

facing down individualism, the Patriots set a wonderful example, showing us all what is possible when we work together, believe in each other, and sacrifice for the greater good.

That example came from the top, and it came from the start of the season. Choosing to be introduced before the game as a team, not as individuals, the Patriots set the tone for their victory. Coach Bill Belichick stressed teamwork, saying that only by working together could the Patriots overcome their opponent, the best team in the NFL's regular season, the St. Louis Rams.

The coach put his faith in second year quarterback Tom Brady, the youngest quarterback ever to win a Super Bowl, and the eventual MVP of the game. At the same time, Drew Bledsoe, team captain and the consummate team player, cheered him—and the entire team—from the sideline.

But this was not a game won by a star quarterback alone, it was a team effort. No one player rose above the rest—but together, they excelled and defied long odds. The defense, a no-name bunch forced to depend on each other, stifled the high-octane Rams offense. It was this defense, led by Ty Law, Teddy Bruschi, Mike Vrabel, and rookie Richard Seymour, that got the Patriots ahead early in the game.

The second half saw a Rams comeback, and a lesser team could have fallen under such dire circumstances. But these Patriots once again banded together, for one final drive. With the game tied, momentum on the side of the Rams, and overtime seemingly inevitable, the Patriots showed their true spirit, using running back Kevin Faulk, receiver Troy Brown, and intelligent play from Brady to drive from inside their own 20 yard line to give kicker Adam Vinatieri a chance to win the game with only 7 seconds left on the clock. As his kick sailed through the uprights, the Patriots completed their unthinkable task: they defeated the Rams, and won their world championship.

All of us in Massachusetts, and indeed all who live in New England, are proud of the Patriots and their extraordinary season. They finished the season with 9 straight victories, a feat that could only be accomplished by a team using all 53 players on its roster. The Patriots had to win two tough playoff games to make the Super Bowl. And even after these improbable victories over the Oakland Raiders and Pittsburgh Steelers, they were big underdogs to the Rams yesterday. Unfazed by these odds, the Patriots won again, defying their critics and naysayers.

Eight years ago Bob Kraft bought the Patriots, and today he will bring the Lombardi trophy home to fans who have been waiting for 42 years. Congratulations.

The Rams also deserve credit, as they had a spectacular season and played a wonderful game. They are certainly an impressive team.

The Patriots' hard work and dedication encapsulates the new spirit in America. I urge the Senate to approve this well-deserved resolution, which I will offer today.

In Boston, April 15 is Patriots' Day—a day when we celebrate the brave men and women who fought for our Nation's independence. But, for generations of New England sports fans—from Bangor to Boston—yesterday will always be our Patriots' Day.

Today, the New England Patriots are the true patriots all over the land. Their perseverance, teamwork, and devotion represent the best of America, and I'm proud to call them not only my home team, but also world champions.

Mr. President, I would like to speak further to the Senate and ask if I could extend my time for an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT, pro tempore. Hearing no objection, the Senator is recognized for the additional 10 minutes.

THE BUDGET

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the budget President Bush presented today clearly demonstrates that we cannot meet our national security needs in the wake of September 11, and afford to fully implement the enormous tax cuts which were enacted prior to that fateful day, unless we ignore our vital education, health, and human resources needs.

All of us agree that we must spend what is necessary to defend the Nation against the threat of terrorism. These new demands on our resources, coupled with the recession, necessitate a reevaluation of the entire budget picture—including the expenditure of \$1.7 trillion to finance the tax cut. Unfortunately, when it comes to the tax cut, the administration is unwilling to admit that the world has changed. If future tax cuts which disproportionately favor our wealthiest citizens are treated as a sacred cow, many of the programs that help our neediest citizens will be sacrificed. The war requires shared sacrifice, not placing all the burden on those families least able to carry it.

Today, we find ourselves in a dramatically different and far less advantageous position than we did one year ago. In January 2001, CBO projected a \$5.6 trillion surplus for fiscal years 2002–2011. One year later, the projected surplus for that period is only \$1.6 trillion, nearly all of it attributable to Social Security. According to CBO, an on-budget surplus will not reappear until fiscal year 2010. Four trillion dollars of the surplus is gone.

Whatever the merits of last year's tax bill at the time it was enacted, those circumstances clearly no longer exist. In the aftermath of September 11, we are facing major new demands on our national resources which must take priority. We cannot meet these demands and afford such an enormous tax cut without raiding Social Security

and Medicare. Jeopardizing the security of millions of senior citizens to finance the full tax cut is not an acceptable price to pay. We cannot now afford the entire tax cut without ignoring critical national needs. Neglecting our children's education and the health and well-being of our families to finance this tax cut is not an acceptable price to pay. Yet, that is what the administration budget would do. At this critical moment, the Senate must transcend the old boundaries of the debate, and act in the nation's best interest.

Social Security is a major victim of the President's budget. His budget does not merely dip into the Social Security Trust Fund for a couple of years when we are experiencing a recession and fighting a war. It proposes to raid Social Security every year through at least 2010, taking a total of \$1.464 trillion out of the trust fund. The magnitude of the administration planned raid on Social Security is truly shocking. It would dramatically weaken Social Security's long-term financial stability. This reckless scheme seriously threatens the well-being of every senior citizen and disabled person who will be depending on the program in the years ahead.

Even with the raid on Social Security, the budget does not meet the nation's critical domestic spending needs. Discretionary domestic spending does not even keep pace with the rate of inflation. It receives a real dollar cut.

The only fiscally responsible course of action now is to postpone some future tax cuts that exclusively benefit the wealthiest taxpayers. These future tax breaks are not scheduled to take effect until 2004 and later. However, if they are allowed to take effect, they will cost hundreds of billions of dollars by the end of the decade. By delaying them, we can save approximately \$350 billion. More than one trillion dollars of tax cuts will still take effect as scheduled.

Under the plan I have proposed, no taxpayer would pay a higher tax rate than he or she paid last year. In fact, income tax rates for everyone would be lower in 2002 and in succeeding years than they were in 2001. The child tax credit would be increased as planned and marriage penalty relief would be provided as scheduled.

The \$350 billion in cost savings would result solely from a delay of future reductions in the tax rate paid by the wealthiest taxpayers in the highest income brackets and from maintaining the estate tax on estates above \$4 million. While a small number of the most wealthy taxpayers may receive less of a tax reduction than they anticipated, they will still be receiving billions of dollars in new tax breaks as a result of last year's bill. Especially in a time of national crisis, it is certainly reasonable to ask them to contribute a fair share to keep our Nation strong.

These future tax cuts for those at the top are not part of the fight against the recession. They are not scheduled

to occur until long after the economy emerges from the downturn. In fact, taking fiscally responsible action now will actually help the economy—by leading to reductions in long-term interest rates that have remained stubbornly high because of the fear that unaffordable tax cuts will lead to growing Federal deficits throughout the decade. Reducing that threat will reduce the cost of long-term borrowing for businesses, and provide a stimulus for new job creation now.

Such a modest reduction in future tax cuts will help us to meet our responsibility to the American people to improve education all along the continuum from birth through college, to extend better health care to more people, and to ensure that workers can find the training that they'll need to fully participate in the modern world economy. The American people have not made future tax cuts their first priority, and Congress should not either.

At the very least, fairness and fiscal responsibility require that future tax cuts be reduced by the cost of the increased defense and homeland security spending these perilous times require. This would allow our domestic priorities to receive the same funding which all of us agreed last year was the essential minimum.

We have only had the administration's budget for a few hours. However, the disturbing neglect of many of our Nation's most pressing domestic needs is evident. I would like to take just a few moments to describe those to the Senate at this time.

First of all, let us take the area of health care. Support for our public hospitals will be reduced by \$27 billion.

The public hospitals in this country are some of the most beleaguered health institutions that we have in this Nation. They are the ones that respond to the pressure when unemployment increases and millions of workers lose their health insurance. Where do laid-off workers go when they get sick? Where do their children go when they get sick? They go to the public hospitals. They are the principal institutions that treat the uninsured and the neediest people in our society.

The idea that we will see additional reductions in terms of support for these major institutions, which are primarily in the great urban areas of our country and operating on such a narrow edge in any event because of the extraordinary kinds of burdens they are facing, is a major mistake from a health policy point of view in terms of caring for our fellow citizens.

Reductions in the support for the training of pediatricians in our children's hospitals by some \$85 billion is also a major mistake. We want to make sure we are going to have the best trained pediatricians in the world to care for our children. I think the idea that the budget is going to short-change the training for those individuals who have made a commitment to making a difference, effectively equals

a reduction in the quality of care, and is shortsighted. We are talking about caring for the children of this country.

We see further reductions in support for medical education, which will clearly reflect itself in a reduction of quality. We have many challenges in our health care system, but one of the most important successes of our health care system is the training, the professionalism, and the quality of our health professionals, who are the envy of countries all over the world. Our training of health professionals is a magnificent example of the best we can provide.

We have other challenges in the delivery of health care services. For example, the cost of health care and the fact that we don't pay for prescription drugs, which our elderly desperately need. But the training of well-qualified personnel is something in which all of us take a sense of pride. We should not lose it. We are seeing a significant reduction in terms of support.

We are seeing reductions in health care professionals at a time when we still have a very significant imbalance in underserved areas—both in rural areas and urban areas. To see a reduction in support for that kind of program makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

Cutting funding in terms of the Child Care Development Block Grant program, at a time when the program is only serving about 12 percent or 15 percent of the need in this country, fails children. Considering the importance of that program for working families, and particularly for the working poor, it also fails workers and families.

Seeing resources cut that help States move individuals from welfare to work, and which can also be used for childcare, training programs, and transportation, undermines our effort to help move people from a sense of dependency into independence.

I am disappointed in the area of education funding after we worked very conscientiously with the Administration to restructure the K-12 program. We are reaching only a third of the children who would be affected by the thrust of the Title I provisions of the reform of education programs. We are effectively going to see the same number of children covered. Because of the recession, an increasing number of children will qualify. One billion dollars of that is going to be cumulative. We are only reaching about a third of the children rather than meeting the needs of all the children who could benefit from that program.

There is effectively an increase of \$1 billion in terms of IDEA, which is the program to help local communities all across this country offset some of the burden they are facing in providing educational opportunities for special needs children. At this rate, it will take 15 to 17 years before we meet our responsibilities in assisting local communities and States in this area. We are failing our special needs children

by failing to give that program the support it should have.

Finally, in the area of teacher quality, there is only level funding. Similarly, for after school programs and bilingual education, there is no increase.

We spent a great deal of time in the last Congress to make sure we were going to use the best of Republican ideas, Administration ideas, and Democratic ideas to try to bring about changes in our educational system, but we all knew it was going to take a combination of reform and resources. As we pointed out during the course of the debate, just having reform without the resources was not going to be consequential. Just having resources without the reforms was not going to be meaningful. We tried to bring those two elements together. I think we did a good job, but now we see in this budget no increase for many of these provisions—many of which are so important in terms of strengthening academic achievement and accomplishment for our young people.

Finally, about 400,000 children drop out of school every single year. We have the Youth Opportunities Act to try to reach out to those young people, to try to get them back into school, and to try to get them employment. One of the major reforms of the Workforce Investment Act, it is an effort to provide educational opportunities and job training to our most impoverished youth. Effectively, that program has been emasculated. The new Administration budget dramatically cuts funding for the program, beginning its eventual phase-out.

It makes absolutely no sense. We were trying to get reforms in terms of education, and then with the Youth Opportunities Program we were trying to reach out to children who have dropped out and try to bring them back into the system, either to complete their education or to move them into training programs so they can be productive. That program has been undermined.

There are training programs for workers to get the skills necessary to be able to compete and produce—on-the-job training programs which have really been the result of very strong bipartisan efforts to reform the 128 different job training programs and 12 different agencies.

Republicans and Democrats worked together. We streamlined these programs in a very efficient and effective way to try to help workers develop new skills in order for them to be more competitive. We now find out this program is being significantly undermined.

If you are talking about young people, if you are talking about failing to develop an effective prescription drug program for our seniors, if you are talking about missed opportunities in the area of education and in training for young people, that is all reflected in this budget.

The final point is that we are in danger of using up all of our Social Security funds, paid by working men and women, by transferring them into a tax break for the wealthiest individuals in this country. The tax breaks that will go into effect in 2004 have jeopardized our ability to meet important domestic priorities. There is going to be a battle during the course of this year in terms of priorities. I look forward to being a part of that debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I will use the 10 minutes available in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

THE BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, one of the issues we are faced with, which will be most controversial, I suppose—and certainly very important—is that budget about which the Senator from Massachusetts has been talking. Obviously, there are different views as to how one deals with the budget. It is always that way.

There are those who think there is a never-ending demand for more spending and, therefore, more taxes, and that the Federal Government ought to be involved in all of our activities in our lives. There are others who believe there are essential elements the Federal Government should address itself to; they change at different times, of course.

So it seems to me, as we take a look at this year's budget and this year's spending and this year's taxes, we have to take a look at the situation we are in and seek to meet the goals of our time. And those goals change from time to time.

America faces a unique moment in our history. Our Nation is at war, our homeland is threatened to be attacked, and our economy is in recession. If those are not factors that ought to be taken into account with respect to a budget, I don't know what would be.

The President's budget has just come to Congress today, so we do not know a great deal about the details. We will be holding hearings starting tomorrow, and we will know more about it. But the outline of the budget, it seems to me, meets the requirements of victory in this war in which we are involved, as well as the tests of responsibility for those areas in which the Federal Government, indeed, has a responsibility.

It holds the Government accountable for results that address the priorities of the American people: Winning the war on terrorism, strengthening the protection of our homeland, revitalizing the economy, and creating jobs.

Defense spending is increased by 12 percent. His budget nearly doubles homeland security spending. So it provides for the kind of safety all of us

certainly have put at the top of our priorities at this time. The growth for spending in programs outside of defense, then, are held to 2 percent. We have been having something around 6- and 7-percent growth when we have not had the terrorism threat. So growth in those areas is reduced.

I think one of the interesting issues—and a little different than what we have just heard—is that the President's budget provides significant funding increases for health care, prescription drugs, education, the environment, agriculture, and retirement security, and returns to budget surpluses within 2 or 3 years if, indeed, we have the kind of economic return that we are talking about from the way we spend our dollars. The fact is we do not have the reserves that we did have; in relation to tax decreases it is a relatively small amount, about 14 percent. The remainder of the loss in revenues has been for increased spending in the war on terrorism and the recession.

So if you are talking about surpluses, the way you get to deal with surpluses is to increase this economic movement forward, to increase the growth in the economy. That is where the surpluses came from, certainly not by increasing taxes at a time when we are in a recession.

So the priorities, of course, will be winning the war on terrorism—some \$38 billion, a 12-percent increase, to increase the capacity of our military, to improve the living conditions of our military, and so on—and strengthening our homeland security, which, of course, whether it be boundary patrol or whether it be airline security or whether it be bioterrorism or whether it be the emergency improvement of intelligence, are things that clearly must be done.

But, of course, if we are really to deal with this business of budgets and this business of surpluses, we have to deal with the economy. That is what we are going to be dealing with later this afternoon, tomorrow, and the next day in terms of an economic stimulus—to provide more push to those signs of an increased economy that we have before us. Hopefully, we can do that. The best way to guarantee surpluses in the future is to strengthen the economy.

Education: This proposal builds on the successful passage of the No Child Left Behind Act, which the President and the Senator from Massachusetts had a great deal to do with and gave leadership. In fiscal year 2002, it dramatically increases to historic levels the funding for special education with \$8.5 billion, boosts funding for low-income students \$5 billion, funds important reading initiatives so that every child can read by the third grade, and provides \$10 million for a new initiative to recruit librarians. So the idea that we are ignoring education simply is not the fact.

Health care: It provides a refundable tax credit to subsidize up to 90 percent of the cost of health insurance for low-

and middle-income Americans. It expands the number of community health centers by 1,200 to serve an additional 6.1 million patients. It doubles NIH medical research spending. That is this budget we are talking about. For prescription drugs, it provides \$190 billion to strengthen Medicare with Medicare prescriptions over a period of the next 10 years.

The environment: It provides record funding for EPA's operating budget. It fully funds the land and water conservation fund. It eliminates the park maintenance balance by 2006 if we continue to do it that way.

Energy, of course, is one of the real issues. It provides \$9.1 billion for incentives.

At any rate, those are items in the budget. The point is that we really need to look at where we are and how we are going to best manage additional spending on our war on terrorism and providing for our safety and freedom and trying to get the economy moving so that we will have more and more revenue without increasing taxes. I cannot think of a worse time to increase taxes by eliminating tax reductions than at a time of recession.

So these are the issues that each of us will have to deal with as time passes. I think we will be able to do this. Certainly, we have done it before. I think it is very important we have a budget agreed to by the Congress so we have some constraints in spending so we have a budget that says to the appropriators: Here is the amount that can be used for agriculture, and here is the amount that can be used for whatever. Otherwise, of course, there is no end to the amount of spending.

There are a million things that we would like done, but we have to give some thought to what is the appropriate role of the Federal Government in terms of participation in these various programs? What is the State's role? What is the local government's role?

We hear—when I am home, at least—that we have too much Federal Government in our lives, but, on the other hand, we ought to have more money for these things. You have to make decisions between items to decide if you like Government closer to the people, if you like the calls made by the bureaucracy from Washington. These are the kinds of things I believe ought to be decided. So budgets are quite more than the amount of money that is going to be spent, even though, of course, that is the discussion.

Budgets are a matter of determining priorities, a matter of taking a look down the road as to where we want our country to be, what kind of programs we think are best for growth, for creating jobs, so people will be able to work in good jobs, and to be able to decide what the role of the Federal Government is vis-a-vis the other levels of government that are so important to us.