

as they try to address the aviation security quandary in a much better way than is currently being done, to protect the jobs of tens of thousands of hard-working Americans. We are also trying to keep competition in aviation and trying to get Americans and America's airways flying again.

I thank my colleagues and urge their support for this very important amendment for jobs, for the commercial aviation industry, and for the traveling public. This amendment also puts the Senate on record as keeping our word to this very important part of our economy.

Thank you and I yield the floor.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Byrd-Stevens amendment that would protect the funding for the airline financial support program established by the Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act of 2001.

Congress and the President moved swiftly after September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks to provide the airline industry with critical financial support to avoid a crisis in our national transportation network and in our economy.

The Air Transportation Safety and System Stabilization Act signed into law on September 22, 2001 was designed to give airlines access to up to \$15 billion in assistance. It included \$5 billion for direct aid to pay for industry losses associated with the results of the World Trade Center and Pentagon attacks. It also included \$10 billion for loan guarantees.

The Fiscal Year 2002 supplemental appropriations bill which we are debating this week would have reduced the size of the loan guarantee provision to \$4 billion. The Byrd-Stevens amendment before the Senate for consideration this afternoon would strike the provision in the supplemental and restore the program to the full \$10 billion level.

I voted for the legislation that established this important financial assistance program in order to ensure the financial viability of the airline industry—which generates 3 percent of the gross domestic product, almost \$273 billion. There is no question as to the significance of airline service not only to our quality of life, but also our national economy. In my home state of Maine, over 56,000 jobs, \$1.29 billion in payroll, and \$3.73 billion in sales are tied to the availability of scheduled commercial air service.

In the wake of the attacks of September 11, thousands of airline employees lost their jobs and remain laid-off. Most major airlines continue to operate more limited schedules than before September 11. United Airlines and American Airlines both announced layoffs of 20,000 personnel and schedule reductions of about 20 percent.

The airlines have begun to re-hire some employees and restore service, but we are still not where we were prior to September 11. Approximately 750 to 1,000 aircraft that were in oper-

ation before the terrorist attacks are out of service to this day.

According to the Air Transport Association, the airlines suffered losses of about \$1.4 billion during the aviation system lockdown that followed the tragic events of September 11. And they have continued to lose money. Before September 11, the airline industry was expected to lose \$1 to \$2 billion in 2001. In the aftermath of September 11, the losses exceeded \$7 billion, and could have been even worse if not for the financial assistance package passed by Congress and signed by the President.

US Airways, the only commercial carrier to serve all six of Maine's commercial airports, warns that without the loan guarantees, it may be forced into bankruptcy. US Airways is a major carrier providing service along the Northeast corridor, and with some hub operations based at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport, suffered significantly as a result of increased security requirements and reduced service levels to Washington.

I think the numbers speak for themselves. I believe it is critical that we restore this funding, and I urge my colleagues to join in a strong show of support of this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to thank our distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator BYRD, and Senator STEVENS for this amendment, which is so very important to tens of thousands of airline industry employees across the country.

This amendment will restore the integrity of the loan guarantee fund we established in the Air Transportation and System Stabilization Act of 2001, and ensure that airlines suffering from the continued effects of September 11 will be able to remain strong and competitive.

I greatly appreciate the efforts of Senator BYRD and STEVENS to put the U.S. Senate on record with this issue as the fiscal year 2002 emergency supplemental appropriations bill moves to conference with the House of Representatives. Their leadership is so very important, because the House bill has a provision that would cripple the loan guarantee fund, a provision that may well bankrupt more than one major U.S. air carrier.

I also want to recognize the thousands of airline industry workers who made their voices heard on this issue over the Memorial Day recess. These workers united in a most impressive way to lobby on behalf of their companies. I found their commitment inspiring, and I want to congratulate them on this great victory they have won on the Senate floor today.

Mrs. CARNAHAN. Mr. President, I support the Byrd-Stevens amendment, which will preserve the loan guarantee program that we established last year.

We acted swiftly and in a bipartisan fashion to respond to the September 11 attacks.

We authorized the use of force, we appropriated funds to start rebuilding, we

bolstered security efforts, and we took important action to assist the aviation industry.

As part of our initiative to promote the ongoing stability of the aviation industry, we created the Air Transportation Stabilization Board, ATSB, to ensure that airlines would continue to have access to capital.

Now, after the ATSB has approved just one airline's application, the bill before us is seeking to impose new limits on this extremely important program.

I think this is unwise, and I am supporting this amendment to strike these new limits from the bill.

When we enacted the airline stabilization bill last year we essentially made a promise of assistance to struggling airlines.

Limiting this program now would be unfair to airlines that are counting on it to help them in their efforts to regain sound financial footing.

One airline that is particularly in need of assistance is Kansas City-based Vanguard Airlines.

As a member of the Senate Commerce Committee, I understand how important low-fare competitors are in our aviation system.

As a low-fare airline operating out of Kansas City, Vanguard contributes substantially to keeping airfares competitive in Kansas City and throughout the Midwest.

Not only did September 11 have a devastating financial impact on Vanguard, but it severely limited the company's ability to obtain private financing as well.

Vanguard's approximately 1,000 employees have been fighting diligently to improve the company's financial standing.

But securing additional capital is absolutely essential to the company's long-term health.

I have been extremely frustrated and disappointed by the ATSB's reluctance to approve Vanguard's application.

I am committed to ensuring that the loan guarantee program is maintained in its current form.

Moreover, I plan to continue working with Vanguard as it re-submits its application in an effort to achieve a positive outcome.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:35 having arrived, the Senate stands in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:35 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. EDWARDS).

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3557

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Byrd-Stevens amendment.

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

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) would vote "yea."

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

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 131 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Akaka	Dodd	McCain
Allard	Dorgan	McConnell
Allen	Durbin	Mikulski
Baucus	Edwards	Miller
Bayh	Ensign	Murray
Bennett	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Frist	Nickles
Bond	Graham	Reed
Boxer	Grassley	Reid
Breaux	Gregg	Roberts
Brownback	Hagel	Santorum
Bunning	Harkin	Sarbanes
Burns	Hatch	Schumer
Byrd	Hollings	Sessions
Campbell	Hutchinson	Shelby
Cantwell	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Carnahan	Inhofe	Smith (OR)
Carper	Jeffords	Snowe
Chafee	Johnson	Specter
Cleland	Kennedy	Stabenow
Clinton	Kerry	Stevens
Cochran	Kohl	Thompson
Collins	Kyl	Thurmond
Conrad	Landrieu	Torricelli
Corzine	Leahy	Voivovich
Craig	Levin	Warner
Crapo	Lieberman	Wellstone
Daschle	Lincoln	Wyden
Dayton	Lott	
DeWine	Lugar	

NAYS—4

Enzi
Fitzgerald

Gramm
Thomas

NOT VOTING—5

Domenici
Helms

Inouye
Murkowski

Rockefeller

Mr. REID. 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.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent all first-degree amendments on H.R. 4775 be filed by today at 5 p.m. except a managers' amendment, an amendment by Senator BYRD, and an amendment by Senator STEVENS, or their designee; and any second-degree amendments be relevant to the first degree to which offered, or deal with offsets for the first degree; that upon disposition of all amendments the bill be read the third time, the Senate vote on passage of the bill, and upon passage, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, without intervening action or debate.

Mr. McCAIN. Reserving the right to object, I will be objecting for several

reasons. One is that just today we received from the administration a statement of administration policy. I will read from it: If the supplemental appropriations bill were presented to the President in its current form, the senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

In this message, there are a number of specific items that the President mentions in his message. We will—at least I and the Senator from Texas and others will—try to come forward with a package of amendments that comports with the President's statements. There are a number of specifics in there, many of which we already discovered, some we haven't.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCAIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. Would the Senator be able to have that letter from the administration made a part of the RECORD?

Mr. McCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the President's statement of administration policy dated 4 June 2002 be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT
AND BUDGET,

Washington, DC, June 4, 2002.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

S. 2551—MAKING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES, FY 2002

This Statement of Administration Policy provides the Administration's views on the FY 2002 Emergency Supplemental Bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

While the Senate Committee bill funds the Defense request at the President's level, it exceeds the President's request for other programs by more than \$4 billion and funds numerous lower priority non-emergency programs as "emergency" needs. The Administration strongly opposes this bill and also would strongly oppose any amendment to further increase spending above the President's request. For instance, the recently enacted Farm Bill provides an historically high level of agriculture spending that can accommodate funding for emergencies, economic assistance, rural development, and other purposes. The Administration supported the Farm Bill to ensure farmers have the resources they need. The Farm Bill breaks the bad fiscal habit of needing to pass emergency agricultural spending bills including drought assistance and other supplemental payments that make it difficult for Congress to live within its budget leading to uncertainty for farmers, ranchers and their creditors. The Administration strongly opposes any new agriculture spending.

In addition, the bill severely constrains the President's ability to fund emergency homeland requirements by compelling him to release non-emergency money provided in the bill. If the supplemental appropriations bill were presented to the President in its current form, his senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill.

Overall Funding Level

The proposals for emergency funding included in the President's request were crafted to provide critical resources to support the war on terrorism, secure the homeland,

and help dislocated workers as the Nation continues to recover and rebuild following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. It is important to note that Congress has already provided \$40 billion since September 11th and only half of those funds have been spent. The President's FY 2002 emergency supplemental request was targeted at this year's immediate emergency needs and funding in addition to this request is not warranted at this time.

The Senate bill includes scores of unneeded items that total billions of dollars—all classified as an "emergency." The bill adds unrequested funds for numerous programs and projects throughout nearly all of the Federal agencies. While some of these items relate to homeland security, many do not, including: \$11 million to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) for economic assistance to New England fishermen and fishing communities; \$26.8 million for the U.S. Geological Survey for urban mapping activities; \$2 million for the Smithsonian to begin design of an alcohol storage facility for specimens away from the Mall (President's FY 2003 Budget already includes funding for this project in FY 2003); and, a directive for the Department of Energy to construct duplicate waste treatment plants in Ohio and Kentucky that will cost at least \$100 million more than necessary. In addition, without regard to the quality of the awards, the bill requires \$26 million more new Advanced Technology Program awards than the Administration recommends for 2002. These awards are not related to homeland security needs, may not meet the Federal Government's standard of peer review, and over their duration are likely to cost the government over \$75 million.

While the Administration is pleased that the Senate Committee provided \$1 billion of the \$1.3 billion needed to finance the Pell grant shortfall, the Administration objects to the provision that designates these funds as an "emergency." The Administration urges the Senate to follow the House's lead and offset this funding. The Administration will continue to work with Congress to identify offsets necessary to finance this and any other non-emergency activities that have not been fully paid for in the bill.

The Administration believes the funding requested for assistance to Colombia is crucial to support the struggle against drugs and terrorism in that country. The reductions in funding and the restrictions on the requested expansion of counternarcotics authorities in Colombia will impede the Administration's prospects of defeating these twin threats.

Homeland Security Needs

While the Senate Committee bill fully funds the President's request for the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), the Senate version of the bill provides \$2.6 billion more than the Administration requested for homeland security-related funding. This funding could not possibly be obligated in the remaining months of this fiscal year, and therefore is not an emergency.

The Senate bill provides \$175 million in new, unrequested funding for the Agriculture Department for research, inspection, and monitoring activities related to bioterrorism. Significant resources have already been provided through the Emergency Response Fund (ERF) as well as in the FY 2003 President's Budget request. For example, funding provided for the construction and renovation of an Ames, Iowa facility is redundant because a total of \$90 million has been provided for FY 2002 as part of the ERF and regular appropriations, so that additional funding is not needed in FY 2002 and FY 2003.

The Senate Committee also added \$100 million for nuclear non-proliferation activities for the National Nuclear Security Agency (NNSA). It is not possible for NNSA to use these funds in the remaining four months of the current fiscal year. The Senate bill also provides \$315 million in unrequested funds for Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) buildings and facilities, including \$278 million for accelerated planning, design, and construction of new facilities, of which \$28 million is designated as bioterrorism-related. CDC will not be able to obligate this additional funding in FY 2002 since they may not even be able to obligate all of the \$250 million they already received in FY 2002 for buildings and facilities. To date, CDC has obligated approximately \$18 million (7 percent) of its FY 2002 funding. In addition, the appropriate analyses have not yet been completed for many of these activities making it unlikely that these funds would be spent until well into FY 2003.

The bill also includes \$85 million for the Justice Department's COPS program to create a new grant program to finance communications equipment for local first responder agencies. Communications equipment is a major focus of the \$3.5 billion first responder initiative the President has proposed for FEMA in his FY 2003 budget. The creation of a new grant program for these purposes in the Department of Justice runs counter to the Administration's proposal to consolidate First Responder programs in FEMA, and in any event is duplicative of efforts currently underway in the Office of Justice Programs and FEMA.

The Administration also objects to the proposed creation of a Principal Associate Deputy Attorney General for Counter-terrorism. While well-intentioned, the creation of this position would hinder, rather than enhance, the Administration's counter-terrorism efforts by creating another unnecessary layer of bureaucracy. In addition, this program would complicate recently announced restructuring plans by the Federal Bureau of Investigation to enhance counter-terrorism efforts.

Restrictions on Presidential Authorities

The Senate version of the bill also unduly restricts the President's prerogatives in numerous areas. First, it requires the President to designate "all or none" of the non-defense funding contained in the bill as an emergency. The Budget Enforcement Act provides that the President retain control over the release of emergency funds added by the Congress to ensure that the funds respond to critical emergency needs. By contravening this long-established budget enforcement mechanism, the Senate would require the President to waste taxpayers' dollars on low-priority, non-emergency items in order to access vital high-priority homeland security and recovery funding.

The Senate version of the bill also requires payment of \$34 million to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) by July 10, 2002. On May 26, 2002, a three-member team returned from a two-week investigation of UNFPA activities in China, designed to provide information relevant to the determination whether UNFPA is in compliance with the Kemp-Kasten law barring support for any program involving coercion. The team is in the process of completing a report outlining their findings. Thus the Senate version would remove the flexibility provided to the President under P.L. 107-115, the FY 2002 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act, to weigh the report's findings in his consideration of funding levels. As has been U.S. policy and law since 1985, no support should be provided to UNFPA if that organization's programs in China support coercion.

In addition, the bill requires that the Director of Homeland Security be confirmed by the Senate, and makes the provision of \$5 million in homeland security funding for the White House contingent upon that confirmation. The Administration recognizes Congress' need to receive information on homeland security, and the Administration to take all steps possible to ensure that this is the case while protecting the confidentiality of Presidential counsel. The President has said that the initial structure for organizing and overseeing homeland security may evolve over time and the National Strategy Review now underway may recommend an arrangement different from the current one. The Administration does not want to pre-judge the outcome of the review process and strongly urges the Senate to drop this objectionable provision.

The Administration appreciates the Committee's support for the \$420 million in military assistance to Pakistan and Jordan. However, we urge the Senate to provide these funds to the Defense Department, as requested, to allow the Defense Department to compensate coalition partners for costs incurred directly related to support of U.S. military operations in the way on terror. The Administration does not believe the State Department should be held accountable for managing or disbursing funds directly related to military operations.

Assistance to Dislocated Workers

The Administration appreciates that the Committee provided \$400 million of the President's \$750 million request to help dislocated workers return to work. However, the Administration is concerned that the Committee provided insufficient funds for National Emergency Grants (NEGs); provided an unrequested \$80 million for State Dislocated Worker formula grants; and did not provide adequate funds for community economic adjustment and a targeted, high-growth job training demonstration. The Administration looks forward to working with the Senate to ensure that adequate assistance is available to displaced workers, through National Emergency Grants, and distressed communities to address higher unemployment levels resulting from the recession.

New York

The Administration appreciates the Senate support for the request for additional disaster relief efforts for New York in response to the September 11th terrorist attacks. However, we are concerned about language that expands FEMA's Mortgage and Rental Assistance program and proposes to redirect \$90 million from FEMA to the Centers for Disease Control. The Administration believes that the program expansion is unnecessary because FEMA has sufficient authority to address the needs of homeowners and renters and that the President's full \$2.75 billion request for FEMA is needed.

Funding for Global HIV/AIDS

The Administration appreciates the intent of the Senate in recognizing this very important issue. The United States is committed to providing a total of \$500 million to the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Global Fund) and we look forward to continuing to work with the Congress on this issue.

The Administration is committed to working with the Congress to enact an emergency supplemental appropriations bill as expeditiously as possible. The Administration looks forward to working with the Senate to address its concerns.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am always intrigued by a managers' amendment. Some of the greatest damage

done around here is a "managers' amendment."

The rest of the Members around here are supposed to file our amendments but not managers' amendments. I will not agree to any unanimous consent agreement at any time unless a managers' amendment is filed at the same time as everyone else's amendment. The worst damage, the worst pork-barreling, the egregious stuff done around here is in managers' amendments.

The Senator from Texas and I spent several hours late at night last year going through stacks of "managers' amendments" that amounted to billions of dollars in porkbarrel spending.

I obviously disagree with that, as well.

Managers' amendments should be filed at the same time that all other amendments should be filed.

Finally, I don't know how the amendment process is going to go, but we are going to go after this porkbarrel spending and we are going to go after it and after it and after it because there is going to be plenty of votes and we may want additional amendments presented in different packages before we agree to any unanimous consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator object?

Mr. GRAMM. Reserving the right to object, I will be brief. We have several problems. We just got back into town and we have a complicated piece of legislation before the Senate. We want an opportunity to go through it.

Second, we have the problem that not only is the bill over the President's bill by some \$3.8 billion, but there is \$10 billion the President asked for that is not given in the bill. There is \$14 billion he did not ask for that is provided, and with something this complicated I think to ask Members to limit our ability to offer amendments in 2 hours and 15 minutes on the first day we get back is unreasonable.

On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate and understand the objections of my two friends, but this is the time they should make some suggestions. The President and the administration have been pushing this legislation now for many weeks. We understand the importance of it. The two managers of the bill understand the importance of it. We want to move this bill along.

I was happy to hear the Senator from Arizona citing the problems he has with the bill and amendments will be offered. That is appropriate. That is what we want. If someone has a problem with this legislation, that is what they should do—offer amendments, a motion to strike, whatever is appropriate, rather than as we did this morning, when this body was basically in a quorum call, doing not much of anything. This is important legislation.

I repeat, the title of this legislation is "Supplemental Appropriations Act for Further Recovery From the Response to Terrorist Attacks in the

United States." That is the name of the bill. That is why the two managers, two of the most senior Members, the most senior Members and one of the most senior Members, Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS, have worked so hard to move it forward.

Mr. McCAIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield.

Mr. McCAIN. I wonder why there should be an exception made for a managers' amendment and an amendment by Senator BYRD and an amendment by Senator STEVENS. Shouldn't all Members be treated the same in this scenario? Why couldn't it be amended to say that all first-degree amendments be filed by whatever date we agreed to, rather than adding a managers' amendment at any time, when we know the havoc that can wreak, in an amendment by Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS; why not add Senator GRAMM, Senator McCAIN and the other 96 Senators, as well?

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. Please.

Mr. STEVENS. I would like to answer that.

Mr. President, the request for Senator BYRD and myself is because of absent Members who have an interest in this legislation. We had asked for an amendment to protect those absent Members, particularly with regard to the budget.

From my point of view, I would be happy to have an agreement that all amendments must be filed by 5 p.m. without regard to anything else, and we would proceed. We would be happy with that.

As far as the managers' amendment is concerned, those primarily are technical amendments that are brought to us as the day goes along. Sometimes people disagree with them and laugh about them, but it is very important that people bring them forward, and I remind the Senate they are adopted by unanimous consent.

Any one Senator could have objected in the past or now to such a process. I am happy to leave that out. We can get the votes on the managers' amendment any time we want. We don't need unanimous consent to get a managers' package adopted.

I would be happy to have an agreement that everything has to be filed by 5 o'clock. I ask the majority whip to change the request so that all amendments must be filed by 5 o'clock.

Mr. McCAIN. Including the managers' amendment?

Mr. STEVENS. Including the managers' amendment.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this shows the wisdom of the two managers of this legislation. I don't have nearly the experience the two managers have, but I have had some experience. There are always things that go wrong with legislation, most of which are technical in nature, and that is why you need a managers' amendment.

These two experts on Senate procedure have asked that I propound a

unanimous consent request, just as I have done, except eliminate the fact that there would be any other amendments in order.

The two managers have more knowledge than I do, but I know the former chairman of the Budget Committee, the ranking member in the subcommittee of appropriations with whom I work, Senator DOMENICI, is not here today. They have a very important primary election in New Mexico. He is not here. I was happy to offer this request, keeping in mind that we would be protecting Senator DOMENICI, who is a person who has some knowledge of things that happen around here. But if the two managers are willing to go forward, I would be happy to do that.

So I propound this unanimous consent request again, indicating—in fact, I will just read it.

I ask unanimous consent all first-degree amendments to H.R. 4775 be filed by 5 p.m., Tuesday, June 4; that any second-degree amendments be relevant to the first degree to which offered or deal with offsets on the first degree; and that upon disposition of all amendments, the bill be read the third time and the Senate vote upon passage of the bill; that upon passage, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAMM. I object.

Mr. REID. I wonder, while the Senator from Texas is on the floor, would the Senator agree, on behalf of the minority, to having a time tonight, say, 5 o'clock, 5:30, for a finite list of amendments? The two managers would be given, by their respective cloakrooms, a finite list of amendments. This has worked well in the past as we proceed to getting a finite list of amendments.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

Mr. REID. I am sorry to interrupt. If we could get a finite list of amendments, then we could proceed to getting a cutoff of amendments at some subsequent time.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I have high regard for the Senator. I understand he is trying to do his job.

We just had a luncheon with the OMB Director, representing the President. We were given, at the luncheon, and Senator McCAIN put it in the RECORD so it will be immediately available to everybody—I am sure everybody will get a copy of it—an outline of why the President opposes the bill, why he will veto it if it is adopted.

This bill is 115 pages long. Just looking through it, there are provisions of which I was unaware. We need time to sit down and read it.

On that basis, we are not going to agree to limit amendments on this bill this day. What we will do tomorrow, I think, depends on where we are when people have had the time to look at it.

For the people who are on the committee who studied these issues, obviously they are up on them; they know them. Most Members are not members of the Appropriations Committee. So in reading through here, I see we have \$2.5 million to train journalists in Egypt. That may be a very good idea. I don't know.

Or that, of the funds appropriated in this paragraph, not less than \$3.5 million shall be made available to programs and activities which support the development of the independent media in Pakistan.

I would have to say, I may be exhibiting my ignorance, but I don't know whether or not that is a good expenditure of the taxpayers' money. I don't know if the President requested it in his bill. We have just gotten on this bill today.

We are going to have to look at this to know where we are going and what we are doing. There are some very controversial amendments that are going to be offered. I think we are going to have to see what they are before we are going to be ready to limit our amendments.

I think there is a hope that this bill might be finished this week. I know our leader has that objective. But it is going to take us time to get through the bill and look at it and see to what extent we are going to want to offer amendments.

Again, having just gotten the administration's position, given their strong opposition to the bill, I think it is going to take a day or 2 days or so for us to get through the bill and decide how we want to go about it.

I know the Senator wants the trains to run on time, but there may be people who decide to blow the train up. They would have a very different objective.

It is going to take us time to absorb the bill and decide what we want to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will sit down very shortly. My friend from Texas is one of the smartest people in the Senate. He is an academic, he has a Ph.D., taught in college, and I certainly have every respect for not only his academic brilliance but also his common sense.

Common sense dictates that this bill, which has been available since May 23—it has been available. Staffs had it; my staff had it. Other staffs have had an opportunity to look at it. There may be a lot of reasons why the Senator from Texas doesn't want to go forward with this legislation, but it is not that this bill just got here, because the bill has been here since May 23. It was reported out May 22.

By Senate standards, it is a pretty thin bill. It is 117 pages. But in this there are a number of issues about which people have complained.

The Egyptian journalists section was not requested by Senator BYRD; it was requested by Senator MCCONNELL. That

is why it is in the bill. The \$3.5 million for the independent media in Pakistan about which my friend complained, that was not requested by Senator BYRD; it was requested by Senator MCCONNELL.

So I appreciate the concern of the Senator from Texas and others. But he is right. We want to move this train. We have so many important things to do and this is the most important thing we have to do now.

I repeat, this is a bill for further recovery and response to terrorist attacks in the United States. Every time we slow the train down, there are resources not going to agencies and entities and people throughout America that they desperately need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I don't want to get into lengthy debate here. I raised the question about the journalists because I didn't know. I could have spent our recess reading this bill. I did not. Maybe many of my colleagues did. I doubt it.

We are not going to get this bill passed by passing it in a form that the President has already said he is going to veto. It seems to me if we are really in a hurry to pass this bill, that we need to figure out what we need to do to put it in a form so the President can and will sign it.

I think we have three clearly identifiable problems. One, it spends \$3.8 billion more than the President requested. No. 2, it does not fund \$10 billion of emergency programs the President did request. And No. 3—what the administration says—

Mr. STEVENS. If the Senator will yield, that statement is really just not correct. We just didn't fund it in the way he requested it, but we funded what he requested.

Mr. GRAMM. All I know is if you take the programs he requested and you take the programs that are funded here, that there is \$10 billion of programs, as he defined them, that are not funded in this bill. That is the second problem.

The third problem is there are \$14 billion of programs that he did not request, that he did not designate as emergencies, that are funded in the bill.

So you have three major problems: It spends too much money, it leaves out \$10 billion that the President asked for to fight the war on terrorism, and then it spends \$14 billion for which the President did not ask.

It may very well be that the way he asked and the way you provided are subtly different. I think that is one of the reasons we need to look at it.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRAMM. All I am saying is that is what the administration is saying in these letters they are giving us. I appreciate the job of the Senator from Nevada. He does it well. But if our objective is to get the money passed for

the war on terrorism so it becomes law and the money can be spent, we are not going to do that by passing a bill the President today, in writing, is saying he will veto.

If we are in a hurry to get the money, what we ought to do is find a way to fix those three problems: No. 1, we are spending way too much money as compared to what the President requested. No. 2, \$10 billion he asked for in some form that we didn't provide. And then \$14 billion he didn't ask for, didn't say that they were emergencies, but we are calling them emergencies.

Then we have a provision in the bill that says he cannot spend any of the money as an emergency unless this \$14 billion is deemed as an emergency, even though he doesn't think it is an emergency.

So I just think we are a long way from home. And if our objective is to get something the President will sign and will become law, there are going to have to be dramatic changes in the bill. If I knew how to fix the bill today, I would do it; but I do not know how. It is just going to take time for us to figure it out. And that is what this is about.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the President asked for this money as an emergency. The committee has made it a contingent emergency. And in terms of the accounting process, that turns up in one column or the other, but it is \$10 billion in each column.

Now, it is true we do allocate some of that money in ways the President did not seek to allocate it. And there is a difference in whether we want money to go to one Department or the other for homeland defense, but it is all still there as in terms of the budget.

I understand the comments of the Senator from Texas about vetoes. If every time we had a veto threat, since I have been in the Senate, we just stood still for 2 days, we would never pass any bills. The appropriations process always faces veto threats—until we come out of conference. And guess what. With very few exceptions, in the 30 years I have been on the committee, we have not had vetoes of the appropriations bills. It is just a tactic of the administration that tells us: If you don't do this and that, we are going to veto the bill. We will work this out, and eventually we will get the President's agreement to a bill.

We have to deal with the House, too. The House bill itself was finally deemed acceptable after it passed, but it faced a veto threat before it passed. As far as I am concerned, the difficulty is we have to sit around for 2 days to wait for people to read a bill that has been here since May 22. I would like to find some way to get people to come here and offer amendments to a bill that was here before we left for the recess.

Now, it is high time that people start thinking about what they are saying. They want 2 days to study this bill?

I think maybe tomorrow we will make a motion to proceed to third reading and see where the votes are. Let's see where the votes are. If the Senate wants to get this bill to the President, what they need to do is let us go to conference. And I will guarantee you, the bill that comes out of conference will be a bill the President will accept because we do not want a supplemental emergency bill to be vetoed. But we have to get to conference to work the matter out with the House and not sit around here to wait for people, in 2 days, to tell us what they object to in this bill that is going to the House for conference in any event.

So I want to serve notice, tomorrow afternoon, unless the chairman disagrees, I think we ought to have a test vote and see who wants to delay the supplemental appropriations bill. We ought to go to third reading tomorrow and take this bill to conference on Thursday. And if we did, we would have it back here next Tuesday so the matter would be settled as far as the President is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I support the statements that have been made by the distinguished ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the former chairman.

We had lengthy hearings on the bill. Those hearings were well attended by Members on both sides of the aisle. The witnesses who came before the committee were witnesses who were agreed upon by both the ranking member, Mr. STEVENS, and myself.

Everything was done that could have been done to try to ascertain what the true needs of the country are. We had seven Department heads. We had the Director of FEMA. We had mayors, Governors, local responders, the people who are first on the scene: the firemen, health personnel, law enforcement people. And we assiduously studied the hearings results as we prepared the bill.

Now, it is easy to sit around and carp and complain and criticize, but there are some around here who believe they have to do some things to help this country. We have to move a bill. It is easy to find fault, but it is not so easy to try to develop the kind of support that this bill justifies. I think we have gone a long way to try to meet the true needs of this country.

I have respect for the President, but he is not the fountain of all wisdom. I would hope that the President would take time to look at the bill, to study it. I think he will find there are provisions in it that he did not request but which are justified. So I have faith that he would be reasonable in that respect.

We appropriated the \$14 billion the President requested for the Department of Defense. We appropriated the \$5.5 billion for New York the President requested. We appropriated the \$1.6 billion for foreign aid. And we appropriated the money for homeland defense in the amount of—we approved

his \$5.3 billion request. He saw a need for that.

We conducted the hearings. We are the representatives of the people. We are the elected representatives of the people. We come here to represent the people. I do not come here by virtue of any President, Democrat or Republican. No President sends me here, and no President is going to send me home. That is up to the people of West Virginia.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. REID. I was here in the Chamber when we went out a week ago last Friday, and there were people complaining about this bill. Remember, they had the bill then. And people are complaining about it today, nitpicking it, for lack of a better description.

I say to my friend, the manager of the bill, people within the sound of our voices should understand that there is \$6.7 billion in this bill to conduct military operations to continue the fight against terrorism. That is there. There is \$4.1 billion for National Guard and Reserve personnel. People, including my friends in Nevada, have been called up. A Capitol policeman here, one person I know very well, left today for 6 months of active duty. He is leaving the Capitol Police, leaving his family, going off to fight for us, to protect us. We have to provide money to take care of that—\$4.1 billion.

There is \$2.7 billion for personnel, command, control, and communications, intelligence, and to replace munitions they are blowing up every day over in Afghanistan and other places.

I also say to my friend, it is true, is it not, there is money in this bill for embassy security and other State Department activities related to the effort to respond to, deter, prevent international terrorism? That is in the bill.

We have \$4.4 billion for the Transportation Security Administration—and I am certain we need that—to improve airport perimeter security, fund research for air cargo inspections.

There is \$1 billion for first responders.

Mr. President, firemen, policemen, paramedics died going into those Twin Towers. People died. We need to have better training facilities around this country to help first responders. That is what this money is for, to make my family, as well as all families, all over this country, safer. So I am kind of tired of people coming over and nitpicking this bill.

We have \$990 million for port security, \$387 million for bioterrorism and to improve lab capacity at the Centers for Disease Control.

I went to the Centers for Disease Control with MAX CLELAND. That place is an embarrassment. They do wonderful work, but they are in hundreds of buildings—little buildings, shacks. Some of them go back to before World War II. This money is to help them become more efficient. This is emergency money.

I say to my friend, I appreciate the work that has been done. I say this not for me but for the people of Nevada, I appreciate the work that you and the Senator from Alaska have done—providing \$200 million for security at nuclear weapons facilities.

Senators LIEBERMAN and CLINTON and I are holding hearings tomorrow in the full Committee on Environment and Public Works because we believe—and there is a large segment of our society that believes—that our nuclear reactors are not secure. The Senator from West Virginia provides money to help this, to make them safer; money for food safety; cyber-security; border security. There is money in the bill so that the EPA can complete vulnerability assessments of water systems. That is what they are telling us might happen; these evil people are going to come in and poison our water so we can't drink it or, if we drink it, everybody will get sick. There is money in here to take care of that. There is money to make sure the Postal Service can respond to bioterrorism attacks.

It is time we understand that this bill is important. It is emergency funding for the programs I have mentioned. I am, for lack of a better word, kind of tired of people coming in, criticizing Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS for the brilliant work that was done getting the bill here in the first place.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, this is a defense bill. This is for the defense of our homeland. This is for the defense of our people, our schoolchildren, our people who go to church, our people who work in the mines and in the fields and the shipyards. We are talking about homeland defense. We can't get any closer to home.

Why some people would come to the floor and attempt to be critical over moneys that are for the defense of our homeland, for the defense of our own people, and in the many areas that have been explained by the distinguished Democratic whip, Mr. REID, is beyond me.

Last year, the President requested \$6 billion for homeland defense. The Congress appropriated \$10 billion for homeland defense, \$4 billion more than the President requested. The President signed that legislation.

The President made a request last year. The Congress, in its wisdom, in its collective wisdom, saw a need to appropriate more money. Those additional moneys that Congress appropriated last year over the President's request have made a difference.

With all due respect to the President, I would say the distinguished ranking member, Mr. STEVENS, and I have worked together, and the other Republicans on that committee, to report the bill; 14 Republicans, 15 Democrats. That is a pretty good indication that this bill is a worthwhile piece of legislation.

I hope Members will stop complaining. If they have any amendments

they want to offer, offer them. Let's get on with the legislation and get it to conference and be prepared. We don't know what will happen 5 days from now, a week from now. I hope Members will restrain their appetites to criticize, find fault and complain, and help us to put across this legislation that is for the benefit of the Nation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there are complaints about specific items in this bill, offer an amendment to get rid of them. Don't come here and carp and complain about it. If they don't like the suggestion of Senator MCCONNELL to have moneys for training journalists in other countries, then move to strike it, have a vote. We could have a debate on that in 15 or 20 minutes and move on to something else. If there is something else they don't like, move to strike it. These bills are not perfect by any sense of the word.

I hope, rather than trying to slow down the train, as my friend from Texas said, we will try to move the train along. This is important legislation dealing with the peace and safety and security of the American people.

We are back where we were this morning with a lot of talk and no amendments. This morning there wasn't even much talk. I hope people will come forward and offer amendments to this legislation. We are open for business. It is too bad we don't have people here. I have had a number of people come to me and tell me they have amendments they want to offer. We hope they will come forward and do that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

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.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I request permission to speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I thank you for recognizing me. I wanted to come and add my voice to the many that have supported the supplemental appropriations bill, and I want to give a unique perspective, that of Florida law enforcement, as to why we need this bill and not the House bill or the President's request.

It is most timely that we examine the question of what we are asking local and State law enforcement personnel to assume in the way of responsibilities for investigation of crime and

now terrorist activity. As we face the realistic fact of the threats to our society, not only do we look at the threats from organized crime, drug crime, white-collar crime, all of those kinds of activities on which the FBI has traditionally done its investigation and worked with State and local law enforcement and worked with the U.S. attorneys and State attorneys, now with the additional requirement to protect the homeland, we have to also marshal considerable law enforcement investigative resources to go after the element that would try to tear down our society by terrorist acts. It also adds a much greater burden as we go about the process of investigating the activity of these people we otherwise would call bad guys who are trying to destroy our way of life in this country.

So then we get to the point of last week's announcement by the FBI Director that he is going to take 400 of his approximately 11,000 agents and shift them from going after normal criminal investigative procedures and shift them specifically to terrorists. I don't think there is any Member who disagrees.

We have to have pause and ask: How are we going to go about the normal job of investigating all the other bad guys besides the terrorists? If we shift this resource of 400 agents, who typically have gone after drug crime and white-collar crime, to going only after terrorists, does that mean we will shift all of that burden of investigation to State and local law enforcement organizations?

Unfortunately, I come from a State that has one of the most active criminal investigations, particularly in the Southern District of Florida. The U.S. attorney in the Southern District of Florida is one of the most active in the country, in large part because we have to prosecute so much drug crime in Florida.

I spoke with one of my advisers this past week during the recess, the sheriff of Broward County, the second largest county in our State; he is an elected official. All the sheriffs in our 67 counties are elected. I asked his opinion. He clearly said, who does not support the shifting of these assets in going after the terrorists. In particular the sheriff of Broward County had a tremendous working relationship with the FBI, the DEA, and all the other Federal agencies that work with State and local law enforcement.

He wanted to encourage that. However, he pondered how he could have the needed resources for that burden of criminal investigation that the FBI was shifting to State and local law enforcement, particularly a very big police force, a sheriff's department.

That is what brings me to the floor today, to speak in favor of this bill, not the House bill and not the President's position. This is a big amount of money in a supplemental appropriations bill, \$31 billion; the President requested \$27 billion; the House passed

\$29 billion. There is a \$2 billion difference.

What are some of the major differences? One of the major differences in the two bills and why we ought to accept the Senate bill is \$1 billion for first responder efforts, including fire-fighting, State and local law enforcement agencies, emergency medical personnel, and particularly in emergency responding to biological, chemical, and nuclear threats. That is important. And there is more funding here than from the House.

If this will give law enforcement organizations such as my 67 sheriffs in Florida, our hundreds of police chiefs in Florida, our excellent Florida Department of Law Enforcement, headed by Tim Moore—and I have had the privilege of working with him for years—if it will give them the resources if the FBI is going to temporarily be pulled over to the bad guy terrorists, that is why we need to pass this Senate bill.

Furthermore, it is instructive, when you see the Web site of the FBI, to see what the FBI lists as its priorities. The first three priorities have to do with going after and investigating the activities of terrorists. Priority No. 4 is public corruption and priority No. 5 is civil rights. It is priority No. 6 that involves drug crimes and going after the national and international criminal enterprise, including lots of activities of the mob.

Therefore, I want to make sure there is not one Member who does not support these priorities of the FBI. I want to make sure that in the process of supporting the Director as he reorients these 400 agents we have not put an unbearable burden of investigation on State and local law enforcement to the point they cannot handle it and they get overworked and overextended, or that they have to retrench and that those kinds of criminal activities in America go uninvestigated. That would be unacceptable.

That is why I come to the floor today, to say to my colleagues that we need to pass this Senate version of the supplemental appropriations bill which passed by a unanimous bipartisan vote out in the Appropriations Committee, led in great bipartisan fashion, as they so often do, by Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS, the two leaders of their respective parties on this Appropriations Committee. We need to pass this bill and get it to a conference committee to iron out the differences with the House and insist on the priorities.

There is one other priority that needs to be attended to. I come from Florida. We have 14 deepwater ports in Florida. Fortunately, we are finally waking up to the fact that terrorist activity may well happen in, at, or through one of those ports. Of the myriad containers that come into this country through our ports, only about 3 percent are inspected. Those who want to do bad things clearly have an avenue. Thus, we have to beef up our port security.

Within this appropriations bill, there is \$970 million that will help increase our security at these ports. That includes, clearly, Coast Guard surveillance. Can we get the Coast Guard to do everything? No. Do we need the Coast Guard to have increased surveillance in our ports? Yes. Do we need the Coast Guard continuing to do drug interdiction on the high seas? Yes. How are we going to do it? We have to provide more resources.

I submit to the Senate that this supplemental appropriations bill is a way to do that. I urge my colleagues to get on with it; stop standing around. Don't make us go to a cloture motion to have to cut off debate. Let's get this supplemental appropriations bill passed and into a conference so we can go about the business of the country.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 3570

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 3570.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out a certain transfer of funds)

On page 7, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 102. Not later than 14 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall carry out the transfer of funds under section 2507(a) of the Food Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-171).

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my amendment simply requires the U.S. Department of Agriculture to take action on a recently enacted farm bill conservation provision. The conservation provision is important. It is already in the farm bill. I am simply asking that they do what they are already required to do.

As many of my colleagues know, the farm bill is 1,000 pages long. The Department of Agriculture just met with the Senate staff to talk about their plans to implement this mammoth bill. It is taking the Department a long time to work out the details of all the programs and provisions of this bill. The provision to which this amendment pertains requires USDA to transfer conservation funds to the Bureau of Reclamation. This amendment does not in any way change the underlying farm bill.

This is in there. They are required to do it. It requires the USDA to carry out a mandatory congressional directive by a date certain so that a small provision does not get lost in a sea of larger programs and priorities.

I want the two managers to have time to look at this amendment. I

want others to, if they have any question about it. It is a fairly simple thing, requiring the Department of Agriculture to do something that the farm bill directs them to do.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the \$417 million in additional fiscal year 2002 funding for veterans health care contained in this supplemental appropriation bill. First, let me give a little background.

In November of last year, Secretary of Veterans Affairs Anthony Principi identified a roughly \$400 million shortfall in the VA medical care appropriation for FY2002. This shortfall, driven by increased demand for VA services as well as rising medical costs, threatened to force the Secretary to stop enrolling new veterans into the VA system.

This was not something the Secretary wanted to do, but he is someone who tries to face challenges honestly and he determined that he couldn't maintain services for veterans already enrolled in the VA and serve new veterans at the same time. But rather than have that happen, the White House told the Secretary that they would find him additional money.

But Mr. President, when the administration sent their supplemental request to Congress in March they only asked for \$142 million for the VA—\$258 million below the level the Secretary said he needed. To add insult to injury, the VA was then told that it had to make up the difference through "management efficiencies."

Well, Mr. President, I think we all know that "management efficiencies" is just inside the beltway talk for balancing the budget on the backs of veterans. I was at any number of joint veterans committee hearings over on the House side where the veterans were talking about the importance of leaving no veteran behind. And remember, this occurs in the context of half a decade in the mid-nineties of cost cutting and belt tightening at the VA. There really isn't much more fat to trim.

I knew that the administration's request was a non-starter. I knew based on what I was hearing from veterans in Minnesota and the VA both here and in Minnesota. I know that you, the Presiding officer, was hearing that in South Dakota as well. Already this year's shortfall has had a tremendous impact in Minnesota and throughout VISN 23:

Higher waiting times generally for care at both hospitals and community based outpatient clinics—28 days for current patients seeking primary care, 30-150 days for new patients seeking

primary care, 4 to 170 days for specialty care at the medical centers.

A freeze on new CBOCs.

A freeze on new patients at some of our medical centers.

The closing of clinics at our hospitals—specifically, for example, the night clinics at the Minneapolis facility—the flagship hospital in our network. And at St. Cloud, the caregivers there tell me they have never seen it so bad, in terms of the cuts they are having to make in personnel and the way it is affecting quality of services.

But these problems are not unique to Minnesota, they are happening all over the country. That's why these additional funds are so critical. Something had to be done.

I, Senator JOHNSON, now the Presiding Officer, and Senator COLLINS drafted a bipartisan letter to the Appropriations Committee asking that the committee include at least \$400 million for VA health care in the supplemental. Altogether, 27 Senators signed our letter—Republicans and Democrats. The veterans organizations that put together the Independent Budget endorsed our effort. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of each of those letters be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

[See Exhibit 1.]

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am pleased to say that the committee agreed to our request. In particular I want to thank Chairman BYRD and Senator STEVENS as well as Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BOND, the chair and ranking member of the VA/HUD subcommittee. They all care deeply about our veterans and they know better than anyone the challenges that the VA faces.

The \$417 million for veterans health care in this bill will mean that Minnesota's Network, VISN 23, will get an additional \$21.4 million to reduce waiting times, keep clinics open, open new clinics, and improve the quality of healthcare. This is very badly needed.

Mr. President, this bill has drawn criticism for going beyond the President's request. Well, at least on veterans health care the President didn't ask for enough. The VA is straining to serve more veterans while spending much less per patient. The VA is our back-up health care provider for the U.S. military. It is the back up provider for our public health care system should there be—heaven forbid—another terrorist attack on U.S. soil. This is money that will be well spent. I am proud to support it.

I say to the Chair, Senator JOHNSON from South Dakota, it has been an honor to be involved with you in this joint effort. The Senate Appropriations Committee got it right. We need to get this bill to the President as quickly as possible.

I have seen the same pattern again and again. I will just tell you that there are incredibly powerful and im-

portant claims by veterans who believe they are being left behind because they are not able to access the kind of health care we promised we would deliver to them, because of the budget constraints. This supplemental will help, though it is not a whole answer to the problem.

I have heard it and seen it with the education community. My State of Minnesota is still waiting for the \$2 billion our State deserves—if the Federal Government had lived up to its commitment on special education over 10 years. I think it would have been an additional \$40 million this past year. It would have made all the difference in the world. Half of it would have been for special education, but the other half could have been applied to other programs that we had to take money from in order to fund special education.

I have had people come into my office to talk about the need for more research money for cancer, all kinds of cancer. This morning we were talking about pancreatic cancer. Of course, we have talked about breast cancer and all kinds of cancer.

I have had people, more recently, come in and talk to me about the need for more money for MS, muscular dystrophy, muscular dystrophy that affects children, Parkinson's disease, diabetes. Frankly, the list goes on and on. The last thing we want is for one group of people struggling with an illness to be pitted against another group. The concern is, will there be enough money to dramatically continue with the research effort within NIH?

By the way, I would argue that ultimately a healthy Medicare recipient makes for a better Medicare system. And to the extent we can find a cure for some of these disabling diseases—including Alzheimer's—we will all be much better. There is the old adage: But for the grace of God go I or my parent or my grandparent.

I have heard from people in Minnesota—elderly people, but not just senior citizens, others as well—about what we talk about all the time—and the majority leader said, indeed, we will bring this to the floor of the Senate—affordable prescription drug legislation. But just as important as that is, our health care delivery system in Minnesota is in crisis. The Medicare reimbursement, which was dramatically cut in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, has just been devastating to our rural hospital system and, frankly, to metro as well—whether it be our hospitals, our nursing homes, our home health care providers, whether it be the whole issue of physician reimbursement vis-a-vis Medicare recipients, whether it be the County Medical Center, which is one of the best public hospitals in the United States. In Medicare and Medicaid, we are faced with some severe problems of underfunding.

To go back to the issue of veterans' health care, when I visit veterans in our medical centers, and then maybe spend some time talking to their

spouses, their spouses do not have a clue about what they are going to do when their husbands get home. Maybe one of the veterans has had hip surgery, and he is 75 or 80 years old. We don't know what to do about home health care, how we can support people so they can stay at home.

But that does not affect just veterans; it affects all of us as we get older or, God forbid, it affects others who struggle with disabilities at a much younger age.

I have been hearing from small businesses more in recent years. Although I have always believed our failure to finance, organize, and deliver health care in our country in a way that makes sense most seriously affects, obviously, people with no insurance and people who are underinsured, my gosh, the self-employed and small businesspeople are getting killed by these spiraling health care costs. This is a system that is imploding.

Frankly, I think we ultimately have to get back to health security for all. I think we have to get back to comprehensive health care coverage.

I remind my colleagues about some of the reports in the New York Times about nursing home conditions. These are elderly people who have built a country, who are infirm, who wind up in nursing homes with inadequate staffing and some pretty horrendous conditions. And it is not because the people in the nursing homes are cruel; it is that they do not have adequate funding.

I could not believe the New York Times front page story, a three-part series. I think the journalist should receive a Pulitzer for his work on adult care for people struggling with mental illness, people who jump out of windows and take their lives because they never received pharmacological treatment, people who have died in heat, people who wear the same urine-soaked and urine-smelling clothing day after day because they have received no care.

This is in the United States of America in the year 2002. Surely we can do better.

By the way, this Thursday there will be maybe as many as 2,000 men and women, who will have come to Washington, DC, from all across the country, who are basically going to say: When are you going to pass a mental health parity bill? When are you going to end the discrimination? We are here to meet with you, Representatives.

They are going to focus most of their effort on the House side. We passed this as an amendment last year in the appropriations bill. We have 66 cosponsors. Senator DOMENICI has done a great job taking the lead. It has been an honor to be his partner in this effort.

But these are people who are just getting tired of waiting, tired of the delay. It is their loved ones or themselves who are affected.

My only point is, I really do think we are on a collision course between tax

cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts—too much of this, of course, focused on the wealthiest citizens or multinational corporations—and not having, therefore, any of the revenue or the funding to make any investment in these other areas.

I do not think, when it comes to education and health care, when it comes to the question of conditions in nursing homes, and when it comes to the question of whether we are going to do everything we can to do the research and find the cure for horrible diseases, that we should basically be put in a position of not making the investment. How can we do that? We will not be a better nation if that is the case.

So I really believe these tax cuts have put us in a straitjacket. When I look at what is being asked for the Pentagon, and then look at what is being asked—and probably there should be more—for homeland defense, and then I look at these other compelling needs, and then I look at all the tax cuts, I ask myself the question: How can you do all of it at the same time? And you can't.

So I hope we will sort that out and make some of these decisions. That is part of what this battle has been about—veterans' health care. Everybody is for veterans. No Senator would ever make a speech saying they were not for veterans. But veterans are saying: Look, when push comes to shove, there is the Fourth of July, there is Memorial Day, and there is Veterans Day. We appreciate the parades and we appreciate the ceremonies, but the truth is, the best way you can honor us is by, please, living up to your commitment to give us the very best health care, by honoring us when we are in the later years of our lives, if we are World War II veterans, by making sure we are not tucked away in some nursing home; if we are Vietnam veterans and we are homeless, and we are struggling with PTSD, try to give us care; if we are Persian Gulf veterans trying to figure out what happened to us, make sure we get the health care.

I think this supplemental bill is, at least in part, a recognition of that. I appreciate the work of all involved, and I especially appreciate the work of the Presiding Officer, Senator JOHNSON. The Presiding Officer has been a real leader in this area. I know veterans in South Dakota thank Senator JOHNSON as well. And I thank Senator COLLINS for her good work also.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, May 8, 2002.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,

Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations,
The Capital, Washington, DC.

Hon. TED STEVENS,

Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Appropriations,
The Capital, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN AND SENATOR STEVENS: We write to urge you to include \$400 million for veterans medical care in the FY2002 Supplemental Appropriations bill. This is the minimum amount necessary to allow the Department of Veterans Affairs

(VA) to maintain current services in the current fiscal year without impairing veterans' access to quality, timely health care.

The VA in recent years has stretched their appropriation as far as possible, even as the number of veterans seeking VA care has risen dramatically. In November of last year, Secretary of Veterans Affairs Anthony Principi identified a \$400 million shortfall in the VA medical care appropriation for FY2002. This shortfall, driven by increased demand for VA services as well as rising medical costs, threatened to force the Secretary to restrict enrollment of new veterans into the VA system.

The Administration has requested a \$142 million supplemental appropriation for the VA—\$258 million below the level the Secretary said he needed. While we appreciate that the President included veterans medical care in his supplemental request, we are concerned that it will not cover the entire shortfall. VA has said the Veterans Health Administration will make up the difference through "management efficiencies." However, such steps will severely undermine the VA's ability to deliver quality, timely health care to America's veterans. The impact of this budget gap has already affected many veterans in the form of longer waiting times for medical appointments, stressed and overworked VA staff, closing of clinics, moratoriums on new Community Based Outpatient Clinics and frozen enrollment at existing CBOCs.

We know that the fiscal strains on the federal budget are significant. However, the crisis in the veterans health care system requires that it be made a top priority. To avert further hardship on veterans, the supplemental should reflect VA's actual need and include \$400 million for medical care.

Thank you for your attention this request. We know of your commitment to our veterans and look forward to working with you as the appropriation process moves forward.

Sincerely,

Paul D. Wellstone; Susan Collins; James M. Jeffords; Byran L. Dorgan; Harry Reid; Max Baucus; Barbara Boxer; Dick Durbin; Robert G. Torricelli; John F. Kerry; Mark Dayton; Patty Murray; Patrick Leahy; Tim Johnson; Jay Rockefeller; Debbie Stabenow; Kent Conrad; Bill Nelson; Tom Daschle; Max Cleland; Zell Miller; Gordon Smith; Ted Kennedy; Olympia Snowe; Tom Harkin; Jean Carnahan.

THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET,

A BUDGET FOR VETERANS BY VETERANS,

Washington, DC, April 29, 2002.

DEAR SENATOR: Last Autumn, Secretary of Veterans Affairs Anthony Principi stated that the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) was facing a shortfall of \$400 million in this fiscal year. In fact, the VA came perilously close to curtailing the enrollment of veterans seeking health care in order to meet this deficit. The co-authors of The Independent Budget, AMVETS, Disabled American Veterans, Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, urge you to sign-on to the Dear Colleague letter being circulated by Senators Paul Wellstone, Susan Collins and Tim Johnson seeking \$400 million in FY 2002 supplemental funding for veterans' health care.

The Administration has requested only \$142 million in supplemental funding for veterans' health care, \$258 million below the demonstrated need. Because of inadequate funding, the VA health care system is in crisis and veterans are facing de facto health care rationing. In fact, almost 175,000 veterans are waiting months and months for basic appointments. This is why The Independent Budget has recommended a \$3.1 billion increase in FY 2003, and why we urge

you to help us achieve the \$400 million in supplemental funding veterans' health care needs this year.

Again, we urge you to support the funding levels needed by veterans' health care.

Sincerely,

RICK JONES,
*National Legislative
Director, AMVETS.*

RICHARD B. FULLER,
*National Legislative
director, Paralyzed
Veterans of America.*

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

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

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

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

Mr. REID. Can the Presiding Officer tell me when is the last time an amendment was offered; what time was that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 3:47 p.m.

Mr. REID. At 3:47 p.m., Mr. President. It is now 4:47 p.m. That is an hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. The debate on that amendment took approximately 2 minutes. So following the vote this afternoon, there was some dialog as to what we should do on this bill. We asked unanimous consent to move forward, having expedited time for filing amendments. At that time, there were a number of people who said they did not like certain provisions in the bill. There was an example of some money that had been suggested by Senator McCONNELL for training journalists in the Middle East and in Pakistan. Some colleagues said they did not like that part of the bill.

I would hope we would do what we are supposed to do. If Senators do not like what is in the bill, let's do something about it. We are waiting around here doing nothing on a bill that is called by title the "Supplemental Appropriations Act for Further Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States," and nothing is happening.

People complain about the bill. There are major programs in this bill that are not being funded. The President has told us on numerous occasions this is an important bill to move along. We are trying to do that. But for his own party, we cannot do that.

I talked with Senator BYRD today publicly about some of the items in

this legislation: \$6.7 billion to conduct military operations to continue the fight against terrorism. I do not think anyone would dispute that is necessary; \$4.1 billion for National Guard and Reserve personnel who have been called up to active duty, and I used the example of one of the police officers who is part of the plain clothes detail. He has very important duties on Capitol Hill. He has been called away for 6 months. There are thousands and thousands of people, just as James Proctor, who have been called to active duty.

We have to pay for this activity, and that is part of what Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS are trying to do with this bill they are managing.

There is \$3 billion for combat air patrol missions within the United States for obvious reasons. Because of September 11, we need these air patrol missions; \$200 million for Guantanamo Bay support, fuel, and miscellaneous costs. We have ongoing activities that certainly have become more difficult with the war on terrorism and because of what Castro has done in the past and also what he has threatened to do and the fact we have moved al-Qaida and Taliban from Afghanistan to a protective facility at Guantanamo Bay. There is \$200 million in this bill to take care of those activities.

In this legislation, there are moneys requested by the President to better protect our embassy personnel, to prevent international terrorism, as well as for military and economic assistance programs to strengthen the ability of other countries to fight terrorism.

In this bill there is \$4.4 billion for the Transportation and Security Administration which funds their request. The bill includes \$265 million in additional airport security funds. These monies would help airports meet the new Federal security standards. Local governments are eating these costs now.

We need to move forward. If there is something in the bill that people do not like, let them move to take it out, have a debate, and an up-or-down vote. If it is not necessary to have something in the bill, they can make their case. I am sure Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD would be happy if that were done.

There are things in this bill for port security. These funds would improve security at our ports, allow for increased surveillance by the Coast Guard, improve container inspections by the Customs Service, as well as improve inspection technology generally. In this bill, there is \$387 million for bioterrorism, including funds to improve lab capacity at the Centers for Disease Control and security at the National Institutes of Health; \$200 million for security at nuclear weapons facilities and nuclear laboratories.

I traveled with Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN in recent months to the Los Alamos and Sandia Laboratories, something of which this country should be very proud, but the problem is they have inadequate security. Maybe we should not announce that on

the Senate floor, but that is a fact. Some of the most sensitive work done in this Government is done in New Mexico at those two laboratories. We are trying to get more money so that these laboratories are not subject to terrorist attack as easily as they might be.

I spoke to a Member of the House of Representatives today and I spoke yesterday to Senator LUGAR. They traveled to Russia during the break, spent almost a week there. I am so happy we have improved our relationship with Russia. It is so important we have done that. I am so happy we have this treaty where each country is going to cut back by two-thirds the number of nuclear warheads, but we are a country that has the means to help the former Soviet Union, Russia, get rid of some of those materials. They need help. There are biological weapons and nuclear weapons stored in facilities that one cannot believe how inadequate they are.

There is money in this bill—not very much, in my opinion, compared to what is needed, but in this bill there is \$100 million for nuclear nonproliferation programs. That is important money. That is money well spent. One hundred fifty-four million dollars is for cyber-security.

This funding would help the private sector and Federal agencies defend themselves from cyber-attack; \$125 million for border security; \$100 million so the EPA can complete vulnerability assessments of water security systems; \$286 million for miscellaneous home and defense needs, Secret Service efforts to combat electronic crime, FBI counterterrorist efforts, courthouse security, Department of Justice information systems. We even have to look at security for visitors to Federal monuments and museums.

So there is more in this legislation than I have outlined, but I am dumbfounded why people who oppose this legislation are, as my friend from Texas said, slowing down the train. This is not hurting the Democrats. It is hurting our country. We need not slow down the train. If there is something on the train that people do not like, have them try to remove it.

This bill would provide the money that has been promised, that is, \$5.5 billion to assist New York City for the response to the September 11 terrorist attacks. These funds would be channeled through FEMA for disaster relief. The Transportation Department will help replace, rebuild, or enhance mass transit systems and restore or reconstruct roads; the Department of Housing and Urban Development for grants to rebuild utility infrastructure.

We heard last week, the day before the event that was to commemorate the removal of the last load of rubbish from the terrorist attack, that in New York City manhole covers were being blown into the sky. They were being blown into the sky because the utility infrastructure that is now in existence

is overworked. They need to repair that and replace what was damaged and demolished by virtue of that terrorist attack. We need to do that. That is what this money is all about.

I hope, and I guess this is a cry upon deaf ears, that somebody would come, if they have amendments, and offer them. It is 5 p.m. All day long we have done nothing. There was an amendment that was called up that passed 95 to 4 or something like that. I do not know the vote, but it was basically an unnecessary vote. That is all we have done today, something the House put in the bill that everyone wanted out dealing with making sure the airlines remain sound, secure, and strong financially. That is all we have done.

I think it is too bad that people who oppose something as much as people say they oppose this emergency legislation for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks in the United States are not willing to come forward. We know it is only a few people, but a few people can stop this body from moving sometimes.

Senator STEVENS said he was going to move to third reading tomorrow, and if people did not want to go to third reading, they would have to respond. That really is a debatable motion. People need to come over and tell us why they do not want to move forward.

I can understand that in this bill there may be parts of it people do not like. If they do not like part of it, I repeat, try to get rid of it. It is not as if we are working on insignificant legislation. The President has devoted his weekly Saturday address to how important this legislation is. He has given press conferences about how important this legislation is, and for people to say the President is going to veto it, the President is not going to veto this legislation. We have a statement of administration policy, unsigned, of course, and we all know it came from some staff. The President certainly has not had anything to do with this, or if he has, it is general in nature.

If we pass something out of here, there is nothing for the President to veto. It goes to conference with the House, and then we would do as we always do on something this important: We would work with the House, as we have to; work with the administration, as we have to; and work out differences if indeed there is something at that time that he does not like.

Remember, this bill is going to pass by a wide margin anyway, so the President also has to be very careful as to what happens.

I heard a statement today from the Senator from Georgia, Mr. MILLER, who has just come into the Chamber. Having been Governor and being, as some say, a legend in his own time as to popularity in the State of Georgia for all the good things he has done in education and other things, he was lamenting the fact how can this body, the Senate, on something that is this

important do nothing? He was talking about prescription drugs. How can we keep going day by day and do nothing?

I say to my friend from Georgia, we have a bill for further recovery from the response to terrorist attacks in the United States and nobody is here. I have been here all day. Nothing has happened. We had some meaningless vote that everybody supported basically, passing 94 to 4, or whatever it was. I am not too sure of the—anyway, I do not need to give an editorial comment.

I think the Senator is so right. The only thing I would say to the Senator from Georgia is the Senator from Georgia said that it seems that people who are a little older—and he mentioned specifically the Senator from West Virginia and the Senators from South Carolina and the Senator from Georgia—may understand how important it is to move forward. More than those Members with white hair understand the importance of this, but a small minority are stopping the Senate from moving forward on legislation, not only on this but other areas.

I did not have the chance at our luncheon to discuss the remarks of Senator MILLER because time was short as Senators spoke on this subject, but I wanted to propound before all the Democratic Senators how good I thought the statement was this morning. I say now to the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Georgia, how good that statement was. I underscore, underline, and put exclamation marks on everything the Senator said.

How can we take up the time of this country and do nothing? We are doing nothing. If Members do not like this bill or something in it, give a speech, offer an amendment, do something. Staff sits around here staring into space like I have all day.

Mr. JOHNSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I yield to my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON. I ask the Senator from Nevada, is there any parliamentary obstacle to anyone bringing an amendment to the floor at any time? Is there anything the leader, or you, would do to interfere with our right to offer an amendment, have a debate, and vote up or down on any amendments?

Mr. REID. The answer is no.

I speak from pretty good information: I bet the minority leader, the Republican leader, wants the bill passed. His President wants the bill passed. A few people are stopping us. We were told they want to slow down the train.

I repeat to my friend from South Dakota, if they don't like something on the train, take it off.

Mr. JOHNSON. If I may continue, I am struck that it is one thing to slow down the train on noncontroversial legislation, but is this not the very legislation that our troops in uniform are relying on so they can continue to be equipped, continue to have ammuni-

tion, continue to have resources they need to fight in Afghanistan and around the world?

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from South Dakota, I remember a very emotional time when the son of the Senator from South Dakota was called into harm's way in Bosnia, the Balkans, wearing a uniform, carrying a gun, representing the United States. I remember that. I remember the emotion the Senator from South Dakota felt in expressing to me how concerned the Senator was but at the same time proud of his son.

There are hundreds of thousands of American troops like your son, all over the world, waiting for the items included in this bill.

Part of this is to replace munitions. There is no endless supply. They have to be manufactured in the United States and taken over there. This legislation calls for part of this money to replenish our munitions supply.

I say to my friend from South Dakota, the Senator is absolutely right. This bill is a supplemental appropriation for further recovery from and response to terrorist activities. There are major provisions, including \$14 billion for the Department of Defense.

Mr. JOHNSON. My oldest son returned from Afghanistan with the 101st Airborne just this week. We are proud to have him back.

I wish Members obstructing this legislation could go to Afghanistan and look at our forces in the north, at Baghram, our forces in the south in Kandahar, look them in the eye and tell them: We have other things to do; we don't want to pass this legislation that allows you to have the resources to conduct our war against terror, to defend American families all over this Nation.

I cannot imagine what the Members obstructing this legislation must be thinking or how they could look in the eye our law enforcement officers, our firefighters, our first responders, our military, all of whom it appears to me are going to be suffering from the lack of passage of this legislation, not to mention the fact, as Senator WELLSTONE said so ably on the floor earlier today, this also contains the funding necessary to keep our Veterans' Administration health care program going through the remainder of this year, for the people who in the past have fought so hard to preserve our liberty, to preserve our democracy.

We have a handful who apparently are going to renege on those obligations, as well. This strikes me as truly an outrage. I certainly hope Senator LOTT will do all he can and that the President of the United States will do all he can to prevail on those Members of their political party to allow this legislation to move forward, to allow free up-or-down votes. Perhaps the Senator from Nevada and I will have provisions in this bill which will be defeated. So be it. We will have a fair up-or-down vote and debate.

To have no debate and no opportunity to move the legislation forward, win or lose, is truly an outrage.

I commend the Senator from Nevada for being on the floor today to clarify why this needed legislation, which frankly should have passed weeks ago, is still floundering.

Mr. REID. I apologize to my friend. I did not know that your son also not only has served in a combat role in the Balkans but also in Afghanistan. Is that the same son?

Mr. JOHNSON. Same son, just returned from the 101st this past week.

Mr. REID. I saw the pictures of this very young man who I knew as a boy, as an athlete. I am glad he is home.

The Presiding Officer proudly wears his marine pin. He has written a book about the Marines.

I mentioned briefly, I attended a reception across the floor this morning and met four of the wind talkers, the Navajo Indians who did so much. Here these old men were, finally after all these years, 4 of 29 wind talkers, getting recognition, value for what they did.

I also mentioned on the floor this morning, I talked to them and asked them where they went. They talked about Guadalcanal and Guam. One of the Navajo Indians spoke in the native Tarawa: That is where I lost a lot of my buddies. He had tears in his eyes.

Mr. President, I don't want to be overly dramatic, but we had 3,000 people killed at the Pentagon and New York City. That is what this legislation is all about. It is about the war we have going on with terrorists. The next bill we will bring up is the hate crimes bill. We should get this done and move to that. Why not legislate?

I have said it 10 times today, and I will say it for the 11th time. If there is something in this bill that somebody does not like, move to strike it. Get rid of it. Instead, nothing is happening. I don't understand how anyone can do that to our troops; the Senator is absolutely right.

Part of this legislation provides \$1.1 billion for payment of veterans' disability compensation. Veterans are not freeloaders. Talk about something they need—disability compensation.

Mr. JOHNSON. I am sure the Senator from Nevada finds the same circumstances when he returns home to his State. We talk to our veterans, we talk to our military, we talk to our firefighters, we talk to our law enforcement officers, our ambulance people, our first responders. These are all people willing to put their lives in harm's way, willing to work at very modest wages. They are willing to disrupt their families. They are willing to do a great deal. All they ask is that the American people and the Senate stand behind them, reinforce them, and show support.

What kind of signal does this inaction, this obstruction—what kind of signal does this send to those men and women in uniform who do so very

much for our Nation during this difficult time? This must be dispiriting to each and every one of them the longer this goes on. I wonder if the Senator has any observations from the people he has talked to in his State about their expectation, that they will do these hard tasks and put their lives on the line but they do expect their Nation to stand behind them.

Mr. REID. I confirm what the Senator said, of course, from my trip to Nevada. I also traveled during the break and went to other places doing some work as relates to the Senate—Utah, various parts of California, and Colorado. All over the country, not only Nevada and South Dakota, all over the country people want our soldiers, sailors, airmen, coastguardsmen, to have enough resources to do their job. But also, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, it is important that those people who are first responders know they have the necessary equipment and the resources.

The problem we have is, every minute this bill does not pass, people in Georgia, South Dakota, and Nevada are having moneys paid out of their own budgets for issues that are the responsibility of the Federal Government. So the people of Nevada are being hurt as we speak because programs that must be provided for first responders—fire, police, paramedics, and medical personnel—are being paid for out of their own budgets. This will relieve them of some of that responsibility.

So the Senator is absolutely right. It is a shame. I do not understand why we are here doing nothing—I mean nothing. If somebody doesn't like the bill, let them have the intestinal fortitude to come and tell us what they are going to do about it.

I say to my friend from South Dakota, we even tried: OK, if you don't like the bill, let's have a time for a finite number of amendments. They responded: No, we can't agree to that. We haven't had a chance to look at the bill.

This bill, by Senate standards, is pretty small. I could sit down and read this bill from cover to cover in 10 to 12 minutes. It is 167 pages, but it is great big print—let's say a half-hour. I think somebody could find, from May 22 to today, a half-hour to read the bill. If not, if you are really slow, maybe assign several staff members and they could divide it up, 25 pages each, and give a report.

We could not get amendments. They said they needed more time to study the bill. Then when I said why don't we try having a time when the two cloak-rooms' staff would exchange amendments, we would have a finite list of amendments—you may not want to offer all those, but we would have a finite list, we could cut the amendments off, maybe 25, maybe 250—whatever, they said: No, can't do that. We have to have time to study the bill.

But they did say the President had already studied it and sent us a state-

ment of administration policy. So some of the moles down in the administration—I do not say that negatively, I mean people who work in the bowels of the White House—have had a chance to look at this bill. From May 22 until today, they found a half-hour to look over it.

I would also say the threat of a veto doesn't work. If we passed the bill 10 minutes from now, the President would not have anything to veto. It has to go to conference with the House. That, I repeat, is where the House will work with us, work with the administration, and come up with something the President will not veto.

Senator BYRD, Senator STEVENS, some of the most senior Members of the Senate, have said they cannot remember an appropriations bill they could not work out with a President. Senator BYRD I think has been here since President Truman.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would the Senator concur as a member of the Appropriations Committee, as this Senator is—I recall the hearings, which were substantial, that went into the formulation of this legislation. Then I seem to recall a markup in the Appropriations Committee where I believe this bill was passed something like 19 to 0.

Mr. REID. Every Member of the Senate who is on the committee voted for the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. This is not some legislation which the Democratic Party is somehow trying to shove past our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. In fact, Senator STEVENS voted for this bill. We had unanimous bipartisan support in the Appropriations Committee by the people who focused very closely on this and attended the many hearings that went into the legislation.

If I understood the Senator correctly, Senator LOTT as well would just as soon see this legislation move forward now.

I think it does need to be clear that this is not some sort of partisan, one-party-against-the-other gridlock. This is an instance where a small handful of people are using and manipulating the rules of the Senate to thwart the will, not just of one political party but the large overall majority of the Senate who would wish to go forward.

So we have heard references to obstructionism around this Chamber over the course of this past year. I ask the Senator, what is the source of the obstruction on this legislation and why are we not proceeding with it and the whole array of additional legislation which the majority leader has outlined for us just today, which is daunting in terms of the scope and breadth of legislation this body is obligated to deal with in the coming couple of months. But we cannot begin to even move on that unless we take care of this urgent matter. That obstructionism appears to me to be not only a political tactic but one that is a disservice to the men

and women in the uniform of this Nation, a disservice to those of us who believe this Nation needs to move aggressively to prepare itself against terror.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have said and I believe Senator LOTT supports this legislation. I have not spoken to him in that regard. I have spoken to those who have spoken to him, and that is my understanding. I do not want to put words in Senator LOTT's mouth, but I do believe he wants this legislation passed.

I say to my friend from South Dakota, I very much appreciate his statements. I think the perspective he has added dealing with his son speaks volumes.

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. DASCHLE. 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. DASCHLE. Mr. President, this is our first full day back. We were in session yesterday. We are not off to a very strong start. I was hoping we could have a vigorous debate today on the supplemental; we could offer amendments; we could move the process forward.

For those who may not be aware, we are now debating the supplemental appropriations for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States. Let me repeat that because people ought to be cognizant of the gravity of the bill we are considering. It is the supplemental appropriations act for further recovery from and response to terrorist attacks on the United States.

It includes \$14 billion requested by the President of the United States for the Department of Defense; \$8 billion for homeland security efforts. It includes \$5 billion for recovery in New York City. It includes money for the global AIDs trust fund, and a number of very high priorities.

This legislation passed on a unanimous basis in the Appropriations Committee.

We are told by some of our colleagues on the other side that—I think the phrase was—they wanted to “slow walk” this. For the life of me, I don't understand why our colleagues would want to slow walk a request by the President of the United States to address the supplemental needs on an emergency basis for homeland defense and for the defense of our country under these circumstances. I don't understand that. But it is clear that is what is underway.

We must get this legislation passed. It must go to conference. We have to get this done. We have virtually wasted an entire day. Senators have not come to the floor to offer their amendments, and the calendar pages are turning. I have shared a list of additional legisla-

tion with our caucus and with Senator LOTT, and I must say that list is ambitious. The Presiding Officer talked about the importance of getting prescription drug benefits passed. I said I would like to get that done before we complete our work this summer.

But it is hard to see how we can take on any priorities unless we can complete our work on an emergency supplemental appropriations bill. We have been negotiating with a number of other colleagues with regard to the budget and the deeming resolution that has been the subject of some discussion over the last several weeks.

We also must pass, at some point in the not-too-distant future, a debt limit increase. That is not something anybody relishes. I indicated to Senator LOTT this morning that if we cannot put a deeming mechanism in the supplemental—and I am told there is opposition on the other side to doing that—we will have no choice but to file a freestanding debt limit resolution with the deeming language associated with it. I intend to rule XIV—that is, put the legislation on the calendar this week—as early as tomorrow. So we will do it one way or the other. We will do it in concert with the supplemental appropriations bill or we will do it in a freestanding resolution. But it will be done. I hope our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will work to achieve what we know must be done. So I hope we can find a way to resolve whatever other outstanding questions there are with regard to the deeming and the supplemental budget so we can move forward.

Mr. President, I must say that this has been a very unproductive day, and it is not a good beginning to what I hoped would be a very productive week.

In order to expedite our consideration of the supplemental, I intend to send a cloture motion to the desk today so we might accelerate and bring to a close the debate on this bill so we can move to the other pieces of legislation that must be considered, attended to, and addressed in a meaningful way in the short period of time we have during the work period this month.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I send that cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 4775:

Harry Reid, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, Dianne Feinstein, Jack Reed, Dick Durbin, Tim Johnson, Jeff Bingaman, Robert Torricelli, Tom Harkin, Daniel Akaka, Byron Dorgan, Joe Lieberman, Tom Carper, Bill Nelson, Maria Cantwell, Barbara Mikulski.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I had not intended to offer a cloture motion this soon, but when I hear colleagues on the other side of the aisle saying they intend to “slow the train down”—those were the words used on the Senate floor—on a bill to provide funding for defense, for homeland security, and for New York City, we have no choice but to accelerate the debate and bring this bill to a successful close.

I am hopeful that, on a bipartisan basis, my colleagues will support cloture and that we can get this bill done this week.

I, very regrettably, announce that there are no more votes tonight. But those Senators who are concerned about amendments are invited to come to the floor early tomorrow and proceed with offering, considering, and voting on their amendments prior to the cloture vote on Thursday. I know that on both sides there are amendments to be offered. Let's get on with that debate, get these amendments on the floor, and let's have these votes.

Let's complete our work so we can move to the other pieces of legislation that I know so many colleagues anticipated we would consider this month and next.

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

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

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD).

● Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, the airline stabilization program is vitally important to my State, and I am pleased that we have reached agreement to strike a potentially threatening provision in the supplemental appropriations bill.

Last September, we created the Airline Stabilization Loan Guarantee program to prevent a collapse of our airline industry in the wake of the September 11th terrorist attacks. Such a collapse would have had a disastrous effect on the national economy, and on communities throughout America.

The loan program is a last alternative to bankruptcy for airlines struggling to recover after September 11. The Air Transportation Stabilization Board has been a strict guardian of public funds with respect to the terms it has required of applicants. The program was intended to be a last resort for airlines and passengers when they have no place else to go.

We established the airline loan guarantee program less than 2 weeks after September 11 because a number of airlines faced crushing losses and the threat of losing their insurance altogether. The law gives the airlines until

June 28 to apply for loans because we knew the full effects of September 11 would take at least that long to be realized. The airlines' continuing poor financial health has proven the case.

It is essential that we not undermine the industry's slow recovery by freezing funding for the remainder of this fiscal year. Absent this amendment, the supplemental would have prevented applicants from obtaining loan guarantees until October 1. Some major carriers, including West Virginia's most prominent airline, just can't wait that long for relief. Here is why.

First, a freeze would have sent negative signals to the financial markets. Airline stocks are low already, and the only reason they aren't even lower is because Wall Street is reasonably expecting support of the airlines from the loan guarantee program. Eliminating funding—even if only temporarily—could signal Wall Street that the program is unstable and subject to changes in each Congress. Given the financial predicament of many airlines, these signals alone could be devastating.

Second, airlines would not have been able to obtain commercial bridge loans between now and October. I know from hard experience in my efforts to help the steel industry that lenders do not offer bridge loans without a reliable Federal guarantee. Anything short of actual issuance of the credit instrument would be insufficient for the private market. A freeze on the loan board would have prevented this from happening.

Without this important amendment, we were almost certain to see more airline bankruptcies. This would have been a terrible result, not just for the airlines, but for the hundreds of communities that depend on them.

My State of West Virginia would have been particularly hard hit, as would rural regions throughout America—regions which frequently have little or no choice of airlines. The predominant airline serving West Virginia is US Airways, and it is expected to apply for a critically-needed loan guarantee within the next couple of weeks.

As of March 31, US Airways had cash reserves of \$561 million and was losing \$3.5 million per day. Airline officials said in a recent SEC filing that, without the loan program, they will be forced to declare bankruptcy as early as this summer.

In Beckley, Bluefield, Parkersburg, and Morgantown, WV, US Airways is the only provider of passenger air service. US Airways is the only way to fly from Clarksburg to Pittsburgh. It is the only way to fly from Huntington to Charlotte or Pittsburgh. It is also the only way to fly from Lewisburg to Charlotte or Pittsburgh. And it is the only way to fly from Charleston to Baltimore, Charlotte, Philadelphia, or Pittsburgh.

For people all across West Virginia, US Airways is a critical connection to the rest of the world, and a major force

in our local economy. If US Airways were to go under, the result would be a serious blow to my state.

Today's amendment is not about any one airline or state. It is about communities across the country that will suffer if airlines go bankrupt.

Last September, we decided that we could not permit the attacks of September 11 to bring down our entire airline industry. That was the right decision then. And I am glad that my colleagues recognize that it is also the right decision today. I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

I should also note that today is a very proud day for my family as we gather for my youngest son's college graduation. I am confident the amendment will pass by a large margin, and had I been present, I would have cast my vote in support of the amendment. I am grateful for everyone's hard work in recent weeks to achieve this good result.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise to offer for the record the Budget Committee's official scoring of S. 2551, the 2002 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Further Recovery From and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States.

The Senate bill provides \$31 billion in net, new discretionary budget authority, of which \$13.9 billion is for defense activities and \$17.1 billion is for non-defense activities. That additional budget authority will increase outlays by a total of \$8.43 billion in 2002. Of the total spending authority provided, the Appropriations Committee has designated \$31.007 billion as emergency spending, which will increase outlays by \$8.243 billion in 2002. In accordance with standard budget practice, the Budget Committee will adjust the Appropriations Committee's allocation for emergency spending at the end of conference. The Senate bill is within the committee's revised section 302(a) and 302(b) allocations for budget authority and outlays. In addition, it provides more than \$1 billion less in net, nonemergency spending authority than either provided by the House Appropriations Committee or requested by the President.

The Senate bill violates section 205 of H. Con. Res. 290, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001, by including a number of emergency designations for spending on nondefense activities.

I ask unanimous consent that two tables displaying the Budget Committee scoring of this bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TABLE 1.—S. 2551, 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

[Spending comparison—302(a) Allocations to Appropriations Committee (in millions of dollars)]

	Current level plus supplemental	Senate allocations	Difference
General Purpose:			
BA	704,234	704,240	-6
OT	686,966	692,717	-5,751
Highways:			
BA			
OT	28,489	28,489	
Mass Transit:			
BA			
OT	5,275	5,275	
Conservation:			
BA	1,758	1,760	-2
OT	1,392	1,473	-81
Mandatory:			
BA	358,567	358,567	
OT	350,837	350,837	
Total:			
BA	1,064,559	1,064,567	-8
OT	1,072,959	1,078,791	-5,832

Notes: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. The Senate-reported bill includes \$31,007 million in emergency BA and \$8,243 million in emergency outlays. The Senate Budget Committee increases the committee's 302(a) allocation for emergencies when a bill is reported out of conference.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has allocated its remaining room under its 302(a) allocation as follows: (1) \$1 million in BA and \$6 million in outlays to the Commerce, State, Justice subcommittee for the conservation category, (2) \$1 million in BA and \$75 million in outlays to the Interior subcommittee for the conservation category, and (3) \$6 million in BA and \$5,751 million in outlays to the full committee. All other subcommittees are exactly at their allocations for each category.

Prepared by SBC Majority Staff, June 3, 2002.

TABLE 2.—S. 2551, 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES

[Spending comparisons—Senate-Reported Bill (in millions of dollars)]

	Defense	Non-defense	Mandatory	Total
Senate-reported bill:				
Emergency:				
Budget Authority	13,932	17,075		31,007
Outlays	5,286	2,957		8,243
Nonemergency:				
Budget Authority		-7		-7
Outlays		187		187
Total:				
Budget Authority	13,932	17,068		31,000
Outlays	5,286	3,144		8,430
House-passed bill¹:				
Emergency:				
Budget Authority	16,079	12,955		29,034
Outlays	5,632	2,441		8,073
Nonemergency:				
Budget Authority	-59	1,112		1,053
Outlays	-7	261		254
Total:				
Budget Authority	16,020	14,067		30,087
Outlays	5,625	2,702		8,327
President's request²:				
Emergency:				
Budget Authority	14,048	13,095		27,143
Outlays	5,310	2,491		7,801
Nonemergency:				
Budget Authority		1,262		1,262
Outlays	35	232		267
Total:				
Budget Authority	14,048	14,357		28,405
Outlays	5,345	2,723		8,068
SENATE-REPORTED BILL COMPARED TO:				
House-passed bill:				
Emergency:				
Budget Authority	-2,147	4,120		1,973
Outlays	-346	516		170
Nonemergency:				
Budget Authority	59	-1,119		-1,060
Outlays	7	-74		67
Total:				
Budget Authority	-2,088	3,001		913
Outlays	-339	442		103
President's request:				
Emergency:				
Budget Authority	-116	3,980		3,864
Outlays	-24	466		442
Nonemergency:				
Budget Authority		-1,269		-1,269
Outlays	-35	-45		-80
Total:				
Budget Authority	-116	2,711		2,595

TABLE 2.—S. 2551, 2002 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT FOR FURTHER RECOVERY FROM AND RESPONSE TO TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES—Continued

(Spending comparisons—Senate-Reported Bill (in millions of dollars))

	Defense	Non-defense	Mandatory	Total
Outlays	-59	421	362

¹The table removes directives of the House Budget Committee to the Congressional Budget Office on how to score certain provisions in the House-passed supplemental bill. The adjustments provide comparability between the House and Senate numbers. In addition to its increase in spending, the House-passed bill also would decrease revenues by \$60 million in 2003 and approximately \$800 million over 10 years.

²Includes the President's request, transmitted with his 2003 budget, to provide supplemental funding in 2002 for Pell grants.

Notes: Details may not add total due to rounding. The committee is with in both its 302(a) and 302(b) allocations and the statutory caps on discretionary spending on 2002. The Senate Budget Committee increases the committee's 302(a) allocation for emergencies when a bill is reported out of conference.

Prepared by SBC Majority Staff, June 3, 2002.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period of up to 5 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO KEITH E. BAILEY

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a true friend of Oklahoma and the energy industry and a true friend of mine. Keith Bailey, chairman of the Williams Companies, retired last month after leading that company for the last 29 years. Keith is a man of energy, of generosity and compassion, whose values have shaped Williams and set a tone of integrity, creativity and vision for the industry throughout his career. From his office in Tulsa, OK, Keith has run a global energy company with a full spectrum of energy products, services and operations. He has also championed innovation in the telecommunications industry, overseeing the building of a nationwide communications network, which sprang from the use of the company's former oil pipeline assets.

Keith is a respected leader in the energy industry and in the Tulsa community. His view of corporate and personal success has always included support for people, education and charitable causes. He has energetically gone about the business of supporting his community and his neighbors in a quiet way, but in a measurable one. His contributions of time, money and expertise have benefited hundreds in Tulsa, in Oklahoma and thousands nationally. Keith has also provided leadership serving the United Way, both as campaign and board chair of the Tulsa area, and on the United Way of America's Board of Governors. He has also served as the chair of the Board of Trustees at the University of Tulsa, board chair for the Philbrook Museum of Art and the Board of the National Cowboy and Western Heritage Museum. Recently, he sponsored the buffalo mural project, which now adorns the capitol building in Oklahoma City.

Keith places a high value on education. He served as a member of President George W. Bush's transition team on education. He has served on the Education Task Force of the Business Roundtable and is currently the chair of the National Alliance of Business and on the Board of AEGIS. He was actively engaged in promoting the President's education reform package. Three of his four children are educators, one of them teaching in Oklahoma.

Keith has been instrumental in the growth of Williams. He joined Williams in 1973 and was named Chairman of the Board in 1994, when the company's assets totaled \$5 billion. Today assets stand at \$38 billion. Shareholders have enjoyed a 790 percent return from 1990 to 2001. The company is listed at number 174 on the "Fortune 500" list this year. On Bailey's watch, the company has grown to be the Nation's third largest marketer of natural gas; a top 10 power marketer; North America's second largest natural gas gatherer and producer; possessor of the largest petroleum storage facilities in North America; a top 10 independent energy producer; and second largest gas pipeline transporter in the Nation.

I know that for all his business achievements, shareholder return and asset growth, Keith Bailey clearly would like to be remembered in more humanistic terms. Bailey has said, "when I think of my time at Williams, I don't think of the deals. I think of people." Keith Bailey lives the core values and beliefs of the company every day. I know he will be missed.

SYRIA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this act recognizes the role that Syria continues to play in promoting instability and terrorism in the Middle East. Syria's support for terrorism, its occupation of Lebanon and efforts toward the development of weapons of mass destruction threaten to hinder efforts to encourage democracy, the rule of law and a lasting peace in the region. As such, this bill represents an effort by Congress to express its outrage with these actions and urge President Bush to take the needed steps that will prod Syria to halt these actions.

Syria has long been on the State Department's list of terrorist nations, and is known to support numerous terrorist organizations including Hizballah, Hamas and the General Command of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. Just as importantly, the presence of Syrian troops thwarts the democratic aspirations of the Lebanese people. The Taif accords which mapped out a security program for Lebanon included Syria's commitment to the "security independence and unity of Lebanon" and its opposition to any action that "threatens security independence or [the] sovereignty" of Lebanon. The current Syrian military presence in Lebanon and its influence in domestic Lebanese pol-

itics runs counter to these commitments.

This legislation seeks to address the more pernicious elements of Syria's foreign policy, and I support that goal. That being said, this legislation is not perfect. I am concerned that this legislation does not grant the President a waiver that he might need "in the interest of national security." In addition, some of the certification requirements contained in the bill may need to be revised. When this legislation comes to the floor, I will offer an amendment that addresses these concerns.

While Syria is a nation whose actions are of grave concern to me, Syria supported the Saudi Peace Initiative which recognized the right of the State of Israel to exist, and recently Syria's representative to the United Nation's Security Council voted in favor of smart sanctions which will alleviate the suffering of the Iraqi people while hindering Saddam Hussein's ability to obtain the materiel needed to support this efforts to obtain, develop and use weapons of mass destruction.

These are useful steps but pale in significance to the negative actions of Syria that have earned it the dubious distinction of being one of the world's rogue states.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the 2002 budget through May 21, 2002. The estimates, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 83, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2002, show that current level spending in 2002 is below the budget resolution by \$11.6 billion in budget authority and by \$18.8 billion in outlays. Current level revenues are equal to the revenue floor in 2002.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 22, 2002.

Hon. KENT CONRAD,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed tables show the effects of Congressional action on the 2002 budget and are current through May 21, 2002. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 83, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2002.