

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.

CAMBODIA'S RULING PARTY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, there are two recent developments in Cambodia deserving of the Senate's attention.

First, voter registration for parliamentary elections in July, which is ongoing throughout that country over the next month, is being undermined by the ruling Cambodian People's Party, CPP. In complete control of the national and local election machinery, the CPP is making it difficult for opposition activists and supporters to register to vote and is creating a climate of fear that only bolsters the status quo.

While I am pleased the opposition Sam Rainsy Party and the royalist FUNCINPEC party have publicly complained of CPP interference and manipulation, I am deeply troubled by the relative silence of the international community in condemning these pre-election abuses.

Unless the complacent donor community aggressively checks CPP's manipulation in the preparation of these polls, the outcome of the elections will be a foregone conclusion even before the first vote is cast.

Second, recent comments by CPP hardliner and Prime Minister Hun Sen should be of grave concern to all donor nations, and democracy activists throughout Cambodia. On January 14, 2003, Hun Sen said: "I would like to announce to all the political parties to be very careful. If you would like to break Hun Sen's party, or the CPP, you might miss the opportunity to work on your own internal affairs. And as usual, Hun Sen would beat up and destroy the head of the engine. Meaning, I never beat up unimportant person but completely destroy the main engine. If you would like to play this game, I would be more than happy to accompany you. And I will use my last resort if that is what it takes. . . ."

This public threat betrays Hun Sen's total commitment to harassment, intimidation, and violence as a means of maintaining his rule.

Hun Sen's dark character was further revealed when he continued: "I assure you that I have all the means to get the information from you [opposition political parties]. If you have the meeting in the morning, the information will come to me in the afternoon. Except if you kill all the people in your own party like Pol Pot, then the information will not reach Hun Sen. Everywhere there are Hun Sen's men. Don't forget that I am the head of an undercover agency. I would like my capabilities to be known to the world. The CIA [Central Intelligence Agency] is American, but we are the Cambodian Intelligence Agency (CIA)."

Through his own words, and by his own admission, Hun Sen has shown himself to be nothing less than a paranoid evil dictator. His tough talk is unimpressive and only underscores his complicity in the numerous corrupt and violent episodes of Cambodia's

more recent past, including illegal logging and the ongoing harassment of Global Witness, the killing of opposition activists, the banning of Voice of America rebroadcasts by the Beehive radio station, the March 1997 grenade attack against the Khmer Nation Party, and the July 1997 coup d'etat.

Let me be very clear to the State Department, the World Bank, and other international financial institutions: the failure to hold Prime Minister Hun Sen and the CPP accountable for their repressive actions and abuses, including in the ongoing harassment of Global Witness, will have funding ramifications in the fiscal year 2004 foreign operations bill.

I want to assure the people of Cambodia that many of us in the Congress will continue to follow political developments in Cambodia. We know that you want change, and the stability that comes from a nation rooted in the rule of law. And we know that the CPP cannot provide this.

EXTENSION OF THE RURAL ADD-ON PAYMENT FOR HOME HEALTH

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator BOND, I want to thank the chairman of the Finance Committee and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee for agreeing to include a 6 month extension of the add-on payment for rural home health services in the omnibus appropriations bill. Extension of this add-on payment, which currently is scheduled to sunset on April 1 will help to ensure that Medicare patients in rural areas continue to have access to the home health services that they need.

Home health has become an increasingly important part of our health care system. The kinds of highly skilled, and often technically complex, services that our Nation's home health agencies provide have enabled millions of our most frail and vulnerable older persons to avoid hospitals and nursing homes and stay just where they want to be, in the comfort and security of their own homes.

Surveys have shown that the delivery of home health services in rural areas can be as much as 12 to 15 percent more costly because of the extra travel time required to cover long distances between patients, higher transportation expenses, and other factors.

Rural agencies also experience higher costs relative to productivity. Because of the longer travel times and distances between patients, rural caregivers are unable to perform as many visits in a day as their urban counterparts. Sandra Scott-Adams, the executive director of the Visiting Nurses of Aroostook in Aroostook County, ME, where I am from, tells me her agency covers 6,600 square miles with a population of only 72,000. Her costs are understandably much higher and her staff productivity much lower than the average due to the long distances her staff must cover to see patients.

Moreover, agencies in rural areas are frequently smaller than their urban counterparts, which means their relative costs are higher due to smaller scale operations. Smaller agencies with fewer patients and fewer visits means that fixed costs, particularly those associated with meeting regulatory requirements, are spread over a smaller number of patients and visits, increasing overall per-patient and per-visit costs.

If the rural add-on payment is eliminated on April 1, it will only put more pressure on rural home health agencies that are already struggling and could force more of these agencies to close. Many agencies operating in rural areas are the only home health providers in a vast geographic area. If any of these agencies are forced to close, the Medicare patients in that region will lose complete access to home health care.

The Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, MedPAC, met earlier this week and voted unanimously to extend for 1 year the add-on payments for rural home health services at 5 percent. Our provision is consistent with the MedPAC's recommendation and will extend the expiring provision through September 30. This will give the Finance Committee time to consider whether this add-on payment should be extended further.

Once again, I thank my colleagues for their assistance, and I look forward to working with them on this and other issues of importance to the health of rural Americans.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

HONORING MISS DAISY ROSE BECK

• Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Miss Daisy Rose Beck who passed away on September 7, 2002, after losing a hard fought battle with leukemia. She retired from the U.S. Federal Service in 1995 after serving America for 54 consecutive years. She holds the record for length of employment as a female GS-level employee.

From the early 1960s through 1995, her duties included personal secretary for the four-star U.S. army generals who pulled tours of duty in the Republic of Korea, commanding the United Nations Command, ROK/U.S. Combined Forces Command, U.S. Forces Korea and the 8th U.S. Army. In addition, she was one of the workers at the German War Crimes Trial at Nuremberg.

Daisy Rose Beck was very quiet, friendly, efficient, respectful, and very much loved by all who met her. Daisy served for decades in places where most Americans only served a single year. She is a true American, hard working, efficient, intelligent, courteous, kind, and yet focused and dedicated to the success of a mission.

These days we face harsh enemies around the globe. We Americans have a proud tradition of doing what is right