

was considered too absurd to be legal in America, and it is.

So much that coarsens society is done just a little bit at a time, just on the fringes, just on the edges. And partial-birth abortion is just on the fringe, just on the edge, but yet coarsening our society, robbing us of the spirit, telling the world that we are not the country that we proclaim to be. And it is not even medically necessary.

I would ask my colleagues, tomorrow, if we get to a final vote, to support this language as is, not to pass any amendments to this bill. I encourage a very strong and robust vote, to send a message to America that this does offend us, and that this does coarsen our society, and we need to stop it, at least here.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will be brief, no more than 5 minutes.

I will just say, I listened to the Senator's remarks. I know the Senator has gone through some personal trials and tragedies in his family. I am aware of that. And I respect the Senator for not only his strength, but for that of his wife and all his family in enduring these trials. Many of our families have been through similar trials.

I will tell you—and I am sure you will not be surprised; and I bet you will identify with this—some of the most heartening things I do are my visits to children's hospitals and seeing these parents, many of whom have children with serious health problems, who show such courage and such determination. It is a miracle to watch them and to see a child finally survive and prosper, as this beautiful little girl whose portrait the Senator brought to the floor.

It is a testament to God and a testament to the strength of the people who just do not give up when their children are at stake. I think that is the right thing to do. God has blessed me and my wife with three great kids, and a grandson to boot.

I will tell you, though, it troubles me that we end this debate on a day when we had a chance to offer across America health insurance to pregnant mothers who have no health insurance, so that they could have the best chance to give birth to a healthy baby, that we had that chance earlier in Senator PATTY MURRAY's and Senator HARRY REID's amendment—a chance to offer them health insurance. That amendment was defeated. It was defeated on a 49 to 47 vote. Three Republicans joined us in voting for the amendment.

I do not understand this: To have such depth of feeling and emotion for children, to have the medical resources to turn out like this beautiful little girl, and then to vote against that amendment; to vote against an amendment which offered health insurance. How can you possibly rationalize that we would have such determination to provide these medical resources, and

when Members were given a chance today, they voted no. They voted no.

I believe this admiration, this strength of families, particularly of the ones I visit in hospitals, has to be put in context. These families have hope because they have access to the great hospitals, the great minds, the great doctors, medicine, and technology. Think of the despondency of the family with a sick child and no health insurance, nowhere to turn, begging—begging—in an emergency room for just any attention whatsoever.

So I would say my belief is that a commitment to family, a commitment to children, goes beyond the abortion issue. It goes to the basic issues of health care and health insurance. We had a chance today with the Murray amendment to do something about it. Sadly, we failed.

I hope another day will come. I hope those who opposed it today saying, oh, it wasn't in the budget, and we are going to save that for the budget resolution debate, will say the same thing next week when the budget resolution comes to the floor. I hope they will join me and others and show that this commitment to kids, this commitment to parents, this commitment to hope goes beyond the debate on abortion.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business.

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

TRIBUTE TO RAUL ELIZONDO DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, our attention if focused right now on Iraq and on our troops—the men and women on the front lines who are protecting us.

But we have always had men and women on the front lines protecting us—right here at home. They are our police officers, and they fight a war against crime every day.

I'd like to talk about one of those officers today—Raul Elizondo, of the North Las Vegas Police Department.

Raul Elizondo went to the same high school I did—Basic High School in Henderson, NV. He was a member of the championship wrestling team there.

He went to the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, and then joined the North Las Vegas Police Department.

We have some outstanding officers in North Las Vegas, but Raul Elizondo quickly distinguished himself as one of the best.

He was known for going above and beyond the call of duty, and for getting personally involved in his community. He even helped get Christmas and birthday presents for children on his patrol beat.

In 1994, Raul Elizondo was named "Police Officer of the Year" by his colleagues in the North Las Vegas Police Officer Association.

That same year, he got a special commendation from the Chief of Police at the Annual Policeman's Ball.

Two months later he was killed in the line of duty.

This Thursday, March 13, will be Raul Elizondo Day in North Las Vegas. Officers from the North Las Vegas Police Department will go to the elementary school that's now named after Raul Elizondo. They will read to students there, and help with classes, and eat lunch with kids.

Then in the afternoon they will have an assembly and a parade.

I wish I could be there with them. But on Thursday, while I'm here on the Senate floor, I'll be thinking about everyone involved.

I will be thinking about the police officers, who will be carrying on Raul Elizondo's tradition of being a role model for the community—as well as a law officer.

I will be thinking about Raul Elizondo's family—his mother Ann, his sister and his two brothers.

I will be thinking about the officers of the North Las Vegas Police Department, who still live with the pain of losing a colleague and a friend.

And I will be thinking of the police officers all over the country, and the sheriff's deputies, and the FBI agents, and my old department—the Capitol Police. I'll remember how they put themselves on the front lines every day to keep me and my family safe. I'll offer my thanks for their sacrifice and my prayers for their safety. I hope you will join me.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. In the last Congress Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I will describe a terrible crime that occurred April 8, 2002 in Northern Virginia. Two men beat a tow truck driver on the Beltway near Washington, D.C. The tow truck driver, who is Iranian, stopped on the highway to assist two men who appeared to be in need of help. After the driver stopped, the two men punched and choked him while calling him racist names.

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 is 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.

COST OF WAR WITH IRAQ

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, earlier today the Committee on Foreign Relations held a hearing about U.S. plans

for humanitarian relief and reconstruction of Iraq, in the event we choose to use force to disarm that country. Senator LUGAR, the Chairman of the Committee did a superb job of assembling a panel of experts to talk about the various issues associated with that subject, including what such initiatives are likely to cost and how much assistance we can expect from other governments, international relief agencies and non-governmental organizations.

The Committee learned a great deal from our witnesses. We had a very good discussion of the range of costs we may be looking at to pay for not only U.S. military action, but humanitarian relief and the longer term reconstruction of Iraq—and the costs are likely to be substantial—even under relatively optimistic assumptions.

I was very disappointed that no administration representatives were present to take part in the Committee's deliberations. While the witnesses we heard from today were excellent and are certainly well qualified experts who could credibly speculate on the costs of these operations and other related matters, they aren't the people who are planning the U.S. operations in Iraq.

Let me say, that my comments are not meant as a criticism of Senator LUGAR, the Chairman of our Committee. He rightly identified the two key administration officials who are most knowledgeable on this matter—Andrew Natisos, USAID Administrator, and retired General Jay Garner, Director of the newly established Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance at the Pentagon—two key individuals in any humanitarian relief and reconstruction effort in Iraq. The administration declined to make them available this morning.

That is deeply troubling to me.

I have to believe that the administration's reluctance to make its representatives available to the Committee was because they would have been asked some hard questions, including the range of cost estimates that they have been working with as they plan for military action, humanitarian relief and the longer term reconstruction of Iraq.

I don't think the Committee would have found it very credible to hear from these witnesses that such a range of costs has yet to be developed, when we are just days away from war with Iraq. Nor would we have found it credible to hear that national security concerns prohibited them from sharing this information, particularly as USAID has just sought public bids from five major U.S. construction firms for \$900 million in contracts for reconstruction projects in Iraq—including for restoration of water systems, roads, ports, hospitals and schools.

Mr. President, are we saying that private American construction companies can be privy to details of U.S. reconstruction plans, but the Congress and the American people cannot? Who is paying the bills here anyway?

Perhaps the administration's unwillingness to provide these witnesses had something to do with the timing of the hearing. Could it be that the administration did not want to make public those cost numbers just as the Senate and House are about to begin debate on the FY 2004 Budget Resolution?

How can this body or the House have a credible debate on the FY 2004 budget without knowing what war and the aftermath of that war with Iraq is likely to cost?

How can this body have a credible debate about the FY 2004 budget without knowing what the total cost of our so called diplomatic efforts to persuade governments to allow the U.S. to station military troops within its territory, or cast favorable votes at the U.N. Security Council will reach?

The answer quite simply is, we cannot.

Mr. President, it would appear that we are on the eve of going to war. This is a very solemn moment for our Nation. The Congress and the American people need to have a full understanding of all that is involved in doing so, including what it will cost and the sacrifices that may be required in other areas. It is time for this administration to stop playing games and politics with this critically important issue.

I would say to the administration it is time to come clean and tell the American people what they are going to have to pay for our military actions in Iraq and for nationbuilding in the aftermath of that conflict.

THE NATIONAL AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES ACT OF 2003

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, last week, I joined several of my colleagues in introducing the National Invasive Species Council Act, which addresses how the Federal Government would coordinate itself in combating aquatic and terrestrial and aquatic invasive species. I was also pleased last week to join my colleagues in introducing the National Aquatic Invasive Species Act of 2003, NAISA.

The National Aquatic Invasive Species Act of 2003 would reauthorize the Non-indigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act, which Congress first passed in 1990 to better deal with the invasion of zebra mussels in the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes are still plagued by invasive species. In fact, over 160 non-indigenous species have been established in the Great Lakes since the 1800s.

The economic damage that invasive species, like the zebra mussels, Eurasian Ruffe, purple loosestrife, sea lamprey, and so many more cause to the Great Lakes is quite high. The zebra mussel has raised the cost of doing business for raw water users in the Great Lakes region by \$24 million per year, and the Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that the economic impact to industries nationwide from

zebra mussels over the next 10 years will be \$5 billion dollars. The Eurasian Ruffe, another invasive species that fortunately has been found in just a couple ports in the Great Lakes, is estimated to cost the Great Lakes fishery \$119 million if it spreads throughout the system. Considering that the value of the Great Lakes fishery is approximately \$4 billion per year, I believe that Congress needs to take the next important steps to minimize the risk of new invasions into the Great Lakes.

NAISA would improve the Great Lakes aquatic invasive species program by authorizing the State Department to pursue a reference to the International Joint Commission, IJC, to analyze the prevention efforts in the Great Lakes. Last fall, the IJC released its 11th biennial Great Lakes Water Quality Report, and in that report, the IJC recommended this reference. Because controlling invasive species in the Great Lakes is an international effort, it is necessary for the IJC to review, research, conduct hearings, and submit to the United States and Canada a report that describes the success of current policies of governments in the United States and Canada having jurisdiction over the Great Lakes.

Our bill also would improve and expand upon the dispersal barrier project in the Chicago Ship and Sanitary Canal. The dispersal barrier was originally authorized in the National Invasive Species Act of 1996, and the project became operational in 2002. The electric barrier is proving to be effective in preventing the movement of carp up and down the canal, but this barrier is imperfect. This canal supports maritime commerce, and finding a permanent solution to preventing the inter-basin movement of invasive species is important. Therefore, NAISA would authorize the construction of a second barrier in the canal and mandate other improvements to this project so that if an invasive species breeches one barrier, there would be a backup barrier. Additionally, NAISA expands the barrier authority so that the Corps and the Fish and Wildlife Service would study additional waterways that would be good candidates for a dispersal barrier.

To address the largest pathway of invasive species introduction—ballast water—NAISA would establish a nationwide mandatory ballast water management program that would apply to ships entering the Great Lakes system. Because these ships still contain small amounts of unpumpable water that may contain organisms, ballast water management practices would help address the problem of “No Ballast On Board” or “NOBOB” vessels, which are ships that enter the Great Lakes reporting no ballast on board. By encouraging the regular flushing of sediments from ballast tanks in Great Lakes ships, management practices can further reduce the likelihood of new invasions.