only after they have struck first is not self-defense, it is suicide.

I commend his administration for searching for every possible solution short of war. That this was not possible does not mean they did not work earnestly and assiduously to avoid conflict. The effort does not guarantee the result. It does not guarantee support of the U.N. Security Council.

On that Security Council, China would rather see a nuclear Korean peninsula than a passive U.S. presence in South Korea. I have seen how Russia would rather see genocide in the Balkans—and Chechnya—than NATO success there. France would rather reject the "logic of war" in responding to a dictator who has never been motivated by anything other than the threat of force. These countries have their own self-interest, whether we like it or not. They stand down when outlaw regimes stand defiant with their illicit weapons of mass murder.

I thank God for the patience, wisdom and courage of this administration. I believe I join all my colleagues as we

offer our thoughts and prayers for the members of the American military, their families, our allies, and the people of Iraq, who will soon be free of a despicable, murderous regime that has kept the world fearful for far too long. And last night, I prayed to God that our mission in Iraq is blessed with providence and His protection. To our brave military I say: Godspeed and safe home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, following the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Virginia will recognize Senator KYL for 2 minutes and then in rotation the Senator from Georgia, Mr. CHAMBLISS, for 2 minutes. That results in all the time under my control being expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I yield 13 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the very distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. LEVIN, for his courtesy, his characteristic accommodative spirit. I also thank the distinguished Senator from Virginia for his characteristic courtesy always. I thank those who have written this resolution.

Months of uncertainty over the fate of Iraq ended with the first U.S. air strikes on Baghdad. Today, regardless of where any of us stand on the decision to go to war, we are all Americans, and our thoughts and prayers go out to the men and women of the U.S. military who have been called to battle in a foreign land.

Few doubt the outcome of this war. The fate of Iraq is sealed. The United States, with its awesome military might, is virtually certain to prevail decisively. But the fate of the individual soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and Coast Guardsmen who will carry the battle to Iraq is far less certain. We pray that every man and woman engaged in the war will return home safely and soon.

Our troops will face intense dangers as the mission to unseat Saddam Hussein proceeds. When our airplanes penetrate the sky above Iraq to deliver computer-guided bombs to their targets, and our ground troops begin their armored charge through the deserts of Iraq, our men and women in uniform surely know that one unlucky shot could send their families into mourning for a fallen patriot.

There are unknown perils as well. We do not know if Iraqi civilians will unite to repel a foreign enemy from their homes. We do not know if Iraq's military will lure us into bloody, house-to-house fighting. We do not know if Saddam Hussein will use chemical or biological weapons against our forces. I pray that the sons and daughters of the United States will never face these grave risks to their safety.

More than 225,000 U.S. troops are now involved. True to its traditions of serv-

ice to our country, West Virginia continues to have the highest per capita rates of participation in our armed forces. Thousands of West Virginians are now carrying out missions to defeat Saddam Hussein, protect our homeland, and root out terrorists in Afghanistan.

Thirty-three different units of the National Guard and military reserves based in the Mountain State are now activated. The 459th Engineer Company, based in Bridgeport, must now be readying to bridge the ancient Tigris and Euphrates Rivers. The 1092nd Engineer Battalion, based in Parkersburg, has been called to duty and might soon join in that effort. The 130th and 167th Airlift Wings are using their cargo aircraft to move men and materiel to where they are needed. West Virginians attached to the 363rd, 157th, and 304th Military Police Companies, out of Grafton, Martinsburg, and Bluefield, stand ready to maintain law and order in places far distant from their homes and families. These are but a few of the multitude of tasks now being carried out by West Virginia mountaineers in service to our country.

The men and women of these military units, like the rest of our troops, did not join the armed forces to fight Saddam Hussein. They did not ask to be sent to the harsh climes of the Arabian desert. Our troops volunteered to serve our country and uphold our Constitution. They are to be commended for their dedication to our country.

I stand foursquare behind our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines. I urge every American to pray for our troops, and pray that they will return safely from those faraway sands, to the loving arms of their families. I will do everything in my power as a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as a member of the Armed Services Committee to provide our troops with the funds that are needed to ensure their safety.

I do not agree with every word of this resolution. I have strong reservations that the new doctrine of preemption does not meet the test of international law. I have strong reservations about the assertion that the Congress has "fully authorized" this war against Iraq. I do not believe that Congress can cede its constitutional power to declare war to the President of the United States.

I have questions about our long-term strategy for the reconstruction of Iraq, the plans to democratize the Middle East, and the application of the preemptive doctrine that has led the United States to war in 2003.

But I have no question about the ability of our military to deliver a crushing blow to whatever army might stand in their way in Iraq. I have no question that our armed forces will carry out their mission with honor and resolve. I have no question that our Nation has the obligation to finish the job and destroy whatever chemical, biological, and radiological weapons that Saddam Hussein possess.

Last night, in his address to the Nation, the President said that "our forces will be coming home as soon as their work is done." I support these words by the President, for they speak to the millions of Americans who now wonder when their loved ones might return home. This is the ultimate measure of support that our Government can give to our military servicemen and women.

We do not know how long this war might last, or how long our troops might occupy Iraq after our victory. We should not rule out the possibility that Saddam Hussein could flee at any time during the course of the battle, precluding further carnage. In the coming days, the television news is sure to show pictures of smart bombs dropping on targets, and perhaps grainy, nighttime images of our troops moving to take their objectives. These sanitized images do not reflect the true cost of war. They cannot hope to convey the perils that our military will encounter as the war continues. But I hope the words spoken on the floor of the Senate today will convey the deep and abiding support of every Member of this body for the men and women of the United States military serving in the Persian Gulf.

I close by referring to those words by Longfellow in "The Building of the Ship":

Thou, too, sail, on, O Ship of State!
Sail on, O Union, strong and great!
Humanity with all its fears,
With all the hopes of future years,
Is hanging breathless on thy fate!
We know what Master laid thy keel,
What workmen wrought thy ribs of steel,
Who made each mast, and sail, and rope,
What anvils rang, what hammers beat,
In what forge and what a heat
Were shaped the anchors of thy hope!
Fear not each sudden sound and shock,
'Tis of the wave and not the rock;
'Tis but the flapping of the sail,
And not a rent made by the gale!
In spite of rock and tempest's roar,
In spite of false lights on the shore,
Sail on, nor fear to breast the sea!
Our hearts, our hopes, are all with thee,
Our hearts, our hopes, our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee,—are all with thee!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, last night leading elements of our coalition forces began to rid the land and the people of Iraq of the oppression of Saddam Hussein and eliminate the threat he poses to the rest of the world.

Throughout our history, our Nation has experienced moments that have defined our spirit, our cause.

We really do hold "these truths to be self evident. * * * That all men are created equal," that all "men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness." This applies to the innocent Iraqis who have been brutalized by a cruel and morally bankrupt regime

as much as it applies to the citizens of our Nation who deserve to be free of Saddam Hussein's threats.

In the past, Americans have crossed oceans to free subjugated peoples and protect ourselves. On more than one occasion in the past century, our friends on the European continent have required our intercession and our sacrifice to extricate them from the foul pit of regional war, and genocide perpetrated by the evil men of those times.

Our experience of war on our own soil also brought with it defining moments. On July 2, 1863, in a field outside of a little town in Pennsylvania called Gettysburg, a young Colonel named Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain addressed a group of his men, men of the 20th Maine, who were about to play a pivotal role in the success of the Union forces in that horrible battle. For his part in this battle, he was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Though no exact record of his words exist, the following has been attributed to him, and I believe it reflects our motive, our mission, and the attitude of our men and women who are now in harm's way. He said to the assembled group: "We all volunteered to fight for the Union * * * ours is a different kind of army. * * * If you look back through history, you will see men fighting for pay, women, some other kind of loot * * * they fight for land or power * * * because a king leads them or because they like killing. We are here for something new—this has not happened much in the history of the world—We are an army out to set other men free."

To those who do not agree with us right now, to those who believe that the threat posed by Saddam Hussein is not worth the effort or the cost required to remove him, I offer the words of one of the great philosophers of liberty. The Englishman John Stuart Mill wrote: "War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse. The person who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, nothing which is more important than his own personal safety, is a miserable creature and has no chance of being free unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

Mr. President, I call upon everyone to pray for our troops; to pray for their safety, to pray that the battle will be quick, and that their families will see them home again soon. I call upon the country to pray, too, for the innocent civilians of Iraq and the citizens of nearby nations whom Saddam seeks to harm; that all of them as much as we may be protected from his evil designs.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time remains? The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4½ minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise in support to the resolution before the Senate.

The President has now started an operation that we had all hoped to avoid. Now that battle has begun, we must win the war and win the peace.

There has been considerable disagreement leading up to this moment—in this chamber, in this country, and throughout the world. Many people have very strong feelings about the military operation in Iraq, and they have expressed those feelings.

The debate has been vigorous. But now that American forces are in combat, our soldiers should not doubt our support for them.

We stand firmly behind the men and women of our military. They have volunteered to serve their country. We are proud of their service, and we admire their courage. During this difficult time, our thoughts and prayers are with them and the families who await their return.

My State of Washington is home to thousands of soldiers, sailors and airmen. I have had the privilege of meeting many of them—at Fort Lewis, Fairchild Air Force Base, McChord Air Force base, Whidbey Naval Air Station, Everett Naval Station, Bremerton Naval Station, the Bangor Sub base, and our Coast Guard stations.

Some of Washington State's finest are now serving in the Middle East, and may be seeing combat. I have no doubt they will distinguish themselves in carrying out their missions.

Many of these soldiers have family back in Washington State. Throughout my state and across the nation, families are anxious, knowing that their loved ones are in military action.

We take comfort in knowing that America's soldiers are the best-trained, best-equipped, and most capable fighting force the world has ever known. They will carry out this dangerous mission, and they will prevail. We are proud of their dedication and courage, and we all pray for their safe and swift return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and I understand the Senator desires to speak and will yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I thank Senator LEVIN for his leadership on this resolution and on this issue.

Last night, the Liberty Bell of freedom and democracy began to ring again. Last night, the United States of America headed down a path of freeing the people of Iraq from the cruel dictator, Saddam Hussein. I don't know how long President Bush or Prime Minister Blair will be in office, but this has to be the most difficult decision that they have made or will ever make. But I commend them for their courage and their leadership. No one wants to see war. But there are times in our country, in the history of our country, when military conflict is necessary to ensure that America and Americans are safe and secure.

I am very proud of all the Active Duty, Reserve and Guard personnel from my State who have been deployed from 8 of the 13 military installations in Georgia. We wish them Godspeed, a successful and quick victory, and wish that they come home safely, sound and soon.

I am privileged to yield the remainder of my time to the only member of the Reserve serving in the Senate, my good friend from South Carolina, LINDSEY GRAHAM.

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President, there is a better day coming. It is a cloudy day right now. We are worried about our families and our troops, but there is a bright day coming. Our American servicemen will give freedom to Iraq, make us more secure. They are a blend of who we are: Rich, poor, black, white, Jew, Gentile, all mixed up into the American military. The strength of our military is they are an optimistic bunch. They are fighting for causes greater than their self-interest. That is why we will win.

Mr. LEVIN. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes 44 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to Senator LANDRIEU and 1 minute to Senator STABENOW.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, less than 24 hours ago, President Bush, our Commander in Chief, issued orders to begin military actions to disarm Saddam Hussein and his totalitarian regime. War is never our first choice, but it is sometimes a necessary last choice. As a mature democracy, we prefer to settle disputes peacefully and use diplomacy whenever possible. But sometimes, disputes cannot be settled peacefully. Force must be used to defend against threats to our freedom and liberate an oppressed people. That is what we are doing in Iraq. I want to express my support for our men and women in uniform and this course of action.

I wish to offer my wholehearted and unwavering support for those serving in our Armed Forces. The men and women serving our country in the military symbolize the best America has to offer. They are dedicated to the defense of our Constitution and willing to make the ultimate sacrifice, if necessary, to protect the Constitution for every American. More importantly, they volunteer to do so. They are well-trained and ready to defend our way of life and improve the lives of Iraqis. Along with the people of Louisiana, I will be praying for our troops and their families. I wish our men and women safety in their missions and a quick return home.

Barksdale—B-52s and A-10s from the 2d Bomb Wing and 917th Air Wing are making great contributions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guam. I am so proud of Barksdale's leadership, pilots, flight crews, and their families.

Fort Polk is the premiere light armored training center in the world.

Our Army will succeed in Iraq because it trained for victory at Fort Polk. Currently, 4,000 men and women of the 2d Armored Cavalry are working to liberate Iraq, and I could not be more proud. Their families should also be proud.

Louisiana has 14,000 Air and Army National Guardsmen; 2,400 are currently deployed, and many are in Iraq and Afghanistan. Many Guardsmen have been activated three times since September 11. In the last 18 months, they have seen little of their families, but they have done much for their country. These proud warriors have served above and beyond the call of duty.

Belle Chasse is the premiere Joint Reserve Base for the Marine Reserve, Navy Reserve, Air Force Reserve, and Air National Guard. Belle Chasse has contributed A-10s, Cobras, F-15s, and F-18s; pilots and crews to the war on terrorism. These men and women, too, have been called up a number of times. They have served valiantly and with distinction.

In closing, I want to thank our allies who have joined us to defend our shores, bring liberty to the people of Iraq, and root out terrorism. British Prime Minister Tony Blair risked his political career to do what is right for world security. I want to tell him that the American people appreciate his courage. Australia is committing forces, and we are grateful. Additionally, Eastern European countries like Romania, Bulgaria, and Poland have been staunch supporters of disarming Saddam Hussein. They have done so because not long ago they lived under dictators. They have recently experienced the sweet breaths of freedom, and they want the Iraqi people to experience the same. God bless our troops.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I thank my esteemed colleague and leader, Senator CARL LEVIN.

With the first shots fired last night, I rise today to talk about the need to support our troops now fighting in the gulf, as well as those on duty around the world.

From that freezing winter in Valley Forge to the baking heat and swirling dust storms of the gulf today, our men and women in uniform have shown over and over the hardships they are ready to endure in service to their country.

They are all in our thoughts and prayers. And we pray this ends quickly and with little loss of life.

I have met with many of these men and women and their commanders and have been impressed with their professionalism, training, and sense of duty and sacrifice.

From my home State of Michigan, the men and women of the 127th Air National Guard Wing in Selfridge, the 110th Fighter Wing in Battle Creek and the Combat Readiness Training Center in Alpena have been mobilized and de-

ployed to bases around the world, including Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, South West Asia, and Turkey.

Army National Guard and Reserve unites from Owosso, Taylor, Grand Ledge, Grayling, Sault Ste. Marie, Midland, Pontiac, Three Rivers, Augusta, Selfridge, and Ypsilanti have all been mobilized and are awaiting their deployment orders.

Many of these men and women leave families and well-paying jobs behind, creating hardships for themselves and their family just so they can serve their Nation.

As the sole remaining superpower, we are asking a tremendous amount of our Armed Forces today. When we look around the globe, the numbers are staggering.

Right now about 225,000 troops are deployed in the Mideast—with more on the way.

But, again, as the sole remaining superpower we still have responsibilities around the globe.

We still have 38,000 Active Duty troops in Korea, nearly 40,000 in Japan, more than 100,000 permanently stationed in Europe, and about 50,000 sailors and soldiers afloat on ships in foreign waters.

In fact, according to the Department of Defense, the U.S. military is operating in more places around the globe than at any time in its history, including World War II, with a military presence in about 140 nations.

These men and women in uniform need to know their Nation will do everything in its power to give them the support they need to do their jobs—and also that gratitude for their sacrifice they will have our support when they come home as well.

General George C. Marshall, who oversaw the movement of forces in Europe and the Pacific in World War II, knew that the morale of the troops is crucial if the Armed Forces are to be effective. He once said:

It is not enough to fight. It is the spirit which we bring to the fight that decides the issue. It is morale that wins victories.

I agree.

And I believe one of the things we must do in this Congress to ensure high morale among our 2.3 million men and women in uniform, including Active, Reserve and Guard units, is to show them we are treating the 25 million veterans who came before them, including about 875,000 from Michigan, with the respect a grateful nation owes them.

One thing I would like to see is a change of policy so that our 600,000 disabled men and women who wore their country's uniform could collect both full pensions and disability benefits.

I also want to make sure our veterans have access to the best possible health care by fully funding the Veterans Affairs health care system.

If you cared enough to wear the uniform, you should be guaranteed high-quality, uniform care.

We also need to eliminate bottle-necks at the Veterans Administration for veterans who need prescription drugs.

Finally, we need to pass legislation creating tax fairness for military personnel.

We need to send to the President S. 351 that would address long-overdue tax reforms for National Guard and Reserve personnel.

We need to remember that in the world after 9-11, our first responders are now also a crucial part of our national security, and they need our full support as well.

They were then, and remain now, on the front lines of hometown defense in this new war against terrorism.

For the past several months I have been traveling throughout Michigan meeting with the public safety officials who have been given the mission of trying to prevent an attack—or be first on the scene to save lives if one occurs.

In nine meetings from Michigan's Upper Peninsula to Detroit, I heard the same message over and over:

Help us get the training, personnel and equipment we need to protect the people we need to protect, and help us meet our obligations in the face of these new threats to our communities.

Mr. President, I hope we will do just that as soon as possible.

This Sunday I will participate in a special ceremony that puts this all in perspective for me. This Sunday I meet with an American hero of World War II to present him a long overdue and richly deserved Bronze Star.

His name is Sergeant Herbert Munford and his story is inspiring.

Sergeant Munford had already earned a Silver Star at the Battle of the Bulge. Of the 385 men in his company when the battle began, only 18 were standing at the end—the rest killed, captured, or wounded.

Months later, SGT Munford's platoon was scouting along the Rhine, looking for a place to cross in advance of General George S. Patton's 3rd Army.

A German machine gun nest opened up on the platoon. SGT Munford made a run for some tall grass, hoping to hide himself while he circled around behind the machine gun.

He was shot in the hip as he was making his run out in the open. But he still managed to make it into the tall grass, circle behind the machine gun nest and take it out.

And what does SGT Munford say today about his heroic act. Well, he jokes about it. He called being shot in the hip his "million dollar wound."

Why? Well, in his own words SGT Munford says:

I can't swim. I didn't know how I was going to get across the Rhine in the first place. I was sent back to be treated for my wound and when I got back about two days later, Patton had taken the Rhine and built a bridge so I could just walk across.

What modesty! And keep in mind, that German bullet is still lodged in his hip today.

And his story doesn't end there. SGT Munford went on to win an Oak Leaf Cluster for his Bronze Star for bravery under fire in Korea.

I tell this story, because I think SGT Munford's story, like the stories of so many of our veterans, shows the great patriotic tradition of our Nation—a tradition that is on display today in the gulf and around the world.

And when I meet with SGT Munford on Sunday—and he's standing there with his family and fellow veterans—I want to be able to look each and every one of them in the eye and tell them in this time of conflict this Nation is doing all it can to support our present military personnel serving in the gulf and other duty stations around the globe. And that we stand behind our veterans of past wars as well.

I want them to know that we are committed to the proposition that those who answered the call to duty will never need to call out for help due to indifference.

I want them to know that those who sacrifice for their country will return to a country ready to sacrifice for them as well.

And I want them to know that those who wear the uniform of this Nation with honor, will themselves be honored long after that uniform has been put away and the guns gone silent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, is there any time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. The men and women we have now placed in harm's way are carrying the prayers of every single Member of this body and every single man, woman, and child in this Nation. They are carrying on in the greatest traditions of the American military. We thank them.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, this has been a historic debate, fully participated in by many Senators. I am privileged to be a part of that debate. I again salute the distinguished majority leader and the Democratic leader for drawing up this resolution. The Senate has spoken.

As we conclude this historic debate, which conclusively states the support of the Senate behind our President, our men and women in uniform and their families, I believe it is appropriate to include as part of this record the speech given to the British Parliament on March 18, 2003 requesting authority to use British forces alongside American forces in the liberation of the people of Iraq, by the Prime Minister, the Honorable Tony Blair, whom I and others view as Churchill II. My colleagues will recall that Prime Minister Blair was specifically mentioned in the text

of this resolution I read earlier. This was a purposeful reflection of our great esteem for this courageous leader who has stood so firm arm-in-arm with America. His request to use force was not a popular motion, but he prevailed. The following is the text of his speech and I commend it to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent to print the speech in the RECORD.

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

TONY BLAIR'S SPEECH

I beg to move the motion standing on the order paper in my name and those of my right honourable friends.

At the outset I say: it is right that this house debate this issue and pass judgment. That is the democracy that is our right but that others struggle for in vain.

And again I say: I do not disrespect the views of those in opposition to mine.

This is a tough choice. But it is also a stark one: to stand British troops down and turn back; or to hold firm to the course we have set.

I believe we must hold firm.

The question most often posed is not why does it matter? But why does it matter so much? Here we are, the government with its most serious test, its majority at risk, the first cabinet resignation over an issue of policy. The main parties divided.

People who agree on everything else, disagree on this and likewise, those who never agree on anything, finding common cause. The country and parliament reflect each other, a debate that, as time has gone on has become less bitter but not less grave.

So: why does it matter so much? Because the outcome of this issue will now determine more than the fate of the Iraqi regime and more than the future of the Iraqi people, for so long brutalized by Saddam. It will determine the way Britain and the world confront the central security threat of the 21st century; the development of the UN; the relationship between Europe and the U.S. the relations within the EU and the way the U.S. engages with the rest of the world. It will determine the pattern of international politics for the next generation.

But first, Iraq and its WMD.

In April 1991, after the Gulf war, Iraq was given 15 days to provide a full and final declaration of all its WMD.

Saddam had used the weapons against Iran, against his own people, causing thousands of deaths. He had had plans to use them against allied forces. It became clear after the Gulf war that the WMD ambitions of Iraq were far more extensive than hitherto thought. This issue was identified by the UN as one for urgent remedy. UNSCOM, the weapons inspection team, was set up. They were expected to complete their task following declaration at the end of April 1991.

The declaration when it came was false—a blanket denial of the programme, other than in a very tentative form. So the 12-year game began.

The inspectors probed. Finally in March 1992, Iraq admitted it had previously undeclared WMD but said it had destroyed them. It gave another full and final declaration. Again the inspectors probed but found little.

In October 1994, Iraq stopped cooperating with UNSCOM altogether. Military action was threatened. Inspections resumed. In March 1995, in an effort to rid Iraq of the inspectors, a further full and final declaration of WMD was made. By July 1995, Iraq was forced to admit that too was false. In August they provided yet another full and final declaration.

Then, a week later, Saddam's son-in-law, Hussein Kamal, defected to Jordan. He disclosed a far more extensive BW (biological weapons) programme and for the first time said Iraq had weaponised the programme; something Saddam had always strenuously denied. All this had been happening whilst the inspectors were in Iraq. Kamal also revealed Iraq's crash programme to produce a nuclear weapon in 1990.

Iraq was forced then to release documents which showed just how extensive those programmes were. In November 1995, Jordan intercepted prohibited components for missiles that could be used for WMD.

In June 1996, a further full and final declaration was made. That too turned out to be false. In June 1997, inspectors were barred from specific sites.

In September 1997, another full and final declaration was made. Also false. Meanwhile the inspectors discovered VX nerve agent production equipment, something always denied by the Iraqis.

In October 1997, the U.S. and the U.K. threatened military action if Iraq refused to comply with the inspectors. But obstruction continued.

Finally, under threat of action, in February 1998, Kofi Annan went to Baghdad and negotiated a memorandum with Saddam to allow inspections to continue. They did. For a few months.

In August, cooperation was suspended. In December the inspectors left. Their final report is a withering indictment of Saddam's lies, deception and obstruction, with large quantities of WMD remained unaccounted for.

The U.S. and the U.K. then, in December 1998, undertook Desert Fox, a targeted bombing campaign to degrade as much of the Iraqi WMD facilities as we could.

In 1999, a new inspections team, UNMOVIC, was set up. But Saddam refused to allow them to enter Iraq.

So there they stayed, in limbo, until after resolution 1441 when last November they were allowed to return.

What is the claim of Saddam today? Why exactly the same claim as before: that he has no WMD.

Indeed we are asked to believe that after seven years of obstruction and non-compliance finally resulting in the inspectors leaving in 1998, seven years in which he hid his programme, built it up even whilst inspection teams were in Iraq, that after they left he then voluntarily decided to do what he had consistently refused to do under coercion.

When the inspectors left in 1998, they left unaccounted for: 10,000 litres of anthrax; a far reaching VX nerve agent programme; up to 6,500 chemical munitions; at least 80 of mustard gas, possibly more than ten times that amount; unquantifiable amounts of sarin, botulinum toxin and a host of other biological poisons; an entire Scud missile programme.

We are now seriously asked to accept that in the last few years, contrary to all history, contrary to all intelligence, he decided unilaterally to destroy the weapons. Such a claim is palpably absurd.

1441 is a very clear resolution. It lays down a final opportunity for Saddam to disarm. It rehearses the fact that he has been, for years in material breach of 17 separate UN resolutions. It says that this time compliance must be full, unconditional and immediate. The first step is a full and final declaration of all WMD to be given on 8 December.

I want to go through all the events since then—the house is familiar with them—but this much is accepted by all members of the UNSC: the 8 December declaration is false. That in itself is a material breach. Iraq has

made some concessions to cooperation but no-one disputes it is not fully cooperating. Iraq continues to deny it has any WMD, though no serious intelligence service anywhere in the world believes them.

On 7 March, the inspectors published a remarkable document. It is 173 pages long, detailing all the unanswered questions about Iraq's WMD. It lists 29 different areas where they have been unable to obtain information. For example, on VX it says: "Documentation available to UNMOVIC suggests that Iraq at least had had far reaching plans to weaponise VX . . ."

"Mustard constituted an important part (about 70%) of Iraq's CW arsenal . . . 550 mustard filled shells and up to 450 mustard filled aerial bombs unaccounted for . . . additional uncertainty with respect of 6526 aerial bombs, corresponding to approximately 1000 tonnes of agent, predominantly mustard.

"Based on unaccounted for growth media, Iraq's potential production of anthrax could have been in the range of about 15,000 to 25,000 litres . . . Based on all the available evidence, the strong presumption is that about 10,000 litres of anthrax was not destroyed and may still exist."

On this basis, had we meant what we said in resolution 1441, the security council should have convened and condemned Iraq as in material breach.

What is perfectly clear is that Saddam is playing the same old games in the same old way. Yes there are concessions. But fundamental change of heart or mind.

But the inspectors indicated there was at least some cooperation; and the world rightly hesitated over war. We therefore approached a second resolution in this way.

We laid down an ultimatum calling upon Saddam to come into line with resolution 1441 or be in material breach. Not an unreasonable proposition, given the history.

But still countries hesitated: how do we know how to judge full cooperation?

We then worked on a further compromise. We consulted the inspectors and drew up five tests based on the document they published on 7 March. Tests like interviews with 30 scientists outside of Iraq; production of the anthrax or documentation showing its destruction.

The inspectors added another test: that Saddam should publicly call on Iraqis to cooperate with them. So we constructed this framework: that Saddam should be given a specified time to fulfill all six tests to show full cooperation; that if he did so the inspectors could then set out a forward work programme and that if he failed to do so, action would follow. So clear benchmarks; plus a clear ultimatum. I defy anyone to describe that as an unreasonable position.

Last Monday, we were getting somewhere with it. We very nearly had majority agreement and I thank the Chilean President particularly for the constructive way he approached the issue.

There were debates about the length of the ultimatum. But the basic construct was gathering support.

Then, on Monday night, France said it would veto a second resolution whatever the circumstances. Then France denounced the six tests. Later that day, Iraq rejected them. Still, we continued to negotiate.

Last Friday, France said they could not accept any ultimatum. On Monday, we made final efforts to secure agreement. But they remain utterly opposed to anything which lays down an ultimatum authorizing action in the event of non-compliance by Saddam.

Just consider the position we are asked to adopt. Those on the security council opposed to us say they want Saddam to disarm but will not countenance any new resolution

that authorizes force in the event of non-compliance.

That is their position. No to any ultimatum; no to any resolution that stipulates that failure to comply will lead to military action.

So we must demand he disarm but relinquish any concept of a threat if he doesn't. From December 1998 to December 2002, no UN inspector was allowed to inspect anything in Iraq. For four years, not a thing.

What changed his mind? The threat of force. From December to January and then from January through to February, concessions were made.

What changed his mind? The threat of force. And what makes him now issue invitations to the inspectors, discover documents he said he never had, produce evidence of weapons supposed to be non-existent, destroy missiles he said he would keep? The imminence of force.

The only persuasive power to which he responds is 250,00 allied troops on his doorstep.

And yet when the fact is so obvious that it is staring us in the face, we are told that any resolution that authorizes force will be vetoed. Not just opposed. Vetoed. Blocked.

The way ahead was so clear. It was for the UN to pass a second resolution setting out benchmarks for compliance; with an ultimatum that if they were ignored, action would follow.

The tragedy is that had such a resolution been issued, he might just have complied. Because the only route to peace with someone like Saddam Hussein is diplomacy backed by force.

Yet the moment we proposed the benchmarks, canvassed support for an ultimatum, there was an immediate recourse to the language of the veto.

And now the world has to learn the lesson all over again that weakness in the face of a threat from a tyrant, is the surest way not to peace but war.

Looking back over 12 years, we have been victims of our own desire to placate the implacable, to persuade towards reason the utterly unreasonable, to hope that there was some genuine intent to do good in a regime whose mind is in fact evil. Now the very length of time counts against us. You've waited 12 years. Why not wait a little longer?

And indeed we have.

1441 gave a final opportunity. The first test was the 8th of December. He failed it. But still we waited. Until January 27, the first inspection report that showed the absence of full cooperation. Another breach. And still we waited.

Until February 14 and then February 28 with concessions, according to the old familiar routine, tossed to us to whet our appetite for hope and further waiting. But still none, not the inspectors nor any member of the security council, not any half-way rational observer, believes Saddam is cooperating fully or unconditionally or immediately.

Our fault has not been impatience.

The truth is our patience should have been exhausted weeks and months and years ago. Even now, when if the world united and gave him an ultimatum: comply or face forcible disarmament, he might just do it, the world hesitates and in that hesitation he senses the weakness and therefore continues to defy.

What would any tyrannical regime possessing WMD think viewing the history of the world's diplomatic dance with Saddam? That our capacity to pass firm resolutions is only matched by our feebleness in implementing them.

That is why this indulgence has to stop. Because it is dangerous. It is dangerous if such regimes disbelieve us.

Dangerous if they think they can use our weakness, our hesitation, even the natural urges of our democracy towards peace, against us.

Dangerous because one day they will mistake our innate revulsion against war for permanent incapacity; when in fact, pushed to the limit, we will act. But then when we act, after years of pretence, the action will have to be harder, bigger, more total in its impact. Iraq in not the only regime with WMD. But back away now from this confrontation and future conflicts will be infinitely worse and more devastating.

But, of course, in a sense, any fair observer does not really dispute that Iraq is in breach and that 1441 implies action in such circumstances. The real problem is that, underneath, people dispute that Iraq is a threat; dispute the link between terrorism and WMD; dispute the whole basis of our assertion that the two together constitute a fundamental assault on our way of life.

There are glib and sometimes foolish comparisons with the 1930s. No one here is an appeaser. But the only relevant point of analogy is that with history, we know what happened. We can look back and say: there's the time; that was the moment; for example, when Czechoslovakia was swallowed up by the Nazis—that's when we should have acted.

But it wasn't clear at the time. In fact at the time, many people thought such a fear fanciful. Worse, put forward in bad faith by warmongers. Listen to this editorial—from a paper I'm pleased to say with a different position today—but written in late 1938 after Munich when by now, you would have thought the world was tumultuous in its desire to act.

"Be glad in your hearts. Give thanks to your God. People of Britain, your children are safe. Your husbands and your sons will not march to war. Peace is a victory for all mankind. And now let us go back to our own affairs. We have had enough of those menaces, conjured up from the continent to confuse us."

Naturally should Hitler appear again in the same form, we would know what to do. But the point is that history doesn't declare the future to us so plainly. Each time is different and the present must be judged without the benefit of hindsight.

So let me explain the nature of this threat as I see it.

The threat today is not that of the 1930s. It's not big powers going to war with each other. The ravages which fundamentalist political ideology inflicted on the 20th century are memories. The Cold War is over. Europe is at peace, if not always diplomatically.

But the world is ever more interdependent. Stock markets and economies rise and fall together. Confidence is the key to prosperity. Insecurity spreads like contagion. So people crave stability and order.

The threat is chaos. And there are two beggeters of chaos. Tyrannical regimes with WMD and extreme terrorist groups who profess a perverted and false view of Islam.

Let me tell the house what I know. I know that there are some countries or groups within countries that are proliferating and trading in WMD, especially nuclear weapons technology.

I know there are companies, individuals, some former scientists on nuclear weapons programmes, selling their equipment or expertise.

I know there are several countries—mostly dictatorships with highly repressive regimes—desperately trying to acquire chemical weapons, biological weapons or, in particular, nuclear weapons capability. Some of these countries are now a short time away from having a serviceable nuclear weapon. This activity is not diminishing. It is increasing.

We all know that there are terrorist cells now operating in most major countries. Just as in the last two years, around 20 different nations have suffered serious terrorist outrages. Thousands have died in them.

The purpose of terrorism lies not just in the violent act itself. It is in producing terror. It sets out to inflame, to divide, to produce consequences which they then use to justify further terror.

Round the world it now poisons the changes of political progress: in the Middle East; in Kashmir; in Chechnya; in Africa.

The removal of the Taliban in Afghanistan dealt it a blow. But is has not gone away.

And these two threats have different motives and different origins but they share one basic common view: they detest the freedom, democracy and tolerance that are the hallmarks of our way of life.

At the moment, I accept that association between them is loose. But it is hardening.

And the possibility of the two coming together—of terrorist groups in possession of WMD, even of a so-called dirty radiological bomb is now, in my judgment, a real and present danger.

And let us recall: what was shocking about September 11 was not just the slaughter of the innocent; but the knowledge that had the terrorists been able to, there would have been not 3,000 innocent dead, but 30,000 or 300,000 and the more the suffering, the greater the terrorists' rejoicing.

Three kilograms of VX from a rocket launcher would contaminate a quarter of a square kilometer of a city.

Millions of lethal doses are contained in one liter of Anthrax. 10,000 liters are unaccounted for. 11 September has changed the psychology of America. It should have changed the psychology of the world. Of course Iraq is not the only part of this threat. But it is the test of whether we treat the threat seriously.

Faced with it, the world should unite. The UN should be the focus, both of diplomacy and of action. That is what 1441 said. That was the deal. And I say to you to break it now, to will the ends but not the means that would do more damage in the long term to the UN than any other course.

To fall back into the lassitude of the last 12 years, to talk, to discuss, to debate but never act; to declare our will but not enforce it; to combine strong language with weak intentions, a worse outcome than never speaking at all.

And then, when the threat returns from Iraq or elsewhere, who will believe us? What price our credibility with the next tyrant? No wonder Japan and South Korea, next to North Korea, has issued such strong statements of support.

I have come to the conclusion after much reluctance that the greater danger to the UN is inaction: that to pass resolution 1441 and then refuse to enforce it would do the most deadly damage to the UN's future strength, confirming it as an instrument of diplomacy but not of action, forcing nations down the very unilateralist path we wish to avoid.

But there will be, in any event, no sound future for the UN, no guarantee against the repetition of these events, unless we recognise the urgent need for a political agenda we can unite upon.

What we have witnessed is indeed the consequence of Europe and the United States dividing from each other. Not all of Europe—Spain, Italy, Holland, Denmark, Portugal—have all strongly supported us. And not a majority of Europe if we include, as we should, Europe's new members who will accede next year, all 10 of whom have been in our support.

But the paralysis of the UN has been born out of the division there is. And at the heart

of it has been the concept of a world in which there are rival poles of power. The U.S. and its allies in one corner. France, Germany, Russia and its allies in the other. I do not believe that all of these nations intend such an outcome. But that is what now faces us.

I believe such a vision to be misguided and profoundly dangerous. I know why it arises. There is resentment of U.S. predominance.

There is fear of U.S. unilateralism. People ask: do the U.S. listen to us and our preoccupations? And there is perhaps a lack of full understanding of U.S. preoccupations after 11th September. I know all of this. But the way to deal with it is not rivalry but partnership. Partners are not servants but neither are they rivals. I tell you what Europe should have said last September to the U.S. With one voice it should have said: we understand your strategic anxiety over terrorism and WMD and we will help you meet it.

We will mean what we say in any UN resolution we pass and will back it with action if Saddam fails to disarm voluntarily; but in return we ask two things of you: that the U.S. should choose the UN path and you should recognise the fundamental overriding importance of re-starting the MEPP (Middle East Peace Process), which we will hold you to.

I do not believe there is any other issue with the same power to re-unite the world community than progress on the issues of Israel and Palestine. Of course there is cynicism about recent announcements. But the U.S. is now committed, and, I believe genuinely, to the roadmap for peace, designed in consultation with the UN. It will now be presented to the parties as Abu Mazen is confirmed in office, hopefully today.

All of us are now signed up to its vision: a state of Israel, recognised and accepted by all the world, and a viable Palestinian state. And that should be part of a larger global agenda. On poverty and sustainable development. On democracy and human rights. On the good governance of nations.

That is why what happens after any conflict in Iraq is of such critical significance.

Here again there is a chance to unify around the UN. Let me make it clear.

There should be a new UN resolution following any conflict providing not just for humanitarian help but also for the administration and governance of Iraq. That must now be done under proper UN authorisation.

It should protect totally the territorial integrity of Iraq. And let the oil revenues—which people falsely claim we want to seize—be put in a trust fund for the Iraqi people administered through the UN.

And let the future government of Iraq be given the chance to begin the process of uniting the nation's disparate groups, on a democratic basis, respecting human rights, as indeed the fledgling democracy in Northern Iraq—protected from Saddam for 12 years by British and American pilots in the no-fly zone—has done so remarkably.

And the moment that a new government is in place—willing to disarm Iraq of WMD—for which its people have no need or purpose—then let sanctions be lifted in their entirety.

I have never put our justification for action as regime change. We have to act within the terms set out in resolution 1441. That is our legal base.

But it is the reason, I say frankly, why if we do act we should do so with a clear conscience and strong heart.

I accept fully that those opposed to this course of action share my detestation of Saddam. Who could not? Iraq is a wealthy country that in 1978, the year before Saddam seized power, was richer than Portugal or Malaysia.

Today it is impoverished, 60 percent of its population dependent on food aid.

Thousands of children die needlessly every year from lack of food and medicine.

Four million people out of a population of just over 20 million are in exile.

The brutality of the repression—the death and torture camps, the barbaric prisons for political opponents, the routine beatings for anyone or their families suspected of disloyalty well documented.

Just last week, someone slandering Saddam was tied to a lamp post in a street in Baghdad, his tongue cut out, mutilized and left to bleed to death, as a warning to others.

I recall a few weeks ago talking to an Iraqi exile and saying to her that I understood how grim it must be under the lash of Saddam.

"But you don't," she replied. "You cannot. You do not know what it is like to live in perpetual fear."

And she is right. We take our freedom for granted. But imagine not to be able to speak or discuss or debate or even question the society you live in. To see friends and family taken away and never daring to complain. To suffer the humility of failing courage in face of pitiless terror. That is how the Iraqi people live. Leave Saddam in place and that is how they will continue to live.

We must face the consequences of the actions we advocate. For me, that means all the dangers of war. But for others, opposed to this course, it means—let us be clear—that the Iraqi people, whose only true hope of liberation lies in the removal of Saddam, for them, the darkness will close back over them again; and he will be free to take his revenge upon those he must know wish him gone.

And if this house now demands that at this moment, faced with this threat from this regime, that British troops are pulled back, that we turn away at the point of reckoning, and that is what it means—what then?

What will Saddam feel? Strengthened beyond measure. What will the other states who tyrannise their people, the terrorists who threaten our existence, what will they take from that? That the will confronting them is decaying and feeble.

Who will celebrate and who will weep?

And if our plea is for America to work with others, to be good as well as powerful allies, will our retreat make them multilateralist? Or will it not rather be the biggest impulse to unilateralism there could ever be. And what of the UN and the future of Iraq and the Middle East peace plan, devoid of our influence, stripped of our insistence?

This house wanted this decision. Well it has it. Those are the choices. And in this dilemma, no choice is perfect, no cause ideal.

But on this decision hangs the fate of many things.

Of whether we summon the strength to recognise this global challenge of the 21st century and meet it.

Of the Iraqi people, groaning under years of dictatorship.

Of our armed forces—brave men and women of whom we can feel proud, whose morale is high and whose purpose is clear.

Of the institutions and alliances that will shape our world for years to come."

I can think of many things, of whether we summon the strength to recognise the global challenge of the 21st century and beat it, of the Iraqi people groaning under years of dictatorship, of our armed forces—brave men and women whom we can feel proud, whose morale is high and whose purpose is clear—of the institutions and alliances that shape our world for years to come.

To retreat now, I believe, would put at hazard all that we hold dearest, in turn the UN back into a talking shop, stifle the first steps of progress in the Middle East; leave the Iraqi people to the mercy of events on

which we would have relinquished all power to influence for the better.

Tell our allies that at the very moment of action, at the very moment when they need our determination that Britain faltered. I will not be a party to such a course. This is not the time to falter. This is the time for this house, not just this government or indeed this prime minister, but for this house to give a lead, to show that we will stand up for what we know to be right, to show that we will confront the tyrannies and dictatorships and terrorists who put our way of life at risk, to show at the moment of decision that we have the courage to do the right thing.

I beg to move the motion.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, resolutions, such as the one before us, are not possible without a dedicated, bipartisan effort. Our staffs have worked hard and well together over the past few days to help members craft this resolution. I want to especially recognize and thank Steve Biegun of the Majority Leader's Office, Dennis McDonough of the Democratic Leader's Office, and Judy Ansley, Rick DeBobs and Chuck Alsop of the Armed Services Committee staff, for their efforts in helping draft this important resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Has all time expired?

Mr. LEVIN. May I make a unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent Senator LANDRIEU be added as a cosponsor, and every Member of the Senate who chooses to, who wants their name added, be allowed to do so, and even though it comes after the vote, that it appear that it occurred before the vote.

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

Mr. WARNER. I specifically ask the Senator from New Mexico be added as a cosponsor.

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

The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. I will close on leader time.

Mr. President, I welcome the strong bipartisan support and the bipartisan spirit in which this debate has been conducted today, the bipartisan support over the last several hours of remarks. American soldiers, American sailors, and airmen are fighting to end the regime of one of the world's worst tyrants.

Our men and women in uniform are in harm's way. They are engaged in battle as we speak. Let us pray for their safety and their success.

I am confident of their victory, and I am confident that it will occur at the earliest possible moment. In passing this resolution, the Senate says to the men and women who wear our Nation's uniform and to their families: We are grateful for your sacrifice.

As they act to free the Iraqi people from Saddam Hussein's oppressive regime, let there be no mistake—they are defending our own liberty as well.

Again I ask in this vote we send a clear message to those brave Ameri-

cans who are risking their lives for us on the battlefield. Our prayers are with you. Godspeed toward victory.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) is necessarily absent due to a family medical matter.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) would vote "aye".

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Dodd	Lieberman
Alexander	Dole	Lincoln
Allard	Domenici	Lott
Allen	Dorgan	Lugar
Baucus	Durbin	McCain
Bayh	Edwards	McConnell
Bennett	Ensign	Mikulski
Biden	Enzi	Murkowski
Bingaman	Feingold	Murray
Bond	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Fitzgerald	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Frist	Nickles
Brownback	Graham (FL)	Pryor
Bunning	Graham (SC)	Reed
Burns	Grassley	Reid
Byrd	Gregg	Roberts
Campbell	Hagel	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Harkin	Santorum
Carper	Hatch	Sarbanes
Chafee	Hollings	Schumer
Chambliss	Hutchison	Sessions
Clinton	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Inouye	Smith
Coleman	Jeffords	Snowe
Collins	Johnson	Specter
Conrad	Kennedy	Stabenow
Cornyn	Kerry	Stevens
Corzine	Kohl	Sununu
Craig	Kyl	Talent
Crapo	Landrieu	Thomas
Daschle	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Dayton	Leahy	Warner
DeWine	Levin	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Miller

The resolution (S. Res. 95) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 95

Whereas Saddam Hussein has failed to comply with United Nations Security Council Resolutions 678, 686, 587, 688, 707, 715, 949, 1051, 1060, 1115, 1134, 1137, 1154, 1194, 1205, 1284, and 1441;

Whereas the military action now underway against Iraq is lawful and fully authorized by the Congress in Sec. 3(a) of Public Law 107-243, which passed the Senate on October 10, 2002, by a vote of 77-23, and which passed the House of Representatives on that same date by a vote of 296-133;

Whereas more than 225,000 men and women of the United States Armed Forces are now involved in conflict against Iraq;

Whereas over 200,000 members of the Reserves and National Guard have been called to active duty for the conflict against Iraq and other purposes; and

Whereas the Senate and the American people have the greatest pride in the men and women of the United States Armed Forces,

and the civilian personnel supporting them, and strongly support them in their efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends and supports the efforts and leadership of the President, as Commander in Chief, in the conflict against Iraq;

(2) commends, and expresses the gratitude of the Nation to all members of the United States Armed Forces (whether on active duty, in the National Guard, or in the Reserves) and the civilian employees who support their efforts, as well as the men and women of civilian national security agencies who are participating in the military oper-

ations in the Persian Gulf region, for their professional excellence, dedicated patriotism and exemplary bravery;

(3) commends and expresses the gratitude of the Nation to the family members of soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and civilians serving in operations against Iraq who have borne the burden of sacrifice and separation from their loved ones;

(4) expresses its deep condolences to the families of brave Americans who have lost their lives in this noble undertaking, over many years, against Iraq;

(5) joins all Americans in remembering those who lost their lives during Operation

Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm in 1991, those still missing from that conflict, including Captain Scott Speicher, USN, and the thousands of Americans who have lost their lives in terrorist attacks over the years, and in the Global War on Terrorism; and

(6) expresses sincere gratitude to British Prime Minister Tony Blair and his government for their courageous and steadfast support, as well as gratitude to other allied nations for their military support, logistical support, and other assistance in the campaign against Saddam Hussein's regime.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of Senate proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's Senate proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 21,
2003

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, March 21. I further ask that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 23, the concurrent budget resolution; provided that the time until 9:45 a.m. be for debate only on the resolution; further, the time be equally divided between the chairman of the

Budget Committee and the ranking member.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, tomorrow the Senate will resume consideration of the budget resolution. At 9:45 tomorrow morning, the Senate will begin a series of votes on the remaining amendments on the budget resolution. There will be a number of amendments to be included in this stacked series of votes, and Members are encouraged to remain in the Chamber during this

very busy session. With the cooperation of all Senators, we will be able to move to a vote on final passage at a reasonable time tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:30 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 21, 2003, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IMPROVING RESULTS FOR CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES ACT

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Improving Education Results for Children with Disabilities Act, which reauthorizes special education programs in our nation's schools. This legislation improves the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to ensure that children with special needs receive the high-quality education they deserve. I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for his assistance in bringing this bill to this point.

For too many years, children with disabilities were denied access to public education. However, with the passage of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act in 1975, the doors of educational opportunity were opened. Today, more than ever, students with disabilities have an opportunity to accomplish their goals. According to the Department of Education, about 6.6 million students currently participate in these programs across the nation. Of those, almost 50 percent of students with disabilities spend 80 percent or more of their day in the regular education classroom. In addition, graduation rates for students with disabilities with a standard diploma are at an all-time high, while drop-out rates continue to fall.

Despite IDEA's many success stories, there is room for improvement in serving children with disabilities. These children are still among those at the greatest risk of being left behind. Now more than ever, we must make sure that children with disabilities are given access to an education that maximizes their unique abilities and provides them with tools for later successful, productive lives. We must continue to be vigilant in our efforts towards improving the quality of education of all children, including children with disabilities. We must shift from the current focus on compliance with bureaucratic rules to ensuring that children with disabilities are making progress and achieving to high expectations so that no child is left behind.

The Improving Education Results for Children with Disabilities Act aims to improve current law by focusing on improved education results, reducing the paperwork burden for special education teachers, and addressing the problem of over identification of minority students as disabled. In addition, this bill seeks to reduce litigation, and reform special education finance and funding.

One of the great benefits of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) is that we have raised expectations and will hold school districts accountable for the annual progress of all their students, including students with disabilities. Although we have made great progress in including students with disabilities in the regular

classroom, we now must make equally great progress in ensuring that they receive a quality education in the regular classroom. We must carefully align the IDEA with NCLB to ensure that students with disabilities are included in the accountability systems of States and school districts.

This bill will help reduce the paperwork burden so that school districts are able to retain and recruit highly qualified special education teachers. The excessive amount of paperwork currently inherent in special education continues to overwhelm and burden teachers, robbing them of time to educate their students. Teachers must have the ability to spend more time in the classroom rather than spending endless hours filling out forms that do not lead to a better education for students.

Furthermore, we are committed to implementing reforms that would reduce the number of students that are misidentified or over represented in special education programs. Minorities are often significantly over represented in special education programs. In fact, African Americans are nearly three times more likely to be labeled as mentally retarded, and almost twice as likely to be labeled emotionally disturbed. Current methods of identifying children with disabilities lack validity or reliability. As a result, thousands of children are inappropriately identified every year, while many others are not identified early enough or at all.

This bill seeks to reduce litigation and restore trust between parents and school districts. All too often miscommunication damages this relationship and results in a proliferation of litigation. We are committed to implementing reforms that provide ample opportunities for positive interaction before a problem becomes serious. We are also committed to ensure that parents are actively involved in their child's education experience. This bill will give parents greater access to be involved in making decisions about their child's education.

Finally, we are very proud of our record in securing the largest funding increases for IDEA over the past 7 years. Since 1995, Congress has nearly tripled federal spending for special education. This bill continues to lead the way in increasing funds for IDEA by creating a path to attain full funding of the federal government's 40 percent goal within 7 years.

We remain committed to build upon reforms already implemented and must keep these challenges in mind as we reauthorize IDEA. I look forward to working with the member of the Committee, other Members of Congress, and stakeholders as we work to craft legislation that will build upon and improve previous reforms and continue to ensure that children with disabilities receive a quality education. I urge my colleagues to join me and the other original co-sponsors in support of the Improving Education Results for Children with Disabilities Act.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DON WILCOX

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Don Wilcox for his outstanding achievements as the president of the Norwood Roping Club of Colorado. Through his leadership, the Roping Club has accomplished much, and it is my distinct honor to stand and recognize Don before this body of Congress and this nation.

The Norwood Roping Club hosts their own rodeo every year and, because of Don and his community's efforts, the size of that rodeo has nearly doubled over the last year. Don aggressively set out to increase the number of sponsors, giving Norwood's rodeo the distinction of having the largest prize money pot in the state. Don's work caught the attention of the Colorado Pro-Rodeo Association, which presented the Norwood club with two awards. Furthermore, the Norwood rodeo now attracts some of the best cowboys in the state. On top of this extraordinary record of success, this year's rodeo will be sanctioned by rodeo associations in New Mexico and Arizona, bringing cowboys from three states to Norwood for the competition. Despite his important role in the advancement of Norwood's rodeo, Don remains a humble man, giving much of the credit to the community.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to recognize Don Wilcox and congratulate him on his accomplishments. His dedication to preserving our Western heritage through his club's rodeo is a credit to himself, the Norwood Roping Club, and the community of Norwood. Don possesses a cowboy's determined spirit, and it is truly an honor to acknowledge his success before this body of Congress and this nation. Keep on riding, Don.

HONORING DEE AND BEN
GETTLER AS THEY ARE HON-
ORED BY THE OHIO CANCER RE-
SEARCH ASSOCIATES

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dee and Ben Gettler, good friends and distinguished constituents, who will be honored for their community service and commitment to cancer research on April 10, 2003, by the Ohio Cancer Research Associates. Dee and Ben's devotion to community and national organizations is legion.

Dee was born in Troy, New York, and graduated from the College of William and Mary. She has served Cincinnati as Chairman of the Women's Committee for the Cincinnati Ballet; President of the Umbrella Board and the

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Board of Trustees for the Seven Hills School; Business Manager for Conversation in the Arts; and Out of Town Chairman for the Cincinnati Opera; President of the Parents Organization for Anderson High School; Member of the Advisory Council for Indian Hill Schools; Board Member for the University of Cincinnati College of Nursing; and Chairman of the University of Cincinnati Presidents Ball. She has been President of the Women's Armed Forces Memorial and is a lifetime member of Hadasah.

Ben is an attorney and manufacturing company executive. Born in Louisville, Kentucky, he graduated from the University of Cincinnati with high honors in economics. In 1945, Ben received his J.D. from Harvard University and was selected as a Frankfurter Scholar. He served to the rank of Captain in the U.S. Army in 1955–56. From 1973 through 1987, Ben practiced law with Gettler, Katz and Buckley in Cincinnati, and is a member of the Ohio and U.S. Supreme Court bars. Currently, he is Chairman of the Board of Vulcan International Corporation, which is listed on the American Stock Exchange.

Ben served as Chairman of the Board of the University of Cincinnati, has been a Member of the Board of Trustees since January, 1984, and is a member of the Presidential Search Committee. He is Chairman of the Jewish Foundation of Cincinnati, and was Chairman of Cincinnati's Jewish Hospital for five years. Ben was National Chairman of the Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs (JINSA) from 1994–98 and is currently Chairman of its Policy Committee. He is also a Trustee of the Southwest Ohio Regional Transit Authority.

All of us congratulate Dee and Ben as they are honored by Ohio Cancer Research Associates and thank them for their commitment to our community.

IN HONOR OF DONNA
RUTHERFORD

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished Californian, Donna Rutherford, as she is inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame.

Donna Rutherford was one of thirteen children who learned early in life the values of work, sharing and helping others. A mother of three, she became active in her children's schools as a parent volunteer, working to improve education for all children. This led to her being elected a Trustee of the Ravenswood City School District, a position she held for 12 years. In 2000, she became a member of the City Council of the City of East Palo Alto and she currently serves as the City's Vice Mayor.

Donna Rutherford worked in the food services industry for many years and became a part-time cook at Mateo Lodge's Wally's Place. She was promoted two years later to Social Rehab Coordinator and now serves as Wally's Place's Program Administrator where she supervises counseling staff and the care and management of the facility.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Donna Rutherford as she is inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame.

CHILD PORNOGRAPHY

HON. MARK FOLEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker. I rise today to talk about a very disturbing issue to all Americans—child pornography. As co-chair of the Congressional Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus, I have been working for years with my colleagues, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, the U.S. Attorney General and the U.S. Customs Service, to eliminate child pornography from the Internet.

Child pornography was a worldwide industry that was all but eradicated in the 1980's. Unfortunately it has resurfaced with a vengeance thanks to computer technology and the Internet—thus requiring those who fight this crime to come up with new ways and seek new allies in our war to save our children. I am pleased to report that Visa U.S.A. (Visa), one of the world's largest credit card companies, has recently begun a program to try to stave off this ever-rising tide of child smut.

Visa's program is designed to put a stranglehold on this growing illegal industry by going after the one thing that keeps it going—money. The way Visa's program works and what it does is pretty amazing, so I'd like to share it with you.

Using sophisticated technical and forensic software tools, they identify sites that advertise that they accept Visa for payment. In fact, Visa's system monitors up to one million Web pages every day. Merchants dealing in child pornography are then reported back to Visa. Tests are conducted to determine who the merchant is and who owns the website and to trace the transaction trail. What this means is that child pornographers will no longer be able to hide by moving from site to site, because they will be found if they post Visa as their payment method. Visa acceptance privileges are terminated and finally—and I like this part the best—Visa and law enforcement officials throughout the world work together to either establish or support criminal investigations.

The results of Visa's monitoring system represent an invaluable intelligence contribution to the FBI's Innocent Images Program, a multi-agency investigative initiative to combat the proliferation of child pornography and exploitation over the Internet. I can tell you that the Innocent Images Program has been highly successful in identifying and investigating the people involved in this predatory crime. And when the FBI gets this level of cooperation from industry, the program becomes even more efficient and effective.

Such cooperation is encouraging and provides a fine example to our friends in private industry of how they can play a role in partnership with government and law enforcement agencies. While we here in Congress must continue to work for legislation that will take away avenues for the merchants who traffic in this abhorrent trade, we must actively seek out new partnerships with the private sector to find additional ways to drive child pornography from the Internet and to protect the interests of children worldwide.

HONORING FRANK BOYER

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Colonel Frank Boyer of Colorado Springs, Colorado for his extraordinary service to this country. After joining the United States Air Force, Col. Boyer sacrificed his career as a jet fighter pilot to pursue nine years of medical training, eventually becoming an Air Force surgeon. That career change was especially important in the winter of 2001, when Col. Boyer was instrumental in saving the lives of seventeen young soldiers injured during their service in Afghanistan. Today I am privileged to honor Col. Boyer for his service before this body of Congress and this nation.

In October 2001, Col. Boyer and his team of seventy doctors, nurses and medical staff from the Air Force Academy set up a combat hospital in Oman to support American troops fighting for Operation Enduring Freedom. Just forty-five days later, a B-52 dropped an errant bomb on a group of American Special Operations fighters in Afghanistan, killing three and wounding twenty, many severely.

On that day, seventeen of the injured soldiers were rushed to Col. Boyer's military hospital. Every one of them survived. Col. Boyer and his team worked for thirty-six continuous hours, performing twenty-three surgeries, including four life-saving procedures. For this exceptional effort under extreme pressure, Col. Boyer received the Bronze Star.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to recognize Col. Frank Boyer for his outstanding service to the United States of America. I want to thank him on behalf of this nation and this Congress for his calm leadership through a chaotic and frightening incident. Seventeen young soldiers owe their lives to Col. Boyer and his medical team. All of our nation is in Col. Boyer's debt.

IN HONOR OF VICKI SMOTHERS

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished Californian, Vicki Smothers, as she is inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame.

As Vice President of Free at Last's Board of Directors, Vicki Smothers has devoted herself to treating substance abuse and its tragic effects on the people of our community. She has been with this highly effective, grassroots organization which specializes in community recovery and rehabilitation from its inception. She was also one of the cofounders of the East Palo Alto AIDS Task Force.

Vicki Smothers is Community Programs Specialist for Prenatal Advantage where she coordinates prenatal services and counsels teen mothers in an effort to reduce infant mortality rates. A long-time East Palo Alto resident, she has a keen awareness of the needs of the community and is devoted to assisting others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Vicki Smothers as she is inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame.

END UNFAIR PUNISHMENT OF
STUDENT ATHLETES

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as we all prepare for college basketball's "March Madness" this month, I am introducing a bill, the Student Athlete Fairness Act, along with Representative ROB ANDREWS, to deal with another kind of madness. Recently a number of institutions of higher education have penalized student basketball players for misconduct, by banning them from post-season intercollegiate play. I support actions by colleges and universities to hold their coaches and players accountable when they engage in misconduct of any kind. Recruiting violations, academic fraud and financial improprieties have no place in college or college sports, and deserve punishment.

However, these particular institutions are penalizing the wrong student athletes—students who were not involved in any wrongdoing. In one case, Fresno State University is barring an entire basketball team from post-season intercollegiate play for the transgressions of previous players and coaches, even though none of the current student athletes or coaches were involved in the wrongdoing at all.

We can no longer allow colleges and universities to penalize innocent student athletes. Instead institutions of higher education must focus their efforts on the guilty parties.

The Student Athlete Fairness Act would prohibit colleges from penalizing players or coaches who had no involvement in a rules violation and would also prohibit colleges and universities from being affiliated with intercollegiate associations, like the NCAA, whose policies might include sanctioning players, teams and/or coaches even if they were not involved in any rules violation.

While many schools and teams work hard to follow the rules that are intended to preserve a quality academic and campus life alongside a vibrant athletic program, some schools have chosen to make innocent students scapegoats for the actions of runaway athletic programs that give win-loss records more priority than ethics and fair play.

An integral ingredient of the college and university mission is to foster both the academic and personal development of their students—from civic engagement and community service, where students learn how to become active participants in democracy, to team athletics, where students gain valuable leadership experience. These objectives are severely undermined when students are punished harshly, in ways that can significantly affect their future careers and earnings, for violations of rules by others. This kind of substitute punishment has no place in our courts, and it should have no place in our colleges and universities either.

The Student Athlete Fairness Act would make certain that the coaches, school officials, or students who break the rules are the ones

who are punished. Innocent student athletes should be free to play ball.

CHILD ABDUCTION PREVENTION
ACT

HON. CAROLYN MCCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, in October 2002, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention released a report entitled the National Incidence Studies of Missing, Abducted, Runaway, and Thrownaway Children, which estimate there are almost 800,000 reported cases of missing children. This equates to over 11 children per 1000 in the U.S. that are missing. Worse yet are the hundreds of thousands of missing children that are not reported. While a large number of missing children are runaways, too many are missing due to abduction. One way to decrease this number is to pass H.R. 1104, the Child Abduction Prevention Act. H.R. 1104 is better known as America's Missing: Broadcast Emergency Response Plan, the AMBER Alert.

Currently, the AMBER alert is a voluntary partnership between law-enforcement agencies and broadcasters to activate an urgent bulletin in case of child abduction. Almost 40 states have established AMBER alerts. Since the program began a little over six years ago, the AMBER alert has been credited with the recovery of 47 children. If the plan were implemented nationwide, with federal funding, the possibilities of recovering more children increase exponentially.

As a parent and a grandparent, I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same, our children deserve it!

PAYING TRIBUTE TO SARA FISHER

HON. SCOTT MCINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise before this body of Congress and this nation today to recognize Mrs. Sara Fisher of Gypsum, Colorado. As Sara prepares to step down from her position as the Eagle County Clerk and Recorder, it is clear that the people of Eagle County are lucky to have benefited from Sara's years of service.

The job of Clerk and Recorder has presented many challenges during Sara's tenure. Since she first took office the population of the county has more than doubled. Sara modernized the county's voting system, streamlined the process of obtaining basic services, and increased staff at satellite offices. Sara, who speaks Spanish fluently, has worked to increase the number of bilingual office staff to better serve her diverse community. Throughout her service as Clerk and Recorder, Sara has always had a positive attitude about serving the people of her county. Sara serves because she loves her community, and that shows in her dedication and hard work. The people who have been fortunate enough to

have worked with Sara while she has been the Clerk and Recorder all know that she is a true asset to Eagle County, and an excellent public servant.

After more than a decade of service, Sara has recently built a new home in Gypsum and is looking forward to spending more time with her husband, Bill, and enjoying the beautiful landscape of Colorado. Throughout all of the challenges that Sara has faced, she has been a strong and competent leader in both Eagle County and throughout the state.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to pay tribute to Mrs. Sara Fisher before this body of Congress and this nation. She has been a diligent servant of Eagle County and her commitment to her community will be greatly missed.

IN HONOR OF MILDRED SWANN

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished Californian, Mildred Swann, as she is inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame.

Mildred Swann organized a neighborhood forum where people of different ethnic heritages gathered to share their experiences and aspirations. She engaged many volunteers in the effort that resulted in the formation of a tutoring and mentoring program for Tongan Youth. She serves as the Facilities Chair of Community Gatepath, and in this position she led the campaign to decrease dependence on shrinking government funding while maintaining the quality of the organization's programs. She also helped Community Gatepath to work with San Mateo County to identify high-risk MediCal families and provide them with prenatal care and parenting skills.

Mildred Swann has served her community in many ways and with many organizations, and has been honored by Menlo College for her contributions to the community. She was also recognized by Foothill College Haramba for her service to youth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Mildred Swann as she is inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame.

AMBER ALERT CONCERNS

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as an OB-GYN who has had the privilege of bringing over 3,000 children into the world, I share the desire to punish severely those who sexually abuse children. In fact, it is hard to imagine someone more deserving of life in prison than one who preys on children. Therefore, I certainly support those parts of H.R. 1104 which enhance the punishment for those convicted of federal crimes involving sexual assaults on children.

I also support the provisions increasing the post-incarceration supervision of sex offenders. However, given the likelihood that a sex

offender will attempt to commit another sex crime, it is reasonable to ask why rapists and child molesters are not simply imprisoned for life?

However, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that making the AMBER Alert system a Federal program is neither constitutionally sound nor effective law enforcement. All Americans should be impressed at the demonstrated effectiveness of the AMBER system in locating missing and kidnapped children. However, I would ask my colleagues to consider that one of the factors that makes the current AMBER system so effective is that the AMBER Alert system is not a Federal program. Instead, states and local governments developed AMBER Alerts on their own, thus ensuring that each AMBER system meets the unique needs of individual jurisdictions. Once the AMBER Alert system becomes a one-size-fits all Federal program (with standards determined by DC-based bureaucrats instead of community-based law enforcement officials) local officials will not be able to tailor the AMBER Alert to fit their unique circumstances. Thus, nationalizing the AMBER system will cause this important program to lose some of its effectiveness.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1104 also exceeds Congress' constitutional authority by criminalizing travel with the intent of committing a crime. As appalling as it is that some would travel abroad to engage in activities that are rightly illegal in the United States, legislation of this sort poses many problems and offers few solutions. First among these problems is the matter of national sovereignty. Those who travel abroad and break the law in their host country should be subject to prosecution in that country; it is the responsibility of the host country—not the U.S. Congress—to uphold its own laws. It is a highly unique proposal to suggest that committing a crime in a foreign country against a non-US citizen is within the jurisdiction of the United States Government.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation makes it a Federal crime to "travel with intent to engage in illicit sexual conduct." I do not think this is a practical approach to the problem. It seems that this bill actually seeks to probe the conscience of anyone who seeks to travel abroad to make sure they do not have illegal or immoral intentions. Is it possible or even advisable to make thoughts and intentions illegal? And how is this to be carried out? Should Federal agents be assigned to each travel agency to probe potential travelers as to the intent of their travel?

At a time when Federal resources are stretched to the limit, American troops are preparing for imminent military conflict, and when we are not even able to keep known terrorists out of our own country, this bill would require Federal agents to not only track Americans as they vacation abroad, but would also require that they be able to divine the intentions of these individuals who seek to travel abroad. Talk about a tall order! As well-intentioned as I am sure this legislation is, I do not believe that it is a practical or well-thought-out approach to what I agree is a serious and disturbing problem. Perhaps a better approach would be to share with those interested countries our own laws and approaches to prosecuting those who commit these kinds of crimes, so as to see more effective capture and punishment of these criminals in the countries where the crime is committed.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, while H.R. 1104 has some good provisions aimed at enhancing

the penalties of those who commit the most heinous of crimes, it also weakens the effective AMBER Alert program by nationalizing it. H.R. 542 also raises serious civil liberties and national sovereignty concerns by criminalizing intent and treating violations of criminal law occurring in other countries' jurisdictions as violations of American criminal law.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO BUZZ ZANCANELLA

HON. SCOTT MCINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Buzz Zancanella, an outstanding individual who has dedicated his life to serving Glenwood Springs, Colorado. For the past thirty-six years, Buzz has worked in his community, most recently as a water maintenance coordinator. After a long and successful career, Buzz has decided to retire. As he looks forward to retirement, I would like to take this time to highlight his service to his community.

Buzz is a native of Glenwood Springs who graduated from Garfield County High School in 1958 and began serving Glenwood Springs as a volunteer firefighter in 1959. In 1961, Buzz left home to fight for his country, serving honorably in the Navy. It was also at this time that Buzz met his wife, Gracie. When Buzz returned to Glenwood Springs in 1966, he began his long career with the city, working for the city's electric company. Later, in 1977, Buzz became the city's fire chief and remained in that role until 1985 when he began working for the Glenwood Springs Water Department. Buzz is now known as the go-to guy in the city of Glenwood Springs. His service has been much appreciated and he will be truly missed.

Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to stand and recognize Buzz Zancanella before this Congress and this nation. Public servants work tirelessly to ensure that our communities are run safely and smoothly. Their service and dedication deserves our recognition and thanks. That is why I recognize Buzz Zancanella as he retires from his many years of service to his community. I wish you all the best Buzz.

IN HONOR OF RUTH-E BENNISON

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished Californian, Ruth-e Bennison, as she is inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame.

Ruth-e Bennison received a Masters degree in accounting from the University of Washington and worked as an accountant until her marriage in 1956. She later opened her own travel agency, began to travel extensively herself and became the Western Regional Manager for Sheraton Hotels. When her mother became ill and entered a nursing home, she developed a keen interest in long-term care facilities. She became a volunteer in the long-

term care ombudsman program in San Mateo County and she has selflessly dedicated more than 15,000 hours to the program over 15 years. Ruth-e Bennison has also given generously of her time and talents as a HICAP volunteer and has given 5,200 volunteer hours to this agency. She's been honored for her work by the Department of Health and Human Services and was honored with the HICAP Excellence Award in 2002 for saving San Mateo County more than \$5 million in Medicare related expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Ruth-e Bennison as she is inducted into the San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame.

HONORING CITY OF LIVONIA FIRE- FIGHTER OF THE YEAR, FIRE- FIGHTER MATTHEW MAURIER

HON. THADDEUS G. MCCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated Michigan resident, Firefighter Matthew Maurier, recently named City of Livonia Firefighter of the Year. Firefighter Maurier has served the City of Livonia with great pride and courage since 1995.

On September 16, 2002, Firefighter Maurier answered a call to a pedestrian injury accident. Upon arrival, he found a young male patient lying in the roadway who suffered significant head trauma and multiple fractures requiring immediate attention. Realizing the patient's airway was compromised as a result of his injuries, Firefighter Maurier began aggressive intervention to ventilate the patient. Recognizing the patient would require the services of a Trauma Center for definitive treatment, Firefighter Maurier immediately requested a helicopter for transport. This action saved considerable time the patient would not have otherwise had available.

Mr. Speaker, Firefighter Matthew Maurier is a hero to the people of Livonia, Michigan and the United States. I extend my sincere appreciation to him for making our community a better place.

THE NORTH MYRTLE BEACH BILLBOARD EFFORT

HON. HENRY E. BROWN, JR.

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and praise the actions of the North Myrtle Beach Republican Club. Their efforts to raise community support and money to erect billboards around their city to show support for President Bush and the American soldiers stationed in the Middle East have been outstanding. The diverse group of community members, comprised of business owners, attorneys, doctors, retirees, and elected officials, have come together under the direction of Ms. Cleo Steele to respond to the numerous anti-American protests held world wide, nationally, and even in the community of

Myrtle Beach. Believing that the media gives a one-sided and distraught view, Ms. Steele gave birth to the idea after hearing of a similar program in Louisville, Kentucky. The group focuses on the ideas that the anti-Bush, anti-war mentality is currently in the minority, and that regardless of the circumstances, American troops need all the support that can be mustered during this crucial time. Within an hour of making her first phone call, Ms. Steele already had the backing of ten people, and the total force has increased since then. I am proud of the efforts of the North Myrtle Beach Republican Club and wish to applaud their actions. In my opinion, they are the epitome of American patriotism, and their zeal should give hope to all who call themselves Americans.

HONORING CITY OF LIVONIA FIREFIGHTER OF THE YEAR, MICHAEL BAILEY

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated Michigan resident, Firefighter Michael Bailey, recently named City of Livonia Firefighter of the Year. Firefighter Bailey has served the City of Livonia with great pride and courage since 1995.

On September 16, 2002, Firefighter Bailey answered a call to a pedestrian injury accident. Upon arrival, he found a young male patient lying in the roadway who suffered significant head trauma and multiple fractures requiring immediate attention. Realizing the patient's airway was compromised as a result of his injuries, Firefighter Bailey began aggressive intervention to ventilate the patient. Recognizing the patient would require the services of a Trauma Center for definitive treatment, Firefighter Bailey immediately requested a helicopter for transport. This action saved considerable time the patient would not have had available.

Mr. Speaker, Firefighter Bailey is a hero to the people of Livonia, Michigan and the United States. I extend my sincere appreciation to Firefighter Bailey for making our community a safer place.

A CALL FOR PRAYER ON THE EVE OF WAR

HON. JO BONNER

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening on what may be the eve of war. Like so many Americans, my prayers are with our men and women in uniform who so bravely and honorably prepare to fight the evils in this world in order to insure the continued safety and wellbeing of friends, family and citizens of this great Nation. On this day, my thoughts are also with our President and our other leaders of this great Nation upon whose shoulders the burden of these decisions falls.

I was recently given a prayer written by Jeff Stewart, a close personal friend and lay leader

at St. Paul's Episcopal Church in Mobile Alabama. The following prayer will be delivered at an ecumenical service in Mobile with the cooperation of four local churches.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in lifting this prayer to our Lord God in hopes that it will provide strength and reassurance to our President and our armed forces.

"Help us, Lord, not be anxious about anything." During this time of pending war and the death that will surely come to our Service men, women and civilians. Give us Your peace and the power to invoke Your love and strength, "but in everything by prayer and petition with thanksgiving, we present our request to You" that those that will lose their lives will find the comfort of Your presence and Your peace. "O God which transcends all understanding, guard their hearts and minds in Christ Jesus." (Phil. 4: 6-7)

We seek not war but peace and we know that You, O God, can bring peace if it is Your will; therefore, we put our trust in You and we know that "You are the Lord, the God of all mankind. And nothing is too difficult for you." (Jer 32:37) Amen.

Be sober, be vigilant, because our adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour. As we seek to do God's will, we must deliberately make ourselves subject one to another and be clothed with humility, for God resisteth the proud and giveth the grace to be humbled. Humble yourself therefore under the mighty hand of God, that He may exalt us in due time, casting all our cares upon Him, for He careth for us all.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Jeff Stewart for this thoughtful prayer and the comfort it provides during these times of needed guidance and wisdom—words from the heart and words from which we may all benefit.

HONORING MICHIGAN STATE TROOPER OF THE YEAR, D/SGT. EVERETT TORLEY

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated Michigan resident, D/Sgt. Everett Torley, recently named City of Livonia Michigan State Trooper of the Year. D/Sgt. Torley has distinguished himself as an outstanding resource for the criminal justice community in southeast Michigan.

His knowledge in his field of service is unsurpassed in this state. He is one of only three persons in the State of Michigan trained and certified in forensic video clarification by the FBI. Those skills have been used to solve numerous crimes, most recently ending a string of local robberies.

As a testament of his expertise, D/Sgt. Torley has been asked to serve as an instructor at the FBI Academy in the Law Enforcement Video Association. As an instructor, D/Sgt. Torley will be instrumental in teaching forensic video clarification to law enforcement officers around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my sincere appreciation to D/Sgt. Everett Torley for making our state and our country a safer place.

HONORING THE CITY OF LIVONIA POLICE OFFICER OF THE YEAR BRIAN DUFFANY

HON. THADDEUS G. McCOTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a dedicated Michigan resident, Police Officer Brian Duffany, recently named City of Livonia Police Officer of the Year. Officer Duffany has served the City of Livonia with great pride and courage since 1991.

On January 14, 2002, Officer Duffany received a dispatch call stating a robbery had taken place at a nearby restaurant. While on patrol, Officer Duffany observed a vehicle and driver matching the bulletin's description and attempted to stop the vehicle for questioning. The suspect attempted to flee, but after striking two civilian cars the chase continued on foot. Officer Duffany quickly apprehended the suspect, who was still carrying a revolver in his pants pocket.

Mr. Speaker, Officer Brian Duffany is a hero to the people of Livonia, Michigan and the United States. I extend my sincere appreciation to him for making our community a safer place.

CONGRATULATING MR. CHARLES J. TODD

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Court Security Officer (CSO) Charles J. Todd for his quick thinking and courage in his recent arrest of a wanted criminal. His quick actions have earned him the U.S. Marshal's CSO of the Year Award.

On July 9, 2002, a violent homicide was committed in the city of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. Three suspects were charged in the homicide and two were arrested immediately. The third suspect, Francis Kelly, remained at large. On July 12, CSO Todd viewed a wanted poster for the third suspect at the beginning of his shift. Later that day, Todd observed an individual who met Kelly's description, as the subject was walking toward him down a street with heavy pedestrian traffic. CSO Todd used a ruse to get the subject to identify himself and then detained him until back-up units arrived.

CSO Todd's attention to detail and dedication to duty and bravery deprived Francis Kelly the opportunity to kill again. CSO Todd's actions were not only a positive reflection on himself and the Court Security Officer program, but also on the United States Marshals Service.

Mr. Speaker, CSO Todd has clearly displayed his bravery and sense of duty in this action. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking him for his commitment to excellence and his desire to see justice carried out. I would also like to ask my colleagues to join me in wishing him good fortune in his new position as Site Supervisor with the CSO contracting firm.

A TRIBUTE TO MADGE JENNINGS
OVERHOUSE**HON. ZOE LOFGREN**

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, today we rise to recognize the achievements and life of Madge Jennings Overhouse. We have had the privilege of knowing Madge for many years, and can personally attest to her lasting legacy of achievement through selfless volunteerism. Hers is the epitome of a life dedicated to public service.

Madge Jennings Overhouse was born in July 29, 1924 in The Dalles, Oregon, and soon moved to San Jose. She attended San Jose State University, graduating cum laude with honors in history. Madge married Howard Overhouse in 1949, and they have one son, Richard, and three lovely grandchildren.

Marge's career as a librarian spanned almost 40 years and two institutions. She started out at San Jose State, then moved to San Jose Community College. Typical of Madge, she assumed a leadership role in her profession, serving on the Santa Clara County Library Commission from 1976 to 1982, as well as serving on the California Library Agency for Systems and Services from 1979 to 1984, representing Santa Clara County as an alternate for Supervisor Rod Diridon. Madge also served on the Steering Committee for the Master Plan of California Libraries.

Madge's contributions to the community throughout her lifetime are legion, and the list of civic organizations that Madge has helped is long. We would like to take a moment to talk about them here. Madge was one of the first women to serve on the Executive Board of the Santa Clara County chapter of the Boy Scouts of America. The Santa Clara County Fair Association benefited from Madge's input as a Board member from 1987 to 1995. Madge also served on the boards of the Iota Delta Chapter of the Chi Omega sorority and the Campbell Historical Preservation Board. Madge is also a long-time member of the San Jose Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce. In addition, Madge lent her talents to the Multi-Modal Transportation Task Force, which led to the completion of Highway 85, which is now a major transportation artery in the Bay Area. During my time on the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, Madge's support on important measures such as this, which often meant doing the "leg-work" that no one else volunteered to do, was instrumental on so many occasions.

Madge has an absolutely amazing record of political involvement. For more than thirty years, Madge has been a stalwart in the Democratic Party at the local, state, and national level. Madge has fostered and encouraged the careers of numerous public officials in California.

Madge's lifelong commitment to volunteerism has been honored by almost every civic organization in Santa Clara County, and we are delighted to offer our heartfelt congratulations and gratitude to Madge for a lifetime of public service achievement.

RECOGNIZING THREE TALENTED
RHODE ISLAND EDUCATORS**HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN**

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of three talented and committed educators from Rhode Island. These outstanding teachers have been selected to receive the 2003 Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching.

The Presidential Award for Excellence in Math and Science Teaching was established in 1983 by the White House and is sponsored by the National Science Foundation. Each year, NSF identifies educators from the 50 states and 4 U.S. territories as leaders in the improvement of science and mathematics education. These educators are awarded a \$7,500 grant from the National Science Foundation and a Presidential citation and serve as role models for their communities and colleagues. Additionally, the grants allow them to continue inspiring their students through innovative teaching.

This year, the winners from my district are Ms. Ann Simonelli from Holden Elementary School in Warwick, Mr. Daniel Potts from Chariho Middle School in Wood River Junction, and Ms. Susan Osberg from North Kingstown High School. Ms. Simonelli has been teaching for 22 years, Mr. Potts for 12 years, and Ms. Osberg for 37 years. Their dedication to educating the leaders of tomorrow is laudable. As the United States works to improve its international rankings for math and science education, it is important to reward teachers who excel in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, I find it heartening that there are educators in this country who devote so much time and effort to shaping the minds of our young people. I hope you and our colleagues will join me in recognizing and congratulating these outstanding teachers on receiving this prestigious award.

PENN STATE MONT ALTO 100TH
ANNIVERSARY**HON. BILL SHUSTER**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Penn State Mont Alto for its 100th Anniversary as a well respected institution of learning. When this institution was first established, in May 1903 by the governor of Pennsylvania, it was known as the Pennsylvania State Forest Academy in Mont Alto. The academy was only the third forestry school in the entire nation, behind Yale and Biltmore respectively. The school was founded by Dr. Joseph T. Rothrock to train men for service in

the state forests. To this day, the Forest Academy still educates America's foresters in addition to students in many other academic programs.

The earliest goal of the academy was to reforest much of the surrounding land, especially in areas made barren by forest fires and charcoal production. On Arbor Day in 1905, the academy's first administrator, George Wirt assigned students to search for native tree species not found on campus. These students returned with over 400 specimens reflecting 30 different varieties of species. These collected specimens were the beginning of the Mont Alto arboretum. An arboretum that to this day continues to provide a training ground for students, as well as a research site for the development of new hybrids.

The Pennsylvania State Forest Academy in Mont Alto has been constantly evolving throughout its history. In 1929, the academy merged with the Pennsylvania State College (now University) becoming one of the Commonwealth campuses. At that time, the campus was used only for the first year of training for Penn State forestry students. The students would then complete their three remaining years at the main campus in University Park. The campus continued to grow and by 1963 the first one or two years of most Penn State majors were being offered at the Mont Alto campus. The school completed its evolution in 1997, when students were able to earn their baccalaureate degrees at the Penn State Mont Alto campus.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in commending Penn State Mont Alto for its 100 years of commitment and dedication to providing a quality education to so many young people.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

HON. RICHARD BURR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States gives the other body the responsibility for confirming, in a fair and just manner, judicial nominees chosen by the President. Unfortunately in the current political climate, qualified nominees are being held captive, causing a vacancy crisis in the federal judiciary.

Injecting ideology into the confirmation process is misguided at best and downright irresponsible at worst. The American people expect better out of their elected officials. There is a drastic shortage of judges in the federal court system, Mr. Speaker. With every passing day that these nominations are allowed to stagnate in the other body, the crisis worsens. These vacancies are denying swift and balanced justice for the American people.

This problem must be addressed in a non-partisan way by placing well-qualified and experienced judges on the bench in an expedient manner. The President has thus far fulfilled his duty by nominating well-qualified men and women to the federal bench. It is long past time for my colleagues in the other body to act.

HONORING CHRISTOPHER COX FOR
HIS SERVICE**HON. MIKE ROGERS**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of America's finest public servants, and my good friend, Mr. Christopher C. Cox.

Chris, who recently departed as my Chief of Staff in order to serve President George W. Bush, exemplifies the finest qualities of the men and women who serve the members of this legislative body. Chris is a man of great integrity, loyalty, intellect, and is dedicated to the best interests of the United States.

It is this selfless service to his government that sets Chris apart from others in his generation. Turning down the lucrative practice of law following his graduation from the University of Illinois School of Law, Chris came to Capitol Hill to be a participant, rather than a mere spectator, in our democracy.

During his service on the Hill, Chris has been a tireless advocate for common-sense conservative government and a key player in the effort to maintain a Republican majority in the House of Representatives. In addition to serving as a trusted advisor to my staff and I, Chris honorably served Congressmen ROBIN HAYES, SAXBY CHAMBLISS and MAC COLLINS.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in wishing Chris well in his new capacity as a Special Assistant to President George W. Bush, and to thank Chris for his years of service in the people's House.

TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE
DON EDWARDS**HON. ZOE LOFGREN**

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, today we rise to recognize the achievements and life of former Congressman Don Edwards. We are proud to have known Representative Edwards for many years.

Born and raised in San Jose, California, Representative Edwards received his bachelor's degree from Stanford University where he later studied law. He became an F.B.I. agent during the Depression, and went on to serve in the U.S. Navy as an intelligence officer and gunnery officer at sea in World War II.

He was first elected to represent what was then California's 9th Congressional District in 1962. In Congress, Representative Edwards served on the House Judiciary Committee and for 23 years he served as the Chairman of the

Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights. He also sat on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Last year, Representative Edwards received the American Bar Association's Thurgood Marshall Award for his "unswerving devotion to the Constitution and its values throughout his career."

One of the foremost defenders of civil liberties in Congress, Representative Edwards in the 1970s—along with Senator Frank Church and his committee—exposed the pervasive abuses of civil liberties in J. Edgar Hoover's COINTEL PRO, which monitored, infiltrated and disrupted entirely lawful civil rights and anti-war organizations. He also fought to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Representative Edwards was one of the first seven Members of the House of Representatives to oppose the Vietnam War in 1965 and became a leader in the anti-war movement.

In the 1960s he was floor leader of the Omnibus Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Rights Amendment. Outside of Congress, he took part in civil rights marches in the South; visited Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. in the Birmingham, Alabama jail and spoke against apartheid while visiting South Africa.

Every year, he introduced an ERA bill to the House, and in 1989, he argued "women are entitled to their birthright to full rights of citizenship."

In 1968, he introduced legislation creating the San Francisco Bay Wildlife Refuge. With the efforts of other Bay Area Representatives, he was instrumental in establishing the largest urban wildlife refuge in the country. The Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge covers 25,902 acres and spans 12 cities and 3 counties.

Representative Don Edwards left a legacy in Congress of supporting civil rights, advocating for those less fortunate in our society and being a strong defender of our Constitution. He is a visionary public servant and a valued friend.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 2003, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting with my constituents, and was unable to vote in rollcall vote No. 71. Had I been able to vote, I would have voted "no."

SUPPORT FOR BAN ON PARTIAL-
BIRTH ABORTION**HON. RICHARD BURR**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a ban on the partial-birth abortion procedure. I firmly believe in the sanctity of human life, and am pleased that my colleagues in the other body have taken this necessary step to protect an unborn child's right to life.

I am pleased to be a supporter and cosponsor of the House version of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban, H.R. 760. I urge my colleagues to consider the lives of thousands of unborn children each year that are terminated by this callous procedure, children who would be spared by the swift passage of this measure. Beyond H.R. 760, I urge my colleagues to support legislation that further protects the rights of unborn children.

I am encouraged that there is great momentum in banning partial-birth abortions, and I am hopeful that the House of Representatives will be able to quickly pass this bill. With passage of legislation outlawing this barbaric practice, we will be taking a significant step in protecting innocent children.

COMMENDING CARPENTER
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**HON. MIKE ROGERS**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Carpenter Elementary School for being named a Michigan Blue Ribbon Exemplary School. This award is given to those elementary schools that exemplify educational excellence. It is designed to identify and give public recognition to outstanding schools that achieve high academic standards, to make available a comprehensive framework of key criteria for school effectiveness, and to communicate best practices for educational success among Michigan schools.

Through hard work and dedication, Carpenter Elementary has met those criteria. It provides year-round education for its students, and even holds, "intercessions," which are optional five day theme-based learning experiences made available during vacation periods. By using this format, the school reduces time spent in review, enhances student retention of learning, and improves student and staff attitude and attendance.

Mr. Speaker, Carpenter Elementary School is to be recognized for earning the Michigan Blue Ribbon Exemplary School Award. They are an example of the tremendous potential elementary schools have to make a difference in the lives of their students. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking the teachers and administration at Carpenter Elementary School for their commitment to excellence and their desire to provide students with a high-quality education. I would also like to ask my colleagues to join me in wishing them good fortune in the future.

INTRODUCING THE INTERMODAL
TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2003**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Intermodal Transportation Act of 2003. This legislation enjoys bipartisan support, and I believe that its inclusion in TEA-21 Reauthorization will significantly enhance our nation's public transportation infrastructure.

We will be facing significant budget restraints in the reauthorization TEA-21 over the next 6 years, and for that reason I believe it is critical to look at ways to maximize our existing transportation assets. One important way we can do this in the realm of public transportation is by connecting the public transportation modes better so that they provide a more accessible and attractive transportation alternative. Public transportation, including intercity bus, intercity rail, local mass transit, and rural transit, serve thousands of communities nationwide, but they are rarely linked together in common facilities and with consolidated travel information. The Intermodal Transportation Act will provide for these missing intermodal connections.

This bill will create a new competitive grant program for intermodal transportation centers, which will provide incentives for states and communities to develop intermodal facilities. These intermodal centers will tie together all public transportation modes in convenient locations, giving public transportation users the ability to make seamless intercity and local trips from origin to destination. Across the country, very little has been invested in intermodal facilities linking the modes of affordable public transportation that the American people rely on everyday. ITA provides benefits to all public transportation riders through dedicated funding for these vital intermodal transportation terminals.

ITA will also create a National Public Transportation Information System so that with one call or website visit, a user can get information on schedules, fares, and locations for the intercity and local transportation services that she will need to make a trip.

ITA also increases funding so that customers using wheelchairs have better access to the intermodal system, thus allowing a mobility-impaired passenger to get on an intercity bus with a wheelchair lift and make accessible connections throughout the country.

In addition to creating a seamless intermodal transportation system, the cost-effective programs in ITA will produce new employment opportunities. These will include not only the construction and operating jobs directly related to the projects, but also new jobs created by the economic development produced by new intermodal transportation hubs in urban areas and through the connections we develop between rural communities and the national airway system.

With a total cost of around \$150 million annually, the Intermodal Transportation Act will create a fully integrated public transportation network throughout the country while also linking hundreds, if not thousands, of rural communities to airports and creating economic development opportunities and new jobs across the country.

I am pleased to introduce these important intermodal proposals with significant bipartisan support. I would especially like to thank JO ANN EMERSON and MICHAEL BURGESS for their strong support of this legislation. I would also like to thank the other original co-sponsors of this legislation: ED CASE, MARTIN FROST, MAJOR OWENS, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, ELEANOR HOLMES-NORTON, RICHARD BAKER, BETTY MCCOLLUM, and JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD. We will work with our fellow colleagues to see that this bill is included in the reauthorization of TEA-21.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MS.
JOYCE WILLIAMS

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ms. Joyce Williams upon her retirement after 37 years of service in the federal government. During her accomplished career, Ms. Williams distinguished herself by aggressively taking on every task assigned and assuming the many associated responsibilities. She consistently exhibited willingness to work as a team player and assumed leadership responsibilities for the good of the Agency.

Beginning her career as a Procurement Clerk at the Defense General Supply Center in Richmond, Virginia, Ms. Williams steadily rose through the ranks till she assumed her current position as Chief of Congressional Affairs Office at the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA). During her tenure as Chief, Ms. Williams innumerable responsibilities included, but were not limited to, managing the liaison operations between DLA and Capitol Hill, monitoring the day-to-day operations of the Congressional Affairs Team, and overseeing the Congressional Hearings process.

On January 26, 2001, the Defense Logistics Agency Headquarters Complex at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, was officially named the Defense Logistics Agency Andrew T. McNamara Complex, a tribute to the Agency's first Director, Lieutenant General Andrew T. McNamara, (Retired). Ms. Williams worked many long hours in conjunction with myself and my staff to enable a special exception to existing law. Buildings on military installations are traditionally named for distinguished individuals, but only posthumously. Due to Ms. Williams diligence, I was able to include language in the fiscal year 2001 National Defense Authorization Act that made the name change.

Throughout her career, Joyce has been rewarded and recognized for her exceptional abilities and sustained the highest level of performance receiving numerous, and letters of appreciation. Joyce's achievements over the course of her 37 year career have been of the quality and level that are clearly deserving of the DLA Distinguished Career Service Award. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to pay tribute to Ms. Williams' lifetime of distinguished service.

INTRODUCTION OF A HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION URGING INCREASED FEDERAL FUNDING FOR JUVENILE (TYPE 1) DIABETES RESEARCH

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce legislation which urges Congress to increase federal funding for Type 1 diabetes, also known as juvenile diabetes.

Type 1 diabetes is a devastating illness that affects over 1 million Americans, many of whom are diagnosed as children. This serious

disease robs children of their innocence and independence, and burdens its victims with a lifetime of finger-sticks, shots, and fear of dreaded complications. Even with a strict regimen of insulin injections, blood-glucose monitoring, diet and exercise, people with Type 1 diabetes are at severe risk for blindness, kidney failure, amputations, heart disease and stroke.

The burden of diabetes is felt by all Americans. Americans spend \$105 billion each year on the direct and indirect costs of this disease. One of every four Medicare dollars is spent on beneficiaries with diabetes, and one in ten health care dollars overall are spent on individuals with this disease.

There is great promise that a cure for Type 1 can be found in the near future. Advancements in genetic research, transplantation and immunology, and research into potential vaccines all hold the potential to eliminate Type 1 diabetes. But if we are to find a cure, we in Congress must find the money to pay for it.

The Diabetes Research Working Group (DRWG), a Congressional appointed panel of experts in diabetes research, issued a report in 1999 that indicates the need for a significant increase in diabetes research. The DRWG recommended a \$4.1 billion increase for diabetes research over a five year period. Congress must heed this report. This legislation I am introducing today recognizes the particular burden of Type 1 diabetes, and the need to follow the recommendations of the DRWG.

Mr. Speaker, full funding for diabetes research will help eradicate this devastating illness, save billions of health care dollars, and end the unnecessary suffering of millions of Americans.

During the previous Congress, this legislation was passed by unanimous consent, but with the pending budget fight and potential cuts to the NIH budget, it is imperative that the Congress raise its voice in support of finding a cure for Type 1 diabetes. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in our fight against this disease.

BANKRUPTCY ABUSE PREVENTION
AND CONSUMER PROTECTION
ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 975) to amend title II of the United States Code, and for other purposes:

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, it is with great regret that I come to the floor in opposition to this bankruptcy bill, H.R. 975.

Last year, I voted for this legislation when it came to the House floor when we had reached a deal with strong legislators on the other side of the aisle, Representative HYDE and Senator HATCH.

Unfortunately, the bill that we are voting on today lacks a critically important provision which would prevent perpetrators of abortion clinic violence from filing for bankruptcy and then avoid paying the fines and penalties assessed against them as a result of their illegal activity.

The Bankruptcy Code's central purpose is to provide a fresh start to the "honest but unfortunate debtor." These debtors are not honest, unfortunate, innocent, or peaceful protestors: They owe fines because of their threats and acts of violence against doctors, clinic staff, and women.

The problem is widespread. Since 1977, there have been over 75,000 acts of violence and/or disruption at the Nation's clinics.

This includes: 7 murders; 17 attempted murders; 41 bombings; 165 arsons; 82 additional failed bombing and arson attempts; 370 physical invasions of personal and business properties; 942 acts of vandalism; 100 butyric acid attacks; 557 anthrax threats, of which 480 happened since September 11, 2001; 122 assaults; 343 death threats; and 3 kidnappings.

Bankruptcy reform is critically important, but without this provision, we will be sending a message to perpetrators of health clinic violence that they can continue to trample on the rights of American women and use violence to do so.

Without this provision, if someone injures or kills someone outside an abortion clinic, they can file for bankruptcy and avoid paying any judgements made against them.

In other words, they are not held financially responsible for violating the law. We must stop these people from violating the law and we must stop them from finding shelter in bankruptcy.

It is for this reason that I cannot vote for this bill.

TRIBUTE TO JIM GRAY

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 2003, Jim Gray, a member of my constituency, was honored with Tennessee's highest artistic award. The Tennessee Arts Commission presented Jim with the Distinguished Artist Award as a part of the 2003 Governor's Awards in the Arts in Nashville, TN.

Jim's artistic drive has been with him his entire life, and he used his talents to guide his career as a young adult as an illustrator, an advertising executive, and as a technical illustrator in the United States Air Force.

After a visit with his family to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in 1966, Jim found an artistic inspiration that he had never felt before. This inspiration led him to move to east Tennessee, where his desire to paint the beauty of the Tennessee countryside became his passion.

Throughout the years, Jim has sold more than 2,000 paintings and 125,000 prints to collectors in the United States and abroad. He has won several other awards, has been commissioned to do many major works, and has held workshops where he has instructed hundreds of students. His two sculptures of President Andrew Johnson are on display at Johnson's hometown of Greeneville, TN and at the Tennessee State Capitol Building in Nashville. Most recently, Jim's painting titled "Rising Above" was purchased as part of the Knoxville Convention Center art collection.

I am proud to display one of Jim's paintings in the entrance of my Washington, D.C. office.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and my fellow colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Jim Gray for his achievements. On April 4th of this year, Jim will again be honored at a reception at the Knoxville Museum of Art, and a copy of this congratulatory statement will be presented to him. I also include here today an article written about Jim from the Knoxville News-Sentinel.

Jim's art continues to be an inspiration to us all and I am pleased today to speak on his behalf.

STATE HONORS 2 OF ITS GREATEST GRACE NOTES

DOLLY PARTON, ARTIST JIM GRAY WIN TENNESSEE'S HIGHEST AWARD FOR ACHIEVEMENT IN ARTS

(By Terry Morrow)

NASHVILLE, Mar. 12, 2003.—A couple of hundred miles away from their beloved Smoky Mountains, singer Dolly Parton and artist Jim Gray found common ground Tuesday night on the stage of Ryman Auditorium.

It was there that the Tennessee Arts Commission paid tribute to them with the 2003 Governor's Awards in the Arts, the state's highest artistic honor. Parton received the Lifetime Achievement Award for numerous musical, educational and thespian achievements. Gray was recognized with a Distinguished Artist Award for his maritime paintings and his part in helping to create the artists' community in Gatlinburg.

Eleven people and three organizations from across the state were honored at the ceremony. Parton, a Nashville resident, and Gray, who lives in Knoxville, attended as did Gov. Phil Bredesen and other state dignitaries, including David Willard, director of Arrowmont School of Arts and Crafts in Gatlinburg, Knox County Commissioner Mary Lou Horner, Randy Tyree and Ted Miller, vice president of Dollywood.

Speaking at the ceremony, Bredesen, who is a painter, said the arts should be able to weather the state's current budget crisis.

Parton was cited not only for her many musical hits but for her educational pursuits in Sevier County. In her native county, Parton boosted the already thriving economy in Pigeon Forge when she retooled Silver Dollar City into Dollywood in the mid-1980s. She later created the Dollywood Foundation and the Imagination Library, which encourages children to read.

"This is called a Lifetime Achievement Award, but I ain't done yet," Parton said, indicating she was working with Bredesen to extend her Imagination Library beyond East Tennessee. Addressing the fact that the award was a "lifetime" award, Parton said, "That makes you feel old. I don't feel old. I don't look that old. As long as I have those surgeons in California, I won't look that old."

In a tribute to Parton, the Peasall sisters sang Parton's hit that many consider her autobiographical single, "Coat of Many Colors." The sisters, who are from Whitehouse, were part of the "O Brother, Where Art Thou?" soundtrack and appeared in the film.

Others receiving the Distinguished Artist Award were Chattanooga musician Roland Carter and Memphis sculptor Luther Hampton. Ralph Blizzard, a legendary old-time fiddler from Blountville, won the Folk Heritage Award.

Parton and Gray were noted for their particular contributions in East Tennessee. Many of Parton's songs are based on her East Tennessee childhood. Gray's work often includes majestic scenes of the Great Smoky Mountains. Moving from Mobile, Ala., in 1966 to Gatlinburg, Gray aided in creating the city's arts and crafts community.

Thanking his wife Fran, his three children and seven grandchildren, Gray said, "What an honor. It's very emotional for me. How can it get any better than this?"

Parton and Gray have worked together before. A bronze statue of Parton, created by Gray in 1987, sits in front of the Sevier County Courthouse in Sevierville. Thousands of tourists stop to see the 2-ton, life-size structure each year.

"At 70, I've been blessed all these years doing what I have loved the best," Gray said. "I have been working full-time in fine arts since 1966. As far as I am concerned, this is icing on the cake, and it has been a wonderful cake I have enjoyed."

Knoxville will honor Gray with a reception Thursday, April 3, at the Knoxville Museum of Art. In addition to celebrating the Governor's Award, the Jim Gray painting "Rising Above" will be on display, and Mayor Victor Ashe will announce that the painting has been purchased as part of the Knoxville Convention Center art collection. The reception is open to the public. Anyone interested in receiving an invitation to attend should contact the Arts and Cultural Alliance, 865-523-7543.

TRIBUTE TO ROSSANA ROSADO, PUBLISHER EL DIARIO-LA PRENSA

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to pay tribute to Mrs. Rossana Rosado, Publisher and CEO of the El Diario-La Prensa who will be honored on Thursday, March 20, 2003, on the 90th anniversary of the newspaper, the oldest Spanish-language daily in the United States. I regret that I am unable to join her and her colleagues for the 18th Annual National Association of Hispanic Publications (NAHP) Convention and luncheon in Las Vegas. I would very much have enjoyed celebrating this well-deserved recognition with her.

For 90 years, El Diario-La Prensa has been instrumental to the Hispanic community in the Northeast, providing the Hispanic community in the United States a vehicle of communication within itself, which has contributed to its development and strengthening and empowered Hispanics to attain significant achievements in the political, economic and social arena. Furthermore, for nine decades, El Diario-La Prensa has informed our Latino community, serving as an ever present link between them and their families and friends in their countries of origin in Latin America and the Caribbean, during times of political turmoil and times of stability, times of success as well as times of economic downturn, joyous occasions or sad times.

Mr. Speaker, good writing is indeed an art. From 1995 to 1999, Ms. Rosado was responsible for the newsroom operations as El Diario's Editor in Chief, becoming the first Latina and one of just a few women in this country to hold this important position at a major newspaper. Her writing, eloquent and to the point, has won the attention and admiration of El Diario-La Prensa readers like me. I commend her for her ability to bring style to provocative and powerful commentary. Editorials that grab the reader with candid and passionate writing about politics and other issues affecting New York City communities deserve recognition.

In September 1999, after dedicating to *El Diario-La Prensa* nine of her seventeen years in the news media, Ms. Rosado was promoted to Publisher and CEO to oversee the day-to-day operations of the entire paper. She, once again, became the first Latina in the U.S. to hold such a high-ranking post in the newspaper-publishing world. This move provided her with the opportunity to cross over to the business and revenue side of the newspaper industry, a new frontier for Latinos in general and for women in particular. It is interesting to mention that her first experience as a reporter was at *El Diario-La Prensa* where she covered my home borough of the Bronx as well as City Hall, and wrote a weekly column. Ms. Rosado has had a diverse career in the N.Y. media, which includes work at radio and television stations, print media and public service.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Rosado is the recipient of several prestigious awards including an Emmy for her work in television. Among many tributes, in March 2002, she received the NYS Governor's award for Excellence—“Women Sustaining the American Spirit”—in honor of Women's History Month. How fitting, Mr. Speaker. Ms. Rosado served as a member of Mayor Michael Bloomberg's transition team. She serves as Director on the board of United Way of NYC and September 11th Fund, as well as in other organizations. She is a graduate of Pace University, in White Plains, New York where she received her B.A. in journalism.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Rossana Rosado for her leadership and extraordinary contributions to the advancement of journalism and in wishing her continued success.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 19, 2003, during the House's consideration of H.R. 97, the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act, I was recorded as voting “yea” on rollcall vote No. 72, the substitute amendment offered by Mr. NADLER of New York. I should have been recorded as voting “nay” on the Nadler substitute amendment.

IMPROVING PARENTAL CHOICE FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

HON. JIM DeMINT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. DeMINT. Mr. Speaker, today I submit for introduction a bill to improve education for children with special needs by encouraging innovative approaches to parental involvement and flexibility.

This legislation is meant to enhance other reforms being proposed in the IDEA reauthorization bill. Those reforms will improve special education by reducing the paperwork burden for educators, improving early intervention

strategies, reducing misidentification of special needs students, and restoring trust between parents and districts by reducing litigation. I believe we must empower parents to be more involved in their child's education.

My legislation would help states create customized education systems for children with special needs. Many states would like to offer options for children with special needs. Unfortunately, the current IDEA structure does nothing to promote these alternatives. This new legislation encourages states to research and develop scholarship programs for children with special needs, providing parents the opportunity to choose the education they see as a best fit for their child.

The Improving Parental Choice bill would give states greater flexibility in providing for supplemental services. Students with special needs should have the flexibility to access the tutoring services of their choice. My bill would make it permissible for districts to use their federal IDEA reserved funds to provide greater opportunities for participation in outside supplemental education services. Children at a school designated for improvement under No Child Left Behind would have the opportunity to access the support services preferred by their family.

This legislation would also allow pre-school age children to continue education with successful and comfortable providers. Children under age three currently receive special needs service from the provider of their choice. This legislation would expand the options of parents and decrease transition problems for the youngest children with disabilities by allowing states to expand programs that currently serve children ages 0–2. It would allow children to continue participation in their preferred program (including private providers) until age five when the child begins school.

Children with special needs have different needs. They deserve education services that are customized for their personal needs. This legislation will provide parents with more resources and more opportunities for their children with disabilities.

IMPROVING PARENTAL CHOICE FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 2003

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my colleague from South Carolina in offering this important legislation to improve and increase the options available to parents of students with disabilities under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The IDEA reauthorization is a top priority for my Committee this year. We want to build on the success of the No Child Left Behind Act and align IDEA with NCLB.

One of our key principles for reauthorization is the encouragement of innovative approaches to parental involvement and parental choice. IDEA already contains choice, for the educated and the wealthy. There is no reason to deny millions of parents those same opportunities. We should empower all parents to expand their participation and increase knowledge of their rights and responsibilities under the law.

This bill would accomplish three goals:

Encourage states to develop innovative, flexible choice programs for children with disabilities and permitting states that have such programs to allow federal funds to follow the child based on the parents' choice. According to a report by Education Week, Florida's pioneering program, launched two years ago under Governor Jeb Bush and Lieutenant Governor Frank Brogan, resulted in state education officials receiving more than 14,000 inquiries from parents interested in exploring scholarships as a means of securing the best education possible for their children. Federal law should not discourage other states from emulating the Florida model or from engaging in other innovative efforts to improve choices for the parents of children with special needs.

Permit districts to use their funds under this Act to provide necessary accommodations (including reasonable, additional expenses) to allow children with disabilities being educated in schools designated for improvement under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) to participate in supplemental educational services. NCLB, enacted in 2002 with overwhelming bipartisan support, guarantees parents with children in underachieving federally-funded schools—including children with disabilities—the right to obtain tutoring and other supplemental educational services for their children from providers reimbursed with their children's share of federal education funds. Eligible providers include private and faith-based providers of educational services. NCLB established an important historical precedent for the portability of federal Title I education funds, in which the money follows the child. The same principle should be applied to federal special education funds when children with special needs are otherwise being denied the opportunity for a quality education.

Expand the options of parents and decrease transition problems for the youngest children with disabilities by allowing states to expand current Part C (currently ages 0–2) programs to children that would otherwise be participating in Section 619 (ages 3–5). Parents can choose for their preschooler to remain in the Part C program with their current providers (including private providers) without interruption or transition from traditional Part C at age 3.

School choice, particularly for children with disabilities, provides a constructive way to continue to improve public education by insisting on excellence for every child. I strongly believe that parents are in the best position to determine where their child should be educated. We should allow all parents the right and the responsibility to have that choice.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure to give parents and children with disabilities the choice they deserve.

CONGRATULATING MR. JOHN LARSEN

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate FBI Agent John Larsen on being named the U.S. Marshals Law Enforcement Officer of the Year. His dedication and desire to work for the cause of

justice is a model for all law enforcement officers.

Agent Larsen was a key figure in the prosecution of Robert Burke. Burke was convicted of supplying the handcuff key to Jeffery Erickson, who ultimately used it to escape confinement and murder Deputy U.S. Marshal Roy Frakes and Court Security Officer Harry Belloumini in 1992.

For the past ten years, Agent Larsen has worked tirelessly to uncover evidence for this case that may never have been found otherwise. Agent Larsen first located Mr. Burke in Ireland, and then helped facilitate his extradition back to the United States on charges of perjury. He then oversaw over 180 witness interviews, most of which were with inmates, being asked to recall conversations that had taken place over a decade ago. Having nothing to offer some of these witnesses for their testimony, Agent Larsen had to implore upon their sense of decency to bring some closure to the family and the United States Marshals Service.

Through perseverance, a strong work ethic, and a commitment to justice, Agent Larsen was a crucial factor in bringing an emotional case to a close.

Mr. Speaker, John Larsen's record of service and the fruits of his labor speak for themselves. Earning the Law Enforcement Officer of the Year award from the U.S. Marshals is a well-deserved token of the respect that is due him for his efforts. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking him for his commitment to excellence and his desire to see justice carried out.

**DIVINITY, DIVERSITY, DIGNITY
BOUND TOGETHER**

HON. J. RANDY FORBES

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the following article written by Rabbi Israel Zoberman, spiritual leader of Congregation Beth Chaverim in Virginia Beach. Rabbi Zoberman's editorial appeared in the Suffolk News-Herald on March 18th.

**DIVINITY, DIVERSITY, DIGNITY BOUND
TOGETHER**

This is a time of decision beclouded by political partisanship and posturing at home and in the United Nations. Going to war for a democracy is not an easy undertaking as it would be for a dictatorship. The value of human life weighs heavily upon decision-makers in a nation such as ours whose guiding concern is the individual's welfare. That is contrary to a totalitarian regime where the individual is not an end in itself but a means to goals serving the interests of an autocratic ruler. There is thus a vast difference between the conduct of George W. Bush and that of Saddam Hussein, both representing diametrically opposing systems of government.

America is on the verge of confronting Iraq primarily for the sake of eliminating a growing danger to the world by a leader who proved that he would not hesitate to use mass destruction weapons even against his own people. Hussein has not given up his dream of gaining hegemony over a region rich in oil to be used for his own megaloma-

niac purposes as he seeks to establish a nuclear option. He has only become emboldened to get his way by his past defeat in the 1991 Gulf War and consequent limitations posed on Iraq by the United Nations. A wounded and humiliated lion is more dangerous than an uninjured one. History taught us that dictators do not willingly relinquish power.

No doubt, the evil of 9/11 created a greater urgency to respond to forces undermining the world's stability, propelled by the global terrorism of uncompromising militant Islam assailing the West and its values. It begrudges our superior standing and their own longstanding inadequacies. Its aim is tragically not dialogue but a deadly duel they are bound to lose. Al-Qaida, now on the run following their defeat in Afghanistan, was too successful for its own good. It will be relentlessly pursued. Imagine if Osama Bin Laden invested his large finances in promoting cultural exchange between civilizations! Hussein contributes to terrorism in a variety of ways, including generous monetary rewards to Palestinian families of suicide-homicide bombers who have terrorized Israel, the West's frontier, for over two years, wrecking havoc that no nation would have tolerated so long. The last terrifying terror act in Haifa was in the neighborhood where I grew up and it was Bus #37 and the stop, which I used only a month ago. My sister, a "Real" school counselor, lost two young teenage students among the fifteen dead.

Another hopeful democracy in the making in the Middle East, the first Arab one, alongside Israel's inspiring example, would bode well for an essential transformation of a critical part of the world once blessing humanity with the vision of the sacredness of each human life and now breeding those who violate it in God's name. America standing up for itself would have a sobering effect on those who believe that it has grown too weak to be the world's leader. That is a dangerous scenario we cannot afford.

Power to defend what we rightfully cherish, touching upon our very security and basic way of life, is not to be snickered at. As son of Polish Holocaust survivors I know what the absence of power meant to the Jewish people in our darkest period. Let us take pride in our hard-earned power and in Hampton Roads' leading role in our nation's military mission for freedom's sake, pledging to support all our heroic servicemen and women as well as their families awaiting their safe return. Eleven members of my own over 300 family unit synagogue are in the Persian Gulf arena. At this trying juncture for humanity, America is called upon once more to assert that divinity, diversity and dignity are bound together.

Mr. Speaker, I comment Rabbi Zoberman for his timely and thoughtful statement. As we appear on the verge of war with Iraq, Rabbi Zoberman's words serve as a strong reminder of the differences between the United States and the evil Iraqi regime.

**DEFENDING AMERICA'S
HOMELAND**

HON. MARIO DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in the early hours of the morning, our men and women in uniform began a campaign to defend America's homeland and lib-

erate a population that has been under the brutal dictatorship of Saddam Hussein. While thousands of miles away, this nation stands behind these heroes and prays for their safety as they risk their lives in order to protect our freedom and security.

As the great battles of the past have clearly indicated, America's armed forces are the world's strongest, most advanced and will always succeed. While America may be in the early days of this conflict, it is certain that our brave soldiers, sailors and airmen will ultimately prevail and decades of oppression will be lifted from the Iraqi people.

The days ahead represent a struggle to prevent Saddam Hussein's terror from reaching our borders in the future. While the work our soldiers are doing now is in an arena far away, it is a direct accomplishment for the security and safety of America's homeland.

The young men and women in uniform are nothing short of heroic and their country stands proud of the missions they are leading abroad—both military and humanitarian. I would also like to commend their families for the sacrifices they have made for America. These days may be difficult, but the results of their work will forever be remembered and America will prevail.

SUPPORTING OUR TROOPS

HON. CALVIN M. DOOLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our nation, along with a coalition of more than thirty supporting nations, entered into military conflict with the nation of Iraq. I want to express my deepest appreciation for the commitment and resolve of our American men and women in service and their families. I join today with all of my colleagues in offering the unyielding support for all of our troops in the United States Armed Forces and their families.

Joining the thousands of troops from around the world in Iraq are many brave and courageous reservists and enlistees from the Central Valley. I join today with all those who have family members and friends in the region as we hope and pray for their safe and speedy return.

There is no question that Saddam Hussein is destabilizing the region, that he is willing to use deadly force against his own people, and that he is a threat to U.S. security. Yet, regardless of how each of us feels today about entering into this conflict, we must stand resolute behind our Commander in Chief and behind our men and women in uniform. Our hearts and thoughts are with those who will be putting their lives on the line for the sake of freedom in the days ahead.

**TUNISIA 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF
INDEPENDENCE**

HON. MARK STEVEN KIRK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a great ally of the United States.

Today, March 20th, marks the 47th year of Tunisia's independence. In 1797, the United States signed a Treaty of Peace and Friendship with the North African country of Tunisia. Over 150 years later, Tunisia peacefully gained independence from France. Today, we congratulate Tunisia as she celebrates 47 years as an independent nation.

The Republic of Tunisia has remained a steadfast friend to the United States, joining Allied forces during World War II and continuing support throughout the Cold War. Today, as we continue in our efforts against terrorism, Tunisia remains by our side as a Muslim nation and a loyal ally. Tunisia's ongoing efforts to work with the United States in the campaign to eradicate terrorism has been absolutely critical.

Tunisia's flourishing economy offers great hope for African and Middle Eastern countries, while she also continues to play an increasingly important role in the politics of the international community. One of Tunisia's most valuable assets has been its continued willingness to support a Middle East peace process. Despite being surrounded by nations engulfed in political turmoil, Tunisia continues to take an active role in combating international unrest.

I congratulate Tunisia on 47 years of independence and look forward to the United States' continuing strong relations with Tunisia for years to come. I urge my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 47th Anniversary of Tunisia's independence.

COMBATTING TERROR AND EVIL

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, last night, the United States continued its march against those who threaten the security of the United States. As the United States leads a coalition of nations willing to combat terror and evil, I offer my prayers to our heroic men and women who have been called on to defend our freedom. These brave soldiers are the latest of a long and proud history of courageous Americans dedicated to protecting the citizens of the United States.

For 12 long years, Iraq has failed to disarm and live up to the agreements it promised to uphold. By choosing not to disarm or to surrender power peacefully, Saddam Hussein has left us with no other option but to disarm him by force.

This is a critical moment in American history. We could either choose the path of appeasement or choose the path of forceful disarmament. History has shown that appeasement has never prevented war; it only postponed war. America must not wait for Saddam Hussein to build an arsenal strong enough and deadly enough to blackmail the Free World. The time for action is now. May God Bless America.

ARMED FORCES TAX FAIRNESS ACT OF 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB ETHERIDGE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support of H.R. 1307, the Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act of 2003. It is only appropriate during this time of conflict that we take every opportunity to recognize and support the brave men and women of our armed forces. The original version of this legislation provided a number of significant tax benefits for our armed forces, National Guard and Reserves, and I am pleased and relieved to see that the bill has been restored to its original form and intent.

As a veteran of the United States Army, I know firsthand the contributions our military service personnel make in defense of our nation and the tremendous burden their families are forced to bear. Here in the U.S. House, I serve on the Army Caucus, and I have worked on a bipartisan basis to support our men and women in uniform. Furthermore, North Carolina's Second Congressional District includes Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, home to many soldiers now on the ground in Southwest Asia. Our service personnel are dedicated, professional and devoted to duty. Congress must stand up for these brave men and women who risk their lives to defend our country, our ideals and our interests around the world.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1307 includes a number of provisions to reduce taxes for the members of the armed services. It provides capital gains tax relief to soldiers who invest in a home for themselves and their families but have to move due to reassignment or deployment before they satisfy the five-year qualifying period.

The bill also provides National Guard and reserve members an "above-the-line" tax deduction for overnight expenses when they travel more than 100 miles from home to attend National Guard and Reserve meetings, as well as filing extensions and penalty-free withdrawals from education accounts for students attending one of our service academies.

Mr. Speaker, prompt passage of this legislation is a small gesture of support to active duty personnel as well as members of the Reserves and National Guard. In these uncertain times, we must remember that many of our soldiers put their civilian lives on hold in service to our country. More than 50,000 Reservists are supplementing active duty forces for our war against terrorism, and another 120,000 have been mobilized for our conflict with Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I urge quick passage of H.R. 1307 in the House and Senate, and I hope the President will promptly sign it into law as a gesture of support and respect for our armed forces. The brave men and women of America's armed forces need to know that Congress stands behind them, and passing this legislation will demonstrate that Congress will put national interests ahead of special interests.

PATRIOTISM OF THE TOWN OF CORNWALL

HON. SUE W. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to report to the House the strong sense of patriotism sweeping through a small town in the heart of New York's 19th Congressional District. The Cornwall Town Board has passed a resolution in support of all of our troops that are deployed overseas to protect our freedom and liberties.

The Resolution states that the Board supports of those brave men and women of Cornwall currently "serving in the armed forces and of our great country and their families and support the armed services for the great sacrifices they must make in the service of our country in the name of freedom."

I commend the Cornwall Town Board for their patriotic actions and ask that the entire text of the Resolution be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RESOLUTION BY THE TOWN BOARD OF THE TOWN OF CORNWALL IN SUPPORT OF OUR TOWN RESIDENTS WHO ARE SERVING OUR COUNTRY IN THE ARMED FORCES, IN SUPPORT OF OUR ARMED FORCES IN GENERAL AND FOR WORLD PEACE

Whereas, heretofore the Town Board of the Town of Cornwall recognizes the great freedoms and liberties that this great nation of our's provides, and

Whereas, the Town Board recognizes that to insure that these great freedoms and liberties exist it is necessary to provide for a national defense, and

Whereas, the Town Board recognizes that the United States Armed Forces protect and defend our country from all enemies foreign and domestic and thereby serve with great dedication, personal risk and sacrifice in the risking of their lives and sacrificing the comfort of being with their loved ones when serving on distant shores, and

Whereas, the Town Board supports our own brave men and women and all members of the armed forces currently serving and preparing to defend our liberties and freedoms and protect us from our enemies and also supports their families in these times of heightened security alert, and

Whereas, the Town Board recognizes that world peace and security is paramount and we support and pray that all diplomatic efforts to secure world peace and security will succeed, now, therefore, be it

Resolved as follows:

1. That the Town Board of the Town of Cornwall supports our residents who are serving in the armed forces of our great country and their families and support the armed services for the great sacrifices they must make in the service of our country in the name of freedom and democracy.

2. That the Town Board of the Town of Cornwall call upon our leaders and other world leaders to bring about world peace as quickly and with firm resolve as possible by whatever means necessary.

3. That the Town Clerk forward a copy of this resolution signed by all members voting herein to our congressional representative SUE W. KELLY and ask that it be read into the Congressional Record at her earliest convenience.

COMMENDING CLEAR LAKE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Clear Lake Elementary School for being named a Michigan Blue Ribbon Exemplary School. This award is given to those elementary schools that exemplify educational excellence. It is designed to identify and give public recognition to outstanding schools that achieve high academic standards, to make available a comprehensive framework of key criteria for school effectiveness, and to communicate best practices for educational success among Michigan schools.

Through hard work and dedication, Clear Lake Elementary has met the criteria for this award. It is committed to instilling, "Competence, Confidence, and Character" in all students. Through partnerships with parents, encouragement of critical thinking and co-operation, and character education, the staff at Clear Lake Elementary provides these excellent educational principles.

Mr. Speaker, Clear Lake Elementary is to be recognized for earning the Michigan Blue Ribbon Exemplary School Award. They are an example of the tremendous potential elementary schools have to make a difference in the lives of their students. Therefore, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking the teachers and administration at Clear Lake Elementary for their commitment to excellence and their desire to provide students with a high-quality education. I would also like to ask my colleagues to join me in wishing them good fortune in the future.

CELEBRATING TUNISIA'S 47TH AN-
NIVERSARY OF ITS INDEPEND-
ENCE

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Republic of Tunisia and its people on the 47th Anniversary of their National Day of Independence. Over the last 47 years, Tunisia has been an outstanding model for developing countries. It has risen from a fledgling democracy to a nation that is at the forefront of instituting an aggressive North African free market economy.

The United States and Tunisia have maintained a strong relationship throughout Tunisia's history. During the Cold War, Tunisia was a crucial partner in the Mediterranean region. In our struggle against terrorism, dating back to the early 1990s, Tunisia has been a steadfast ally. As early as 1993, Tunisia condemned forms of Islamic extremism and terrorism. In 1994, Tunisia warned the West of terrorism's evils and spoke of the need to fight terrorism on a global level.

The relationship between our countries has only been strengthened over the past two years, as we both act to confront the scourge of terrorism. Tunisia's unwavering opposition to terrorism is no more evident than in its re-

sponse to the tragic terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Immediately following the attacks, Tunisia's President, Zine El Abidine Bel Ali, offered his country's heartfelt condolences to the American people and strongly condemned the attacks and those behind them. President Ben Ali also offered his country's steadfast support for our efforts to bring those responsible to justice. Tunisia's steadfast co-operation and support continues today.

As a friend of Tunisia, I again congratulate the Tunisian people on 47 years of independence and would like to share with my colleagues the insightful words of President Ben Ali, describing the reasons for Tunisia's success in building a democratic society:

"Tolerance is at the heart of our social traditions as well as a characteristic of Tunisia's history. Pluralism, whether religious, cultural, or political, is ingrained in our society. Tunisian Moslems and Jews have lived together under the same sky and same state for many centuries. Each contributed to the building of [Tunisia], whose greatness is based on the tolerance of its people—a tolerance which has been among the highest values governing relations between the two parties, as there was no room for hatred."

CELEBRATING THE ANNIVERSARY
OF TUNISIA'S INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN S. TANNER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the celebration of Tunisian Independence Day, a historical occasion that occurred forty-seven years ago today when the people of Tunisia officially declared independence.

Since that time, the people of Tunisia have begun building the foundation for a great democracy, a process that continues to move forward. The almost ten million citizens of Tunisia now live in a country that shares many of the democratic values that make our own nation great, including civil rights, a more open political process and a thriving culture that highlights the history of the Tunisian people.

The quality of life for the Tunisian people has been greatly improved in recent decades, largely due to trade agreements and economic development in the nation's urban areas and elsewhere. There are great economic strides still to be made, but much progress has been made in a relatively short period of time, and that progress will continue.

Tunisia has been an important friend of the United States throughout history, including serving as an important ally in the ongoing war on terrorism. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that our relationship will continue to strengthen as Tunisia continues building onto its democratic foundation.

HONORING EMMITT SMITH

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the living legend of Emmitt Smith, the

NFL's all-time leading rusher. I was among the legions of Dallas Cowboys fans who were saddened to see Emmitt leave the Cowboys after thirteen seasons with America's Team. I would like to take this opportunity to honor this future Hall-of-Famer for both his professional success and for his tireless community service efforts. Emmitt served as the Cowboy's representative to the United Way from 1994–1995 and is the founder of Emmitt Smith Charities, providing educational scholarships to his hometown of Pensacola, Florida.

While Emmitt is only 5'10" tall, his giving heart is the size of Texas. I was only too happy to be able to watch Emmitt rush for his NFL record of 17,162 yards. When Emmitt was drafted by the Cowboys in the first round of the 1990 NFL Draft, he had left the University of Florida as a junior without his college degree. Today, many pro athletes leave college early without a degree, or don't even go to college and leave high school straight for professional sports. To his credit, Emmitt went back to the University of Florida and received his Bachelor's degree in 1996.

I will miss not being able to see #22 suit up for the silver and blue. However, I wish Emmitt Smith all the best, and sincerely thank him for all that he has done on the field, and off the field for the greater Dallas community.

IN MEMORY OF CECILIA ELEANOR
HADLEY

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of Cecilia Eleanor Hadley, a warmhearted and generous woman who dedicated her life to others.

I have known Cecilia Hadley since I was a boy and her husband, Al "Skipper" Hadley, served as my Sea Scout, BSA, Scoutmaster. Cecilia died last month at age 96. Skipper died in 2000, also at age 96.

Cecilia Hadley was born in Milwaukee and moved to California as a child. She graduated from the Los Angeles Conservatory of Music and Arts and, after 6 years of courtship, married Al Hadley in 1935.

Cecilia Hadley remained active long after retirement. She volunteered as a third-grade teacher's aide for nearly a decade, tutored students in reading and math after school, and taught countless children to play the piano.

She belonged to many women's clubs and was a member of St. Peter's Catholic Community for more than 20 years. She volunteered for the Fallbrook Hospital Auxiliary, working in the gift shop and hand-crocheting baby blankets for newborns. She also made baby blankets for Birth Choice, a crisis pregnancy center she actively supported.

Mr. Speaker, Cecilia Hadley is survived her sons, Pete and David; five grandchildren; and two great-grandchildren. I know my colleagues will join me in sending condolences to Cecilia's family, and in thanking her for making her community and our country a better place through her passion and compassion.

IN HONOR OF ROBERT M. MORGENTHAU, MANHATTAN DISTRICT ATTORNEY AND CHAIRMAN, MUSEUM OF JEWISH HERITAGE—A LIVING MEMORIAL TO THE HOLOCAUST

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, it is my very great personal pleasure to rise today to pay tribute to Robert M. Morgenthau, New York County's District Attorney and Chairman of the Museum of Jewish Heritage—A Living Memorial to the Holocaust. Mr. Morgenthau is being honored at the Museum's Heritage Dinner, and I would like to honor him myself, today.

Mr. Morgenthau, as an elected official, an advocate, and a selfless leader, epitomizes the very best of public service. He served his country as a naval reservist and then as a distinguished naval officer during World War II, achieving the rank of Lt. Commander. He was asked to serve the Nation once again as a U.S. Attorney, appointed by President John F. Kennedy in 1961. We are most fortunate that his pursuit of justice brought him to watch over our great borough of Manhattan, where he has been the District Attorney of New York County since 1974 and has won re-election eight times.

His wisdom, his energy, and his leadership have made New York a better city. His tireless devotion to the law resulted in his establishing units that oversee the prosecution of crimes against society's most vulnerable victims, and he has pursued major cases that affect the economic and social viability of New York City.

Since 1982, Mr. Morgenthau has lent his talent and vision to the Museum of Jewish Heritage—A Living Memorial to the Holocaust. With the memory of those who were murdered in the Holocaust always in his thoughts, he has seen the Museum through two construction projects and helped raise millions of dollars to ensure its future. Because of Mr. Morgenthau's leadership, the Museum, which is located five blocks south of the World Trade Center site, began building its new wing on November 27, 2001, mere months after the worst terrorist attacks this nation has ever witnessed. Located across New York Harbor from the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, the new wing will incorporate centers for memory, learning, performance, and exhibitions. It will also incorporate the strength and humanity of a man who has steered the Museum through both rough seas and calm waters. Mr. Morgenthau's tireless determination, infinite supply of good counsel, and unconditional devotion are as fundamental to the Museum's existence as the foundation on which it stands. The new wing, which is just about complete, will be named for Robert M. Morgenthau on April 6, 2003.

It gives me great pleasure to honor Robert M. Morgenthau, on behalf of the people of New York City. I thank him for ensuring justice for all.

IMPRISONMENT OF DR. NGUYEN DAN QUE

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly condemn the arrest of Dr. Nguyen Dan Que by the Vietnamese Communist government on March 17th, 2003. I am outraged to hear that these Communist officials detained Dr. Que at a local security station in Saigon, while they had their secret police break into his house to seize his cellular phones, laptop computer, and collection of written essays.

As you may know, Dr. Que is the most vocal and ardent advocate in Viet Nam for freedom, democracy and human rights for almost the past 30 years. When Saigon fell into Communist hands in 1975, Dr. Que refused to leave Viet Nam, and later turned down a government offer to resettle in the United States. Dr. Que could have continued a successful medical practice in America, but he consciously chose to remain in Viet Nam to speak out and defend the human dignity and rights of all Vietnamese people.

Because of his unrelenting efforts in the pursuit for freedom and human rights for Viet Nam, the Vietnamese government imprisoned Dr. Que in 1978. He remained in detention, often under inhumane conditions, for 10 years, pending formal charges and a trial. During this time, he was tortured, beaten, and placed into solitary confinement where his hands and feet were chained together. Due to the continuous intervention of the Congressional Dialogue on Viet Nam and international human rights groups, Dr. Que was finally released in 1988 after 10 years in prison.

On May 11, 1990, Dr. Que founded the Non-Violent Movement for Human Rights. He issued a manifesto appealing to all individuals and organizations inside Viet Nam and throughout the world for support of his moderate, non-violent struggle to establish human rights for all Vietnamese people. He demanded that the Vietnamese government invest in the welfare of its people, and reduce the size of its military. His manifesto also stipulated that the Communist government of Viet Nam cease its aggressive actions towards neighboring countries, and to bring about lasting peace for the region in Southeast Asia.

Dr. Que was arrested again in June 1990, and forcibly returned to prison without trial. His family received information that he was tortured and had received emergency medical care several times due to these beatings. Finally Dr. Que was released from prison in September 1998, but remained under house arrest with constant government surveillance and restrictions on any use of communication, such as phone calls and letters.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Que's arrest by the Vietnamese government comes at a time when the world is preoccupied with the impending conflict in Iraq. I believe they made this decision on the basis that we, the international community, would not likely express strong condemnation towards their actions—but they

are wrong. I urge my colleagues to join me now to collectively voice our strong opposition to the arrest of Dr. Que by the Vietnamese Communist government and demand his release immediately.

ELKS CLUBS CREATE ARMY OF HOPE TO HELP MILITARY FAMILIES

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, in a shining example of how Americans pull together in times of crisis, the Elks USA has pledged its support of the families of Reservists and National Guard Members who have been called to active duty. The Army of Hope, comprised of volunteers coordinated by the Elks, will assist families with all sorts of needs to ease their stress and financial burdens.

This could not be a more welcome and needed gesture of support and I am pleased to place the attached letter from the Elks to the President, of which I received a copy, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We should all applaud them for their patriotism. This is a trying time for our military families. Supporting them is one of the most patriotic things we as Americans can do.

ELKS USA,

Richland, WA, February 21, 2003.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
President of the United States of America, The
White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The families who have a father or mother in the military reserves or National Guard called to active duty during our War on Terrorism and the current Iraq crisis will experience severe economic burdens as well as emotional stress. As National President of the one million men and women who comprise the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks, I am writing to express our organization's support of these families.

Mr. President, the Elks have mobilized the volunteers as an Army of Hope. We are teachers, lawyers, accountants and health workers. We are carpenters, electricians, mechanics, plumbers and tradesmen of every type. We are the hearts and hands of our communities. We will help with the kids, make minor home repairs and provide other assistance to these families of our service men and women as they attempt to keep hearth and home together during these trying times.

I cannot begin to stress to you our Order's willingness and preparedness to lend any further assistance as directed. We are committed to do everything you request of us and for these valiant people and their families. Mr. President, please know the Benevolent and Protective Order of the Elks is here for our nation.

Pledging you the full support of the men and women of the Elks, I remain,

Sincerely Yours,

ROGER R. TRUE,
Grand Exalted Ruler
(National President).

SENSE OF HOUSE THAT NEWDOW V. UNITED STATES CONGRESS IS INCONSISTENT WITH THE SUPREME COURT'S INTERPRETATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT AND SHOULD BE OVERTURNED

SPEECH OF

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 19, 2003

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal's decision in *Newdow v. the United States Congress* is inconsistent with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the First Amendment and should be overturned.

The Court ruled on a case in which children were required to recite the pledge. Just as we should not bar anyone from reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, we should not force anyone to recite words they do not believe.

As I have stated before, I believe the Ninth Circuit was right in ruling that the reference to "God" in the Pledge of Allegiance is unconstitutional. It is a religious term that does not respect the diversity of faiths and opinion in America and the separation of Church and State as our Constitution requires.

This House has now been given three separate opportunities to vote on almost identical resolutions denouncing the Ninth Circuit for its rulings on this issue. Right or wrong, Congress has made its voice heard. But, it appears that many of my colleagues are not content to let the judicial branch do its job. They want to intervene, exerting as much political pressure as necessary to sway the Supreme Court to side with their far-right Christian ideology.

These same colleagues seem to forget that religious liberty, religious tolerance and freedom of thought and expression were foremost principles in the minds of the Constitution's framers. This resolution before us today states that "religious belief was central to our nation's founding"—completely ignoring these other integral ideals. As written, the resolution flatly mischaracterizes the very foundation of our democracy.

I urge my colleagues to end this effort to derail the Supreme Court's impartial deliberation on this issue. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the resolution.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID AND CHERYL VIENNA

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor David and Cheryl Vienna as they prepare to begin their well-deserved retirements. For more than two decades, they have served dozens of clients before the Federal and State governments and, in doing so, have maintained standards of excellence that we would do well to recognize.

In 1978, David founded a Federal Government affairs company called David Vienna and

Associates, and Cheryl joined him a year later. Together, they have made what is now known as Vienna, Gregor and Associates into one of the premier small firms in the Washington area. Among other clients, they represent several from my own State—the California State Senate, the California Franchise Tax Board, and the California Public Employees' Retirement System, the largest pension fund in the United States. My staff and I have worked with the firm many times and we know firsthand the level of knowledge, skill and integrity they bring to every task.

While operating one business successfully is enough of a challenge, David and Cheryl opened a second in 1981. Public Affairs Support Services has, for more than 20 years, filed federal and state campaign finance reports for the political action committees of some of the largest businesses and associations in the country. In this venture, as in their government affairs work, they have demonstrated the expertise and attention to detail that is the hallmark of every successful business owner.

Both David and Cheryl had extensive experience in this very building before starting their companies. David was on the staffs of two Senate subcommittees and worked closely with Senators Abe Ribicoff and Scoop Jackson, while Cheryl was director of legislation for senator Sam Nunn. In their public service, they showed the outstanding character and ability that foreshadowed their future success in the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating David and Cheryl Vienna on their distinguished careers and wishing them continued success in their future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO DR. DONALD BANGASSER, PRESIDENT OF THE CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to commend the incoming president of the California Medical Association, Dr. Ronald Bangasser. For nearly two decades, I have known Dr. Bangasser as a friend and a community leader in San Bernardino County, California, and I believe he will be a strong asset at the head of the nation's largest state medical association.

Dr. Bangasser has been a prominent member of the San Bernardino County medical community since 1977, when he began in private practice. By 1982, he had established a reputation as an expert at treating complicated wounds as director of the Wound Care Center at Redlands Community Hospital. He became Chief of Staff at the hospital in 1990 and is now Medical Director for the Beaver Medical Group in Redlands.

Known for his interest in teaching, Dr. Bangasser is a member of the American Board of Family Practice, American College of Hyperbaric Medicine, American College of Physician Executives, and is a fellow of the American Academy of Family Physicians and

an associate Professor at Loma Linda University Medical Center.

The legions of patients devoted to Dr. Bangasser include many in the retirement communities of Yucaipa, California, and a generation of young athletes at San Bernardino Valley College, where he has given 12,000 sport physicals in 22 years as team physician for the football team. Since 1986, he has served as team physician for the local minor league baseball team, currently known as the Inland Empire 66ers.

Dr. Bangasser is well known for his leadership role in the medical community and on public policy both in California and on the national level. He has served on nine medical association reference committees, and has been a San Bernardino County Medical Society board member for 25 years. He has served in a series of top positions on the California Medical Association, and is a delegate to the American Medical Association. He is a member of the AMA Council on Medical Services, and was recently appointed to the AMA's Quality Committee for NCQA. He was named Outstanding Physician by the San Bernardino County group in 1995, and was presented with the San Bernardino Valley College Distinguished Service Award in 1999.

In the community, Dr. Bangasser spearheaded a collaborative effort between the San Bernardino and Riverside County medical associations and the San Bernardino Bar Association on domestic violence awareness. He annually sponsors and pays for travel costs of two students to AMA events, and helped cover the costs of a group of teens to attend an AMA conference on teen pregnancy. He has served on the boards of the local United Way, the YMCA, the Redlands Community Hospital Foundation and the "Just for You Volunteers" seniors group in Yucaipa.

Dr. Bangasser is not unknown to us in Washington, where he has traveled to testify in support of medical programs, and last year he was honored by President Bush in a White House discussion on senior citizen health. He has already gained a reputation as a strong advocate of health care in his role as president-elect of the 35,000-member CMA.

Along with his other accomplishments, Dr. Bangasser trained as a former Navy Diving Medical Officer, and has taught many colleagues, friends, and patients the joys of this underwater adventure. I can thank him and his wife Susan for helping me rediscover my love for this sport, and helping me to train and qualify as a SCUBA diver.

Mr. Speaker, the job of president of the California Medical Association comes with heavy responsibility, but I am certain Dr. Ronald Bangasser will perform wonderfully in the role. I ask you and my colleagues to congratulate him on his election as president, and wish him success in his future endeavors.

HONORING BENJAMIN BRISCOE, FORMER LORD MAYOR OF DUBLIN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and celebration of the Honorable Benjamin Briscoe, former Lord Mayor of Dublin

and former prominent member of the Dail. We extend a warm welcome to you and to your wife Carol and we hope that your St. Patrick's Day journey from County Kildare to Cleveland, Ohio, proves to be a joyous and enriching experience.

For the past twenty-four years, Tim Collins and Thomas Scanlon have organized the St. Patrick's Day Party. This joyous event brings people together for an enchanted evening of renewing old friendships and discovering new ones, and serves to build a living bridge that extends from the North Coast to the Emerald Isle.

Like his father before him, Mr. Briscoe has dedicated his life to political service and social leadership and activism. Though retired from the political stage, Mr. Briscoe continues to dedicate his time promoting tourism and investment in Ireland. Moreover, Mr. Briscoe continues his significant work that focuses on helping others. He is a Founding Member and Council Member of the Bone Marrow for Leukemia Trust of Ireland; Founder of Friends of the Vocal Arts; and Council Member of the Association of Recreation Clubs for the Handicapped.

Mr. Speaker and Colleagues, please join me in tribute to the Honorable Benjamin Briscoe, former Lord Mayor of Dublin, for joining us in Cleveland as we celebrate St. Patrick's Day. Please also join me in recognition of Tim Collins and Thomas Scanlon for organizing this wondrous St. Patrick's Day Party each year for the past twenty-four years. "Ni dheanfaidh smaoinemh an treabhadh duit—You'll never plough a field by turning it over in your mind"—Old Irish Proverb.

H. CON. RES. 103

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution supporting the members of the United States armed forces and our allies who are engaged in the war on terrorism and the war with Iraq.

More than 1.4 million men and women make up America's active and reserve forces and are responsible for our national defense. They distinguish themselves daily in selfless service to this Nation and it is a privilege to take a few minutes today to pay tribute to them.

This resolution also acknowledges the families of our armed forces. Their contribution to our Nation's freedom is appreciated and our thoughts and prayers are with them as well. It is a sacrifice to send your son or daughter or husband or wife, into harm's way.

Finally, this Resolution acknowledges the military forces of our allies. They share our commitment to democracy and global security and have joined us in our fight against terrorism, the threat of nuclear weapons, and crimes against humanity.

Regardless of our thoughts on U.S. policy, we are now united in our support to the men and women in harm's way. Each of us is now focused on the safety of deployed forces, the success of the mission, and the minimization of casualties.

I believe it is fitting that I end this statement by reading the final sentences in the Resolution I am introducing today.

It is the sense of Congress that every American service member be commended for serving with such distinction and professionalism.

It is the sense of Congress that every American family be commended for their special role in providing support for the members of our Armed Forces.

It is the sense of Congress that every allied service member be commended for serving with such distinction and professionalism.

It is the sense of Congress that all citizens of the United States pay homage to our armed forces, their families, and allied service members.

THE FAILURE OF CYPRUS TALKS

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was very disheartened to learn about the failure last week of the United Nations sponsored peace talks regarding a just and lasting settlement in Cyprus. It is apparent that while the Greek-Cypriot people and their leaders are ready for a peaceful settlement to this longstanding problem, the Turkish-Cypriot leaders, and possibly the leaders of Turkey as well, are not committed to a peaceful settlement at this time.

The commitment of the United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan to resolving the Cyprus dispute is notable, especially considering the impending crisis in Iraq. Mr. Annan, in good faith, presented a plan to both sides that required concessions from each party. Mr. Tassos Papadopoulos, the newly elected President of the Republic of Cyprus, was prepared to submit the United Nations plan to the Greek-Cypriots as a referendum, even though he was required to make unpopular concessions in order to achieve what was believed to be a workable plan.

Mr. Rauf Denktash, the leader of the Turkish-Cypriots, on the other hand, refused to submit the United Nations plan to the Turkish-Cypriots as a referendum. This is yet another case of the Greek-Cypriots negotiating in good faith, whereby they continue to demonstrate their dedication and commitment to a peaceful resolution to the division of Cyprus, and Mr. Denktash is not willing to negotiate.

In the United States, I believe that we must continue our efforts to improve the dialogue for the reunification of Cyprus. I strongly urge Mr. Denktash, and other Turkish leaders, to view this recent breakdown of talks as a lost opportunity that cannot occur again. I also urge the Administration to pressure Mr. Denktash and other Turkish leaders to re-evaluate their opposition to a unified Cyprus, especially in light of Turkey's desire to become a member of the European Union.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Cyprus deserve to have their voices heard about the future of their country and their people, and I sincerely hope that this will happen in the near future.

WITHDRAWAL OF H.R. 1333

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to formally withdraw H.R. 1333, which I introduced on Tuesday, March 18, 2003.

Mr. Speaker, I offered this legislation in an attempt to provide United States citizenship to the members of the Tohono O'odham Nation of Arizona in both Arizona and Mexico. However, I withdraw H.R. 1333 and instead offer my full support for H.R. 731, the Tohono O'odham Citizenship Act of 2003, of which I am an original cosponsor.

In addition to this statement of withdrawal, I have filed a formal request with both the chairman and ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over H.R. 1333, to not take up this legislation in any hearings or markups during the course of the 108th Congress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I look forward to further legislative proceedings on H.R. 731.

HONORING JOHN T. CORRIGAN

HON. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give honor to a great American, John T. Corrigan, who served 34 years as the Cuyahoga County prosecutor in the great State of Ohio. On yesterday, Mr. Corrigan died at the Ohio Veterans Home in Sandusky. He was 79.

He was my predecessor in the Prosecutor's Office. John T. Corrigan gave me the opportunity to serve as his assistant. As his assistant, I had the opportunity to work with his son, Judge Michael J. Corrigan. His support laid the foundation for my future elected public service.

John T. Corrigan was 33 and a state senator when he was elected in 1956 to head a county legal staff that was larger than most law firms. The County Prosecutor prosecutes criminal cases and serves as county counsel for all county officials and county agencies.

John T. Corrigan was the son of Cleveland policeman John J. Corrigan and his wife, Ann, both of whom were from Achill Island, Ireland. John T. Corrigan took pride in being an Irish-American. He was also a football player at St. Ignatius High School, where he graduated in 1941.

He entered John Carroll University, but his college days were interrupted by a 39-month stint as an Army infantryman in Europe and the Pacific during World War II. In 1951, he graduated from Western Reserve University School of Law and joined the Carney & Carney law firm.

John T. Corrigan is survived by his wife, Virginia H.; son, Michael of Westlake; daughters, Margaret Gaughen in Cohasset, Mass., Marlene Sanford and Martha Costello, both of Olmsted Falls, and Dr. Mary V. of Avon Lake; and 11 grandchildren.

On behalf of the United States Congress and the people of the 11th Congressional District, I extend my sympathies to all of the family and friends of John T. Corrigan.

47TH ANNIVERSARY OF REPUBLIC
OF TUNISIA

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 20, 2003

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the Republic of Tunisia's 47th Anniversary on March 20, 2003. I invite my colleagues to join in extending our congratulations to the leaders and people of this important ally.

While Tunisia is celebrating 47 years of independence, our relationship with this country has roots much older. As early as 1797, The United States first signed a treaty of

peace and friendship with Tunisia. This first step was a portentous omen for the future.

Throughout Tunisia's brief history they have been a staunch ally to the United States and democracy at large. Whether it be their willingness to support the United States in World War II by suspending their own struggle with the French to lend aid to the allied cause, or their unwavering commitment to seeing terrorism vanquished through their membership in the U.S. led coalition against terror, it becomes evident that Tunisia's dedication to freedom and democracy is held in the highest regard by its people.

Not only is Tunisia a defender of democracy outside its borders, but within as well. Few are the nations that can boast of a more progressive attitude towards women's rights, enshrined in law, as early as 1956, The Code of Personal Status established a new organization of family based on equal rights through a series of provisions including the abolition of polygamy, and setting the minimum age of marriage at 17. In 1993, amendments were

adopted that went still further, guaranteeing alimony for divorced women and their children. Mothers were also given the explicit right to partake in the management of their children's affairs whether married or not.

Tunisia is also a country that values its heritage and culture. It is a proponent of the arts and its distinct, diverse culture. The government of this culturally rich country has passed laws that allow texts and musical instruments bound for cultural purposes to be imported tax free to stimulate interest and growth in this important sector of society. Tax breaks have also been levied towards investment in monuments from antiquity that might otherwise fall into ruin.

Tunisia is a country that has overcome many obstacles. From foreign powers to economic reform Tunisia has never shied from change while also preserving its unique and rich heritage. For this reason, and many others, I invite my colleagues to join in congratulating all Tunisians as they celebrate the 47th anniversary of their nation's independence.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to S. Res. 95, Commending President and Armed Forces.

The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 104, expressing the support and appreciation of the Nation for the President and the members of the Armed forces who are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4043–S4107

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 670–680, and S. Res. 95–96, and S. Con. Res. 25–27.

(See next issue.)

Measures Reported:

S. 671, to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws. (S. Rept. No. 108–28)

S. Res. 48, designating April 2003 as “Financial Literacy for Youth Month”.

S. Res. 52, recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of the problem, with an amendment.

S. Res. 58, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning June 1, 2003, as “National Citizen Soldier Week”.

S. 330, to further the protection and recognition of veterans’ memorials.

(See next issue.)

Measures Passed:

Commending President and Armed Forces: By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 61), Senate agreed to S. Res. 95, commending the President and the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

Pages S4075–S4107

Iraqi Scientists Immigration Act: Senate passed S. 205, to authorize the issuance of immigrant visas to, and the admission to the United States for permanent residence of, certain scientists, engineers, and

technicians who have worked in Iraqi weapons of mass destruction programs.

(See next issue.)

Congressional Budget Resolution: Senate continued consideration of S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S4044–75 (continued next issue)

Adopted:

By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 62), Kyl/Sessions Modified Amendment No. 288, to provide financial security to family farm and small business owners by ending the unfair practice of taxing someone at death.

(See next issue.)

By 80 yeas to 19 nays (Vote No. 64), Rockefeller Amendment No. 275, to express the sense of the Senate concerning State fiscal relief.

(See next issue.)

Rejected:

Graham (FL)/Dorgan/Stabenow Amendment No. 294, to provide a meaningful prescription drug benefit in Medicare that is available to all beneficiaries. (By 55 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 63), Senate tabled the amendment.)

(See next issue.)

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that with respect to amendment No. 294 (listed above), that the names be reversed, and that Senator Graham’s name appear first as the one proposing the amendment.

(See next issue.)

Pending:

Schumer Amendment No. 299, to provide immediate assistance to meet pressing homeland security needs by providing funding in 2003 for first responders, port security, bioterrorism preparedness

and prevention, border security and transit security, the FBI; to restore the elimination of funding of the COPS program, firefighter equipment grants, Byrne Grants and Local Law enforcement grants; to provide a sustained commitment of resources for homeland security needs without reducing funding to other key domestic law enforcement and public safety priorities; and to reduce the deficit. **Pages S4046–63**

Brownback Amendment No. 282, to express the sense of the Senate that a commission be established to review the efficiency of Federal agencies.

Pages S4063–71

Conrad (for Feingold/Corzine) Amendment No. 270, to set aside a reserve fund for possible military action and reconstruction in Iraq. **Pages S4071–75**

Breaux Amendment No. 339, to reduce tax cuts by \$375 billion and to reduce projected deficits by \$464 billion. **(See next issue.)**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for a series of votes on certain amendments to begin at 9:45 a.m., on Friday, March 21, 2003.

Page S4107

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the resolution at 9:30 a.m., on Friday, March 21, 2003. **Page S4107**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the additional steps taken with respect to the national emergency which was declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990 by exercising the statutory authority to confiscate and vest certain property of the Government of Iraq and its agencies, instrumentalities, or controlled entities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–28) **(See next issue.)**

Messages From the House: **(See next issue.)**

Measures Referred: **(See next issue.)**

Measures Read First Time: **(See next issue.)**

Executive Communications: **(See next issue.)**

Executive Reports of Committees: **(See next issue.)**

Additional Cosponsors: **(See next issue.)**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions:

(See next issue.)

Additional Statements: **(See next issue.)**

Amendments Submitted: **(See next issue.)**

Authority for Committees to Meet: **(See next issue.)**

Privilege of the Floor: **(See next issue.)**

Record Vote: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—64) **Pages S4106 (continued next issue)**

Adjournment: Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 11:30 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, March 21, 2003. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4107.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded hearings to examine the nomination of Vernon Bernard Parker, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Civil Rights, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators McCain and Kyl, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary concluded hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2004 for the Department of Commerce, after receiving testimony from Donald L. Evans, Secretary of Commerce.

APPROPRIATIONS: FOREST SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior concluded hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2004 for the Department of Agriculture Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Dale N. Bosworth, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS: EPA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies concluded hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2004 for the Environmental Protection Agency, after receiving testimony from Christine Todd Whitman, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION: ENERGY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded hearings to examine proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2004 for the Department of Defense, focusing on atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy, after receiving testimony from Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy.

REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES ACT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded hearings to examine issues relating to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's proposed rule on the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, focusing on the effort to better protect consumers and increase homeownership by making the home financing process more transparent, simpler, and less costly, after receiving testimony from Mel Martinez, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety concluded hearings to examine S. 385, to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate methyl tertiary butyl ether from the United States fuel supply, to increase production and use of renewable fuel, and to increase the Nation's energy independence, and other proposed legislation amending the Clean Air Act regarding fuel additives and renewable fuels, gasoline, water contamination, and the oil and natural gas industry, after receiving testimony from Jeffrey R. Holmstead, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; David K. Garman, Assistant Secretary for Renewable Energy, and Mary Hutzler, Director, Office of Integrated Analysis and Forecasting, Energy Information Administration, both of the Department of Energy; Paul J. Granger, Plainview Water District, Plainview, New York; Craig Perkins, Environmental and Public Works Management, Santa Monica, California; Fred Yoder, Plain City, Ohio, on behalf of the National Corn Growers Association; Edward Murphy, American Petroleum Institute, Bob Slaughter, National Petrochemical and Refiners Association, Scott H. Segal, Bracewell and Patterson, on behalf of the Oxygenated Fuels Association, all of Washington, D.C.; Richard Wagman, G.A. & F.C. Wagman, York, Pennsylvania, on behalf of the American Road and Transportation Builders Association; and A. Blakeman Early, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the American Lung Association.

EMBASSY SECURITY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings to examine how to make embassies safer in areas of conflict, focusing on federal efforts to provide secure diplomatic and consular facilities for U.S. Government personnel overseas, the Anti-Terrorism Assistance Program, and related provisions of the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2004 for the Department of State, after receiving testimony from Charles E. Williams, Director and

Chief Operating Officer, Overseas Buildings Operations Bureau, and Francis X. Taylor, Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security and the Office of Foreign Missions, both of the Department of State; and Jess T. Ford, Director, International Affairs and Trade, General Accounting Office.

CARGO CONTAINERS SECURITY

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded hearings to examine securing seaport cargo containers from terrorist attack by implementing and using the Container Security Initiative, Operations Safe Commerce, and the Customs Trade Partnership Against Terrorism, focusing on the coordination between agencies regulating seaport commerce, the standardization of procedures between and within agencies, intelligence information available to port managers, departmental funding, and providing qualified and well trained personnel for port security programs, after receiving testimony from Asa Hutchinson, Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Border and Transportation Security; Peter W. Hall, United States Attorney for the District of Vermont, Department of Justice; Stephen E. Flynn, Independent Task Force on Homeland Security Imperatives, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, New York; Jeffrey W. Monroe, Department of Ports and Transportation, Portland, Maine; and Michael O'Hanlon, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 330, to further the protection and recognition of veterans' memorials;

S. Res. 48, designating April 2003 as "Financial Literacy for Youth Month";

S. Res. 52, recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of the problem, with an amendment;

S. Res. 58, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning June 1, 2003, as "National Citizen Soldier Week"; and

The nominations of Cormac J. Carney and James V. Selna, each to be a United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Philip P. Simon and Theresa Lazar Springmann, each to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana, and Gregory A. White, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, Thomas Dyson Hurlburt, Jr., to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Florida, Christina Pharo, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Florida, Dennis Arthur Williamson, to be United States Marshal for the

Northern District of Florida, and Richard Zenos Winget, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada, all of the Department of Justice.

Also, Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 108th Congress and announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts: Senators Sessions (Chairman), Grassley, Specter, Craig, Cornyn, Schumer, Leahy, Feingold, and Durbin.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security: Senators Kyl (Chairman), Hatch, Specter, DeWine, Sessions, Chambliss, Feinstein, Kennedy, Biden, Kohl, and Edwards.

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights: Senators DeWine (Chairman), Hatch, Specter, Graham (SC), Chambliss, Kohl, Leahy, Feingold, and Edwards.

Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights: Senators Cornyn (Chairman), Kyl, Graham (SC), Craig, Chambliss, Feingold, Kennedy, Schumer, and Durbin.

Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship: Senators Chambliss (Chairman), Grassley, Kyl, DeWine, Sessions, Craig, Cornyn, Kennedy, Leahy, Feinstein, Schumer, Durbin, and Edwards.

Subcommittee on Crime, Corrections and Victims' Rights: Senators Graham (SC) (Chairman), Hatch, Grassley, Sessions, Craig, Cornyn, Biden, Kohl, Feinstein, Durbin, and Edwards.

MEDICARE REFORM: PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded hearings to examine proposals to improve and modernize the current Medicare system, focusing on prescription drugs benefits, regulatory and contractor reforms, and demographic and health care trends, after receiving testimony from Thomas A. Scully, Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: Measures introduced will appear in the next issue of the Record.

Additional Cosponsors: (See next issue.)

Reports Filed: No reports were filed today.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. David K. Stewart, Pastor, First United Methodist Church of Wayne, Michigan.

Page H2133

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of Wednesday, March 19 by ye-and-nay vote of 373 yeas to 49 nays with 2 voting "present", Roll No. 75.

Pages H2133, H2135-36

Expressing the Support and Appreciation of the Nation for the President and the Members of the Armed Forces: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 104, expressing the support and appreciation of the Nation for the President and the members of the Armed Forces who are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom by ye-and-nay vote of 392 yeas to 11 nays with 22 voting "present", Roll No. 83.

(See next issue.)

Earlier agreed by unanimous consent to consider the concurrent resolution.

(See next issue.)

Leave of Absence Granted to Representative Buyer of Indiana: On motion of Speaker Hastert, Representative Buyer was granted a leave of absence for an indefinite period of time on account of military service. Earlier, the Speaker read a letter from Representative Buyer wherein he stated that he had been called to active duty in the United States Army and that pending further orders, he requested immediate indefinite leave of the House of Representatives to accommodate his military duties. (See next issue.)

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act: Debated on March 19, H.R. 1307, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for members of the uniformed services in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of a principal residence and to restore the tax exempt status of death gratuity payments to members of the uniformed services (agreed to by $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-and-nay vote of 422 yeas with none voting "nay," Roll No. 76); and

Pages H2136-37

Urging that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Ruling on the Pledge of Allegiance be Overturned: H. Res. 132, expressing the sense of the House of

Representatives that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling in *Newdow v. United States Congress* is inconsistent with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the first amendment and should be overturned (agreed to by $\frac{2}{3}$ ye-and-nay vote of 400 yeas to 7 nays with 15 voting "present," Roll No. 77).

Page H2137

Concurrent Resolution on the Budget: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 by ye-and-nay vote of 215 yeas to 212 nays, Roll No. 82.

Pages H2145–70 (continued next issue)

Pursuant to the rule, the Nussle amendment in the nature of a substitute specified in part A of H. Rept. 108–44 was considered as adopted.

Rejected:

Hill ("Blue Dog Coalition") amendment in the nature of a substitute no. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 108–44 that sought to provide for spending at the levels contained in the President's budget as estimated by CBO; include reconciliation for a tax package with tax relief offset by deferring a portion of tax cuts for upper income taxpayers if the budget remains in deficit; directs a Medicare prescription drug benefit of \$400 billion; provides an increase in the debt limit of 150 billion but prohibits any further increase in the debt limit of more than \$100 billion until CBO certifies that the budget is on path to balance by 2009 (rejected by a recorded vote of 174 yeas to 254 noes, Roll No. 78);

(See next issue.)

Toomey ("Republican Study Committee") amendment in the nature of a substitute no. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 108–44 that sought to balance the budget in four years; provide \$512 billion in tax relief over the next five years and \$1.6 trillion over the next 10 years, all under reconciliation; freezes total discretionary spending for one year and then permits growth at half of the rate of inflation for two years; and within the total level of discretionary spending, defense and homeland security are funded at the requested levels (rejected by a recorded vote of 80 yeas to 342 noes, Roll No. 79);

(See next issue.)

Cummings ("Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus") amendment in the nature of a substitute no. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 108–44 that sought to freeze the tax cut; support defense funding commensurate with the President's request; provide \$300 billion for economic stimulus; provide for universal single payer healthcare program and \$528 billion for Medicare prescription drug benefit; and increase education funding by \$20 billion (rejected by recorded vote of 85 yeas to 340 noes, Roll No. 80);

(See next issue.)

Spratt ("Democratic Alternative") amendment in the nature of a substitute no. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 108–44, as modified, that sought to restore \$98 billion of direct spending cuts and increase funding for homeland security, education, and other priorities; provide \$528 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit and allows increases to the extent offsets are identified; achieves budget balance in 2010 and adds \$573 billion less to the public debt (rejected by recorded vote of 192 yeas to 236 noes, Roll No. 81).

(See next issue.)

Earlier agreed to the unanimous consent request made by Representative Spratt that the amendment no. 4 in H. Rept. 108–44 be considered as modified by the form that he placed at the desk.

Page H2145

The House agreed to H. Res. 151, the rule that provided for consideration of the concurrent resolution by voice vote.

Pages H2138–45

Presidential Message—National Emergency re Iraq: Message wherein he reported that he has taken additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990, by exercising his statutory authority to confiscate and vest certain property of the Government of Iraq and its agencies, instrumentalities, or controlled entities—referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 108–51).

(See next issue.)

Legislative Program: The Majority Leader announced the Legislative Program for the week of March 24.

(See next issue.)

Meeting Hour—Monday, March 24 and Tuesday, March 25: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 24 and agreed that when the House adjourns on Monday, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 25, for morning hour today.

(See next issue.)

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, March 26.

(See next issue.)

Recess: The House recessed at 11 a.m. and reconvened at 12:30 p.m.

Page H2138

Senate Message: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H2133.

Referrals: S. 153 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and S. 342 was held at the desk.

(See next issue.)

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five ye-and-nay votes and four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H2135–36, H2136–37, H2137, (continued next issue). There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:11 a.m. on Friday, March 21.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies held a hearing on Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services. Testimony was heard from Eric Bost, Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, USDA.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE AND THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and State and The Judiciary, and Related Agencies held a hearing on DEA and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Justice: John B. Brown III, Acting Administrator, DEA; and Bradley A. Buckles, Acting Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Fiscal Year 2004 Navy/Marine Corps Budget Overview. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Navy: H.T. Johnson, Acting Secretary; Adm. Vernon E. Clark, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; and Gen. Michael W. Hagee, USMC, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held a hearing on Department of Energy: Nuclear Waste Management and Disposal. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Energy: Jessie Roberson, Assistant Secretary, Energy, Environmental Management; and Margaret Chu, Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Secretary of Homeland Security. Testimony was heard from Tom Ridge, Secretary of Homeland Security.

LABOR, HHS, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on Secretary of Health and Human Services. Testimony was heard from Tommy G. Thompson, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

VA, HUD AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies held a hearing on Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. Testimony was heard from Ellen Lazar, Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. Testimony was heard from Henry Falk, Assistant Administrator, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Department of Health and Human Services.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST—BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on the 2004 fiscal year defense authorization budget request for Ballistic Missile Defense programs. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: E.C. "Pete" Aldridge, Jr., Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics; J.D. Crouch, Assistant Secretary, International Security Policy; Lt. Gen. Ronald T. Kadish, USAF, Director, Missile Defense Agency; and Thomas P. Christie, Director, Operational Test and Evaluation.

MILITARY READINESS AND REVIEW—DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness continued hearings on the state of military readiness and review of the fiscal year 2004 Defense Authorization budget request. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: H.T. Johnson, Acting Secretary, Navy; Brig. Gen. Ronald S. Coleman, USMC, Assistant Deputy Commandant, Installations and Logistics (Facilities); Rear Adm. Christopher Cole, USN, Office of Chief of Naval Operations, Ashore Readiness Division; Rear Adm. Craig McDonald, USN, Deputy Director, Naval Reserve; Nelson F. Gibbs, Assistant Secretary, Air Force, Installations, Environment and Logistics; Maj. Gen. Earnest O. Robbins II, USAF, The Air Force Civil Engineer; Brig. Gen. David A. Brubaker, USAF, Deputy Director, Air National Guard; and Brig. Gen. William A. Rajczak, USAF, Deputy to the Chief, Air Force Reserve.

**NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION
BUDGET REQUEST**

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on the fiscal year 2004 national defense authorization budget request. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Glen Lamartin, Director, Tactical and Strategic Systems; Claude M. Bolton, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Army, Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, Department of the Army; Gen. Paul J. Kern, USA, Commanding General, Army Materiel Command; and Lt. Gen. Robert Magnus, USMC, Deputy Commander, Programs and Resources, U.S. Marine Corps.

**WORKFORCE REINVESTMENT AND ADULT
EDUCATION ACT**

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 1261, Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003.

**HIV/AIDS, TB, AND MALARIA—
COMBATING GLOBAL PANDEMIC**

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on "HIV/AIDS, TB, and Malaria: Combating a Global Pandemic." Testimony was heard from Claude Allen, Deputy Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

**ACCOUNTANT, COMPLIANCE, AND
ENFORCEMENT STAFFING ACT**

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance and Government Sponsored Enterprises approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 658, Accountant, Compliance, and Enforcement Staffing Act of 2003.

**DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT
REAUTHORIZATION**

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 1280, Defense Production Act Reauthorization of 2003.

**FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ENERGY
MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT**

Committee on Government Reform: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 1346, to amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act to provide an additional function of the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy relating to encouraging Federal procurement policies that enhance energy efficiency.

**ENERGY DEPARTMENT ACQUISITIONS—
DECADE OF FAILURE**

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing on "Breaking Fumes; A Decade of Failure in Energy Department Acquisitions." Testimony was heard from Robin M. Nazzaro, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, GAO; and the following officials of the Department of Energy: Gregory H. Friedman, Inspector General; and James A. Rispoli, Director, Engineering and Construction Management.

**U.S. AND SOUTH ASIA CHALLENGES AND
OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN POLICY**

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific held a hearing on the U.S. and South Asia: Challenges and Opportunities for American policy. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: Christina Rocca, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of South Asian Affairs; and Wendy J. Chamberlin, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Asia and the Near East, AID.

**FEDERAL COURTS IMPROVEMENT ACT;
E-GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENTS**

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 1302, Federal Courts Improvement Act of 2003; and H.R. 1303, amended, to amend the E-Government Act of 2002 with respect to rulemaking authority of the Judicial Conference.

**SBA FINANCING PROGRAMS—CHANGES
NEEDED**

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing entitled "Changes to SBA Financing Programs Needed for Revitalization of Small Manufacturers." Testimony was heard from Ronald Bew, Associate Administrator, Capital Access, SBA; and public witnesses.

PROTECTING COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation met in executive session to hold a hearing on Protecting Commercial Aircraft from the Threat of Missile Attacks. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

**MEDICARE REGULATORY AND
CONTRACTING REFORM ACT**

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 810, Medicare Regulatory and Contracting Reform Act of 2003.

**FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS—
REVIEW STATE USE**

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing to Review State Use of Federal Unemployment Funds. Testimony was heard from Emily S. DeRocco, Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor; Sigurd R. Nilsen, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, GAO; Jon Brock, Executive Director, Employment Security Commission, State of Oklahoma; Melissa DeLisio, Assistant Director, Department of Job and Family Services, State of Ohio; Dawn Watson, Secretary, Department of Labor, State of Louisiana; and a public witness.

**NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING
AGENCY PROGRAM**

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a hearing on National Imagery and Mapping Agency Program. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

Joint Meetings**VETERANS' LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATIONS**

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs concluded joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine legislative presentations of certain veterans' organizations, after receiving testimony from W.G. Kilgore, AMVETS, Lanham, Maryland; Maurice S. Sharp, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Arlington, Texas; Thomas H. Corey, Vietnam Veterans of America, Silver Spring, Maryland; Colonel Robert F. Norton, USA (Ret.), Military Officers Association of America, Alexandria, Virginia; and Raymond G. Boland, National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs.

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,
MARCH 21, 2003****Senate**

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Friday, March 21, 2003

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, March 24

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 23, Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2004.

At 9:45 a.m., Senate will begin a series of votes on certain amendments.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: Pro forma session.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Boehner, John A., Ohio, E536
 Bonner, Jo, Ala., E531
 Brown, Henry E., Jr., S.C., E530
 Burr, Richard, N.C., E532, E533
 Castle, Michael N., Del., E527
 Davis, Tom, Va., E540
 DeMint, Jim, S.C., E536
 Diaz-Balart, Mario, Fla., E537
 Dooley, Calvin M., Calif., E537
 Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E535
 Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E528, E528, E529, E530, E532, E533
 Etheridge, Bob, N.C., E538
 Farr, Sam, Calif., E532, E533
 Foley, Mark, Fla., E528
 Forbes, J. Randy, Va., E537

Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E539
 Graves, Sam, Mo., E538
 Green, Gene, Tex., E534
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E542
 Hinchey, Maurice D., N.Y., E539
 Honda, Michael M., Calif., E532, E533
 Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E533
 Jones, Stephanie Tubbs, Ohio, E542
 Kelly, Sue W., N.Y., E538
 Kirk, Mark Steven, Ill., E537
 Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E541
 Langevin, James R., R.I., E532
 Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E541
 Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E532, E533
 McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E529
 McCotter, Thaddeus G., Mich., E530, E531, E531, E531
 McInnis, Scott, Colo., E527, E528, E529, E530
 Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E534

Matsui, Robert T., Calif., E541
 Miller, George, Calif., E529
 Moran, James P., Va., E534
 Murtha, John P., Pa., E540
 Nadler, Jerrold, N.Y., E540
 Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E542
 Paul, Ron, Tex., E529
 Portman, Rob, Ohio, E527, E536
 Rahall, Nick J., II, W.Va., E543
 Rogers, Mike, Ala., E531, E533, E533, E536, E539
 Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E542
 Serrano, José E., N.Y., E535
 Sessions, Pete, Tex., E539
 Shuster, Bill, Pa., E532, E533
 Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E532, E533, E541
 Tanner, John S., Tenn., E539

(Senate and House proceedings for today will be continued in the next issue of the Record.)



Congressional Record

provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through GPO Access at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at (202) 512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or GPO Access can be directed to the GPO Access User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$217.00 for six months, \$434.00 per year, or purchased for \$6.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$141.00 per year, or purchased for \$1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to (866) 512-1800 (toll free), (202) 512-1800 (D.C. Area), or fax to (202) 512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate