

better moving to the debt ceiling sooner rather than later. We feel it should be done before this tax bill. We are working on that. I have worked with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky the last couple of hours. If we get a few breaks during the caucuses, we may be able to bring it up this afternoon. I have no objection to the request by the Senator from Kentucky.

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VOINOVICH).

THE ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003—Continued

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

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

HEALTH CARE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this past weekend my wife and I met up with some life-long friends from my home area of East Saint Louis, IL. We had a good time together. We sat around and talked about our lives and some of the challenges we face.

My friends own a small business. It is a trucking company with about six or eight employees, and about the same number of trucks. It has been in their family for decades. They are very proud of it. They put their life work into it. We talk about business every time I see them. This time the conversation was not so much about business; it was about an issue which was clearly on their minds, and I believe the minds of small and large businessmen across America. The issue was health insurance.

Something they had taken for granted for so many years has now become a challenge not only to their business but to their personal lives. A few years ago, one of their employees' wives had a baby with some serious medical problems. As a result of that, when the health insurance for their small company came up for renewal the next year, they saw their premiums double.

This small company struggling to get by was faced with an impossible burden, how to continue to provide health insurance for the families and the workers in their employ at costs that

were now out of reach. They tried for a year. When the rates continued to go up, in desperation they made a desperate decision. They called their employees in and said: We can no longer offer health insurance to you as an employee of this company. We will give you the amount of money we were paying monthly as a premium as an increase in your pay, but you have to go out in the open market and find health insurance.

The sad reality is one of the families, the one with the sick child, could not find health insurance, and still has not. The others found it with costs going up every year. But that was not the end of the story. They went on to tell me the insurance they now have to buy in the open market is almost worthless. If they should ever turn in a claim during the course of the year for any medical problem, they can count in the next year that that will be excluded from coverage and protection. If you have a problem with your foot, of any kind, in the next year the health insurance policy offered to you will exclude anything to deal with feet, either one of them, any condition.

The woman told me at this get-together: When I go to get a mammogram now and they ask me who my doctor is, I tell them I do not have one. Send the results to me personally. She said: I try to decide whether or not something serious has been found. I cannot let this get into my medical records because, frankly, I will find an exclusion to coverage if any question is raised.

This was a very startling conversation for me. It was an eye opener. What troubled me the most about this, I do this for a living. I am a Senator, and I am proud of it. I have devoted my life to public service and I hope I have done some good, but when my friends, family members, and businesses across my State all come to me with the same concern over and over again, I cannot explain the feeling of helplessness and frustration I have.

I think about that in the context of the debate in which we are engaged. Of all the debate in the last several years in Washington, DC, of all of the proposals from this administration and from the leaders in this Congress, why is it we can never get close to the issues that really count, the issues that are tearing families and businesses apart? The cost of health insurance is one of those issues. As a nation, is it expensive for us to try to come up with a new approach which says that every American, regardless of their wealth or poverty, will have a basic level of protection of health insurance? That cannot be beyond us.

This is a country and a society which took a look at its impoverished parents and grandparents over 50 years ago and said, we are going to create Social Security. We want these people whom we love to live in dignity. This is the same country and society which in the 1960s took a look at the same parents and

grandparents and said, for goodness sakes, they ought to have basic health insurance. If they have retired, we are going to create Medicare. And we did. This is a country which stepped back and said we are no longer going to discriminate against people because of their disabilities or handicaps. We are going to provide them protection, and we did.

Time and time again, we have risen to the challenge. But what do we have before us now? A debate on the floor of the Senate about a tax cut, the range of the cost of this tax cut over a 10-year period, \$420 billion to \$550 billion, a significant sum of money, on top of a tax cut we just passed 2 years ago.

How will this tax cut benefit my friends who are struggling with the cost of health insurance? How will it benefit families across America who cannot find health insurance and cannot find work? The answer, sadly, is that it is not designed to help them at all.

President Bush comes before us with a tax cut proposal that is a nonstarter. It serves his political philosophy, which is to propose a tax cut whether we are in good times or bad, but it does not serve America and its needs. Our fear of government, our fear of working collectively to solve problems, has driven this Senate and this Congress away from the reality of the challenges of life in America.

We passed a bill called No Child Left Behind. The President said: This is my answer to education in America. And then the President comes back and refuses to fund it. It is an unfunded mandate on the schools of Illinois, Ohio, New Mexico, and Nevada, when these States are facing deficits.

When it comes to health care, this administration has no proposals or suggestions to help the families and businesses struggling to provide health insurance to cover their kids.

When it comes to prescription drugs, there is lip service—nothing that will provide real and meaningful relief from the cost of prescription drugs, particularly for senior citizens and disabled people.

Instead, what are we suggesting? We are discussing a tax cut with the Bush approach, a tax cut that will say to people making over a million dollars in income a year, this elite class will receive about \$90,000 more in breaks from the Federal Government.

What is wrong with this picture? I will tell my colleagues what is wrong, from my point of view. It depends on one's outlook on the future of America. If they believe the future of America is driven and controlled by elite investors, the highest-income people in America, then they should sign on quickly to the Bush tax cut. That is what it is designed to do, to provide to those elite investors, those dividend earners, extra benefits so they can have a more comfortable life and perhaps spend their money in ways to help the economy. That is the Bush approach. For most Republicans—not all,

but for most Republicans—that is their approach.

There are others, such as myself, who take a different approach. We believe the future of this country has always been based on hard-working families, those middle income working families which have made this country great. They have played by the rules. They paid their taxes. They have raised their families. They have been conscientious in making certain their schools and neighborhoods are strong and safe.

What do we give them in this tax cut? Not \$90,000 a year, like the millionaires in the Bush tax cut, but around \$400 or \$500 a year. That is not fair and it is not right. It is what we face time and time again when it comes to dealing with the problems across America.

This week, the Senate will consider amendments to this tax bill. Republicans and Democrats will be given choices as to whether they want to cut taxes at the highest levels in the highest brackets or whether they want to provide real tax relief to working families and small businesses across America. The choices will be stark. They will contrast our attitude toward life and our attitude toward America's future.

Is it worth it to reduce the tax cuts of people making over \$300,000 a year or give a tax credit to small businesses that offer health insurance to their employees? I would like to take that issue back to Illinois. In fact, I will take it back to any State, and I know what I will hear from small businesspeople and their workers: For goodness sakes, it does not make any sense to give a tax cut to people making over \$300,000 a year. Give a helping hand to the families struggling to get by.

Senator SCHUMER of New York is going to offer his amendment, which goes to the heart of the future of America. It goes to the cost of education.

We now know what happens to young men and women, accepted to the best schools, finally graduate and find themselves deep in debt. Senator SCHUMER and others and I have joined to offer an amendment that says the cost of college education should be deductible so families wanting to give their kids the best, wanting their kids to achieve the most in their lives, will have a helping hand from this Government.

What makes more sense, a tax break for an individual already successful in America making over \$300,000 a year or a tax deduction for a working family whose son or daughter has been accepted to the college of their dreams, the best school possible, who just need a helping hand from this country so they can be all that they can be, achieve greatness?

That is an easy call, too. I will take that home to Illinois, and I invite President Bush to come to Illinois and debate that. Pick the town, Mr. President. Whether he is going to be visiting Nebraska or Indiana, I would like the

people in those environs to have the choice the Senate will face this week, choices that are meaningful.

I close on this point. We have lost more jobs under this President than anyone ever imagined. In the Clinton 8 years, 22 million new jobs were created in America. Under the Bush administration, with this recession, we have lost more than 2 million jobs. In fact, we have lost more than 2 million jobs since the President's last tax cut, that failed policy which took more than \$1 trillion from the Treasury and did not create jobs in America. It was a failure then and this replacement, even if it is smaller, will fail as well.

Sadly, the unemployed people across America are reaching a level of desperation. They cannot find jobs in this economy with this recession.

My home State of Illinois announced last week an unemployment rate of 6.3 percent. We are in the top four States of unemployment across America.

I met some of the workers while I was back this weekend. One man who was in the communications industry lost his job last December after working more than 30 years. He is desperately looking for a job and does not know which way to turn.

Unemployed people like him across America, victims of this recession, cannot get a helping hand from this Bush administration. The helping hand is extended to the wealthy, to the millionaires, to those with all the dividends who want all the tax breaks, but no helping hand to the poor unemployed family member trying to keep it going.

During President Bush's father's recession in the early 1990s, we extended unemployment benefits five different times; three times under President Bush senior, twice under President Clinton. In this administration, with this terrible recession, we have extended them only twice. Individuals are falling off eligibility. What happens to a person unemployed, no longer eligible for unemployment compensation?

You can count on the following: First, they will find it difficult to pay their utility bills. Second, they will find they have to make real sacrifices on the basis of family, food, clothing. You will find many of them moving in with family and friends. You can count on one of the first items to go being health insurance. They have just enough money not to qualify for Medicaid for the poor but sadly not enough money to provide health insurance for their family.

Over the weekend, my friends talked about health insurance and said, we feel very badly for people who are poor, those who are unemployed, but it is the working families of America who are losing today. This tax break, this \$400 to \$500 billion tax bill, ignores those families, ignores that reality, and in ignoring that reality, it calls into question whether those who have dedicated our time to public service are really listening to the people we represent.

I hope during the course of this week as we debate this bill and we debate the

debt limit, as we get into these important issues, some of my friends on both sides of the aisle will reflect on what they have heard at home from the real working families of America. They need help. The Bush tax program does not help. It is irresponsible. It is unfair. It will not move this economy forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI and Mr. REID pertaining to the introduction of S. 1051 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: What is pending before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Feinstein second-degree amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Feinstein second-degree amendment to the ethanol amendment to S. 14, the comprehensive energy bill; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. I might say, if anyone cares to speak on either the amendment or the underlying bill or, for that matter, the comprehensive energy bill, the floor is open for that purpose. I have asked the majority leader if it would be appropriate to have a vote on the Feinstein amendment, a vote on it or in respect to it, this evening. He has indicated that sometime after 7 o'clock that might be in order. I am not asking for that at this point, but I am just saying to Senators that probably will happen.

If there are no other Senators desiring to do so, I will myself move to table it sometime after 7 o'clock, when it is deemed appropriate by the majority and minority leaders.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COLEMAN. 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. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes as in morning business.

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

RELIEF FOR TCHISOU THO

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for giving me this opportunity to make this presentation. I am very appreciative.

I wish to talk about a young man I read about in the Minneapolis Star Tribune last Friday. It was the story of Tchisou Tho, an 18-year-old currently facing two situations: in three weeks, high school graduation and, in one day, the threat of deportation.

Yesterday, I introduced legislation that would grant citizenship to Tchisou, a senior at Como Park High School in St. Paul, MN who would become the first member of his family to attain a high school diploma.

In 1975, Tchisou's parents fled Communist rule in Laos and settled their family in France. At age 5, with his parents having visitors' visas, Tchisou's family came to the United States, first settling in California before eventually moving to Minnesota in 1993, mainly for the quality schools and educational opportunities for their children. As Tchisou's mother commented, "We consider it a precious thing to wear the gown and receive the diploma with honor and applause."

The Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Service states that the Tho family defied a judge's order to leave the United States voluntarily before March 26 of this year. Mr. and Mrs. Tho had been granted work authorizations, but a meeting with immigration officials to request modifications of their status resulted in knowledge of the March deadline and consequently the deportation order.

I have great respect for the folks of Immigration. They do their job. they do it well. They are following the law. Unfortunately, Tchisou is a good kid experiencing a bad situation.

The sins of the parents should not automatically fall upon the shoulders of the children. Actively involved in his church, Tchisou teaches Sunday school, belongs to the youth group, and sings in the choir. At Como Park High, he is registered for challenging courses such as advanced-placement calculus. Furthermore, Tchisou has been accepted by the University of Minnesota, where he plans on studying either aerospace engineering or natural resources.

The situation Tchisou faces is not all that uncommon. It is a circumstance that, I am sorry to say, many children have to experience. In response, it is my understanding that my good friend and colleague Senator HATCH reintroduce the Dream Act in the near future, a bill that will address tough circumstances such as this, in a comprehensive manner, and I look forward to working with Senator HATCH on this important legislation. However, Tchisou can't wait for the Dream Act to become law, and that is why I introduced private relief legislation for him last night.

Mr. President, good kids like Tchisou should not pay for the mistakes of others. Tchisou should graduate from high school with his friends, and I believe the bill I introduced last night will make that happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand we are speaking as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is not the order of business. The Senate currently has before it the Feinstein amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent to be able to proceed as if in morning business.

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

THE REAL CURE FOR OUR SICK ECONOMY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the health of the American economy has been deteriorating for more than 2 years and the patient's vital signs are getting steadily worse.

President Bush's response has been to prescribe sugar pills—tax cuts for the wealthy that may taste good for a moment but do nothing to cure the patient's illness. Like a quack doctor who knows only one remedy, while the patient keeps getting worse despite the treatment, the President just keeps prescribing larger and larger doses of sugar pills. The Bush administration's policies will never revive this sick economy.

I am deeply concerned about the continued stagnation of the economy. Unemployment is still on the rise. We climbed to 6 percent in April. There are now 8.8 million men and women unemployed across the Nation. The economy has lost more than a half million jobs in just the past 3 months, and there is no end in sight. In the absence of an effective stimulus from the Federal Government, the economy is not likely to improve quickly.

Behind such disturbing statistics are people who need our help. A strong economy allows working men and women to have greater control over their lives and more opportunity to pursue their personal dreams. A stagnant economy takes much of that control out of their hands, leaving families vulnerable to circumstances they cannot control.

Across America in the last 2 years, workers have lost their job security. As layoffs mount, they live in fear of being the next to be let go. There are 2.7 million fewer private sector jobs in America today than there were in January of 2001. Those looking for a job are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain one. The number of long-term unemployed has tripled.

The pain caused by this destructive wave of economic stagnation is not limited to those who have lost their jobs. Health insurance is becoming less and less affordable for workers and their families across the country. The Congressional Budget Office now estimates that over the course of a year, 60 million Americans go without health insurance. One in ten small businesses which offered their employees health insurance in 2000, no longer do so.

Nationally, the average cost of health insurance is rising at double digit rates, up by 11 percent in 2001, and another 12.7 percent in 2002 nearly 4

times the rate of inflation. The health care squeeze on working families is getting tighter and tighter.

Senior citizens who desperately need prescription drug coverage are suffering, too. While their incomes are stagnating because of low Social Security cost-of-living adjustments, the cost of prescription drugs is escalating at double digit rates, increasing an average of 16 percent each year. Children who are being asked to do more in school are receiving less support. School districts faced with declining tax receipts have increased class sizes, cut weeks from school calendars, and laid off teachers. Our economy's inability to support public education is setting up America's children to fail in the global marketplace.

There is a crisis in public higher education as well that has been created by a weak economy. States are being forced to sharply cut aid to public colleges. State and community colleges in turn have increased tuition to an unprecedented rate to cope with State budget cuts.

Nationally, the gap between the cost of college tuition and the tuition assistance provided by the Federal Government has grown by \$1,900 in the last 2 years.

Millions of families have seen their retirement savings seriously eroded. The value of savings in 401(k) plans and other defined contribution plans has declined by \$473 billion in the last 2 years.

These are the realities American families face today.

It is imperative that the National Government respond to the growing economic crisis. There is much the Government can do to stimulate economic growth in the near term without generating huge deficits that will undermine prosperity in the long term. Unfortunately, the Bush administration has consistently refused to follow such a course of action.

Historically, Republicans and Democrats have had fundamentally different views on how to strengthen the economy. Republicans believe if you give tax breaks to the wealthiest taxpayers, they will invest more and the economy will grow. It is called trickle-down economics. The problem with this theory is the wealthy may not immediately use the money to create jobs and expand production. If there is no demand because consumers are not buying, companies will not produce more. They will just wait until the economic climate improves.

Democrats believe that tax relief and public resources should go to America's working families. They are the ones who are struggling most in this brutal economy, and they will quickly spend the money. They will create the demand which is needed to get the economy moving again.

It is an old debate. We have very different approaches to stimulating the economy. Republicans keep making the same mistake. If trickle-down economics worked, the economy would not

be stagnating today. In 2001, at President Bush's insistence, Congress passed one of the largest tax cuts in history, and wealthy taxpayers got the lion's share of the tax benefits. America has lost more than 2.5 million jobs since the first Bush tax cut passed. The Republican response is more of the same. But the American people want a new approach.

The President has repeatedly rejected the pragmatic advice of mainstream economists and opted instead for an ideologically rigid and ineffective strategy. His single-minded commitment to ever larger tax cuts for the wealthy as the cure to every economic ailment has made a bad situation worse. The administration has ignored remedies that would provide a significant stimulus this year, while implementing policies that will undermine our future economic strength. As a result, the economy continues to stagnate, and the number of families facing hardships continue to grow. The budget presented to Congress by President Bush this year calls for over \$1.6 trillion in new tax cuts, in addition to the massive tax cuts already enacted in 2001. According to the Congressional Budget Office, if the President's budget is accepted, the on-budget deficit will grow to \$4 trillion by 2013. More than three-quarters of that amount would be directly attributable to the Bush tax cuts. A deficit that large would make it impossible for the Federal Government to meet its most basic obligations to the American people in national security, in health care, in education, and in retirement security.

While imposing this enormous long-term burden on the economy, the President's economic growth plan would not even provide the immediate stimulus the economy needs. The economy needs a real stimulus plan. A genuine economic stimulus must meet three criteria. It must have an immediate impact. It must be temporary. And it must be fair in bringing the recovery to all Americans and not just the wealthy few.

The Bush proposal fails on all three counts. Only \$40 billion of the \$726 billion cost of the administration's plan would reach the economy in 2003, when it is needed to stimulate growth. Most of the revenue will be spent long after the recession has ended. Eighty percent of that total amount would not be spent until 2005 or later. What we need is just the reverse. We need to put much more money into the economy in 2003 and keep the long-term costs low. Temporary tax cuts to stimulate the economy are affordable, but the President's large, permanent, new tax cuts are not.

The Republican plan will not provide the timely and targeted stimulus that the economy needs.

Under the President's so-called economic growth package, households with annual incomes over \$1 million would receive an average tax cut of \$90,000 each year. They are not the ones

who are struggling to make ends meet in this faltering economy. They are not the ones who need our help. Nor are they the ones who will quickly spend the money they receive.

In contrast to this windfall for the richest taxpayers, households in the middle of the income spectrum would receive an average of less than \$300 per year in tax benefits.

The Bush plan is simply not an effective stimulus. A recent analysis of the administration's economic growth plan by a respected independent financial research firm, Economy.Com, determined that elimination of the income tax on corporate dividends, the centerpiece of the President's plan, is one of the least effective forms of stimulus, generating less than a dime of stimulus for every dollar of Federal revenue lost. By comparison, extending unemployment benefits and providing aid to State and local governments would produce substantially more than a dollar of stimulus for every dollar of Federal revenue spent.

The plans announced by House and Senate Republicans in the past few days both contain the same fundamental flaws as the Bush plan. They put far too little money in the economy this year and cost far too much in the long term. Only \$60 billion of the House's \$550 billion tax cut would go into the economy this year, and even less, just \$33 billion of the Senate's \$420 billion tax cut, would reach the economy in 2003, when it is needed to create jobs.

The Senate Republican bill reported out of the Finance Committee last week would give taxpayers who earn more than \$1 million a year an average annual tax cut of \$64,400, while middle-income taxpayers would only receive an average tax cut of \$233. Sixty percent of all the tax benefits in the legislation would go to the wealthiest 10 percent of taxpayers.

This chart I have in the Chamber reflects that. This chart is the result of an analysis by the Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center. The average tax cut for middle-income families is \$233 a year, and for the millionaires, \$64,400 a year.

While the Senate Republican bill is not as extreme as the Bush administration proposal, it still fails the test of an effective and immediate stimulus. It does not maximize the economic impact in 2003. We can create many more jobs much sooner by better targeting the resources provided in the legislation. Senate Republicans are still proposing to spend \$80 billion on a permanent dividend tax cut and \$35 billion on lowering the tax rate on the highest incomes. These cuts, which constitute one-third of the entire cost of the bill, do not provide the needed effective stimulus, and they take resources away from proposals that would.

It is incredible that Republicans could not find the dollars to extend unemployment benefits and to provide tax relief for low-income workers but

they could find the money to pay for these tax breaks benefitting the wealthiest taxpayers. These priorities are all wrong for America.

Let me just point out that in their Republican tax proposal, there are virtually no provisions for unemployment compensation for American workers—either the almost 3 million American workers who have lost their jobs over the period of the last 2 years or those who have already seen their unemployment compensation expire because of the downturn in the economy, let alone the hundreds of thousands of part-time workers and low-income workers, who are primarily women. There is no proposal whatsoever in the Republican tax proposal to have an extension of unemployment compensation in spite of the fact that the unemployment compensation fund is in heavy surplus. At this time, it is well able to afford it.

A well-designed stimulus plan could generate far more economic activity at a small fraction of the cost of the Republican proposals. The Senate Democratic plan would inject \$125 billion into the economy this year and is designed to maximize the stimulus effect of each dollar. There is twice as much stimulus effect in 2003 as the House Republican plan and three times as much as the administration's plan and the Senate Republican plan.

Three widely respected economic models all show that the Democratic plan would generate substantially more growth in 2003 and create a half million more jobs this year than the Republican plan.

In the Democratic plan, half of the total amount would be used to provide immediate tax relief to working families. It would provide tax relief to all those who pay either income tax or payroll tax and would provide additional tax cuts to families with children. The tax cuts are directed to hard-working families who need them most and are most likely to spend the dollars quickly.

The current installment of Federal unemployment benefits runs out at the end of this month, and the Democratic plan would extend those benefits.

An effective stimulus plan also needs to provide immediate, targeted tax relief for businesses to stimulate new investment. Accelerating depreciation to 50 percent for this year and tripling the amount small businesses can expense this year makes sense. The goal is to provide businesses with strong tax incentives to invest in new plants and equipment now, rather than postponing those expenditures until future years.

To be credible, a stimulus plan must recognize the dire fiscal problems that State and local governments across America are facing. The current fiscal crisis in the States is the most severe in decades. Collectively, States are facing budget deficits of nearly \$100 billion and making up for it by cutting education programs.

Last Congress we passed a good bill, a bipartisan bill, in the No Child Left

Behind Act, in order to ensure we had smaller classrooms, better trained teachers, improved curricula, and after school services. We had a whole range of commitments: improving literacy, and putting additional kinds of expectations on schools to perform. We did all of that.

But we have found now that the administration has backed out of that commitment at the same time we are finding the States are backing out. We have a golden opportunity to strengthen and enhance K through 12 education, but we are undermining that possibility with the cuts that are taking place at the State level as a result of the first Bush tax cut. And we know that this new tax request by this administration will permanently undermine our ability to fund these programs into the future.

It is important to remember that more people need to rely on State and local programs in an economic downturn. The number of people eligible for Medicaid grows substantially in times of recession, and many other costs rise as well. Without jobs and without health care, families have nowhere else to turn. They don't have the health insurance, so they have to go to the neighborhood health centers. Who do we think picks up the cost in terms of the neighborhood health centers? It is the local communities that are going to be required to do this. We should make certain that the needed resources are available for them.

Our stimulus plan would provide at least \$40 billion to hard-pressed States and communities. It would provide additional dollars to maintain health care, education, and social services. It would also help with the substantial costs of dealing with the threat of terrorism. It is money well spent which will help stimulate the economy now. Unfortunately, the President's plan completely ignores this need.

We had the hearings in our human resources committee not long ago about the dangers associated with the outbreak of SARS and about how local, State, and public health services are so heavily burdened in responding to various kinds of inquiries and tension in local communities on this, and how they are stretched to the breaking point.

SARS is not the result of a terrorist activity, but if it had been or if we should have one now, we know our public health systems are stretched to their limit. And they are our first responders. We also know that the major hospitals now are overstretched because of the reductions in their budgets. They need to be ready to contain any kind of an outbreak of a major terrorist attack that is going to use chemical or biological agents. So we are talking about matters that involve the security of this Nation in terms of terrorism and the potential use of anthrax and other dangerous substances.

The best way to stimulate real economic growth is to make sound invest-

ments in our human capital and in our infrastructure.

That is what the Bush administration does not realize. That is the essential element missing from all their economic plans. If we deny the necessary resources now, we are jeopardizing the future well-being of our people. We are also jeopardizing our future prosperity. Today we need an economic growth plan that recognizes the real forces which drive our economy and invests in them. As President Kennedy said 43 years ago, at the time of another Republican recession: It is time to get America moving again.

As debate on the tax bill progresses, I intend to offer amendments to reverse the misguided priorities of the Republican bill. One of my amendments will eliminate the dividend tax cut and the accelerated reduction in the rate of the top brackets in order to provide the necessary funding for a Medicare prescription drug benefit that will effectively meet the needs of the elderly. The people's representatives will have a chance to say what is more important for the American people, a tax cut for the wealthy or a solid prescription drug program which was effectively left out of the Medicare program when we passed Medicare in 1965. We got the hospitalization. We got the physician services. But we left out prescription drugs. We made a commitment to American seniors: Work hard and your health care needs are taken care of. We didn't say they would be taken care of with the exception of prescription drugs, but that is exactly what has happened. Every day that we have Medicare without prescription drugs, it is a violation of that commitment.

We will have an opportunity tomorrow to make a decision whether we are going to as a nation place the funding of a good prescription drug program ahead of providing additional kinds of tax reductions for the wealthiest individuals in this country. It is an issue of choice. It is an issue of priorities. The Members of the Senate will be able to make that judgment and decision. One will take place; the other will not. Which way will the Senate go?

Too many of our elderly citizens choose between food on the table and the medicine their doctors prescribe. Too many elderly are taking half the drugs their doctors prescribe or none at all because they cannot afford them. The Republican budget shortchanges senior citizens who desperately need prescription drug coverage. Prescription drug spending for senior citizens will cost \$1.8 trillion over the next decade, but the Republican budget allocates only \$400 billion additional dollars for Medicare. This \$400 billion is not even reserved just to pay for prescription drug coverage. The additional \$115 billion my amendment provides will help us to enact a real drug benefit without coverage gaps and high deductibles and will meet the needs of all seniors. It is a statement by the

Senate that mending the broken promise of Medicare and providing seniors with the lifesaving prescription drugs they need is far more important than additional tax breaks for millionaires.

The Republican budget also seriously underfunds education. I am planning to offer an amendment that would reduce the size of the tax cut and use the funds to make real the promise of No Child Left Behind.

We made a commitment to parents and children, with No Child Left Behind, that we were going to guarantee a well-qualified teacher in every classroom. We made a commitment that they would be in smaller classes. We made a commitment that parents would be informed as to the progress those children were making and the school was either making or not making. We made a commitment that we would hold schools accountable, and if the schools were not going to perform, they would be altered or changed. And if they still were not performing effectively, they would be completely reorganized. We made that commitment to parents. We made that commitment to the American people.

But we also made a commitment to the American people that we were going to do our share by providing the resources to get that done. We have failed them.

My amendment will also address the needs of college students caught up in the widening financial gulf between tuition assistance and the cost of higher education.

We make choices in the Senate. We are going to give the Members of the Senate the opportunity to make a choice about which is more important: Investing in our youngest children, and those children who are continuing their education into college as well who today are in many instances spending their time during the breaks, rather than talking about their books or the courses they are taking in school, are talking about when their next job will be and how much they will get paid and how much their student loan is going to take out of that. We know so many of the most talented and most gifted students come from hard-working, middle-income families and they turn down the opportunity to go on to school and college because they do not want to assume that debt or assume the debt for their families.

We are going to provide an opportunity for the Senate of the United States to make a choice. Do you want to provide more tax breaks for the wealthiest or do you want to invest in schools? They will have that chance tomorrow.

Unemployment benefits expire 2 weeks from now. My third amendment will extend the current program for 6 months and help the 1.1 million Americans who are long-term unemployed, and the hundreds of thousands of part-time, low-wage workers. These are men and women who have worked hard and paid into the fund. If they haven't paid

into the fund, they are not eligible. Make no mistake. These are men and women who, through no fault of their own, because of the downturn in the economy, are thrown out of work. They are able to collect some unemployment compensation. But then after a period of time, that compensation expires.

Historically, in a nonpartisan way, Republicans and Democrats together have said: We will provide a helping hand to you until we get the economy back. And then, when they are on their own feet, they repay back into that fund. That is the way it has worked historically. But not under this Republican proposal. There isn't 5 cents in here, not one nickel for these fellow Americans who are trying to pay a mortgage, educate their children, and put food on the table. We will have a chance tomorrow to vote on this issue and to find out the decision of the Members.

The debate will only last for 2 days because of the rules of the Senate. We are limited to 25 hours under the process that was accepted a number of years ago, with which I have great difficulty when we have a situation such as this.

We know that national economic policy has a most dramatic and important impact in terms of the national economic well-being and welfare. In the early 1960s, sound fiscal policy led to a long period of economic growth and price stability. We did see a reduction in taxes under President Kennedy at that time, when taxes were up to 90 percent of income. Imagine that. They went down to 70 percent.

The distribution in that tax bill, which eventually was signed into law in 1964, was for middle income and low income working families, and over \$3 billion went to reduce and close tax loopholes. We don't have that now. There are some provisions in here that raise the taxes on Americans who are working overseas. But I wish we had a committee that would review the tax expenditures the same way that we review the expenditures in terms of spending.

We hear a great deal about reduced spending, and there are areas where it should be reduced. But what we don't see is any call for reducing the tax expenditures that have been building up over years and years and benefit just the few, the privileged, in the Tax Code. They have been growing and growing and growing.

Make no mistake about it, the working families make that up every time we see another tax loophole created. If we are going to get back to a balanced budget, somebody has to fill it in, and it turns out to be the working families who are the ones filling that in. That is wrong.

When we saw a strong tax program in the early 1960s, we saw, as a result, economic growth and price stability. It continued for a number of years until we found additional expenditures as a result of the Vietnam war. Then we

saw the same thing as the result of President Clinton's economic program in 1993. After that we had the longest period of economic growth and price stability in this country in years, with the creation of millions of jobs as a result of the economic policy decided on the floor of the Senate.

We are going to be debating how to recreate this success this week in the Senate. I believe that is the most important question that will be decided by this Congress this year—outside of the particular assurance of our own national security and defense and the battle against terror.

The challenge the American people should give to us is to make sure, one, that the economic policy is going to be fair and, two, it is going to be a stimulus to the economy and, three, it is going to be temporary. If we do that, whatever the program, Democrat or Republican, we will have met our responsibilities.

We should put an emphasis on meeting the Nation's priorities with respect to education, health care and unemployment insurance.

America should be watching this debate and paying close attention because the decisions that are going to be made in the next 36 hours will have a profound impact on our economy and what kind of country we are going to be over the period of these next several years.

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

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

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I thank the Chair.

JUNK E-MAIL

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to talk about what we are going to be considering for the next couple of days, which is the fiscal policy of this country. Before I do, I am compelled to share again with my colleagues the brief remarks I had made this morning about an experience I had yesterday in my Tampa office. Having opened up the office from the weekend, our employees in the Tampa office went into their e-mail account for the Senate. What they found was their e-mail mailbox was filled with unwanted junk, so much so that one of my employees in the Washington office talks about the unwanted e-mail junk, including pornography, that comes to the Senate office in Washington. In the course of the day's activities, it takes her some 45 minutes to clean up this unwanted e-mail.

We are already seeing the statistics that it is upwards of 45 and 50 percent now of an average person's e-mail that is unwanted. Therefore, the normal course of commerce of e-mail, this new

and wonderful mechanism for instant and cost-effective communication, is being denied to our everyday consumers because their e-mail mailbox is so cluttered and, in fact, is imposed on them. Then they have to go through the process of deleting it.

I thought it was also instructive that the intern we have in our Tampa office happened to be gone for the last week and came back and checked on her own personal e-mail, and she had 321 unsolicited e-mail messages that had accumulated in the course of a week.

This is getting out of control and it needs to be addressed. In part, we addressed it last year in the Senate Commerce Committee, but legislation never flowed because there was so much of whose ox was going to get gored.

Various e-mail companies certainly do not want to impair their commerce, and so in the past they did not want any kind of check and balance on the ability to e-mail. But now we are seeing those companies such as AOL coming around and suddenly they are recognizing their ability to use their mechanism of e-mail is being impaired because there is so much unwanted junk.

As I was in the Tampa office yesterday, I happened to look through this single-spaced page of all the e-mail messages that had just come in that morning. The third one on the list was all about salacious sex pictures. Well, that is obviously not something that is appropriate and yet this kind of information is being forced on the consumers of America, and the American people are saying enough already.

What we are going to do in this session of Congress is stop it. There are only 20-some States that have addressed this issue, the most recent of which is the Commonwealth of Virginia. They have passed the most severe penalties for this kind of junk e-mail. As we address it in this Congress, what we should be doing is recognizing that if a State wants to adopt an even higher standard than the penalties we are going to set in law at the Federal level, then a State clearly ought to have the right to make it even more punitive.

The bill I introduce will basically have two parts. The first part of the legislation is going to set up criminal penalties, both financial and jail time, for unwanted e-mail.

Now, it is not going to catch the unsuspecting person whose post office you cannot trace—in other words, masking their identity because they did not intend it to. It is going to be intentional masking that we are going to stop or else they are going to get heavy fines and/or up to 5 years' jail time.

The second act we are going to prevent is we are not going to let bulk e-mails, which I think is defined in terms of over 10,000 e-mail, falsify information. If they do, they are going to suffer the consequences.

Third, we are going to try to work out some process so that normal commerce will not be impeded but that excessive junk that clutters your e-mail box will be stopped. That is the first part of the bill.

If you violate those three standards, you are going to be subject to prosecution, and the penalty is already in law for fines and/or jail time.

There is a second part to the legislation. We are going to make that first criminal act a component part of the RICO statute. That is the Racketeering Influence and Corruption Organizations Act. It was the statute passed some two decades ago giving prosecutors new tools to go after the criminal enterprise, the enterprise of many different criminal activities which had a pattern of criminal activity that became a criminal business. The prosecutors had a new tool to go after them because they could seize the assets of the criminal enterprise—not just the fine and the jail time.

If we want to be serious about stopping this, we need to get serious about fines and criminal penalties and giving prosecutors the additional tools to stop this terrible invasion of individual privacy by invading an individual's mailbox.

That is the bill I introduce today. Clearly, I have not seen a reaction like this. I mentioned this yesterday to some assembled press when I was in the Tampa office. I am getting all kinds of reaction.

The senior Senator from Virginia has arrived. I have been talking about the Senator's Commonwealth of Virginia. They just passed the strongest antispam legislation in the entire country. Virginia now has the strongest in penalties against those who clutter our consumers' e-mail boxes with unwanted mail, including pornographic stuff.

To the Senator from Virginia I tell of my personal experience in Tampa yesterday and in the Washington office today, the amount of time it takes our staff to delete this unwanted e-mail. It has become such a burden for our consumers.

I yield to the Senator from Virginia, my distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I came on the floor to see my colleague. I was aware of the Governor's action. The Governor and I have the same name, although we are not related. He has shown great leadership on this issue. We hope for the best.

Virginia has often struck out and led America in the right direction to correct what is perceived as an invasion of privacy and a wrong. I thank the Senator for his remarks.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. I look forward to working with the Senator from Virginia. Clearly, his State will be protected. There are some 27 other States that do not have laws. They are begging the Federal Government to step in and establish a standard that will stop this obnoxious practice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

DEBT EXTENSION AND THE TAX CUT

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Madam President, I rise to talk about the legislation we are scheduled to deal with this week, the debt limit extension bill and the tax cut.

The debate over the debt ceiling may seem esoteric to the folks back home, but it is actually a fairly simple issue. The President has decided to borrow more money on our Nation's credit card and now he is asking his credit be enlarged. The President's credit card is very clearly over the limit. He is asking the bankers in this room to approve his credit expansion.

So we are going to talk about it because we want to be sure he can afford to take on this much debt based on the fiscal management he is directing. By the end of this month, the President's card will be revoked because his balance will far exceed the credit card limit. What is that limit? The limit the President cannot comply with is \$6.4 trillion. That is the amount of indebtedness we are currently permitted to have.

Now he is asking us, the bankers in this case, the 100 Senators, to extend his limit by another \$984 billion. But the President does not have to pay that back. That debt is going to be deferred to future generations, about \$3,400 for every man, woman, and child in America.

Right after he gets the extension of the debt limit, the President wants to charge at least another \$350 billion on the credit card for a tax cut that goes primarily to the wealthy among us. The best part for the President is that he doesn't have to worry about paying the balance. He will hand the credit card off to someone else in a few years and say: You deal with this. All of us will be stuck with the bill—all of our children, all of our grandchildren. I personally was blessed with the birth of a ninth grandchild last Monday. I did not want to greet him with the news he might be inheriting a debt of \$3,400 as he starts life. That will be his part of the deficit we are facing. At the rate President Bush is going, maybe our great grandchildren will participate as well.

The flawed economic budget policies have been nothing short of a disaster. It is a disaster of the administration's own making. Now the President wants to make the situation worse with another bloated, irresponsible tax cut.

I thought it was common knowledge when trapped in a hole you stop digging. Our President wants us to keep on digging and digging until we are in a budgetary canyon.

This chart tells a tale of three administrations and fiscal discipline, be-

tween the growing deficits of the two President Bushes, then the Clinton administration. We see the bars go from red deficit to a white surplus in the Clinton administration. And now we are headed back for deep deficits.

We see what has been happening with our fiscal conditioning in the last years. Under the first President Bush we had a fairly rapidly growing mass deficit. And then we had a new President come in with a different view of how we ought to manage our financial affairs. In 8 years, we see an amazing change. From 1992-1993 when President Clinton took over, we see it going rapidly into a surplus.

As a coauthor of the 1997 balanced budget agreement, I was proud to work with President Clinton to attain that surplus. At the signing of the agreement as the official Senate representative, I escorted President Clinton, along with Vice President Gore and Speaker Gingrich, across the White House lawn to permit the entire country to see this historic agreement put into effect—a balanced budget agreement. We made tough choices and they paid off and we put the country's fiscal health back on track.

But shortly after President George W. Bush took over, we saw the downward slide to fiscal irresponsibility. President Bush inherited Bill Clinton's surplus and it was squandered in short order. While there are many factors in such a slide, President Bush's irresponsible 2001 tax cut undid any hope of staying in surplus. Now the President—and this is just an honest policy disagreement—now the President's answer is to borrow more and more. That is why we are talking about expanding the debt with yet another tax cut.

We already passed an irresponsible, bloated tax cut in the last Congress and it has not helped the economy. Circumstances have gotten worse and worse.

Just look at the job situation in America: How people earn their living, pay their bills, take care of their families. Those folks get a heck of a tax cut. Half of the taxpayers of middle income get about \$100 a year—basically nothing. If they should lose their jobs, heaven forbid, they will be darned lucky to find new work, and this administration is unwilling to expand their unemployment benefits.

I recently saw President Bush talking about this tax cut plan in front of a board that had written on it: Jobs, growth, jobs, growth—all over it. The White House staff made sure those words would be in every television image, every photograph of the President at that event. But simply printing the words "jobs" and "growth" on a board will not turn the President's irresponsible tax cut plan into a job creation plan.

No one seriously believes this program will do anything to create jobs anytime soon. Beyond the slogans, the reality is this administration has, unwittingly or otherwise, been a job eliminator. They have done nothing to

stimulate the economy or create jobs. They say, "Trust us, and if we get more tax cuts, some will surely dribble down to the job market."

Look at this chart:

If You Want to Keep Your Job, Stay Out of the Bushes.

Unemployment rate grows rapidly under the Presidents Bush. The higher the bars go, the worse the situation is for thousands of working people. After the high unemployment rates of the first President Bush, we saw President Clinton bring the unemployment rate steadily down, all the way to 4 percent. Virtually no economist thought we could get to 4 percent, but we did. Now we look at how President Bush, George W. Bush, has handled employment. We see unemployment rising again. Just this month we hit 6 percent.

The first Bush tax cut was supposed to create jobs, but we haven't seen any. Since January of 2001, the number of unemployed has increased over 45 percent, with 8.8 million Americans out of work. Since the beginning of the Bush administration, 2.7 million private sector jobs have been lost—over 500,000 jobs have been lost in the last 3 months, with 48,000 lost in the month of April just past.

On top of that, the administration has indicated it would like to eliminate 850,000 Federal employee jobs. In historical context, President George W. Bush has had a rather grim picture, the worst job growth record since the Great Depression. What is growing is unemployment.

Just look at this chart: From the highest job growth to the worst job growth in 58 years. That is terrible.

The chart has a certain attractiveness about it. But if you look beyond the colors, you see a very grim picture. All of these people who are presently out of work are struggling—this shows it very graphically—with an almost impossible situation.

The chart shows President Truman on the left. We see job growth in all the administrations except one. That administration is the current Bush administration. This administration is in the red. It is not creating jobs. We are losing 74,000 jobs on average each month.

Compare this administration with either of the two terms of the Clinton administration. We averaged over 200,000 new jobs throughout the Clinton administration. We are losing jobs in this country. But President Bush's preference is to give more huge tax breaks that go primarily to the wealthiest among us. He is addressing the problem with symbols and signs that suggest a rosier future, but it does not happen, and that adds outrage to neglect. In almost every category, these economic policies are failing.

Real GDP growth is another example. Look at this chart. It shows the average annual percent change in real GDP in Clinton's two terms and so far in President Bush's tenure. It is a stark contrast, as you see—the Clinton first

and second terms here and the present George W. Bush term. President Clinton had us above 4 percent real GDP growth, and President Bush's average is barely above 1 percent.

President Clinton practiced fiscal discipline and it paid off. Under President Clinton, we attained a budget surplus. Under President Bush, we are back in deficits as far as the eye can see. Just as a reminder, when President Clinton left office we were looking at the prospect of a \$5 trillion surplus over a 10-year period. Now it is expected we will have a \$2.2 trillion deficit. Look at the change—\$7.2 trillion in a period of 10 years. Under President Clinton, tremendous job growth; under President Bush, losing jobs at a record pace.

President Bush's economic policies are not working the way we would like them. I am sure they are not working the way he would like them to either. Our economy and the Federal budget are in real trouble and it is my hope there will be a reexamination of the tax cut plan in front of us. The first Bush tax cut didn't stimulate anything except the wallets of some of the most wealthy among us. Are we going to make the same mistake twice? It seems as if we are on the verge of doing just that.

We should not have to increase our Nation's debt limit. We should not have to pass the irresponsible tax bill we are considering. But the reason we are going to have to increase that debt limit \$984 billion is to accommodate another tax cut, a tax cut that will not stimulate the economy, will not reward those who are working hard to make a living, taking care of their families, providing for education and a roof over their heads, health care, all that is essential in this day and age to provide good, responsible leadership for a family. It will not help.

It is alleged that the tax cut will produce something like \$2,000 for the middle class, but it is untrue. It is more like \$100 or \$200. When you get rid of or reduce the tax obligation for the wealthiest among us, there is not enough left to do more than \$100, on average, for half of the taxpayers in the country.

So I hope we will take a second look at what we are doing and curb the expansion of debt that this country is going to have to suffer for many years, maybe decades, to come and not proceed with a tax cut that extends, again, the best benefits to the wealthiest among us, people who need it the least.

I have had many conversations with people, and we have heard from distinguished entrepreneurs such as Warren Buffett, who said he would rather not have a tax cut because he knows that if he pays more taxes, he is left with a higher result in his pocket. I think we have to look at it realistically.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. 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. DORGAN. Madam President, for the remainder of this week we are going to be discussing some very important fiscal policy issues dealing with increasing Federal debt limits and proposals to reduce taxes in our country. We will have a substantial amount of debate about both of those issues. Both of them relate to the question of whether our country's economy is growing or whether it is stagnant, whether it is producing jobs or losing jobs. I want to talk just a bit about that.

In the last couple of weeks, we have heard all of the discussions about our country having lost some 2 million jobs over the last 2½ years. In fact, in the last week or so even Michael Jordan got laid off. It tells you a little something about the state of our economy, I guess.

Some while ago, I was reading about an opening for the Oscar Mayer Wienermobile driving position. They had an opening for a driver for the Oscar Mayer Wienermobile. Most people remember what that is because they have seen it in parades or on television. So they posted this in the newspaper: We have an opening for a driver for the Oscar Mayer Wienermobile. Eight hundred college graduates applied to be the driver for the Wienermobile. That also says a little something about the state of our economy and the state of jobs.

As we discuss these issues of jobs and economic expansion, I think the first place to start is with this understanding: Both political parties in the Senate want the same thing for our country. We want an economy that expands, that provides opportunity and jobs and growth and hope for the American people. That is what we all want. There is no disagreement about the goal here. The question is, What is the menu of policies we can implement in the Congress that might help achieve this goal?

I recall, going back 10 years to the year 1993, when our economy was at that point stagnant, in deep trouble. We had the largest deficits in this country's history at that point.

President Clinton came to office, and he said: I want to put this economy of ours on a different track. I want to change some policies. And they were controversial. They passed the Senate by one vote, and passed the House by one vote, were signed into law by the President, and put this country on a different track altogether. They were not easy to vote for. I voted for them. But the easiest vote was simply to say no.

In the 1990s—as a result of fiscal policy that the American people, that Wall Street, that Main Street, that the

bond market could look at and say: This is a sound policy. It puts the country on the right track. It gets rid of these Federal budget deficits. It makes tough choices—but people had confidence, and that confidence was manifested by doing the things you might not otherwise do.

If you are confident about your job, about your family, about the future, about your security, then you buy a home, buy a car, take a trip, make a purchase, and do the kinds of things that manifest that confidence you have in the future for yourself and your family and your country. And that is the expansion side of the American economy.

In the 1990s, this economy grew and grew and grew. Millions and millions of new jobs were created in the private sector in this economy. But things have changed. We have run into some tough sledding these days. Let me describe some of the circumstances that occurred.

We began to run into an economic slowdown which then became a recession. On top of that recession, we had the terrorist attack in this country on 9/11. We had the bursting of the technology bubble and the pancaking of values in the stock market. We had the largest corporate scandals in American history. Companies such as Enron, Arthur Andersen, Tyco, and others were splashed across the front pages of America's newspapers. We saw some of America's best known executives led away in handcuffs. And we had a range of other circumstances that caused great uncertainty in this country.

As a result, instead of gaining jobs, in the last couple of years we have lost jobs. At the start of this period, President Bush was elected and came to town and said: My policy is, I want a \$1.7 trillion tax cut over 10 years. And the reason I want that tax cut, he said, is because I can see surpluses as far as the eye can see. This money belongs to the American people, and we ought to give it back. If we are going to have surpluses for 10 years, let's put in place permanent, deep tax cuts for 10 years.

Some of us said: Well, we support tax cuts, but perhaps we ought to be a bit conservative. What if something happens? What if we run into some tough times? What if we find some white water on these economic waters of ours? What if we find some difficult circumstances?

No, never mind about that, they said. This is about tax cuts right now that are permanent. And they won—by one vote. And the result is long-term, permanent tax cuts. Very shortly thereafter we discovered that we had a recession, and then the terrorist attack, then the war on terrorism, and corporate scandals. And guess what happened. Very quickly, those long-term, big-budget surpluses turned into large projected Federal budget deficits as far as the eye can see.

So things have changed dramatically. What do we do about that? The Amer-

ican people are concerned about the future. They lack the confidence that is necessary to provide a boost for the expansionary phase of the economy. What do we do about that? The President says: I have a recipe. My menu is, let's cut taxes once again.

Let me describe in economic terms where we find ourselves. In fiscal policy, we have this year a budget deficit of over \$1 billion a day that we spend more than we take in—over \$1 billion a day. That is our deficit, every day, 7 days a week, 365 days in the coming year. It is pretty hard to be more stimulative to the economy than that. You talk about Keynesian; that is Keynesian economics. Those are very large deficits. How can you be more stimulative than that to the economy? That is a huge fiscal policy stimulus.

Monetary policy: The Federal Reserve Board has driven short-term interest rates down about as far as they can go, a percent and a quarter. It is hard to see a monetary policy that is more stimulative than that.

So we have policies in place, both monetary and fiscal policies, that are stimulative. Yet our economy is barely moving. It is not producing new jobs; it is losing jobs. So what do we do about that? The President says: Let's cut taxes again.

What the President has said is that he wants to cut taxes at this moment. I want to show the consequences of that. On page 4 of the Budget Act, the concurrent resolution passed by both the House and the Senate, it says: Debt subject to limit. This is the Federal debt. It says, in fiscal year 2003, it will be \$6.7 trillion.

The President says: If I get all that I want from you, Members of Congress, I propose we grow the Federal debt from just over \$6 trillion to \$12 trillion.

What he is saying is: Adopt my plan and double the Federal debt in 10 years.

I don't know, I come from a really small town, but that doesn't seem to me like it is moving forward. It seems to me like this is losing ground. We have lost 2 million jobs. We are proposing to double the Federal debt in the next 10 years. I just don't understand how this inspires confidence in the American people that we somehow have our fiscal house in order.

I don't understand where conservatives are hiding. I thought being a conservative was to say: Let's be a bit conservative in the way we deal with this. Let's make sure we will have a sound dollar in the future. Let's make sure we have our fundamentals right. Let's make sure we are moving towards some balance in the budget. And let's make sure we are investing in things that produce big dividends for the people.

Let me say what the President has talked about. He says his dividend for the American people is to cut taxes. That all sounds good. The easiest lifting in American politics by far is for any politician to say: My proposal is to cut taxes.

I guarantee you, that makes you popular.

How about the alternative that says: My proposal is to double the Federal debt? The President is not going to say that, but that is what he is proposing. He won't get on Air Force One and go to Indianapolis to say: I have a great proposal for the people; I propose we double the Federal debt to \$12 trillion.

I would just like to hear it once because here it is. It is in black and white. It is not me saying it. It is the President proposing it here on this document. That is the end result of this fiscal policy. Will that inspire confidence about the future? It will not.

So we will have a debate this week on these proposals, and these proposals will be to increase the Federal debt limit by nearly \$1 trillion. Let's make sure we understand that. It is actually just \$984 billion. It is hard to keep billions and trillions separate in the Congress some days. They have constructed this debt ceiling increase so that it is just under \$1 trillion.

So let's understand what this means. We will vote this week to increase the debt ceiling by nearly \$1 trillion. I want to tell you how many times we will do that again in order to meet what the President proposes to happen with this fiscal policy. We will increase it \$1 trillion now, \$1 trillion later, \$1 trillion after that, another \$1 trillion later, another \$1 trillion, and finally another \$1 trillion. Those debt ceiling increases will all be necessary in order to meet the President's objective with a fiscal policy that results in doubling the Federal debt from \$6 trillion to \$12 trillion.

Is that putting this country on track? Is that making tough choices? In McCullough's book I have mentioned previously, John Adams writes to Abigail frequently, as he is serving his country in France and England. He writes to Abigail plaintively asking, in different words: Where is the leadership going to come from? Where on Earth, he asks 200 years ago, will the leadership come from to help create this new country of ours? Who will provide it?

He laments: There is only us. There is myself, George Washington, Ben Franklin, Mason, Madison, Thomas Jefferson. There is only us.

Of course, we understand now, with the hindsight of two centuries, we had some of the greatest talent in human history thinking through how to put this country of ours together. But it seems to me that it is important to constantly ask the question: Where is the leadership going to come from?—in this case on fiscal policy.

We have good people on all sides of the political aisle. The President is a good person. Members of the Senate, Republican and Democrat, come here because they have a passion in their heart to want to do good things for the country. They all share the same goal. They want this country to expand and provide opportunity and jobs and prosperity.

The fact is, they have different visions about how to approach the goal. Some believe this economic engine runs because you put something in at the top and somehow it trickles down; that which is put in at the top one day will benefit everyone. There are others who believe you give everyone a little something to work with, jobs, especially for working people, and things percolate up, and this engine runs best that way. We have had plenty of opportunities to test those theories.

Let me submit that the test in recent years has been quite clear: Put your economic house in order. Give people some confidence that you are making tough choices, that you will carve out a future for their children and grandchildren that is one we can be proud of, and have them inherit a growing economy rather than be saddled with the burden of debt. If we do that, it is quite clear that people will do what is necessary to expand this economy. If we don't, the economy languishes and contracts.

I will offer some amendments to the tax bill. I don't intend to vote for a large permanent tax cut on top of what we did in 2001. I don't intend to vote for it because every single dollar that is used for this tax cut—most of which will go to upper income people—is going to come from the Social Security trust funds. Let me use Donald Trump's name because he doesn't mind. Donald Trump puts his name on everything, and I am sure he doesn't mind. He is a very successful American businessman. Assume that a successful American businessman makes \$1 million a year in net income. My assumption is that Donald Trump does much better than that. But assume he made \$1 million a year in income. Under the President's plan, he will get a \$90,000-a-year tax cut. Now, I have just described to you that this process is going to double the Federal debt. You know and I know and everyone in the Chamber knows it is going to make it much more difficult to fund Medicare and Social Security. This plan is going to use the trust funds that we were supposed to save for Social Security. My Aunt Blanche is dependent upon Social Security. And Aunt Blanche is not going to like it when she discovers that Congress has decided to use the trust fund surpluses to provide a tax cut to people at the top of the income ladder. That is just not something she and many other senior citizens want to have happen in this country. It is not something they expect the Congress or the Government to do; yet, we are just hours away from making that mistake.

Let me try to describe a couple of amendments I am going to offer as we go through this process. There is a \$323 million expenditure included in the large tax cut legislation that will be coming to us from the Senate Finance Committee that is interesting and troubling to me as well. Do you know what it is for? It is to have the IRS go out and hire private collection compa-

nies to collect Federal tax bills. I will say that again. In this bill is \$323 million, I believe, to have the Internal Revenue Service go out and hire private collection agencies to collect taxes. That is quite a departure. We spend a lot of money on the IRS. They want to hire—the Finance Committee and those in Congress who support this—private collection agencies.

Let me give you an example of what happened. They did a pilot project of this in 1996, a test. I didn't support it then and I don't support it now. I will offer an amendment to strike this. They did a little test in which they hired private collection agencies to collect tax debt. The test was a failure. Among other things, an IRS internal audit found some collectors violated their contracts with the IRS by placing telephone calls outside the time frames specified by the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act. In this little test, there were 294 calls placed before 8 a.m., or after 9 p.m. The earliest call was received at 4:19 a.m. How would you like to get a call from a debt collection agency at 4:19 in the morning about a tax bill?

I don't support that at all. The IRS ought to collect their own receivables. They ought not turn them over to private collection agencies. This is, after all, the most sensitive of people's financial information. That test also discovered problems with the safeguarding of that information. I am going to offer an amendment that will strike that provision. I don't know whether it will prevail, but it is a terrible idea to suggest we ought to spend hundreds of millions of dollars turning some of the Internal Revenue Service collection rolls over to private collection agencies.

I will, with my colleague, Senator REID, offer an amendment dealing with the issue of concurrent receipt for retired military personnel. At the moment, as most in this Chamber know, if somebody served our country for 20 years in the armed services and they were disabled during that period, they cannot receive both their full military retirement pension as well as veterans' disability compensation. That is outrageous and that ought to be changed. Of all the things to do to disabled veterans, this makes no sense at all. We tried to fix this last year and the President blocked it by threatening to veto the Defense Authorization bill. I hope to offer an amendment with Senator REID to solve this problem.

I also intend to offer an amendment that will provide a trigger, and perhaps some other colleagues will. If they do, I will probably not offer this. But there needs to be an amendment that decides that we will have these tax cuts, provided we have the capability to offer them. If the on-budget deficit exceeds a certain amount, or the Secretary of the Treasury cannot certify that it such deficit doesn't exceed a certain amount, two things would happen: One, we would freeze some of the tax cuts

and, two, we would identify the spending in Federal agencies that represents overhead burden and cut that spending by 5 percent at the same time. So you have a combination of both delaying a tax cut and also cutting some Federal spending.

I believe also the income tax increase on Social Security benefits that occurred in 1993 should be repealed. It seems to me the question is, what has more priority, dividend exclusion for those at the upper income level, or dealing with this Social Security tax increase? I will submit an amendment to repeal the 1993 income tax increase on Social Security payments. These and other things, I think, represent a number of approaches we ought to take.

Also, this week when we deal with the increase in the debt limit, we are going to increase that by nearly \$1 trillion—but not with my vote, because I didn't vote for the fiscal policy that creates this. But for those who support it, have at it. You really ought to vote for this increased debt limit.

I am going to also propose an trade deficit amendment. The structure is not complete, but I will make this point. We have a debt limit with respect to fiscal policy in this country. When you reach that limit, bump up against it, you either have to extend it, or cut back in certain areas, or freeze spending. The fact is, there is no similar limit with respect to the trade debt.

The trade deficit on an annual basis is \$470 billion at the moment and growing rapidly. It is Katie bar the door, whatever it is, it is; nobody has to approve it, nobody has to do anything about it. The President and the trade ambassador and the Congress can sleep through it and never utter a sentence, knowing that all their newspaper friends—the major daily newspapers, friends of the Republicans and Democrats who support this trade policy—will never say a critical word about the trade deficit threatening to undermine this country's economy as well. I will offer an amendment that deals with that.

I will finish by saying this. What most American families want from their Government is pretty simple. It is what they sit around the supper table and talk about. There are very simple questions they ask each other. The questions are: Do I have a decent job? Does my job pay well? Do I have job security? Do I have decent benefits on my job? Are we sending our kids to schools we are proud of? Do we live in a safe neighborhood? Do Grandpa and Grandma have access to good health care when they reach their limited income years? Are we treating our two uncles who served this country in the Second World War fairly on veterans' health care? All of these are issues families ask about every day. It is what matters to them. It is what makes a difference in their lives.

The answers to these questions, in many cases, are what has made this a

great country. Just go around the globe and you will see the same green places where there are trees and grass, and you will see the same ground where there is sand and you will see a world that looks pretty much the same. But there is one spot that is dramatically different, and that is this great country of ours. We are lucky to be Americans and lucky to be alive now. We have inherited an obligation for us not to just think about today, but to think about our kids and about tomorrow. The one thing that has made this country, I think, really a remarkable, unique country is that we decided two centuries ago that every child in the country shall be able to become whatever their God-given talents allow them to become. We are not going to separate kids in the education process and say you are going to go to this school, or you will go to trade school and you will go to college. We don't do that. We say every kid who enters a classroom has the opportunity to be whatever their God-given talent allows. It is a wonderful thing. This notion of universal education is a wonderful thing for our country.

I told this story before. I will do it again. When I came to Congress, the oldest member was Claude Pepper from the State of Florida. He had, behind his desk, above his chair, two pictures I have never forgotten that were autographed to him. One picture was of Orville and Wilbur Wright making the first airplane flight. It was autographed to Congressman Claude Pepper with admiration from Orville Wright. Before he died, he apparently autographed a picture for Claude Pepper. And Claude Pepper had an autographed picture of Neil Armstrong setting foot on the Moon. One human being in a picture of the first person to fly and leave the Earth, and the first person to walk on the Moon.

What is the difference between those two autographed pictures in one person's lifetime? The distance is education—the science, the math, and the learning that allows us as a country to produce men and women who learned to fly and then take off and fly to the Moon. That is how important education is. It is about progress in this country.

The question for us, it seems to me, as we consider this issue of fiscal policy and tax cuts, is about choices. What is it in the choices we make in public policy in America that strengthens our country? What produces dividends, growth, opportunity, and hope in our country? What makes our country unique?

Those are the choices we have to make, and part of that, in my judgment, has always been we have been willing to choose the kinds of things that give people an opportunity. Education is about opportunity. Education, health care—one can think of a whole series of these policies that we have over many years said: Let's set these policies in place to give people opportunity.

The policies we see today coming from the Finance Committee and from the White House are to say the choice for us in every circumstance, whether it is tax cuts versus Medicare for the elderly, tax cuts versus Social Security, tax cuts versus education, tax cuts versus veterans' health care, you name it, the choice for us is tax cuts.

I know there are some in this country who say that is a pretty logical choice because, frankly, we pay too much in taxes. The fact is, with these tax cuts, we will inherit a deficit that will burden our children and their children.

The President often says: This is your money; people should be able to keep more of their money. That is certainly true. It is also the case that this is your debt, and when this \$6 trillion debt turns to a \$12 trillion debt, the question is, Isn't this debt something with which we are saddling America's children and grandchildren, and is that sound public policy? Is that the seedbed for economic growth? Does that produce and inspire confidence in the American people about the future of this economy?

The answer clearly is no. That is why my hope would be, in the coming days at least, that we could find some common ground. Perhaps there is an appetite for tax cuts that says we have to do this unabated under any circumstance, but there is perhaps another appetite by people who say: Let's do a series of things. Let's together both deal with Federal spending and Federal taxes and also the choices of investment in education, health care, and other issues. Let's do it in a way that represents sound thinking, sober thinking; in a way that gives people confidence and inspires them that we are going to have a better future.

I do not know how this is going to come out this week. I worry a great deal that we have a viewpoint that has been expressed that says: There is only one way and that is our way. It is tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts. You have big surpluses, then tax cuts. Big deficits, tax cuts. The economy is doing well, tax cuts. The economy is in the tank, tax cuts.

It seems to me that for every politician who ever has run for public office, the instinctive reaction to understanding how to be popular is to propose tax cuts. The American people, in my judgment, deserve better than that. They deserve an answer to the question John Adams kept asking: Where is the leadership going to come from to make tough choices; choices that may not be so popular, not so attractive in the short run but, in the long run, will produce opportunity, economic growth, and new jobs?

Those sometimes are choices that we are required to make in public service. I think this is one of those times.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, it is with a heavy heart that I stand before the Senate today to pay tribute to the life of CWO Hans Gukeisen.

Just before 8 p.m. on Friday, May 9, Hans was sitting in the copilot seat of an Army UH-60 air medical helicopter somewhere near Smarrah in northern Iraq. Gukeisen and his crewmembers were involved in the rescue of an Iraqi child injured by a landmine when they came upon hostile fire.

While the circumstances remain unclear, the helicopter crashed in the Tigris River killing three crewmembers. The wounded child was riding in another helicopter.

Chief Warrant Officer Gukeisen, 31, became the first South Dakota casualty of the war in Iraq, and he will be sorely missed. His mother Margaret of Hill City and his father, Terry, of Lead remember their son as a considerate and easygoing young man who enjoyed hunting, fishing, and stock car racing. A member of a proud military family, Hans was dedicated to the military and had dreamed of becoming a warrant officer and helicopter pilot. He is survived by his brother Ray, a Special Forces instructor at Fort Bragg.

I offer my deepest condolences to the Gukeisens. Their son has made the supreme sacrifice while working to protect an innocent child.

I join with every South Dakotan and every American in expressing my heartfelt gratitude to Hans and his family for his years of brave and dedicated service on behalf of our country and its ideals. We grieve his death but celebrate the life he chose to lead.

DEBT LIMIT

Madam President, I come to the floor, in addition to speaking of this very tragic moment in the life of the Gukeisen family, to talk about an issue of great concern that will be the subject of significant debate later on this week. I will take a minute, while we are waiting for others to come to the Senate floor, to talk about the issue of the debt limit.

Last June, Congress was forced to raise the national debt limit by \$450 billion to avoid defaulting on our loan obligations for the first time in American history.

Now the administration informs us that we must raise our Nation's debt limit again. House Republicans have already acted to raise the debt ceiling by nearly \$1 trillion, the largest increase in debt in our Nation's history. If the Senate follows their lead, our national debt will increase by \$1.4 trillion in less than 12 months, by far the largest 1-year increase in debt in our Nation's history.

The debt figures by themselves are shocking, but even more shocking is

the fact that at the same time there are many who, while requesting the American people take on this record new debt, but also insist on another massive round of new tax breaks that would increase the national debt by another trillion dollars or more over the next decade.

Supporters of these new tax breaks insist that they will pay for themselves. The Republican request for another nearly \$1 trillion increase in the Nation's debt limit shows that that is not so.

There are no free lunches. And there are no cost-free tax cuts.

War, recession, and terrorism have all taken a toll on America's economy over the last 2 years. But they are not the only reasons we are being forced to consider raising the national debt limit. Another major reason is the massive tax cut of 2001.

Republican economic policies are undermining the fiscal strength of the United States.

Before the 2001 tax cut, we had not had to raise the debt limit once in nearly 4 years. Now we are being asked to raise the debt limit twice in one year, for a total of \$1.4 trillion in new debt.

In 2 years, we have gone from record surpluses to record deficits.

Late last week, the Congressional Budget Office announced that the deficit this year is likely to exceed \$300 billion—an all-time high. That is without any new tax cuts, so the actual deficit this year is likely to be even higher. Many private economic forecasters warn that it could exceed \$400 billion.

Deficits and debt do matter.

The national debt clock is in the Capitol today. It shows that every man, woman and child in America already owes more than \$22,260 toward our national debt.

Last year, Americans paid \$332,536,958,599.42 just in interest on the national debt. That is money that cannot be used to educate one child, cure one illness, build one tank, or make America one bit safer.

Bigger deficits and a larger national debt also hurt America's families by driving up interest rates, which will make it more expensive for consumers to buy homes and cars and pay their credit card bills.

Yet instead of reducing the deficit—or even just slowing its growth—the administration is insisting that the American people take on more debt.

The tax and spending plans proposed by the administration will add another \$2.7 trillion in deficits to the national debt over the next decade. Just the interest on that new debt would cost taxpayers an extra \$500 billion.

Actions have consequences. Tax cuts have costs. And those costs have a real impact on the fiscal strength of our Nation and on the economic well-being of working families in my State of South Dakota and all across America.

For that reason, we sought consent yesterday, and again today, that the

Senate take up and consider the Republican request to raise America's debt limit by another nearly \$1 trillion today—before we vote on the administration's request for another trillion-plus dollars in new tax breaks and additional debt.

America has lost more than 2.7 million jobs since January 2001, nearly 100,000 jobs a month. A half-million jobs were lost in the last 3 months alone.

We are proposing a plan to get America back to work and put the Federal Government back on the path to fiscal discipline.

Our plan will create jobs, opportunity and prosperity for all Americans. It will create twice as many jobs as the Republican plan, at a fraction of the cost. It will also provide a tax cut to every working American this year, when our economy needs the boost.

We look forward to making a strong case for our plan on the Senate floor.

Before we move to that debate, however, the Senate should level with the American people about the costs and consequences of the Republican economic policies. We should admit that the Republican plan for even more tax breaks for the elite will be paid for the same way the first round is being paid for: by heaping even more debt on America's families.

Mr. REID. Will the leader yield before he leaves the floor?

Mr. DASCHLE. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. REID. The distinguished Democratic leader, I am certain, is aware of the fact that during the last 3 years of the Clinton administration there was an actual paydown of the national debt. Is the leader aware of that?

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is absolutely right. The record is very clear. In those years, we had surpluses for the first time in almost 40 years. We were able to begin paying down the debt some \$600 billion totally, and if the Senator will recall, there was even debate by those who were concerned we were paying down the debt too quickly. It sounds almost too hard to believe, but that indeed was part of the discussion.

Mr. REID. I ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if he is as concerned as I am about there being no concern as to the unbalanced budget we now have. I have in front of me statements made by Republican leaders in years past where they said, among other things:

The real threat to Social Security is the national debt. If we do not act to balance the budget and stop adding to the debt, then we are truly placing the future of Social Security in jeopardy.

That is a direct quote from a Republican leader in 1997. I have several pages of quotes about the Republicans feeling the importance of balancing the budget. Is the Senator as concerned as I am that they no longer are concerned about balancing the budget?

Mr. DASCHLE. Well, there are those who appear to argue that not only do

they not want a balanced budget but they are using the deficits to shrink the Government—a very crass, clumsy, and dangerous way of reducing Government expenditures. The majority leader in the House even argued a few weeks ago that tax cuts are the most important matter before the country, even more important than war, he argued. So clearly tax cuts have a special place in the minds of many on the other side, but as the Senator says, I do not think there is the same degree of interest or commitment to fiscal responsibility.

I was on Wall Street yesterday, and I was taken aback by the extraordinary concern expressed to me by so many people in the financial community, people who are concerned about what message we are sending about fiscal responsibility and what international investors are saying about our position. The euro continues to increase in strength against the dollar, in part because in some circles people have more confidence in the euro today than they do the dollar. Why is that the case? Because they are very concerned about the implications of U.S. fiscal policy today.

So I believe that whether it is our fiscal policy, our trade policy, our long-term circumstances with regard to the budget in particular, we are going to pay dearly for the consequences of what some have proposed in tax cuts this week.

Mr. REID. I listened to a speech just delivered, and the leader indicated we are going to be asked in the next few days to increase the national debt by almost a trillion dollars—not a billion, almost a trillion dollars. Is that what the leader said?

Mr. DASCHLE. Well, unfortunately, the request by the administration is to increase the debt by \$984 billion. That is the single biggest increase in our Nation's history. Never before has there been a request of that kind.

I would add, as I did just a moment ago, that that is in addition to the \$425 billion request that was made less than a year ago—last summer. We were told then that that increase in the debt limit would last for some time. Unfortunately, those predictions were erroneous. So now we are back again, in large measure because of the consequences of the tax cuts of 2001. So it is all the more ironic that in the very week we are going to be passing this increase in the debt limit by close to a trillion dollars, we are going to be passing the first installment of yet another trillion-dollar tax cut that will be enacted, if the Republicans have their way, before the end of this year.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statements of five Republican Senate leaders regarding their beliefs in years past about balancing the budget be printed in the RECORD.

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

IN THEIR OWN WORDS—SENATE REPUBLICANS
ON THE IMPORTANCE OF BALANCED BUDGET

SENATE MAJORITY LEADER BILL FRIST

We have a moral obligation to balance the budget . . . I'm very hopeful that we're going to see that.—[Chattanooga Free Press, 1/5/96]

SENATOR RICK SANTORUM

The American people are sick and tired of excuses for inaction to balance the budget. The public wants us to stay the course towards a balanced budget, and we take that obligation quite seriously.—[Pittsburgh Post Gazette, 11/15/95]

SENATOR TRENT LOTT

I think the most important thing really does involve the budget, keeping a balanced budget, not dipping into Social Security, and continuing to reduce the national debt.—[Chattanooga Free Press, 1/27/02]

SENATOR CHUCK HAGEL

The real threat to Social Security is the national debt. If we don't act to balance the budget and stop adding to the debt, then we are truly placing the future of Social Security in jeopardy.—[Omaha World Herald, 2/6/97]

SENATOR JUDD GREGG

As long as we have a Republican Congress, we're going to have a balanced budget, and if we can get a Republican President, we can start paying down the debt on the Federal government.—[New Hampshire Sunday News, 2/1/98]

Mr. DASCHLE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALEXANDER). The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 542 WITHDRAWN

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Earlier this morning I sent to the desk my amendment numbered 542. There is no unanimous consent agreement. I withdraw that amendment at this time because it is scheduled for a vote at 7:30 tonight and Members are not yet returned from the codel. Therefore, they would have no advance warning of the amendment. I will do it at another time. Therefore, I withdraw amendment No. 542.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

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

RECOGNIZING DON WILLIAMS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a great American: Retired Colonel Don Williams, who is

stepping down as Executive Director of the CORE Committee of Fort Knox on May 31, 2003. Since retiring from the Army in 1990 as Chief of Staff at Fort Knox, Kentucky, Don has remained in Kentucky and tirelessly fought for that installation and the community surrounding Fort Knox.

For nearly as long as I have been a Senator, Don has been a valuable source of expertise for both me and my staff. I am grateful for his friendship and his tremendous assistance on Army and Fort Knox matters throughout the years. Although Don will be retiring from his position as Executive Director, I am heartened that he will remain an active member of the CORE Committee, and will continue to be an eloquent and influential advocate for Fort Knox.

Don's efforts as Executive Director of the Fort Knox CORE Committee, Vice Chairman of the Kentucky Commission on Military Affairs, Chairman for Legislative Affairs of the Fort Knox Chapter of AUSA, Vice President of the Board of Directors of the Patton Museum, and Executive Committee Member of the Armor and Cavalry Association illustrate the extent of his dedication to the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Don's contributions to Fort Knox and Kentucky are lasting, and I will continue to support federal funding for Fort Knox projects that live up to Don's vision of Fort Knox's central role in the future of the Army.

Many of the tremendous high-tech assets at Fort Knox for which I have worked to provide Federal funding came to my attention through the efforts of Don Williams. Don deserves credit for highlighting the importance of projects such as the Zussman Mounted Urban Combat Trainer site and the high-tech research at the Mounted Maneuver Battle Lab to the Congressional Delegation. These assets have allowed Fort Knox to play an important role in training our soldiers for urban combat and designing the requirements for the Army of the Future. I will always view these important assets as just a couple of Don's legacies.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to inform my colleagues about why I would object to a unanimous consent request to proceed to the intelligence authorization bill or any other legislation that may contain a provision undoing or modifying a straightforward law establishing congressional accountability for the Total Information Awareness Program.

Just this past February, as part of the fiscal year 2003 supplemental appropriations bill, the Senate considered, debated and adopted unanimously an amendment sponsored by myself and Senators FEINSTEIN, REID, BOXER, CORZINE, LEAHY, CANTWELL, HARKIN, LEVIN, DURBIN, BIDEN, DASCHLE, and CLINTON. That amendment requires specific congressional approval for any

deployment of technology developed by the Defense Department's Total Information Awareness Program; the Defense Department must seek authorization and appropriation for any deployment of the TIA technology to another agency or department. DARPA may continue to research and develop TIA technology as long as it submits a report required by the amendment. The report is due May 20, 2003, and it requires an explanation of the intended and actual use of funds for each project and activity of the TIA Program, the schedule for proposed research and development of each project and activity and target dates for the deployment of each project and activity. The report will also address the efficacy of systems such as TIA in predictive assessments of terrorist capabilities and plans, the likely impact of the TIA Program on privacy and civil liberties, the laws that will require modification to use the TIA Program and recommendations for eliminating or minimizing the adverse effects of the TIA Program on privacy and other civil liberties.

The TIA technology will give the Federal Government the capability to operate the most massive domestic surveillance program in the history of our country. It will put the financial, medical and other details of America's private lives at the fingerprints of tens of thousands of bureaucrats. The American people have the right to know if the federal Government intends to deploy this technology against them, when it will do and how, and Congress should preserve its oversight over the program. The amendment enacted in February provides that accountability.

Just last week the American people got a painful reminder about the shameful abuse of power and secrecy in the McCarthy era, and are rightfully wary about the protection of their privacy. In fact, although some in the Defense Department and elsewhere claim they are only interested in mining "lawfully-collected" information, just about any piece of information about any U.S. citizen can be "lawfully" collected or obtained by the federal government. It is for these reasons that I will object to any motion to proceed to any legislation affecting the Total Information Awareness Program unless and until I have fully reviewed it to guarantee that the accountability in the TIA amendment is preserved.

CHANGES TO COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, section 310(c)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, provides the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee with authority to revise committee allocations, functional levels, and budgetary aggregates for a reconciliation bill which fulfills an instruction with respect to both outlays and revenues. The chairman's authority under 310(c)