

This year that bill came to the floor with the solid support of the Republicans and Democrats on that committee. It was unanimously supported. It increased the homeland security part above the President's request by \$3 billion.

As we have gone through the process—it was a long, dragged-out effort when it came to working with the other body on the conference. We finally had to yield and come down from the \$3 billion to \$1.4 billion in additional money over the President's request for homeland security.

Again, all the way, I am proud to say, we have a bipartisan group in that committee that walks step by step and shoulder to shoulder to my colleague, Senator STEVENS, and I. We don't have any quarrels. We don't have any differences. We don't have any partisan discussions. We don't have any partisan bickering, nor do the members on the committee.

The distinguished Senator from Utah, Mr. BENNETT, is a member of that committee. I served with his father. I believe his father sat right here. I believe his father sat right there in that chair when the son, in whom his father was well pleased, was around these premises and knew a great deal about the Congress and worked in the Congress. He worked in his precincts.

We don't have any middle aisle in our committee. It was a joint effort on the part of Republicans and Democrats in close ranks and voting to support moneys for the security of the American people. These are moneys that are in this conference report.

When it comes to homeland defense, this Appropriations Committee has been right out front. I am very proud of the way we have been able to do our work and work together. It has been a long time since this committee started on this bill. I guess the budget was sent up here last February. It has been all that long time.

Here we are in July with the conference report that we will be voting on tomorrow morning.

I thank the distinguished Senator.
I yield the floor.

CHANGES TO THE 2002 APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS AND THE BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires that chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the budgetary aggregates and the allocation for the Appropriations Committee by the amount of appropriations designated as emergency spending pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended. The conference report to H.R. 4775, the 2002 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Further Recovery From and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States, provides \$29.886 billion

in designated emergency funding 2002 for a variety of activities, including homeland security and the war on terrorism, which is estimated to result in \$7.783 billion in outlays in 2002.

Pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby revise the 2002 allocation provided to the Senate Appropriations Committee in the concurrent budget resolution in the following amounts.

TABLE 1.—REVISED ALLOCATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, 2002
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays
Current Allocation:		
General Purpose Discretionary	704,240	692,717
Highways	0	28,489
Mass Transit	0	5,275
Conservation	1,760	1,473
Mandatory	358,567	350,837
Total	1,064,567	1,078,791
Adjustments:		
General Purpose Discretionary	29,886	7,783
Highways	0	0
Mass Transit	0	0
Conservation	0	0
Mandatory	0	0
Total	29,886	7,783
Revised Allocation:		
General Purpose Discretionary	734,126	700,500
Highways	0	28,489
Mass Transit	0	5,275
Conservation	1,760	1,473
Mandatory	358,567	350,837
Total	1,094,453	1,086,574

Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby revise the 2002 budget aggregates included in the concurrent budget resolution in the following amounts.

TABLE 2.—REVISED BUDGET AGGREGATES, 2002
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays
Current allocation: Budget Resolution	1,680,564	1,645,999
Adjustments: Emergency Spending	29,886	7,783
Revised allocation: Budget Resolution	1,710,450	1,653,782

Prepared by SBC Majority staff on 7-23-02.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 3210

Mr. REID. Madam President, when I today read Congress Daily, as I often do, I was stunned. I was stunned as a result of what the President said in his radio address.

I have to acknowledge that I didn't wait around and listen to it Saturday. But I read about it here.

Let me read what the President said on Saturday. I say this with total sincerity. I am so disappointed in the President. I am sure others think that what he has done is hypocrisy. I will not use that word.

I am just terribly disappointed in the President.

This is what he said. The headline is: BUSH URGES CONGRESS TO SEND HIM TERRORIST REINSURANCE BILL.

President Bush made another plug for enactment of a terrorism reinsurance bill, noting in his radio address over the weekend, "Until Congress sends a bill to my desk,

some buildings will not be able to get coverage against terrorist attacks, and many new buildings will not be built at all. Commercial development is stalling, and workers are missing out on those jobs. This year alone, the lack of terrorism insurance has killed or delayed more than \$8 billion in commercial property financing. Congress should pass a terrorism insurance bill without unnecessary measures."

Can you imagine giving an address to the American people about Congress needing to do something on terrorism insurance?

Rather than wasting time on the radio address, why doesn't he call the Republican leadership in the Senate and ask: Why don't you let us go to conference?

Almost everything we have done with this terrorism insurance, we have had to fight the minority every step of the way. We fought to get it on the floor. We tried to do it even last year, right after the events of September 11, and we were stopped from doing so.

I have been on this floor maybe 10 or 12 times offering a unanimous consent request that we be allowed to go forward with the conference.

Just to remind everybody, we were told by the leadership that all we needed to do is change the ratio. Senator DASCHLE—and he has that right—decided the ratio should be 3 to 2. We were told: Make it 4 to 3, and we will go right to conference. That was weeks ago. We changed: OK, if that is what you want, then we will be happy to do that. We changed it to 4 to 3.

Then we are told: Well, there are two people in the minority who want that third spot, and they can't work that out.

So, as a result of that, as the President has indicated, there is no question about it, there is work being held up in Nevada and all over the country because they cannot get terrorism insurance. We cannot go to conference because you will not let us.

Last week, we were told: Give us 24 hours to resolve this. I have said here, for this unanimous consent agreement that I have been seeking for several days: I will put it in my desk and do it again. No more. No more. This is the last. As far as I am concerned, terrorism insurance is dead.

The industry, obviously, does not care enough to put enough pressure on the minority so that we can go to conference. If the role were reversed, and we, the Democrats, were holding up the appointing of conferees on a terrorism insurance bill, our phones would be ringing. We would have petitions. We would have demonstrations. But because it is the insurance industry, which is a little closer to the minority than we are, nothing happens. Day after day after day goes on, and I guess they expect me and Senator DASCHLE to come and offer this unanimous consent request.

No more. They can do it. In the meantime, terrorism insurance is dead. Nothing is going to happen. The House is going out Thursday.

So, as far as I am concerned, this bill is dead. I am not putting the unanimous consent request in my desk anymore; I am putting it in the garbage can. And we will wait and see what happens.

I think it is too bad. But maybe there has been something that has happened in the last few hours that will change their minds. Maybe my statement now will change their minds.

So I ask unanimous consent—I better take it out of the garbage so I can read it; and then I will put it right back, as soon as I finish—that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 252, H.R. 3210, the House-passed terrorism insurance bill; that all after the enacting clause be stricken, and the text of S. 2600, as passed in the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof, the bill, as thus amended, be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that 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, with the ratio of 4 to 3, all without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say to my friend from Nevada that his words are well-taken. His passion is understood. At least as far as I am concerned, his determination to get this bill through is fully shared.

However, on behalf of the ranking member of the Banking Committee, Senator GRAMM, and reserving his rights, as I am sure the Senator from Nevada has from time to time reserved the rights of some of his colleagues, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 3694

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 381, H.R. 3694, and that the Jeffords-Reid-Smith-Inhofe amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read three times, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am told that the amendment is still under review on this side of the aisle; therefore, I must again object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah. He is absolutely correct. I, on an occasion or two, have represented Senators here, doing

things that sometimes I did not personally agree with. But I do hope that we can move forward on both matters.

I was serious about everything that I said on the terrorism insurance bill. On the matter dealing with highway funding, it is very important we get this done for a lot of different reasons. One reason is to prepare for the bill that is coming up next year, of which everyone has an interest. It is the bill we do every 5 or 6 years to fund highway projects around the country. It is money that collected during the 5-year period from the gas taxes. We need to make sure we have the ability to meet as many of the demands of the country as we can.

So I appreciate the Senator working on his side to get that cleared.

I have another unanimous consent request.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4775

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous order with respect to the conference report accompanying H.R. 4775, the supplemental appropriations bill, be modified to provide that the debate time commence at the conclusion of the debate with respect to the Hagel amendment to S. 812; with the debate time on the conference report remaining as provided for under the previous order; that upon the use of the time, without further intervening action or debate, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the conference report; that upon disposition of the conference report, there be 5 minutes for debate prior to a vote in relation to the Hagel amendment, with the time equally divided and controlled between Senators Hagel and Kennedy or their designees, provided further that the previous provisions relating to the Hagel amendment remain in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am happy to say on this occasion there is none.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, debate will begin on the Hagel amendment at 11 a.m. Under the previous order, there will be 2 hours of debate. At 1 p.m., the Senate will take up the supplemental conference report with 30 minutes of debate. The first vote tomorrow will be at 1:30, approximately, to be followed by a vote with respect to the Hagel amendment. There will be two votes then at 1:30 tomorrow.

I appreciate everyone working with us. We will be able to get a lot of work done in committees. The Appropriations Committee—Senator BYRD's committee—is reporting out, I think, four appropriations bills tomorrow morning.

We have a lot to do. This will allow us to do that without being broken up for votes.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for a period not to exceed 5 minutes each.

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

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of last year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred in November 2000 in Bloomington, MN. Cecil John Reiners, 57, attacked a Hispanic man for speaking Spanish at work. Witnesses told police that Reiners, the business owner, was upset when a 23 year-old employee was speaking Spanish with two others at a break table. Reiners went to the warehouse with a wood post and severely beat the victim, who was treated for severe skull fractures and clots at the hospital. "All I wanted was for that Mexican to leave my property," Reiners said. Mr. Reiners was later convicted of felony first-degree assault in connection with the incident.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

CIVILIZATION NEED NOT DIE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in the more than 10 months since the attacks of September 11, 2001, all of us have been trying to bring context and understanding to the new world challenges we are confronting. It is at times such as this that the Senate needs wisdom and clarity to bring such context to our times.

Often in the past, the Senate turned to one of its most distinguished colleagues for vision and wisdom. That person, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, understood history and the actors and actions that make history.

Recently, I came across the Harvard University commencement speech that our former colleague, Senator Moynihan, gave this year, on the 58th anniversary of D-Day. I think all of my colleagues will benefit from reading Pat's remarkable speech, for it gives historical context to the times in which we are living.

I, for one, miss hearing Pat's insights into life. All of us who served with Pat