

President and his instincts that he will, in fact, ultimately make the correct decision.

PROVIDING FOR A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H. Con. Res. 12, a resolution providing for a joint session of Congress, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President on the state of the Union.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 12) was agreed to.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session to be held tonight, Tuesday, January 28, 2003, at 9 p.m.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

PRAYERS FOR THE PRESIDENT AND THE MEN AND WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first let me join my friend from Utah in sentiments that he expressed at the end of his speech in that we hope and pray for the wisest decision from the President. And we hope and pray for our young men and women who are amassing in the Middle East now.

War, of course, should be the last resort. We still hope that it can be avoided. But if it cannot, we wish them and their families the best and pray for their speedy success.

HOMELAND SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, my reason for coming to the Chamber today is similar to those of many of my

colleagues on this side of the aisle. We are discussing what we hope the President will speak about tonight, what we want him to speak about, what we expect him to speak about.

Some of my colleagues have talked about areas such as the economy, the environment, education, and health care. I am going to address the issue of homeland security because, as much as we do overseas, we have to make sure our homeland is secure as well.

If, God willing, we were able to just eliminate all of al-Qaida and all of Saddam and his supporters, we would still face a danger from terrorism. Terrorists can strike almost at will in different ways, and our country is not yet secure against them, although I will say we have made some progress, particularly in the areas of air safety and in bioterrorism, since 9/11.

But we have so much more to do. What worries me is that the focus of this administration is almost exclusively on fighting the war on terrorism overseas. To beat the terrorists we need a one-two punch—one, fighting that war overseas, dealing with terrorism overseas; but, two, making our homeland more secure. And there seems to be a rather quaint and quirky notion among many of those in the administration that we can successfully fight the war here at home without spending a nickel. That is just wrong.

The bottom line is if someone were to say to the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, go fight the war in Iraq without any new resources, without any new dollars, he would say: I can't. But that is basically what we are saying to Mr. Tom Ridge and those who work under him.

Time and time again, when Members on both sides of the aisle have done a lot of research and proposed measures that would increase our security here at home, we are told: Well, that's a good idea, but we can't spend any money on it.

That just cannot be. There are so many areas where we lie naked, possible prey, God forbid, to terrorists.

Take our ports. We are far, far behind where we should be in monitoring what comes in on our ships. As we all know, those ships could be filled with deadly devices.

Take our borders. On the northern border, my State has a long and peaceful border with Canada. But, right now, if we pass the budget that was passed in the Senate, there will be fewer Customs inspectors on that northern border than there were on 9/11.

As to the FBI, this new budget that we passed, unfortunately, cuts the number of FBI agents. While the counterterrorism parts of the FBI are increasing, all the other parts are decreasing. It makes no sense to say we are going to make our citizens more secure from a foreign threat and leave them prey to a domestic threat. Bank robberies in my community are going up. It seems logical to assume that one of the reasons for that is that the FBI

is not able to do its function under the strained budget that we have given it—to do both functions: fighting terrorism and fighting crime here at home.

As to cyberterrorism, unfortunately, Richard Clark, a brilliant man—the administration's point man on cyber-security—is leaving. But I am sure, as he has told many of you, we are again doing virtually nothing to make ourselves more secure from a deadly virus that might invade one of the very important technological systems that secure our country. And the list goes on and on and on.

As to truck safety, trucks that carry hazardous material, Brazil is doing a far better job in dealing with terrorism there than we are, even though they have not been the focus of terrorist attacks.

As to the rails, in my City of New York, Penn Station has a 1½-mile tunnel that has no egress. God forbid if something terrible happened there. What we have to do is look at all of our weak pressure points in terms of where terrorists would strike and strengthen them.

But this administration, in part because they do not want to spend the dollars necessary—as eager as they are to spend the dollars overseas that are necessary—is not doing the job.

So today we are going to look, as the President speaks, as to what specifically he is going to do to bolster our case in terms of homeland security. We are going to see if the promise that was made—for instance, in the USA Patriot Act, that we triple the number of Border Patrol and Customs agents and immigration authorities at the northern border—will be fulfilled.

We are going to look and see if there are the dollars necessary to update the INS computers, which are notoriously bad, so terrorists cannot slip into the country, and the FBI computers that, again, were so bad that all the signals we had about a plot that was hatched for 9/11 were missed, mainly because the FBI computers were less sophisticated, frankly, than the one my eighth grade, 14-year-old daughter has at her home.

The list goes on and on. And no one expects this administration will clean up every single problem we have in 6 months. But in terms of effort, in terms of focus, in terms of allocation of resources, they are woefully behind.

My good colleague from West Virginia, who has done so much to lead this fight, made a very good point on the homeland security bill. That bill, as you all know, rearranged agencies but did not change what happens within them.

Rearranging agencies does not change things. Moving the Coast Guard over to this new agency is not going to help it patrol 200 miles off the coast as it must do in our post 9/11 world.

When our President tonight gives his speech, we are all going to be looking to see what specifically he will say and

what resources he will devote to protect our domestic security. Up until now the administration's voice has been all too quiet and all too silent. We hope tonight's speech indicates a large change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. What is the status of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time until 4:45 is under the control of the Senator from New Hampshire, 5 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct.

Mr. GREGG. I was of the impression that the unanimous consent gave us 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is now 5 minutes.

FUNDING

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, there have been a lot of representations made on the floor today by Members of the other side of the aisle relative to funding and lack of funding. It is interesting because, as we went through the last budget exercise in the Senate last week, when the appropriations bills were passed, we heard from the other side that they needed more and more money. And although the President tried to hold the line on fiscal discipline by setting a number of \$750 billion of discretionary spending, which was the agreed-to amount signed off on by the Senator from West Virginia and members of the Democratic Party back when they controlled the Senate in the last Congress, suddenly we found that money was not enough.

There was over a half a trillion dollars of new spending proposed from the other side of the aisle that was not offset, not paid for, that would have been put on top of the spending which the President had committed to. That irresponsible explosion in proposals in spending is an example of the lack of discipline which we are seeing in the area of fiscal policy from the other side of the aisle.

It has to be put in the context not only of the fact that it is an explosive attempt to expand the Federal deficit through new spending, but also in the context of the fact that this President has made stronger commitments in the area of education and national defense than any President in recent times and certainly than the President who preceded him.

I yield the floor.

It is very hard for me to understand how with a straight face, Members from the other side of the aisle can come down here and attack this President for failing to fund education. When we look at what this President has done in the area of funding education, we need to look at some pretty simple and obvious charts. In his first year, President Bush increased funding for education over President Clinton's budget by \$20 billion. That is \$20 billion

of new money this President put directly into education in his first year as President.

An example of that commitment was in the area of special education, where President Clinton basically zero funded, relative to increases, the issue of special education, while President Bush dramatically increased it, by \$1 billion a year, year in and year out, since he has been President the first 3 years—\$1 billion each year, so that he has radically increased funding for special education.

It is pretty hard for the other side to come down here and make the representation that this President has not significantly increased funding. In fact, if you look at the spending this President has committed to funding and done in the context of fiscal responsibility, not exploding the budget with spending as was proposed from the other side of the aisle when they proposed over half a trillion dollars of new spending last week without offsets, this President, in the area of education, has increased funding by \$2.5 billion in the area of title I, for example, in his first 2 years in office. That is a greater increase, by 25 percent, than President Clinton gave in his 7 years in office. So the commitment for funding for education has been dramatic.

We heard earlier that the President hasn't funded up to the authorization levels. That is not unusual in this Congress or in this Government not to fund to the authorization levels. I will point out that if you are going to compare funding up to the authorization levels of this Presidency versus President Clinton, under President Clinton's Presidency, the gap between funding, the difference between funding to appropriation levels and authorization levels was about twice what this President's gap is in that area. President Bush has done even a better job in coming close to funding at authorization levels than President Clinton did.

It is really inconsistent and a touch hypocritical to come down here and attack President Bush for failing to fund education when, in fact, he has done more to fund education than any President in recent times and certainly dramatically more than his predecessor during a time when the Democratic Party controlled both the Senate and the Presidency.

There have been other representations that he has not funded adequately homeland security. That is an incredible representation. When I hear the Senator from New York come down here and say that homeland security has not been adequately funded, when you think of the billions, tens of billions of dollars the Congress has voted to assist the City of New York, very appropriately, under the leadership of this President, I find it difficult to understand how that argument can be made.

If you look at the funding in the area of the FBI, we have heard this rep-

resentation: This number of agencies is going to have to be cut.

That is a total fabrication. FBI funding under this President has gone up every year. It is going up significantly this year. It went up significantly last year. And more agents are being added. The same is true of the INS, the same is true of the Marshals Service, of DEA. All of these accounts come under the jurisdiction of a committee which I had the good fortune to be ranking member of and now am chairman of, the Commerce, State, Justice Committee. The representation that we are actually reducing manpower or reducing the accounts in these areas is simply wrong. It is inaccurate, and it is a gross misstatement. It should not be made on the floor of the Senate because people should know the facts before they come down here and make these representations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GREGG. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is a most interesting discussion we are having. I guess two and two equals five here in the Senate. We are told repeatedly that this Senate and Congress should increase defense spending, and it does; increase spending on homeland security, and it does. And then cut other domestic discretionary spending. But now we are told, we don't really cut other domestic discretionary spending.

The President apparently wants to increase defense spending, increase homeland security spending, increase other spending, and then have tax cuts, as if somehow that all adds up. I don't know where you get that kind of schooling. Does two and two equal five? I don't think so.

Either there are cuts in domestic discretionary spending or there are no cuts. We all know the truth. I will bring charts down here and talk about these areas of the Government where they will be spending less this year than they did last year. With respect to homeland security, I wonder if my colleagues really make the case that the President has not in any way ignored the needs of homeland security when in fact we appropriated \$2.5 billion for homeland security that the President would not spend, in spite of the fact that, for example, with port security, that is the security of America's seaports, we have 5.7 million containers coming in every year to the seaports, and 100,000 of them are inspected and 5.6 million are not.

Everyone in this country understands, all law enforcement understands, that that is a very difficult problem. The homeland security issue with respect to seaports is a very serious issue. It is unaddressed.