

We want to also encourage people to have health insurance by allowing more trade associations to give health insurance options to their members because small businesses are not able to afford health care costs. If they are able to afford them, they are suffering even more. We are hearing of more small businesses that are dropping health care coverage for their employees because of the high cost of health care. So we are going to be doing some things that would benefit the States.

The President's package is a good one. It is a bold package, and it is a package that will stimulate our economy. If people know they are going to have money in their pockets, even if it is next year or the following year, they can plan. That is the key—being able to know what the Tax Code is, so people can plan accordingly and know what their savings are going to do.

So I applaud the President. I think he has been visionary in not sitting back and saying: I cannot do anything; we are going to let the market take its course. He is watching the stock market. He is watching the jobless rate. He is concerned about it. I have talked to him. He is very concerned about people who do not have jobs. It is probably the largest concern he has right now in addition to national defense and trying to make sure we make the right decisions in national defense for the security of our country. These are the two most important issues we are facing. So the President is trying to do something about them. He is trying to stabilize the market, give people more money to spend, and encourage corporations to make the capital investments that would create more jobs.

I applaud the President. I am going to support him, and I am going to do everything I can to see that we do not have rhetoric that says this is class versus class. This is for everyone. This is for more jobs. It is for more money to spend for people who are working and who deserve to keep more of the money they earn.

I yield the floor.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business be extended until noon and the time be equally divided in the usual form with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

HIV/AIDS FUNDING

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise this morning to draw my colleagues' attention once again to an issue that is plaguing our world. That issue, of course, is the tragic global HIV/AIDS endemic.

The Los Angeles Times newspaper ran a particularly heartbreaking piece this past Sunday that detailed the HIV/

AIDS crisis in Africa. I will take a moment to read an excerpt from this article, as it paints a very disturbing and very accurate picture of the reality of this global HIV/AIDS crisis. This is last Sunday's Los Angeles Times:

The mother rises from her deathbed to bury her baby boy. She slumps in a wheelchair borrowed for the occasion, and an elderly relative must help hold her head up so that she can watch the body descend into the red earth.

The casket is heartbreakingly small, and though Evelyn Matule weeps for her child, her eyes are dry. Sickness and despair have stolen her tears.

Alfred is the second boy Matule has lost in a year to a disease also racking her body: AIDS. A toddler's coffin is mercifully inexpensive, but the earlier death left Matule and her family so strapped that they will serve only butter sandwiches to the few guests.

On one side of the boy's grave in this township outside the city of Welkom in central South Africa are fresh heaps of loam, each new grave marked with numbered aluminum tags, baby rattles and prescription bottles for remedies that didn't save the victims. A dozen open graves lie to the right. In less than a month, they will be full.

Mr. President, this is the reality of AIDS. Today, one in every nine South Africans—that's 4.7 million people—has AIDS. Last year alone, 2.4 million people in sub-Saharan Africa died from AIDS. Furthermore, over 34 million children worldwide have lost one or both parents to AIDS or related causes.

As the LA Times article points out, the City of Johannesburg is expecting to have 70,000 burials a year by 2010—that's up from 15,000 burials just five years ago.

This is having a huge economic impact on the African Continent, both in terms of a reduced agricultural capacity and also just in terms of the costs of burials and funerals. As morbid as it may sound, there is, quite literally, a shortage of undertakers and cemetery space in Africa, and it is adding to an already tragic health crisis.

As we all know, Mr. President, HIV/AIDS is a global problem, with a huge impact and devastating impact in our own Hemisphere. I have seen it in Haiti, a nation with the second highest prevalence of HIV/AIDS in the world—second only to sub-Saharan Africa. My wife, Fran, and I have traveled to Haiti nearly ten times—and we are planning another trip for next week. We have seen, first-hand, the devastation of HIV/AIDS—we've seen the children, the babies, and the families. It is a true human tragedy.

An estimated 300,000 Haitians—and that is out of a population of only 8 million—are currently living with AIDS. According to the Centers for Disease Control projections, Haiti will experience up to 44,000 new HIV/AIDS cases this year. That is at least 4,000 more than the number expected in the United States, a nation with a population nearly 35 times larger than Haiti's.

This disease is having a profoundly devastating impact on Haitian chil-

dren. Already, estimates suggest that HIV/AIDS has orphaned 163,000 children in Haiti, a number expected to skyrocket to between 323,000 to 393,000 over the next 10 years. Haiti also continues to suffer from an unbelievably high HIV transmission rate from mother to child, and, of course, two-thirds of the infants born with the disease, we know, will die within the first year.

This truly is a tragedy because we know that the transmission of HIV from mother to child can be substantially reduced with proper counseling and proper medication. The reality is that millions of children are dying, and we can do something about it. We must do something about this.

I was pleased, to join my friend and colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, in leading an effort to show the Senate Appropriations Committee our support for increasing funds to combat this horrible disease. In a letter to the Committee signed by fourteen fellow Senators, we have asked for the full appropriation of \$236.4 million in additional FY03 funds to fight global AIDS. This would bring our nation's total 2003 AIDS spending level to \$1.5 billion—that's a 50 percent increase over 2002 levels.

Furthermore, I look forward to working with Majority Leader FRIST and Senator SANTORUM in the coming months to not only increase our overall contribution to fight global AIDS, but to work to ensure that our funds are being spent in the most efficient and effective ways.

At the end of the day, I believe that all of us in this Chamber are working toward the same objective—and that is to alleviate the continued suffering caused by this epidemic.

Quite simply, we have a moral obligation to do so, and I believe we must show the leadership by tackling the problem in our backyard and around the world. I thank all of my colleagues who have come to this Chamber in the past to talk about this issue and show their support for dealing with this problem. We must continue to act. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

THE PRESIDENT'S STIMULUS PLAN

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I come to the floor this morning to speak once again on last week's proposals by the President with regard to the so-called stimulus plan. I think this is one of the very most important things we need to be debating right here on the Senate floor.

As the President and most of the Members of the Senate know, we just had another announcement of unemployment last week. We are at an 8-year high, 6 percent. We lost another 100,000 jobs in December. The number of people who are going on long-term unemployment without unemployment benefits is roughly 100,000 a week. Our

capacity utilization is about 74 or 75 percent, well below historic averages. There is a real problem in our economy. We do not seem to put together our actions and our words.

I have heard some of my colleagues label the President's so-called stimulative program an economic sedative package. I don't know whether it is a sedative or not, but in my view it borders on antigrowth, antijob. It certainly is anti-State.

Without any question, from most people's perspectives, it has some serious distributional issues. If you believe rising tides lift all boats, one wonders why we are targeting all of this stimulus, a significant portion of these benefits, to a very narrow segment of America's population.

Finally, maybe the most serious issue, it is reckless if you look at it in the long-term fiscal context. We are talking about taking another almost \$1 trillion out of the fiscal flows that our Federal Government will receive to fund tax cuts and fund them at a time when we are approaching a war in the Middle East, when we have serious international challenges in North Korea, we have a tremendous need to make sure that our people here at home are secure. Homeland defense we hear talked about and talked about, and then we are not necessarily providing the resources to the first responders to make it happen.

Whether it is a sedative program or not, I think it is close. I don't think it is a stimulus. I don't think it is fair. I actually think it is reckless and imprudent with regard to our long-run fiscal health.

Let me go through a few points because I gave a rather lengthy speech last week with regard to a lot of these elements, and in more depth. That is in the RECORD. But I think it is important we have a repeated focus on the need to get stimulus into our economy and get our economy growing again, and I don't think this does it.

First of all, 90-plus percent of this program gets implemented after 2003. The need in the economy is today—the people who are losing their jobs or have lost their jobs, and see the weakness in the economy. It is today. Again, 190,000 jobs were lost in the last 2 months. The President has talked about creating only 190,000 new jobs in 2003. I think that speaks to how much focus is in the near term. I think it is absolutely essential to get going.

But that is not the real issue. Well over 50 percent of this program is in the dividend exclusion. Dividend exclusion puts money into a targeted, narrow segment of the American population in serious proportions. I will get to the fairness issue in a little bit. But the most undermining element of this program is it does something very simple; it takes cash off the balance sheets of corporations. If corporations are going to invest in jobs, if they are going to sustain jobs, if they are going to invest in new plant and equipment,

how do they do that? They do it with the resources they have on their balance sheet. That is cash. That is what they have to have when they go to the bank to extend their ability to invest. That is how business works. If we are going to take cash away from corporations, how are they going to invest in growing America's economy?

Sure, some of the dividends are going to go through a process that then will allow them to trickle back into the economy somehow or another. Some economic theorists say we will have more particular focus or the best rate of return investments, but the fact is, our corporations are going to have less money to be able to expend on driving our economy. That is antigrowth. It is very clear and very simple. I believe this is its major flaw, given that this is the centerpiece of this argument the President is making.

The third piece is also very clear. Our States are in fiscal distress. Everybody knows it. I am sure the Presiding Officer knows his State is suffering from fiscal strain as well as anyone else. I know he has a high unemployment rate. I am sure the Medicare rolls are growing as is the need for charity care in our hospitals. Our school systems are stretched to meet mandates that we put down, the Federal Government, whether it is special education, IDEA, or now the Leave No Child Behind Act.

The fact is, we here in Washington put requirements on our States and they are running very large deficits. They have a constitutional responsibility to not run deficits, to run balanced budgets. So what are they doing? They are raising taxes. In the State of New Jersey, we just raised our property taxes. In some areas it is a 15-percent increase, in some a 2- or 3-percent increase, but the average is 7-percent increases. That goes to the middle class. Those are the people who actually need it and, by the way, are getting virtually nothing out of this dividend exclusion.

Here we have rising property taxes or cuts in services at our State level: \$950 billion is the cumulative deficits of our State governments as we approach this coming year, and that is a major league drag on our economy. We are only putting in about \$650 billion from this package that the President has proposed. I say that is antigrowth.

For the reasons I have discussed, this is a bad plan with regard to whether you are stimulating the economy or whether you are doing what the White House says, trying to create a growth plan. There is no way it is going to be stimulative when we are emphasizing raising taxes at the State and local level because the Federal Government is not accepting its responsibility when we are taking all this cash off the balance sheets of corporations that would be reinvested in the economy and when we are putting so little money into this year.

For all those reasons, this is clearly either a sedative or, I think even more seriously, an antigrowth problem.

On the fairness issue, you don't have to be into class warfare to say it is going to a very narrow segment of the economy. Let me give some statistics. The 10-year benefit of this proposal the President laid down, for people who make \$1 million or more, is \$900,000. That is what it is over 10 years.

For people, at least in New Jersey, who sort of consider themselves in the middle class, those earning \$75,000 to \$100,000 in adjusted gross income, the benefit is \$18,500. That is 2.5 percent of what is going to the people at the top.

If you were in the more national average of what middle class is, the \$30,000 to \$40,000 range, it is \$3,500 over 10 years.

And if you are one of those struggling at the bottom of our income classes—you are under \$20,000—this is worth \$50 over 10 years because you don't get the child tax credit the President is talking about. You didn't pay taxes. It doesn't mean anything to those people who would spend the most. It is not a refundable child tax credit, marriage penalty, all those things—they don't apply here. So we are leaving out broad swaths of our national population as we deal with how you are going to distribute this.

By the way, one wonders how many of our men and women who are going to the Middle East to surround Iraq, who sit on the border of North Korea, the 37,000 American troops, are going to benefit from a dividend tax exclusion. I find it very doubtful. In fact, I am going to come back to the floor with some very precise numbers.

What we are doing is rewarding those who are already doing well. And there is nothing bitter about people doing well. There were more millionaires made in the 1990s than there were at any time in the history of the country. But what we are talking about is just simple fairness. By the way, the people who are in the middle class and struggling to make ends meet in this country are the people who will spend money and drive the economy. They fill up that excess capacity.

There is a major fairness issue that once again ties to economic growth. I think we have an antigrowth package here, and it is pretty clear by any simple analysis of who spends money and drives the economy.

Finally, you can't get away from the serious considerations of long-term undermining of our fiscal health. We are going to put ourselves into a bad position. We already have taken \$5.5 trillion off projected estimates of where our budget will be 10 years out—just, by the way, at the time the baby boomers are retiring and Medicare and Social Security will be at their greatest stress points. We are running deficits that are growing and growing and growing, and they are going to continue to grow. We are making that process worse. It is not \$675 billion, because you have to put the interest against what you pay. That is another \$300 billion over 10 years.

I know people are going to talk about dynamic scoring. I tried to deal with this by speaking to why I think this is antigrowth. The fact is, we are not putting money in the hands of people who will turn around and spend it, and those estimates I think are risky to make. The fact is, we are putting in place a serious undermining of the revenues of this country at a time when we are talking about going to war. It is impossible to understand, in my mind, how we can take such an imprudent step of undermining the fiscal health of this country at a moment in time when the American people expect us to be protecting them, expect us to be supporting those people who are out there defending us, to make sure they have the equipment and all the kinds of things that will make a difference.

We are talking about a tax cut that goes almost entirely to the very high income people in this country. That is not class warfare. That is just telling it like it is with respect to how we are shaping our economic policy in this country. I think it has failed. I think it will fail. I hope we can have a real debate here on the floor of the Senate about how we can get our economy going. I think it is great that the President recognizes we have a problem. He clearly believes that. He changed his whole economic team and came out with a second stimulus plan. We need to get this economy moving so that it supports our national economic health here at home. That is not being done by this program. It is a sedative program, if not worse. It is antigrowth. It is certainly a mistake, and I hope I can come up with some of these figures just thinking about how many of our military men and women are going to benefit from a tax exclusion on dividends. I think it is misplaced. I think the American people know it is misplaced.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant 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.

THE MICHIGAN CASE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I read with interest today that the administration currently is considering what to do with regard to the so-called "Michigan case" before the Supreme Court. This is a watershed moment for the administration. They must decide whether they are for civil rights and diversity or not. They must make a very important choice, and whether or not they make the right choice depends in large measure on what happens in this particular case. Over the last several weeks we have heard the Republican leadership talk about how this is

a changed party, and how Republicans have had a change of heart. To a certain extent, we know they have had a change of face. The question is whether or not this is truly a change of heart.

I was concerned with leadership comments made over the weekend, that while additional dialog may be important, there really wouldn't be a change in policy. There would be no change in policy on affirmative action, or on a number of issues relating directly to diversity. My hope is there may be a change of heart on hate crimes. We have had that vote over and over and faced Republican filibusters. I hope at a very early date we will have an opportunity to see whether there has been a change of heart.

I can't think of a better occasion for Congress and for the Republican leadership to be clear about their change of heart, than to support, for the first time, the hate crimes legislation. There certainly was not a change of heart when it came to judicial nominations.

Once again, almost immediately following these laudatory comments made by the Bush administration and our Republican colleagues toward civil rights leaders and the civil rights movement, the administration turned around and said now we are going to renominate Judge Pickering and renominate Judge Owen for the second highest court in the land. There is no change of heart there. There is no indication of a willingness to change past practices or policies.

If President Bush chooses to oppose the University of Michigan case, he calls into question the very commitment he claims to have made with regard to expanding opportunity for African Americans and for Hispanic and Native American students. All of us will be left to draw one conclusion. All of those words about promoting educational opportunity will have been just that. They will have been words.

Today's reports indicate the debate in the White House isn't about what decision to make. It appears they have already done that. It appears they will oppose the University of Michigan's effort to boost African American, Hispanic, and Native American enrollment. It seems, instead, the question they are struggling with is how to describe that decision.

If they put the weight of John Ashcroft's Department of Justice against the University of Michigan's diversity efforts, there is only one way to describe that decision: It is a slap in the face to America's minority students and to the colleges that seek not only to educate America but to reflect America's diversity.

Today is Dr. Martin Luther King's birthday. Had an assassin's bullet not taken his life, he would be 74 years old today; he might very well still be with us. Because of hatred and intolerance, he is not. But his words still are with us.

In 1948, at Morehouse College, he discussed the purpose of a college education. He said:

The complete education gives one not only power of concentration, but worthy objectives upon which to concentrate.

He said:

The broad education will, therefore, transmit to one not only . . . accumulated knowledge . . . but also the accumulated experience of social living.

If the administration chooses to stand against the University of Michigan, I fear they will be encouraging a decision that would deny tens of thousands of minority students that knowledge and deny millions of American students that experience.

THE PRESIDENT'S TAX PLAN

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I also want to comment, if I have another moment, on the recklessness of this administration in considering economic policy. The extraordinary recklessness of offering a tax plan, that has yet to be unveiled but was certainly outlined by administration officials, leaves me with a great deal of concern and I think ought to be a source of anxiety for the American people.

The President has said we need stimulus. Yet the plan he has outlined has almost no stimulative value at the very time when it is required. We lost 190,000 jobs in November and December. Mr. President, 190,000 jobs were lost. There are 190,000 families unemployed. That was just in the last 2 months of last year. And 2.2 million Americans have lost their jobs since the President was sworn in.

The Wall Street Journal, the other day, noted you have to go back decades to find an economic record as serious and, in many respects, as dislocating to working families as this one. Yet the President's so-called stimulus plan provides for 190,000 jobs in the remaining 11 months of this year. That is their figure. That is what they say they will generate. For the next 11 months, they will generate the same number of jobs, under their plan, that they lost in the last 2 months of last year.

How, in Heaven's name, can anyone suggest that is a stimulus? In fact, by their own acknowledgement, over 91 percent of whatever stimulative value there is in what the President has proposed does not take place until next year and the year after that.

So, No. 1, it fails with a capital letter F with regard to its stimulus value and its stimulus potential as we look at reviving the economy at the end of January of the year 2003.

The second question is: How fair is a plan of this kind? We are told we have 226,000 millionaires. We have 92 million people who fit the income category of \$50,000 a year or less. Mr. President, 92 million Americans are in that category. And 226,000 are in the millionaire category in our country today.

Yet, under the President's plan, \$20 billion goes to the 226,000 people; \$15