

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.

It is interesting to come here and listen to this, but there are either cuts in spending or there are not. We will have some discussion about that in the future. Let me talk about a couple of other things, if I might.

We are going to hear the State of the Union speech tonight. The fact is, I want this President to succeed. I want this country to succeed. I wish no ill will towards anyone because of partisanship. We are of different parties, but we serve the same interest. We serve the common interest of this country. All of us want this President to succeed, want his administration to succeed, and we want this country to do well.

But I want to tell you, there are some days when I wonder about what is going on around here. Today is one of those days. I don't know when in all the years I have served in the House and Senate that I have been more disturbed than I was in reading this article I will describe. It appeared in yesterday's Washington Times. A similar story ran in the Los Angeles Times the day before yesterday.

Let me read the first paragraph:

Top White House officials warned yesterday the Bush administration has not ruled out using nuclear weapons against Iraqi President Saddam Hussein if he deploys weapons of mass destruction against the United States.

Now, I don't understand this at all. We are told in the Los Angeles Times, and in this story, that they are talking about using designer bunker buster nuclear weapons, something that has been discussed previously in the administration. Do you know that India and Pakistan were shooting at each other yesterday over Kashmir? Both of them have nuclear weapons, and the leadership of this country must be exhorted to tell these countries you cannot use the nuclear option? We are the country that must exercise restraint.

We have people in this administration who, in my judgment, make the most reckless, dangerous statements I have heard in some 2 decades in this town when they talk about the potential of using nuclear weapons. That is not what this country ought to be talking about. There are some 30,000 nuclear weapons, give or take a couple thousand, that exist on this Earth. It ought to be our responsibility to try to make sure that never again is a nuclear weapon exploded in anger on the face of this Earth. If one, just one, is exploded, others will explode. This country ought not talk about the use of nuclear weapons. We ought not be reckless to talk about designing a new type of bunker buster nuclear weapon. This lowers the threshold of other countries who aspire to having nuclear weapons about when they might consider using them. It is reckless, dangerous, and irresponsible. I cannot believe I am reading this sort of thing. The nuclear option in Iraq—the L.A. Times says:

The United States has lowered the bar for using the ultimate weapon. The United

States is thinking about the unthinkable, preparing for the possible use of nuclear weapons against Iraq.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 27, 2003]
ADMINISTRATION WON'T BAR USE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS

(By Ellen Sorokin)

Two top White House officials warned yesterday the Bush administration has not ruled out using nuclear weapons against Iraqi President Saddam Hussein if he deploys weapons of mass destruction against the United States or its allies.

White House Chief of Staff Andrew H. Card Jr. said on Sunday morning talk shows that the United States will use "whatever means necessary" to protect its citizens and the world from a "holocaust."

"I'm not going to put anything on the table or off the table," Mr. Card said on NBC's "Meet the Press." "But we have a responsibility to make sure Saddam Hussein and his generals do not use weapons of mass destruction."

Dan Bartlett, White House communications director, echoed Mr. Card's sentiments.

"What is clear—and the message that President Bush has sent unequivocally—is that if the Iraqi regime, if Saddam Hussein and his generals decide for one second to use weapons of mass destruction against allied forces of the United States of America and our allies, we will make sure it doesn't happen," Mr. Bartlett said on CNN's "Late Edition."

Their comments came two days after an article published in the Los Angeles Times claimed the United States was considering using nuclear weapons in a possible war against Iraq to destroy underground command posts and stop Iraqi forces from using weapons of mass destruction.

The story cited top U.S. private military expert William M. Arkin. According to the story, he said plans for using nuclear weapons against Iraq were being fleshed out at the U.S. Strategic Command in Omaha, Neb., at the Pentagon and at an "undisclosed location" in Pennsylvania where Vice President Richard B. Cheney spent time during terrorism alerts.

Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld signed in December 2001 a classified nuclear posture review that opened the possibility for nuclear weapons to be used against targets able to withstand most non-nuclear attacks. Countries such as Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Libya and Syria were added to the list of possible targets.

Defense Department spokesman Maj. Ted Wadsworth refused to confirm or deny the report, saying: "That's something that policy-makers have to talk about."

Yesterday, several lawmakers and policy analysts said they hoped the administration would not resort to using nuclear weapons to deal with the situation in Iraq.

Sen. RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana Republican and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, said he hasn't heard any discussion on using nuclear weapons on Iraq.

"Our policy is negotiation," Mr. LUGAR told "Late Edition." "[Secretary of State Colin L.] Powell at the United Nations, bringing together the U.N., trying to get Saddam to declare, hoping the inspectors against hope will find something. All we're saying . . . Saddam has to realize he will be disarmed. He doesn't understand that. I don't think he believes it. And that's the critical point."

Sen. BARBARA BOXER, California Democrat and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, said the real test of the country's leadership is bringing the world together and resolving the issues in a way that results with the least loss of life.

"It's very chilling to talk about first use of nuclear weapons," Mrs. BOXER said on "Late Edition."

"And I wish we didn't go down the path. The whole world knows that we are the superpower, we are for sure the only superpower, we have an arsenal that could destroy every man, woman and child in the world 10 times over. We don't have to go around beating the drums of war," she said.

Pentagon adviser Richard Perle said on "Fox News Sunday" he couldn't think of a "target of interest" in a conflict with Iraq that couldn't be addressed with non-nuclear weapons.

"We have extraordinary military technology, weapons of great precision that have the enormous benefit of destroying the target almost all of the time without doing unintended damage to civilians," said Mr. Perle, a resident fellow at the conservative American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research in Washington.

"I can't see why we would wish to use a nuclear weapon," he said.

Several lawmakers said they would first want Mr. Bush to present evidence as to why military force against Iraq is needed.

Senate Minority Leader TOM DASCHLE, South Dakota Democrat, said Mr. Bush has yet to make a "compelling case" that military force against Iraq is necessary right now.

"He hasn't done that," Mr. DASCHLE said on CBS' "Face the Nation."

"The President needs to make a compelling case that Iraq poses a very imminent threat to the United States and, secondly, that he has worked through the international community and exhausted all other options. Only if those two criteria are met does he have the authority, the license to take military action."

Mr. DORGAN, Mr. President, I hope those who are in closed rooms thinking in this kind of a dangerous way are not part of the Government for long, or part of this administration for long. That is not what we ought to be doing in this country.

Let me describe one other piece of information about this issue of foreign policy. One year ago in the State of the Union Address, the President said—correctly, in my judgment—that the greatest threat to this country is the network of terrorists around the globe that wish this country harm. They are the ones who murdered thousands of innocent Americans. One year ago now, I was in Afghanistan. Flying into that country over the mountains, you looked down and you understood that deep inside caves in the mountains were Osama bin Laden and his key planners, planning the murder of innocent Americans. That network of terrorists and others around the world represent a serious threat to this country.

But we have not heard about Osama bin Laden for a long while. I read yesterday that the President himself mentioned Osama bin Laden six times in the last year. It appears that these days it is "Osama been forgotten," rather than Osama bin Laden.

Osama bin Laden is a very serious threat to this country. He is apparently alive, according to our intelligence services. His chief deputy has not been found. Key leadership of the al-Qaida has not been discovered. The head of the CIA says we are at as great a risk today for terrorism as we were the day before September 11. It is now Iraq, all Iraq, all the time.

But the President was right last year. This country, in my judgment, suffers grave danger from the acts of terrorists who are still there, still active, and still wish to harm this country and kill innocent Americans.

My hope is that we could have some balance in the concerns we express about what is going on around the world between North Korea, Iraq, al-Qaida, and more.

Mr. President, I assume President Bush will talk a great deal about foreign policy tonight, but I think he will also talk about economic policy.

Saddam Hussein is a bad, evil guy, no question about that. North Korea is a threat. Terrorists, especially, are a very serious continuing threat. All of that, to be sure, exists. It is also the case that here at home we have an economy that is not doing very well. A great many people are out of work. Some people say, well, let's brush all that aside, things are just fine. They are not fine. The administration, for some while, has said this is just fine. The economy has hit a little speed bump, I think they called it, but things will be fine.

In the last 2 months, the administration fired their economic team, brought in some new people, and now they are saying we need a stimulus program, despite what they have provided us is not a stimulus at all. It will provide no jump start to the economy. If that is what we want, this is like hooking a flashlight battery to a car and hoping to start it. It will not work.

The question for all of us is: What will really work to give this economy some boost? First and foremost, part of what is weighing down on the neck of this economy is every morning every American wakes up and tunes in the news and the top story every day, every month, is the potential of war. That means unpredictability, uncertainty, and great concern. When that exists, the American people don't have the confidence in the future that we need. Confidence is what this economy is about. Our economic foundation is confidence by the American people. When they are confident, they do things that manifest that confidence. They take a trip, buy a car, buy a home, make a purchase, and the country expands. That is the expansionary side of the business cycle. When they are not confident about the future, they do the exact opposite. They defer the trip, don't buy the car, don't make the purchase, and the economy then contracts.

First and foremost, people are concerned about this talk every day, every

week, every month regarding the specter of war. We have to find a way to move through this period and give people confidence about the future. But the economy also needs a boost, a fiscal policy that gives it a boost, a jump start.

The principles are very simple. They have nothing at all to do with what the President suggested. The principles are that a jump start of the economy ought to be immediate, temporary, and effective. I regret to say that the President proposes none of that. I wish he would have proposed something that was consistent with those principles. I would say sign me up, I am for it. But that is not the case.

We have lost a great many jobs—2.4 million private sector jobs—since President Bush took over. Now, it is not the role of Government to create jobs. That is not what Government does. The private sector and businesses create jobs. But the Government creates conditions under which jobs are created, economic conditions in which the economy expands or contracts. When it contracts, people lay their employees off, entrepreneurs and businesses lay off employees because they don't see a better future. When the economy expands, people are hired and more people are put to work as employees.

The fact is that, at the moment, we have exploding deficits, high unemployment, a lack of confidence in the future, and we need, it seems to me—all of us—to be serious about what we do in putting the economy back on track. We are finally talking about "how" rather than "whether." Three months ago, the question was "whether." The President's economic team was saying that things are fine. We are all saying they are not fine, we have to fix what is wrong with the economy, and the sooner the better.

My hope is that this evening the President will recognize all of us want to work with him on national economic policy and on foreign policy. It is very important that we do the right thing. The President's plan, regrettably, is not near the right thing for what ails this economy.

Providing exemptions for dividend payments, the bulk of which are owned by upper income people, the wealthiest Americans, and borrowing money to do it so we can have tax cuts for 10 years into the future of \$670 billion makes no sense at all.

If someone were to say let's have a debate on reforming the tax system, we could debate all of these things, but if we are talking about how to stimulate this economy, how to jump-start the American economy, the President has provided exactly the wrong set of recommendations. They are not immediate, temporary or effective. He will be stuck, we will be stuck, and the American people will be stuck with an economy that is sluggish and is not doing what it needs to do to expand and help businesses create jobs. That is

not what I want. It is not what any of my colleagues want. We had an economy that works, one that gave hope and opportunity to the American people, and we want that back.

I am going to come to the Chamber in the next couple of days and show some charts. I was going to show them today. The Office of Management and Budget, which tells us how the economy is doing, is so wildly off the mark they might as well be throwing darts at some chart to find out what the surplus, deficit, and fiscal policy ought to be. They predict, and promise from time to time, that the fiscal condition of this country is going to be incredibly good with big surpluses. Then a few months later, they say it is going to be an economy in big trouble and big deficits. It seems to me one could probably get as close as they are getting by throwing darts at a board. We really need a plan that works, one that is predictable, one we can count on, one that restores economic health to this country and puts the economy back on track.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator explain what this chart means?

Mr. DORGAN. This chart shows the predictions of the Office of Management and Budget. In the year 2002, they predicted we would have a \$283 billion surplus.

Mr. REID. How did that turn out?

Mr. DORGAN. It turned out we had a \$159 billion deficit.

Mr. REID. How far were they off? It is \$283 billion, plus \$159 billion, that's how far they were off?

Mr. DORGAN. That is very good. They were off over \$400 billion. For 2003 they said we were going to have a \$41 billion surplus. Now we are going to have over a \$300 billion surplus.

Mr. REID. That is easy: \$341 billion.

Mr. DORGAN. That is right. The Senator took advanced math in Searchlight, NV, I can see.

Mr. REID. I also ask my friend, wouldn't this \$300 billion surplus that is the revised estimate be one of the largest deficits in more than 2 decades?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes, absolutely.

Now we have some people saying deficits really are not so bad. Where did that start? It seems to me if children are saddled with the debt from our spending, or our tax cuts, the kids are being told, by the way, here is our policy and you pay for it.

Is that good or bad? Where I come from, that is not the kind of value system that one wants to express in fiscal policy.

I am going to have more to say on this, but this is not the time. I know we want to be out soon and the President is going to be giving his State of the Union Address this evening.

I want to make the point that both in foreign policy and fiscal policy, this country is significantly challenged. These are very tricky times. It requires a very steady hand and good policies.

Let me finish where I started. I am very concerned about people, on the eve of a State of the Union Address by a President of the United States, talking about the potential use of nuclear weapons by our country. I cannot believe that is what is happening. Just after India and Pakistan, who possess nuclear weapons and do not like each other much, have been shooting at each other, this country is saying, by the way, there might be circumstances in which we could use nuclear weapons. Whoever these two top White House officials are who said this, shame on them.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DORGAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. REID. The majority leader is not in the Chamber to close the Senate, and I have a couple of questions I would like to ask. Mitch Daniels, the head of the Office of Management and Budget, said on January 16 this year we ought not to hyperventilate about this new deficit estimate. Are you aware that the Senate majority leader said on January 5, 1996: "We have a moral obligation to balance the budget; I am very hopeful that we are going to see to that"? Are you aware he said that?

Mr. DORGAN. It is not surprising. I think the value system for most of us has been we ought to try to have fiscal responsibility and balance the budget.

I say to the head of the Office of Management and Budget, he ought to start hyperventilating. If he does not hyperventilate over this, I guess there is nothing that gets his heart rate or breathing up.

When we talk about the issue of projected surpluses and then huge, suffocating budget deficits as far out as the eye can see, one better hyperventilate a little bit about that.

Mr. REID. Is the Senator aware that on February 1, 1998, the senior Senator from New Hampshire said: "As long as we have a Republican Congress we are going to have a balanced budget, and if we can get a Republican President we can start paying down the debt on the Federal Government"?

That really has not proven to be true, has it?

Mr. DORGAN. It is not true that we have at this point a balanced budget. What is true is the budget is seriously out of balance and headed south. It is going to get worse and we need to fix it. Ignoring it is not going to solve the problem. We need to jump-start this economy with something that is effective and that is a stimulus plan of some type that gives something to the American people to work with, and gives them some confidence.

I happen to believe that Senator DASCHLE, myself, and others who have talked about rebates make a lot of sense. Incentivizing consumption in the short term and incentivizing business investment in the short term, in an immediate and temporary way, is what I think will give some boost to this American economy.

Mr. REID. Is the Senator aware that on November 15, 1995, the junior Sen-

ator from Pennsylvania, now a part of the Senate leadership in the majority, said: "The American people are sick and tired of excuses for inaction to balance the budget. The public wants us to stay the course toward a balanced budget, and we take that obligation quite seriously"?

That really is not the way it is. Is it not true that during the last 4 years of the Clinton administration we spent less money than we took in?

Mr. DORGAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. REID. Is it not true we had a surplus?

Mr. DORGAN. We had very significant and increasing surpluses in the Federal budget. As a result of those surpluses, we began to actually eliminate Federal indebtedness, which relieved some of that burden off the shoulders of our children and their children.

Mr. REID. Is it not true we were even warned the last year of the Clinton administration to be careful, the debt is being paid down too quickly, slow it down or it may have some short-term impact on the economy?

Mr. DORGAN. What is true is when we got to a new fiscal policy proposal by the administration, they said let's cut \$1.7 trillion in taxes because we have surpluses as far as the eye can see. Some of us said—I certainly did—maybe we ought to be a little bit conservative. What if we do not have surpluses forever? What if we run into some tough times? What if the economy runs into trouble? Then guess what happened. Without my vote, Congress passed a very large, permanent tax cut. We quickly discovered we were in a recession. Then we had a terrorist attack on September 11. Then we had a war on terrorism. Then we had the largest corporate scandals in history. All of this happened, it seems to me, suggesting that perhaps some of us who urged caution were right, because what happened is those big budget surpluses are now very big budget deficits.

What does the President say we ought to do about that? Let's provide more 10-year tax cuts to the tune of \$670 billion. When interest is added to it, it is going to be over \$1 trillion. None of that adds up.

Mr. REID. Is the Senator aware that on February 6, 1997, the senior Senator from Nebraska said: "The real threat to Social Security is the national debt. If we do not act to balance the budget and stop adding to the debt, then we are truly placing the future of Social Security in jeopardy"? These huge deficits that have been accumulated during the last 2 years of this administration—the first 2 years, I should say, of this administration, the last 2 years—certainly that is not good for Social Security. Senator HAGEL is right, is that not true?

Mr. DORGAN. What these deficits do is they injure the Social Security system, and the long-term solvency of the Social Security system. There is no question about that. We have a lot

riding on putting this economy back on track. The sooner the better. I think what the President and the Congress need to do is find a way to work together to do something that is effective right now.

Let me thank the Senator from Nevada for his questions.

I yield the floor.

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

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—S. 224

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I understand that S. 224, introduced earlier today, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 224) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

Mr. DASCHLE. I now ask for its second reading, and I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST
TIME—S. 225

Mr. DASCHLE. I understand S. 225, introduced earlier today, is at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill for the first time.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 225) to provide for emergency unemployment compensation.

Mr. DASCHLE. I now ask for its second reading, and I object to my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we will have more to say about these matters tomorrow. As my colleagues know, this is an ongoing interest on the part of our caucus to move forward in providing benefits to those who are uninsured, especially those who are no longer eligible for current benefits. There are about a million of those people who are looking to us for help, and we will have more to say about that tomorrow.