wrong. Our veterans waited silently when there was no money to pay for this legislation, but today there is a budget surplus which provides the perfect opportunity to honor their service to this great Nation.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we can go to final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we are finished. We are ready to vote on final passage. I do not believe after all these long hours that anyone wants to hear a speech from anyone, regardless of how eloquent the speaker.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I really would like to hear Senator DOMENICI for a while.

Mr. DOMENICI. He is just one of the few, Mr. President. In any event, we have nothing further. The next vote is final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are the yeas and nays requested?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Without objection, the substitute amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 170), as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to H. Con. Res. 83, as amended.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 86 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Allard	Ensign	McCain
Allen	Enzi	McConnell
Baucus	Feinstein	Miller
Bayh	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Bennett	Frist	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Gramm	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Roberts
Brownback	Gregg	Santorum
Bunning	Hagel	Sessions
Burns	Hatch	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Carnahan	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Carper	Hutchison	Snowe
Chafee	Inhofe	Specter
Cleland	Jeffords	Stevens
Cochran	Johnson	Thomas
Collins	Kohl	Thompson
Craig	Kyl	Thurmond
Crapo	Landrieu	Torricelli
DeWine	Lincoln	Voinovich
Domenici	Lott	Warner
Edwards	Lugar	

NAYS—35

Akaka	Dorgan	Mikulski
Biden	Durbin	Murray
Bingaman	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Graham	Reed
Byrd	Harkin	Reid
Cantwell	Hollings	Rockefeller
Clinton	Inouye	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kennedy	Schumer
Corzine	Kerry	Stabenow
Daschle	Leahy	Wellstone
Dayton	Levin	Wyden
Dodd	Lieberman	

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83), as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 65, the nays are 35. The House Concurrent Resolution No. 83, as amended, is agreed to.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

KLAMATH BASIN WATER CRISIS

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, the Senate has just completed a long week debating a budget that I believe will help the American people in many ways, and I am proud of that work. But there are thousands of people in southern Oregon who are today getting some very bad news: the water on which the future of their farms and families depend will not be delivered this year.

As I speak, my state is currently experiencing its worst drought in seventy-seven years. And while the lack of irrigation water is not completely the fault of the federal government, the situation has been exacerbated by the actions of federal agencies, primarily the Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service, that have authority over the quantity of water provided to the farmers and ranchers of the Klamath Basin. In the midst of this natural disaster, these two agencies have issued new requirements that increase lake levels in the Upper Klamath Lake as well as streamflows down the Klamath River. These edicts were issued in spite of admissions by Bureau of Reclamation officials that the proposed water levels are not attainable this year, even if there are no agricultural deliveries.

For eight years, the Clinton Administration waged war on hard-working people who depend on natural resources to sustain their families and their communities. Sharp reductions in timber sales and the growth of onerous regulations has already weakened the economy of the Klamath Basin. Now, without irrigation water the economy stands to lose almost $144 million. This cannot be allowed to happen.

When President Bush was elected, the people of Southern Oregon breathed a collective sigh of relief, believing that help was on the way. And although this decision was set in motion by the prior administration, my constituents cannot help but wonder if better days are yet to come. Unfortunately, one thing they do know for sure is that worse times are coming this year. I do not doubt the President's dedication to farmers, ranchers, and others in the wide rural expanses throughout this land. But I do understand that many of the people in the Klamath Basin cannot help but question this administration's commitment to their needs.

While I appreciate the intermediate assistance the administration has offered, I have to again ask the President to reexamine the draconian orders that have turned a difficult drought into a crisis of immense proportions. In the meantime, I promise the people of the Klamath Basin that I will continue to fight for their needs and for the needs of their families until this dire mistake is rectified.

SUPPORT FOR THE HOPE FOR CHILDREN ACT

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, adoption is a rewarding, but often expensive and frustrating option for many South Dakota families. As a member of the bipartisan ''adoption caucus'' in the Senate I have tried to make adoption a more viable option for loving parents. During the past couple of years, we have made major improvements in adoption policy including legislation: giving parents of adopted children the same time-off rights as those who give birth; outlawing racial or ethnic discrimination in adoption; automatically giving foreign-born adoptees American citizenship; and implementing international agreements to outlaw trafficking in children and promoting international adoption.

These laws have resulted in an increase of adoptions nationwide by cutting much of the paperwork and bureaucracy of the adoption process. Yet there are still almost half a million kids in foster care nationwide, and a large number of those are minorities and kids with special needs. There are even more families who want to adopt, but simply can't afford to. More needs to be done. For too many South Dakotans, adoption is not an option because of the high costs associated with it. By some estimates, an adoption can cost upwards of $25,000 in fees, paperwork, and legal assistance.

I am pleased to be an original cosponsor of bipartisan legislation called the Hope for Children Act. This bill will help South Dakotans choose adoption by increasing the current tax credits for non-special needs children and special needs children to $10,000. This

bill will also make the tax credit permanent, adjust the credit for inflation, and increase the income cap for families to be eligible for the tax credit.

I have talked with a number of South Dakotans who have adopted children with special needs, and I discovered that changes needed to also be made to the types of adoption expenses that can be credited. For example, families adopting a special needs child may have to buy a wheelchair or special van for the adopted child with a physical disability. Counseling may also be needed for the family to cope with the extraordinary challenges of a child with special needs. Instead of being limited to the adoption expenses that the Internal Revenue Service decides are allowable, these families would be entitled to the full credit and exclusion under the Hope for Children Act.

South Dakota families will receive tax relief by the end of this year. The amount that each family gets will be the result of a spirited, yet constructive debate that will take place here in Congress. Throughout this discussion, I will continue to emphasize the need to make changes in our tax code that encourage new and growing South Dakota families through adoption.

SINKING OF THE F/V ''ARCTIC ROSE'' OFF THE COAST OF ALASKA

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to make note of the 15 people who have lost their lives in the waters off the coast of Alaska. On Tuesday, April 2 the U.S. Coast Guard received a distress signal from the vessel *Arctic Rose*. The *Arctic Rose* sank with all hands on board in the Bering sea, some 200 miles northwest of St. Paul Island. I would like to join my colleagues from the home states of these people to recognize those whose lives were lost in this tragic event, and would ask that their names be entered into the record.

Aaron Brocker, Jimmy Conrad, Robert Foreman, Edward Haynes, G.W. Kandris, Kenneth Kivlin, Jeff Meinche, and Mike Olney, all from Washington. Kerry Egan from Minnesota. Angel Mendez from Texas. Michael Neureiter from California. Dave Rundall from Hawaii. Shawn Bouchard and James Mills from Montana. I am sure I join with all members of Congress and express our sincerest condolences to the families of these men.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deep condolences to the family and friends of the 15 men who were aboard the *Arctic Rose*, which was lost at sea on April 2, 2001. On March 31, 2001, the trawl vessel left St. Paul Island, AK to fish for flathead sole in the Bering Sea. The boat was supposed to be at sea for about two weeks.

Sometime during the early morning of April 2, however, something happened that caused the *Arctic Rose* to go down. We still don't know why the fishing vessel sank, but we know that 15 men lost their lives in pursuit of their livelihoods. Nine of these men were from Washington state, and all of them leave behind families, friends and coworkers. My thoughts are with the crewmen's loved ones, who are only beginning to cope with this tragedy. I also extend my condolences to the owner of the vessel, Mr. David Olney, to the employees of Arctic Sole Seafood, Inc., and to everyone who is part of this important industry.

Most people are aware that fishing in the seas off Alaska is a dangerous occupation, but it still is a major shock when lives are lost at sea. We must continue our efforts to improve the safety of crews fishing in the Bering Sea and the Gulf of Alaska. One of the ways to improve safety is to allow the creation of individual fishing quotas, which guarantee catch to fishermen. This allows fishermen to wait for better weather before going out to sea. I have consistently supported using quotas as one tool to manage fisheries.

Many of the Alaskan fishing seasons take place during the fall, winter and spring, when the weather is often severe. This business is inherently dangerous. The *Arctic Rose* had survival suits on board, but it seems the ship went down too quickly for most crewmen to even put them on. Nor were they able to get to the life raft. We should continue our efforts to improve the safety of commercial fishing in Alaska, and throughout the country, but I doubt we will ever be able to completely eliminate the hazards.

The loss of the *Arctic Rose* reminds us of the risks commercial fishermen take every day to provide seafood enjoyed by so many people throughout the Northwest and world. Let's not take their work for granted. While we mourn the loss of the *Arctic Rose*, we should also thank the men and women who face these dangers every day to bring food to families across our country.

IMPROVED UNITED STATES-INDIA RELATIONS

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, I rise today to welcome to our nation's capital the Honorable Jaswant Singh, Minister of External Affairs and Defense for the Republic of India. Minister Singh's visit will be an opportunity to reaffirm the warm relations between our countries as a new Administration gets established in Washington. The Minister's visit to Washington will include meetings with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, as well as the National Security Advisor.

Minister Singh's visit comes at a time of major transition in U.S.-India relations. Last month, Washington welcomed the arrival of the new Indian Ambassador to Washington, Mr. Lalit Mansingh. Ambassador Mansingh succeeds Ambassador Naresh Chandra, who was well known and admired by many in Congress during his tenure. Ambassador Mansingh presented his credentials to Secretary of State Powell on March 23, and the two discussed a wide range of issues concerning the future of U.S.-India relations. Secretary Powell reiterated President Bush's intention to ''build on the good work done in the past.''

I hope that the message from the new Administration to Mr. Singh will be one of support for building on the progress in U.S.-India relations that we have seen for much of the past decade. After years of being treated as a relatively low priority, the U.S.-India relationship has, since the early 1990s, steadily moved to a higher priority on the American foreign policy agenda.

President Clinton's Administration recognized the importance of India, as a trading partner, as a force for stability in Asia, and as a leader for democracy and prosperity in the developing world. The Clinton Administration also recognized the wonderful resource that the Indian-American community, over a million strong, represents in building closer ties between the world's two largest democracies.

I hope that the Bush Administration will continue this progress. The early signs are that the Administration recognizes the significance of India to the United States. In announcing the nomination of Robert D. Blackwill as his choice to be the next Ambassador to India, President Bush spoke of ''the important place India holds in my foreign policy agenda.''

I look forward to reviewing Mr. Blackwill's nomination in my role as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. If Mr. Blackwill is confirmed, he would succeed U.S. Ambassador Richard Celeste, the former Governor of Ohio. Ambassador Celeste, who presented his credentials in November 1997, has served during an eventful time in U.S.-India relations. In the past two months, as India recovers from the devastating earthquake that struck the state of Gujarat on January 26, Ambassador Celeste has done an excellent job of helping to coordinate the American aid effort. As he prepares to leave New Delhi, I want to congratulate Ambassador Celeste for a job well done.

In the past year, with President Clinton visiting India in March and Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee visiting the United States in September, the level of friendship and partnership between India and the United States is perhaps the highest it has ever been. During last year's summits between President Clinton and Prime Minister Vajpayee, the United States and India signed a series of agreements to accelerate bilateral cooperation in a wide range of areas. The U.S.-India Vision Statement of March 2000, signed in New Delhi, pledged cooperation on counterterrorism. The two countries also pledged to cooperate on issues of nuclear non-proliferation. That agreement also established the U.S.-India