



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 2003

No. 49

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable LINDSEY GRAHAM, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be given by our guest Chaplain, Rev. Campbell Gillon, pastor emeritus of Georgetown Presbyterian Church.

PRAYER

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, we thank Thee for this cornucopia of a continent, blessed not only by natural beauty and resources but by the courage, endurance, inventive skill, and robust faith of those who came, and by the vision and wisdom of the Founders who lived with the awareness that their deeds were done under Thy Providence. We are heirs to a freedom, itself not free, but bought by others' sacrifice. We think even now of those who suffered and died to pass on this legacy.

Remind us, Lord, that the everyday panoramic picture of life in this land is only possible when maintained within the framework of a strong defense. Since the only guarantee of the rights enunciated by the Constitution lies in the will of people prepared to die for them, then multiply, O God, our gratitude to all those who have done so in the past and those who continue to lay their lives on the line for the long-term safety and protection of this Nation and the cause of liberty across the globe. In these testing times give guidance and steadfastness to freedom's defenders: the President and his advisors, the Armed Forces, our allies, and the representatives of the people who gather under this roof.

O God, although the future is unknown, yet grant to this Senate to see clearly the eternal beacons by which the Founders were led. So bless them with vision informed by wisdom; wisdom instructed by truth; truth revealed to integrity and integrity

touched by love—all learned in humility before Thee, O God, whose children we are called to be. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable LINDSEY GRAHAM 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.

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 26, 2003.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable LINDSEY GRAHAM, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TED STEVENS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LINDSEY GRAHAM thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. For the information of all Senators, this morning there will be a period for morning business until 11:30 a.m. A number of Members have requested time to make remarks regarding our courageous men and

women of the Armed Forces, and this morning will be an opportunity for them to do that.

At 11:30, we will resume consideration of the budget resolution. We made substantial progress yesterday. Of the 22 amendments remaining on the list, far fewer will be offered and require votes. We will resume voting on the offered amendments at 11:30 a.m. and will continue voting over the course of the afternoon until we reach passage of the resolution.

Under the consent agreement reached last week, we will vote on adoption of the budget resolution at 4 p.m. today. It may be possible to complete action on the resolution earlier than that, but we will have to wait and see how many amendments will actually necessitate votes over the course of the late morning and early afternoon. To this point, we have had 45 rollcall votes on this budget resolution.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the chairman and ranking member for their orderly consideration of this very important measure. I will have more to say about their good work as we approach passage over the course of the afternoon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. While the majority leader is in the Chamber, on behalf of the Senate, I commend him and the minority leader for the arrangement that was made. This legislation upon which we work is almost impossible to go through each year, but we have done it. This year has been about as orderly as I have seen. I know the leader wanted to finish this bill last week, but it was just impossible to do, no matter what his wishes were. The work that the majority leader and Senator DASCHLE have done to allow us to get to this point has made it possible that the two managers could do the great work they have done to move this legislation along.

As I heard one Senator say last night, this is the Senate at its best. I

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4397

believe we have had good, short debate and we have had some spirited voting. I hope we can continue that today, which I am confident we will, and make this one of the most productive weeks we have had in a long time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. I thank the assistant minority leader for his comments. Indeed, I believe that by 4 p.m. today the product we end up with will reflect the will of the Senate after adequate time for debate, discussion, and time for people to express both their feelings and their convictions. We will have a product of which we will all be proud, where neither side will agree with it in its entirety.

We have a lot of work to do. I appreciate the comments and look forward to a productive day.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. WARNER. Will the leader suggest perhaps what the order of the first few speakers might be? I see the Senator from Texas is in the Chamber. I understand the Senator from North Dakota is due to arrive shortly and then the Senator from Virginia could follow. Could that be a tentative arrangement?

Mr. REID. That would be certainly appropriate, if the Senator from Texas wishes to speak, and then if Senator DORGAN is on time, which I am confident he will be, then the Senator from Virginia could follow him. I put that in the form of a unanimous consent request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 11:30 a.m., with the time to be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Texas.

SUPPORT FOR OUR TROOPS

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I thank the majority and minority leaders for setting aside this time for Senators to talk about events in the battlefield. While our troops are in the field in the Iraqi conflict, I certainly hope we will set aside an hour every morning for Senators to talk about happenings in the field, tributes to the troops, and other related incidents. I can think of no better way to start the

Senate every morning than to pay tribute to those who are in the field as we speak.

All of us have seen the graphic pictures on television of the sandstorm and our troops continuing to make their way forward toward Baghdad, even though the pictures show that it is so dark that even in the daytime they have been hampered by these horrendous sandstorms.

I am particularly moved by the prisoners of war and the missing in action. All of us were riveted this weekend to the television that showed our first prisoners taken. There have been quite graphic pictures of these prisoners taken by the Iraqis and published on television stations overseas. They have not, mostly, been published over here. Certain parts have not been published at all.

I say, first, that every single one of the missing or prisoners are from Texas bases, they are from Fort Bliss or Fort Hood—every single one of them.

I have talked to some of the families. I have tried to reach some but I have not been able to. But it really brings it home when you hear that this has happened and you feel as if you know these people because they are so close to home.

I want to reiterate what the President of the United States has said—all of our leaders. We hope the Iraqis will treat the prisoners of war as Americans are treating the Iraqi prisoners of war. Americans are giving the Iraqis medical treatment. They are giving them food and water. I think one of the most poignant early pictures from the field was a marine giving water from his canteen to an Iraqi soldier who had surrendered.

It is my fervent hope that the Iraqis will show a good side in complying with the Geneva Convention so they will not harm these prisoners or in any way treat them improperly, certainly not humiliate them in any way.

There will be more stories of heroism as we go through the coming days and weeks. Today I wish to share some remarks from British Army LTC Tim Collins, who spoke to his troops just before they moved into their first battle against Saddam's forces. These words are stirring and they give us a glimpse into the hearts of those who are carrying out the job in Iraq, who are doing the job so well, part of a coalition of freedom-loving people.

I don't think anyone in America will ever forget the incredible support of the British Government and the British Army. There are many other governments and armies that have come forward. We are up to 45 countries in support of this action, the last I heard. But I particularly was touched by Lieutenant Colonel Collins's speech to his men. He said:

There are some who are alive at this moment who will not be alive shortly. It is my foremost intention to bring every single one of you out alive, but there may be some

among us who will not see the end of this campaign. We will put them in their sleeping bags and send them back. There will be no time for sorrow. . . .

Those who do not wish to go on that journey, we will not send. As for the others, I expect you to rock their world. Wipe them out if that is what they choose. But if you are ferocious in battle, remember to be magnanimous in victory. It is a big step to take another human life. It is not to be done lightly. . . .

I know of men who have taken life needlessly in other conflicts. I can assure you they live with the mark of Cain upon them. If someone surrenders to you, then remember they have that right in international law and ensure that one day they can go home to their family. The ones who wish to fight, well, we aim to please. . . .

We go to liberate, not to conquer. We will not fly our flags in their country. Iraq is steeped in history. It is the site of the Garden of Eden, of the Great Flood and the birthplace of Abraham. Tread lightly there. . . .

You will see things that no man could pay to see and you will have to go a long way to find a more decent, generous and upright people than the Iraqis. You will be embarrassed by their hospitality even though they have nothing. . . .

Colonel Collins and his men formed the first battalion of the Royal Irish Regiment. Colonel Collins is from Belfast and most of his men are from Northern Ireland. We are very proud to have them among our coalition.

I think I speak for every American in saying we support our troops, we support our allies, and we support everything they are doing in the field as we are here, enjoying the freedom they are fighting to keep for us, for our children and our grandchildren.

We will never be able to fully repay the debt to those who have lost their lives, but we will always remember them. We will respect them. We will duly honor them as time goes by, as one of those brave souls in the history of our country who have allowed us to keep the freedom that is the beacon to the world.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

THE BUDGET

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, 100 years from now, none of us will be here. I guess that is the bad news. We will all be dead a century from now. But those who are interested in who we were, what we were, what our value systems were about, could take a look at what we are doing here and determine a little something about what we thought was important.

Someone once asked the question, if you were charged with writing an obituary for someone else and knew nothing about them but had to write it from their check register—the only information you had about someone was their check register—how would you write their obituary? I suppose you would find out what they spent their money on, what they thought was important, what was their value system.

So, too, could you evaluate the value system of this country and this Congress by this budget we are voting on today.

I am going to vote against this budget. I will tell you why. Because I think in the rearview mirror, this budget represents a value system that misses much of what is important about what our obligation is today.

We are at war. We are at war with terrorists. We are at war in Iraq. We have a responsibility to protect our homeland. We have a serious threat with respect to North Korea, apparently now building additional nuclear weapons.

What does this budget document tell us is the most important element in the Federal Government? They say the most important element is to give those who have the highest incomes in America more tax cuts.

Let me turn to page 6 and tell you what this budget document says. This budget document says, assume all of the President's proposed tax cuts, most of which go to wealthy Americans—assume that. This is the result on page 6: By the year 2013, this country will have a nearly \$12 trillion Federal debt—this country will have a nearly \$12 trillion debt. The gross debt will be \$11.919 trillion—almost \$12 trillion.

We are saying to those men and women fighting for this country today, you go ahead and pursue this battle on behalf of America and when you come back what we will do is burden you, we will saddle your shoulders with all of this debt because the priority in this budget is tax cuts, most of which will go to upper income Americans.

We heard all day yesterday on amendments that this is going to hurt the growth package. What growth? Where is the growth? The only growth I see in this package is going from \$6.6 trillion in debt to \$12 trillion in debt. Yes, it is on page 6. That assumes all the tax cuts. This is the President's plan. The plan is to go to \$12 trillion in debt. I don't think that is much of a plan. This grows the economy, does it? It produces new jobs, new economic opportunity? New tax revenues? I guess not, not if you are going to go to a \$12 trillion gross debt. I do not understand at all what on Earth is happening here.

About 2 years ago we had this debate about dramatically increased tax cuts. Some of us said let's be a bit conservative. The President said, no, there is no need to be conservative; let's pass all these tax cuts. Then we had a recession. The technology bubble burst. The stock market pancaked. We had 9/11. We had a war on terrorism. We had the largest corporate scandals in decades and decades—perhaps in this country's history. And the result, of course, was very large budget surpluses turned to very large budget deficits.

Now we are told if we just pass this budget it will be better. But look on page 6. Assuming all the President wants, assuming all he asks us to do, on page 6, they say, in the year 2013,

our gross debt will be nearly \$12 trillion. Explain that. Explain this. It makes no sense. That is why I am going to vote no.

RECONSTRUCTION AND HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE IN IRAQ

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me make a comment about another item. We will be, later this week, responding to the President's request for a supplemental appropriations.

Clearly, we need to provide supplemental funding. We will not send America's sons and daughters to war and then decide we will not provide the funds necessary. This Congress will and must.

One piece, however, of this request by the President is for reconstruction assistance in Iraq, and humanitarian assistance. Should we do humanitarian assistance? You bet we should. Absolutely. It ought to be a first priority.

But reconstruction? Let me make the case that reconstruction in Iraq, in my judgment, should be funded from Iraqi resources and Iraqi oil. This is a country rich in resources, endowed with very substantial oil reserves.

While I will support reconstruction in Iraq, I am one who believes, when the job in Iraq is finished, the resources and the oil that exists in the country of Iraq ought to produce the revenue for the reconstruction of Iraq. I intend to make that case in the Appropriations Committee later this week and next week here in the Congress.

COVERAGE OF THE WAR ON TELEVISION

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me make one final point while I am in the Chamber.

I came to talk about this budget and the \$12 trillion of debt that this budget document heads us toward. Let me make one final point. I watch the television coverage every morning, as do most Americans, with respect to the war. And my thoughts and prayers are with our soldiers. My thoughts and prayers are with the innocent folks in Iraq. We have no quarrel with the Iraqi citizens. This is with Saddam Hussein and his regime.

It breaks my heart to see casualties on any side. But one of the things that concerns me, in the mornings when I watch this coverage, or in the evenings before I retire and I watch this coverage, is there are a number of retired generals and admirals and others who stand before the cameras, showing us, on the maps, exactly where our troops are moving, exactly what the strategy is, saying: Here is the route to Baghdad for this division and that division.

I ask myself: I wonder if that is in the interests of the American soldiers fighting in Iraq. I just wonder. Do we need to have retired officers, with pointers, pointing to maps and saying, "Here is where this division is going;

here is where I think it is going to be," and some saying, "I disagree with the current strategy"?

I worry a lot about whether the information provided to the other side—the information provided to our adversaries from that kind of briefing that goes on on every channel, every network, by retired officers, who know a great deal about battle plans—I wonder whether they should be offering that precise analysis of exactly where troop movements are on television morning, noon, and night.

The 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week coverage on this is something I think provides information to the American people—and I think we want information—but I do not believe anyone wants information disclosed during this 24-7 news cycle in a manner that would in any way alert the adversary about what is happening.

I worry sometimes, when I see this on television: Is this healthy? Is more information made available, by retired generals and admirals and others who are analyzing troop movements, than really should be made available to our adversaries? I just ask the question. I think it is an important question to ask. I intend to ask it this morning in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, where I will return in just a few moments.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state his inquiry, please.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask, what is the parliamentary situation?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are in morning business until 11:30, at which time we will proceed out of morning business to resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 23.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, has morning business been allocated equally to each side?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. By unanimous consent, we have the Senator from Virginia to speak next. And I believe the time will be equally divided after that.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak following the Senator from Virginia. As I understand it, the Senator from Virginia is now to be recognized to speak. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak following the Senator from Virginia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I will certainly accede to that, but that then we should indicate the Senator from Utah would follow the Senator from Maryland, if that is agreeable.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would also

like to get in this queue. So we make sure, maybe we can specify the times as well so that we know that we have got enough time before 11:30.

How much time does the Senator from Virginia—

Mr. WARNER. I say to my distinguished colleague, about 10 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. How much time does the Senator from Maryland seek?

Mr. SARBANES. How much time would there be available?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We have until 11:30 in morning business.

Mr. CONRAD. So there would be 25 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Yes. Equally divided?

Mr. CONRAD. Would that be fair for the Senator, if we equally divide the remaining time?

Mr. BENNETT. Reserving the right to object, I want to accommodate my friend and more senior colleague, but I had understood that the time was equally divided between the two sides; the Republicans would have 11 to 11:30, and the Democrats from 10:30 to 11. If that were not done, I would be more than happy to split the time available, after the Senator from Virginia is finished, with the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 10 minutes for the Senator from Virginia, followed by the Senator from Maryland for 8 minutes, the Senator from Utah for 8 minutes, and 8 minutes for the Senator from North Dakota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, and then the time remaining would be accorded to someone on this side of the aisle, should that person appear to seek that recognition?

Mr. CONRAD. I think that will actually use up all the time, I say to the Senator.

Mr. WARNER. If there is time remaining, then it would return to this side.

Mr. CONRAD. All right.

Mr. WARNER. I do not object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia.

SUPPORTING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise this morning with a deep sense of humility to express this Senator's gratitude for the courage and bravery being displayed from our President, Commander in Chief, to the Secretaries of State and Defense, and to, particularly, General Franks and General Abizaid, and those immediately in charge of the operations in Iraq, and, most importantly, to the men and women of the Armed Forces under these commands, and their families.

We all start this morning with expressing our deepest condolences to the families and loved ones who have lost

members of the Armed Forces. That is the cost of freedom.

As we watch unfolding the pictorial representation of these families, as they boldly step up to appear on media, all of us cannot but be heartened by the courage that the families are showing, and as exemplified by the men and women in uniform fighting this battle.

I thought to myself, there were roughly 1,300,000 men and women on active duty prior to the commencement of the larger operations in Iraq. And as the buildup progressed, the President called up roughly 300,000—somewhat short of that—so for ease of mathematics, about 1.5 million are now on active service, together with their families. I always mention the families.

In that 1.5 million, if you juxtapose it with the total population of this Nation of 290 million, roughly one-half of 1 percent—one-half of 1 percent—of our population is out there assuming the full risks of loss of life and limb to defend freedom and to defend this Nation. That shows the magnitude of the depth of gratitude that we have to all those who are engaged in this conflict.

We have conducted—and I commend the administration—each morning, at 9 o'clock, a briefing in S-407. All Senators are invited. We have had very good attendance. We will have, this afternoon, from 5:30 to 6:30, a briefing with the Secretary of Defense in S-407 again for all Senators. But the questions raised there are very good questions. They are tough questions.

I assure America that the Senate is involved in its oversight responsibilities as a coequal branch in this conflict, in the judgment of this Senator. I am proud of the large participation from numbers of our Senators—questions about the magnitude of the battle plan; is that sufficient?

Our colleague from North Dakota just mentioned that there had been a lot of criticism. That is part of the freedoms we enjoy. Those who have served honorably in our Armed Forces are coming forth with their expertise. Frankly, I follow it very carefully. I think it has been constructive on the whole. Nevertheless, the Secretary of Defense, here in the Vice President's office yesterday afternoon when he met with several of us, was asked questions on the battle plan. He very firmly said this battle plan was conceived carefully. It went through the Joint Chiefs, not once, not twice, but perhaps a dozen times, and was shared with our principal ally, Great Britain, and others. I have total confidence in the manner in which this war is being conducted by our military commanders and, indeed, by the Commander in Chief, the President.

The question of the prisoners of war is very much on our minds. It is hoped that the Senate will address this issue in the near future. I have been in consultation, as have other Senators, with the distinguished leadership on both sides. It is important that this institution express its strong sentiment for

the care and protection and adherence to international law as this conflict ensues.

The coalition has been very substantial, over 40 nations. I will ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD following my remarks a communication from the distinguished Ambassador to the United States from Australia, Mr. Michael Thawley, along with the comments of the Prime Minister of Australia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WARNER. Australia has been a vital part of the coalition from the beginning. They have forces in country in Iraq now assisting in many aspects for the success of this operation.

This morning at around 6:30, I watched the Prime Minister of Great Britain address Parliament just prior to his departure for the United States to confer with our President today. In the course of that dissertation—it is always fascinating for those of us in the Congress to watch their freewheeling system—the first question out of the box to the Prime Minister: Will you talk to the President, impressing upon him the need to address the conflict in the Middle East, most specifically, the remarks made by the President just recently as to reasserting once again the efforts of this President to foster the peace process.

This brings to mind a thought this Senator has had for some time as to one idea—it is just an idea, a concept, a concept that might help to bring about some stability in that region—a cessation of some hopefully large measure of the conflict so that the talks can get under way. It is difficult to see how any constructive talks can take place without the cessation of the fighting, the human bombing employed by the Palestinians, and the retaliation, that is really necessary but all too often takes place before the cameras, as a disproportionate use of force in the eyes of the world, by the Israelis, who have been afflicted so grievously by these human bombs.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter I wrote to the President just a week or so ago, on March 14.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. WARNER. I will now address the contents of the letter.

Dear Mr. President: I would like to commend you on the step you took today to give new impetus to the Middle East process by announcing that it was time to share with Israel and the Palestinians the road map to peace that the United States has developed with its "Quartet" partners. This is a welcome and timely initiative, given the complex way in which the Middle East conflict, Iraq and the global war against terrorism are intertwined.

I pointed out that I have given basically this same set of remarks in connection on the floor three times. I have

addressed the NATO ambassadors and given this concept. It is one basically that can help to bring about a measure of stability and cessation to the fighting; that is, at the invitation of the Government of Israel and the Palestinian Authority, particularly now that the new Prime Minister has been designated, at that invitation, that NATO be asked to look at whether or not they could constitute a peace-keeping force to bring in to work in coordination with the security structures of both the people of Israel and the people of Palestine in hopes that the fighting can be brought under control such that the peace talks can originate. That is something I believe in strongly because it has a direct relationship, a threat to not only our forces but the other forces throughout the world of the hatred generated among militants in that region, generated by this conflict.

To the degree this conflict can be brought under control and peace talks initiated, hopefully there will be a commensurate lessening of the threat to our forces, not only the military but our embassies and others abroad. It is an important step. I commend our President. I hope they will consider this concept as they proceed.

The war we are witnessing in Iraq was a last resort to disarm a regime that for more than 12 years has defied the international community and brutalized its own people. Despicable tactics Iraqis are using on the battlefield and the way in which they are treating some of the POWs are further proof of the willingness of this regime to flout international law and the laws of human decency. The coalition is taking great efforts to protect innocent civilians and minimize civilian casualties. Humanitarian assistance—food, water, and medicine—is already being delivered. That will increase in the days ahead hopefully.

Once this regime is removed, the Iraqi people can hopefully look forward to a measure of the freedom they have not experienced these many years, governed by a rule of law of their own design.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

EMBASSY OF AUSTRALIA,
Washington, DC, March 21, 2003.

Hon. JOHN WARNER,
U.S. Senator, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I just wanted to thank you very much for your reference in the Senate debate yesterday to the support of Australian armed forces in the current fighting in Iraq. It was greatly appreciated. It is nice to know that our contribution is valued.

You might like to see the Prime Minister's comments about the role of our alliance with the United States in the speech he made to the Australian parliament on our commitment. I also attach his address to the nation in which he set out the reasons why the Government had authorized the engagement of Australian forces in military action.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL THAWLEY,
Ambassador.

EXTRACT FROM PRIME MINISTER HOWARD'S
STATEMENT TO THE AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT,
18, MARCH 2003

Our alliance with the United States is unapologetically a factor in the decision that we have taken. The crucial, long-term value of the United States alliance should always be a factor in any major national security decision taken by Australia.

America has given strong leadership to the world on the issue of Iraq. The Security Council would not have been re-energised, the United Nations would not have been re-energised, had it not been for the action of the United States returning the issue to the United Nations in September of last year. We have supported the American position on this issue because we share their concerns and we share their worries about the future if Iraq is left unattended to. Alliances are two-way processes and, where we are in agreement, we should not leave it to the United States to do all of the heavy lifting just because they are the world's superpower. To do so would undermine one of the most important relationships we have and, in an increasingly globalised and borderless world, the relationship between Australia and the United States will become more rather than less important as the years go by.

TRANSCRIPT OF THE PRIME MINISTER, THE
HON. JOHN HOWARD, MP, ADDRESS TO THE
NATION, MARCH 20, 2003

Good evening: The Government has decided to commit Australian forces to action to disarm Iraq because we believe it is right, it is lawful and it's in Australia's national interest.

We are determined to join other countries to deprive Iraq of its weapons of mass destruction, its chemical and biological weapons, which even in minute quantities are capable of causing death and destruction on a mammoth scale.

Iraq had been an aggressor in the past against its neighbours and even its own people. If Iraq is allowed to keep these weapons not only might she use them again but moreover other rogue countries will copy Iraq knowing that the world will do nothing to stop them.

And the more countries that have these weapons—countries run by despotic regimes—the greater becomes the likelihood that these weapons will fall into the hands of terrorists. If that happens can anyone doubt that the terrorists will use them whatever the cost might be?

The attacks on the 11th of September and in Bali showed that international terrorists have no regard for human life no matter what the nationality of their victims may be.

Iraq had long supported international terrorism. Saddam Hussein pays \$25,000 to each family of Palestinian suicide bombers who wreak such murderous havoc in Israel. He has sheltered and sponsored many terrorist groups.

International terrorism knows no borders. We have learnt that to our cost. Australia and Australians anywhere in the world are as much targets as any other western country and its people.

Therefore the possession of chemical, biological, or even worse still, nuclear weapons by a terrorist network would be a direct undeniable and lethal threat to Australia and its people.

That is the reason above all others why I passionately believe that action must be taken to disarm Iraq. Not only will it take dangerous weapons from that country but it will send a clear signal to other rogue states and terrorists groups like Al Qaeda which

clearly want such weapons that the world is prepared to take a stand.

There's also another reason and that is our close security alliance with the United States. The Americans have helped us in the past and the United States is very important to Australia's long-term security.

It is critical that we maintain the involvement of the United States in our own region where at present there are real concerns about the dangerous behaviour of North Korea.

The relationship between our two countries will grow more rather than less important as the years go by.

A key element of our close friendship with the United States and indeed with the British is our full and intimate sharing of intelligence material.

In the difficult fight against the new menace of international terrorism there is nothing more crucial than timely and accurate intelligence. This is a priceless component of our relationship with our two very close allies.

There is nothing comparable to be found in any other relationship—nothing more relevant indeed to the challenges of the contemporary world.

I know that some people are saying that what we have done makes it more likely that terrorists will attack Australia.

Australia has been a terrorist target at least since the 11th of September 2001.

Australia is a western country with western values. Nothing will or should change that. That is why we are a target.

Remember that bin Laden specifically targeted Australia because of our intervention to save the people of East Timor.

Does any Australian seriously suggest that if bin Laden's warning had come before the East Timor action we should have caved in and changed our policy. That will never be the Australian way.

We believe that so far from our action in Iraq increasing the terrorist threat it will, by stopping the spread of chemical and biological weapons, make it less likely that a devastating terrorist attack will be carried out against Australia.

I want to assure all of you that the action we are taking is fully legal under international law. Back in the early 1990s resolutions were passed by the Security Council authorizing military action against Iraq.

That action was only suspended on condition that Iraq gave up its weapons of mass destruction. Clearly we all know this has not happened. As a result the authority to take military action under those earlier resolutions has revived.

America's critics both here and abroad have been both opportunistic and inconsistent. They know and admit that weapons inspectors only returned to Iraq because of the pressure of the American military buildup. Yet they have persistently criticized American policy.

Apparently they believe that a quarter of a million American, British and indeed Australian troops should stay in the desert doing nothing indefinitely. We all know that if the troops had been withdrawn Iraq would have immediately stopped its minimal co-operation with the inspectors.

Another point I'd make to you very strongly is that we're not dealing here with a regime of ordinary brutality. There are many dictatorships in the world. But this is a dictatorship of a particularly horrific kind.

His is an appalling regime: its torture, its use of rape as an instrument of intimidation, the cruelty to children to extract confessions from parents. It is a terrible catalogue of inflicting human misery on a people who deserve much better.

This week, the Times of London detailed the use of a human shredding machine as a

vehicle for putting to death critics of Saddam Hussein. This is the man, this is the apparatus of terror we are dealing with.

The removal of Saddam Hussein will lift this immense burden of terror from the Iraqi people.

Our argument is with Saddam Hussein's regime. It is certainly not with Islam.

Australians of an Arab background or of the Islamic faith are a treasured part of our community. Over the weeks ahead and beyond we should all extend to them the hand of Australian mateship.

To those in the community who may not agree with me, please vent your anger against me and towards the government. Remember that our forces are on duty in the Gulf in our name and doing their job in the best traditions of Australia's defence forces.

Can I say something that I know will find an echo from all of you whether or not you agree with the Government. And that is to say to the men and women of the Australian Defence Force in the Gulf—we admire you, we are thinking of you, we want all of you to come back home safe and sound. We care for and we anguish with your loved ones back here in Australia. Our prayers and our hopes are with all of you.

We now live in a world made very different by the scourge of international terrorism.

This has been a very difficult decision for the Government but a decision which is good for Australia's long term security and the cause of a safer world. Good night.

U.S. SENATE,

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2003.

PRESIDENT GEORGE W. BUSH,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I would like to commend you on the step you took today to give new impetus to the Middle East peace process by announcing that it was time to share with Israel and the Palestinians the road map to peace that the United States has developed with its "Quartet" partners. This is a welcome and timely initiative, given the complex way in which the Middle East conflict, Iraq and the global war against terrorism are intertwined.

The festering hostilities in the Middle East are an enormous human tragedy. Along with you, and many others, I refuse to accept that this is a conflict without end. You have articulated a vision of an Israeli and a Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security. That is a bold initiative that deserves strong international support. With the Israeli elections concluded, and the imminent confirmation of a Palestinian Prime Minister, you are right to refocus international attention on the Middle East peace process.

Mr. President, in August 2002, I wrote to you to propose an idea concerning the possibility of offering NATO peacekeepers to help implement a cease-fire in the Middle East. I have spoken of this idea numerous times on the Senate Floor. I am now even more convinced that the United States and its NATO partners should consider an additional element for the "road map" concept: NATO should offer, and I stress the word "offer," to provide a peacekeeping force, once a cease-fire has been established by the Israeli Government and the Palestinian authority. This NATO force would serve in support of the cease-fire mechanisms agreed to by Israel and the Palestinian Authority. The NATO offer would have to be willingly accepted by both governments, and it in no way should be viewed as a challenge to either side's sovereignty. The acceptance of this offer would have to be coupled with a commitment by Israel and the Palestinian Authority to cooperate in every way possible to permit the peacekeeping mission to succeed.

I fully recognize that this would not be a risk-free operation for the participating

NATO forces. But I nonetheless believe that the offer of peacekeepers from NATO would have many benefits. First, it would demonstrate a strong international commitment to peace in the Middle East. Second, it would offer the prospect of a peacekeeping force that is ready today. It is highly capable, rapidly deployable, and has a proven record of success in the Balkans. A NATO peacekeeping force is likely to be acceptable to both parties, given the traditional European sympathy for the Palestinian cause and the traditional United States support of Israel.

Third, this would be a worthy post-Cold War mission for NATO in a region where NATO member countries have legitimate national security interests. It could even be an area of possible collaboration with Russia through the NATO-Russia Council. A NATO peacekeeping mission in the Middle East would be wholly consistent with the Alliance's new Strategic Concept. Approved at the NATO Summit in Washington in April 1999, the new Strategic Concept envisioned so called "out-of-area" operations for NATO.

Given the fractious debate in NATO over Iraq and the defense of Turkey, it would be important to show that NATO can work together to make a positive contribution to solving one of the most challenging security issues of our day.

There will be many detractors to the idea of sending NATO peacekeepers to the Middle East to help implement a cease-fire. But I think there is a broad agreement on the imperative of giving new hope to the peace process and redoubling diplomatic efforts to keep Israel and the Palestinians moving on the road to peace. Peacekeepers coming from many NATO nations could give new hope and confidence to the peoples of Israel and Palestine that there could soon be an end to the violence that overhangs their daily lives.

Mr. President, I hope that you will receive this idea in the constructive spirit in which it is offered.

With kind regards, I am
Respectfully,

JOHN WARNER,
Chairman.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore.
The Senator from Maryland.

TAX CUTS

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution on which we will be voting later this afternoon. Let me note at the outset that this budget resolution is one of the most important documents we will consider in the Senate. It contains within it thousands of decisions with respect to our national life.

We really set our national priorities by our budget, making fundamental decisions within the budget—how much shall we allot for this spending program, what shall we do on the tax side. In addition, the aggregate budget and the projected deficit can have a profound effect upon our overall economy, not only this year but extending well into future years.

We are considering this budget in the context, first and foremost, of the military conflict in Iraq and, secondly, in the context of a domestic economy which is clearly sputtering.

Last month, we lost over 300,000 private sector jobs. The number of long-term unemployed continues to go up. Now almost 2 million people have been out of work for more than 26 weeks. Consumer confidence is at a nine-year low.

Moreover, our fiscal situation has deteriorated significantly over the course of this administration. In January of 2001, when President Bush took office, the Congressional Budget Office was projecting a budget surplus over 10 years of \$5.6 trillion. In fact, the President pointed to that projected surplus as a rationale for doing the 2001 tax cuts. Now the Congressional Budget Office is projecting a \$2.1 trillion deficit over the same period, assuming the President's tax proposals are adopted. That is a swing of more than \$7.5 trillion in our fiscal position, from a projected surplus of \$5.6 trillion to a projected deficit of \$2.1 trillion. Despite this severe economic deficit outlook, the fight over this budget resolution has focused primarily on whether to encompass within it sufficient room for another very large tax cut which the President is seeking.

It is asserted by the Administration that this is going to be a growth stimulus package. It is not going to be a growth stimulus package. It is only a flagrant example of discredited trickle-down economics.

Instead, this budget is going to drive us deeper into the deficit and debt hole. It is going to leave us with deficits projected out into the indefinite future. We are really mortgaging away our future. This is bad macroeconomic policy.

In addition, within the budget, our urgent national priorities are not being adequately addressed. There is not enough for homeland defense. We have a pressing health care problem in this country, with regard to both the uninsured and prescription drug benefits for our senior citizens. We have an affordable housing crisis, in which millions of working families cannot afford even a modest apartment in many high-cost cities. We have the question of supporting our first responders. The mayors across the country are saying they are not getting sufficient support from the Federal level in order to meet their responsibilities. Instead of providing fully for education so we leave no child behind, the proposed tax cuts are designed to leave no millionaire behind.

But I want to address a somewhat broader issue dealing with fairness and equity. I first want to note that in every previous instance when we went to war, we didn't cut taxes; we raised taxes to help pay for the war and to meet its costs. The President has now submitted a \$75 billion supplemental, and it is very clear that that is a downpayment only. No one asserts that is going to cover the full cost of the war and the reconstruction. So clearly the \$75 billion represents the initial downpayment, and there is more to follow.

That further raises the question whether this is the appropriate time to commit away significant resources to a tax cut to benefit the wealthy. Analysis of the tax cut, which the President

is seeking and which his supporters in the Senate are trying to carve out room in the budget resolution to accommodate, shows that almost half of the benefits of the proposed tax cut will go to the top 1 percent of the population. Almost three-quarters of it goes to the top 5 percent of the population. The proposed tax cut is very heavily skewed toward those at the very top of the income and wealth scale in this country; this at the very time when the Nation is being rallied, as it should be, to support our men and women in the Armed Forces. This at the very time when we are talking about sacrifice. And it is appropriate that we should talk about sacrifice at a time like this because one cannot follow the events taking place now in Iraq without some deep appreciation of the sacrifice our fighting men and women are making and the risks they are taking every minute.

What sacrifice are those who are most favored in our society in terms of their economic position making at this critical juncture in our history? Not only are they not making a sacrifice, they are getting a very large tax cut skewed to their benefit which, in turn, will put our economy in a more difficult position into the future. It will build up deficits and debt which the fighting men and women, when they return home, will have to pay off well into the future. They are being called upon to make a double sacrifice, now and in the future.

What is the sacrifice here at home that the beneficiaries of this tax cut will be making? Winston Churchill, at the beginning of World War II, when he became Prime Minister, told his nation, "I have nothing to offer but blood, toil, tears, and sweat."

Our young men and women positioned in the Middle East are called upon to sacrifice even as we debate this budget resolution. There will be sweat. There will be tears. There will be toil. And there will be blood. What sacrifice will be made by those who are the most well off in our society? At a time when we face these critical challenges, should they not be making a contribution instead of reaping a large economic benefit?

Mr. President, I urge the defeat of this budget resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

DIPLOMACY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, we have heard on this floor and in the popular media that the main reason we are at war is because "diplomacy has failed," and there are those who have attacked the President for his "failure" in diplomacy. We also hear that polls are running heavily against the war.

My mind goes back to a somewhat similar situation in Great Britain when Neville Chamberlain returned from

Munich and said, "We have established peace in our time." He referred to the Czechs, whose country he gave to Adolf Hitler in this fashion:

Why should we consider people who live in a land far away and with whom we have little or nothing to do?

Winston Churchill opposed the treaty that Neville Chamberlain brought home from Munich. He offered stirring rhetoric, saying, "We have suffered a defeat of the first magnitude." That stirred my soul as a young schoolchild reading about it. What I didn't realize until I became an adult is that Winston Churchill got only three votes, as Parliament overwhelmingly endorsed Chamberlain. And the popular polls, as I say, made Chamberlain the most popular politician in Great Britain, and maybe in all of Europe. Of course, within 2 years, we found that Winston Churchill was right and Chamberlain went off to historical disgrace.

The Munich example is not exactly analogous to this situation. No historical situation is exactly analogous to a current circumstance, but it is one we should keep in mind as we hear rhetoric saying that diplomacy has failed. Diplomacy in Munich is what failed and the war followed.

The Senator from North Carolina has a resolution she wishes to offer with respect to the current British Prime Minister. I yield to her the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. DOLE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mrs. DOLE pertaining to the introduction of S. 709 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. DOLE. I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from North Dakota.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for this opportunity this morning to bring to my colleagues' attention where we stand with respect to the budget resolution that we will be completing today.

A very important report came out late yesterday from the Congressional Budget Office, which is nonpartisan, which is in charge of estimating the effects of what we do here. I might add, while the CBO is nonpartisan, because the Republicans control the House and the Senate, they were able to choose the new CBO Director. One of the tests they had was the use of so-called dynamic scoring. The gentleman who now heads CBO is committed to dynamic scoring, and he has now released an analysis of the budget before us based on dynamic scoring. His conclusion is exactly what I have been reporting to my colleagues day after day on the floor: Tax cuts will make the deficit soar.

I hope we can put this old canard to rest once and for all that somehow you can tax cut your way to prosperity when at the same time you are increasing spending. When you start from a base of record budget deficits, there can only be one result. When you start with record budget deficits and then cut your revenue stream, as the President has proposed, by nearly \$2 trillion and increase spending, the deficits and the debt are going to get bigger. The Congressional Budget Office is telling us that is exactly what we face.

There was another article in the Washington Post on this same story. They point out:

The CBO report also said the president's tax and spending proposals "imply a deficit in every year over the next decade," thus adding to the national debt and to the annual interest payments on that debt beyond 2013.

"For some time, that added need could be met by running higher deficits. However, the federal government could not follow such an approach indefinitely. At some point in the future under the president's proposals, either taxes would have to be higher than they otherwise would have been, or spending would have to be lower," the report said.

It is time we sober up around here. I do not know what happened to our friends on the other side who used to be fiscal conservatives, who used to believe in balanced budgets and now endorse tax cuts that are going to plunge us into deep deficit and debt.

This is the analysis again from the Congressional Budget Office of what the plan before us will do. This is the President's budget plan: a deficit next year of \$512 billion. That does not count the war costs. Add in the \$75 billion the President wants for the war, and the deficit next year will be \$587 billion. Does anybody have sticker shock around here yet? That is getting close to being twice as big as the previous record deficit.

The analysis shows we will not be out of deficit any year for the next 10 years. But that is not the most sobering effect. None of the deficits will be less than \$400 billion.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one quick question?

Mr. CONRAD. I will.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to be very clear. The Senator is saying the budget deficit for the next year will be close to \$600 billion, more than double the highest deficit we have ever run previously; is that correct?

Mr. CONRAD. That is exactly what we are being told by the Congressional Budget Office. We now face, if we adopt the President's plans for massive tax cuts on top of the spending increases for defense and homeland security, which we all endorse—we endorse the increased funds for defense and homeland security—that we are going to have budget deficits as far as the eye can see, and they are not going to be small deficits. They are going to be massive deficits.

This chart shows that, in fact, we are in the sweet spot now. This is not my

chart. This comes from the President's own document. It shows in the period we are in now that the deficits, although they are record levels, are going to get much bigger. As we approach the retirement of the baby boom generation and as we approach the full phasing in of the President's proposed tax cuts, at the very time the cost of the Federal Government explodes, the retirement of the baby boom generation, the cost of the President's tax cuts explode, sending us right off the cliff into deficits and debt that are totally unsustainable.

The other day one of our colleagues on the other side said Democrats were proposing spending that he suggested was just out of control. This chart shows the Democratic alternative we offered. This is a comparison of spending with the Republican plan, which is the green line, 18.8 percent of GDP; the blue line is our spending, 19.3 percent. One of the big reasons there is a difference is because we put the money in to pay for the war. We put the money in to pay for increased homeland security. So certainly we have more spending. We have more spending because we have responded to the President's call to put the spending in for the war. Our friends on the other side did not.

Let me go to the next chart quickly. He also showed what he called the Democrat spend-o-meter. We can look at the Republican debt-o-meter because what they are doing is running up the debt.

When the President took office, he told us that by 2008, there would only be \$36 billion of debt left. In his 2002 budget, he said—

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CONRAD. Let me complete this thought first, and then I will be happy to yield.

He had the debt run up to \$1.2 trillion after adopting his plans; in August of 2001, \$1.6 trillion. In February of 2002, with the President's 2003 budget, the debt is up to \$3.2 trillion. And if we adopt his budget for 2004, the debt by 2008 will be \$5 trillion.

I conclude by saying when we proposed additional spending to fund the war, to fund homeland security, and to improve education, we did it in a controlled way, every bit of it paid for, but we added deficit reduction so that we would have less deficit, less debt, a stronger economy, and more opportunity for the American people.

When I see in the newspapers the President in his plan is down to \$350 billion of tax cuts, oh, no, they are only looking at half the proposal. Right now the budget resolution that is before us has \$852 billion in tax cuts, not the \$350 billion that has been widely reported. When they are talking about the \$350 billion, they are talking about the reconciled tax cuts, those that will be given special consideration which cannot be filibustered. So the total tax cuts in this plan are \$852 billion.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland to a question.

Mr. SARBANES. I ask the ranking member of the Budget Committee, with these record deficits and this incredible buildup of debt which would flow out of the administration's policy, who is going to carry the burden of that debt? Will not the same men and women who are now fighting out in the Middle East, when they come home, have that debt settle upon them? And in the meantime, very big tax cuts are being given to very wealthy people. What sacrifice are the people who have been most favored in our society economically making in order to meet this economic crisis? There is no sacrifice on their part.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from New Mexico.

TRIBUTE TO THE BRAVE

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the brave men and women who are serving our country in both Iraq and Afghanistan, three individuals in particular. First, I will speak briefly about SP Joseph Hudson. He is a 1998 graduate of Alamogordo High School in my State. He is a member of the 507th Maintenance Company out of Fort Bliss, TX, who was captured this past Sunday. His image was seen on a videotape by his wife and high school sweetheart, Natalie, and young daughter Cameron, and his mother Anecita, also of Alamogordo, as well as everyone around the world watching the television coverage of this war. Like them, we wait anxiously for any word about his well-being, and pray for his safe return.

While our attention is focused on the fierce conflict in Iraq, it is important to remember that there are also young men and women putting their lives on the line every day in the conflict in Afghanistan as well. Many of us in New Mexico got a terrible reminder of that on Sunday, when two young people with strong ties to New Mexico were killed attempting to help two Afghan children.

Air Force 1LT Tamara Long Archuleta was the copilot of the helicopter that crashed while on a rescue mission, killing all six aboard. Tammy was from Adelino, near Belen, NM, and her life was a shining example of the power of discipline, drive, and determination. Tammy was valedictorian of her class and a world karate champion. She graduated from the University of New Mexico with honors, and while there became involved with Air Force ROTC. She had wanted to become a fighter pilot, but instead decided to do rescue work. Her grandfather was a Navy pilot and her uncle a pararescue man, and Tammy had been strongly influenced by her family's dedication to service.

Tammy had a 3-year-old son and was to marry a fellow Air Force pilot soon. Sadly, she was scheduled to return

home in a mere 2 weeks. Words cannot express the grief many New Mexicans are feeling about the loss of this extraordinary young woman.

I would also add that New Mexico was twice touched by this tragedy, the loss of this helicopter. Another young man killed in the crash, SSG Jason Hicks, met his future wife, Cristy Nolan of Rio Rancho, NM, when he was in training at Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque. We honor his memory as well as Tamara's.

We hope this is the end of the casualties and problems we see for the young men and women of our State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

IMMINENT DANGER PAY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is the nature of our debate on the budget resolution that there is a very limited amount of time available to discuss amendments which we will be offering. I am taking this opportunity this morning to describe to my colleagues and those following the debate an amendment which I plan to offer this morning to the budget resolution.

All of us are transfixed by images that come over the television, as we listen to the radio, and as we read the newspaper about the war in Iraq. We are reminded on a minute-by-minute basis of the heroism, bravery, and determination of our Armed Forces.

Last week, there was a resolution commending the Armed Forces for their efforts, as well as standing, by the President as Commander in Chief as he leads these forces into battle. That resolution was enacted by a vote of 99 to 0, with all Senators present voting in favor of it—all Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. It is an indication of the solidarity in this Chamber behind the men and women in uniform.

The amendment which I will offer during the course of the budget resolution debate today will be further evidence of our solidarity behind the men and women in uniform. My colleagues may be surprised to learn that those who are serving in the military in Iraq are eligible for what is known as imminent danger pay, combat pay. It is one of those rare moments in military life when we know these men and women put their lives on the line and we give them a bonus, an imminent danger pay bonus, above their ordinary compensation. One might ask themselves, well, how much is combat pay for those who are serving? Combat pay today is \$150 a month, \$5 a day. Combat pay to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and Coast Guard is less than the minimum wage for one hour in America for each day they are in battle in harm's way. That was last changed in 1991, when it was raised to \$150.

The amendment I will propose, the imminent danger pay increase amendment, will raise the monthly amount to \$500 a month. Make no mistake,

there is no compensation in dollar amounts we can give these men and women for their heroism and sacrifice, but I think it is important that we step forward with this increase so that combat pay is \$500 a month.

There is a second part to the amendment. We also say when we activate someone into a war theater that we help their family at home. That is known as family separation allowance. How much do we give the family of these service men and women back home during the period of time their loved ones are in combat? The family separation allowance is \$100 a month. I met with some of those families at the Rock Island Arsenal in my State last Saturday. They are facing extraordinary challenges for child care, for the expenses of their families they had not anticipated. We should do better for them. I am suggesting as part of my amendment that \$500 should be the monthly compensation for the family separation allowance. That is the nature of my amendment.

I ask all my colleagues in the Senate who stood shoulder to shoulder, 99 to nothing behind the men and women in uniform, to do the same now when we raise combat pay to \$500 a month and the family separation allowance to \$500 a month as well. That will be a clear demonstration that our commitment to these troops goes beyond words and goes to the budget, so we can provide them and their families the resources they need to not only come home safely but without the hardships that would be part of this service if we did not do our part to help them.

I hope my colleagues on a bipartisan basis will join as we did on the resolution.

I might add, there are some procedural hurdles being thrown in my path. People are saying the procedures may not allow you to offer this amendment. I beg my colleagues on both sides, as our men and women in uniform cannot hide in the deserts of Iraq, we should not hide on the floor of the Senate behind procedural niceties when it comes to fair compensation for our men and women in uniform and their families waiting dutifully at home.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider their opposition to this amendment. This is the right thing to do, and we should do it today.

I yield the floor.

THE GUARD AND RESERVE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, in just a few moments as we get underway to debate a series of amendments to the budget bill, I am going to be offering an amendment. Under the rules, I will have just a minute to speak on it, so I thought I would take this time while we are getting organized to describe a little more detail about the Landrieu amendment regarding the Guard and Reserve.

There have been any number of articles—I see the chairman of the Armed

Services Committee here, and he is well aware of this—there have been any number of articles written as of late about the tremendous weight the National Guard and Reserve are carrying in our current war against terror, whether it be the campaign underway in Iraq, the supporting of a civilian government in Afghanistan, the carrying out of our missions in Bosnia and Kosovo, or guarding the homefront right here; whether it is in New Orleans or Baton Rouge or sites in Maryland or Virginia or your home State, Mr. President, or overseas.

The Guard and Reserve are doing a magnificent job. These are men and women who maybe served part of their time in the military for a few years and then, because of other family commitments or other calls on their talents, went into the private sector. Some of them started their own businesses. They come from a wide range of backgrounds. You yourself, Mr. President, served in the National Guard and Reserve. There are several Members of Congress who have not only carried out their job here, serving as Member of Congress, but also serve in this capacity.

You are to be commended. I know you have spoken out, Mr. President, on many instances about the problems that are arising in the sense that we are calling on the National Guard and Reserve over and over again. Their deployments are longer and our compensation to them, our benefit package to them, the way we supply them equipment, in my opinion—and an opinion that I think you share and is shared on both the Republican and Democratic sides—is not supportive to the degree that they, basically, are supporting us. I guess I could put it that way.

We ask these men and women to go for longer deployments, more frequent deployments, and not only put their life on the line but their livelihood on the line. We need to keep up our commitment on the benefit compensation end, on the financing side. In a moment—I know I only have a minute or so—whenever the leadership feels it appropriate for my amendment to be taken up, I am going to suggest we make a very modest change in the budget submitted to us by the President. Of course, there are parts of that budget I support. There are some parts that I think could be improved. That is what the amendment process is all about.

This is one of those areas that I think can be improved, to take \$10 billion out of the tax cut portion that is not the stimulative part but the unreconciled portion of the tax cut, and add basically \$1 billion a year over 10 years to provide critically needed equipment for our Guard and Reserve units.

There are two units now that are being forward deployed to Iraq that, under the President's budget as submitted—and I believe one unit is from

Georgia and one unit, I say to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is from Virginia—those units will be decommissioned. There is not even enough money in the current budget we are debating to keep those units fighting and forward.

That is what my amendment attempts to do. It adds money. I would like to get more, but we are trying to be reasonable in this request because the Guard is really carrying a tremendous weight. They are happy to do it. They are proud to serve. They are not whining and complaining. But we should be supporting them. I think that is what we should be about today.

I thank you for letting me explain the Landrieu amendment. At the appropriate time, it will come up in the list of amendments. But now, more than ever, we are depending on them. Let us let them know they can depend on us.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

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 bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (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.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the managers of the bill are working with Senators DURBIN and LANDRIEU to try to get something resolved there.

We know Senator WARNER wants to speak. He should be given whatever time he needs to respond to the Senator from Louisiana. But I would indicate that as soon as we get this resolved, and Senator WARNER has a chance to talk, rather than going directly to the Landrieu amendment, I think we should go to Dayton and get that out of the way.

In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Virginia be recognized to speak for up to 6 minutes to speak on the Landrieu amendment, which will be offered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I commend our distinguished colleague from

Louisiana for bringing to the attention of the Senate the need for greater attention to the Guard and Reserve forces. It has been absolutely magnificent how they have been, in many instances, abruptly called from their families and their jobs and within days they are side by side with an active force member performing duties with commensurate skills and commensurate risks.

That is the concept of the total force. It has been in place for some time. But, today, in this situation involving Iraq, we have seen the magnificence of how this total force concept is working.

The Senator is correct; there are needs to increase the equipment, pay in benefits. But the amendment, as written, only goes to equipment. But I am glad you mentioned pay in benefits because the Armed Services Committee will be taking this up, first, in the context of the supplemental, where there will be some provisions therein to provide for the needs the Senator points out, and, secondly, in the annual review of the 2004 Presidential budget we will make corrections.

But as the Senator knows, having served with great distinction on the Armed Services Committee for several years—and you are always welcome back, I say to the Senator—there is a fine balance between allocating the funds between the active and Reserve and Guard forces. And with all due respect to our distinguished colleague, I do not believe this approach you suggest at this time enables us to do the fine balance that we must do, first in the supplemental, and then subsequently in the 2004 review.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia is our chairman of the Personnel Subcommittee; he will have a good deal to say about this as our committee reviews both. So I yield such time as I have remaining to my colleague from Georgia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I thank the chairman very much for yielding time.

To the Senator from Louisiana, let me say, I do not think there is anybody in this body who disagrees with you with respect to our need to look at some sort of modernization package—that is the way I refer to it—for our Guard and Reserve.

I think when the Guard and Reserve were created decades ago, nobody ever anticipated they would be called to active duty as many times as they have been called over the last 10 years. We do need a modernization package.

Now, the Senator from Louisiana has this amendment which applies to increasing hardware purchases for our Guard and Reserve. That is great. We need that, certainly. But there are some additional things I think we need to do immediately.

We are not going to send anybody into harm's way—Active-Duty, Guard, or Reserve—who is not properly

equipped. But we have families of those guardsmen and reservists who are at home now who need to be taken care of.

For the Senator's information, I will tell you, we have a series of bills, some of which I think will reach the floor at the end of this week, in which we are going to be dealing with benefits, both from the standpoint of pay and additional benefits, such as commissary use, and any number of other benefits for the families of those individuals.

Over the next several weeks, we are going to have, through the normal process, an additional benefits package, that is a modernization package, where we look at health care benefits, and where we look at long-term retirement benefits for our Guard and Reserve. Because, in my home State, we now have the 116th Guard Wing, the Air Control Wings at Robbins Air Force Base, where the Guard has been blended into the active force.

Our Guard folks, today, as we sit here and speak, are flying the Joint Stars Airplane weapon system in Iraq. It is critically important that we continue to look after our Guard and Reserve. And I think there is an ongoing series of packages that are going to be coming forward that are more necessary at the present time than what the Senator from Louisiana is asking for here.

But I look forward to working with the Senator to try to do that long term.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia has 1½ minutes.

Mr. WARNER. Fine. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

I say to our colleagues from Louisiana and Georgia, those Guard and Reserve that are now reporting for duty and are integrating with our active forces are, by and large, using that equipment which is in the regular force structure, the equipment which they use having been left at home at their various training centers in the several States. So at this time I believe the equipment to which you refer is that which will be kept in the respective States for the purpose of training.

So I wish to point out that our Guard and Reserve do have the best of equipment. It is available; namely, that of our active forces today.

Will the Senator not concur?

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Without question. Nobody is going to be sent into harm's way without being properly equipped.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WARNER. I will leave it to the managers.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, Parliamentary inquiry: How much time remains?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-five seconds.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I will take those 25 seconds, if I could.

Mr. President, I thank the leadership for this discussion. I think it has been helpful. I look forward to working with my colleagues to fashion a remedy. But at the appropriate time, I will insist on a vote on this amendment because in order for us to put a budget together, we have to have some money reserved for all of these changes that we are talking about.

I hope, over the course of the day, we can come to some resolution so that the Guard and Reserve can depend on something in this budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam 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. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. DAYTON, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 409

Mr. DAYTON. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 409.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAYTON] proposes an amendment numbered 409.

Mr. DAYTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide full and mandatory funding for IDEA beginning in FY 2004)

SEC. 1. FINDINGS.

The Senate finds that: Twenty-eight years ago, the Federal Government promised to pay for 40 percent of the additional cost of special education. Presently, the Federal share is only 17.6 percent. The Nation's school districts cannot afford such a large unfunded mandate. Thus, it is imperative that Congress increase IDEA funding to the long-promised 40 percent share.

SEC. 2.

On page 3 line 10, increase the amount by \$792,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by \$25,771,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$38,503,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$41,764,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$43,121,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$44,515,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$45,912,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$47,316,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$48,731,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$50,129,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$792,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$25,771,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$38,503,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$41,764,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$43,121,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$44,515,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$45,912,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$47,316,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$48,731,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$50,129,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$19,797,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$20,103,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$19,903,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$19,417,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$18,837,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$18,416,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$17,347,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$16,435,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by \$15,382,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by \$14,179,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$389,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$12,533,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$18,013,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$18,482,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$17,873,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$17,182,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$16,377,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$15,457,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$14,418,000,000.

On page 5 line 14, increase the amount by \$13,239,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$403,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$13,239,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$20,489,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$23,283,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$25,248,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$27,333,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$29,535,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$31,859,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$34,313,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$36,890,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by \$403,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by \$13,642,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by \$34,131,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by \$57,414,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by \$82,662,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by \$109,995,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by \$139,529,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by \$171,388,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by \$205,701,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by \$242,591,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by \$403,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by \$13,642,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by \$34,131,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by \$57,414,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by \$82,662,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by \$109,995,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by \$139,529,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by \$171,388,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by \$205,701,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by \$242,591,000,000.

On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by \$19,804,000,000.

On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by \$396,000,000.

On page 25, line 20, increase the amount by \$20,456,000,000.

On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by \$12,886,000,000.

On page 25, line 24, increase the amount by \$21,141,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by \$19,251,000,000.

On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by \$21,817,000,000.

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by \$20,882,000,000.

On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by \$22,525,000,000.

On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by \$21,560,000,000.

On page 26, line 11, increase the amount by \$23,221,000,000.

On page 26, line 12, increase the amount by \$22,257,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by \$23,925,000,000.

On page 26, line 16, increase the amount by \$22,956,000,000.

On page 26, line 19, increase the amount by \$24,635,000,000.

On page 26, line 20, increase the amount by \$23,658,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by \$25,329,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, increase the amount by \$24,366,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by \$26,005,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by \$25,064,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by \$7,000,000.

On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by \$353,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by \$353,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by \$1,238,000,000.

On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by \$1,238,000,000.

On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by \$2,400,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by \$2,400,000,000.

On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by \$3,687,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by \$3,687,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by \$5,076,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by \$5,076,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by \$6,579,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by \$6,579,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by \$8,201,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by \$8,201,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by \$9,947,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by \$9,947,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by \$11,826,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by \$11,826,000,000.

Strike Section 211.

Mr. DAYTON. Madam President, this amendment increases spending for America's schoolchildren and reduces the tax cut for millionaires. That should not be controversial. It finally fulfills the promise Congress made 28 years ago that we would pay for 40 percent of special education costs and would do so starting in fiscal year 2004.

The President deserves great credit for proposing, and Congress for passing, increased special education funding. We have raised the Federal share to 17 percent nationwide, but that is still less than half of what we promised. It is good, but it is not enough.

We have increased spending for defense and homeland security in the last couple years, and when that wasn't enough, we increased it more. We responded to urgent needs. For once, let's meet an urgent need that isn't military. Last year's increase for special education was only 2 percent of that for the Department of Defense. We can afford to do more.

The need is so urgent that surely we can postpone half of the tax cut going to the richest Americans. The President's proposal would give people whose annual incomes exceed \$1 million tax cuts averaging \$85,000 every year. That is in addition to the \$45,000 they are already getting each year from the 2001 tax bill.

So who comes first, schoolchildren or millionaires? Yes, it is a vote for our children.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. We seem to have had an intermission on the issue of spending, but the curtain has risen again. This amendment sets a new standard, quite honestly.

We increased IDEA spending by 24 percent in this bill in 1 year, and 380 percent since 1996. What this amendment would do is increase IDEA spending by 250 percent in 1 year, \$229 billion over 10 years. In fact, the way the amendment is drafted, the Federal Government would now be paying not 40 percent of the cost of IDEA; it is on

a glidepath—under the amendments that were already accepted, the Federal Government would be paying 60 percent of the cost of IDEA, which is 20 percent over what we committed to as a government. Now, that is absurd.

At some point, this spending simply has to be brought under control. At some point, we have to recognize that what is happening here is not an attempt to have fiscal responsibility or proper budgeting but simply to put forward a show.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 409.

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.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), is absent attending a funeral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there are other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 70, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 103 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Akaka	Edwards	Lieberman
Boxer	Feingold	Mikulski
Byrd	Harkin	Murray
Cantwell	Inouye	Pryor
Clinton	Jeffords	Reed
Corzine	Johnson	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Dayton	Kerry	Stabenow
Dodd	Leahy	
Durbin	Levin	

NAYS—70

Alexander	Dole	McCain
Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Allen	Dorgan	Murkowski
Baucus	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Feinstein	Nickles
Bingaman	Fitzgerald	Reid
Bond	Frist	Roberts
Breaux	Graham (FL)	Santorum
Brownback	Graham (SC)	Schumer
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Shelby
Campbell	Hagel	Smith
Carper	Hatch	Snowe
Chafee	Hollings	Specter
Chambliss	Hutchison	Stevens
Cochran	Inhofe	Sununu
Coleman	Kohl	Talent
Collins	Kyl	Thomas
Conrad	Landrieu	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lautenberg	Warner
Craig	Lincoln	Wyden
Crapo	Lott	
DeWine	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—2

Biden Miller

The amendment (No. 409) was rejected.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, on rollcall vote No. 103, I voted no. It was my intention to vote aye. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote since it will not affect the outcome.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, for the information of our colleagues, we are making progress a little slower today than we would like. But yesterday we had 23 rollcall votes. We had 13 voice votes. So we disposed of a lot of amendments, a lot of resolutions yesterday. We only have a few remaining for today.

I thank a couple of my colleagues, particularly Senator WARNER, Senator DURBIN, and Senator LANDRIEU, because they have been able to work out a couple of amendments, probably saving us two or three rollcall votes. So I appreciate their cooperation. Shortly we will be accepting a couple of other amendments that I believe will be offered by the Senator from California and the Senator from Michigan. So we are making progress and we will make our 4 o'clock final vote. I just wanted to mention that to our colleagues.

We will shortly be voting on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, dealing with AIDS.

Mr. REID. Madam President, Senator BIDEN was necessarily absent on the last vote as a result of attending a funeral. I want the RECORD to reflect that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, on rollcall vote No. 94, amendment 413, I voted yea. It was my intention to vote nay. I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to change my vote, since it will not affect the outcome of the vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 383, AS MODIFIED

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I now yield to the Senator from California, Senator BOXER, for the purpose of presenting an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 383. I ask unanimous consent to modify it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order, please.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 383 having to do with afterschool activities and ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment, deleting finding No. 5 in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 383) as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that the number of children in after-school programs does not decrease)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FUNDING FOR AFTER-SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—
(1) Studies show that organized extracurricular activities, such as after-school

programs, reduce crime, drug use, and teenage pregnancy.

(2) According to the FBI, youth are most at risk for committing violent acts and being victims of violent crimes between 3 p.m. and 8 p.m.—after school is out and before parents arrive home.

(3) There remains a great need for after-school programs. The Census Bureau reported that at least 8 to 15 million children have no place to go after school is out.

(4) Current funding for after-school programs provide almost 1.4 million children across the country a safe and enriching place to go after school instead of being home alone.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that funding for 21st Century Community Learning Centers is at least enough to ensure the number of children participating in after-school programs does not decrease.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for agreeing to this sense-of-the-Senate amendment. I will be very brief in explaining it.

The budget before us assumes a cut of 40 percent in afterschool programs. This is a program that both sides of the aisle have been very involved in crafting, watching the number of children grow in the program.

We know from the FBI the greatest number of juvenile crimes occur after school. We also know mentoring is working in these afterschool programs. We do not want to see 570,000 kids kicked out of the valuable program, so this sense of the Senate simply is actually a plea that it not occur, and at the minimum we provide afterschool slots for the current number of children who are in those programs right now, 1.4 million children.

I ask at this time the amendment be unanimously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I thank our colleague from California. We have no objection to her sense-of-the-Senate amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 383), as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KERRY, to address amendment No. 281.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 281

Mr. KERRY. I call up amendment No. 281.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. DASCHLE, proposes an amendment numbered 281.

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent that Senators KOHL, LAUTENBERG,

DASCHLE, and BOXER be added as co-sponsors and the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Wednesday, March 19, 2003, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. KERRY. As all of us know, there are 42 million people living with AIDS worldwide. The Senate has addressed this issue previously, but the amount of money annually allocated falls short of the promises almost every single year. We have been working in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to develop bipartisan legislation. What I ask our colleagues to do today is to provide the amount of money that we will authorize in that legislation, in order to combat the AIDS epidemic. It simply increases the funding level included in the budget resolution to match the spending levels that will be in the authorization bill by \$800 million.

In addition, I tell all my colleagues, this is completely in line with the legislation Senator FRIST and I wrote and put together and that the Senate passed last year. So it is not a change; it is what we did before, but it meets the promise of the Senate and does not fall short. It also dedicates \$800 million for deficit reduction.

I ask my colleagues to help us fulfill a promise that has been too long in coming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, we adopted an amendment yesterday, offered by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator LUGAR, to restore spending to international affairs programs next year by over \$1.1 billion, from the committee's level. The bipartisan Lugar-Biden level would fund the President's proposal next year for global AIDS prevention. The resolution now accommodates \$15 billion in spending over the next 5 years for those countries hardest hit by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. This is the largest commitment made by any country in the world to address this specific problem.

This administration is taking a very bold step, which we support, to combat HIV/AIDS. I therefore rise in opposition to the Kerry amendment which would increase by nearly 80 percent the amount of money provided by this function of the budget. It would also increase taxes by nearly \$1.6 billion, further undermining the growth package now assumed in the resolution.

I have been working with Senator LUGAR and others on this important issue and will devote my full resources to the effort to combat the scourge of HIV/AIDS.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added to the amendment as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. NICKLES. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 281. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask unanimous consent this vote be limited to 10 minutes.

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID: I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER), is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), is attending a family funeral.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 104 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Akaka	Durbin	Levin
Baucus	Edwards	Lieberman
Bayh	Feingold	Lincoln
Bingaman	Feinstein	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham (FL)	Murray
Breaux	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Byrd	Hollings	Nelson (NE)
Cantwell	Inouye	Pryor
Carper	Jeffords	Reed
Clinton	Johnson	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Corzine	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Schumer
Dayton	Landrieu	Stabenow
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dorgan	Leahy	

NAYS—51

Alexander	DeWine	McCain
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Allen	Domenici	Murkowski
Bennett	Ensign	Nickles
Bond	Enzi	Roberts
Brownback	Fitzgerald	Santorum
Bunning	Frist	Sessions
Burns	Graham (SC)	Shelby
Campbell	Grassley	Smith
Chafee	Gregg	Snowe
Chambliss	Hagel	Specter
Cochran	Hatch	Stevens
Coleman	Hutchison	Sununu
Collins	Inhofe	Talent
Cornyn	Kyl	Thomas
Craig	Lott	Voinovich
Crapo	Lugar	Warner

NOT VOTING—2

Biden Miller

The amendment (No. 281) was rejected.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The Senator from Oklahoma.

RECESS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, we are making good progress. We only have a few amendments left. To give staff a chance to work out a couple of amendments—I thank my colleagues for working together with us on the amendments—I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 1:40.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:04 p.m., recessed until 1:45 p.m.,

and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HAGEL).

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. CLINTON. I 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. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 403

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 403, offered by our colleague from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 403.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam 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 printed in the RECORD of Friday, March 21, 2003, under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, this is something we are all familiar with, except perhaps new Members. Back in the fifties, we had a program to replace some of the money that was taken away when land was taken off the tax rolls. It is called impact aid.

Over the years, people started taking money out of this program. It is an easy place to grab money. It has gotten down to 40 percent funding. We are now up to 70 percent. The current legislation would leave it at 70 percent. This amendment will increase it by \$112 billion, bringing it up to \$1.3 billion, 76 percent. That keeps us on track to have it fully funded 5 more years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, maybe my ears deceived me. I heard the Senator say \$112 billion. My reading on the amendment is \$112 million.

Mr. INHOFE. That is what I said.

Mr. CONRAD. I heard the Senator say \$112 billion.

Mr. INHOFE. We are used to using the B's around here. It is \$112 million.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator. My further understanding is this is

funded by an across-the-board cut in all other functions.

Mr. INHOFE. That is right.

Mr. CONRAD. So there are no new discretionary funds available through this amendment. With that understanding, there is no objection on this side to the Senator's amendment. He is quite correct that impact aid is underfunded, and it is important to virtually all our States and all our communities.

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate that. I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I encourage our colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 403) was agreed to.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The senior assistant bill clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I believe the Senator from Alaska has an amendment to send to the desk.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, we have been negotiating for some time, trying to resolve two or three amendments. I think we have done that.

I thank Senator WARNER, Senator CHAMBLISS, Senator DURBIN, and Senator LANDRIEU because I think they have cooperated. They came up with amendments I think all of us can be supportive of.

I ask on this amendment, and this amendment alone, there be 4 minutes equally divided so all the principal players can have a moment to speak on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 429

Ms. LANDRIEU. I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator DURBIN, Senator WARNER, and Senator CHAMBLISS, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU], for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CHAMBLISS, proposes an amendment numbered 429.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: Provide additional pay and benefits for active duty, guard, and reserve forces, such as augmenting Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance, and for modernization of equipment, weapons, and technology needs of the National Guard and Reserves in recognition of those currently involved in conflict operations and the need of their family members left behind)

On page 8, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 8, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator STABENOW and Senator LINCOLN be added as original cosponsors.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I thank my colleagues and particularly Senator DURBIN for his work in working out this amendment. It is for the Guard and Reserve units that have been called up.

This amendment is crucial. It is important that we adopt it for a number of reasons. No. 1, from 1945 to 1990, a period of 45 years, our Guard and Reserve units were called up four times. In the last 13 years they have been called up eight times. They represent a growing and necessary component of our force protection for our Nation, both abroad and at home.

Unfortunately, our commitment to their budget has not kept up with the contributions they are making. This amendment attempts to begin to fill that gap.

I submit for the RECORD, because this is a \$1 billion amendment, a list of equipment needs that could be provided by this amendment. I suggest the \$1 billion could be for this or something comparable to it. I ask unanimous consent that be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRATEGIC EQUIPMENT, WEAPONS, AND TECHNOLOGY NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE

Service	System	Cost
Air Force Reserve	WC-130J Radar—Upgrades Reserve Radar to specifications needed by Active forces	\$50,000,000.
Air Force Reserve	F-16 LITENING II AT Upgrade Modification—Provides Reserve Tactical Fighters with same radar upgrades as active forces; reserve fighters flying same missions.	\$16,200,000.
Air Force Reserve	F-16 LITENING II AT Pod Procurement—Provides Reserve Tactical Fighters with same radar upgrades as active forces; reserve fighters flying same missions.	\$14,400,000.
Air Force Reserve	A-10 TARGETING PODS—Provides Reserve Tactical Fighters with same radar upgrades as active forces; reserve fighters flying same missions.	\$48,000,000.
Air Force Reserve	B-52 TARGETING PODS—Provides Reserve B-52s with same radar upgrades as active B-52s; performing same missions	\$4,800,000.
Air Force Reserve	TACTICAL RADIOS—Provides radio upgrades for interoperability with active forces	\$14,900,000.
Air Force Reserve	LAND MOBILE RADIO INFRASTRUCTURE	\$12,000,000.
Total		\$169,300,000.
Navy Reserve	VAW-78, EC-2 Squadron—Funding Prohibits decommissioning in FY05 of this currently deployed unit	\$10,160,000; Allen/Warner.
Navy Reserve	VFA-203, F/A-18 Squadron—Funding Prohibits decommissioning in FY04 of this currently deployed unit	\$20,110,000; Chambliss/Miller.
Navy Reserve	Littoral Surveillance System—Procures one additional system to upgrade port surveillance by Navy Reserve	\$14,500,000; Lott/Cochran/Specter/Santorom.
Navy Reserve	F/A 18 Advanced Targeting FLIR—Procures radars for 5 squadrons to make compatible with Active Navy	\$14,700,000; Bond/Talent.
Navy Reserve	P-3 Aircraft Improvement Program (AIP)—Would upgrade 28 of 42 Reserve P3s to have same capabilities as Actives; AIP allows P-3s to better operate against surface combatants and improve surveillance and targeting.	\$29,700,000; Snowe/Collins.
Navy Reserve	P-3 Block Modification Upgrade Program (BMUP)—Brings all Reserve P-3s into compliance with each other, not Actives—gives all Reserve P-3s similar computers and acoustics sensors.	\$33,000,000; Snowe/Collins.
Navy Reserve	F/A 18 ECP 560 Precision Guided Munitions Upgrade—Provides 1 Reserve F/A Squadron with precision guided munitions similar to Active F-18s.	\$33,240,000; Kyl; McCain.
Navy Reserve	CBR-D Equipment Storage and Logistics—Funds shortfall of 10,000 bio-chem suits for Navy Reservists	\$8,000,000.
Total		\$163,410,000.
Army Reserve	High Frequency Radios (Interoperability for Special Ops Reservists)	\$57,138,816.
Army Reserve	M-4 Rifles	\$1,200,000.
Army Reserve	M-16 Rifles	\$1,200,000.
Army Reserve	Tactical Electrical Power (5-60KW) TQG	\$5,404,000.
Army Reserve	Tactical Electrical Power (3KW) TQG	\$3,000,000.
Army Reserve	Truck Tractor Line Haul	\$12,420,000.
Army Reserve	Improved Ribbon Bridge	\$22,400,000.
Army Reserve	Truck Cargo PLS 10X10 M1075 (T40999)	\$6,936,000.
Army Reserve	Trailer PLS 8X20 M1075 (T93761)	\$1,320,000.

STRATEGIC EQUIPMENT, WEAPONS, AND TECHNOLOGY NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE—Continued

Service	System	Cost
Army Reserve	Spreader Bituminous Module PLS 2500 Gal. (S13546)	\$2,080,000.
Army Reserve	Mixer Concrete	\$1,375,000
Army Reserve	Dump Body Module	\$3,496,000
Army Reserve	Engineer Mission Module Water Distributor	\$9,630,000
Army Reserve	Airborne/Air Assault Scraper (S30039)	\$7,575,000
Army Reserve	Distributor Water Self-Propelled 2500 Gal.	\$2,970,000
Army Reserve	Truck Transporter Common Bridge (CBT) (T91308)	\$8,360,000
Army Reserve	Truck Dump 20 Ton	\$7,215,000
Army Reserve	Generator Smoke Mechanical	\$11,667,600
Army Reserve	Tent Expandable Modular (Surgical)	\$729,000
Total		\$166,116,416.
Army Nat'l Guard	Black Hawk Helicopters	\$223,200,000; Santorum, Specter, Chambliss, Ensign, Frist, Alexander.
Army Nat'l Guard	SINGARS (Radio Systems)	\$34,900,000.
Air Nat'l Guard	F-16 Targeting Pods	\$35,100,000; Talent/Bond.
Air Nat'l Guard	A-10 Targeting Pods	\$70,200,000.
Air Nat'l Guard	C-130H2 AN/APN-241 Radar	\$24,500,000.
Air Nat'l Guard	F-15 AIFF/IFF (Data Link Systems)	\$31,300,000; Smith (OR), Talent, Bond.
Air Nat'l Guard	F-15 220E Engine Kits	\$98,000,000 Smith, Talent, Bond.
Total		\$517,200,000.
Marine Corps Reserve	Reserve Training Center Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Mobile, AL	\$8,000,000; Sessions/Shelby.
Marine Corps Reserve	Reserve Tank Maintenance Facility, Columbia, South Carolina	\$3,800,000; Graham (SC).
Marine Corps Reserve	Reserve Training Center Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Camp Lejeune, NC	\$8,100,000; Dole.
Marine Corps Reserve	Uniform and Equipment needs	\$13,200,000.
Marine Corps Reserve	Weapons System Repairs	\$7,300,000.
Total		\$40,400,000.
Grand Total		\$1,047,426,416.

Ms. LANDRIEU. This amendment is supporting the Guard and Reserve for equipment, as well as for pay and compensation, and Senator DURBIN will explain the second part of this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty seconds.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank my cosponsors, Senators MIKULSKI, DAYTON, BOXER, SCHUMER, CLINTON, and FEINGOLD.

What we are seeking to do here is to raise combat pay, the imminent danger pay for those who are serving overseas. It will be raised from \$150 a month to at least \$250 a month, and to increase the family separation allowance from currently \$100 a month to at least \$250 a month.

Senator WARNER was generous enough to talk about \$3 billion here, which will accommodate the needs for the Guard and Reserve that Senator LANDRIEU has raised and also bring the combat pay and separation allowance figures up to where they should be. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the distinguished managers of the bill and our two colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I think this is an amendment each Senator not only can but should vote for. I hope we get 100 votes because it is a consensus across the aisle about the imminent needs of the men and women of the Armed Forces, indeed the Guard and Reserve which in historic numbers have rallied to the call to serve side by side with the Active Force in the conflict, not only in Iraq but also elsewhere in the world.

I strongly support it and yield the remainder of my time to my colleague from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, I, too, thank my colleagues, Senators

WARNER, LANDRIEU, and DURBIN for their strong leadership on this issue. We now have a significant number of Guard and Reserve personnel who are in harm's way, protecting freedom and democracy. It is only right that we address some shortfalls in the way in which these folks are compensated.

In addition to that, we have provided within this budget number for the ability of the authorizing committees to come back and purchase needed equipment from a hardware perspective, as well as to look after the families of our brave guardsmen and reservists.

I think this is a good amendment. I echo what Senator WARNER said. I hope we get 100 votes so we can send the right message to all our Guard and Reserve and Active duty personnel that we are concerned about them and we want to make sure we treat them fairly and equitably. This does so.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to add Senator KENNEDY as an original cosponsor.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 429.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 105 Leg.]

YEAS—100

Akaka	Carper	Dorgan
Alexander	Chafee	Durbin
Allard	Chambliss	Edwards
Allen	Clinton	Ensign
Baucus	Cochran	Enzi
Bayh	Coleman	Feingold
Bennett	Collins	Feinstein
Biden	Conrad	Fitzgerald
Bingaman	Cornyn	Frist
Bond	Corzine	Graham (FL)
Boxer	Craig	Graham (SC)
Breaux	Crapo	Grassley
Brownback	Daschle	Gregg
Bunning	Dayton	Hagel
Burns	DeWine	Harkin
Byrd	Dodd	Hatch
Campbell	Dole	Hollings
Cantwell	Domenici	Hutchison

Inhofe	McCain	Schumer
Inouye	McConnell	Sessions
Jeffords	Mikulski	Shelby
Johnson	Miller	Smith
Kennedy	Murkowski	Snowe
Kerry	Murray	Specter
Kohl	Nelson (FL)	Stabenow
Kyl	Nelson (NE)	Stevens
Landrieu	Nickles	Sununu
Lautenberg	Pryor	Talent
Leahy	Reed	Thomas
Levin	Reid	Voinovich
Lieberman	Roberts	Warner
Lincoln	Rockefeller	Wyden
Lott	Santorum	
Lugar	Sarbanes	

The amendment (No. 429) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, for the information of our colleagues, we are making good progress. I again thank my colleagues for their cooperation in working out the last two or three amendments.

I now call upon the Senator from Alaska to introduce an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 430

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 430.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 45, line 24, increase the amount by \$47,904,000,000.

On page 46, line 1, increase the amount by \$18,768,000,000.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator withhold for a moment.

I think it would be wise for us to get in place an agreement on the amendment that would either be in the second degree or be side by side at this moment so that that is prepared at the end of the presentation of the Senator

from Alaska. Otherwise, the second-degree amendment would be offered. I think it would be better if we did not do it that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the Murkowski amendment, Senator CONRAD or his designee be allowed to introduce a sense of the Senate relative to the Murkowski amendment.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, the current budget resolution assumes the growth package will immediately raise the \$600 child tax credit to \$1,000. My amendment is going to require that the growth package extend that \$1,000 child credit until the year 2013. The child credit is currently \$600, and it is scheduled to go up to \$1,000 in 2010. The problem we have with this, however, is that in the year 2011, you are going to have a child credit of \$1,000. But the following year, that is going to drop in half to \$500. In other words, families with two children will face a \$1,000 tax increase in the year 2011. A family of three is going to face a tax increase of \$1,500. I don't think any of us would suggest that is fair. This is to help the families, particularly in times when we have some economic difficulties. This is an amendment that will help America's families.

I urge Members' support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, let me just say to my colleagues, the amendment of the Senator from Alaska has nothing to do with the child tax credit—zero. The amendment increases the tax cut by \$47.9 billion and increases the instruction to the Finance Committee for outlays of \$18.8 billion. It has nothing whatever to do with the child tax credit because the budget resolution does not make those decisions, as the chairman has indicated over and over.

There will be a subsequent amendment by the Senator from Arkansas that will make clear there is plenty of room in the underlying tax cut to accommodate the child tax credit the Senator from Alaska is advocating. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this increase to the tax cut.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on this amendment and subsequent amendments be limited to 10 minutes.

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

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 430.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 106 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alexander	DeWine	Lugar
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Allen	Domenici	Miller
Bennett	Ensign	Murkowski
Bond	Enzi	Nickles
Brownback	Fitzgerald	Roberts
Bunning	Frist	Santorum
Burns	Graham (SC)	Sessions
Campbell	Grassley	Shelby
Chambliss	Gregg	Smith
Cochran	Hagel	Specter
Coleman	Hatch	Stevens
Collins	Hutchison	Sununu
Cornyn	Inhofe	Talent
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Lott	Warner

NAYS—52

Akaka	Durbin	Lincoln
Baucus	Edwards	McCain
Bayh	Feingold	Mikulski
Biden	Feinstein	Murray
Bingaman	Graham (FL)	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Breaux	Hollings	Pryor
Byrd	Inouye	Reed
Cantwell	Jeffords	Reid
Carper	Johnson	Rockefeller
Chafee	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clinton	Kerry	Schumer
Conrad	Kohl	Snowe
Corzine	Landrieu	Stabenow
Daschle	Lautenberg	Voinovich
Dayton	Leahy	Wyden
Dodd	Levin	
Dorgan	Lieberman	

The amendment (No. 430) was rejected.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DASCHLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I believe there is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment that is going to be offered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield time to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for the purpose of offering another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 431

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN] proposes an amendment numbered 431.

Mrs. LINCOLN. 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 regarding extending the \$1,000 child credit for three additional years (2011–2013))

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE \$1,000 CHILD CREDIT.

It is the sense of the Senate that extending the \$1,000 child credit for three additional years (2011–2013) can be accommodated within the revenue totals and instructions of this resolution.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I compliment my colleague from Alaska for the intent of the previous amendment. Many of us in this body have children. We understand what it takes to raise our children. Across this country, we want to provide all families, all parents the ability to do as much as they possibly can for their children. I again compliment the Senator from Alaska for the intent of her amendment.

My amendment expresses that it is the sense of the Senate that we should extend the refundable child credit for 3 years and that this can be accommodated within the revenue totals in the resolution as it currently exists.

As the Senator from Oklahoma has said several times during this debate, we cannot write the tax cut on the budget resolution. The previous amendment was simply an attempt to increase the size of the tax cut, nothing more, nothing less.

Although the intent of the amendment of the Senator from Alaska I think was good, I do think it is important that we make sure this tax cut actually goes in the child credit and we understand that the money already exists to do it. I ask for my colleagues' support of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, this amendment is a sense of the Senate. It may provide political cover—I compliment my colleague from Alaska for her effort to help American families—but this is a sense of the Senate, so it does not change any revenue numbers. It may give political cover.

I have no objection to this amendment. I hope we accept it by a voice vote. Almost all of the sense-of-the-Senate amendments have been accepted by voice vote. Regardless, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and provide ample political cover for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 431. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 107 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Baucus	Bingaman
Alexander	Bayh	Bond
Allard	Bennett	Boxer
Allen	Biden	Breaux

Brownback	Feingold	McCain
Bunning	Feinstein	McConnell
Burns	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Byrd	Frist	Miller
Campbell	Graham (FL)	Murkowski
Cantwell	Graham (SC)	Murray
Carper	Grassley	Nelson (FL)
Chafee	Gregg	Nelson (NE)
Chambliss	Hagel	Nickles
Clinton	Harkin	Pryor
Cochran	Hatch	Reed
Coleman	Hollings	Reid
Collins	Hutchison	Roberts
Conrad	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Cornyn	Inouye	Sarbanes
Corzine	Jeffords	Schumer
Craig	Johnson	Sessions
Crapo	Kennedy	Shelby
Daschle	Kerry	Smith
Dayton	Kohl	Snowe
DeWine	Kyl	Specter
Dodd	Landrieu	Stabenow
Dole	Lautenberg	Stevens
Domenic	Leahy	Sununu
Dorgan	Levin	Talent
Durbin	Lieberman	Thomas
Edwards	Lincoln	Voinovich
Ensign	Lott	Warner
Enzi	Lugar	Wyden

NAYS—1

Santorum

The amendment (No. 431) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, we are very close to finishing. I expect we will have a vote on final passage in probably about 10 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Michigan has a sense-of-the-Senate amendment to be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 407

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 407.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW], for herself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. KOHL, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. REED, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DODD, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 407.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further 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 the final budget conference agreement should not take or propose any actions that reduce the level of funding provided for domestic nutrition assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture below current baseline spending levels for the programs)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR DOMESTIC NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) domestic nutrition assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture—

(A) have a long history of bipartisan support;

(B) have an accomplished record of preventing health problems for children and promoting the health, growth, and development of children;

(C) provide United States agricultural producers and food manufacturers with important and substantial markets through which they can obtain and sustain livelihoods; and

(D) are due to be reauthorized and improved during the 108th Congress; and

(2) the budget proposed by the President for fiscal year 2004—

(A) maintains current levels of funding for child nutrition;

(B) extends and improves nutrition assistance programs, including—

(i) the school breakfast program established by section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773);

(ii) the school lunch program established under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.); and

(iii) the child and adult care food program established under the section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766); and

(C) renews and fully funds the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786).

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the final budget conference agreement should not take or propose any actions that reduce the level of funding provided for domestic nutrition assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture below current baseline spending levels for the programs.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, this amendment is a sense of the Senate declaring that there will be no cuts to important domestic nutrition programs in this year's budget. I am very pleased to have letters of support from the American School Food Services Association and a number of other nutrition organizations. This is a bipartisan amendment cosponsored by Senators FITZGERALD, HARKIN, LEAHY, JOHNSON, MURRAY, DAYTON, KOHL, CORZINE, JACK REED, CLINTON, BINGAMAN, DODD, and WYDEN.

Our concern is that the House budget resolution will cut child nutrition funding by an estimated \$5.9 billion. These cuts would have a devastating impact on important child nutrition programs such as the School Lunch Program, breakfast programs, child and adult care feeding programs, and WIC.

We, in the Senate, have a long tradition of working together in a bipartisan way on nutrition programs. I hope we can adopt this sense of the Senate and, once more, show that we are very supportive that reauthorization of child nutrition programs is one of the Agriculture Committee's top priorities this year.

Frankly, Mr. President, we need more funding for child nutrition, not less. I ask for the Senate's support.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Ms. STABENOW and my other colleagues today in offering this amendment to express the sense of the Senate that the final conference agreement on the budget resolution should not reduce funding for domestic nutrition programs below the current baseline levels. The reconciliation instructions included in the House Budget Resolution to cut mandatory funding in the areas of domestic nutrition assistance would be devastating to the children and families who count on

these programs to meet their daily food needs. In these difficult economic times, we must not put the basic needs of low-income Americans—particularly children—on the chopping block in order to make room for an ill-advised tax cut package this country cannot afford. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I believe we adequately take care of many of the functions that our colleague from Michigan mentioned in her statement. We have no objection to accepting her amendment by a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 407) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the majority leader for comments about the former chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, who did such a superb job over so many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I take this opportunity, before we enter into the final vote on the resolution, to congratulate the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator NICKLES, first, on bringing before this Chamber a budget resolution, and for the last 7 days of his very diligent work. My thanks to him and his staff for the long hours of hard work and their dedication.

I also thank the ranking member, Senator KENT CONRAD, for his cooperation here on the floor, as well as that of the Democratic assistant minority leader and the minority leader. We have not agreed on many issues over the last several days, but it has, nonetheless, been a respectful debate. And I think the will of the Senate will have spoken in a sound way when we adopt this resolution today.

I will have more to say about the resolution after adoption, but I did want to take just a few moments to pay tribute to the former chairman and former ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator PETE DOMENICI.

For many in this Chamber who have been through the budget wars over the last nearly three decades, it has been a little strange over the last 7 days not to see the senior Senator from New Mexico right here and down in the well managing this resolution. But I also know he trained his successor—and all of us—well, and we have all benefited from his counsel and guidance.

With the start of this Congress, Senator DOMENICI stepped down as the longest serving chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. I should note, under our conference rules, he could have served as chairman of the Budget Committee but chose, rather, to pursue

another of his passions, energy policy. He gave up the chairmanship of Budget to take on another with the Energy Committee. I know he will devote his extensive talents and energies to help the country craft a sensible and reliable energy policy, as much as he devoted them to the process over the last 28 years in the field of the budget. Both remain major challenges.

Senator DOMENICI has been a member of the Budget Committee since 1975—1 year after it was created with the enactment of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act. History will also show that shortly after his first coming to this Chamber in 1972, he and a group of other Senators, including the very distinguished Senator BOB BYRD of West Virginia, saw a need to put some order into what was then an even more chaotic budget and appropriations process. Indeed, it was through this freshman Senator PETE DOMENICI's efforts and prodding that the Budget Act became a reality.

Until Senator NICKLES took over the reins in January, Senator DOMENICI had been the only Republican chairman in the committee's history, holding that position for 12½ years, and the ranking member position for 9 years. Over 21 years—three-quarters of the committee's history—Senator DOMENICI has been at the forefront of setting and guiding fiscal policy in this country.

I am proud to say, in my first 8 years in this body, I had the honor to call Senator DOMENICI my chairman, as I served on that committee, learning the complexities of the Federal budget.

Senator DOMENICI has always been known for his tireless devotion to the budget process, his ability to patch together coalitions, and even a moodiness on fiscal policy that led another majority leader from Tennessee, Howard Baker, to dub his good friend Senator DOMENICI as the "Hamlet of the Senate" in the 1980s.

What has been accomplished under his leadership? Over the period, Senator DOMENICI has participated in the adoption of 26 concurrent budget resolutions, 27 Senate-passed budget resolutions, 26 committee-reported budget resolutions, and 17 major budget reconciliation bills. Conservatively, we estimate that he has taken over 1,000 votes on the Senate floor during the budget debates, and countless additional votes on motions to waive the Budget Act when enforcing the budgets he helped to craft.

He has been at the center of all debates and legislation to modify the Budget Act over the years, with the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, better known as the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act. When differences between the Senate, House, and President seemed to doom the budget process, he took the Senate lead in putting it back on track with its major budget summits in 1987, 1990, and, of course, the 1997 historic bipartisan balanced budget agreement.

Many of these agreements were not always popular, even with some of his fellow Republicans. But he has always—always—stood on principle and what he thought was best for the country at the time. Those principles and convictions to sound public policy have been evident in this debate on this resolution, specifically related to ANWR and the Federal energy policy in this country.

Despite the impressive record on the budget, the one statistic no one will ever challenge in the Senate's entire history, and the one statistic he is probably most proud of, is the fact that in 1986, while serving as a Senator, Senator DOMENICI had seven children in college and graduate school at one time. This son of an Italian immigrant grocer has always been devoted to his family through the good and the tough times. His wife Nancy has been loving support and inspiration to her husband throughout their 45 years of marriage. But I also know that Nancy, in her own right, has been a dedicated public servant, working to improve health care throughout the country, and particularly in New Mexico.

So, Mr. President, I did not want this occasion to pass, as we are about to complete another budget resolution, without paying tribute to the former chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee for his years of service and devotion to this process, to his family, to his State, and to his country.

Thank you, Senator DOMENICI.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, momentarily we will be voting on final passage. We have a couple of additional things to do.

I believe we are trying to work out a McConnell sense of the Senate. That will take just a moment. And then we will be voting in just a few minutes.

I also wish to join the majority leader in complimenting Senator DOMENICI for his many years of service, either as chairman or ranking member of this committee. I have a much greater appreciation for its challenges. He passed resolutions when we had a majority and minority, even when we were 50–50. My compliments to him. He is "Mr. Budget" as far as I am concerned. Plus, as evidenced in some of the debates, he proved that he knows this act unlike any other on the floor.

So I thank our friend and colleague.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 432

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I send a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on behalf of Senator MCCONNELL to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], for Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 432:

(Purpose: To provide for future consideration of a possible free trade agreement with the United Kingdom)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"It is the Sense of the Senate that the President should negotiate a free trade agreement with the United Kingdom."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it has been said that the United States and the United Kingdom are a common people separated by a common language. But we also share a unique cause for freedom, and to preserve that we should also share a common market.

Today I am offering an amendment that ensures that our economies become as integrated as the other common causes that we share. The amendment will provide for a Free Trade Agreement to be negotiated between the United States and United Kingdom similar to the North America Free Trade Agreement.

Specifically, this amendment will create room in the budget for Congress to consider, and the President to successfully negotiate with, the United Kingdom for a Free Trade Agreement with the United States.

The world is witnessing once again the unique brotherhood of freedom and the special bond between America and United Kingdom. Those who know and enjoy the benefits of freedom are willing to join together and pay freedom's price. With so much at stake, America and United Kingdom should do all we can to ensure our common cause stays strong for the benefit of generations to come. With this United Kingdom—United States Free Trade amendment, our mutual bond will only become stronger.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I hope our colleagues will agree with this. We can agree with it by voice vote. It is a sense of the Senate that we should negotiate a free trade agreement with the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom has proved to be a very valuable ally, certainly in this latest conflict, but they have been for a long time. I compliment Prime Minister Blair and his leadership team and compliment Senator MCCONNELL for his amendment and also thank the cooperation of the staff of the Finance Committee for working with us to make this an acceptable resolution. I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. We have no objection on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 432) was agreed to.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to explain why I had to oppose Senator CORZINE's amendment to increase funding for environmental and natural resource programs in the budget resolution.

Let me be clear that I fully support the goals of Senator CORZINE's amendment. While it is true that we are facing a tight budget situation, protecting our environment and the health and well-being of our citizens should remain a top priority. That includes setting aside adequate funding for programs such as the Superfund and Brownfields programs.

But I was forced to vote against Senator CORZINE's amendment because of another concern. My concern with mounting deficits. The budget resolution brought before us includes tax cuts that total \$1.3 trillion. The budget also proposes that \$725 billion of these tax cuts be enacted immediately, under the reconciliation process.

Two years ago, we passed a \$1.3 trillion tax cut. I supported that tax cut. But those were different times. We had a surplus. We did not foresee the significant decline in revenues. Or the deficits that followed.

This is not the time to reduce revenues by \$725 billion. It would hurt our budget and our economy.

Why is \$725 billion in tax cuts inappropriate at this time? The most crucial problem is that it is not paid for. The budget resolution brought before us forecasts enormous deficits for almost the next decade. Reducing revenues by \$725 billion adds to the already mounting deficits. In order to prevent the passage of tax cuts that would drive up the deficit and hurt our economy, I believe that we must reduce the size of this tax cut.

I joined three of my colleagues in a letter that laid out these concerns—we pledged that we would not agree to tax cuts above \$350 billion. This is crucial. The Budget Committee approved \$725 billion in tax cuts, and brought it to the Senate floor. Along with my colleagues, I promised to vote to bring this number down by \$375 billion.

In a narrowly divided Senate, it is important that both parties work together to come up with the appropriate spending and revenue targets for the budget. That is why I worked with both Democrats and Republicans. Together, we came up with a target of \$350 billion for this tax cut, and we agreed that we would all stick to that number.

As part of our commitment to try to reduce the size of the tax cut approved by the Budget Committee, we also agreed that we would not try to reduce the size of the tax cut below \$350 billion. That means I am forced to make difficult decisions. In order to keep my commitment to a more responsible tax cut, I have to vote against funding priorities.

During tough times, we must make tough choices. I chose to commit to a responsible tax cut. A tax cut that will prevent worsening deficits that would hurt our economy.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 23.

Although I believe this budget, as amended on the floor of the Senate, is better than the resolution passed by the Budget Committee, it is still fiscally irresponsible, and I cannot support it at this time.

This budget, if passed, would increase the fiscal year 2004 budget deficit by \$138 billion above the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, baseline, to \$338 billion. This does not include the cost of the war or the reconstruction of Iraq, which is likely to push the budget deficit above \$400 billion.

The resolution contains a \$350 billion tax cut which we cannot afford, and which would be financed entirely through deficit spending.

The resolution does not adequately address numerous domestic spending priorities, such as education and homeland security.

Despite having been amended to reduce the size of the tax cut from \$726 billion to \$350 billion, this budget would still add more than \$1.3 trillion to our national debt over the next 10 years when interest costs are included.

Our budget deficit this year alone is likely to surpass \$400 billion, even before the new tax cuts proposed in this budget go into effect. While the administration pushes for new tax cuts, our fiscal situation continues to deteriorate.

Just last night, CBO released a report that indicates that even with no changes in tax law, the Government will take in \$30 billion less in 2003, and \$60 billion less between 2004 and 2008.

In the same report, CBO estimated that the President's tax cut package would have at most a small stimulative effect on economic growth, and might not increase growth at all.

While the effect this budget will have on the economy is uncertain, we can be certain that it will increase our debt. In fact, net public debt will exceed \$5 trillion by the end of the decade, and interest payments on the debt will double over the next 10 years, from \$155 billion this year to \$310 billion in 2013.

Only at the very end of the 10-year budget period, and under the most optimistic scenario, would we return to surplus.

There is an urgent need to fund many priorities which are not dealt with in this budget, and those needs are not likely to disappear over the next decade.

Those priorities include, among others: The war in Iraq and the subsequent reconstruction of Iraq, the President's No Child Left Behind education initiative, homeland security, and a full prescription drug benefit in Medicare.

Thanks to the success of an amendment offered by Senator FEINGOLD, the

budget does include a \$100 billion war reserve fund to be used to cover the cost of the war in Iraq. The reserve fund is not paid for, however, and will increase the deficit substantially in fiscal years 2003 and 2004.

Moreover, the ultimate costs of the war and postwar reconstruction are still unknown, and could be substantially higher than \$100 billion.

With regard to domestic spending, the limits set out in this budget are extremely low. The President's No Child Left Behind initiative would go largely unfunded, and funding for homeland security is not adequate to meet the security needs of cities, towns, and counties across the country.

Many priorities that are important to Californians are either cut or eliminated altogether, most notably funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program. If that program is eliminated, the burden of processing and incarcerating criminal aliens will fall entirely on thinly stretched State law enforcement budgets.

I believe that bipartisan cooperation is crucial to the Federal budget process, and such cooperation requires both sides to forgo certain new spending initiatives and new tax cuts.

In an attempt to bridge the gap, I co-sponsored a bipartisan amendment offered with Senators CARPER, CHAFEE, LINCOLN, and LANDRIEU.

Unlike the final resolution being voted on today, our substitute budget included significant tax relief for low- and middle-income families that is paid for over a 10-year period by freezing future tax cuts for taxpayers in the two highest income tax brackets.

That budget would have balanced the budget in 2009, 3 years before the underlying resolution.

That budget would have required tough choices with regard to discretionary spending, but it would have been entirely revenue neutral over the 10-year budget period and would not have added any new debt whatsoever.

When faced with the choice between supporting a bad budget and no budget at all, I must choose the latter.

I support a budget which faces our fiscal needs head on, even when an economic downturn forces us to make tough choices, and which resists the temptation to further increase the debt burden on future generations of taxpayers. Mr. President, this is not that budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is sadly ironic that at the same time we are asking our young people to fight a war for our security, Republicans are passing a budget that will force those same young people to pay the bill for the reckless fiscal policies of this administration and the Republican Congress. Democrats are proud that we were able to make an irresponsible budget a little less irresponsible. But by showering the most privileged among us with hundreds of billions of

dollars in tax breaks and running up more than a trillion dollars in debt, this amended budget still poses a serious threat to the long-term economic well-being of the Nation.

Month after month, more American families are suffering from the failure of this administration's irresponsible economic strategy. With the economy hemorrhaging jobs from every sector, an increasing number of Americans are losing faith that they will ever find a job. With this budget, Republicans have turned their backs on the problems of American families. Instead of offering new ideas and fresh solutions, the administration continues to push a tired ideology that has turned our economy into a job-destroying machine. This budget will hang more than a trillion dollars of debt around the necks of our children and grandchildren. They will be paying for this mistake for decades to come. The President's own chief economist, in his academic writings, agrees that the chronic deficits perpetuated by this budget will raise interest rates and cut off economic growth for the future.

And though all Americans' thoughts are with our armed forces today, I would ask that they take a moment to ask, why is this Republican Congress saddling our children with record-breaking deficits and massive debt? It's not to fund the war or the rebuilding of Iraq that will follow.

It is not to honor our men and women in uniform. Republicans voted against funding for health care for reservists.

It is not to strengthen our homeland defense. Republicans continue to short-change the police and firefighters who need our help to prevent or respond to a terrorist attack in their own communities, and continue to oppose funding to better secure our borders, ports, and vulnerable infrastructure.

It is not to get our economy moving again. Like the President's budget, the Republican resolution before us contains very little to stimulate the economy now.

This budget is not about meeting the challenges of the moment or the future. Its focus is on more new tax breaks for the very wealthy at the expense of everyone else. At the expense of deep cuts in domestic priorities. At the expense of record deficits that will be imposed on our children and grandchildren.

Democrats have been able to restore a small measure of sanity to this budget. And we are going to keep fighting to make sure that government's resources are used responsibly to meet the fundamental needs of our country. We are going to keep fighting to get our economy moving today with a broad-based tax cut that stimulates job creation; to fund homeland security; to provide a real Medicare prescription drug benefit, and to honor our commitment to our students and teachers. This is not a time to shrink from our responsibilities to one another.

We need to meet the test of this demanding moment in our history. This Congress should be producing a fiscally responsible budget that reflects the very best of our Nation, the spirit that our soldiers exemplify, the spirit of honor, community and duty in the service of a better future for us all.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we are now coming to an end in our debate on this year's budget resolution.

I congratulate the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator NICKLES for producing this resolution and reporting it from his committee in an expedited manner. We are doing the Nation's business on time.

I know that this resolution has put extraordinary pressure on the committee and floor staff, and I want them to all know my appreciation for their long hours of work. We are not done, but we will take a major step forward with the passage of this resolution today.

I also want to thank the ranking member, Senator CONRAD, who, while certainly not supporting this resolution, did cooperate in the scheduling of this resolution both in the committee and here on the floor.

Having been a member of the Budget Committee my first 8 years here in the Senate, I know how difficult it is to craft a budget resolution.

These are challenging times for our great country—certainly challenging on the international front and equally as challenging in setting a fiscal path for the future. Clearly how the war unfolds with Iraq can impact our economic outlook. But as we move forward on this budget resolution, we are also confronted with longer-term challenges of slow economic growth and the increasing demands of an aging population.

In the near term we will provide whatever resources are necessary to our troops in Iraq to bring that conflict to a quick, expeditious, and victorious end. I also believe that the completion of that conflict and the liberation of the Iraqi people from its dictator will not only provide freedom and economic growth for that country but also lift this cloud of uncertainty that has hung over our economy and depressed investment, growth, and job creation here at home.

For the long term, economic growth remains the key to an expanding economy. Real economic growth will provide the resources necessary to address the demographic changes that confront us both in the Social Security and Medicare programs. We should never forget that for these two programs, it is not the size of their trust fund that matters, it is the size of the economy that matters.

It is for this reason that the President's economic growth and job creation proposal is critical to setting a path toward future economic growth. I will continue to press for the largest growth package possible that will allow us to fully consider the growth

legislation later this spring. But for now this is just the beginning, not the end of the process.

S. Con. Res. 23, as amended, and before us today is a blueprint. It is the start of the process. Once adopted later today in the Senate and conferred with the House, this budget blueprint will guide the fiscal policy for the remainder of this first session of the 108th Congress. Unfolding events over the next many months may require modifications to the resolution. I believe emergency provisions built into this resolution will allow it to be flexible and adjust to changing events.

The failure of the last Congress to even consider here in the Senate chamber a budget resolution undermined the budget process and created significant problems. The failure to even consider a budget left the process in shambles and resulted in the failure to complete action on 11 of 13 annual must-do appropriations bills.

We all know the result. Less than 6 weeks ago, with one-quarter of this fiscal year already over, we finally passed an omnibus spending bill for FY 2003.

We must not repeat that mistake of the last Congress. We must pass a budget resolution and then get on with the business of enacting legislation that follows the budget's outline.

Beyond making it possible for considering an economic growth package later this spring, this resolution will provide resources requested by the President to win the war on terrorism, to protect the homeland, to modernize the Medicare program with a prescription drug benefit, increase funding for both IDEA and Title 1 education programs, increase veterans health funding, and provide over \$450 million next year for global AIDS programs.

Equally as important this resolution reinstates the tools we need here in the Senate to provide fiscal discipline. It establishes discretionary spending caps for this year and the next two. It puts a limit on the budgetary gimmick of advance funding. It extends the discipline of pay-go beyond its expiration date of April 15, and it reestablishes the supermajority points of order against spending that is not truly emergency spending.

Once again I congratulate the Chairman and the members of the Budget Committee on all their work that has brought us to this point. We will pass a budget and the legislative, budget and appropriation process will go forth as it should.

LOCAL HEALTH EMERGENCY REIMBURSEMENT
ACT OF 2003

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to briefly address a health care issue of great importance to Arizona, all other southwest border States, and numerous other States. Hospitals in Arizona and throughout the country incur uncompensated costs of over \$1.5 billion annually to provide federally mandated emergency health treatment to undocumented immigrants.

MTG Corporation, a Texas-based firm, and the Border Counties Coalition, through a congressionally directed study, determined that the 24 counties along the Southwest border alone incur unreimbursed costs of over \$200 million per year to provide emergency health treatment to undocumented aliens. Based on these estimates, MTG Corporation has concluded that nationwide hospitals, ambulances and other providers incur costs of over \$1.5 billion per year.

Arizona, as an example, is indicative of the problems that all States and their providers are facing. The cost to Arizona and its providers for providing these services might well be close to \$200 million. These unreimbursed costs, and other health-related issues, have put hospitals around the country in a state of dire fiscal emergency. As a result of these costs, many doctors are simply choosing to practice medicine in such a way that they do not have to provide emergency room treatment—in Phoenix, AZ, depending on the time of day, if you have a specific emergency a specialty doctor might not be available to treat you. Some emergency rooms have closed, or are in danger of having to close, their emergency rooms either temporarily or permanently because of these costs.

I have introduced legislation, along with Senators MCCAIN, FEINSTEIN, DOMENICI, CORNYN, HUTCHISON, CLINTON, and SCHUMER to provide \$1.45 billion in funding annually to reimburse providers for these federally mandated, but uncompensated, costs.

It is my understanding that there are resources in the budget for the Finance Committee to consider a measure to provide reimbursement funding for health providers that currently provide federally mandated, but uncompensated, emergency medical treatment to undocumented aliens, be it in the Finance Committee allocation, its reserve fund for the uninsured, or any other appropriate funding stream.

Mr. NICKLES. That is correct. I appreciate the important information that Senator KYL has brought to the attention of the Senate, and I will work with Senator KYL and other interested Members to address this issue.

Mr. KYL. I would ask the Finance Committee, in its consideration of legislation dealing with welfare reform, Medicaid, and issues regarding uncompensated care, to work with me to provide for consideration of legislation to provide for this reimbursement funding.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will work with both Senators and other interested Members to provide for consideration of legislation to provide reimbursement to health providers who provide federally required, but uncompensated, emergency health treatment to undocumented aliens.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Senator for taking the time to help me clarify this important issue.

PAYMENT LIMITATIONS

Mr. COCHRAN. Can the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee offer me assurance that budget resolution agreement will leave policy decisions regarding payment limitations to be resolved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. NICKLES. I provide that assurance.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator for his cooperation.

SUPERFUND

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am in support of Senator LAUTENBERG's amendment to replenish the superfund trust fund, by reinstating the superfund taxes that expired in 1995. The trust fund is running dangerously low, and that is just not acceptable.

As I've stated before, I remember very clearly when Congress debated the original superfund law, and I remember thinking what an incredible legacy Congress could leave the Nation by enacting that historic legislation.

Seeing how successful superfund has been over the last 25 years, particularly in Libby, MT, reinforces my belief that we did the right thing for the people of this country when we created the superfund program.

The superfund program brought millions of dollars to Montana for clean up activities, to protect the health and well being of Montana's citizens and create good paying jobs in the local communities left with a contaminated site. For example, more than \$34 million has been spent in Libby alone in an effort to remove asbestos contamination caused by the now defunct WR Grace vermiculite mine, as well as to provide health screenings for Libby residents. Hundreds of millions have been spent in the Clark Fork basin to remedy decades of industrial pollution. Millions more will be spent to clean up the Berkeley Pit and other sites in the State.

Some of this money will come from an identifiable, solvent responsible party, but much of it will not, as companies go out of business or declare bankruptcy. And, Montana is not alone. That is why maintaining the integrity of the superfund trust fund is so important.

I'm extremely concerned that the more we fall behind in securing the funding necessary for clean-up activities at sites in Montana and around the country, the worse off we're going to be in future years. This has serious implications for the future stability of the superfund program.

I don't believe it's fair to solve this problem by forcing the average taxpayer to pick up the tab for the clean up of toxic sites that were created by private entities, and which threaten our health and our children's health. That's why I strongly support reinstating the superfund tax, and why I support Senator LAUTENBERG's amendment.

A Superfund designation is not a trivial event for the communities in-

involved—it invokes real fear and uncertainty in people about the future, about the future economic health of their community, and about the future effects of any contamination on their health or their children's health. These communities cannot shoulder the immense burden of cleaning up highly contaminated sites by themselves, or forcing a responsible party to pay for the clean-up. The Federal Government is a necessary and important partner in this effort through the Superfund program.

Superfund is a success; we should build on that success, not allow it to fall apart.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I express my strong opposition to a provision in the budget resolution that proposes to shift \$1.4 billion in mandatory spending over the next 10 years from agricultural programs, budget function 350, to the Conservation Security Program, budget function 300, compared to projected mandatory spending under the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction under current law. I am pleased that the budget resolution does not require the Agriculture Committee to report legislation reducing mandatory spending pursuant to a budget reconciliation instruction, nonetheless this proposal amounts to a policy recommendation that the Agriculture Committee shift spending away from agricultural programs and towards the Conservation Security Program.

More importantly, as I understand it, the \$1.4 billion in agricultural program savings is to be achieved by reducing farm support program payment limitations below those that were agreed to as part of the 2002 farm bill, the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, FSRIA. Specifically, the proposal would reduce statutory payment limitations for farm program payments to producers of covered crops—wheat, feed grains, oilseeds, cotton, and rice—from \$40,000 to \$20,000 for direct payments and from \$65,000 to \$30,000 for counter-cyclical payments. In addition, the proposal would include certificate transactions and loan forfeitures under the marketing loan program's payment limitation.

I oppose this proposal for a number of reasons. First, the FSRIA, enacted less than a year ago, has already reduced farm program payment limits compared to the 1995 farm bill. Second, the FSRIA, established a Commission on Application of Payment Limitations which is to analyze and make recommendations related to this issue to the President and to the House and Senate Agriculture Committees in a report that is due on or before May 13, 2003. Clearly, the Senate should consider the Commission's findings before it endorses a further policy change in this area. Third, the budget resolution should provide us with a broad plan for Federal revenues and expenditures but leave policy decisions within that budget framework to the Appropriations Committee, in the case of discretionary spending, and to the various

authorizing committees such as the Agriculture Committee, in the case of mandatory spending. This proposal violates that principle by attempting to dictate policy to the Agriculture Committee without having any impact on the overall level of Federal expenditures. Fourth, because their crops cost more to produce, southern cotton and rice farms tend to be larger, on average, than wheat, corn, and soybean farms in other regions. The payment limit proposal would reduce Government payments to larger farms, hurting southern cotton and rice producers the most. It is unclear, at best, what the proposal's changes to the marketing loan program would mean for our farmers. This is a program that has been highly successful in helping our farmers remain internationally competitive without undue Government involvement in the marketplace.

Taken together, the proposal's payment limitation changes could seriously undercut the farm safety net that was a principal goal of the FSRJA, particularly for southern producers of cotton and rice. I strongly oppose this provision.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, our Nation is at war. Our Federal budget faces unprecedented deficits. According to the Congressional Budget Office, counting the cost of that war, the deficit will be \$587 billion this year alone. And we are on the threshold of a crisis in the funding of our Social Security system as the baby boom generation begins to retire in the next decade.

Yet this budget resolution calls for fully \$850 billion in tax cuts, all of which will be borrowed from that Social Security system. In my 30 year career in the Senate, I cannot recall a more reckless or irresponsible proposal.

Instead of a careful, conservative approach to our finances, instead of caution and a sense of responsibility in these dangerous times, this budget throws caution to the wind and simply dumps the bill for our actions today on our children and grandchildren.

These are no ordinary times. We are now fully engaged in a war in Iraq, a war that will not be truly over until the reconstruction of that nation is accomplished. The \$75 billion that the President has just requested is just the first installment on that commitment. We cannot know the full costs of that undertaking, which could take many years to complete. At the same time, the global war on terrorism must be fought here at home as well as in the farthest corners of the globe. The costs of that commitment will be substantial and could well represent a permanent change in the way we do business.

This budget simply ignores those new realities and treats the Social Security system like a broken piggy bank, grabbing the savings the system will soon need for its own obligations to paper over the costs not only of our new security responsibilities, but hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars of

tax cuts as well. But those bills will come due, as the baby boom generation retires, and this budget plants a time bomb in a Social Security system that already faces a serious future imbalance.

Beyond those profound problems, the massive loss of revenues called for in this budget means that we do not have the funds available for such fundamental priorities as homeland defense, health care, or education.

I was glad to see that we fixed some of the problems in this resolution. Senator FEINGOLD's amendment rescued \$100 billion from those tax cuts to set aside to pay for the war now being fought in Iraq. That will be just the beginning of the resources we will need to fully cover the cost of that conflict and the massive reconstruction that will follow.

I am glad that we were able to reduce by half the size of the tax cuts that will be protected by a special budget fast-track procedure. We need to stimulate our sagging economy and restore the growth and job creation we have lost in the past 2 years. But at \$350 billion, half the original amount that was protected by budget rules, that tax cut is still far too large given the other obligations that we face.

But on top of the \$350 billion in tax cuts protected by special budget rules, this resolution still contains an additional \$500 billion in other tax cuts, for a total of \$850 billion in revenue losses. Counting the additional interest we will have to pay on the debt we will pile up, that is another trillion dollars that will not be available for our national security and homeland security obligations, not available for health care, for education, for law enforcement. Nor will it be there when we need to restore balance to Social Security.

We have made some progress during this debate to restore funding in some of those areas, but not enough to meet the needs and priorities of the vast majority of Americans. This budget resolution is the first step in our consideration of priorities this year, and it is a big step in the wrong direction, one that I fear we will regret.

I hope my colleagues will join me in rejecting this resolution. We can and must do better. We can hardly do worse.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I cannot support this budget resolution. In my judgment, this budget, like the President's budget which it reflects, represents the wrong priorities. A close look reveals too many ill-advised cuts in too many critical areas in order to help pay for a tax cut which is too large, too inequitable, and which will worsen our fiscal situation without providing our economy the jump-start it needs.

The proposed budget cuts in education are particularly troubling. While I am pleased that the Senate passed an amendment I introduced that increased education funding by over \$2

billion by proposing to close down two egregious tax haven loopholes, that increase doesn't come close to making up for the shortfalls.

Other priorities are similarly underfunded. The transportation request is less than what was allotted in 2002 and 2003. This year Congress plans to reauthorize TEA-21, the highway reauthorization bill, yet the budget resolution as proposed would limit our ability to increase the program to meet our Nation's transportation needs. The budget would provide inadequate funding for State sewer and water programs, and would cut funding to the Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, Program, which has helped fund more than 3,300 police officers in Michigan. The proposal provides no funding for the community access program, which improves health care coordination for the uninsured, or for extending unemployment benefits for those whose benefits have expired, even though the number of unemployed in our country has increased by about 40 percent since January 2001.

While I am pleased that we were able to reduce the President's fiscally irresponsible tax cut proposal, the tax cut package in the existing budget resolution is still too large, and likely will increase in conference committee with the President's party in charge of both Houses.

In January 2001, the Office of Management and Budget was projecting a 10-year surplus of \$5.6 trillion. Now we are back into a huge deficit ditch and will be for the foreseeable future. In fact, the President's proposed budget and tax cuts would lead to more than a trillion dollars in deficits over the next 5 years, including record deficits of over \$300 billion this year and next. The right type of tax cuts could stimulate the economy by being effective in the short term and going to working families and small businesses that will spend the money now instead of mainly going to the wealthiest among us who don't need tax cuts. But tax cuts that drastically worsen our long-term fiscal situation, that won't help out in the short term, and that would require cuts to many other priorities are not what our economy needs.

Surely, simple equity as well as economic stimulus needs suggest that if we are going to have tax cuts they should be broad-based tax cuts, providing, for instance, every working family of four with an immediate tax cut of \$1,200. And we should also extend unemployment benefits for those whose benefits have expired and weren't previously extended, provide short-term incentives for businesses to invest immediately, and provide some assistance to our struggling States for education, homeland security, Medicaid, and highway and other infrastructure improvements.

These measures would be better for our economy today, our fiscal situation in future years, and the many other challenges that lay ahead. They also

would address today's problems today without passing the bills onto future generations.

In addition, the Senate is asked by the majority to pass a budget without including any estimated costs of the war in Iraq and its aftermath, even though such estimates exist. Yesterday the President sent a \$75 billion funding request regarding Iraq to Congress in the form of an emergency supplemental. That request is not included in the current 2004 budget resolution before us. There is no reason that the costs of the war and its aftermath after September 30, 2003, should be omitted. While there is no question that we will fully fund our troops, we are asked to approve massive tax cuts and huge deficits while totally ignoring the large additional expenditures which will be required by the war in Iraq. In my view, it is both reckless and irresponsible to intentionally keep those costs out of this budget resolution.

This budget emphasizes the wrong priorities, burrows us deeper into the deficit ditch, continues our reliance on the Social Security surplus, and fails to provide the stimulus needed to improve our sputtering economy. I cannot support it.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the administration's budget was wrong for the Nation when the President proposed it in February. It is even worse for the Nation now that we are at war. I will oppose it, and I hope that reason and common sense will prevail in the remaining steps of the budget process to prevent this package from doing lasting damage to the economy and to our communities.

As incredible as it might seem, this budget plan would worsen the fiscal and economic harm done by the administration's 2001 economic package, which, in one fell swoop squandered the hard-won budget surpluses and converted them to ever-deepening deficits and debt. Making matters all the worse, this budget would compound this squandering while the Nation is at war.

Can anyone seriously argue, just for instance, that it makes fiscal or economic sense to borrow money to pay for a tax cut package which itself is steeply tilted to the wealthiest individuals?

This budget plan is misguided in its priorities. It severely underfunds essential health, education and employment training programs; it contains an enormous government giveaway to wealthy corporations and the wealthiest individuals that will skyrocket our Nation's debt; and it is wholly inadequate to meet the domestic security needs of the first-responder agencies that are our first line of defense against terrorism.

Even before the war, when the President unveiled his budget proposal in February, his priorities were sharply out of kilter with the Nation's needs. By severely underfunding education and other domestic needs, and by mak-

ing a nearly \$700 billion tax package the focus of his budget, the President compounds the irresponsible policies of the last 2 years that have traded record surpluses for record deficits.

Let me cite just a few examples of how bad the President's budget is for Vermont: The \$6.7 million cut in after-school programs that will leave 9,566 children in my State without after-school activities; the \$2,405,259 cut in Clean Water Act funding, at a time when Vermont has nine toxic waste sites on the National Priorities List; the \$524,673 cut in the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) that helps Vermonters who need assistance with the electricity and heating bills; the \$793,220 cut in the Community Services Block Grant that provides local organizations in Vermont with funds to help reduce poverty, revitalize low-income communities, and offer families the help they need to become fully self-sufficient; and the elimination of the COPS police-hiring program that has put 245 officers on our streets. And I could go on and on.

In 2001, I voted against the Bush tax package because it was too skewed toward the wealthiest Americans and it was fiscally irresponsible. Since then, we have gone from record surpluses to red ink, and the economy is still floundering. Leading economists have repeatedly made clear that the elimination of taxes on dividends paid to investors, the centerpiece of the President's tax-cut proposal, will do little if anything to spur economic growth or to reduce the Nation's jobless rate.

As Congress shapes an economic package, fiscal responsibility needs to be a priority. We need to be smart about how we proceed, and we need to be fair about it. The tax cuts the President has proposed not only will worsen our Federal deficit, but it will also eliminate \$16 million in revenue from the State of Vermont. Congress now has the responsibility to bring stability and sensible fiscal policies back into the budget process. We must work to reestablish a balanced budget and to restore our country's economic health.

Our Nation is at war. We have nearly a quarter of a million troops in the Middle East. We have five carrier battle groups in the region. And we have National Guard units being called up all across the country. Yet the President has only recently submitted an estimate to Congress about the cost of this war. The \$75 billion he requested on Monday does not adequately address our country's homeland security needs and is likely just a start in funding all of the United States operations in Iraq.

I was disappointed that the Senate did not adopt my amendment to boost funding for first responders. We are in a two-front war, overseas and here at home, and we need to fund both. First responders are on the front lines in defending against and preparing for terrorist attacks. The White House has refused to adequately fund homeland se-

curity, and these added responsibilities have become unfunded Federal mandates that are severely straining our police, fire and rescue agencies. Every time the alert level is raised, it costs our communities and states millions more. Everyone recognizes the vital role of first responders, but the White House is overdue in acting accordingly. The sooner we help first responders help us in the war on terrorism, the better.

In his State of the Union Message, the President was right when he said we should not pass on our problems to other Congresses, other Presidents and future generations. Unfortunately, that is exactly what this budget plan would do. The White House's own documents predict the deficit will hit highs of \$304 billion this year and \$307 billion in 2004. Over the next 5 years, deficits would total \$1.08 trillion. Even these staggering numbers are short of the real mark because the administration will surely need hundreds of billions of dollars more in Iraq-related spending that is not counted here.

This administration has been in a rush to war, but it has been in no hurry to substantively deal with the poor economy that millions of Americans are coping with today.

This budget was a bad plan for the Nation before the war began. It is an even worse plan now.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial by Emerson Lynn that appeared in the March 21 edition of the St. Albans Messenger be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S WRONG TO TIE PATRIOTISM TO MASSIVE
TAX CUT

There is the distinct sense that the American people cannot do two things at once, that we cannot separate our thoughts of the war with our thoughts of how the government spends and collects our taxpayer dollars. Worse, there is the conviction that one should be labeled unpatriotic if the attempt is made to draw the distinction.

This contradiction was played out yesterday in the House of Representatives which passed largely along party lines the president's proposed budget, including his budget busting tax cuts. The cuts were thought to be in jeopardy a month ago, particularly with the Congressional Budget Office's assessment of unending budget deficits as far as the eye can see.

Why the miraculous turnaround? Because, as partisan Republicans said, it would be wrong to embarrass the president just as war is being waged in Iraq. In other words, one's budget sense should be placed at the mercy of the president's polling numbers.

Hmmm. If there is a sense of discomfort in having the budget resolution being debated while war is being waged, then why not delay discussion of the budget? If the president's experts are to be believed, the war will be over in less than a week or so. Why the hurry?

Was the pressure applied because the Republican leadership (and the White House) are concerned about conflicting messages of domestic support, or is it because they saw the opening moments of the war as the most propitious time to push the president's \$726

billion in tax cuts, a proposal most Republicans a month ago thought would be beyond their reach?

Guess.

Today, the same arm-twisting efforts will be applied in the U.S. Senate. Again, it was thought only a week or so ago that the entire tax cut proposal had no chance of being approved, particularly with several moderate Republicans proposing a plan to shave the tax cut in half. The ground has shifted, Senate insiders now believe the president has a good chance of winning it all. Again, it's the war and the pushed thought that a good American supports whatever the president wants right now. We must stand together.

Dear Mr. President: We are smart enough to distinguish between a necessary war and an unnecessary tax cut. Too, our patriotism remains intact; in fact, it is with ease that we can argue that being opposed to the \$726 billion in tax cuts is utterly patriotic. How else to avoid an endless string of swollen budget deficits? How else to protect the integrity of legislative branch's responsibility to be acting on behalf of its constituents?

We find it incredible that we have a president who lost the popular vote and today rules as if it was his divine right, as did the kings in Shakespeare's time. And, yet, we are impressed. Highly impressed. In terms of sheer accomplishment, he has achieved more in two years than Bill Clinton did in eight. An it was thought that the balance of power between the Democrats and the Republicans would largely result in legislative stalemate. The Democrats could only wish.

What is most upsetting, however, is understanding how completely backwards the argument before congress is. The primary focus is on the war and stalwart Republicans are using the emotion of the moment to wash away all other thoughts. In truth, what happens in Iraq, while terribly important, pales in comparison to the long-term effects of the president's decision to essentially strip this Congress and all future Congresses of the resources needed to address essential issues such as health care, Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare. The war will not last long, and even the rebuilding efforts afterwards will be short in duration when compared to huge tax cuts that keep on taking, and taking, and taking.

So you say, just elect a Democrat as president. A year from now the primaries will be in full swing. We could have a change in leadership within 24 months.

Think again.

Politically, it is almost impossible for Congress to raise taxes. Our representatives can oppose the cuts to begin with, which is what we hope happens, but once they are in place, good luck turning back the clock.

That's why today's vote in the United States Senate is so important. Although it is a budget resolution and does not have the effect of law, it does pave the way for acceptance later. Let's hope common sense prevails and that our legislators act as if they are capable of distinguishing between what needs to happen in Iraq and what needs to happen here.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise to day to discuss several issues related to agriculture funding in the budget resolution proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

While there are no specific reconciliation instructions for agriculture in this proposal, the summary documents issued by the committee indicate an assumed savings of \$80 million from the crop insurance program.

I have been one of the strongest defenders of this program in the Con-

gress, and I have fought hard to improve the program for producers throughout the country.

Simply put, cutting \$80 million from this program is exactly the wrong thing to do at this time. As budgets continue to tighten, both the administration and Members of this congress have said that producers must do more to rely on crop insurance as their primary risk management tool and decrease reliance on emergency disaster assistance programs.

Last fall we also saw the collapse of the largest seller of crop insurance in the country. This was the result of several factors, but the significant drought we have suffered took its toll as indemnity payments to producers added up. And, several other companies are not in strong financial positions for the same reason.

Finally, the entire insurance industry has struggled with reinsurance since 9/11. This is also true in the crop insurance industry, and the difficulties of obtaining reinsurance have been compounded by the drought.

The bottom line is this: We have worked hard to make crop insurance the primary risk management tool for producers. But, crop insurance is struggling along with the entire insurance industry, and this cut many be something it can not recover from. It could put several of the smaller companies out of business and lead to further consolidation in the industry and concentration in agriculture.

I urge the chairman to omit this specific cut in any reconciliation instructions that may come out of the conference with the House.

Finally, I understand that an amendment was offered during committee discussion of the resolution that shifted funds from commodity programs to the conservation budget. I am not going to discuss the merits of the proposal that accomplished this shift. I think that is a discussion best conducted within the Agriculture Committee.

However, if we are going to shift funds to the conservation program, I believe they should go to our well-established programs that benefit producers throughout the United States. These include the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, the Conservation Reserve Program, the Wetlands Reserve Program, and the Farmland Protection Program.

I do not think these funds should go to the Conservation Security Program—a program that will divert the largest portion of the funds to only a couple States that can undertake farming practices that simply do not work in regions of the country where the land is not on the river bottom and the rain comes down sideways with a 50-mile-per-hour wind.

Lets put the money where it will actually work and achieve real conservation benefits.

I thank my colleagues for listening to my views on these issues, and I hope

they will continue to consider them as this process toward a final budget agreement progresses.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, it does not seem like all that long ago that efforts were under way to reauthorize the 1996 farm bill. Many of you know that we spent over 2 years listening to ideas and formulating the model for this legislation. I am pleased that I was able to be a part of yet another farm bill that provides planting flexibility, price stability, and allows producers to receive a decent return on their investments.

The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 is a balanced 6-year farm bill which met specified budget requirements and was adopted by Congress. The farm bill provides an adequate financial safety net in times when prices are depressed. This safety net allows crops to be priced competitively in the domestic and world markets.

The farm bill is less than 1 year old. The United States Department of Agriculture, USDA, is still working to fully implement some of the remaining provisions. However, the actions taken by the distinguished Senator from Iowa during the markup of this budget resolution was an effort to unravel this carefully drafted legislation. I am referring to a provision that was adopted in the Senate Budget Committee which shifts the Senate Agriculture Committee's mandatory spending, totaling \$1.4 billion, from agriculture programs, budget function 350, to the Conservation Security Program, budget function 300.

I want to express my strong opposition to this provision as it negates the carefully crafted payment provision during the farm bill. The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 contains specific limitations on program benefits and adds an adjusted gross income test that makes participants with substantial nonfarm income ineligible for program benefits. In addition, program participants are required to meet detailed eligibility requirements regarding contributions of management and/or labor requirements. My colleague's further efforts to make these limitations even more restrictive only adds additional transitional costs which producers must absorb and creates additional administrative costs for USDA.

As a result of this provision, my distinguished colleague ultimately discriminates against southern crops which are more expensive to produce. Farms in the South tend to be larger than those in the Midwest and other areas of the country where the cost of production is much less. Further restrictions on payment limitations only hurt southern commodity producers.

The farm bill has been debated in the Senate Agriculture Committee, passed by Congress, and signed into law by the President of the United States. This provision reopens the farm bill—the farm bill should not be reopened during

the budget process—that results in bad farm policy. And it should not be reopened during the appropriations process—that results in bad farm policy. Therefore, I strongly oppose this provision in the Senate budget resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the American people recognize the importance of the family farmer to our Nation and the need to provide an adequate safety net for family farmers. In recent years, however, assistance to farmers has come under increasing scrutiny.

Critics of farm payments have argued that the largest corporate farms reap most of the benefits of these payments. What's more, farm payments that were originally designed to benefit small- and medium-sized family farmers have contributed to their own demise. Unlimited farm payments have placed upward pressure on land prices and have contributed to overproduction and lower commodity prices, driving many family farmers off the farm.

Last year, the Senate agreed, by an overwhelming vote of 66 to 31, to a bipartisan amendment sponsored by Senators DORGAN and myself to target Federal assistance to small- and medium-sized family farmers. The amendment would have limited direct and counter-cyclical payments to \$75,000. It would have limited gains from marketing loans and LDPs to \$150,000, and generic certificates would have been included in this limit. That would have limited farm payments to a combined total of \$275,000.

That amendment was critical to family farmers in Iowa and indeed farmers across the Nation. I feel strongly the farm bill failed Iowa and failed all of our farmers when it failed to effectively address the issue of payment limitations.

A solid majority in the Budget Committee voted last week in favor of a payment limitation provision to limit total payments of all kinds to a combined limit of \$300,000. This is more than I think is necessary. It is \$25,000 more than the limit that won over two-thirds of the Senate. But in the interests of compromise it seems like a fair approach. The most important thing is that loopholes in the payment limitation law be closed so that the limitation at whatever level is actually the real, effective level.

The Budget Committee voted to apply the savings from this reasonable payment limit proposal against the reductions suffered by the Conservation Security Program, CSP, during consideration of the agricultural disaster package in the fiscal year 2003 omnibus appropriations bill.

This new conservation initiative from the 2002 farm bill will reward farmers and ranchers who voluntarily implement effective conservation on their working lands. Farmers and ranchers will receive public support as they provide public benefits to the Nation's natural resources and environment. This program allows family

farmers to solve critical resource problems, with graduated rewards for increasing efforts. The CSP is an innovative new program in the Federal agricultural conservation toolbox and its full funding should be restored as soon as possible.

The Budget Committee endorsed payment limitation reform including a combined maximum cap of \$300,000 and endorsed restoring funds to the Conservation Security Program. Payment limitation reform is long overdue, a fact reflected in the vote of the Budget Committee. If cuts should be ordered in the final budget resolution emerging from conference, payment limitations would be the most logical place to look for savings. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 4 minutes equally divided between myself and the ranking member for closing debate on the resolution.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I urge our colleagues to vote in favor of the resolution. I thank all of our colleagues. We have conducted a number of rollcall votes. By the time we have final passage, there will have been 51 rollcall votes; we will have had 29 voice votes, for a total of 80 votes on this resolution. That may be an all-time high, one I hope we don't repeat next year.

The budget process, in my opinion, is somewhat flawed. It is not easy to pass a budget. That is one of the reasons I wanted to compliment my friend and colleague, Senator DOMENICI, because he did it year after year. It is not easy to do. I understand we didn't get it done last year. I don't want to be too critical, but we didn't pass a budget last year. And because we didn't pass a budget, we didn't get appropriations bills done. We didn't do a prescription drug bill, a Medicare bill. We didn't do anything to help grow the economy. The budget does lay the blueprint for the next Congress, certainly for the rest of the year. So we need to pass a budget. I have told my colleagues, we need to pass a budget regardless of the size of the growth package.

I readily admit this growth package is not what I wanted. It is about half a loaf. That is better than none.

We could have done better. We didn't; we tried. We let the legislative process work. With 80 votes, the legislative process did work. The Senate did speak.

I thank my colleagues for their participation. I happen to believe the level of debate was good. I think it was a healthy debate. I thank colleagues on all sides for their cooperation in making that happen.

I also especially thank my friend and colleague, Senator CONRAD, and his staff. They have been a pleasure to work with in a very challenging environment, particularly on Friday

evening. Also, I thank our staff as well, Hazen Marshall and Stacey Hughes and our entire staff. They worked very hard to put together a budget process that will work, a budget that will lead us to a balanced budget, a budget that will have deficits declining, substantially declining in the next couple of years, the percentage of GDP substantially.

We need to be in balance. We will work to do that. That is not easily done since we have inherited a situation where revenues have declined substantially in the last 2 years. We need to figure out ways to grow the economy. I look forward to working with my colleagues to try to make that happen. I appreciate very much their cooperation and support throughout the challenging last several days. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, first let me thank the outstanding staffs on both sides. Hazen Marshall, staff director for Senator NICKLES, and his able staff, thank you for the really good attitude that you all brought to this task and challenge. I thank also on our side my staff director, Mary Naylor, who has done such a superb job holding us all together. I think part of the reason this was well organized was because of Mary's talents. And to Jim Horney and Sue Nelson and Lisa Konwinski and all of the other staff members of the Budget Committee, thank you.

Special thanks to the chairman of our committee. Thank you for the effort to organize these votes in a way that was comprehensive and that was understandable to people. Thanks, too, for the attitude and the tone you brought to the debate because we have had significant differences. But I think we have conducted ourselves in the way that our forefathers intended the Senate to be conducted—real debate on real differences without personal rancor of any kind.

While this budget resolution has been substantially improved, we have now reduced the President's proposed tax cut of \$1.6 trillion to \$850 billion. Still I believe it is fatally flawed. I don't believe we can afford \$850 billion of tax cuts that will add in this budget resolution over a trillion dollars of deficit to our country when we are already in record deficit and when we are right on the brink of the retirement of the baby boom generation.

That does not make sense to me. I believe it threatens the long-term economic security of our country. I don't believe it will grow the economy. That view is buttressed by the report of the Congressional Budget Office today. They applied dynamic scoring and what they said is, the one thing that is going to grow under this budget is the deficits and the debt of our country. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator's time has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 108 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Crapo	McConnell
Allard	DeWine	Miller
Allen	Dole	Murkowski
Baucus	Domenici	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Ensign	Nickles
Bennett	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Fitzgerald	Santorum
Breaux	Frist	Sessions
Brownback	Graham (SC)	Shelby
Bunning	Grassley	Smith
Burns	Gregg	Snowe
Campbell	Hagel	Specter
Chafee	Hatch	Stevens
Chambliss	Hutchison	Sununu
Cochran	Inhofe	Talent
Coleman	Kyl	Thomas
Collins	Landrieu	Thomas
Cornyn	Lott	Voivovich
Craig	Lugar	Warner

NAYS—44

Akaka	Edwards	Lieberman
Biden	Feingold	Lincoln
Bingaman	Feinstein	McCain
Boxer	Graham (FL)	Mikulski
Byrd	Harkin	Murray
Cantwell	Hollings	Nelson (FL)
Carper	Inouye	Pryor
Clinton	Jeffords	Reed
Conrad	Johnson	Reid
Corzine	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerry	Sarbanes
Dayton	Kohl	Schumer
Dodd	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden
Durbin	Levin	

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

(The concurrent resolution will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to thank all of our colleagues for their cooperation. We did finish the budget resolution by 4 p.m. on Wednesday, as we committed to do. That would not have happened if it had not been for the cooperation certainly of Senator CONRAD and his staff.

I wish to thank Mary Naylor and their entire team, as well as Hazen Marshall, Stacey Hughes, Beth Felder, and our team. The staffs had to work extremely hard over the weekend. This lasted about 2 or 3 days longer than is usual for the budget process. I hope maybe we can streamline it next year a little bit more.

I thank all the staff for their hard work. They put in a lot of hours. We produced a product that is not perfect but it is a significant improvement over no budget. Again, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of staff Democrats and Republicans be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE

Amy Angelier; Lauren Baylor; Dan Brandt, Economist; Cara Duckworth; Beth Smerko

Felder; Ron Floyd; Megan Hauck; Jim Hearn; Jody Hernandez; Stacey Hughes; Rachel Jones; Don Kent; Hazen Marshall; David Myers; Maureen O'Neill; and David Ortega.

Gayle Osterberg; Anne Oswald; David Pappone; Roy Phillips; Cheri Reidy; Margaret Stewart; Bob Taylor; Jennifer Winkler; Lee Greenwood; Letitia Fletcher; Tim Nolan; Lynne Seymour; George Woodall; Shelley Amdur; Steve Bailey; and Rock Cheung, Jr. Jim Esquea; Tim Galvin; Lawrence Hershon; Jim Horney; Mike Jones; Erin Keogh; Lisa Konwinski; Sarah Kuehl; Jessie LaVine; Stu Nagurka; Mary Naylor; Koby Noel; Steve Posner; Lee Price; John Righter; Dakota Rudesill; and Barry Strumpf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, first, I congratulate the chairman of our committee on successfully passing a budget resolution. As strongly as I disagree with the contents of this resolution, I feel equally as strongly about the way this process was conducted, and the chairman's leadership both in the committee and on the floor in terms of the tone that he set and in terms of the attitude he brought to the job. It makes a big difference, and we appreciate it.

I will now take a moment to thank staff: Mary Naylor, my staff director; Jim Horney and Sue Nelson, my deputy staff directors; Lisa Konwinski, my counsel; Shelley Amdur, who handles education and appropriations; along with John Righter, who is our chief numbers man and handles appropriations as well; Steve Bailey, who does taxes; Sarah Kuehl, who handles Social Security and transportation; Jim Esquea, who handles Medicaid, welfare, and veterans; Tim Galvin, who handles agriculture; Mike Jones, homeland security and energy issues; Dakota Rudesill, who handles defense; Rock Cheung, international affairs; Lee Price, our chief economist; Koby Noel, our chart master—as my colleagues know, we produced a lot of charts—and Stu Nagurka and Steve Posner, in charge of communications for me; and Jessie Lavine, Erin Keogh, and Lawrence Hershon, our staff assistants. We appreciate very much their hard work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 95; all after the resolving clause is stricken and the text of S. Con. Res. 23 is inserted in lieu thereof, the resolution is adopted, the Senate insists on its amendment and requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints conferees.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. ENZI) appointed Mr. NICKLES, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. SARBANES, conferees on the part of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95), as amended, was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CONRAD. I now ask there be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today with great honor and pride to pay tribute to the men and women of our Armed Forces, tens of thousands of whom are deployed right now in the Middle East in military action against Iraq. I encourage all my colleagues in the Senate, and in the Congress, that we take a few moments out of each and every one of our days we are engaged in this conflict to come to the floor and speak to our constituents, speak to the American people, and speak to the servicemen and servicewomen who are so valiantly out there defending our freedoms and this great country that we believe in. We are going to take a few moments here today to talk about how important are these men and women in service to our country. We would like to encourage, again, all Members of Congress to come to the floor and spend a few minutes out of their day or out of their week to talk about the incredible lives of these individuals who are there on our behalf, defending our freedom.

Over the course of the last week, since hostilities began in earnest on March 19, our troops have made tremendous progress toward the objectives of their mission. At the same time, we have seen a few setbacks, but these do not detract from what has been accomplished. For that, we have no one to thank but the courageous, hard-working men and women of the American service arm and the coalition of Armed Forces.

We hear a great deal about the technology behind this war—missiles, aircraft, telecommunications devices, weaponry, and other equipment of battle. But we should all remember that even the best equipment and the best technology is of little value without the best soldiers and commanders to make it useful.

Today we have over 230,000 troops representing air, sea, and land forces in the theater, with our allies in the coalition contributing an additional 45,000. These young men and women are serving in a wide variety of capacities but with a unifying mission—to liberate the Iraqi people from the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein, and to destroy his weapons of mass destruction which threaten our globe. They are separated from their families and their friends, placing themselves in great personal danger in order to provide for a safer, more secure world for all of us.

I myself have a young man from my staff who is serving in the Middle East.

He was called up on a Tuesday, left here on Friday, and I just recently heard from his mother. He is in Baghdad. Our thoughts and prayers go out to him. We want him to know we are thinking about him and that we are looking forward to his safe return to us here at home.

We are all deeply grateful for the sacrifices our service men and women are making and the risks they are taking on all of our behalf. Those sacrifices and those risks will not be forgotten.

In addition, I remind my colleagues that a large number of these troops come from the National Guard and the Reserve, nearly 217,000 at our last count. Over 2,000 of these guardsmen and reservists come from my home State of Arkansas. One of those soldiers is Major Stephen Wilson, of Rogers, AK.

Major Wilson, who is 38 years old, is the operations officer for an Apache attack helicopter unit, the 2nd Squadron, 6th Cavalry of the 11th Aviation Regiment. We have all seen in recent days the difficult odds our attack helicopter crews work under. They are vulnerable to small arms fire from the ground, not to mention difficult weather conditions that we have all been seeing on the television. In spite of these difficulties, Major Wilson and his colleagues persevere in an extremely challenging but extremely necessary mission.

He is a proud representative of our State and our Nation, and we are extremely proud of him for his service to this country.

If there were a way to thank each and every soldier by name, I would do it. I would take the necessary time to make sure that each of them knows how important they are in this conflict and in our resolve. Since it is not possible for me to recognize who is serving today, allow me at least to give a sense of where these units come from all across our great State of Arkansas: Little Rock, North Little Rock, Fort Smith, Van Buren, Siloam Springs, West Memphis, Ozark, Charleston, Marked Tree, Fayetteville, Pine Bluff—and the list could go on.

Furthermore, these units are comprised of individuals from all over the State, meaning that we have soldiers serving from virtually every community in our great State of Arkansas. It is a reminder that even from thousands of miles away, Arkansans have a very serious stake in this war.

On behalf of the people of Arkansas, I wish to say we are proud of all of our troops, and we look forward to welcoming them back home soon and safely.

It is also true that as of today we have suffered casualties, and we should not turn away from this fact. It is believed that up to 14 of our troops from both the U.S. and our broader coalition are missing or captured by enemy forces. Our prayers are that they will be returned to their units safely and timely.

We also had a number of our troops wounded in battle, and we wish them

the best in a speedy, full recovery from all of their injuries.

Most tragically of all, over 40 troops from the U.S. and from Great Britain have been killed in action or in accidents. We extend our deepest sympathies to their families, their friends, their loved ones, and we vow that we will honor their service and their memories by finishing this great task in which they have given their lives. Those lives will not have been lost in vain.

In the days and weeks to come, we will no doubt discover that others of our troops will have been captured, wounded, or cut down, but we must remain firm in our resolve that Operation Iraqi Freedom will continue to move forward.

My own father, who passed away last October, was a veteran of the Korean war, and he taught me always to respect the great commitment made by our troops in fighting to protect our freedoms. He taught me better to understand the mind of a soldier when he shared with me the stories and experiences he had on the front lines of Korea. And also, sitting at the foot of the chair of my grandfather, who served in World War I—both of my grandfathers did—I listened to stories of his travels on trains from Helena, AR, west to Little Rock, to catch another train to boot camp, and then on to France.

To better understand the minds of the men and women who serve us in the armed services, each of us must take the time to reflect on the personal stories of the family members, the neighbors, the friends, the staff, all of those who are so critically involved in this conflict in which we now find ourselves.

I again encourage all of my colleagues to take those few moments out of their day, out of their week, to think about what these generous souls are giving on our behalf to be there, to defend so many of the freedoms we in this great country take for granted, to remember them and their families in our thoughts and prayers.

Our troops of today's generation deserve the same respect for the work they do as when we look back at many of our family members who have served in previous wars.

As I reflect today with my colleagues in the Senate, there is no one I think of more at this moment than one of my colleagues here in the Senate, who I would like to share my time with, someone who has a son overseas in the Middle East.

I have to say, as a mother of twin boys who are now in the first grade, it is amazing to imagine how quickly our children grow up. The questions that I get at night from my children—Where they are going? What they are doing? What is our country involved in? Where will they be in 10 or 15 years from now?—it is so important for each of us to reflect on this as we lift up the service men and women who are there valiantly now defending our freedoms.

They and their families will be in our hearts and in our minds and in our prayers in the coming weeks. We wish them Godspeed, God's safety, and a timely return home to this country and this land that we all love so much.

I thank you, Mr. President. And I want to again tell my colleague, Senator JOHNSON, how much I appreciate him and his family for the incredible contribution they make with his son serving in the Middle East right now. It is an unbelievable gift, and we are all truly indebted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I am honored to have an opportunity to take part in this tribute to our American troops this evening here on the floor of the Senate.

I express a special commendation to my colleague and good friend, Senator LINCOLN of Arkansas, for her comments and for her leadership in helping to put together this tribute, as well as my South Dakota colleague, Senator DASCHLE, for all his support of our troops and his suggestion that we go ahead with a regular tribute and acknowledgement of the contributions our American military personnel are making.

This is a matter of particular personal importance to me with my own oldest son Brooks serving in the 101st Airborne in Iraq today. But there are thousands of others from South Dakota—Reserve, National Guard, Active Duty, Ellsworth Air Force Base in our case in South Dakota—and around the Nation who each are making profound contributions to the security and freedom of this country and for stability in that troubled part of the world.

We owe so much to each and every one of them, not only to honor the men and women who put on our Nation's uniform and jeopardize their lives by doing so but their families who suffer mightily from the sacrifices that are made, and from the prospect of death, injury, captivity—all that to which our military personnel subject themselves.

In our own family's case, we recognize this is a voluntary military in this day and age. Our son Brooks chose to enter the military. It was not my encouragement, particularly. It was his choice. All the credit goes to him. And that young man, with so many others, has served in four conflicts in the last 5 years: Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq, now Afghanistan. And we in South Dakota, and many around the country, do what we can to demonstrate our pride and support. In South Dakota, we have revived an old World War I tradition of wearing the blue star if we have a family member in the war. We have banners on our front door and at my offices around the State and here in Washington with that same blue star. We recognize that as the tradition goes, some of those blue stars will eventually become gold stars, and that is the symbol worn by parents who have lost a loved one.

We keep a map of Iraq in our family kitchen, as I am sure, in some similar way, the hundreds of thousands of other parents do all across this country, trying to keep track, as best we can, where our son is, as others keep track of where their sons and daughters are, their husbands and wives.

The communication, of course, at this time is just spotty. Initially, we were able to get a couple e-mails. A short time ago, I received a note from our son Brooks on the back of a beef stew box, a piece of cardboard. They had no paper anywhere, and they had to make do as they could. We will keep this forever.

We sent, obviously, notes and cards to them. There are organizations that have encouraged this to go on, and I am sure that builds morale, as these troops suffer through incredible circumstances, both militarily as well as just the sandstorms and all that goes with living out in a desert and in a troubled place.

One of the things Barbara and I recognize, that all the other parents share in a way that is more profound than could possibly be the case unless you have had a loved one in a circumstance like this, is that every glance at the television, every glance toward the radio could convey to you at any moment some catastrophic news. There are many who follow the conflict, have an interest in it, but the families recognize more so than anyone the very real nature of what is happening.

These are not video games. There is a tendency sometimes in the media to talk about collateral damage and casualties, and you see numbers on the maps and colored diagrams going in one direction or another. But the families recognize that each one of those represents real people and real hopes and the love of real families. We in this body understand the sacrifices that need to be made. But it goes almost beyond understanding how much we owe to these men and women and all that they do.

This past week, Barbara and I were listening at our home to some reports, and there was a report of casualties and deaths in our son's division. I went to tell Barbara about it, and it was almost impossible for me to even speak. She had been following the news herself and knew that in this instance it involved a different brigade than where our son was; our son had left Kuwait for Iraq the day before. We breathed a sigh of relief as parents will when their own son or daughter has escaped harm, but we recognized more than ever because of our circumstances that while our son in that case was safe, the losses were very real. Someone else's son, someone else's husband was injured, was killed, somewhere else families are devastated.

We will win this war. We have the greatest military in the world. The world will be a better place when we are victorious. But it is important for us to take stock of the men and women

who make this possible. It is important for us to express our honor for what they do and who they are. It is important for us to share our prayers that this conflict is a short and decisive conflict with the fewest losses of life possible on either side.

We as a people owe more to these men and women than words can possibly convey. It is my hope that as we follow this conflict and pray that it is a short one, we in the Senate will do all we can, obviously, to express our honor and our praise for these people, but also that we will go beyond that to take the steps necessary so when they come home, they will come home to a country where there is opportunity, where schools for their children are good, where the environment is clean, the economy is growing, where there are jobs available that are challenging and meaningful to them, and that so long as they remain in the military, their pay, their housing, their quality of life is what it deserves to be.

Every night when we go home and live in relative comfort, I hope we keep in mind these hundreds of thousands of our troops, who this very night, many of them, are sleeping in a hole in the sand 2 or 3 feet deep to protect themselves from shrapnel during the course of the evening, blowing sand, horrible weather, fear of snipers, bombs, biological, chemical warfare that could arise at any moment, and appreciate the quality of these troops and how we as a free people could not possibly sustain our freedoms were it not for the willingness of these troops, these men and women, to voluntarily step into this kind of circumstance and fight this war.

I yield to our leader, Senator DASCHLE. Again, I acknowledge my gratitude to him for helping to organize this tribute to our American troops.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am sure everyone can appreciate the difficulty that our Senator from South Dakota has experienced in coming to the floor to talk, as he has with pride and enormous appreciation, of the commitment made by a member of his own family.

On a regular basis, we want to come to the Chamber with our Republican colleagues and call attention to all those who, like Brooks Johnson, are now serving in the Persian Gulf. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for agreeing to help organize today's colloquy and reiterate my deep gratitude to my dear friend and colleague, Senator JOHNSON. We thought it would be appropriate today, as we begin this practice, to call the Senate's attention to the fact that Senator JOHNSON is the only Member of this Congress who has a child serving in Iraq.

As he has noted, Brooks, his son, is a staff sergeant with the Army's 101st Airborne Division. He is 31 years old. I

know him, and I can see why his parents are as proud of him as they are. He is remarkable. He has turned down offers to attend recruiter's school because he said he wants to be close to the men he leads.

He is 6'1", 215 pounds, almost all shoulders and biceps. He loves the rough-and-tumble of the outdoors. But he also enjoys gourmet cooking and Broadway musicals. He is a very thoughtful man, an eloquent speaker. He loves to read the classics. When he was serving in Afghanistan, he was reading the history of the Peloponnesian wars.

He has known since he was a very young man that he wanted to serve and protect our country. He missed his own high school graduation because he was attending Marine Corps Reserves basic training at Parris Island. He went to college at the University of South Dakota, and during college, Brooks served first in the Marine Corps Reserve, then the Army Reserve, then the Army National Guard.

The reason he served in so many branches is that he was looking for a unit that was close to college. He wanted to be able to learn and to serve at the same time. When he decided to make a life of the military, he chose the Army. He has now been on active duty for 8 years.

This is Staff Sergeant Johnson's fourth war in 5 years. He served in Bosnia. He served in Kosovo. He arrived in Afghanistan in December of 2001, 2 months after the terrorist attack on America. He served in Afghanistan for 6 months.

Like so many family members who have loved ones in this war, TIM and Barb aren't exactly sure where Brooks is detailed, but they do know his division has been moved into Iraq.

The other day, TIM came to the floor and he shared something with me. I hope he doesn't mind if I share it with our colleagues. Brooks sent him a postcard, but this isn't a normal postcard. This is a postcard carved out of the box of an MRE, one of these portable meals that they take with them. I have eaten them myself. They are a box about like this. Well, Brooks carved out one side of an MRE, brown, cardboard box. On one side of that postcard box he wrote a message to his parents. On the other side was the address to his parents and his return address. Up in the right-hand corner, instead of a postage stamp, it said "free." There are a lot of connotations to the word "free" on that postcard.

So we think of Brooks and the freedom he fights for, the freedom he has, and all the things that we cherish as Americans, recognizing that Brooks Johnson learned those values from two extraordinary parents.

A quarter of a million Americans and several thousand South Dakotans today serve in the Persian Gulf. We are in awe of their courage. Their dedication. Their sacrifice. We are grateful to every one of them and their families.

We are resolved to ensure they have everything they need so they can be successful and return home safely.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it seems only yesterday that Senator JOHNSON and I were sharing stories about our sons, the athletes. They both were back here with their parents in the East while we were in the Congress. They were little boys then. Then they got to where they were in high school, and they were bigger boys, but they were boys. So it is hard to imagine now our two boys are grown up. They are adults.

Barbara and TIM's son, though, is really grown up. This young man is fighting in the deserts, in the sands of Iraq so that we can continue to enjoy our freedoms in America.

I had to call TIM at home this past Sunday to talk about some of the issues we were working on legislatively. I hated to call TIM because I am sure he and Barbara at this stage do not like to get phone calls on Sunday afternoons, during nonworking hours. I am sure TIM and Barbara every night pray for their boy and probably a few times during the day.

All of us should recognize that we, too, can join in a prayer for the Johnson's son Brooks. We need to do that because you see, what is going on in Iraq is more than just numbers. We hear numbers such as 250,000 people over there, and we hear talk about skirmishes that have taken place. I pray that Brooks Johnson will return home safely to his parents, TIM and Barbara.

I received a message yesterday, as we are notified as Senators, when something happens to someone from our States. Yesterday I received a message about a young man from Tonopah, NV. It used to be a big booming town where heavyweight prize fights were held, and at the turn of the last century it was a great mining community. Now it is a relatively—not relatively, it is a small place.

A man by the name of Frederick Pokorney came there. His parents moved around a lot. He wanted to finish high school. He was a sophomore. He was able to stay with the sheriff. Wade Lieseke took in this young man. It was great for Tonopah High School because he was large—6 foot 7, very athletic; he was a linebacker, a center for the basketball team. He was a great young man, quiet and kept to himself.

To make a long story short, he went into the military. He was in the military for 11 years. He was just made a second lieutenant. He was one of the

seven who was taken down in an ambush and killed.

People who serve in the Iraqi conflict are in harm's way—every one of them. My heart goes out to Senator JOHNSON. Through TIM JOHNSON, we all recognize the ultimate sacrifice that young men and women are making in Iraq. He represents, in effect, the Congress. He is the only Member I am aware of who has a family member serving in that conflict.

I congratulate TIM and Barbara for raising such a wonderful son. As I said, Brooks sets a great example for other young men and women in this country. I again say I hope that we all celebrate with the Johnsons when he returns home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for his words. We came to Congress together with TIM JOHNSON many years ago and feel a special kinship and friendship with TIM and Barbara and the family.

I was fortunate enough to be walking past the Chamber and saw Senator TIM JOHNSON speaking and stopped to hear the words he had to say about his son. I thought he showed remarkable composure when he talked about his son who is currently with the Army in Iraq in the midst of this battle. Obviously, he has a great deal of pride and, of course, a great deal of concern, natural concern of any parent.

And then to hear Senator DASCHLE's special tribute to Brooks Johnson told us a little more about this young man, an extraordinary young man who has done so many things in his short life of 31 years and has tried over and over to continue to serve his country.

What a great reminder of the men and women who are serving their country overseas today. I am glad this Senate went on record today with an incredible vote of 100 to 0 to increase combat pay and the family separation allowance of those who are serving. That is something that should be done, and I am glad we said it today and said it decisively, and I hope we move quickly to change the law to help those families.

I also wish to say before I yield to my great friend and colleague from West Virginia, that I thank the Senator from Arkansas, Mrs. LINCOLN, who has brought us to the floor now several times to talk about our men and women in uniform. It is important we continue on a daily basis to remind America that this Senate, as well as the Congress, is very sensitive to the fact that what is happening on the screens of the television just a few feet away involves real lives and real Americans and that our commitment is to them.

The vote in the Senate just last week, 99 to 0 in support of those men and women in uniform, I think shows the current state of affairs in America transcends our political differences. We may disagree on foreign policy, we may

disagree on what led up to this war, but when the first shot was fired, 99 Senators, everyone voting stood up and said: At this point, make no mistake; we are standing behind our men and women in uniform.

I have been surprised and disappointed by some of the comments I have received in my office from a few people, some by e-mail and some by telephone, who have taken exception to that vote. They said: We thought you voted against the use-of-force resolution, and now what are you doing, hedging your bet by saying you support the men and women in uniform?

What I have said to them and I say on the floor of the Senate is: You better draw a clear and bright line between the debate on foreign policy and whether or not we stand up for these young men and women who have volunteered to serve their country to risk their lives in battle.

I lived through the Vietnam war and remember it as one of the most formative experiences in my life and one of the saddest chapters in American history, the fact that many people channeled their hatred for the war toward the men and women in uniform. That was unfair. It was unfortunate. It should never be repeated.

Political leaders make decisions about foreign policy, committing our troops in various parts of the world, and those men and women who are sworn to serve the leaders and our Nation meet their call of duty, and we should never forget they did not make the foreign policy decision. They are serving their Nation as we asked them to serve. We should never ever compromise our commitment to them. That is why I think the resolution we have adopted, the vote today when it comes to combat pay and the tribute on the floor, is a reminder that we stand as one, shoulder to shoulder in unity, with these men and women in uniform.

In the congressional family of 100 Senators and 435 Members of the House, it turns out we have, to my knowledge, only one son, and that is TIM JOHNSON's son, Brooks, who is in our Senate congressional family serving our Nation.

We are going to be mindful of him. I ask TIM every day: Have you heard anything from Brooks? We will be mindful of him, as we are mindful of people from my town of Springfield, IL, or my State of Illinois who may be in harm's way. It is part of an expanding American family that we come together in times of fear and in times of crisis.

To those who oppose the war, to those who favor peace, please draw that clear bright line: We should never take it out on the men and women in uniform, no matter how much we may disagree with the policy. And I think most Americans who feel that way, even those with misgivings with the events that led up to this war, feel this commitment should be singular.

I mentioned Senator BYRD. Today there is a front-page story in the Washington Post about a family in West Virginia—and I imagine he will bring our attention to that in his remarks which follow. It, too, tells the story of a young woman, in this case, who made an extraordinary sacrifice and is in an usual, unpredictable situation perhaps being captured in Iraq.

I take the floor today to thank Senator LINCOLN and Senator JOHNSON. I urge my colleagues, if you can, spare a few moments each day to come and tell a story of those you know who are serving this war and serving this Nation so well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, just an hour or so ago, barely 50 feet out this door, many remaining members of the Delaware Army and National Guard were gathered. Coincidentally, it was a day that had long been scheduled for them to be on the Hill. National Guard associations from all over the country have converged on Washington, DC.

In the last several weeks, many of their colleagues in the Army and National Guard have since deployed to the Middle East, to the area around Iraq, and some to Iraq. On Sunday night, at a National Guard headquarters hangar in Wilmington, DE, at the airport we said goodbye to almost 100 of the members of the 166th Military Airlift Command as they set off to join their colleagues and their aircraft on the other side of the world. They are the maintainers of the C-130s which are part of the air bridge from the United States to Iraq.

It starts here with a very large C-5 aircraft and includes the C-17s, and at the end of the delivery system, the end of the air bridge, the C-130s, the smaller sort of rangers. The maintainers, the members of the 166th who have gone to join their colleagues, are the folks who make sure the landing gear works, the radio works, the hydraulic works, the avionics systems work. Without them we would not have C-130s that function, and without C-130s we would not have the kind of air bridge that we need to be successful in this war.

I was privileged to be there to salute them and send them on their way, as were our former Governor, former commander in chief of the Delaware National Guard, MIKE CASTLE, our Congressman, and our Governor, our current commander in chief of the Delaware National Guard, Ruth Ann Minner. I was privileged to be their commander in chief for much of the last decade when I served as Governor of Delaware.

As we said goodbye to the men and women of the 166th, we also had important words for the families of those who stayed behind, the wives and the husbands, the children, the parents of those whose loved ones are climbing on to that C-5 and getting prepared to fly thousands of miles from home. In some

cases—and I say this as one who deployed on several occasions as a naval flight officer in the Navy back during the Vietnam war—the deployment is tougher not on the one being deployed but on the ones who stay behind. To those families we owe a lot because they have shared their loved ones with us, and in many cases they put their families in difficult straits at a tough time.

We voted today on several amendments to the budget resolution which are designed to lighten the load a little bit for those who are being deployed, particularly those who are being put into a hazardous place to perform their duties. I am grateful for that and would express on behalf of not just the families of the 166th whose loved ones deployed this Sunday but on behalf all the members of the Delaware National Guard who are now serving in this war, thank you on their behalf and on behalf of their families for thinking of them, for remembering them along with the other Guard and Reserve men and women who are being called to active duty around this country.

During the time I served on active duty in Southeast Asia, we would from time to time receive a Reserve air crew that came in usually from the west coast, but flying their P-3 aircraft for 3 years hunting for Red October, tracking Soviet nuclear submarines, but also flying low-level missions along the coast of Vietnam and Cambodia.

In those days, back in the early 1970s, when we had a tough and dangerous job to do, we would never turn it over to a reserve air crew. The Active-Duty crews would take care of that, and we would be careful to send the Reserve air crews on a job where they could not get in trouble or could not get hurt. That was 30-some years ago. Today it is such a different world. We have guards men and women, activated, deployed, reservists called to active duty who are serving alongside full-time soldiers, sailors, and airmen. They are doing the very same jobs, dangerous jobs, tough dirty jobs in some cases, and to them we owe an enormous debt of gratitude.

A closing word to my friend Senator TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota whose son is over in Iraq, and I am sure a matter of great concern to him and to Barbara, his wife, a concern that is shared by literally tens of thousands of families across this country. I say a special prayer for Brooks and for the Johnson family, and remember them and all who have been deployed and serve our Nation at this tough and challenging time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

Mrs. CLINTON. Madam President, I come to the floor on very sad business, both for this body, for my State, and my country. We have just received word that Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan has passed away. For those of us who were privileged to know him, to work with him, to admire and respect him, this is a loss beyond my capacity to express.

Senator Moynihan for decades represented the highest ideals and values of the United States of America. A son of Hell's Kitchen in New York City, he rose to be a confidante and adviser to Presidents. He is responsible for many of the most important ideas and legislative programs that have improved the lives of people in New York, people here in Washington, DC, and our country and around the world.

I am very honored to hold the seat that Senator Moynihan held for so long and so well. Along with his wonderful wife Liz Moynihan, they have been great counselors and advisers to me personally. I will miss him greatly.

Sometimes when I sit here on the floor of the Senate, I wish that Senator Moynihan could be here in spirit as well as body, that his wise counsel could influence our decisionmaking, that he would remind us that what we do, what we say, what we vote for is not just for today, it is for all time. It goes down into the history books. It represents the judgments that we make. It truly displays the values that we claim to hold.

He understood that being a U.S. Senator was a precious trust. Anyone who ever heard him speak knows the experience of learning more than you ever thought possible in a short period of time. He could explain and expound on such a range of subjects that it took my breath away. I remember riding with him through western New York on a bus during the 1992 campaign and hearing the most exquisite disposition about the history of the Indian nations, the Revolutionary War, the geological formations. The love he had for New York and America was overwhelming and so obvious to anyone who spent more than a minute in his company.

He also held high standards about what we should expect from this great country of ours. He wanted us to keep looking beyond the short term, looking beyond the horizon, thinking about the next generation, understanding the big problems that confront us, having the courage to tackle what is not immediately popular, even not immediately understandable, because that is what we are charged to do in this deliberative body.

Senator Moynihan's scholarly undertakings also will stand the test of time.

He sometimes was ahead of his time. In each of his writings or his speeches, whether you agreed with him or not, you were forced to think and think hard. He certainly opened my eyes to a lot of difficult issues.

I could not have had a stronger, more helpful adviser during my campaign than Senator Moynihan. I started my listening tour of my exploration of whether or not to run for this office at Pinders Corner, his farm in upstate New York, a place that he loved beyond words.

I met him in a little schoolhouse, a 19th century schoolhouse that was on the property where he wrote. He would walk down the road from his house to that little schoolhouse every day where he would think deeply and write about the issues that he knew would be important, not just for tomorrow's headline but for years and years to come.

There is not any way that anyone will ever fill his place in this Senate, not just in the order of succession definition but in the intellectual power, the passion, the love of this extraordinary body and our country. He will be so missed.

On behalf of myself and my family and the people I represent, I extend my condolence and sympathy not only to his wonderful family and not only to New Yorkers who elected him time and time again, increasing majorities from one end of the State to the next, but to our country. We have lost a great American, an extraordinary Senator, an intellectual, and a man of passion and understanding about what really makes this country great.

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. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I rise in abject sadness on the horrible news that Senator Moynihan has passed from our midst. When it was announced in our caucus that this terrible event had occurred, you could just see the energy come out of the room and the sadness come on everybody's face. Senator Moynihan was a unique individual. He wasn't just another Senator. He wasn't just another human being. He was very special.

Rarely has one man changed society so with his ideas, the idea that one man can change society for the better. Senator Moynihan's life was testament to that fact. His life was testament to the fact that one man who just thinks can make an enormous difference. He was truly a giant—a giant as a thinker, as a Senator, and as a human being. He was a kind and compassionate person, a loving husband. Liz, our thoughts go out to you and to all of the Moynihan children and family. I have known him for a very long time.

When I was a student at Harvard College, I audited his course. I got to know him a little bit then. As I went through my congressional career, we used to have lunch every so often. He was a complete joy to just sit down and have lunch with and exchange ideas.

He looked out for people. He cared about people. He had real courage. When he disagreed with the conventional wisdom, nothing would stop Pat Moynihan from making his view heard and making it heard in such an interesting and intellectually and thoughtful way.

Again, he changed our world for the better. There are hundreds of millions of human beings in this country who do not know it, but he made their lives better. There are billions of people in the world, and through his work he made their lives better.

Senator Moynihan was loved in my home State of New York from one end of the State to the other. We are a big, broad, diverse State. It is very hard to find consensus with 19 million New Yorkers, but just about everybody loved Pat Moynihan. He did it through a big heart and a great mind.

He is now with his Maker. I know I will be looking up to the heavens for inspiration, as I looked to Senator Moynihan's office when he was still with us.

I very much regret his passing. I pray for the Moynihan family and for the children. I hope God gives us a few more Pat Moynihans in this Senate and in this country. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, I commend the distinguished Senator from New York for his eloquence and his empathy for the family especially of our departed colleague, Pat Moynihan.

The Senator from New York used the term "giant," and, indeed, in this case, I can think of no better word to describe the man, the magnitude, the depth, the history, the persona of Pat Moynihan.

"The Almanac of American Politics" called Pat Moynihan the Nation's best thinker among politicians since Lincoln and its best politician among thinkers since Jefferson. Scholar, educator, statesman, adviser to four Presidents—Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, and Ford—Pat Moynihan was the only person in American history to serve in a Cabinet or sub-Cabinet position in four successive administrations.

As my colleagues have noted, he represented the State of New York for 24 years in the Senate with unique vision, imagination, intelligence, and integrity. In many respects, Pat Moynihan was larger than life, whether on the streets of New York or in the corridors of this Capitol. He was a beloved father, grandfather, friend, and colleague to so many of us.

I, too, extend my condolences on behalf of the entire Senate to his wife Liz, to his children, Tim, Maura, and

John, his grandchildren, Zora and Michael Patrick. New York and the Nation have lost a giant.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I was very sorry to learn of the passing of our good friend and great Senator from New York, Senator Moynihan. I wanted to come and extend condolences on behalf of myself and a lot of other Senators to the family, the children, the grandchildren, and the people of New York, and to America because we have lost truly a great man in Senator Pat Moynihan.

Sometimes people do not realize the types of relationships we do build in this Chamber across the broad philosophical and partisan divide. But Pat Moynihan was not that kind of man. He was always willing to work with Senators, no matter where they were from or what their views were, to try to do the right thing.

Since I have been watching the Senate over the last 30 years up close and personal, as a House Member and a Senator, I have not known a more brilliant and more erudite Senator than the distinguished Senator Pat Moynihan of New York. He served his country in so many different critical roles.

He studied, wrote papers, and made us realize problems we would just as soon not talk about—problems with the children in America, the problems of poverty, the importance of the world community.

He did so many exceptional things for Democratic administrations and, yes, Republican administrations, and in the majority and in the minority in the Senate. I grew to admire him and appreciate him, to seek his advice, and even try to get his vote on occasion, and on occasion he gave it because I was able to convince him that maybe it was the right thing to do.

He also had a sense of humor I learned to appreciate. But more than anything, I will remember my encounters with Senator Moynihan in the little dining room downstairs. About once a week—sometimes not that often, maybe once a month—I would go down to get a bite to eat and he would be there. He always ate strange orders of food, I might say, but I just loved his knowledge. It became an opportunity for me to learn about the world. I would pick a country: Tell me about India. An hour later he was still talking.

I remember one time, I said: I do not quite understand what is going on in East Timor, and he corrected my pronunciation and told me what was going on in that part of the world, what had happened historically—such a wealth of knowledge—all the players involved, the religious considerations, what the solutions could have been, what the solutions might be, what the future would hold. More than once—I would say at least three times—before I got back to my office, before the afternoon

was out, a book would arrive that he had written or that I should read to understand what was going on in the world. What a special touch.

Senator Pat Moynihan tried to help educate this Senator, one who needed a lot of help, but he gave me a greater appreciation of our relationship with countries and people all over the world.

This was a giant of a man, a giant of a Senator, a humble man, in many respects. I have missed him since he left the Senate, and we will all miss him now that he has gone on to his great reward.

I had to come to the floor and express my personal feelings about the great Senator from New York and how much he meant to me personally, to the Senate, and to the country.

I yield the floor, Madam President.

Mr. DASCHLE, Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENNETT. 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. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have just heard the saddening news that our former colleague, Senator Moynihan of New York, has passed away. This is a great loss for the State of New York, but it is also a great loss for the people of the United States. He was one of the truly outstanding public servants of his time and one of the intellectual towers of this body.

I first met Pat Moynihan when I served in the Nixon administration working at the Department of Transportation. I can say with some accuracy that the name Pat Moynihan filled us all with dread and fear because he was the President's counselor on domestic issues. We were afraid he would come to the Department of Transportation and expose all of our weaknesses; that with his intellect he could discover very quickly where we were doing things wrong.

I met him at the White House as we would go over and discuss various transportation issues. On one occasion, Secretary Volpe invited Mr. Moynihan to come to the Department and address all of the Department's senior management. We had a program of management dinners where all of the senior officials of the Department would gather together and we would have a speaker come in and talk with us. Mr. Moynihan was the first of those speakers, along with Bryce Harlow, who came at my invitation, a little later. That was my moment in the sun with Secretary Volpe, that I was able to call Bryce Harlow and get him to come over and give the address. I still remember very clearly what Pat Moynihan said to us on that occasion and the lesson he gave us.

Being the student of history that he was, he went back to relatively recent

history in describing pivotal events in America. He made this point: Political scientists assume that President Kennedy and President Johnson were activist Presidents, whereas President Eisenhower is always described as a passive President, or a pacifist kind of President. He said that particular characterization is given by their opponents, as well as their defenders, people defending Eisenhower's passive attitude toward Government, as well as those attacking it, and so on with Kennedy and Johnson.

However, he said, history will show that President Eisenhower affected life in the United States more than all of the things done by Kennedy and Johnson put together. Why? Because President Eisenhower was responsible for the creation of the interstate highway system.

Recognize again, he was addressing a group of officials at the Department of Transportation. He had done his homework and focused on a transportation issue. He outlined for us the changes in American life that came from the interstate highway system, how cities that were left off the system more or less withered and died and other cities that found themselves on the system had tremendous growth; how the system created efficiency for the transportation of goods and people all over the United States.

I remember one statistic, when I worked at the Department of Transportation, that said 95 percent of intercity trips took place on the interstate highway system. We focused on travel as being a competition in those days between air travel and rail travel, and indeed in the industrial age, going back to Abraham Lincoln's time and after the Civil War, almost all intercity trips were by rail. Then the airlines came in and we talked about the airlines cutting into the rail industry.

He pointed out it was not the airline industry that destroyed railroad passenger traffic; it was the interstate highway system and the convenience that came with the opportunity to take one's own automobile and go from one city to the other and then have local transportation while there. They did not have to catch a cab when they came out of the train station. They brought it with them.

It was this ability to see beyond the specifics of conventional wisdom, step back and see the overall picture that defined Pat Moynihan. He did it for us in that particular speech, but he did it throughout his entire career.

I remember as we became acquainted that he talked with me about the work he did with my father when my father was in the Senate and he was in the Nixon administration. They were talking about programs that the Nixon administration tried to put into place which, for one reason or another, the Congress did not accept. He said to me, if we had prevailed in that program that Wallace Bennett was for, we wouldn't have many of the urban problems that we have today.

I won't try to imitate his accent because it was distinctly his and was part of his charm.

One of the things that I had not understood but that I came to know while Pat Moynihan was in the Senate was the role he played in the rejuvenation of Washington, DC. The story is told and accepted as conventional wisdom that when John F. Kennedy went in his inaugural parade from the Capitol to the White House, he noticed how rundown Pennsylvania Avenue was—and it was. Those of us who remember Pennsylvania Avenue in the 1960s remember it as a place of rundown seedy shops and disreputable buildings that were badly in need of replacement. The conventional wisdom is that John F. Kennedy noticed that as he went by in his limousine and said, We have to do something about that. And the rejuvenation of Pennsylvania Avenue began in the Kennedy administration.

In fact, that is not true. It was not John F. Kennedy who noticed it; it was Pat Moynihan who noticed it and called it to the attention of John F. Kennedy, who, then, in the spirit of all of us in politics, took his staffer's advice and put it forward as his own.

Pat Moynihan, as chairman of what we used to call the Public Works Committee—now it is the Environment and Public Works Committee—Pat Moynihan, of what we used to call the Public Works Committee, presided over the public works that saw to it that Pennsylvania Avenue was turned into the kind of memorial avenue that the world's greatest power deserves; that it changed from what it had been to become the architectural delight that it is today.

I had not realized that until I read Pat Moynihan's memos. He shared them with me, in another circumstance, and going through the memos I realized he was personally the driving force behind that kind of an effort. That demonstrates how much of a renaissance man he was. He was interested in architecture. He was interested in art. He was one of those who helped create the National Endowment for the Arts.

Yes, as a legislator he was interested in public issues and public policy, but as a renaissance man he remained interested in just about everything else.

I can't think of any career covering a wider number of opportunities than his: Ambassador to the United Nations, Ambassador to India, serving Presidents regardless of party, regardless of ideology, with wisdom, clarity, and again the ability to see the big picture, the overall historical circumstance, and not just the issue directly in front of him.

I remember when he was chairman of the Finance Committee and we were locked in this Chamber in a bitter battle over health care. He did his duty. He was the good soldier. He did his best to carry the water for the administration. But in private conversations with him he would candidly share some of

the same concerns that the rest of us had. While he was the good soldier all the way to the end, I know he gave the administration Dutch uncle advice as to what they should be doing.

I remember sitting in the Cabinet Room of the White House when President Clinton had a group of us down to talk about what we needed to do to get trade authority, to get fast track. All of us were being appropriately respectful of the President, as you are in that kind of circumstance. All of us were trying to put forward our opinions in as tender and gingerly expressed a way as we could because we were with the President. Pat Moynihan sat at the President's left and the President said; "What do we need to do to get trade authority passed?"

He said; "Sir, you need to get more Democrats."

That warmed my heart. The Republicans were in favor of fast track. We didn't want to say it. And Pat Moynihan summarized it: "Sir, you need to get more Democrats."

The President looked at him and said; "Pat, you are absolutely right. How do we do that?"

Then they had a very candid discussion.

He was not overly awed by anyone, regardless—with respect to their position. But he was always awed by any human being who had something to tell him. His attitude was that he could learn from anyone.

His health was not the best. His passing is not unexpected. But this is a time for us to rejoice in the opportunity of having known him, having worked with him in this body and having been blessed by his intellect, his humor, his humility, and his great understanding. We shall miss him, and we express our great condolence to his wife Liz and to all of the members of his family.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am glad I had the opportunity to hear the Senator from Utah talk about our friend Pat Moynihan because in 1969 the Senator from Utah and I had different jobs. I was working for Bryce Harlow in the White House and he was working for Secretary Volpe, both of us in the Nixon administration.

One of the things I think many people will look at, about the Nixon administration, is what an extraordinarily diverse group of individuals the President was able to attract. The Senator from Utah and I were young persons. I am not talking about us at that time. But I am talking about Henry Kissinger and Arthur Burns and Bryce Harlow and foremost among them was Pat Moynihan.

Particularly when we look at a Washington, DC, where so many issues are so divisive and so partisan—and there was a lot of partisanship back then. Look back at 1969. Here was Pat Moynihan, a Harvard professor, Kennedy

Democrat, who became the Republican President's domestic policy adviser. He was an extraordinary person. He was, as the Senator from Utah pointed out, a man who could see a long distance.

In the 1960s he coined the phrase "benign neglect," when he talked about the breakdown of the American family and the effect it might have on African-American families. He was courageous enough to talk about that. He predicted at that time that if the rate of breakdown of families that was then occurring among African-American families were to occur among all families, it would be a catastrophe for America. That percentage has long since passed. Pat Moynihan was willing to talk about it.

He was a great teacher. He attracted into the White House at that time a cadre of young Moynihan devotees who are still around today—for example, Checker Finn, a young Harvard graduate who is a leading education expert; and Chris DeMuth, who has had a distinguished career here. All of those young people were attracted by his intellect and his sense of public service.

He had an ability even then to be a person who crossed party lines. He was one of the old Democratic liberals such as Al Shanker—some of them are now called neoconservatives today—who saw our country in a very accurate and clear way.

He believed in America. He was an immigrant, a great immigrant, an Irish immigrant, with all the characteristics that we think of when we think of great Irish immigrants, but he was an American first. He was proud of where he came from but he was prouder of the country to which he came.

He loved politics. His favorite character was George Washington Plunkett, the boss of Tammany Hall. He wrote a forward for a book on Plunkett. Plunkett's favorite comment was:

I seen my opportunities and I took them.

He went to the United Nations where he pounded the desk. He went to India as Ambassador. He ran for the Senate. Think of this. He ran in 1976, a Republican from the then-disgraced Nixon administration. I know what that was like. I was in that administration. I had been a candidate myself in 1974—lost; and here was Pat Moynihan in New York State, a Democratic State, running for the Senate as a Democrat, able to be elected because of the respect people had for him.

I watched him during his whole career. When I was Education Secretary he came down and lectured me from this body because he wanted me to be more aggressive on standards. But he was always such a gentle person.

As I have gone along in life, I have especially appreciated people who are well known and famous who take time for people who are not so well known and famous. I can remember when my wife and I, in our early 30s—I was, she was younger—went to Harvard, to the John F. Kennedy School of Govern-

ment, where Pat had gone in the early 1970s. He was a famous man, a great professor, a former adviser to Presidents. Everyone knew him. No one knew us. But he saw us and he spent 45 minutes or an hour with us. He was a teacher and we were his students.

I am glad to be on the floor today to hear my friend from Utah speak of such a distinguished American. We need more Senators, more public leaders, with the breadth and the intellect and the understanding of American history that Pat Moynihan had. We need more who have the capacity to work across party lines, to solve tough problems such as Social Security, which he helped to solve, and to enjoy politics, to love George Washington Plunkett, and the rough and tumble of Tammany Hall politics, but at the same time, when the Nation's issues are foremost, to put them first.

So I rise today to salute a great American, a real patriot, and perhaps a person who most of us—Senators or students—will remember as a great teacher.

Mr. President, 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.

PASSAGE OF THE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today we passed the budget resolution 56 to 44. I want to end what has been a very productive week on this budget resolution—the debate and the vote earlier this afternoon—by congratulating the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator NICKLES, for doing an outstanding job in terms of leadership, in terms of keeping this train moving on time, so that legislative process will be able to go forward in a timely way.

In addition, there are so many others to thank, but in particular I thank Senator JUDD GREGG from New Hampshire, who spent so much time on the floor debating the various amendments and supporting the budget resolution and its ultimate passage today.

In addition, on that committee, there are seven new Republican members. I thank them. The budget process is one that I had the opportunity to address first through that committee in my first 8 years in the Senate. I know it has been an eye-opening experience for them. They did a tremendous job in supporting their leader, their chairman in accomplishing this resolution passage today.

In addition—and it has been mentioned on the floor several times this afternoon since we voted on the bill—we have had a very cooperative spirit. People have been able to express their

opinions, to debate, to articulate their views as to what is appropriate to establish their priorities. But at the end of today—this afternoon, shortly after 4 o'clock—I think we can all be proud, on both sides of the aisle, for developing a product that reflects that debate, that reflects the will of the Senate.

I congratulate Members on the other side of the aisle, the ranking member, Senator KENT CONRAD, the assistant Democratic leader, HARRY REID, and Minority Leader DASCHLE for their cooperation in moving this resolution to a conclusion today.

I thank the staffs. It has been done on the floor already today, but I thank the staffs, under the direction of Hazen Marshall and Mary Naylor, for their long hours and dedication to the process. We saw their participation here on the floor. And in addition to that time on the floor, they have spent many hours developing this budget, they and their staff. I thank them because without their hard work, their tremendous dedication, what we have accomplished today simply would not have been possible.

Today, we did accomplish a lot in passing this budget resolution. I say that because it was on the backdrop of last year, where we were unable even to bring a budget to the floor of the Senate. We were unable to ever see the conclusion that we saw today in this vote.

I understand—and we all understand—this is the first step, the next is the conference, and then the reconciliation. But what we have done today is to establish the framework for that legislative process. It has taken a lot of cooperation on both sides of the aisle.

The resolution today, in terms of the jobs and growth package, is, indeed, less than what I had preferred as we come forward. But the majority of people in this body did speak today. I do want to tell the Members on our side of the aisle that I will continue to work to achieve the growth in this resolution because I think it is important. In fact, it is incumbent upon us to address those jobs and growth issues to stimulate the economy, both in the short term, midterm, and long term.

Again, that process has just begun. The resolution today accomplishes a lot. I am not going to go through the various priorities that were placed, but it establishes fiscal discipline on the spending side. It does that through what we call pay-go and certain spending caps. But it is important the American people understand that what we have done is slowed that growth of spending, which is absolutely critical to do in this environment of deficits.

It strengthens and improves Medicare. That is our health care system and program for our seniors and our individuals with disabilities. It takes a major step forward to strengthen and improve that program so that we can better serve our seniors, so they will have more security in terms of their health in the future.

In terms of our national defense and homeland security needs, it sets those parameters to accommodate that necessary funding, as spelled out by the Budget Committee, by the priorities in the Senate, and the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

Fourthly, it increases funding for that much broader spectrum of education in an unprecedented way. It includes education K-12, IDEA—that is the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act—for title I, and then there is veterans health and an initiative that is important to this body, global HIV/AIDS.

But you wrap all that together and, most importantly, I think what we accomplished today is that we allow this legislative process to continue in an orderly, systematic way, to accomplish our responsibilities in this institution of the Senate.

We are on course to finish the conference report of this budget by April 11. The law says that we do it by April 15. I think, just as we have today, we will be able to pass that in advance, not just on time, but in advance a few days.

Again, I thank Chairman NICKLES for being so instrumental in this process.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise with sadness on the word we heard this evening with regard to the death of one of our most notable former Members this afternoon.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan served in the Senate over a period from 1977 to 2001. But he served our country in so many different roles over the past half century, as we have heard through other tributes tonight. Rising from the depths of Hell's Kitchen in New York, he became one of America's true leading intellectuals whose foresight and whose ability brought to public attention a mass of critical issues long before others even realized these issues existed. From identifying the stresses and challenges of urban America to spearheading the reformation of Pennsylvania Avenue, from President Nixon's welfare reform plan to Y2K, from Soviet spying to bringing our national security state into the sunshine, Pat Moynihan was at the center of most of our public policy challenges in the last half of the 20th century.

Pat Moynihan, a confidant and essential aide to Presidents of both parties, came to Washington's attention in the early 1960s as a steward of President Kennedy's effort to bring Pennsylvania Avenue back to life. His ability brought him to President Nixon's Cabinet as head of the Domestic Policy Council, and he later became Ambassador to India and Gerald Ford's Ambassador to the United Nations, where he served so well defending the West against totalitarian regimes.

Elected to the Senate in a notable class, he quickly became a leading

voice on an extensive range of public policy. While the Senate recognized his ability as chairman of both the Finance Committee and the Environment and Public Works Committee, his contributions to our work were broad and deep.

For example, at a time when Social Security was reeling and near insolvency, Pat Moynihan stepped forward and, with Senator Dole, Alan Greenspan, and President Reagan, rescued the system for the benefit of millions of Americans. In that role, he bridged partisan differences and rose above petty politics to forge a successful solution that brought stability and security to that system. He did that conscious of the need to be responsible not only to the current recipients but to the future beneficiaries who at the time were not even born.

This spirit animated his observations and animated his work, not just on Social Security but other great domestic programs, such as Medicaid, Medicare, and welfare.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan served not only as a Senator from New York, he was one of our leading lights and innovative thinkers. He never hesitated to offer a timely observation, a useful insight, or a historical analogy that not only demonstrated his vast knowledge but was truly useful in analyzing the challenges ahead. His contributions to public policy and his influence in this Chamber will echo for decades to come.

Indeed, our condolences go out to his family and to loved ones, as well as to his many friends and former staff members. We are a better institution, and we are all better public servants for having known Pat Moynihan.

NAVY LIEUTENANT THOMAS MULLEN ADAMS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to another American—and another Californian—killed in the line of duty. His name: LT Thomas Mullen Adams, of La Mesa. He was only 27.

Yesterday, I spoke of LCpl Jose Gutierrez, a young immigrant from Guatemala who was struck down trying to liberate the Iraqi port city of Umm al Qasar. Corporal Gutierrez was an orphan who first settled in a homeless shelter in Hollywood, before being taken in by foster parents.

Lieutenant Adams, on the other hand, grew up in comfort, in the suburbs, as a member of a family that traces its roots directly to John Adams, one of America's most important Founding Fathers.

On the surface, there seems little in common with Corporal Gutierrez and Lieutenant Adams. But together, they embody the depth and breadth of America's Armed Forces—men and women from all walks of life, willing to give their lives to defend our freedoms.

Lieutenant Adams graduated from Grossmont High School in 1993 and the United States Naval Academy in 1997.

He received flight training in Pensacola, FL, and inherited his love of flying from his father, John, an architect who helped design the Aerospace Museum in San Diego.

Promoted to lieutenant in the year 2000, Adams won two National Defense Service Medals, three Sea Service Deployment Ribbons and other awards.

"He's one of these amazingly clean-cut, all-American kids," his aunt, Elizabeth Hansen, told the San Diego Union Tribune newspaper. "He's the kind of kid that if you had a very special daughter, you would hope that she would snag him. He was just amazingly bright, funny and kind."

In October of 2002, Lieutenant Adams was assigned as an exchange officer with the British Royal Navy's 849 Squadron, now on the aircraft carrier *Ark Royal*.

An avid soccer fan who had volunteered to go to Japan with the carrier *Kitty Hawk* in time for the World Cup finals last summer, he joined a local team near his base in Helston, England. Lieutenant Adams' family said that he particularly enjoyed his time with the Royal Navy for two reasons: every ship had a pub on board, and he was allowed a weekly 20-minute phone call home.

"This is an extremely close family, and none of us will ever be the same," said his aunt, Elizabeth Hansen. "All of us just remember him as a fun-loving guy with a wry sense of humor and we can't imagine going forward without him."

I can only hope that they do go forward. And it is to his family—to his parents, John and Marilyn, and his younger sister, Cari—that I extend my deepest sympathies.

All Americans owe an enormous—an almost incalculable—debt to LT Thomas Mullen Adams, who accepted great risk and was willing to sacrifice his future for the future of the country he so clearly loved, so that we, as a people, might be safe and free. His sacrifice will never be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO CALIFORNIA SERVICEMAN KILLED IN IRAQ

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, as we pray for all those who are in harm's way, I rise to pay tribute to a Californian who was killed in the Iraqi war.

Marine Corps Cpl Randal Kent Rosacker, age 21, of San Diego, CA, was killed on Sunday, March 23, when he encountered Iraqi troops pretending to surrender. He graduated in 2000 from San Diego's Junipero Serra High School where he was a star baseball player. He joined the Marines at age 18 and was a machine gunner based at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina. He is survived by his wife, his father—a Navy Master Chief at Naval Station Bremerton his mother and two sisters.

May this beautiful young American rest in peace. May we have a short war. And may we also pray for the wisdom of those who send our young men and women on their mission.

THE WAR IN IRAQ AND SUPPORT FOR OUR TROOPS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 20, President Bush ordered U.S. forces to begin attacking Iraqi installations. There are currently 225,000 American service men and women in the Persian Gulf region. Two hundred thousand members of the Reserves and National Guard have been called to active duty. Several thousand Connecticut residents are doing their part—1,500 members of Connecticut's National Guard; 750 deployed to the Middle East and another 750 activated to participate in homeland security related responsibilities. There are also 2,778 of Connecticut's sons and daughters serving in the Navy—active members and reservists, 532 in the Army, and 310 in the Air Force. Dozens of Connecticut's police officers and firefighters have been called up for active duty. I thank each and every one of them. And say to them that I am proud and honored to represent them in the United States Senate.

As is always the case, these young men and women stand ready to obey the orders of the Commander in Chief—the President of the United States—to take up arms and risk their lives in 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 home and loved ones. Americans stand as one in support of these brave individuals. I also want to express my gratitude to the family members of our soldiers. They more than anyone understand the sacrifices involved in the service of our country. War is a treacherous endeavor, and we will all pray for their safe return. I am confident that in the days and weeks to come, America and the U.S. Congress will continue to provide our service men and women with all the support they need and deserve.

Over the last several months, my colleagues and I have engaged in an ongoing dialog about when and under what circumstances the U.S. should commence military action in Iraq. I have been a participant in these important debates, as have many others in this Chamber. And across the country, in cities and towns, Americans have also been discussing these issues with their families and neighbors. Many have voiced strong opinions. It is right and appropriate that this has occurred—that is what living in a free country is all about.

Last Fall, I supported President Bush's decision to go the United Nations and seek the support of U.N. members to resolve the threat posed by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. I supported the deployment of U.N. weapons inspectors to Iraq to verify its peaceful disarmament. As much as anyone, I wanted those diplomatic efforts to succeed. I believe that 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 every critical juncture, Saddam Hussein chose to impede the work of the inspectors. At every fork in the road, he chose to squander opportunities for peaceful disarmament presented to him by the international community. Finally time has run out.

And now, 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 not 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 contribute 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.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. In the last Congress Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred September 16, 2001, in Eagan, MN. An Indian-American woman left a grocery store followed by three teenage boys. One of them pushed her against her car. When she turned, another punched her in the stomach and then elbowed her in the back. As they left, the assailants said, "This is what you people deserve."

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I speak today to ask my colleagues to support the nomination of Mr. Harold Damelin, whom President Bush has nominated to serve as the next Inspector General, IG, of the U.S. Small Business Administration, (SBA). Mr. Damelin's extensive experience in and out of government makes him very well suited to this important position, and I look forward to working closely with him and his office.

As my colleagues are well aware, the IG post at any Federal agency is a critical one—assigned by Congress the duties of protecting taxpayer money, ensuring that laws are upheld, and investigating abuses within an agency. This is no less true at the SBA, which has played a vital role in helping to develop and foster small businesses and small business initiatives for the past 50 years.

The role of the IG is unique: someone who is above the political fray of other appointees, and someone who may even be called upon to investigate them. By their very nature, IG's must function independently and with a distinct authority, so it is no small amount of trust the President and the Congress must place in any IG. Additionally, an IG must possess not only managerial

and policy experience, but should possess investigative experience as well. Fining such a candidate can be a difficult task.

Phyllis Fong, the former IG for the SBA, was recently confirmed as the IG for the Department of Agriculture, where I am sure she will continue to perform her official duties in a skillful, competent, and efficient manner. However, because of a delay in her confirmation, the IG position at the SBA was only recently vacated. Given this delay, coupled with the importance of the IG position, Senator SNOWE, the Chair of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, and I have agreed to seek unanimous consent that Mr. Damelin's nomination be discharged from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and considered immediately by the full Senate.

In my capacity as ranking member, I have thoroughly reviewed Mr. Damelin's employment and educational experience, his FBI background check and the Committee questionnaire. Mr. Damelin has fully answered all questions put before him. As Mr. Damelin clearly possesses the necessary skills and experience to serve as the next SBA IG, I support moving forward with his nomination at this time.

Mr. Damelin, if confirmed by the Senate, will come to the SBA from the private sector, where he most recently worked as a lawyer for the firm of Powers, Pyles, Sutter and Verville in Washington, DC. Prior to joining the private sector, Mr. Damelin had a long and illustrious career as a public servant, holding such positions as the branch chief for the U.S. Department of Justice's Criminal Division, Fraud Section, Governmental Fraud Branch and the senior counsel to the majority for the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs' Special Investigation Committee. I believe these experiences and others uniquely qualify Mr. Damelin to serve as the SBA's IG.

Mr. Damelin was born in Malden, in my home State of Massachusetts, although he now resides in Virginia. He attended Boston College and earned his JD from Boston College Law School, also my alma mater. Mr. Damelin was also a member of the Armed Forces, serving as a 2nd Lieutenant after college and attaining the rank of Captain in the Army Reserves before being honorably discharged with the rank of Captain. I am always pleased to see a fellow Bay Stater, and Eagle, dedicate his energies toward public service, and this is no exception.

Mr. Damelin's nomination also has the support of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Committee Chair OLYMPIA SNOWE.

I ask all of my colleagues to vote in favor of Mr. Damelin's nomination to be the next Inspector General of the U.S. Small Business Administration.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NORWICH UNIVERSITY CADETS, ICE HOCKEY NATIONAL CHAMPIONS

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the victory last weekend of the Norwich University men's ice hockey team in the NCAA Division III National Championship against the Oswego State Lakers. This is the second championship in four years for the Cadets, who finished this season with an outstanding 27-3 record.

Norwich University enjoys a proud history as the United States' oldest private military college. The campus, founded in 1819, sits in the small town of Northfield, VT, and it offers a tremendous education for those in the Corps of Cadets as well as for students who choose the civilian lifestyle. Norwich is a school of honor and tradition, qualities well-reflected in their champion ice hockey team. The Cadets play with discipline, energy, and confidence. The team played hard this season and now they deserve to enjoy their success.

I congratulate each member of the team: Coach Mike McShane, Assistant Coaches Steve Mattson and Fred Coan, Strength Coach Eric Corey, Trainer Rachel Sutherland, Kevin Schieve, Brad Powell, Brian Mullally, Toza Crnilovic, Ryan Thompson, Chris Fuss, Lou DiMasi, Matt Schmidt, Peter Catalano, Paul Mattucci, Ed Boudreau, Jon Bokelmann, Bob Jaggard, Vadim Beliaev, Marshall Lee, Kurtis McLean, Chris Petracco, Lynn Beedle, Michael Serba, Andrew Senesi, Phil Aucoin, Dominick Dawes, Mario Chinelli, John Grabie, Garrett Winder, Randy Hevey, Mike Boudreau, and Aaron Lee. Everybody involved deserves much credit for this outstanding season.

Again, congratulations for a job well done and good luck next season.●

HONORING ELIZABETH NAMUSOKE KIZITO

● Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I have the honor of rising today to recognize Ms. Elizabeth Namusoke Kizito of Louisville, KY. Earlier this month, Ms. Kizito was named Woman Business Owner of the Year by the Louisville chapter of the National Association of Women Business Owners.

Ms. Kizito is being honored for demonstrating smart business practices that have led to the success of Kizito Cookies located in Louisville. Almost 20 years ago, Ms. Kizito began her entrepreneurial experience by selling cookies as a way to pay for her son's birthday present. Shortly thereafter, she had enough business to begin selling cookies from a street cart. Within a few years she traded her cart for a bakery on Bardstown Road. What sets Kizito Cookies apart from other businesses are Ms. Kizito's superior marketing skills. Dressed in traditional garb from her native country of Uganda, she sells cookies from a basket

placed atop her head. Many Louisvillians affectionately refer to her as the "Cookie Lady."

Her African heritage plays a dominant part in her life and business. Born in Uganda during the 1950s, she moved to America to attend school. Unfortunately, civil unrest resulting in a civil war prevented her from returning to Uganda. She moved to Louisville in 1978 and began making cookies for co-workers, a skill she learned from her father who ran a bakery in Uganda. Each year she travels to her home country and even provides financial assistance to her relatives. Ms. Kizito continues honoring her roots by passing along to the people of Louisville a piece of her culture.

Ms. Kizito's hard work and dedication are inspiring. She has created a great deal from very little, and in the process made an entire community her friend. Please join me in congratulating Ms. Elizabeth Namusoke Kizito on this much deserved honor.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:18 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution permitting the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate to designate another member of the Committee to serve on the Joint Committee on Printing in place of the Chairman.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution providing for the acceptance of a statue of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, presented by the people of Kansas, for placement in the Capitol, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 620. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide supplemental funding and other services that are necessary to assist the State of California or local educational agencies in California in providing

educational services for students attending schools located within the Park.

H.R. 788. An act to revise the boundary of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Arizona.

H.R. 961. An act to promote Department of Interior efforts to provide a scientific basis for the management of sediment and nutrient loss in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 620. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide supplemental funding and other services that are necessary to assist the State of California or local educational agencies in California in providing educational services for students attending schools located within the Park; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 788. An act to revise the boundary of the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Utah and Arizona; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 961. An act to promote Department of the Interior efforts to provide a scientific basis for the management of sediment and nutrient loss in the Upper Mississippi River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURE HELD AT THE DESK

The following concurrent resolution was ordered held at the desk by unanimous consent:

S. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to commend and express the gratitude of the United States to the nations participating with the United States in the Coalition to Disarm Iraq.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 711. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to alleviate delay in the payment of the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus to members of Selected Reserve who are mobilized.

S. 712. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for surviving spouses of Reserves not eligible for retirement who die from a cause incurred or aggravated while on inactive-duty training.

S. 718. A bill to provide a monthly allotment of free telephone calling time to members of the United States armed forces stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in Iraq or Afghanistan.

S. 721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the combat zone income tax exclusion to include income for the period of transit to the combat zone and to remove the limitation on such exclusion for commissioned officers, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1727. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Rule exempting three Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) systems of records from subsection (e)(5) of the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a): National Crime Information Center (NCIC), FBI-001; Central Records System (CRS), FBI-002; and National Center for Analysis of Violent Crime (NCAVC), FBI-015 (Justice/FBI-001, FBI-002, FBI-015)" received on March 26, 2003; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1728. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Justice Management Division, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clandestine Laboratory Seizure System (CLSS) Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) -002 (Justice/DEA-002)" received on March 26, 2003; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 253, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to exempt qualified current and former law enforcement officers from State laws prohibiting the carrying of concealed handguns (Rept. No. 108-29).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. COCHRAN for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Vernon Bernard Parker, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FITZGERALD):

S. 708. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7401 West 100th Place in Bridgeview, Illinois, as the "Michael J. Healy Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. DOLE (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 709. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Prime Minister Tony Blair; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 710. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that aliens who commit acts of torture, extrajudicial killings, or other specified atrocities abroad are inadmissible and removable and to establish within the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice an Office of Special Investigations having responsibilities under that Act with respect to all alien participants in war crimes, genocide, and the commission of acts of torture and extrajudicial killings abroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. ALLEN):

S. 711. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to alleviate delay in the payment of the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus to members of Selected Reserve who are mobilized; read the first time.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. ALLEN):

S. 712. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for surviving spouses of Reserves not eligible for retirement who die from a cause incurred or aggravated while on inactive-duty training; read the first time.

By Mr. ALLEN:

S. 713. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate any portion of a refund for use by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in providing catastrophic health coverage to individuals who do not otherwise have health coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH):

S. 714. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of Bureau of Land Management land in Douglas County, Oregon, to the county to improve management of and recreational access to the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 715. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the calendar year limitations on the use of commissary stores by certain reserves and others; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 716. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to improve the electricity transmission system of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 717. A bill to require increased safety testing of 15-passenger vans, ensure the compliance of 15-passenger vans used as schoolbuses with motor vehicle safety standards applicable to schoolbuses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 718. A bill to provide a monthly allotment of free telephone calling time to members of the United States armed forces stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in Iraq or Afghanistan; read the first time.

By Mr. GREGG:

S. 719. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the payment of compensation for certain individuals with injuries resulting from the administration of smallpox countermeasures; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Mr. FRIST, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. GREGG):

S. 720. A bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to provide for the improvement of patient safety and to reduce the incidence of events that adversely affect patient safety; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina):

S. 721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the combat zone income tax exclusion to include income for the period of transit to the combat zone and to remove the limitation on such exclusion for commissioned officers, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 722. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that manufacturers of dietary supplements submit to the Food and Drug Administration reports on adverse experiences with dietary supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 723. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide refunds for unjust and unreasonable charges on electric energy in the State of California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BUNNING, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. Res. 98. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week of October 12, 2003, through October 18, 2003, as "National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. FRIST, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr.

SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TALENT, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 99. A resolution relative to the death of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, former United States Senator for the State of New York; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. MILLER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 100. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary year of the founding of the Ford Motor Company, which has been a significant part of the social, economic, and cultural heritage of the United States and many other nations, and a revolutionary industrial and global institution, and congratulating Ford Motor Company for its achievements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUGAR (for himself and Mr. BIDEN):

S. Con. Res. 30. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to commend and express the gratitude of the United States to the nations participating with the United States in the Coalition to Disarm Iraq; ordered held at the desk.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 55

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 55, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the annual determination of the rate of the basic benefit of active duty educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill, and for other purposes.

S. 59

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 59, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit former members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces are entitled to travel on such aircraft.

S. 148

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 148, a bill to provide for the Secretary of Homeland Security to be included in the line of Presidential succession.

S. 243

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 243, a bill concerning participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization.

S. 300

At the request of Mr. KERRY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 300, a bill to award a congressional gold medal to Jackie Robinson

(posthumously), in recognition of his many contributions to the Nation, and to express the sense of Congress that there should be a national day in recognition of Jackie Robinson.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 330, a bill to further the protection and recognition of veterans' memorials, and for other purposes.

S. 333

At the request of Mr. BREAU, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 333, a bill to promote elder justice, and for other purposes.

S. 380

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 380, a bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to reform the funding of benefits under the Civil Service Retirement System for employees of the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes.

S. 464

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 464, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and expand the credit for electricity produced from renewable resources and waste products, and for other purposes.

S. 468

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 468, a bill to amend the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 to assist the neediest of senior citizens by modifying the eligibility criteria for supplemental foods provided under the commodity supplemental food program to take into account the extraordinarily high out-of-pocket medical expenses that senior citizens pay.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to extend the authority for the construction of a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr.

S. 478

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 478, a bill to grant a Federal charter Korean War Veterans Association, Incorporated, and for other purposes.

S. 480

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 480, a bill to provide competitive grants for training court reporters and closed captioners to meet requirements for realtime writers under the Tele-

communications Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

S. 544

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 544, a bill to establish a SAFER Firefighter Grant Program.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 589

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 589, a bill to strengthen and improve the management of national security, encourage Government service in areas of critical national security, and to assist government agencies in addressing deficiencies in personnel possessing specialized skills important to national security and incorporating the goals and strategies for recruitment and retention for such skilled personnel into the strategic and performance management systems of Federal agencies.

S. 598

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a clarification of the definition of homebound for purposes of determining eligibility for home health services under the medicare program.

S. 678

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 678, a bill to amend chapter 10 of title 39, United States Code, to include postmasters and postmasters organizations in the process for the development and planning of certain policies, schedules, and programs, and for other purposes.

S. 700

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to provide for the promotion of democracy, human rights, and rule of law in the Republic of Belarus and for the consolidation and strengthening of Belarus sovereignty and independence.

S.J. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 4, resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr.

ENSIGN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the sharp escalation of anti-Semitic violence within many participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is of profound concern and efforts should be undertaken to prevent future occurrences.

S. CON. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 15, a concurrent resolution commemorating the 140th anniversary of the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation.

S. CON. RES. 25

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 25, a concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring America's Jewish community on the occasion of its 350th anniversary, supporting the designation of an "American Jewish History Month", and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 26

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 26, a concurrent resolution condemning the punishment of execution by stoning as a gross violation of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 27

At the request of Mr. BOND, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAU) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 27, a concurrent resolution urging the President to request the United States International Trade Commission to take certain actions with respect to the temporary safeguards on imports of certain steel products, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 48

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 48, a resolution designating April 2003 as "Financial Literacy for Youth Month".

S. RES. 58

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 58, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning June 1, 2003, as "National Citizen Soldier Week".

S. RES. 74

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 74, a resolution to amend rule

XLII of the Standing Rules of the Senate to prohibit employment discrimination in the Senate based on sexual orientation.

AMENDMENT NO. 281

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 281 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 281

At the request of Mr. KOHL, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 281 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 281

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 281 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 281

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 281 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 281

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 281 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 401

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 401 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 407

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 407 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 409

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 409 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. FITZGERALD):

S. 708. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7401 West 100th Place in Bridgeview, Illinois, as the "Michael J. Healy Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to name the U.S. Post Office at 7401 W. 100th Place in Bridgeview, IL after Postal Police Officer Michael Healy.

On June 21, 1981, while guarding the Chicago Main Post Office at Harrison Avenue and Canal Street, Officer Healy's life was senselessly cut short by a random act of violence. Officer Healy was murdered by three assailants in a foiled robbery attempt. Sadly, Michael Healy became the first officer of the Postal Inspection Service to be killed while on duty.

Shortly after his murder, the Postal Inspection Service retired Michael's badge, number 3972. Subsequently, Michael's name was added to the Federal Law Enforcement Memorial in Washington, DC as well as the Law Enforcement Memorial in Springfield, IL.

In 2001, the Northern Illinois Division of the United States Inspection Service honored the 20th anniversary of Michael's death. The Fraternal Order of Police, FOP, has tried for two years to rename the local post office after Officer Healy.

In protecting others, Officer Healy made the ultimate sacrifice. I believe it is fitting to pay tribute to him by designating the postal facility in honor of Michael J. Healy. I think that it is the most appropriate way to recognize and remember a man who gave so much to his family, his friends, the Postal Inspection Service, and his community of Hometown, IL.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. LEVIN):

S. 710. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that aliens who commit acts of torture, extrajudicial killings, or other specified atrocities abroad are inadmissible and removable and to establish within the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice an Office of Special Investigations having responsibilities under that Act with respect to all alien participants in war crimes, genocide, and the commission of acts of torture and extrajudicial killings abroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. I am pleased today to introduce the Anti-Atrocity Alien Deportation Act of 2003, a bill intended to close loopholes in our immigration laws that have allowed war criminals and human rights abusers to enter and remain in this country. Senator HATCH has joined me in offering this bill, along with Senators LIEBERMAN and LEVIN. In the other body, Representatives MARK FOLEY and GARY ACKERMAN today introduce identical legislation.

Our bill would update the charter of the Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations, OSI, which for

years has investigated and has sought justice in the cases of Nazi war criminals who have sought refuge on our shores. It is time to renew the OSI charter to take into account the new generations of war criminals who try to escape justice by living among us.

This bill closely mirrors legislation I had offered that was reported unanimously by the Senate Judiciary Committee last year, and which passed the Senate during the 106th Congress. I hope and expect that, with the help of Senator HATCH and others, this bill will become law during this Congress.

As we introduce this bill, our armed forces are fighting to replace an Iraqi regime that has been marked by its utter disregard for the human rights of its people. We must not fight this war on the one hand, and let human rights abusers from around the world enter our Nation with impunity on the other.

When they learn it is so, the American people are appalled to learn that our country has become a safe haven for those who exercised power in foreign countries to terrorize, rape, murder and torture innocent civilians. A report issued last year by Amnesty International claims that nearly 150 alleged human rights abusers have been identified living here and warns that this number may be as high as 1,000. Meanwhile, an article in the *New York Review of Books* stated that "hundreds, if not thousands, of foreign nationals who have been plausibly accused of the most heinous human rights crimes, including torture and assassination, either have lived or still live freely in the U.S." [William Schulz, "The Torturers Among Us," *New York Review*, p. 22, April 25, 2002.]

I introduced a similar version of this bill on May 10, 2001, and the Judiciary Committee reported the bill with a Leahy-Hatch managers' amendment on April 18, 2002. Unfortunately, the bill was subject to an anonymous hold on the Senate floor.

I introduced similar legislation in the 106th Congress and was pleased when the proposal garnered bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate. The legislation passed the Senate on November 5, 1999, as part of S. 1754, the Hatch-Leahy "Denying Safe Havens to International and War Criminals Act," but unfortunately it was not acted on by the House before the end of the 106th Congress. Nevertheless, Representatives FOLEY and ACKERMAN have provided consistent leadership in moving this legislation in the House, by introducing the measure in the 106th Congress as H.R. 2642 and H.R. 3058, in the 107th Congress, as H.R. 1449, and again today.

The problem of human rights abusers seeking and obtaining refuge in this country is real, and requires an effective response with the legal and enforcement changes proposed in this legislation.

For example, three Ethiopian refugees proved in an American court that

Kelbessa Negewo, a former senior government official in the military dictatorship that ruled Ethiopia in the 1970s, engaged in numerous acts of torture and human rights abuses against them when they lived in that country. Negewo oversaw and participated in the torture of opposition political figures in Ethiopia, and then moved to the United States only to work at the same Atlanta hotel as one of his own victims. The court's descriptions of the abuse are chilling, and included whipping a naked woman with a wire for hours and threatening her with death in the presence of several men. The court's award of compensatory and punitive damages in the amount of \$1.5 million to the plaintiffs was subsequently affirmed by an appellate court. [See *Abebe-Jira v. Negewo*, 72 F.3d 844 (11th Cir. 1996).] Yet during the pendency of his appeal of the civil verdict, the Immigration and Naturalization Service granted Negewo citizenship.

This situation is an affront both to the foreign victims of torture who fled here to escape their persecutors, and to the American victims of such torture and their families. As Professor William Aceves of California Western School of Law has noted, this case reveals "a glaring and troubling limitation in current immigration law and practice. This case is not unique. Other aliens who have committed gross human rights violations have also gained entry into the United States and been granted immigration relief." [20 Mich. J. Int'l.L. at 657.]

Indeed, another case actually involves American victims. In 1980, four American churchwomen were raped and murdered by the Salvadoran National Guard. Two former Salvadoran government officials who allegedly covered up the murders currently reside in Florida.

Unfortunately, criminals who wielded machetes and guns against innocent civilians in countries like Haiti, Chile, Yugoslavia and Rwanda have been able to gain entry to the United States through the same doors that we have opened to deserving refugees. We need to lock that door to human rights abusers who seek a safe haven in the United States. To those human rights abusers who are already here, we should promptly show them the door out.

We have unwittingly sheltered the oppressors along with the oppressed for too long. We should not let this situation continue. We waited too long after World War II to focus prosecutorial resources and attention on Nazi war criminals who entered this country on false pretenses, or worse, with the collusion of American intelligence agencies. Thousands of declassified CIA documents were made public last year, as a result of the Nazi War Crimes Disclosure Act that I was proud to help enact in 1998. These documents made clear the extent to which the United States relied upon and helped Nazi war criminals. As Eli M. Rosenbaum, the head of

the Justice Department's Office of Special Investigations, noted at the time, "These files demonstrate that the real winners of the Cold War were Nazi criminals." We should not repeat that mistake for other aliens who engaged in human rights abuses before coming to the United States. We need to focus the attention of our law enforcement investigators to prosecute and deport those who have committed atrocities abroad and who now enjoy safe harbor in the United States.

When I first introduced this bill, the *Rutland Daily Herald* in Vermont editorialized that:

For the U.S. commitment to human rights to mean anything, U.S. policies must be strong and consistent. It is not enough to denounce war crimes in Bosnia and Kosovo or elsewhere and then wink at the perpetrators of torture and mass murder slip across the border to find a home in America. (October 31, 1999)

The Clinton Administration recognized the deficiencies in our laws. One Clinton Administration witness testified in February 2000 that:

The Department of Justice supports efforts to enhance our ability to remove individuals who have committed acts of torture abroad. The department also recognizes, however, that our current immigration laws do not provide strong enough bars for human rights abusers. . . . Right now, only three types of human rights abuse could prevent someone from entering or remaining in the United States. The types of prohibited conduct include: (1) genocide; (2) particularly severe violations of religious freedom; and (3) Nazi persecutions. Even these types of conduct are narrowly defined. [Hearing on H.R. 3058, "Anti-Atrocity Alien Deportation Act," before the Subcomm. on Immigration and Claims of the House Comm. on the Judiciary, 106th Cong., 2d Sess., Feb. 17, 2000 (Statement of James E. Costello, Associate Deputy Attorney General).]

The Anti-Atrocity Alien Deportation Act would provide a stronger bar to human rights abusers and close loopholes in our current laws. The Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) currently provides that (i) participants in Nazi persecutions during the time period from March 23, 1933 to May 8, 1945, (ii) aliens who engaged in genocide, and (iii) aliens who committed particularly severe violations of religious freedom, are both inadmissible to the United States and removable. [See 8 U.S.C. §1182(a)(2)(G) & (3)(E) and §1227(a)(4)(D).] This bill would expand the grounds for inadmissibility and deportation to: (1) add new bars for aliens who have engaged in acts, outside the United States, of "torture" and "extrajudicial killing," and (2) remove limitations on the current bases for "genocide" and "particularly severe violations of religious freedom."

The definitions for the new bases of "torture" and "extrajudicial killing" are derived from the Torture Victim Protection Act, which implemented the United Nations' "Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment." These definitions are therefore already sanctioned by the Congress. The bill in-

corporates the definition of "torture" codified in the federal criminal code, 18 U.S.C. §2340, which prohibits:

an act committed by a person acting under the color of law specifically intended to inflict severe physical or mental pain or suffering (other than pain or suffering incidental to lawful sanctions) upon another person within his custody or physical control." [18 U.S.C. §2340(1).]

"Severe mental pain or suffering" is further defined to mean:

prolonged mental harm caused by or resulting from (A) the intentional infliction or threatened infliction of severe physical pain or suffering; (B) the administration or application, or threatened administration or application, of mind-altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or personality; and (C) the threat of imminent death; or (D) the threat that another person will imminently be subjected to death, severe physical pain or suffering, or the administration or application of mind-altering substances or other procedures calculated to disrupt profoundly the senses or personality. [18 U.S.C. §2340(2).]

The Torture Victim Protection Act also included a definition for "extrajudicial killing." Specifically, this law establishes civil liability for wrongful death against any person "who, under actual or apparent authority, or color of law, of any foreign nation . . . subjects an individual to extrajudicial killing," which is defined to mean "a deliberated killing not authorized by a previous judgment pronounced by a regularly constituted court affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognized as indispensable by civilized peoples. This term, however, does not include any such killing that, under international law, is lawfully carried out under the authority of a foreign nation."

The bill would not only add the new grounds for inadmissibility and deportation, it would expand two of the current grounds. First, the current bar to aliens who have "engaged in genocide" defines that term by reference to the "genocide" definition in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. [8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(E)(ii).] For clarity and consistency, the bill would substitute instead the definition in the federal criminal code, 18 U.S.C. §1091(a), which was adopted pursuant to the U.S. obligations under the Genocide Convention. The bill would also broaden the reach of the provision to apply not only to those who "engaged in genocide," as in current law, but also to cover any alien who has ordered, incited, assisted or otherwise participated in genocide. This broader scope will ensure that the genocide provision addresses a more appropriate range of levels of complicity.

Second, the current bar to aliens who have committed "particularly severe violations of religious freedom," as defined in the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (IRFA), limits its application to foreign government officials who engaged in such conduct within the last 24 months, and also bars from admission the individual's

spouse and children, if any. This bill would delete the reference to prohibited conduct occurring within a 24-month period since this limitation is not consistent with the strong stance of the United States to promote religious freedom throughout the world. As Professor Aceves has written:

This provision is unduly restrictive . . . The 24-month time limitation for this prohibition is also unnecessary. A perpetrator of human rights atrocities should not be able to seek absolution by merely waiting two years after the commission of these acts. [William J. Aceves, *supra*, 20 Mich. J. Int'l L., at 683.]

In addition, the bill would remove the current bar to admission for the spouse or children of a violator of religious freedom. This is a serious sanction that should not apply to individuals because of familial relationships that are beyond their control. The purpose of these amendments is to make those who have participated in atrocities accountable for their actions. That purpose is not served by holding the family members of such individuals accountable for the offensive conduct over which they had no control.

Under current law, most aliens who are inadmissible may receive a waiver under section 212(d)(3) of the INA to enter the nation as a nonimmigrant, where the Secretary of State recommends it and the Attorney General approves. Participants in Nazi persecutions or genocide, however, are not eligible for such a waiver. Our bill retains that provision. It does not, however, ban waivers for those who commit acts of torture or extrajudicial killings. I would hope that such waivers are used sparingly and only under the most compelling of circumstances.

Of course, changing the law to address the problem of human rights abusers seeking entry and remaining in the United States is only part of the solution. We also need effective enforcement. As one expert noted:

[s]trong institutional mechanisms must be established to implement this proposed legislation. At present, there does not appear to be any agency within the Department of Justice with the specific mandate of identifying, investigating and prosecuting modern day perpetrators of human rights atrocities. The importance of establishing a separate agency for this function can be seen in the experiences of the Office of Special Investigations. 20 Mich. J. Int'l L., at 689.

Our country has long provided the template and moral leadership for dealing with Nazi war criminals. The Justice Department's specialized unit, OSI, which was created to hunt down, prosecute and remove Nazi war criminals who had slipped into the United States among their victims under the Displaced Persons Act, is an example of effective enforcement. Since OSI was created in 1979, more than 60 Nazi persecutors have been stripped of U.S. citizenship, almost 50 such individuals have been removed from the United States, and more than 150 have been denied entry.

OSI was created almost 35 years after the end of World War II and it remains

authorized only to track Nazi war criminals. Specifically, when Attorney General Civiletti, by a 1979 Attorney General order, established OSI within the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, that office was directed to conduct all "investigative and litigation activities involving individuals, who prior to and during World War II, under the supervision of or in association with the Nazi government of Germany, its allies, and other affiliated governments, are alleged to have ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person because of race, religion, national origin, or political opinion." (Attorney Gen. Order No. 851-79). The OSI's mission continues to be limited by that Attorney General Order.

I believe it is time to reward the tremendous work that OSI has done by expanding its mission to ensure effective enforcement against war criminals of all stripes.

Little is being done about the new generation of international human rights abusers and war criminals living among us, and these delays are costly. As any prosecutor knows instinctively, such delays make documentary and testimonial evidence more difficult to obtain. Stale cases are the hardest to make. We should not repeat the mistake of waiting decades before tracking down war criminals and human rights abusers who have settled in this country. War criminals should find no sanctuary in loopholes in our current immigration policies and enforcement, and should never come to believe that they will find safe harbor in the United States.

The Anti-Atrocity Alien Deportation Act would amend the INA, 8 U.S.C. § 1103, by directing the Attorney General to establish an Office of Special Investigations (OSI) within the Department of Justice with authorization to denaturalize any alien who has participated in Nazi persecution, torture, extrajudicial killing or genocide abroad. Not only would the bill provide statutory authorization for OSI, it would also expand its jurisdiction to deal with any alien who participated in torture, extrajudicial killing and genocide abroad not just Nazis.

The success of OSI in hunting Nazi war criminals demonstrates the effectiveness of centralized resources and expertise in these cases. The knowledge of the people, politics and pathologies of particular regimes engaged in genocide and human rights abuses is often necessary for effective prosecutions of these cases and would best be accomplished by the concentrated efforts of a single office, rather than in piecemeal litigation around the country or in offices that have more diverse missions.

These are the sound policy and practical reasons that experts in this area recommend that the United States "establish an office in the Justice Department similar to the one that has tracked Nazi war criminals, with an exclusive mandate to carry out the task

of investigation [of suspected human rights abusers]." [William Schulz, *supra*, at p. 24.]

I appreciate that this part of the legislation has in the past proven controversial within the Department of Justice, but others have concurred in my judgment that the OSI is an appropriate component of the Department to address the new responsibilities proposed in this bill. Professor Aceves, who has studied these matters extensively, has concluded that the OSI's "methodology for pursuing Nazi war criminals can be applied with equal rigor to other perpetrators of human rights violations. As the number of Nazi war criminals inevitably declines, the OSI can begin to enforce U.S. immigration laws against perpetrators of genocide and other gross violations of human rights." 20 Mich. J. Int'l. 657.

Unquestionably, the need to bring Nazi war criminals to justice remains a matter of great importance. Funds would not be diverted from the OSI's current mission instead, additional resources are authorized in the bill to cover the costs of the Office's expanded duties.

Significantly, the bill further directs the Attorney General, in determining what action to take against a human rights abuser seeking entry into or found within the United States, to consider whether a prosecution should be brought under U.S. law or whether the alien should be deported to a country willing to undertake such a prosecution. Despite ratifying the Convention Against Torture in 1994 and adopting a new law making torture anywhere in the world a crime, federal law enforcement has not used this authority. In fact, one recent observer noted that "the U.S. has never prosecuted a suspected torturer; nor has it ever extradited one under the Convention Against Torture, although it has surrendered one person to the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda." [William Schulz, *supra*, at p. 23 - 24.]

As one human rights expert has noted:

"The justifiable outrage felt by many when it is discovered that serious human rights abusers have found their way into the United States may lead well-meaning people to call for their immediate expulsion. Such individuals certainly should not be enjoying the good life America has to offer. But when we ask the question 'where should they be?' the answer is clear: they should be in the dock. That is the essence of accountability, and it should be the central goal of any scheme to penalize human rights abusers." [Hearing on H.R. 5238, "Serious Human Rights Abusers Accountability Act," before the Subcomm. on Immigration and Claims of the House Comm. On the Judiciary, 106th Cong., 2d Sess., Sept. 28, 2000 (Statement of Elisa Massimino, Director, Washington Office, Lawyers Committee For Human Rights).]

Finally, the bill directs the Attorney General to report to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House on implementation of the new requirements in the bill, including procedures for referral of matters to the OSI, any

revisions made to immigration forms to reflect amendments made by the bill, and the procedures developed, with adequate due process protection, to obtain sufficient evidence and determine whether an alien is deemed inadmissible under the bill.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate again to give their approval to this bill, and for the House to help us finally make it law. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 710

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Anti-Atrocities Alien Deportation Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF ALIENS WHO HAVE COMMITTED ACTS OF TORTURE OR EXTRAJUDICIAL KILLINGS ABROAD.

(a) INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(3)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)(E)) is amended—

(1) in clause (ii), by striking "has engaged in conduct that is defined as genocide for purposes of the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide is inadmissible" and inserting "ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in conduct outside the United States that would, if committed in the United States or by a United States national, be genocide, as defined in section 1091(a) of title 18, United States Code, is inadmissible";

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(iii) COMMISSION OF ACTS OF TORTURE OR EXTRAJUDICIAL KILLINGS.—Any alien who, outside the United States, has committed, ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the commission of—

"(I) any act of torture, as defined in section 2340 of title 18, United States Code; or

"(II) under color of law of any foreign nation, any extrajudicial killing, as defined in section 3(a) of the Torture Victim Protection Act of 1991 (28 U.S.C. 1350 note); is inadmissible."; and

(3) in the subparagraph heading, by striking "PARTICIPANTS IN NAZI PERSECUTION OR GENOCIDE" and inserting "PARTICIPANTS IN NAZI PERSECUTION, GENOCIDE, OR THE COMMISSION OF ANY ACT OF TORTURE OR EXTRAJUDICIAL KILLING".

(b) DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a)(4)(D) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(4)(D)) is amended—

(1) by striking "clause (i) or (ii)" and inserting "clause (i), (ii), or (iii)"; and

(2) in the subparagraph heading, by striking "ASSISTED IN NAZI PERSECUTION OR ENGAGED IN GENOCIDE" and inserting "PARTICIPATED IN NAZI PERSECUTION, GENOCIDE, OR THE COMMISSION OF ANY ACT OF TORTURE OR EXTRAJUDICIAL KILLING".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to offenses committed before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. INADMISSIBILITY AND DEPORTABILITY OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WHO HAVE COMMITTED PARTICULARLY SEVERE VIOLATIONS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

(a) GROUND OF INADMISSIBILITY.—Section 212(a)(2)(G) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(2)(G)) is amended to read as follows:

"(G) FOREIGN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WHO HAVE COMMITTED PARTICULARLY SEVERE VIOLATIONS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.—Any alien who, while serving as a foreign government official, was responsible for or directly carried out, at any time, particularly severe violations of religious freedom, as defined in section 3 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6402), is inadmissible.".

(b) GROUND OF DEPORTABILITY.—Section 237(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(E) PARTICIPATED IN THE COMMISSION OF SEVERE VIOLATIONS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.—Any alien described in section 212(a)(2)(G) is deportable.".

SEC. 4. WAIVER OF INADMISSIBILITY.

Section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and 3(E)" and inserting "and clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (3)(E)"; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking "and 3(E)" and inserting "and clauses (i) and (ii) of paragraph (3)(E)".

SEC. 5. BAR TO GOOD MORAL CHARACTER FOR ALIENS WHO HAVE COMMITTED ACTS OF TORTURE, EXTRAJUDICIAL KILLINGS, OR SEVERE VIOLATIONS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM.

Section 101(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting "and"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(9) one who at any time has engaged in conduct described in section 212(a)(3)(E) (relating to assistance in Nazi persecution, participation in genocide, or commission of acts of torture or extrajudicial killings) or 212(a)(2)(G) (relating to severe violations of religious freedom)."

SEC. 6. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE OFFICE OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS.

(a) AMENDMENT OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—Section 103 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1103) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h)(1) The Attorney General shall establish within the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice an Office of Special Investigations with the authority to detect and investigate, and, where appropriate, to take legal action to denaturalize any alien described in section 212(a)(3)(E).

"(2) The Attorney General shall consult with the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security in making determinations concerning the criminal prosecution or extradition of aliens described in section 212(a)(3)(E).

"(3) In determining the appropriate legal action to take against an alien described in section 212(a)(3)(E), consideration shall be given to—

"(A) the availability of criminal prosecution under the laws of the United States for any conduct that may form the basis for removal and denaturalization; or

"(B) the availability of extradition of the alien to a foreign jurisdiction that is prepared to undertake a prosecution for such conduct.".

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice such sums as may be necessary to carry out the additional duties established under section 103(h) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as added by this Act) in order to ensure that the Office of Special Investigations fulfills its continuing obligations regarding Nazi war criminals.

(2) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) are authorized to remain available until expended.

SEC. 7. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ACT.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on implementation of this Act that includes a description of—

(1) the procedures used to refer matters to the Office of Special Investigations and other components within the Department of Justice and the Department of Homeland Security in a manner consistent with the amendments made by this Act;

(2) the revisions, if any, made to immigration forms to reflect changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act made by the amendments contained in this Act; and

(3) the procedures developed, with adequate due process protection, to obtain sufficient evidence to determine whether an alien may be inadmissible under the terms of the amendments made by this Act.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to The Right Honorable Tony Charles Lynton Blair, Prime Minister of Great Britain, First Lord of the Treasury and Minister for the Civil Service.

For more than two centuries, Congress has expressed public gratitude on behalf of the Nation for the notable contributions of individuals and of groups through the Congressional Gold Medal. Congress created this honor as its highest expression of national appreciation for distinguished achievement and contributions.

Originally bestowed upon military leaders, the first Congressional Gold Medal was awarded to George Washington by the Continental Congress on March 25, 1776, for his heroic service in the Revolutionary War. In the two centuries since the medal was first awarded, Congressional Gold Medal recipients have transcended nationality, country and politics. In addition to modern military leaders including General Douglas MacArthur and General Colin Powell, this award has recognized the extraordinary character and efforts of such world leaders as Mother Teresa, Pope John Paul II, and Prime Minister Winston Churchill, another British wartime leader.

In the year and a half since September 11, 2001, and particularly over the course of recent weeks, Prime Minister Blair has exhibited extraordinary courage in the war against terror. With steadfast and unwavering resolve, he has held firm to his principles without regard to, indeed in spite of, the shifting political winds. Again and again, he has been called on to demonstrate his recognition that tyrannical dictators cannot be allowed to terrorize their citizens and neighbors, or the world community.

In the process, Prime Minister Blair has proven to be one of the strongest and most distinguished allies of the United States in our efforts to rid the world of terrorists, and to bring to justice the corrupt regimes that support them. Great Britain has long been a trusted ally of our Nation; however,

Prime Minister Blair has gone beyond friendship to demonstrate true leadership for his nation and for Europe.

In the 18th century, English philosopher Edmund Burke once said, "The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." How poignant and how true that remains today.

It is clear that Prime Minister Blair understands the truth in these words, and that true leaders often hold lonely positions when they forgo the political expedient to stand for what is right.

Last week, a British newspaper editorialized about Prime Minister Blair's lonely struggle. "Mr. Blair has not shrunk from debate," said *The Independent*, a newspaper that has frequently and loudly criticized the Prime Minister in the past. "He has taken the argument to all quarters of his restive party. He has allowed the Commons its say. And despite all the doubts about this war, Mr. Blair has shown himself in the past few days to be at once the most formidable politician in the country and the right national leader for these deeply uncertain times."

These are uncertain, but defining, times. America suffers with Great Britain during the struggles in Iraq. And we mourn together the loss of the brave individuals who dedicate their lives to defending freedom. The courage of the coalition forces in the theater, their skill and bravery on the front lines, the dedication and patriotism of their families at home, all extends back to their leaders.

Prime Minister Blair has had the vision to see that Saddam Hussein is a dangerous man who continues to pose a threat to the region's stability, to his own people, and to the world through his sponsorship of terror.

The liberation of Iraq will be the beginning, not the end, of our commitment to the people of Iraq. We will work together to supply humanitarian relief and strive for the long-term recovery of Iraq's economy.

In this effort to bring freedom to a nation of people who have thirsted for relief from terror, Prime Minister Blair has taken a courageous and principled stand before the world. The simple lesson learned, the lesson Prime Minister Blair personifies, is that evil must be checked.

History will be a kind judge of Tony Blair, for great leaders are remembered well when they stand by their convictions, especially when those stands are tested in the face of adversity, during times of conflict and strife. In such times of testing, we take the measure of our leaders, our institutions, and ourselves.

Prime Minister Blair's character has proven strong and he deserves nothing less than our highest accolades.

That is why I am proud and honored today to introduce legislation to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Prime Minister Blair, and to thank him, on the floor on this Chamber, for his steadfast stand against evil.

I encourage my colleagues to recognize Prime Minister Blair for the courage of his convictions by joining in support of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 709

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDING.

Congress finds that Prime Minister Tony Blair of the United Kingdom has clearly demonstrated, during a very trying and historic time for our 2 countries, that he is a staunch and steadfast ally of the United States of America.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) **PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.**—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design, to Prime Minister Tony Blair, in recognition of his outstanding and enduring contributions to maintaining the security of all freedom-loving nations.

(b) **DESIGN AND STRIKING.**—For purposes of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary") shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) **NATIONAL MEDALS.**—The medals struck pursuant to this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) **NUMISMATIC ITEMS.**—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 5. AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS; PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO USE FUND AMOUNTS.**—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund such amounts as may be necessary to pay for the costs of the medals struck pursuant to this Act.

(b) **PROCEEDS OF SALE.**—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals authorized under section 3 shall be deposited into the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. ALLEN):

S. 711. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to alleviate delay in the payment of the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus to members of Selected Reserve who are mobilized; read the first time.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. ALLEN):

S. 712. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for surviving spouses of Reserves not eligible for retirement who die from a cause incurred or aggravated while on inactive-duty training; read the first time.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 718. A bill to provide a monthly allotment of free telephone calling time to members of the United States armed forces stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in Iraq or Afghanistan; read the first time.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bills were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 711

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PAYMENT OF SELECTED RESERVE REENLISTMENT BONUS TO MEMBERS OF SELECTED RESERVE WHO ARE MOBILIZED.

Section 308b of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (d), (e), and (f) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

"(d) **PAYMENT TO MOBILIZED MEMBERS.**—In the case of a member entitled to a bonus under this section who is called or ordered to active duty, any amount of such bonus that is payable to the member during the period of active duty of the member shall be paid the member during that period of active duty, notwithstanding the service of the member on active duty pursuant to such call or order to active duty."

S. 712

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SURVIVOR BENEFIT PLAN ANNUITIES FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES OF RESERVES NOT ELIGIBLE FOR RETIREMENT WHO DIE FROM A CAUSE INCURRED OR AGGRAVATED WHILE ON INACTIVE-DUTY TRAINING.

(a) **SURVIVING SPOUSE ANNUITY.**—Paragraph (1) of section 1448(f) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) **SURVIVING SPOUSE ANNUITY.**—The Secretary concerned shall pay an annuity under this subchapter to the surviving spouse of—
"(A) a person who is eligible to provide a reserve-component annuity and who dies—

"(i) before being notified under section 12731(d) of this title that he has completed the years of service required for eligibility for reserve-component retired pay; or

"(ii) during the 90-day period beginning on the date he receives notification under section 12731(d) of this title that he has completed the years of service required for eligibility for reserve-component retired pay if he had not made an election under subsection (a)(2)(B) to participate in the Plan; or

"(B) a member of a reserve component not described in subparagraph (A) who dies from an injury or illness incurred or aggravated in line of duty during inactive-duty training."

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—The heading for subsection (f) of section 1448 of such title

is amended by inserting "OR BEFORE" after "DYING WHEN".

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as of September 10, 2001, and shall apply with respect to performance of inactive-duty training (as defined in section 101(d) of title 10, United States Code) on or after that date.

S. 718

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Troops Phone Home Free Act of 2003".

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this Act to support the morale of the brave men and women of the United States armed services stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in Iraq or Afghanistan (as determined by the Secretary of Defense) by giving them the ability to place calls to their loved ones without expense to them.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The armed services of the United States are the finest in the world.

(2) The members of the armed services are bravely placing their lives in danger to protect the security of the people of the United States and to advance the cause of freedom in Iraq.

(3) Their families and loved ones are making sacrifices at home in support of the members of the armed services abroad.

(4) Telephone contact with family and friends provides significant emotional and psychological support to them and helps to sustain and improve morale.

SEC. 4. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TELECOMMUNICATIONS BENEFIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as possible after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall provide prepaid phone cards, or an equivalent telecommunications benefit which includes access to telephone service, to members of the armed forces stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in Iraq or Afghanistan (as determined by the Secretary) to enable them to make telephone calls to family and friends in the United States without cost to the members.

(b) MONTHLY AMOUNT.—The value of the benefit provided by subsection (a) shall not exceed \$40 per month per person.

(c) END OF PROGRAM.—The program established by subsection (a) shall terminate on the date that is 60 days after the date on which the Secretary determines that Operation Iraqi Freedom has ended.

(d) FUNDING.

(1) USE OF EXISTING RESOURCES.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall maximize the use of existing Department of Defense telecommunications programs and capabilities, private support organizations, and programs to enhance morale and welfare.

(2) USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—In addition to resources described in paragraph (1) and notwithstanding any limitation on the expenditure or obligation of appropriated amounts, the Secretary may use available funds appropriated to or for the use of the Department of Defense that are not otherwise obligated or expended to carry out this section.

SEC. 5. DEPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL TELEPHONE EQUIPMENT.

The Secretary of Defense shall work with telecommunications providers to facilitate the deployment of additional telephones for use in calling the United States under this Act as quickly as practicable, consistent with the availability of resources and without compromising the Department's military objectives and mission.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH):

S. 714. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of Bureau of Land Management land in Douglas County, Oregon, to the county to improve management of and recreational access to the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today, with my friend and colleague Senator SMITH of Oregon, to introduce legislation to improve the management of and recreational access to the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area in Douglas County, OR.

For the small, rural, coastal community of Winchester Bay in Douglas County, OR, this piece of legislation is critical. Hit first in the early 90's with a steep downturn in the timber economy, closely followed by a near shutdown of the fishing industry, this community found itself on the brink of economic ruin. The final blow came in March of 2000 when the major employer, International Paper, closed its paper mill, putting 300 residents out of work and sending an economic shockwave through the community that impacted the city, the school district, the hospital district, and literally every resident in the area.

Yet, since that time, Winchester Bay, OR has adopted a "never give up" attitude, changed its long term outlook, and focused its efforts on developing a thriving tourist industry. The bill I introduce today directs the Secretary of the Interior to convey approximately 68.5 acres from the Bureau of Land Management, BLM, in Douglas County, OR, to Douglas County to be managed for open space and for recreational purposes. The acreage is located just west of tourist and recreational area developments already owned and run by Douglas County. The County will use the land to provide a staging area for off-highway vehicles, thereby improving management of the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area. The land transfer also facilitates the policing of unlawful camping and parking along Salmon Harbor Drive and adjacent areas. This land transfer will improve tourism on Oregon's economically challenged South Coast, as well as improve public safety and reduce traffic congestion along Salmon Harbor Drive.

This legislation is supported by the entire Oregon delegation. It is also supported by the BLM, Douglas County Commissioners, and the community of Winchester Bay. An identical bill was introduced in the last Congress by Representative DEFAZIO, though the 107th Congress ended before both houses could pass it. Representative DEFAZIO reintroduced this land transfer legislation in the 108th Congress, H.R. 514, in the House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

S. 714

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND IN DOUGLAS COUNTY, OREGON.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) CONVEYANCE.—The Secretary of the Interior shall convey, without consideration, to Douglas County, Oregon (referred to in this section as the "County"), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel described in paragraph (2) for use by the County for recreational purposes.

(2) PARCEL.—The parcel referred to in paragraph (1) is the parcel of real property consisting of approximately 68.8 acres under the administrative jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management in the County, as depicted on the map entitled "Umpqua River Light-house and Coast Guard Museum Master Plan Study", dated April 17, 2002.

(b) PURPOSES OF CONVEYANCE.—The purposes of the conveyance under subsection (a) are to improve management of and recreational access to the Oregon Dunes National Recreation Area by—

(1) improving public safety and reducing traffic congestion along Salmon Harbor Drive (County Road No. 251) in the County;

(2) providing a staging area for off-highway vehicles; and

(3) facilitating policing of unlawful camping and parking along Salmon Harbor Drive and adjacent areas.

(c) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that the parcel conveyed under subsection (a) is not being used by the County for a recreational purpose—

(A) all right, title, and interest in and to the parcel, including any improvements on the parcel, shall revert to the United States; and

(B) the United States shall have the right of immediate entry onto the parcel.

(2) DETERMINATION ON THE RECORD.—Any determination of the Secretary under this subsection shall be made on the record after an opportunity for an agency hearing.

(d) SURVEY.—The exact acreage and legal description of the parcel to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey—

(1) that is satisfactory to the Secretary; and

(2) the cost of which shall be paid by the County.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

By Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. CHAMBLISS):

S. 715. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the calendar year limitations on the use of commissary stores by certain reserves and others; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 715

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF CALENDAR YEAR LIMITATIONS ON USE OF COMMISSARY STORES BY CERTAIN RESERVES AND OTHERS.

(a) MEMBERS OF THE READY RESERVE.—Section 1063(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the period at the end of the first sentence and all that follows and inserting “in that calendar year.”.

(b) CERTAIN OTHER PERSONS.—Section 1064 of such title is amended by striking “for 24 days each calendar year”.

By Ms. LANDRIEU:

S. 716. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to improve the electricity transmission system of the United States; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today I introduce the “Federal Power Act Amendment of 2003.” This bill is intended to ensure for the future the two things that matter most to all electricity customers: affordable electricity and reliable electricity.

Electricity users, my constituents and your constituents, wake up in the morning, flip a switch and expect their lights to turn on. They also expect that each month when their electricity bill arrives in the mail that they’ll pay a reasonable price for that service. Customers don’t care where the electrons come from or what new scheme the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has in mind for the electricity industry or really much of anything else. And frankly, as a representative of nearly four and a half million people in my home State of Louisiana, affordable and reliable electricity are my primary concerns when it comes to electricity policy, and that is the purpose for which I offer legislation today.

Electricity prices in Louisiana, and throughout the Southeast for that matter, are some of the lowest in the nation. According to the North American Electric Reliability Council’s most recent reliability assessment report, the Southeast region is expected to enjoy, at least for the near term, “adequate delivery capacity to support forecast demand and energy requirements under normal and contingency conditions.” In other words, electricity customers in the Southeast should expect to continue to enjoy reliable electric service over the short run. My concern, however, is about the future of retail electricity service in my State.

There are several specific areas of concern that I have and that I attempt to address in the legislation being offered today.

First, the current balance between State and Federal jurisdiction, which has worked exceedingly well in my home State to provide low-cost and reliable electric service, is in jeopardy. Retail transactions, regulated by State public utility commissions, have historically comprised 90 percent of most utilities’ transactions and continue to do so in a majority of States that have

not restructured their electricity markets. In fact, there is not a single State in the Southeast with the exception of Virginia that has authorized retail competition. Yet, customers in our region of the country enjoy some of the lowest priced electricity service.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission or FERC, however, has issued a proposed rule that would strip States of much of their current jurisdiction over retail electric service, including the transmission component of bundled retail sales. In so doing, FERC would dramatically impair the ability of States to use retail ratemaking to attain local policy goals and to continue to ensure low costs for retail customers. It would also prohibit States from ensuring that retail customers are given a priority for electricity service. As a result, in the event that supplies are tight, retail customers could lose the right to priority service.

FERC’s proposed plan is a one-size-fits-all scheme on the entire country based on a model that closely resembles the one in place in New Jersey, much of Pennsylvania and Maryland. This model may work well in the Northeast, but it has never been tested or proven viable in any other part of the country. In fact, in a study performed by the consulting firm, Charles River Associates, it was concluded that there is “considerable uncertainty as to whether [the FERC’s proposed plan] would provide greater benefits to the southeast than the implementation costs.” In Louisiana, and I’m sure in many other States throughout the Southeast and across the country, customers are happy with their electric service. So I ask, what’s wrong with the current jurisdictional division between the State and Federal government? If a State or region wants to adopt a new approach, they should be free to do so. But we should not allow a Federal agency to make fundamental policy decisions that are best left to State officials who are accountable to local interests. We know what happened out West when California regulators attempted to institute a sweeping, new plan for its electricity markets. I hope to avoid importing those problems into Louisiana.

To address this jurisdictional concern, Section 2 of my bill would clarify the Federal-State arrangement under the Federal Power Act by explicitly stating that States shall have jurisdiction over the retail sale of electric energy, including all component parts of a bundled retail sale. In addition, Section 7 would enable States to continue to allow utilities to reserve transmission capacity for retail customers. This is current law and the current practice in a large number of States, including States with some of the lowest average retail rates and the best history of reliability. As contemplated by Congress when the Federal Power Act was enacted, FERC will retain jurisdiction over the wholesale sales of electric energy and States will retain jurisdiction over retail.

My second concern for retail customers is the potential for increased rates caused by the costs of accommodating the “merchant generation” that, over the past several years, have been seeking to connect to the electric grid in the Southeast. Though new generation is important to wholesale competition, it is a strain on the transmission system. To accommodate the new generation, new transmission facilities and upgrades to existing facilities are needed. However, customers in Louisiana would be forced to pay for the facilities needed to accommodate the merchant generators, even though most of their customers are out-of-region customers. State regulatory commissioners, understandably, are reluctant to pass transmission construction and upgrade costs off to local customers who are not benefitting from the electricity. Meanwhile energy dependent regions of the country are denied cheap and reliable electricity.

A reason they choose to site in Louisiana is because we are blessed with abundant reserves of natural gas—the currently favored fuel source for electric generation. Merchant generators are siting their facilities to gain access to these resources as cheaply as possible, and then are delivering electricity to regions where they can sell electricity at a higher cost. If enough transmission is built to export just a portion of the new generation that is planned to come on-line in Louisiana—10,000 megawatts—the estimated cost would impose a retail rate increase of 5 to 11 percent.

Surely, there must be a more equitable way to allocate cost while simultaneously enhancing our transmission capacity. It is not fair to expect customers in energy generating States to keep paying for transmission expansion when this increased transmission is primarily being developed for out-of-region use. In Sections 3 and 4 of this bill, I have attempted to provide a more equitable system. Section 3 would allow for “voluntary participant-funding” in which a regional transmission organization may choose to establish a system in which market participants pay for expansions to the transmission network in return for the transmission rights created by the expansion investment. This approach gives proper economic incentives for new generator location and transmission expansion decisions.

Similarly, Section 4 of my bill would require the FERC to initiate a proceeding to establish rules for interconnecting new generation to transmission facilities. As in Section 3, any costs made necessary by the interconnecting generator would be funded by the generator, or cost-causer, in return for a right to use such facilities funded by the investment.

The third problem that I see is the lack of new investment in transmission facilities. FERC noted in its Electric Transmission Constraint study that transmission congestion costs retail

customers across the country millions of dollars every year. Over the past 10 years, demand for electricity has increased by 17 percent while transmission investment during the same period has continuously declined about 45 percent.

What is even more troubling is that current demand for electricity is projected to increase by 25 percent over the next 10 years with only a modest increase in transmission capacity. In the short term, this lack of transmission investment and the corresponding lack of transmission capacity, adversely affects the ability of retail customers to realize the benefits of wholesale competition. Over the long term, and if this trend continues, the reliability of the bulk power system could be compromised. In the summer of 2000, transmission constraints limited the ability to sell low-cost power from the Midwest to the South during a period of peak demand, causing higher costs for customers. In the summer of 2001 during the California electricity crisis, transmission constraints along the Path 15 transmission route were a significant cause of the blackouts experienced by customers in the northern parts of that State.

To help spur this needed investment in the transmission sector, Section 5 of the legislation would provide further guidance to FERC in establishing transmission rates in two ways. First, Section 5 would amend Section 205 of the Federal Power Act to clarify that the cost causer is responsible for paying the costs of new transmission investment and that all users of the transmission facilities are required to pay an equitable share of the costs such facilities. These provisions will help ensure that users of the transmission system have proper economic price signals and encourage investment where it is needed most. Second, Section 5 would add a new section to the Federal Power Act, Section 215, that would require the FERC to initiate a rulemaking to establish transmission pricing policies and standards to promote investment in transmission facilities. Although the Commission may have sufficient authority under current law to initiate such policies, our Nation's transmission system has been neglected too long and I believe that the FERC could benefit from more specific guidance from Congress.

Finally, customers are not realizing all of the potential benefits of wholesale electricity markets because of its balkanization. The likely result is higher electricity prices. In different parts of the country, electric utilities are in various stages of joining together to form large regional markets, or in the terms used by FERC—regional transmission organizations. In addition, public power entities, including municipal utilities, cooperatives, and federal and State power marketing associations have been willing or resisting, to varying degrees, to contribute to the efforts to establish re-

gional markets. Exacerbating this problem is the underlying fact that FERC does not have the same jurisdiction over public power utilities as it does over electric utilities.

Properly functioning regional markets for electricity can bring about significant benefits to customers in all parts of the country. More competitive wholesale generation, for example, will allow retail sellers greater opportunities to purchase generation from independent power producers. Improperly functioning markets, or one-size-fits all proposals that do not take into consideration regional differences, can be devastating. Current law and policy at FERC has been insufficient in achieving the proper balance between the need for robust regional markets, the reality of regional differences and the legitimate efforts of utilities.

Therefore, in Section 6 of the bill, the FERC would be required to convene regional discussions with State regulatory commissions to consider the development and progress of regional transmission organizations. It would further provide for specific topics of discussion between FERC and the States including the need for regional organizations, the planning process for facilities, the protection of retail customers, and the establishment of proper price signals to ensure the efficient expansion of the transmission grid. Section 6 would also help reduce the balkanization of the electric grid by authorizing the federal utilities such as the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration to join regional transmission organizations. Also, in an attempt to help expand wholesale markets, Section 8 would provide for FERC to require that public power entities provide a limited form of access to their transmission facilities. This provision would give wholesale generators increased access to markets and ensure that competitors pay only the fair and reasonable price to use the transmission grid owned by public power.

In conclusion, I ask my colleagues to support this legislation and consider its affect on retail electricity customers in their States. Affordable and reliable electricity should be our objective for all customers, in all parts of the country.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 717. A bill to require increased safety testing of 15-passenger vans, ensure the compliance of 15-passenger vans used as schoolbuses with motor vehicle safety standards applicable to schoolbuses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation designed to enhance the safety of large passenger vans, which are highly susceptible to rollovers and have been associated with more than 500 fatalities since 1990.

It was under the most tragic circumstances that this issue came to my

State's attention last year. On September 12th, 2002, 14 migrant forestry workers were killed when their 15-passenger van rolled off a bridge over the Allagash Wilderness Waterway in northern Maine. The sole survivor of this catastrophe escaped when he kicked out the rear window of the sinking van in what was the single worst motor vehicle accident in Maine's history.

I quickly learned that this was the latest in a long line of deadly crashes involving the popular vans, which were initially designed to carry cargo rather than passengers and are highly prone to rollovers, especially when fully loaded. There are more than 500,000 of these vans on the road today, and they are frequently used for a wide variety of purposes, from van pools and church outings, to transportation to and from airports, to transporting college athletics teams or workers.

In response to the spate of fatal accidents involving the vans in the past few years, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, NHTSA, conducted a study in 2001 to analyze the vans' propensity to rollover. In May 2001, after concluding the study, NHTSA issued a national warning to users of such vehicles that they have an increased risk of rollovers under certain conditions. They issued a similar warning in April 2002. The results of the NHTSA study are dramatic, finding that rollover risks rise sharply as the number of van occupants increases. With 10 or more occupants, the rollover rate is nearly three times the rate of vans that are lightly loaded. And with more than 15 occupants, the risk of a rollover is almost six times greater than if the van only has five occupants.

Following up on NHTSA's work, and as the deadly march of van accidents continued, last year both the National Transportation Safety Board, NTSB, and the consumer advocacy group Public Citizen issued a number of safety recommendations on the issue. Given the increasing use of 15-passenger vans in transporting larger groups, I believe it is time to move beyond warnings and for Congress to take action to address the safety of these vans.

The bill I am introducing today would require NHTSA to include 15-passenger vans in their dynamic rollover testing program. While NHTSA is currently developing this program, as mandated by The Transportation Recall Enhancement, Accountability, and Documentation, TREAD, Act of 2000, it does not include 15-passenger vans. Given the demonstrated propensity of these vans to roll, and the deadly effects of a rollover in fully loaded passenger vans, it is vital that we subject them to the same safety standards that NHTSA plans to apply to passenger cars and sport utility vehicles, SUVs.

My bill would also require NHTSA to include 15-passenger vans in their New Car Assessment Program, NCAP, rollover resistance ratings, and to test them at various load conditions. The

NCAP, which provides consumers with a measure of the relative safety potential of vehicles in frontal crashes, was expanded recently to include the rollover risk of passenger cars and light trucks. However, the expansion does not extend to vehicles that carry more than 10 passengers. I believe that before churches or colleges or employers purchase one of these vans, they should have access to NCAP information about their rollover propensity relative to other vehicles.

In addition, the bill requires NHTSA to work with van manufacturers to evaluate and test the potential of technological systems to help drivers in maintaining control of the vans. Specifically, NHTSA would look at electronic stability control, ESC, systems that some high-end SUVs are already equipped with and rear-view mirror-based rollover warning systems. ESC systems are computer-controlled systems that attempt to stabilize the vehicle by monitoring a vehicle's movement and the direction the driver is steering. I am also aware of rollover warning systems under development, attachable to the rear-view mirror, that will warn a driver if his speed or driving maneuvers risk a rollover. In short, technology can help us to greatly reduce the tendency of these vans to roll, and in the process save lives.

These vans are also in widespread use for commercial purposes like airport shuttles and vanpools. Therefore, my legislation would require the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, FMCSA, to finish their rulemaking on the application of federal motor carrier safety regulations to 15 passenger vans used for commercial purposes. Both the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, TEA-21, and the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 directed FMCSA to promulgate regulations on the commercial use of the vans. While they initiated rulemaking in 1999, to date, FMCSA applies no operating regulations whatsoever to these vans.

Finally, this bill addresses the use of 15-passenger vans to transport schoolchildren. Under current law, schools are prohibited from purchasing these vans new to transport schoolchildren because they do not meet the same safety standards as schoolbuses do. However, counter-intuitively, Federal law is silent about the purchase of used vans, or the use of rental vans.

My bill addresses this loophole by incorporating language introduced during the 107th Congress by Representative MARK UDALL of Colorado to extend the ban from the sale of vans to leasing, renting and buying of vans. This is intended to make the buyers accountable as well as the seller. At a recent Senate Commerce Committee hearing, I asked NHTSA Administrator Jeffrey Runge about this disparity in current law, and he agreed that when we're talking about transporting schoolchildren, what's good for new vans should be good for used and rented vans.

Also, to make it worth NHTSA's while to pursue violators, my bill would raise the maximum penalty for violations of the prohibition on the sale or rental of these vans to schools from \$5,000 to \$25,000.

I truly believe that this legislation will cut down on the number of fatal accidents involving 15-passenger vans by subjecting them to federal rollover standards, providing consumers with adequate safety information and making sure that our schoolchildren are driven to school in safe vehicles. I urge my colleagues to join me in a strong show of support for this effort.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina):

S. 721. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the combat zone income tax exclusion to include income for the period of transit to the combat zone and to remove the limitation on such exclusion for commissioned officers, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 721

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF INCOME TAX EXCLUSION FOR COMBAT ZONE SERVICE.

(a) COMBAT ZONE SERVICE TO INCLUDE TRANSIT TO ZONE.—Section 112(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "Such service shall include any period of direct transit to the combat zone."

(b) REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON EXCLUSION FOR COMMISSIONED OFFICERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to certain combat zone compensation of members of the Armed Forces) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 112(a) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking "below the grade of commissioned officer", and

(ii) by striking "ENLISTED PERSONNEL" in the heading and inserting "IN GENERAL".

(B) Section 112(c) of such Code is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (5) and by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to months beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN TAX BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES PERFORMING SERVICES AT GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL STATION, CUBA, AND IN THE HORN OF AFRICA.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a member of the Armed Forces of the United States who is entitled to special pay under section 310 of title 37, United States Code (relating to special pay: duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger), for services performed at Guantanamo Bay Naval Station, Cuba, or in any country located in the region known as the Horn of Africa as part of Operation Enduring Freedom (or any successor operation),

such member shall be treated in the same manner as if such services were in a combat zone (as determined under section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) for purposes of the following provisions of such Code:

(1) Section 2(a)(3) (relating to special rule where deceased spouse was in missing status).

(2) Section 112 (relating to the exclusion of certain combat pay of members of the Armed Forces).

(3) Section 692 (relating to income taxes of members of Armed Forces on death).

(4) Section 2201 (relating to members of the Armed Forces dying in combat zone or by reason of combat-zone-incurred wounds, etc.).

(5) Section 3401(a)(1) (defining wages relating to combat pay for members of the Armed Forces).

(6) Section 4253(d) (relating to the taxation of phone service originating from a combat zone from members of the Armed Forces).

(7) Section 6013(f)(1) (relating to joint return where individual is in missing status).

(8) Section 7508 (relating to time for performing certain acts postponed by reason of service in combat zone).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) WITHHOLDING.—Subsection (a)(5) shall apply to remuneration paid on or after such date of enactment.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 723. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide refunds for unjust and unreasonable charges on electric energy in the State of California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, released documents substantiating evidence of market manipulation during the California electricity crisis.

At the same time, I am stunned that FERC took no action today on ordering the companies that cheated California to pay refunds. Nor did FERC order renegotiation of the long-term electricity contracts that were entered into when prices were artificially inflated. The documents released provide absolute and irrefutable evidence of market manipulation by power generators and wholesale traders during California's electricity crisis. I believe it is long past due to end the discussions and deliberations and time to start sending the refund checks.

FERC should use its authority to order full refunds and order them immediately. To make sure that happens, I am introducing legislation to guarantee that the people of California get back the money they are owed.

When the crisis first began in 2000, I introduced my first bill to order refunds. The bill that I am introducing today would require energy companies to pay full refunds in the minimum amount of \$8.9 billion. In addition, my bill requires the FERC to order the renegotiation of long-term contracts.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation. We must not let these companies get away with thievery.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 98—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE PRESIDENT SHOULD DESIGNATE THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 12, 2003, THROUGH OCTOBER 18, 2003, AS ‘NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS AWARENESS WEEK’

Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BUNNING, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. CRAIG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 98

Whereas cystic fibrosis, characterized by digestive disorders and chronic lung infections, is a fatal lung disease;

Whereas cystic fibrosis is one of the most common fatal genetic diseases in the United States and one for which there is no known cure;

Whereas more than 10,000,000 Americans are unknowing carriers of the cystic fibrosis gene;

Whereas 1 out of every 3,500 babies born in the United States is born with cystic fibrosis;

Whereas approximately 30,000 people in the United States, many of whom are children, have cystic fibrosis;

Whereas the average life expectancy of an individual with cystic fibrosis is 33 years;

Whereas prompt, aggressive treatment of the symptoms of cystic fibrosis can extend the lives of those who have this disease;

Whereas recent advances in cystic fibrosis research have produced promising leads in gene, protein, and drug therapies beneficial to persons afflicted with the disease;

Whereas this innovative research is progressing faster and is being conducted more aggressively than ever before, due in part to the establishment of a model clinical trials network by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation; and

Whereas education of the public on cystic fibrosis, including the symptoms of the disease, increases knowledge and understanding of cystic fibrosis and promotes early diagnoses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. NATIONAL CYSTIC FIBROSIS AWARENESS.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week of October 12, 2003, through October 18, 2003, as ‘National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week’.

(b) PROCLAMATION.—The Senate requests the President to issue a proclamation—

(1) designating the week of October 12, 2003 through October 18, 2003, as ‘National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week’; and

(2) calling on the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

(c) ADDITIONAL ACTION.—The Senate commits to increasing the quality of life for individuals with cystic fibrosis by promoting public knowledge and understanding in a manner that will result in earlier diagnoses, more fund-raising efforts for research, and increased levels of support for those with cystic fibrosis and their families.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I am submitting a resolution recognizing October 12, 2003, through Oc-

tober 18, 2003, as National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Week. I am pleased to be joined by thirteen of my colleagues who are original cosponsors of the bill. We are hopeful that greater awareness of cystic fibrosis (CF) will lead to a cure.

The resolution is similar to one which I introduced in the 107th Congress, S. Res. 270, which was agreed to by unanimous consent on October 3, 2002. Since then, I have received input from the National Cystic Fibrosis Foundation (CFF) and the National Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Committee (NCFAC) and have updated the information accordingly. Cystic fibrosis is one of the most common fatal genetic diseases in the United States and there is no known cure. It affects approximately 30,000 children and adults in the United States. As recently as 25 years ago, most children born with cystic fibrosis died in early childhood and few survived to their teenage years. Today, most can expect to live past 30. The difference stems from productive research which has led to an understanding of the way cystic fibrosis causes life-threatening damage and to the development of preventive techniques and treatments.

While there is no cure, early detection and prompt treatment can significantly improve and extend the lives of those with CF. My home state of Colorado was one of the first states to require CF screening for newborns. Happily, more states are now performing this simple test.

And, since the discovery of the defective CF gene in 1989, CF research has greatly accelerated. I am proud that Colorado is home to the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center, including the Children’s Hospital, the National Jewish Medical and Research Center and the Anschutz Centers for Advanced Medicine, all of which are actively involved in CF research and care. The Children’s Hospital is one of fourteen innovative Therapeutics Development Centers nationwide performing cutting edge clinical research to develop new treatments for CF.

Currently, the CF Foundation oversees more than 27 potential CF products in its drug development pipeline, including dozens in clinical trials. In addition, small pilot trials and large clinical studies are carried out in the 119 CF Foundation-accredited care centers across the United States. Organizations such as the Cystic Fibrosis Research, Inc. also sponsor studies for treatment of the disease. Efforts such as these throughout the nation are providing a greater quality of life for those who have CF. We applaud these efforts.

While I am encouraged by the CF research in Colorado and elsewhere, more needs to be done. I believe we can increase the quality of life for individuals with Cystic Fibrosis by promoting public knowledge and understanding of the disease in a manner that will result in earlier diagnoses, more fund raising

efforts for research, and increased levels of support for those who have CF and their families.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to act on this resolution so we can move another step closer to eradicating this disease.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

SENATE RESOLUTION 99—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. FRIST, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LOTT, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TALENT, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 99

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan served in the United States Navy from 1944 to 1947;

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan held cabinet or sub-cabinet positions under Presidents John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, and Gerald Ford from 1961 to 1976;

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan served as Ambassador to India from 1973 to 1975;

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan served as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 1975 to 1976;

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan served the people of New York with distinction for 24 years in the United States Senate; and

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan was the author of countless books and scholarly articles which contributed enormously to the intellectual vigor of the nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable

Daniel Patrick Moynihan, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased;

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

SENATE RESOLUTION 100—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY YEAR OF THE FOUNDING OF THE FORD MOTOR COMPANY, WHICH HAS BEEN A SIGNIFICANT PART OF THE SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES AND MANY OTHER NATIONS, AND A REVOLUTIONARY INDUSTRIAL AND GLOBAL INSTITUTION, AND CONGRATULATING FORD MOTOR COMPANY FOR ITS ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. MILLER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 100

Whereas on June 16, 1903, then 39 year-old Henry Ford and 11 associates, armed with little cash, some tools, a few blueprints, and unbounded faith, launched the Ford Motor Company by submitting incorporation papers in Lansing, Michigan;

Whereas the Ford Motor Company began operations in a leased, small converted wagon factory on a spur of the Michigan Central Railroad in Detroit;

Whereas the first commercial automobile emerged from the Ford Motor Company in 1903 and was the original 8-horsepower, 2-cylinder Model A vehicle, which was advertised as the "Fordmobile" and had a 2-speed transmission, 28-inch wheels with wooden spokes, and 3-inch tires;

Whereas between 1903 and 1908, Henry Ford and his engineers developed numerous models named after the letters of the alphabet, with some of the models being only experimental and not available to the public;

Whereas on October 1, 1908, the Ford Motor Company introduced its "universal car", the Model T (sometimes affectionately called the "Tin Lizzie"), which could be reconfigured by buyers to move cattle, haul freight, herd horses, and even mow lawns, and Ford produced 10,660 Model T vehicles its first model year, an industry record;

Whereas the Ford Motor Company inaugurated the first automotive integrated moving assembly line in 1913, changing the old manner of building 1 car at a time through moving the work to the worker by having parts, components, and assemblers stationed at different intervals, and beginning a new era of industrial progress and growth;

Whereas Henry Ford surprised the world in 1914 by setting Ford's minimum wage at \$5.00 for an 8-hour day, which replaced the prior \$2.34 wage for a 9-hour day and was a truly great social revolution for its time;

Whereas, also in 1914, Henry Ford, with an eye to simplicity, efficiency, and affordability, ordered that the Model T use black paint exclusively because it dried faster than other colors, allowing cars to be built daily at a lower cost, and Ford said the vehicle will be offered in "any color so long as it is black";

Whereas, Ford's self-contained Rouge manufacturing complex on the Rouge River, completed in 1925, encompassed diverse industries, including suppliers, that allowed for the complete production of vehicles from raw materials processing to final assembly, was an icon of the 20th century, and, with its current revitalization and redevelopment, will remain an icon in the 21st century;

Whereas, in 1925, the company built the first of 196 Ford Tri-Motor airplanes, nicknamed the "Tin Goose" and the "Model T of the Air";

Whereas consumer demand for more luxury and power pushed aside the current model, and, on March 9, 1932, a Ford vehicle with the pioneering Ford V-8 engine block cast in 1 piece rolled off the production line;

Whereas, while Ford offered only 2 models through 1937 (Ford and Lincoln), due to increased competition, in 1938 Ford introduced the first Mercury, a car with a distinctive streamlined body style, a V-8 engine with more horsepower than a Ford, and hydraulic brakes, thus filling the void between the low-priced Ford and the high-priced Lincoln;

Whereas the United Automobile Workers (UAW), one of the largest labor unions in the Nation, was formed in 1935 and, after a rather tumultuous beginning, won acceptance by the auto industry, becoming a potent and forceful leader for auto workers with Ford, which built a strong relationship with the union through its policies and programs;

Whereas, by government decree, all civilian auto production in the United States ceased on February 10, 1942, and Ford, under the control of the War Production Board, produced an extensive array of tanks, B-24 aircraft, armored cars, amphibious craft, gliders, and other materials for the World War II war effort;

Whereas Ford dealers rallied to aid the Ford Motor Company in its postwar comeback, proving their merit as the public's main point of contact with the Company;

Whereas on September 21, 1945, Henry Ford II assumed the presidency of Ford, and on April 7, 1947, Ford's founder, Henry Ford passed away;

Whereas a revitalized Ford met the postwar economic boom with Ford's famed F-Series trucks making their debut in 1948 for commercial and personal use, and the debut of the 1949 Ford sedan, with the first major change in a Ford body since 1922, the first change in a chassis since 1932, and the first integration of body and fenders which would set the standard for auto design in the future;

Whereas these new models were followed by such well-known vehicles as Ford "woodies", the Mercury Turnpike Cruiser, the retractable hardtop convertible Ford Skyliner, the high performing Ford Thunderbird (introduced in 1955), the Ford Galaxy (introduced in 1959), and the biggest success story of the 1960s, the Ford Mustang, which has been a part of the American scene for almost 40 years;

Whereas, in 1953, President Dwight D. Eisenhower christened the new Ford Research and Engineering Center, which was a milestone in the company's dedication to automotive science and which houses some of the most modern facilities for automotive research;

Whereas Ford's innovation continued through the 1980s with the introduction of the Ford Taurus, which was named the 1986 Motor Trend Car of the Year and which resulted in a new commitment to quality at Ford and in future aerodynamic design trends in the industry;

Whereas Ford's innovation continued through the 1990s with the debut in 1993 of the Ford Mondeo, European Car of the Year, the redesigned 1994 Ford Mustang, and the

introduction in 1990 of the Ford Explorer, which defined the sport utility vehicle (SUV) segment and remains the best selling SUV in the world;

Whereas, as the 21st century begins, Ford continues its marvelous record for fine products with the best-selling car in the world, the Ford Focus, and the best-selling truck in the world, the Ford F-Series;

Whereas the Ford Motor Company is the world's second largest automaker and includes Ford, Lincoln, Mercury, Aston Martin, Jaguar, Land Rover, Volvo, and Mazda automotive brands, as well as diversified subsidiaries in finance and other domestic and international business areas; and

Whereas, on October 30, 2001, William Clay Ford, Jr., the great-grandson of Henry Ford, became Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Ford Motor Company, and as such is concentrating on the fundamentals that have powered the company to greatness over the last century and made it a world-class auto and truck manufacturer, and that will continue to carry the company through the 21st century with even better products and innovations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes—

(A) the 100th anniversary year of the founding of the Ford Motor Company, which has been a significant part of the social, economic, and cultural heritage of the United States and many other nations, and a revolutionary industrial and global institution; and

(B) the truly wondrous achievements of the Ford Motor Company, as its employees, retirees, suppliers, dealers, its many customers, automotive enthusiasts, and friends worldwide commemorate and celebrate its 100th anniversary milestone on June 16, 2003;

(2) congratulates the Ford Motor Company for its achievements; and

(3) expects that the Ford Motor Company will continue to have an even greater impact in the 21st century and beyond by providing innovative products that are affordable and environmentally sustainable, and that will enhance personal mobility for generations to come.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS TO COMMEND AND EXPRESS THE GRATITUDE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE NATIONS PARTICIPATING WITH THE UNITED STATES IN THE COALITION TO DISARM IRAQ

Mr. LUGAR (for himself and Mr. BIDEN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was ordered held at the desk:

S. CON. RES. 30

Whereas on September 12, 2002, the President of the United States, appearing at the United Nations, called on that institution and its member states to meet their responsibility to disarm Iraq;

Whereas on November 8, 2002, the United Nations Security Council approved Security Council Resolution 1441 under chapter VII of the United Nations Charter by a vote of 15-0, giving Iraq a final opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations;

Whereas on January 30, 2003, the Prime Ministers of Denmark, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal, and the United Kingdom, and the Presidents of the Czech Republic and the Spanish Government, issued a declaration regarding Security Council Resolution 1441,

wherein they stated that “[t]he transatlantic relationship must not become a casualty of the current Iraqi regime’s persistent attempts to threaten world security...The Iraqi regime and its weapons of mass destruction represent a clear threat to world security. This danger has been explicitly recognized by the United Nations. All of us are bound by Security Council Resolution 1441, which was adopted unanimously.”;

Whereas the January 30, 2003, declaration continued to state that “Resolution 1441 is Saddam Hussein’s last chance to disarm using peaceful means. The opportunity to avoid greater confrontation rests with him...Our governments have a common responsibility to face this threat...[T]he Security Council must maintain its credibility by ensuring full compliance with its resolutions. We cannot allow a dictator to systematically violate those resolutions. If they are not complied with, the Security Council will lose its credibility and world peace will suffer as a result.”;

Whereas on February 5, 2003, the Foreign Ministers of Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia issued a declaration regarding Security Council Resolution 1441, stating that “the United States [has] presented compelling evidence to the United Nations Security Council detailing Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction programs, its active efforts to deceive United Nations inspectors, and its links to international terrorism...The transatlantic community, of which we are a part, must stand together to face the threat posed by the nexus of terrorism and dictators with weapons of mass destruction.”;

Whereas the February 5, 2003, declaration continued to state that “it has now become clear that Iraq is in material breach of United Nations Security Council resolutions, including United Nations Resolution 1441...The clear and present danger posed by Saddam Hussein’s regime requires a united response from the community of democracies. We call upon the United Nations Security Council to take the necessary and appropriate action in response to Iraq’s continuing threat to international peace and security.”;

Whereas many of the supporters of the January 30, 2003, and February 5, 2003, declarations have provided important support to the United States in addition to their political declarations; and

Whereas in addition to the supporters of the January 30, 2003, and February 5, 2003, declarations, important diplomatic and strategic support to the United States-led Coalition to Disarm Iraq have been provided by such nations as Afghanistan, Angola, Australia, Azerbaijan, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Georgia, Honduras, Iceland, Japan, Kuwait, Macedonia, the Marshall Islands, Micronesia, Mongolia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua, Palau, Panama, the Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, the Solomon Islands, South Korea, Tonga, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) commends and expresses the gratitude of the United States to the nations participating in and contributing to the Coalition to Disarm Iraq, including—

(A) the supporters of the January 30, 2003, declaration issued by the Prime Ministers of Denmark, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal, and the United Kingdom, and the Presidents of the Czech Republic and the Spanish Government;

(B) the supporters of the February 5, 2003, declaration issued by the Foreign Ministers of Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Lat-

via, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia; and

(C) other allies of the United States who are participating in or contributing to the Coalition;

(2) expresses sincere gratitude to Australia, Denmark, Poland, and the United Kingdom, whose military forces have joined United States Armed Forces to disarm and liberate Iraq;

(3) expresses sincere gratitude to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Tony Blair, the Prime Minister of Australia, John Howard, and the President of the Spanish Government, Jose Maria Aznar, for their courageous support and strong commitment to the Coalition to Disarm Iraq;

(4) expresses sincere gratitude to other allied nations, including nations in the Persian Gulf region, for their military support, logistical support, and other assistance in the current campaign against the regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq;

(5) welcomes and encourages the active involvement and participation of these countries, other nations, and key international organizations in the reconstruction and administration of Iraq after the current conflict in Iraq; and

(6) commends and expresses the gratitude of the United States to the military personnel and civilians of the member states of the Coalition to Disarm Iraq who are serving in operations against the regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq, and to the family members of such personnel and civilians who have borne the burden of sacrifice and separation from their loved ones during the current conflict in Iraq.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 428. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution 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; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 429. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra.

SA 430. Ms. MURKOWSKI proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra.

SA 431. Mrs. LINCOLN proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra.

SA 432. Mr. NICKLES (for Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

March 25, 2003

SA 411. Mr. CONRAD proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution 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; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 including

the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013 as authorized by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Social security.

Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 2003 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003:	\$1,282,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:	\$1,473,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:	\$1,633,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:	\$1,739,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:	\$1,851,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:	\$1,960,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:	\$2,076,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:	\$2,192,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:	\$2,427,396,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:	\$2,650,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:	\$2,805,810,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003:	–\$77,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:	\$7,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:	\$16,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:	–\$1,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:	–\$1,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:	–\$2,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:	–\$1,620,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:	–\$785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:	–\$100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:	\$800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:	\$1,600,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003:	\$1,901,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:	\$1,864,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:	\$1,979,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:	\$2,120,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:	\$2,246,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:	\$2,366,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:	\$2,475,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:	\$2,584,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:	\$2,709,145,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:	\$2,798,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:	\$2,922,872,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003:	\$1,829,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:	\$1,899,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:	\$1,978,628,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:	\$2,089,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:	\$2,207,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:	\$2,229,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:	\$2,445,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:	\$2,502,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:	\$2,695,793,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:	\$2,772,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:	\$2,907,760,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003:	–\$546,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:	–\$426,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:	–\$345,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:	–\$350,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:	–\$356,587,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: —\$368,836,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: —\$369,005,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: —\$369,876,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: —\$268,397,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: —\$121,895,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: —\$101,950,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$6,781,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004: \$7,286,882,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005: \$7,738,623,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$8,214,232,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$8,700,321,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$9,202,613,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$9,706,954,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$10,216,905,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$10,629,297,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$10,902,099,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$11,156,541,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of the debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$3,540,427,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004: \$3,951,933,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005: \$4,202,001,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$4,360,348,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$4,509,222,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$4,643,691,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$4,769,925,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$4,876,352,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$4,964,366,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$4,932,374,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$4,738,818,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$531,607,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004: \$557,886,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005: \$587,895,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$619,162,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$651,228,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$684,509,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$719,212,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$755,834,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$792,232,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$829,648,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$869,770,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: \$459,795,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004: \$480,249,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005: \$499,040,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$522,970,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$549,367,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$548,159,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$610,553,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$645,845,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$682,594,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$724,415,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$770,807,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—For the Senate, the amounts of the new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,838,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,838,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,257,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,206,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,338,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,301,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,424,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,409,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,522,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,505,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,638,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,617,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,792,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,766,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,954,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,??? ,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,121,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,091,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,292,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,260,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,471,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,439,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$472,494,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$418,229,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$400,658,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$430,664,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$420,402,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$426,536,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$440,769,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$430,191,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$461,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$441,621,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$482,340,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$465,115,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$489,209,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$477,989,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$495,079,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$487,993,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$502,947,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$500,478,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$510,984,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$501,628,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$519,393,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$514,885,000,000.
 (2) International Affairs (150):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,506,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,283,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,681,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,207,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,734,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,917,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,308,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,539,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,603,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,464,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,611,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,604,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,413,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,733,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,258,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,689,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,136,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,565,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,005,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,408,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,298,000,000.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,153,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,556,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,577,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,854,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,125,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,746,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,642,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,081,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,153,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,544,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,709,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,015,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,267,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,560,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,849,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,119,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,453,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,703,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,299,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,668,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,899,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,074,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$439,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,401,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$656,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,193,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$468,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,232,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$733,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,137,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$641,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,789,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$303,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,762,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$371,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,823,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$435,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,883,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$576,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,954,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$917,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,022,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$842,000,000.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,816,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,940,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,394,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,895,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,286,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,102,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,263,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,700,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,018,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,374,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,823,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,021,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,163,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,258,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,229,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,290,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,263,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,318,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,194,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,219,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,121,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,214,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,418,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,212,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,909,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,382,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,166,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,229,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,038,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,718,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,562,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,933,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,798,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,517,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,545,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,970,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,132,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,415,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,596,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,995,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,192,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,715,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,909,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,812,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,881,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,134,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,204,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,867,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,620,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,895,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,959,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,936,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,720,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,605,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,451,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,274,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,274,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,736,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,193,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,074,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,236,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$624,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,248,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$475,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,222,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,038,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,717,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,058,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,965,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,348,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,324,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,253,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,925,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,290,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,735,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,825,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,503,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,305,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,375,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$88,246,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,263,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,135,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$91,622,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,114,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$92,924,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,251,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,994,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,554,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,647,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,418,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,281,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,214,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,956,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,726,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,659,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,993,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,070,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,336,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,431,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,696,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,787,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,072,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,153,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,506,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,823,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,883,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,741,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,660,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,881,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$89,997,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$96,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$93,577,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$100,520,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$97,167,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$104,433,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$100,927,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$108,432,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$104,866,000,000.
 (A) New budget authority, \$112,408,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$108,840,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$116,371,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$112,863,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$120,499,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$116,923,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$124,539,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$120,984,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$128,287,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$125,109,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$227,453,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$223,596,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$242,169,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$241,908,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$259,307,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$258,521,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$279,273,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$278,287,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$300,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$298,793,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$321,927,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$320,406,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$345,464,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$344,019,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$371,391,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$369,962,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$399,645,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$398,217,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$430,046,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$428,629,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$463,499,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$462,005,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$248,586,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$248,434,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$259,303,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$259,575,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$273,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$276,130,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$323,590,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$320,333,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$359,859,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$360,110,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$388,766,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$388,619,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$420,626,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$420,357,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$453,765,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$454,019,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$490,382,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$493,735,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$530,821,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$526,990,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:

- (A) New budget authority, \$576,244,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$576,494,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$324,956,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$322,807,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$328,369,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$330,827,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$332,643,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$334,607,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$340,868,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$342,360,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$348,137,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$349,374,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$360,894,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$361,729,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$372,590,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$373,311,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$385,559,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$386,327,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$403,220,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$404,150,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$395,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$396,397,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$410,715,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$412,374,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,255,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,224,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,224,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,331,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,331,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,452,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,452,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,976,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,976,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,828,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,828,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,983,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,983,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,358,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,358,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,236,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,236,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,451,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,451,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,482,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,482,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,597,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,486,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,779,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,355,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,557,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,124,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,264,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,935,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,171,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,725,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,331,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,028,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,969,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,614,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,712,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,413,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,995,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,866,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,226,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,784,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,543,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,193,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,022,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,567,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,121,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,965,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,370,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,613,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,149,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,766,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,239,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,040,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,455,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,357,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,746,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,714,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,088,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,093,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,463,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,877,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,178,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,103,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,264,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,214,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,770,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,302,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,888,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,902,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,973,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,106,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,779,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,798,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,295,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,518,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,981,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,264,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,704,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,043,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,613,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,841,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,231,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$240,412,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$240,412,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$258,221,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$258,221,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$303,153,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$303,153,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$338,449,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$338,449,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,047,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$363,047,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$385,858,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$385,858,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$408,666,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$408,666,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$429,837,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$429,837,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$449,662,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$449,662,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, \$464,064,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$464,064,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, \$472,058,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$472,058,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,084,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,578,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$9,276,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$7,252,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,584,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,624,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,737,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,737,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,872,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,872,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$13,506,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$13,506,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$13,839,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$13,839,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$14,508,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$14,508,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$14,813,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$14,813,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$15,200,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$15,200,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$41,104,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$41,104,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$42,894,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$42,894,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$52,598,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$52,598,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$54,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$54,459,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$49,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$49,035,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$51,221,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$51,221,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$52,785,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$52,785,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$54,856,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$54,856,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, —\$57,007,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$57,007,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, —\$61,585,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$61,585,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, —\$63,783,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$63,783,000,000.

SEC. 201. FIVE-YEAR EXTENSION OF SUPER-MAJORITY ENFORCEMENT OF POINTS OF ORDER AND SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER.

Sections 2(a)(1) and 2(b)(1)(B) of S. Res. 304 (107th Congress) are amended by striking "2003" and inserting "2008".

SEC. 202. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING CAPS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, for the purposes of enforcement in the Senate the term "discretionary spending limit" means—

(1) for fiscal year 2004—

(A) for the discretionary category, \$796,428,000,000 in new budget authority and \$832,371,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the highway category, \$31,598,000,000 in outlays; and

(C) for the mass transit category, \$6,754,000,000 in outlays; and

(2) for fiscal year 2005—

(A) for the discretionary category, \$828,285,000,000 in new budget authority and \$837,201,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the highway category, \$33,374,000,000 in outlays; and

(C) for the mass transit category, \$7,197,000,000 in outlays.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that exceeds any discretionary spending limit set forth in this section.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

(3) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) CHAIRMAN.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution, the offering of an amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the adjustments set forth in subparagraph (B) for the amount of new budget authority in that measure and the outlays flowing from that budget authority.

(B) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in subparagraph (A) are to be made to—

(i) the discretionary spending limits, if any, set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget;

(ii) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 1302(a); and

(iii) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) AMOUNTS OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments referred to in paragraph (1) shall be amounts provided and designated as an emergency requirement by Congress and the President.

SEC. 203. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE, PRESCRIPTION DRUGS, AND HEALTH CARE.

(a) MEDICARE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may re-

verse the allocations to the Committee on Finance for a bill, amendment, or conference report that provides a drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries that is equitable, dependable, affordable, and protects beneficiary access to all medically necessary drugs, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, but not to exceed \$594,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013 except as provided in subsection (d).

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) "Equitable," as used in this section, shall be construed to mean that Medicare beneficiaries in traditional Medicare shall receive prescription drug coverage that is on an equal basis with regard to benefit level whether they remain in the traditional fee-for-service Medicare program or enroll in a private plan;

(2) "Dependable," as used in this section, shall be construed to mean that beneficiaries shall have access to a drug benefit that is administered through a stable and dependable delivery system so that beneficiaries will not lose coverage or face significant premium increases from one year to the next;

(3) "Affordable," as used in this section, shall be construed to mean that low-income beneficiaries shall receive assistance with premiums and cost sharing;

(4) "Protects beneficiary access," as used in this section, shall be construed to mean that the plan shall include measures that protect beneficiary access to medically necessary drugs with no financial penalty, and shall preserve access to local pharmacies.

(c) HEALTH CARE.—If the Committee on Finance reports legislation that would expand health insurance coverage to the uninsured (and build upon and strengthen public and private coverage), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations for that committee and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) and may revise the revenue aggregates and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$95,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013 except as provided in subsection (d).

(d) TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS.—The total of adjustments allowed under subsections (a) and (c) shall not exceed \$594,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

SEC. 205. RESERVE FUND FOR THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, in consultation with the Members of the Committee on the Budget and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the appropriate committee, increase the allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pension of the Senate by up to \$1,750,000,000 in new budget authority and \$35,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, \$26,250,000,000 in new budget authority and \$14,963,000,000 in outlays for the total of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and \$95,881,000,000 in new budget authority and \$72,880,000,000 in outlays for the total of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, for a bill, amendment, or conference report that would provide increased funding for part B grants, other than section 619, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), with the goal that funding for these grants, when taken together with amounts provided by the Committee on Appropriations, provides 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities in the tenth year.

SEC. 106. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) 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.

(b) 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.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purpose of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, 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.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 428. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by \$367,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$1,807,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,881,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,921,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,963,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,006,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$2,051,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$2,097,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,143,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$367,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,807,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$1,881,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$1,921,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,963,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$2,006,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$2,051,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$2,097,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$2,143,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$1,835,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,874,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$1,913,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,956,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,998,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$2,042,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$2,088,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by \$2,134,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by \$2,180,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$367,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,807,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,881,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,921,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$1,963,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$2,006,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by \$2,051,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$2,097,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$2,143,000,000.

On page 25, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,835,000,000.

On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by \$367,000,000.

On page 25, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,874,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by \$1,807,000,000.

On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,913,000,000.

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by \$1,881,000,000.

On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,956,000,000.

On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,921,000,000.

On page 26, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,998,000,000.

On page 26, line 12, increase the amount by \$1,963,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by \$2,042,000,000.

On page 26, line 16, increase the amount by \$2,006,000,000.

On page 26, line 19, increase the amount by \$2,088,000,000.

On page 26, line 20, increase the amount by \$2,051,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by \$2,134,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, increase the amount by \$2,097,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by \$2,180,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by \$2,143,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,835,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by \$367,000,000.

SA 429. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BINGAMAN) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution 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; as follows:

On page 8, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 8, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

SA 430. Ms. MURKOWSKI proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution 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; as follows:

On page 45, line 24, increase the amount by \$47,904,000,000.

On page 46, line 1, increase the amount by \$18,768,000,000.

SA 431. Mrs. LINCOLN proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution 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; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE \$1000 CHILD CREDIT

It is the sense of the Senate that extending the \$1,000 child credit for three additional years (2011–2013) can be accommodated within the revenue totals and instructions of the resolution.

SA 432. Mr. NICKLES (for Mr. MCCONNELL) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution 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; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following: "It is the sense of the Senate that the President should negotiate a free trade agreement with the United Kingdom."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a judicial nominations hearing on Wednesday, March 26, 2003, at 2 p.m. in the Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Panel I: The Honorable Paul Sarbanes, United States Senator [D-MD]; The Honorable Barbara Mikulski, United States Senator [D-MD]; The Honorable Jeff Bingaman, United States Senator [D-NM]; The Honorable John Breaux, United States Senator [D-LA]; The Honorable Mary Lendrieu, United States Senator (D-LA); The Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison, United States Senator [R-TX]; The Honorable John Cornyn, United States Senator [R-TX]; The Honorable

Blanche Lincoln United States Senator [D-AR]; The Honorable Mark Pryor, United States Senator [D-AR]; The Honorable George Allen, United States Senator [R-VA]; and The Honorable Billy Tauzin, United States Representative [R-LA-3rd District].

Panel II: Edward C. Prado to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Panel III: Richard D. Bennett to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland. Dee D. Drell to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana. J. Leon Holmes to be United States District Court Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas. Susan G. Braden to be Judge for the Court of Federal Claims. Charles F. Lettow to be Judge for the Court of Federal Claims.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for Kevin Avery to be granted the privilege of the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Ann Marie White, a legislative fellow in the office of Senator DODD, be granted the privilege of the floor for the duration of this debate on S. Con. Res. 23.

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

DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 99 submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A resolution (S. Res. 99) relative to the death of Daniel Patrick Moynihan, former United States Senator for the State of New York.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 99) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 99.

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan served in the United States Navy from 1944 to 1947;

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan held cabinet or sub-cabinet positions under Presidents John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, Richard Nixon, and Gerald Ford from 1961 to 1976;

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan served as Ambassador to India from 1973 to 1975;

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan served as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations from 1975 to 1976;

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan served the people of New York with distinction for 24 years in the United States Senate; and

Whereas Daniel Patrick Moynihan was the author of countless books and scholarly articles which contributed enormously to the intellectual vigor of the nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Daniel Patrick Moynihan, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased;

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT
AGREEMENT—H.R. 1307

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, March 27, at 11 a.m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1307, the military tax bill, that there be 3 hours of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee; further, that the only amendment in order be a Grassley substitute which is the text of calendar item No. 11, S. 351; that at the expiration or yielding back of time, the amendment be adopted, the bill, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate proceed to a vote, with no intervening action or debate.

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

MEASURE HELD AT THE DESK—S.
CON. RES. 30

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. Con. Res. 30, which was submitted earlier today by Senators LUGAR and BIDEN, be held at the desk.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST
TIME—S. 711, S. 712, S. 718, S. 721

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand the following bills are at the desk, and I ask that they be read for the first time, en bloc: S. 711, S. 712, S. 718, and S. 721.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bills by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 711) to amend title 37, United States Code, to alleviate delay in the payment of the Selected Reserve reenlistment bonus to members of Selective Reserve who are mobilized.

A bill (S. 712) to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for surviving spouses of Reserves not eligible for retirement who die from a cause incurred or aggravated while on inactive-duty training.

A bill (S. 718) to provide a monthly allotment of free telephone calling time to mem-

bers of the United States Armed Forces stationed outside the United States who are directly supporting military operations in Iraq or Afghanistan.

A bill (S. 721) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the combat zone income tax exclusion to include income for the period of transit to the combat zone and to remove the limitation on such exclusion for commissioned officers, and for other purposes.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I now ask for their second reading and object to further proceeding on these matters, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following calendar items en bloc: No. 45, S. Res. 48; No. 46, S. Res. 52; No. 47, S. Res. 58.

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

The clerk will state the resolutions by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
A resolution (S. Res. 48) designating April 2003 as "Financial Literacy For Youth Month."

A resolution (S. Res. 52) recognizing the social problems of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of the problem.

A resolution (S. Res. 58) expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning June 1, 2003, "National Citizen Soldier Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments to the resolutions, where applicable, be agreed to, the resolutions, as amended, if amended, be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc, and that any statements relating to these matters be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 48) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 48

Whereas the percentage of income used for household debt payments, including mortgages, credit cards, and student loans, rose to the highest level in more than a decade in 2001 and remained at 14 percent in 2002;

Whereas consumer bankruptcies in 2001 increased 19 percent over those in the previous year, exceeding the previous high reached in 1998, and the rate of filings did not slacken during the first 9 months of 2002;

Whereas personal savings as a percentage of Gross Domestic Product decreased from 7.5 percent in the early 1980s to 2.4 percent in 2002;

Whereas approximately 40,000,000 Americans, the "unbanked", are not using mainstream, insured financial institutions;

Whereas home foreclosures in 2002 reached the highest rate in 30 years;

Whereas 55 percent of college students acquire their first credit card during their first year in college, and 83 percent of college students have at least 1 credit card;

Whereas 45 percent of college students are in credit card debt, with the average debt being \$3,066;

Whereas only 26 percent of 13- to 21-year-olds reported that their parents actively taught them how to manage money;

Whereas a 2002 study by the JumpStart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy found that high school seniors know even less about credit cards, retirement funds, insurance, and other personal finance basics than seniors did 5 years ago;

Whereas a 2002 survey by the National Council on Economic Education found that a decreasing number of States include personal finance in their education standards for students in grades K-12;

Whereas a greater understanding and familiarity with financial markets and institutions will lead to increased economic activity and growth;

Whereas financial literacy empowers individuals to make wise financial decisions and reduces the confusion of an increasingly complex economy;

Whereas personal financial management skills and long-lived habits develop during childhood;

Whereas personal financial education is essential to ensure that our youth are prepared to manage money, credit, and debt, and become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens; and

Whereas the JumpStart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy, its State affiliates, and its partner organizations have designated each April as "Financial Literacy for Youth Month", the goal of which is to educate the public about the need for increased financial literacy for youth in America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2003 as "Financial Literacy for Youth Month" to raise public awareness about the need for increased financial literacy in our schools and the serious problems that may be associated with a lack of understanding about personal finances; and

(2) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe the month with appropriate programs and activities.

The resolution (S. Res. 52), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

[Omit the part in bold brackets and insert the part printed in italic]

S. RES. 52

Whereas approximately 3,000,000 reports of suspected or known child abuse and neglect involving 5,000,000 American children are made to child protective service agencies each year;

Whereas 588,000 American children are unable to live safely with their families and are placed in foster homes and institutions;

Whereas it is estimated that more than 1,200 children, 85 percent of whom are under the age of 6 years and 44 percent of whom are under the age of 1 year, lose their lives as a direct result of abuse and neglect every year in America;

Whereas this tragic social problem results in human and economic costs due to its relationship to crime and delinquency, drug and

alcohol abuse, domestic violence, and welfare dependency; and

Whereas Childhelp USA has initiated a "Day of Hope" to be observed on Wednesday, April 2, 2003, during Child Abuse Prevention Month, to focus public awareness on this social ill: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

[(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—

[(A) all Americans should keep the victims of child abuse and neglect in their thoughts and prayers;

[(B) all Americans should seek to break the cycle of child abuse and neglect and to give these victimized children hope for the future; and

[(C) the faith community, nonprofit organizations, and volunteers across America should recommit themselves and mobilize their resources to assist these abused and neglected children; and

[(2) the Senate—

[(A) supports the goals and ideas of the "Day of Hope", which was initiated by Childhelp USA and will be observed on April 2, 2003, as part of Child Abuse Prevention Month; and

[(B) commends Childhelp USA for all of its efforts on behalf of abused and neglected children throughout the United States.]

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) all Americans should keep the victims of child abuse and neglect in their thoughts and prayers;

(B) all Americans should seek to break the cycle of child abuse and neglect and to give these victimized children hope for the future; and

(C) the faith community, nonprofit organizations, and volunteers across America should recommit themselves and mobilize their resources to assist these abused and neglected children; and

(2) the Senate—

(A) supports the goals and ideas of the "Day of Hope", which will be observed on April 2, 2003, as part of Child Abuse Prevention Month; and

(B) commends those working on behalf of abused and neglected children throughout the United States.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 58

Whereas members of the National Guard and the other reserve components of the Armed Forces perform a vital role in the defense of the United States;

Whereas members of the National Guard and the other reserve components of the Armed Forces make significant personal sacrifices in performing military service when called to active duty; and

Whereas there are over 100,000 members of the National Guard and the other reserve components of the Armed Forces serving on active duty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL CITIZEN SOLDIER WEEK.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning June 1, 2003, as "National Citizen Soldier Week".

(b) PROCLAMATION.—The Senate requests the President to issue a proclamation—

(1) designating the week beginning June 1, 2003, as "National Citizen Soldier Week"; and

(2) calling on the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 96-388, as amended by Public Law 97-84 and Public Law 106-292, appoints the following Senators to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council for the 108th Congress:

The Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH; the Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS; and the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. COLEMAN.

S. CON. RES. 23 RETURNED TO CALENDAR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on adoption of S. Con. Res. 23 be vitiated. I further ask that the resolution be returned to the calendar.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 27, 2003

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Thursday, March 27. I further ask that following the prayer and 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 there then be a period for morning business until 11 a.m., with the time equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, the Senate will be in a period for morning business until 11 a.m. Under a previous order, at 11 a.m., the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1307, the military tax bill, for 3 hours of debate. The Senate will vote on passage of the military tax bill at approximately 2 p.m.

In addition, there are several judicial nominations which may be cleared for votes during tomorrow's session. We are also attempting to reach an agreement for the consideration of S. Con. Res. 30 which expresses the gratitude of the United States to the nations participating with the U.S. in the coalition to disarm Iraq. Members, therefore, should expect rollcall votes throughout the day tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRIST. 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 provisions of S. Res. 99 as a further mark of respect for our friend and col-

league, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, following the remarks of Senator SESSIONS for up to 10 minutes.

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

The Senator from Alabama.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to share a few thoughts on the passing of the remarkable Daniel Patrick Moynihan, one of America's most brilliant people. He graced this Senate and served this country in innumerable ways.

He, of course, was a great scientist, a person able to study complex data and make serious judgments. I remember being in the subway at a point not too long before he left the Senate. Some numbers had come out that indicated we were doing a little better in marriage, a little less number of children were being born out of wedlock. We were standing there and somebody said something about that point. With great intensity and passion, he said: That's nothing. In the history of the world, no Nation has ever seen a collapse of marriage like we are seeing in this country.

It just hit me he was giving us a scientific analysis of a very serious social problem with which we needed to deal, and he took it very seriously.

Another incident I recall was being in this small dining room. We were working late one night and voting. I went in with the majority leader, TRENT LOTT, and was talking to TRENT about Colombia, the revolutionaries there, the Marxist group, the drug dealing group and wanted to do some things better for Colombia. We sat down and Senator Moynihan was there. TRENT said: Pat, tell me about Colombia; what's going on in Colombia.

We just sat in rapt attention as he described the last 50 years in Colombia in detail—how this country had developed a history of violence, how they were having revolutionary problems, and how it was going to be very difficult to eliminate those problems. I was stunned at the encyclopedic knowledge he displayed.

As we left, TRENT said: I love to ask him those questions. He always knows those kinds of things. He said: I do it frequently just to see what he will share with us.

I remember asking about serving as Ambassador to India. He told a story, a complex story, that gave such great insight into the good people of India.

Pat Moynihan was an extraordinary person. He operated on a higher level. He benefited this country in many ways. He served Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents, and he served in this body. He helped point out the problems with welfare and helped us move toward reform. He served on the commission that courageously gave insight into how we may improve Social Security. He, in many

ways, on those two issues with Nixon going to China had the ability and the credibility to move the country in a way that some lesser Senator may not have been able to do.

I wanted to take a moment before we adjourned to express my thoughts about Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, one of the most brilliant people to ever grace this body.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m., Thursday, March 27.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:35 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 27, 2003, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 26, 2003:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARSHA E. BARNES, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SURINAME.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

JOHN FRANCIS BARDELLI, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN R. O'CONNOR.

ADAM NOEL TORRES, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOSE ANTONIO PEREZ.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

MICHAEL J. GARCIA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY. (NEW POSITION)

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT N. DAVIS, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS FOR THE TERM PRESCRIBED BY LAW, VICE A NEW POSITION CREATED BY PUBLIC LAW 107-103, APPROVED DECEMBER 27, 2001.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS, UNITED STATES ARMY AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 3036:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DAVID H. HICKS, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

CHAPLAIN (COL.) JEROME A. HABEREK, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. HENRY P. OSMAN, 0000

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

GARY D. BOMBERGER, 0000
WILFRED R. BRISTOL, 0000
JEFFREY A. DULL, 0000
ROBERT S. HOCHREITER, 0000
JOSEPH S. KUAN, 0000
WARREN R. ROBNETT, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

REBECCA G. ABRAHAM, 0000

ALAN K. ANDERSON, 0000
LYNDON S. ANDERSON, 0000
MICHAEL ANGLE, 0000
MARK ANTHONY, 0000
GLEN A. APGAR, 0000
ROBERT A. ARBACH, 0000
STEVEN J. ARQUETTE, 0000
TIMOTHY D. ARRINGTON, 0000
CARLOS V. ARVIZU, 0000
BRADLEY K. ASHLEY, 0000
GARRY C. BACCUS, 0000
DANIEL D. BADGER JR., 0000
OCTAVIO NMI BAEZ JR., 0000
STEVEN F. BAKER, 0000
MARTIN D. BANNON, 0000
RICHARD D. BARTHOLOMEW, 0000
MICHAEL L. BARTLEY, 0000
MICHAEL O. BEALE, 0000
DENNIS J. BEERS, 0000
SHERON L. BELLIZAN, 0000
ROBERT S. BELLOMY, 0000
HOWARD D. BELOTE, 0000
LISA M. BELUE, 0000
GARY C. BENDER, 0000
EDWARD J. BERGEMANN, 0000
THOMAS W. BERGESON, 0000
WILLIAM J. BERNARD, 0000
LOUIS A. BERRENA, 0000
WARREN D. BERRY, 0000
THOMAS W. BILLICK, 0000
MATTHEW T. BLACK, 0000
LEMOYNE F. BLACKSHEAR, 0000
RANDY L. BLAISDELL, 0000
CAROLYN M. BLALOCK, 0000
GRACE M. BLEVINSHOLMAN, 0000
JODIE L. BLISS, 0000
MICHAEL J. BLOOMFIELD, 0000
LOUIS G. BOCHAIN, 0000
RICHARD L. BORNHANN JR., 0000
AMY M. BOUCHARD, 0000
CHRISTOPHER W. BOWMAN, 0000
GARY A. BRAND, 0000
JOSEPH P. BREEN, 0000
WILLIAM J. BRIDGES, 0000
ANDREW J. BRITTSCHIG, 0000
STEPHEN M. BRUMMOND, 0000
JOHN A. BRUNDERMAN, 0000
JOHN S. BRUNHAVER, 0000
ARNOLD W. BUNCH JR., 0000
ROBERT E. BURNETT JR., 0000
THOMAS A. BUTER, 0000
GREGORY S. BUTTERBAUGH, 0000
ALAN E. BYNUM, 0000
KENNETH L. BYRD, 0000
DANIEL H. CAMPION, 0000
JAY S. CARLSON, 0000
JOHN C. CASSERINO, 0000
WILFRED T. CASSIDY, 0000
JOHN R. CAWTHORNE, 0000
MICHAEL J. CAYLOR, 0000
CHRISTOPHER S. CEPLECHA, 0000
RAYMOND J. CHAPMAN, 0000
WILLIAM G. CHAPMAN, 0000
RICHARD M. CHAVEZ, 0000
JUDY G. CHIZEK, 0000
DANIEL A. CIECHANOWSKI, 0000
RICHARD M. CLARK, 0000
JOSEPH D. CLARK, 0000
KRISTINE M. CLIFTON, 0000
BARRY B. COBLE, 0000
JOSEPH M. CODISPOTTI, 0000
JAMES R. CODY, 0000
PATRICK A. COE, 0000
CYNTHIA M. COHAN, 0000
CATHERINE G. COLEMAN, 0000
LEONARD T. COLEMAN, 0000
CHRISTOPHER E. COLEY, 0000
JAMES M. COLLINS, 0000
PATRICK M. CONDRAVY, 0000
JEFFREY M. CONNORS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER A. COOK, 0000
MICHAEL B. COOLIDGE, 0000
MICHAEL A. CORBETT, 0000
KIMBERLY J. CORCORAN, 0000
MARIA L. CORDERO, 0000
DAVID C. CORDON, 0000
MICHAEL A. COX, 0000
STEVEN M. GRANDALL, 0000
DAVID W. CRIEB, 0000
YOLANDA CRUZ, 0000
STEPHEN B. CZERWINSKI, 0000
SUSAN E. DABROWSKI, 0000
ARDEEN B. DAHL, 0000
SIGFRED J. DAHL, 0000
LOUIS M. DANTZLER, 0000
CONSTANCE H. DAVIS, 0000
DENNIS J. DECARAFF, 0000
JAMES E. DENNIS, 0000
LEE E. DEREMER, 0000
BRUCE R. DEWITT, 0000
BRIAN D. H. DICKERSON, 0000
DEREK R. DICKEY, 0000
MICHAEL R. DICKEY, 0000
TERESA L. DICKS, 0000
MARK C. DILLON, 0000
MARC K. DIPPOLD, 0000
LAURA A. H. DISILVERIO, 0000
RALPH S. DOBBS, 0000
MATTHEW J. DORSCHSEL, 0000
MARIA J. DOWLING, 0000
WILLIAM E. DURALL, 0000
MICHAEL S. DUVAL, 0000
JAMES E. EDGE, 0000
GEORGE V. EICHELBERGER, 0000
JAMES E. EISENHART, 0000
MATTHEW C. ENGLUND, 0000
JAMES C. EPTING, 0000

STEPHEN C. FAIRBAIRN, 0000
ANNE R. FAIRCHILD, 0000
ANTHONY W. FAUGHN, 0000
ANGELIQUE L. FAULISE, 0000
TERRY M. FEATHERSTON, 0000
MARK P. FITZGERALD, 0000
MARTIN E. BARTEAU FRANCE, 0000
RANDAL C. FRANKLIN, 0000
WARREN H. FRANKLIN, 0000
DAVID T. FREANEY, 0000
KEITH D. FREDER, 0000
MICHAEL K. FRYE, 0000
JAMES P. GALLOWAY III, 0000
JERRY L. GANDY, 0000
IGOR J. P. GARDNER, 0000
ERIC D. GARVIN, 0000
JORGE S. GARZA, 0000
HENRY J. GAUDREAU, 0000
MILO R. GAVIN, 0000
JOHN P. GEIS II, 0000
CHRISTIAN G. GEISEL, 0000
BRADFORD D. GENTRY, 0000
JAMES F. GEURTS, 0000
PHILLIP G. GIBBONS, 0000
RICHARD F. GIBBS II, 0000
TOM GILBERT, 0000
DORILYNN D. GIMONDO, 0000
JOHN PHILLIP GOOD, 0000
DAVID E. GOSS, 0000
ROBERT S. GREEN, 0000
TIMOTHY S. GREEN, 0000
RODERICK I. GREGORY, 0000
RONALD A. GRUNDMAN, 0000
GLEN E. GULLEKSON, 0000
MORRIS E. HAASE, 0000
CHRISTOPHER B. HALE, 0000
THELMA R. HALES, 0000
BRIAN K. HALL, 0000
DONALD J. HALPIN, 0000
CHARLES A. HAMILTON, 0000
ROBERT E. HAMM JR., 0000
HARVEY L. HANMOND JR., 0000
JAMES L. HANSON, 0000
JEFFREY A. HANSON, 0000
MICHAEL R. HARGROVE, 0000
STUART D. HARTFORD, 0000
MARVIN D. HARVEY JR., 0000
WALTER B. HARVEY III, 0000
KEN R. HASEGAWA, 0000
MICHAEL L. HELLSAEBECK, 0000
JAMES E. HENRY, 0000
WILLIAM E. HERR, 0000
JENNIFER L. HESTERMAN, 0000
MARK C. HIEBERT, 0000
DOUGLAS J. HINE, 0000
PAMELA R. C. HODGE, 0000
EDWARD E. HOLLAND JR., 0000
GARY W. HOLLAND, 0000
DANA J. HOURIHAN, 0000
STEPHEN P. HOWARD, 0000
ARTHUR F. HUBER II, 0000
BENJAMIN C. HUFF, 0000
STEPHEN L. HUFFMAN, 0000
CRAIG A. HUGHES, 0000
WILLIAM D. HUGHES III, 0000
JOHN F. HUNNELL, 0000
JAMES C. HUTTO JR., 0000
JUAN IBANEZ JR., 0000
NANCY R. INSPUCKER, 0000
MICHAEL J. IRWIN, 0000
DOUGLAS JACKSON, 0000
JOHN C. JACKSON III, 0000
ALLEN J. JAMERSON, 0000
VERALINN JAMIESON, 0000
JEROME M. JANIKOWIAK, 0000
MARK P. JELON, 0000
BRUCE A. JOHNSON, 0000
DAVID C. JOHNSON, 0000
JEFFREY R. JOHNSON, 0000
PAUL T. JOHNSON, 0000
GERARD JOLIVETTE, 0000
STEPHEN M. JONES, 0000
DANIEL P. JORDAN, 0000
MARTHA K. JORDAN, 0000
GREGORY J. JUDAY, 0000
MICHAEL J. KADLUBOWSKI, 0000
ROBERT J. KAUFMAN III, 0000
KEVIN V. KECK, 0000
GAIL A. KEEFE, 0000
ALVIN R. KEMMET JR., 0000
JON A. KIMMINAU, 0000
ROBYN M. KING, 0000
MICHAEL J. KINGSLEY, 0000
MAX E. KIRSSBAUM, 0000
BRET T. KLASSEN, 0000
KURT A. KLASNER, 0000
ANDREW Q. KNAPP, 0000
MARK E. KOECHLE, 0000
KEVIN C. KRINER, 0000
ROBERT D. LAFEBRE, 0000
PAUL S. LAND, 0000
GARY W. LANE, 0000
RONALD K. LAUGHBAUM, 0000
TIMOTHY J. LEAHY, 0000
DAVID C. LEE, 0000
RICHARD W. LEIBACH, 0000
JOHN W. LENT, 0000
ROBERT M. LEROUX, 0000
AFRED M. LEWIS, 0000
JOHN C. LIBURDI, 0000
JOHN S. LILLY, 0000
MARK F. LIST, 0000
RODNEY K. H. LIU, 0000
PAUL S. LOCKHART, 0000
JEFFREY G. LOFGREN, 0000
JAMES T. LONG, 0000
KEVIN W. LOPEZ, 0000

ROBERTA R. LOWE, 0000
 MARC A. LUIKEN, 0000
 GEOFFREY T. LUM, 0000
 KENNETH O. LYNN, 0000
 BRIAN R. MADTES, 0000
 ROBERT J. MAHONEY, 0000
 JOEL E. MALONE, 0000
 JAMES R. MARRS, 0000
 KEVIN L. MARTIN, 0000
 WILLIAM H. MARTIN JR., 0000
 EARL V. MCCALLUM JR., 0000
 ROBERT S. MCCORMICK, 0000
 WAYNE L. MCCOY JR., 0000
 MICHAEL E. MCGAUVAN, 0000
 ANNE E. MCGEE, 0000
 MATTHEW P. MCKEON, 0000
 CHARLES G. MCMILLAN, 0000
 MICHAEL R. MCPHERSON, 0000
 JOSEPH MEANS JR., 0000
 LINDA R. MEDLER, 0000
 MARCUS S. MILLER, 0000
 SCOTT A. MILLER, 0000
 STEVEN F. MILLER, 0000
 EDWARD M. MINAHAN, 0000
 TIMOTHY R. MINISH, 0000
 MICHAEL J. MIXON, 0000
 STEVEN J. MOES, 0000
 JAMES P. MOLLOY, 0000
 PAUL J. MONTGOMERY, 0000
 LLOYD B. MOON JR., 0000
 DAVID A. MOORE, 0000
 MICHAEL A. MORABITO, 0000
 WILLIAM A. MORGAN, 0000
 LEONARD S. MOSKAL, 0000
 MARK R. MUELLER, 0000
 STEVEN C. MUHS, 0000
 EDEN J. MURRIE, 0000
 JAMES J. NALLY, 0000
 WILLIAM M. NAPOLITANO JR., 0000
 RICHARD G. NAUGHTON, 0000
 DAVID NEGRON JR., 0000
 DEAN A. NELSON, 0000
 ALLAN S. NETZER, 0000
 JOHN F. NEWELL III, 0000
 JAMES O. NORMAN, 0000
 DAVID H. NUCKLES JR., 0000
 WILLIE G. NUNN, 0000
 THEODORE P. OGREN, 0000
 LOUIS W. OLINTO, 0000
 DAVID P. OLSON, 0000
 JOHN T. ORSATO, 0000
 TERENCE J. OSHAUGHNESSY JR., 0000
 STEVEN R. OTTO, 0000
 ROXANN A. OYLER, 0000
 CHARLES E. PARKS, 0000
 ERNEST L. PARROTT, 0000
 CHARLES C. PATTILO JR., 0000
 CHRISTOPHER E. PELC, 0000
 JOSEPH PELCHAR, 0000
 ALAN J. PERDIGAO, 0000
 GEORGE PERKINS, 0000
 RICHARD M. PERRY, 0000
 DAVID E. PETERSEN, 0000
 EDWARD J. PHILLIPS, 0000
 ALFRED L. PITTS, 0000
 NICOLE H. PLOURDE, 0000
 GARY L. PLUMB, 0000
 ROBERT D. POLLOCK, 0000
 CHARLES H. PORTER, 0000
 RUSSELL L. PORTER, 0000
 JAMES N. POST III, 0000
 NORMAN D. POTTER, 0000
 JOHN D. POUCHER II, 0000
 JOSEPH J. PRIDOMKAS, 0000
 MARVIN S. PUGMIRE, 0000
 MARY L. PURDUE, 0000
 FOWLER O. RAGLAND JR., 0000
 GLENDA P. RAICHAND, 0000
 DOUGLAS J. RAILEY JR., 0000
 ROBERT A. RATNER, 0000
 GREGORY J. RATTRAY, 0000
 STEVENSON L. RAY, 0000
 TIMOTHY M. RAY, 0000
 JOHN W. RAYMOND, 0000
 DOUGLAS J. REED, 0000
 JOEL S. REESE, 0000
 ROBERT E. REHBEIN, 0000
 JERRY RENNE, 0000
 CURTIS R. REYNOLDS, 0000
 PATRICK L. RHODE, 0000
 DAVID L. RICHARDS, 0000
 EDDIE L. RICHARDSON, 0000
 DENEAN P. RIVERA, 0000
 HECTOR V. RIVERA, 0000
 LARRY E. ROAN, 0000
 STEVEN W. ROBINETTE, 0000
 CHARLES M. ROBINSON, 0000
 JOSEPH T. ROHRET, 0000
 STEVEN A. RUEHL, 0000
 COLLEEN M. RYAN, 0000
 MICHAEL C. RYAN, 0000
 FREDERIC C. RYDER, 0000
 DAVID H. SAMMONS JR., 0000
 SCOTT H. SCHAFER, 0000
 JOHN M. SCHLAVI, 0000
 DAVID F. SCHILLER, 0000
 CHARLES J. SCHNEIDER, 0000
 SHEILA L. SCHROCK, 0000
 BERNARD A. SCHWARTZ, 0000
 JOSEPH H. SCHWARTZ, 0000
 GEORGE D. SCISS, 0000
 REBECCA N. SEEGER, 0000
 WILLIAM D. SELLENS, 0000
 ROBERT H. SHAMBLIN, 0000
 MICHAEL R. SHANAHAN, 0000
 KENNETH M. SHARPLESS, 0000
 WILLIAM L. SHELTON JR., 0000

MICHAEL M. SHEPARD, 0000
 LAURA E. SHOAF, 0000
 PAUL D. SIEVERT, 0000
 MICHAEL A. SILVER, 0000
 JOHN D. SILVIA, 0000
 THOMAS L. SIMPSON, 0000
 ERIC N. SINGLE, 0000
 ALBERT L. SLY, 0000
 LEONARD C. SMALES, 0000
 KEVIN C. SMITH, 0000
 ANNE E. SOBOTA, 0000
 JOHN L. SOKOLSKY, 0000
 DAVID F. SOLOMON, 0000
 DON W. SPARKS, 0000
 JEFFREY W. SPRAGGINS, 0000
 ROBERT J. STAIB, 0000
 ROBERT M. STAMBAUGH, 0000
 EDWARD M. STANHOUSE, 0000
 WENDELL T. STAPLER, 0000
 JOHN D. STAUFFER, 0000
 CAREY A. STEGALL, 0000
 JOSEPH V. STEPHANS, 0000
 WILLIAM D. STEPHENS, 0000
 JEFFREY L. STEPHENSON, 0000
 RALPH O. STOFFLER, 0000
 KURT A. STONEROCK, 0000
 BRIAN W. STORCK, 0000
 DAVID A. STRAND, 0000
 SUSAN E. STREDNANSKY, 0000
 PAUL C. STRICKLAND, 0000
 THOMAS R. STULL, 0000
 SHANNON M. SULLIVAN, 0000
 PHILIP A. SWANSON, 0000
 GERALD E. SZPILA, 0000
 JOHN R. TAYLOR, 0000
 MICHAEL D. TAYLOR, 0000
 LEE E. THOMAS, 0000
 ANTHONY C. THOMPSON, 0000
 DAVID D. THOMPSON, 0000
 JEFFERY G. THOMPSON, 0000
 TERRY D. TICHENOR, 0000
 THOMAS L. TINSLEY, 0000
 STEVEN M. TIPPETS, 0000
 DAVID M. TOBIN, 0000
 THERESA MARY TOIA, 0000
 KIMBERLY K. TONEY, 0000
 LINDA E. TORRENS, 0000
 GEORGE TORRES JR., 0000
 BENJAMIN D. TROTTER, 0000
 DAVID P. TROTTIER, 0000
 COUNT B. TYE JR., 0000
 DAVID C. UHRICH, 0000
 SCOTT A. VANDERHAMM, 0000
 DEBORAH S. VANDEVEN, 0000
 VICTORIA A. VELEZ, 0000
 JOHN R. VENABLE, 0000
 ROSS A. VICTOR, 0000
 TIMOTHY D. VINOSKI, 0000
 RONALD J. WAGNER, 0000
 MARK T. WALDRON, 0000
 PAUL C. WALKER, 0000
 JOSEPH S. WARD JR., 0000
 DONALD S. WATROUS, 0000
 ROBERT D. WATSON, 0000
 DAVID D. WATT, 0000
 JOHN D. WEIDERT, 0000
 STEPHEN P. WELER, 0000
 JAMES G. WELTON, 0000
 RICHARD J. WHEELER, 0000
 JERRY D. WHITLEY, 0000
 ERIC J. WILBUR, 0000
 TERRY E. WILLETT, 0000
 DAVID J. WILMOT, 0000
 KENNETH S. WILSBACH, 0000
 MICHAEL P. WINSLOW, 0000
 RICHARD L. WOJCIK JR., 0000
 MARTIN J. WOJTYSIK IV, 0000
 ELDON A. WOODIE, 0000
 WILLIAM N. WOOTTON, 0000
 EDWARD G. WORLEY, 0000
 ROBERT G. WRIGHT JR., 0000
 DONALD E. WUSSLER JR., 0000
 CHARLES E. WYNNE, 0000
 JEFFREY YUEN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BRIAN J. ACKER, 0000
 LOREN A. AHNBERG, 0000
 JOHN L. BINDER, 0000
 PAULETTA D. BLUEITT, 0000
 CHARLES M. CAMPBELL, 0000
 PERRY R. COOPER, 0000
 THOMAS S. DELANEY, 0000
 RONALD S. DORNIN, 0000
 CATHERINE M. ERICKSON, 0000
 LEONARD W. JACKSON, 0000
 KENNETH C. JACOBS, 0000
 KELLEY J. KASH, 0000
 GRANT D. KOTOVSKY, 0000
 DAVID J. LANNEN, 0000
 LAWRA A. LEE, 0000
 DENISE K. LEW, 0000
 CHARLES E. POTTER, 0000
 ANGELA D. WASHINGTON, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

PAUL M. BARZLER, 0000
 BARBARA G. BRAND, 0000
 MARSHALL L. CAGLIANO, 0000

WILLIAM T. CUMBIE, 0000
 GORDON R. HAMMOCK, 0000
 STEPHEN R. IRWIN, 0000
 ALBERT W. KLEIN JR., 0000
 FELIX A. LOSCO, 0000
 MICHAEL W. MEADOWS, 0000
 WILLIAM W. PISCHNOTTE, 0000
 MATTHEW J. POLGAR, 0000
 RONALD A. RODGERS, 0000
 LAURENCE M. SOYBEL, 0000
 JEFFREY W. WATSON, 0000
 RONALD J. WILLIAMS, 0000
 CHARLES W. WILLIAMSON III, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

PAUL V. BENNETT, 0000
 NAOMI M. BOSS, 0000
 SHERRY L. COX, 0000
 DAVID T. HOCKING, 0000
 LELA M. HOLDEN, 0000
 PAULA R. JAMESON, 0000
 JOHN S. MURRAY, 0000
 MICHAELA R. SHAFER, 0000
 MARGARET A. STULTZLALK, 0000
 DONNALEE SYKES, 0000
 GLORIA J. TWILLEY, 0000
 BARBARA L. WOLFE, 0000
 VICTORIA G. ZAMARRIPA, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL F. ADAMES, 0000
 LISA M. BECK, 0000
 PAUL F. BLAISSE, 0000
 DEAN B. BORSOS, 0000
 ERIC C. BRUSOE, 0000
 JAMES J. BURKS, 0000
 RICHARD C. BYRD, 0000
 CHARLES D. CHAPDELAIN, 0000
 JAMES R. CLAPSADDE, 0000
 ROBERT H. COTHREN III, 0000
 SUSAN L. DAVIS, 0000
 PATRICK L. DAWSON, 0000
 DONALD L. FAUST, 0000
 JAMES T. FISH, 0000
 BARBARA J. HENNING, 0000
 EDWIN A. HURSTON, 0000
 PHILIP E. JONES, 0000
 BRIAN E. KING, 0000
 DARRELL W. LANDREAU, 0000
 REX A. LANGSTON, 0000
 RACHEL H. LEFEBVRE, 0000
 ARMAND L. MARTIN, 0000
 LEWIS M. MARTIN, 0000
 RICHARD W. MILES, 0000
 DANIEL S. MILNES, 0000
 TERANCE L. NIVER, 0000
 JAMES B. PAYNE JR., 0000
 THEODORE O. PERSINGER, 0000
 JAMES C. RAY, 0000
 HEIDIE R. ROTHSCHILD, 0000
 WEATHERLY A. RYAN, 0000
 KIM L. SCHMIDT, 0000
 CHARLES W. SCHOTT, 0000
 REBECCA C. SEESE, 0000
 PAUL M. SKALA, 0000
 THOMAS A. STEINBRUNNER, 0000
 TRACY A. TENNEY, 0000
 MARK W. TESMER, 0000
 CAMILLE M. TILSON, 0000
 WILLIAM R. TYRA, 0000
 ROBERT A. VALENTINE, 0000
 KENNETH R. WILSON, 0000
 SCOTT A. ZUERLEIN, 0000

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

HENRY E. ABERCROMBIE, 0000
 DAVID L. ALLWINE, 0000
 MICHAEL E. BONHEIM, 0000
 MATTHEW L. BRAND, 0000
 PETER C. BRIGHAM, 0000
 STEVEN M. BROUSE, 0000
 DONALD J. BURNETT, 0000
 PEGGY R. CARSON, 0000
 ANGEL L. COLON, 0000
 JOHN P. CONNELL, 0000
 CHARLES G. COTTTEAU, 0000
 DAVID L. CRAWFORD, 0000
 PHILIP J. DERMER, 0000
 TIMOTHY D. DIXON, 0000
 NATHAN R. EBEL, 0000
 ANAS T. ECONOMY III, 0000
 GEORGE D. EVELAND JR., 0000
 JEFFREY FARGO, 0000
 FRANCIS X. FIEBKO, 0000
 TIMOTHY G. GODDETTE, 0000
 RICHARD L. GREENE JR., 0000
 SUSAN K. GRUBB, 0000
 MICHAEL A. HALLISEY, 0000
 RICHARD D. HANSEN JR., 0000
 EARNEST D. HARRIS, 0000
 THEODORE C. HARRISON, 0000
 PETER F. HOFFMAN, 0000
 ANTHONY R. INCORVATI II, 0000

KERMIT C JONES, 0000
 ROBERT KENDRICK III, 0000
 JIYUL KIM III, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER F KUREK, 0000
 GLEN D LAMBKIN JR., 0000
 KELLY M LANGDORF, 0000
 DEBRA R LITTLE, 0000
 CORY W MAHANNA, 0000
 PAUL A MCGUIRE JR., 0000
 LEONARD R MONTFORD JR., 0000
 SUSAN B NEUMANN, 0000
 ROBERT B NEWMAN, 0000
 WILLIAM E PARKER, 0000
 JAMES R RALPH III, 0000
 ENRIQUE RAMOS, 0000
 GRADY G REESE JR., 0000
 MARK D RIDER, 0000
 JESS A SCARBROUGH, 0000
 GEORGE A SEARS II, 0000
 JORGE L SILVEIRA, 0000
 WILLIAM W STEVENSON, 0000
 MICHELLE D STOLESON, 0000
 KENNETH R STOLWORTHY, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER C SULLIVAN, 0000
 GREGORY J ULSH, 0000
 JOHN K VAUGHN, 0000
 THOMAS D WAHLERT, 0000
 STEPHEN WALTERS, 0000
 HENRY WALLER III, 0000
 RANDY L WILLIAMS, 0000
 DANIEL G WOLFE, 0000
 MICHELLE F YARBOROUGH, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MICHAEL P ARMSTRONG, 0000
 WILLIAM BALOGH, 0000
 WAYNE M BRAINERD, 0000
 ROBERT H BRUCE, 0000
 CURTIS P CHEESEMAN, 0000
 JOHN A DAVIS, 0000
 GARRIE P DORNAN, 0000
 CHARLES DUNN III, 0000
 KIMBERLY K DURR, 0000
 DAVID C GROHOSKI, 0000
 THOMAS G HARRIS, 0000
 RUDOLPH C HAYNIE, 0000
 CARL W HUNT, 0000
 THOMAS C LUTHER, 0000
 SHARON M MACK, 0000
 RANDALL L MACKEY, 0000
 KEVIN J MCCLUNG, 0000
 NELSON MCCOUCH III, 0000
 DAVID R McDONALD JR., 0000
 THOMAS Z NAPIER, 0000
 SCOTT F NETHERLAND, 0000
 KEVIN P POLCZYNSKI, 0000
 GREGORY S RASSATT, 0000
 PATRICK H RAYERMANN, 0000
 ARNOLD K VEAZIE, 0000
 ROGER WATERS, 0000
 CRAIG M WHITEHILL, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JOHN F AGOLIA, 0000
 RICHARD E ARNOLD, 0000
 CHARLES T BARHAM, 0000
 MARGARET H BELKNAP, 0000
 KENNETH W BISHOP, 0000
 DAISIE D BOETTNER, 0000
 CLARENCE A CRUSE III, 0000
 MICHAEL F DAVINO, 0000
 PETER DEFLURI III, 0000
 JOHN J DOLAC, 0000
 MICHAEL E DONOVAN, 0000
 ROBERT M DYESS JR., 0000
 ALLEN C EAST, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER W FOWLER, 0000
 THOMAS FREEMAN JR., 0000
 ANTHONY GLENN JR., 0000
 BRIAN L GROTT, 0000
 DARRALL R HENDERSON, 0000
 RICKY E HILL, 0000
 PAUL S HILTON, 0000
 WILLIAM C HIX, 0000
 GREGORY C HOSCHEIT, 0000
 CINDY R JEBB, 0000
 BARRETT F LOWE, 0000
 MICHAEL W KIRSCH, 0000
 JAMES A KNOWLES, 0000
 PARIS M MACK, 0000
 ROBERT W MACKAY, 0000
 JOE D MANOUS JR., 0000
 LLOYD W MARSHALL, 0000
 RICKIE A MCFEAK, 0000
 STEVEN J MULLINS, 0000
 DANIEL J RAGSDALE, 0000
 BRUCE J REIDER, 0000
 DAVID J SCARICHLI, 0000
 ROBERT L STEINRAUF, 0000
 WILLIAM J TARANTINO, 0000
 WENDELL L TAYLOR, 0000
 PAUL D THORNTON, 0000
 BRIAN S VEIT, 0000
 ALFRED VIANA, 0000
 MICHAEL L WACLAWSKI, 0000
 JAMES N WASSON, 0000
 RONALD W WELCH, 0000
 MICHAEL C WILMER, 0000
 MICHAEL B WINZELER, 0000

JEFFREY R WITSKEN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

PAUL F ABEL JR., 0000
 MICHAEL S ADAMS, 0000
 GARY A AGRON, 0000
 MICHAEL W ALEXANDER, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER E ALLEN, 0000
 RODNEY K ALSTON, 0000
 ROBERT ASHLEY, 0000
 KEVIN M BADGER, 0000
 ALVIN L BAILEY, 0000
 JEFFREY L BAILEY, 0000
 MARK D BAINES, 0000
 JAMES B BALOCKI, 0000
 STEFAN J BANACH, 0000
 THERESA L BARTON, 0000
 RICHARD C BASSETT, 0000
 ALLEN W BATSCHLET, 0000
 PETER C BAYER JR., 0000
 JEFFREY A BEDEY, 0000
 JAMES L BEDINGFIELD, 0000
 BRENDA K BESS, 0000
 ROBERT L BETHEA JR., 0000
 TERRY W BEYNON, 0000
 MICHAEL D BIANCHI, 0000
 GWENDOLYN BINGHAM, 0000
 PETER E BLABER, 0000
 DAVID J BISHOP, 0000
 RICHARD E BLOSS, 0000
 CHARLES A BOAZ JR., 0000
 RANDALL J BOCKENSTEDT, 0000
 ALAN G BOURQUE, 0000
 MICHAEL A BOWERS JR., 0000
 MICHAEL A BRADLEY, 0000
 CLAY F BRIDGES, 0000
 JASEY B BRILEY, 0000
 CRAIG A BROWN, 0000
 GARY B BROWN, 0000
 JAMES B BROWN, 0000
 KEVIN W BROWN, 0000
 DANIEL V BRUNO, 0000
 VICTORIA M BRUZESE, 0000
 JEFFREY S BUCHANAN, 0000
 RANDY A BUHIDAR, 0000
 MICHAEL J BURNS, 0000
 JAMES B BURTON, 0000
 RALPH A BUTLER, 0000
 MICHAEL D CASE, 0000
 JAY W CHAMBERS JR., 0000
 CLARENCE K CANN, 0000
 JOHN M CHIU, 0000
 MICHAEL C CLOY, 0000
 ROBIN D COFER, 0000
 GEORGE G COFFETT, 0000
 HECTOR L COLON, 0000
 THOMAS J COMODECA, 0000
 BRIAN A CRAWFORD, 0000
 CARDON B CRAWFORD, 0000
 JAMES B CROCKETT III, 0000
 JOSEPH P CROWLEY, 0000
 JACQUELINE E CUMBO, 0000
 JOHN P CUMMINGS, 0000
 KENDAL W CUNNINGHAM, 0000
 CRAIG J CURREY, 0000
 PETER E CURRY, 0000
 KENNETH R DAHL, 0000
 EDWARD E DALY, 0000
 GORDON B DAVIS JR., 0000
 MICHAEL J DAVIS, 0000
 WAYNE K DAVIS, 0000
 TIM L DAY, 0000
 WILLIAM S DECAPM JR., 0000
 NORVEL L DILLARD, 0000
 RICHARD J DIXON, 0000
 JANICE L DOMB, 0000
 SCOTT F DONAHUE, 0000
 CHARLES W DURR JR., 0000
 JAMES P DUTTWELER, 0000
 TIMOTHY J EDENS, 0000
 MICHAEL C EDWARDS, 0000
 BILLY D FARRIS II, 0000
 QUILL R FERGUSON, 0000
 ROBERT S FERRELL, 0000
 JEFFREY D FIELD, 0000
 KENNETH F FISHER JR., 0000
 KELLY F FISK, 0000
 DEBRA F FIX, 0000
 CHRISTINA P FLANAGAN, 0000
 PETER W FOREMAN, 0000
 KIRK L FOSTER, 0000
 BRYAN C FOY, 0000
 TONY R FRANCIS, 0000
 MARY L FRANKLIN, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER T FULTON, 0000
 JOHN G GALLAND, 0000
 MARK C GARDNER, 0000
 MARGUERITE C GARRISON, 0000
 KEITH G GEIGER, 0000
 STEPHEN J GERAS, 0000
 WALTER L GILLIAM, 0000
 JAMES A GRAY, 0000
 GARY R GRIMES, 0000
 ROBERT D GRYMES, 0000
 MICHAEL C GUNY, 0000
 SAMUEL A GUTHRIE, 0000
 DAVID L HAGG, 0000
 CATHERINE G HAIGHT, 0000
 DAVID B HAIN, 0000
 JOHN L HAITHCOCK JR., 0000
 SCOTT A HALASZ, 0000
 WILLIAM E HARMON, 0000
 DAVID D HAUGHT, 0000

STEVEN P HAUSTEIN, 0000
 SAMUELL R HAWES, 0000
 MARK W HAYES, 0000
 FALKNER HEARD III, 0000
 MARK S HELD, 0000
 SCOTT A HENRY, 0000
 WALTER M HERD, 0000
 ERNEST J HEROLD III, 0000
 ROBERT T HESS, 0000
 STEPHEN L HILL, 0000
 RICHARD D HOOKER JR., 0000
 RICHARD M HORNACK JR., 0000
 JAMES R HOY JR., 0000
 JONATHAN B HUNTER, 0000
 FRANK P IPPOLITO, 0000
 JEFFREY JARKOWSKY, 0000
 GREGORY L JOHANSEN, 0000
 MICHAEL R JOHNSON, 0000
 ROBERT L JOHNSON JR., 0000
 SAMUEL H JOHNSON, 0000
 MARK A JOHNSTONE, 0000
 BRIAN D JONES, 0000
 FRANKLIN K JONES, 0000
 JOHN D JORDAN, 0000
 RAY A JOSEY, 0000
 KENNETH G JUERGENSEN, 0000
 JEFFREY T KAPPENMAN, 0000
 BRIAN KEETH, 0000
 BRYAN D KEIFER, 0000
 THOMAS M KELLEY, 0000
 MICHAEL M KERSHAW, 0000
 HOWARD J KILLIAN III, 0000
 DAVID M KING, 0000
 ROBERT W KLINE, 0000
 THOMAS G KNIGHT JR., 0000
 JAMES A KNOWLTON, 0000
 TIMOTHY A KOKINDA, 0000
 MICHAEL A KRIZ, 0000
 THOMAS W KULA, 0000
 DWAYNE A LACEWELL, 0000
 CATHERINE H LACINA, 0000
 RAYMOND L LAMB, 0000
 SCOTT A LANG, 0000
 GARY D LANGFORD, 0000
 HENRY S LARSEN III, 0000
 JON S LEHR, 0000
 RONALD N LIGHT, 0000
 BRIAN S LINDAMOOD, 0000
 JAMES B LINDER, 0000
 DAVID H LING, 0000
 MICHAEL D LINGENFELTER, 0000
 XAVIER P LOBETO, 0000
 MARK A LORING, 0000
 KEITH R LOVEJOY, 0000
 THOMAS F LYNCH III, 0000
 SEAN B MACFARLAND, 0000
 FRANCIS A MACHINA, 0000
 DONALD M MACWILLIE, 0000
 KEVIN W MANGUM, 0000
 GERALD M MANLEY, 0000
 DAVID L MANN, 0000
 DORIOU A MASCARICH, 0000
 RICHARD J MASON JR., 0000
 ANTON E MASSINON, 0000
 JAMES J MATHIS, 0000
 DAVID S MAXWELL, 0000
 MICHAEL T MCBRIDE, 0000
 DOUGLAS E MCCALLUM, 0000
 EVERETT K MCDANIEL, 0000
 JAMES D MCDONOUGH, 0000
 RALPH M MCGEE, 0000
 MARK J MCKEARN, 0000
 MARK E MCKNIGHT, 0000
 HERBERT R MCMASTER JR., 0000
 JOHN J MEGNIA, 0000
 CHARLES R MEHLE II, 0000
 FRANCIS R MERRITT, 0000
 AUSTIN S MILLER, 0000
 BRICK T MILLER, 0000
 DEREK A MILLER, 0000
 EARL E MILLER, 0000
 ROSE M MILLER, 0000
 DAVID L MOLINELLI, 0000
 JOHN M MOORE, 0000
 DOUGLAS J MORRISON, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER W MOYLAN, 0000
 JOSEPH P MUDD, 0000
 PAUL J MULLIN, 0000
 JAMES M MURPHY, 0000
 MARK D NEEDHAM, 0000
 GLENWOOD NORRIS JR., 0000
 THOMAS E ODOVONAN, 0000
 JEFFREY R OESER, 0000
 TIMOTHY M OHARA, 0000
 JOHN A OLSHEFSKI, 0000
 DAVID C OSBORNE, 0000
 KEVIN C OWENS, 0000
 KEVIN J PALGUTT, 0000
 MARK S PATTERSON, 0000
 DAMON C PENN, 0000
 DEBRA J PEREZ, 0000
 STEVEN W PETERSON, 0000
 JAMES A PHELPS, 0000
 WARREN E PHIPPS JR., 0000
 AUNDRE F PIGGEE, 0000
 MARTIN B PITTS, 0000
 RICHARD J POOLE, 0000
 THOMAS G POPE, 0000
 GREGG C POTTER, 0000
 KENNETH L PRENDERGAST, 0000
 BECKY PRETTYMAN, 0000
 DANNY G PUMMILL, 0000
 ALEXANDER B RAULERSON, 0000
 DOUGLAS E RAYMOND, 0000
 CHRISTOPHER J REDDISH, 0000
 JARROLD M REEVES JR., 0000
 CARLTON B REID JR., 0000

STEWART E REMALY, 0000
 BRYAN T ROBERTS, 0000
 ROBERT H ROOME, 0000
 MICHAEL S ROSE, 0000
 JOHN G ROSSI, 0000
 MICHAEL A ROSSI, 0000
 DINO D ROTH, 0000
 DONALD M SANDO, 0000
 LAWRENCE SANSONE, 0000
 TIMOTHY A SASSENATH, 0000
 WAYNE A SAUER, 0000
 WALTER J SAWYER, 0000
 MICHAEL D SAXTON, 0000
 ANDREW K SCHWEIKERT, 0000
 ROBERT E SCURLOCK JR., 0000
 THOMAS C SEAMANDS, 0000
 MICHAEL K SEIDL, 0000
 GARY M SERVOLD, 0000
 TIMOTHY M SHERWOOD, 0000
 MICHAEL H SHIELDS, 0000
 JAMES D SHUMWAY IV, 0000
 JAMES M SIMMONS, 0000
 DAVID A SMITH, 0000
 EUGENE B SMITH, 0000
 JACK F SMITH JR., 0000
 KEVIN B SMITH, 0000
 STEPHEN T SMITH, 0000
 WILLIAM E SMITH, 0000
 AUDY R SNODGRASS, 0000
 JEFFREY J SNOW, 0000
 ROBERT D SNYDER, 0000
 PATRICK T STACKPOLE, 0000
 CHARLES A STAFFORD, 0000
 GARY R STANLEY, 0000
 MICHAEL D STEELE, 0000
 GRANT D STEFFAN, 0000
 KENNETH R STRICKLAND, 0000

ERIC C SURLLES, 0000
 LORI L SUSSMAN, 0000
 DAVID W SUTHERLAND, 0000
 ANTHONY SWAIN, 0000
 PETER J TABACCHI, 0000
 MICHAEL J TALIENTO JR., 0000
 STEVEN C TALKINGTON, 0000
 JOHN A TARTALA, 0000
 JOHN J TAYLOR, 0000
 PETER F TAYLOR JR., 0000
 LOUISE V TERRELL, 0000
 DEBRA A THEDFORD, 0000
 RICHARD G THOMAS JR., 0000
 JOSEPH E THOME JR., 0000
 DAVID S THOMPSON, 0000
 GARY M THORNE, 0000
 MARK E TILLMAN, 0000
 RICHARD C TOWNES, 0000
 STEPHEN J TOWNSEND, 0000
 TODD J TRAVAS, 0000
 RONALD D TUGGLE, 0000
 JOHN N TULLY, 0000
 BARRY N TYREE, 0000
 JOHN UBERTI, 0000
 RAMON VALLE, 0000
 RAYMOND T VANPELT, 0000
 ROBERT J VASTA, 0000
 DAVID W VERGOLLO, 0000
 ANTHONY C VESAY, 0000
 DOROTHEA I WALLACE, 0000
 JOSEPH K WALLACE, 0000
 JAMES M WARING, 0000
 TIMOTHY L WHALEN, 0000
 WILLIAM A WHATLEY JR., 0000
 TIMOTHY L WHITE, 0000
 JOHN A WILCOX, 0000
 JOHN A WILHELM, 0000

ANTHONY L WILLIAMS, 0000
 BENJAMIN H WILLIAMS III, 0000
 DARRYL A WILLIAMS, 0000
 DONNA L WILLIAMS, 0000
 HERMAN WILLIAMS III, 0000
 VIRGIL S WILLIAMS, 0000
 THOMAS F WOLOSZYN, 0000
 JOHN K WOOD, 0000
 KENT T WOODS, 0000
 EDMUND W WOOLFOLK JR., 0000
 HAROLD H WORRELL JR., 0000
 JOHN T WRIGHT, 0000
 LARRY D WYCHE, 0000
 EDGAR J YANGER, 0000
 MICHAEL S YARMIE, 0000
 MARK W YENTER, 0000
 PETER B ZWACK, 0000
 X0000
 X0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL H. GAMBLE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JEFFREY L. MILLER, 0000