

upon a city of a state that has not attacked this country. There are men and women, old people and young people, sick and dying people there. At least we should have enough respect to quit now. We have done a good day's work. We passed 15, 16, 17 amendments by rollcall votes. Why do we have to continue? We don't have to—not for the political reason of getting action completed on this resolution before we find out what the administration is going to ask for in the supplemental.

I hope Senators will insist on our going over to next week. Our staffs haven't had a chance to read the amendments. Senators don't know what is in these amendments. I don't.

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

Mr. BYRD. Let's take the weekend and have our clerks read them so they can better advise us next week. I ask Senators to think about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I appreciate the concerns raised by my friend and colleague from West Virginia, who just doubled the subsidy for Amtrak over my opposition. The majority leader has asked me to finish this bill, and we are going to finish the bill. I regret it. I will tell you, I have been here 23 years. We usually spend 1 week on a budget. Undoubtedly, on that last day of the budget, we have a lot of votes. We didn't do a budget last year and we should have. Maybe I should have worked more with the chairman at that time to make that happen. The Congress didn't function because it didn't get the budget done. We are going to finish this budget this week—tonight or tomorrow.

I know there are a lot of amendments, but most of them are repetitive. We have dealt with almost every subject area in the budget. The budget is not an appropriations bill. The budget is not a tax bill. We have had people offer amendments as though this is going to micromanage section 750. We don't do that in the budget. We don't write tax bills in the budget. We have had umpteen amendments. Oh, this will finance this, or it will be that portion of a tax bill. That is not what a budget does. A budget says basically how much we are going to spend and how much we are going to take in.

We have a budget and we need to finish our work. I know it is unpleasant and painful, and I know people would rather be home with their families, but we have to finish. Two years ago, we had 34 votes—tons of votes. We eventually passed a budget. I congratulated Senator DOMENICI because it wasn't easy or pretty. That is the way we are right now.

I tell my colleague from North Dakota, we knew this was coming a couple of days ago. I know it will not be pleasant, and we are going to ask people, and some people have to catch planes, and that is unfortunate, but we are going to finish the budget.

All these amendments that are pending, for the most part, don't need to be offered. They can be offered if you want—we are going to set an amount for appropriations. Most of those amendments can be dealt with on an appropriations bill or on a tax bill. We are going to have both this year. So I urge my colleagues to show some restraint. I will work with my colleagues, and I think I have considered every amendment fairly. We have not postponed anybody's amendments. I think we have been as fair as possible to everybody. I might mention that 90 percent of the amendments offered on the other side—well, I will be happy to work with my colleagues, but I think it is important to finish our work, whether it is midnight tonight or tomorrow night. It is very much my intention to finish. I urge our colleagues to work together to complete our work.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, let me just say the chairman and I have worked together closely to try to move this agenda, to have amendments and do it in an efficient way. But I must say I don't see any earthly reason this bill has to be done today. The requirement is April 15. I think we are getting over the edge into unreasonableness. When one side gets unreasonable, that creates a reaction on the other side. I have tried to be reasonable, but I say to my colleagues, at some point it is going to be hard to feel that there is some rational reason for this press.

We can get this bill done, and get it done in a timely way, without going endlessly into the night. We went until midnight last night, the same the night before. I will tell you, I think we should press ahead, do additional amendments for a time, but I think we need to fold our tent and recognize that we need to come back tomorrow or Tuesday morning and finish.

I just ask my colleagues to think about that and, in the meantime, we can try to get an agreement on another tranche of amendments to work on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I tell my colleague from North Dakota that I will let him know of this request.

I ask unanimous consent that the only amendments that be allowed to be considered be those filed and presently at the desk.

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF FORCE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, as President pro tempore, I ask unani-

mous consent to have printed in the permanent RECORD a letter I have received from the President consistent with its requirements under the authorization for use of military force against Iraq, Public Law 107-243.

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

Hon. TED STEVENS,

President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On March 18, 2003, I made available to you, consistent with section 3(b) of the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243), my determination that further diplomatic and other peaceful means alone will neither adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq, nor lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq.

I have reluctantly concluded, along with other coalition leaders, that only the use of armed force will accomplish these objectives and restore international peace and security in the area. I have also determined that the use of armed force against Iraq is consistent with the United States and other countries continuing to take the necessary actions against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations, or persons who planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001. United States objectives also support a transition to democracy in Iraq, as contemplated by the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-338).

Consistent with the War Powers Resolution (Public Law 93-148), I now inform you that pursuant to my authority as Commander in Chief and consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution (Public Law 102-1) and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243), I directed U.S. Armed Forces, operating with other coalition forces, to commence combat operations on March 19, 2003, against Iraq.

These military operations have been carefully planned to accomplish our goals with the minimum loss of life among coalition military forces and to innocent civilians. It is not possible to know at this time either the duration of active combat operations or the scope or duration of the deployment of U.S. Armed Forces necessary to accomplish our goals fully.

As we continue our united efforts to disarm Iraq in pursuit of peace, stability, and security both in the Gulf region and in the United States, I look forward to our continued consultation and cooperation.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BUSH

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, we are going to soon ask unanimous consent to clear seven amendments that Senator CONRAD and I have agreed upon. Prior to that, though, I might ask the minority leader if he has an announcement to try to rally his troops.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we have been in discussions for the last hour or so. I am calling a caucus for 6:45 to discuss our current situation and a series of ideas that might allow us to bring this debate to closure.

I do not want to discuss it here and now, but I hope Senators will attend at 6:45 and we will have more information at that time.

Mr. NICKLES. If the minority leader will yield, I would very much appreciate it—I know you don't want to get into the details, but having final passage of the budget by 7 o'clock tonight would be very much appreciated by all Members of the Senate.

I appreciate the cooperation of the minority leader.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 353, 283, 390, 388, 389, 309, 296 AS MODIFIED, EN BLOC

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that seven amendments—No. 353, Senators SMITH and CLINTON's sense of the Senate dealing with health care coverage; No. 283, Senator FEINSTEIN and others' sense of the Senate dealing with criminal alien assistance; No. 390, NICKLES' technical correction, Social Security administrative expenses; No. 388, Senator VOINOVICH's sense of the Senate CBO report on liabilities and future costs; No. 389, Senator HUTCHISON's sense of the Senate dealing with the Corps of Engineers; No. 309, BINGAMAN language change to Medicaid Reserve; No. 296, Senator ROCKEFELLER's sense of the Senate first responders, with a modification that is presently at the desk—be considered en bloc, agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid on the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be shown as a cosponsor of the Hutchison amendment.

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

The amendments were considered and agreed to en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 353

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate concerning the expansion of health care coverage)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. —. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING AN EXPANSION IN HEALTH CARE COVERAGE.

- (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
- (1) there were 74,700,000 Americans who were uninsured for all or part of the two-year period of 2001 and 2002;
 - (2) this large group of uninsured Americans constitutes almost one out of every three Americans under the age of 65;
 - (3) most of these uninsured individuals were without health coverage for lengthy periods of time, with two-thirds of them uninsured for over six months;

(4) four out of five uninsured individuals are in working families;

(5) high health care costs, the large number of unemployed workers, and State cut-backs of public health programs occasioned by State fiscal crises are causing more and more individuals to become uninsured; and

(6) uninsured individuals are less likely to have a usual source of care outside of an emergency room, often go without screenings and preventive care, often delay or forgo needed medical care, are often subject to avoidable hospital days, and are sicker and die earlier than those individuals who have health insurance.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this resolution assume that—

(1) expanded access to health care coverage throughout the United States is a top priority for national policymaking; and

(2) to the extent that additional funds are made available, a significant portion of such funds should be dedicated to expanding access to health care coverage so that fewer individuals are uninsured and fewer individuals are likely to become uninsured.

AMENDMENT NO. 283

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the States and localities should be reimbursed through the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program for the fiscal burdens undocumented criminal aliens place on their criminal justice systems)

On page 79, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. —. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The control of illegal immigration is a Federal responsibility.

(2) In fiscal year 2002, however, State and local governments spent more than \$13,000,000,000 in costs associated with the incarceration of undocumented criminal aliens.

(3) The Federal Government provided \$565,000,000 in appropriated funding to the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) to reimburse State and local governments for these costs.

(4) In fiscal year 2003, the fiscal burden of incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens is likely to grow, however, Congress provided only \$250,000,000 to help cover these costs.

(5) The 56 percent cut in fiscal year 2003 funding for SCAAP will place an enormous burden on State and local law enforcement agencies during a time of heightened efforts to secure our homeland.

(6) The Administration did not include funding for SCAAP in its fiscal year 2004 budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the functional totals underlying this resolution on the budget assumes that the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program be funded at \$585,000,000 to reimburse State and local law enforcement agencies for the burdens imposed in fiscal year 2003 by the incarceration of undocumented criminal aliens; and

(2) Congress enact a long-term reauthorization of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program beginning with the authorization of \$750,000,000 in fiscal year 2004 to reimburse State and county governments for the burdens undocumented criminal aliens have placed on the local criminal justice system.

AMENDMENT NO. 390

On page 8, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new

budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,812,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,257,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,207,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,338,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,424,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,409,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,522,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,505,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,638,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,617,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,792,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,766,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,954,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,924,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,121,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,091,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,292,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,260,000,000.

Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,471,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,439,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 388

(Purpose: To require annual reports on the liabilities and future costs of the Federal Government and its programs)

At the end of subtitle A of title II, insert the following:

SEC. —. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REPORTS ON LIABILITIES AND FUTURE COSTS.

It is the sense of the Senate that The Congressional Budget Office shall consult with the Committee on the Budget of the Senate in order to prepare a report containing—

- (1) an estimate of the unfunded liabilities of the Federal Government;
- (2) an estimate of the contingent liabilities of Federal programs; and
- (3) an accrual-based estimate of the current and future costs of Federal programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 389

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the urgent need for increased funding for the Corps of Engineers)

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. —. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING PROGRAMS OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

- (a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—
- (1) the Corps of Engineers provides quality, responsive engineering services to the United States, including planning, designing, building, and operating invaluable water resources and civil works projects;
 - (2) the ports of the United States are a vital component of the economy of the United States, playing a critical role in international trade and commerce and in maintaining the energy supply of the United States;
 - (3) interruption of port operations would have a devastating effect on the United States;
 - (4) the navigation program of the Corps enables 2,400,000,000 tons of commerce to move on navigable waterways;
 - (5) the Department of Transportation estimates that those cargo movements have created jobs for 13,000,000 people;

(6) flood damage reduction structures provided and maintained by the Corps save taxpayers \$21,000,000,000 in damages every year, in addition to numerous human lives;

(7) the Corps designs and manages the construction of military facilities for the Army and Air Force while providing support to the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies;

(8) the Civil Works program of the Corps adds significant value to the economy of the United States, including recreation and ecosystem restoration;

(9) through contracting methods, the civil works program employs thousands of private sector contract employees, as well as Federal employees, in all aspects of construction, science, engineering, architecture, management, planning, design, operations, and maintenance; and

(10) the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that \$1,000,000,000 expended for the Civil Works program generates approximately 40,000 jobs in support of construction operation and maintenance activities in the United States.

(b) BUDGETARY ASSUMPTIONS.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) to perform vital functions described in subsection (a), the Corps of Engineers requires additional funding; and

(2) the budgetary totals in this resolution assume that the level of funding provided for programs of the Corps described in subsection (a) will not be reduced below current baseline spending levels established for the programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 309

(Purpose: To provide the Committee on Finance of the Senate with additional options to reform and improve medicaid without the need to resort to block grant allotments with predetermined growth rates, which fail to adjust for economic recessions, demographic changes, or disasters)

On page 63, beginning on line 12, strike "through" and all that follows through "rates" on line 14.

AMENDMENT NO. 296, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Attorney General should conduct a study on the need and cost to establish radio interoperability between law enforcement agencies, fire departments, and emergency medical services, and that Congress should authorize and appropriate \$20,000,000 for grants to local governments to assist fire departments and emergency medical services agencies to establish radio interoperability)

On page 79, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 308. RADIO INTEROPERABILITY FOR FIRST RESPONDERS.

(a) STUDY.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, should conduct a study of the need and cost to make the radio systems used by fire departments and emergency medical services agencies interoperable with those used by law enforcement to the extent that interoperability will not interfere with law enforcement operations.

(b) GRANT PROGRAM.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should authorize and appropriate \$20,000,000 to establish a grant program through which the Attorney General would award grants to local governments to assist fire departments and emergency medical services agencies to establish radio interoperability.

AMENDMENT NO. 283

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, this non-binding sense of the Senate amend-

ment expresses that the budget resolution before us should accommodate an appropriation of \$750 million for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program—SCAAP—for Fiscal Year 2004.

I am pleased that Senators KYL, BINGAMAN, MCCAIN, and SCHUMER have joined me in introducing this important measure.

The bipartisan amendment I offer today with my colleagues would also put the Senate on record as favoring a restoration of fiscal year 2003 funding for this important program, which does so much to help State and county governments deal with the growing costs of incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens.

Without adequate funding, this fiscal burden will continue to fall on many of our local law enforcement agencies—including sheriffs, police officers on the beat, anti-gang violence units, and district attorneys offices.

The SCAAP program is based on the principle that when the Federal Government falls short in its efforts to enforce the laws against immigration violations, it must bear the responsibility for the financial and human consequences of this failure.

Thus, the SCAAP program properly vests this burden with the Federal Government when undocumented aliens commit serious crimes within our communities.

It does so by providing Federal reimbursement funding to the States and county governments for the direct costs associated with incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens, who are convicted of felonies or multiple misdemeanors.

Increasingly, State and county governments from all across the country have made use of these funds over the years. In fact, in Fiscal Year 2002, the number of State and local governments seeking SCAAP funding jumped 25 percent from the previous fiscal year.

The combination of this increase, and the fact that all 50 States and the District of Columbia receive some funding from the program, suggests that no State is immune from the fiscal costs associated with crimes committed by illegal aliens.

Today most States are encountering their largest deficits in more than 60 years. Indeed, the fiscal consequences of illegal immigration have contributed to this challenge.

In Fiscal Year 2002, State and county governments incurred more than \$13 billion in costs associated with incarcerating criminal illegal aliens. These costs are expected to grow over the next several years, given the new challenges of terrorism and our efforts to enhance security within our Nation's borders.

California's border counties are among the hardest hit in terms of dollars spent on incarceration, prosecution and court costs for those in the United States illegally. I am greatly concerned about the substantial burden these immigration-related costs im-

pose on the criminal justice system on our local communities, especially given the limited tax base and fiscal resources State and local jurisdictions are working with today.

The SCAAP program is not in place to prevent crime, but to fulfill portion of the Federal Government's responsibility, so local governments can use their limited resources for their own responsibilities, such as funding jail enlargement or new homeland security ventures at the local level.

At a time when cash-strapped State and local governments are being asked to do even more to protect our homeland, we cannot afford to eliminate vital funding that already falls far short of what local governments spend to incarcerate undocumented criminal aliens. In previous years, Congress has appropriated between \$500 million and \$585 million for SCAAP to alleviate some of the fiscal burdens placed on the local criminal justice systems.

In Fiscal Year 2002, Congress appropriated \$565 million for this important program. Unfortunately, the prolonged debate over Fiscal Year 2003 appropriations produced budgetary pressures that resulted in a 53-percent drop in SCAAP funding for FY 2003.

SCAAP payments have never matched the true costs to the States dealing with this problem, but they have nevertheless been critical additions to prison and jail budgets. They have also symbolized the Federal Government's obligation to pay for the results of its failed immigration strategies.

These are challenging times in our Nation's history. And, we want, to the best extent possible, our constituents to feel secure in their homes and in their communities.

At a time when the Nation is focused on enhancing security within our borders, our States, and our local communities, a vital program like SCAAP should not be vulnerable to being under-funded or eliminated altogether.

The control of illegal immigration is a Federal obligation and we owe it to our States and local communities to provide them with the crucial Federal assistance they need to continue doing their job.

Again, I wish to emphasize that while this amendment would put the Senate on record as supporting this initiative, the amendment is not binding and therefore, does not require any offsets.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I thank our colleagues for their cooperation and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, the caucus, for the information of our Democratic Senators, will be in the LBJ Room, our normal caucus room.

I have something else, though, that I want to share with my colleagues.

CONGRATULATING SENATOR PAUL SARBANES ON CASTING HIS 10,000TH VOTE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, at 3:45 this afternoon, our friend and colleague, PAUL SARBANES, joined what is truly one of the most exclusive clubs in the world. He cast his 10,000th vote as a United States Senator.

Of the 1,875 people ever to serve in the Senate, only 20 others have ever reached this remarkable milestone. Remarkably, eight of the 21 "10,000 vote" Senators are serving in this Senate.

In addition to Senator SARBANES, they include our friends JOE BIDEN, Senator BYRD, PETE DOMENICI, FRITZ HOLLINGS, DAN INOUE, TED KENNEDY and TED STEVENS. I'm proud to note that, at least in this very distinguished caucus, Democrats still have a majority.

Reaching this historic milestone is just the latest remarkable accomplishment in what has been, by anyone's standards, a remarkable American success story. PAUL SARBANES is the proud son of Greek immigrants. His parents, Spyros and Matina Sarbanes, emigrated from the same town in Greece, but met in America. The Sarbanes family owned a restaurant in Salisbury, MD. They gave it a quintessentially American name: The Mayflower Restaurant. PAUL worked in the restaurant, and he and his family lived above it.

He graduated from a public high school and won a scholarship to Princeton University.

He was a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University. After Oxford, he came home and, in 1960, earned a law degree from Harvard. From Harvard, PAUL SARBANES went to the White House, one of the "best and brightest" who answered President Kennedy's call to public service. He worked as Administrative Assistant to Water Heller, chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisors.

He won his first elected office in 1966, to the Maryland House of Delegates, where he served for 4 years. In 1970, the people of Maryland elected him to the House of Representatives. In 1976, he won his first election to the United States Senate. In November 2000, he won his fifth election to the Senate, making him the longest-serving Senator in Maryland's history.

It's been said that there are two kinds of Senators: those who are here to make headlines and those who are here to make history. PAUL SARBANES is one of the history makers. He is one of the most modest men I know. He is also one of the most intelligent. He was a voice of reason on both the White-water and Iran-Contra committees. It was his leadership and his refusal to accept defeat—more than anything—that enabled us, in the last Congress, to pass the most far-reaching corporate accountability reforms since the Securities and Exchange Commission was created 70 years ago.

The Sarbanes-Oxley reforms will help prevent the kinds of corporate abuses that have so damaged our economy and shaken people's faith in the economic markets these last few years. They will protect people's investments, and their economic futures.

I learned a Greek word from PAUL SARBANES: "idiotes." It is the Greek root for the English word "idiot." But it has a different meaning in Greek. It means "someone who takes no part in the affairs of his community." In the Sarbanes family, it was almost a curse.

PAUL SARBANES' parents taught him that serving one's nation is a noble calling. I know they would be proud of him. So are we. I congratulate my friend on casting his 10,000th vote in the Senate—and on his long and exemplary career. I look forward to seeing him cast a few thousand more votes.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and congratulate our colleague.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I thank our distinguished leader for his very kind comments about the 10,000 votes I have cast in the Senate. I must say, if we keep doing these vote-aramas, everyone can aspire to reaching this goal in short order.

Our very able leader was very kind and generous in his remarks. I appreciate them very much.

I wish to register my deep appreciation to the people of my State who sent me to the Senate now for my fifth term and, therefore, made it possible for me to be here exercising my judgment on important issues that come before us. I certainly hope that people, looking back over that record, will think there was some quality in those votes as well as quantity.

I thank my colleagues for their constant support and the ability to interact with them as we deal with important matters of public policy. Even though we sometimes differ, we support one another in a very unique and, to some, not understandable way. I am in my 27th year in the Senate, and I am pleased to be in the company of those who our leader enumerated that have also passed the 10,000 mark. I particularly want to acknowledge my respect for Senator BYRD, who I think has cast more votes than anyone who has ever served in the Senate, and continues to be an example to us all.

I also would be remiss if I did not thank my family, my wife in particular, for their strong support over these many years now. And finally, I would like to thank the many staff members who have served me so well for these past 27 years.

Again, I thank all of those who have been so gracious to me in extending their best wishes and congratulations. And, in particular, I thank our leader, Senator DASCHLE.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, while Senator SARBANES is still here, I want to congratulate him.

Mr. SARBANES. I appreciate that.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am on that list. I just want to tell you, 10,000 is just the beginning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to join our colleagues in congratulating Senator SARBANES on the milestone, and his accomplishments in the Senate.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I announce we now have a Democratic caucus in the LBJ Room. If all Democratic Senators can move over there, it would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we are all following, on a moment-by-moment basis, the developments in Iraq and the sad reality that this war is upon us, but we also have the great feeling of support for our men and women in uniform.

I was notified today that one of the first casualties in the war was from my home State. His name is Ryan Beaupre from Saint Anne, IL, a 30-year-old Marine Corps captain who was a pilot on the helicopter that went down with eight British commandos and four marines, a wonderful young man by all reports from a good family who attended Bishop MacNamara High School in Kankakee and then Illinois Wesleyan and enlisted in the Marine Corps and served his country so well. I have called his family today. Of course, they are grief-stricken, as is everyone in the community.

A special tribute was given to him today at his old high school, and I am sure there will be many more. Our hearts go out to the Beaupre family and all of their friends at this great loss.

We are fortunate in this country to have young men and women like him, willing to volunteer and to risk their lives for their Nation. We should remember the cost of war and remember how much we owe those who will step forward to defend this Nation in time of need.

I hope, before this debate on the budget resolution is over, to ask my colleagues in the Senate to consider an amendment which I hope to offer. If someone asked you today how much

combat pay do we pay to the marines and sailors and soldiers and airmen for fighting the war in Iraq, most Americans would not know the answer. But combat pay for our soldiers and those who are risking their lives now in Iraq is \$5 a day—\$5 a day—\$150 a month. That is combat pay for those who are in active military, as well as those who are activated.

Also, you might be interested in knowing how much we pay the families when we separate people and send them off to war. What kind of monthly supplement do we provide for the families who now have someone important in their lives gone for a period of time and have to struggle to try to keep things together when it comes to child care and added responsibility and added expenses? How much do we give to these military families? About \$3.30 a day; \$100 a month.

The amendment I am going to offer to the budget resolution will raise those two amounts, not to what they truly deserve but to show that we have not forgotten that they need more, to \$500 a month for combat pay, and \$500 a month to families who are separated because of this war.

It is a small token. It should be much more. But I hope my colleagues will seriously consider that amendment. As we all feel so good and so strong about the contribution of the men and women in uniform, let us not forget they deserve a helping hand and the combat pay differential as well as the assistance to their families.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I wish to elaborate on Amendment No. 277, which would provide an additional \$16 billion next year to fund our urgent homeland security needs. Because of the failure of the Schumer amendment—which would have provided a substantial but smaller increase in homeland security funding next year—it is clear that my amendment will not carry the Senate. Nevertheless, I would like to set forth the following statement on the reasons behind my amendment and the urgency of dramatically increasing our investment in homeland security.

America has the greatest military in the world—as we are witnessing in Iraq today—and we have it because we pay for it. For generation after generation, presidents, members of Congress, and the American people have come together across partisan divides and every other conceivable divide to invest what's necessary in our military, and in the men and women in uniform who make our military what it is.

If we want the best domestic defenses, we'll have to pay for them, too. But consider this comparison. Under the resolution before us, between this year's and next year's budgets, defense spending would be increased by some \$19 billion. I support that increase. But over the same period, this resolution would invest only \$300 million more in improving our homeland defenses.

Why? One reason and one reason only: the President's unaffordable, unfair, and unfocused tax cuts are leaving no room for necessary investments. They're crowding out every other priority. It's bad enough that they haven't done anything to create jobs, to grow the economy, to expand the middle class. On top of that, they have raided the national cupboard.

There's little money left for urgent needs—not for healthcare, not for education, not for Social Security or homeland security. Little money left for smart tax cuts that will spur real growth and innovation. Little money left to keep down the deficit at a time when we're looking at \$2 trillion in additional debt.

I urge my colleagues to stop and think about this for a second. The President's budget would have us spend about \$100 billion next year alone on brand new tax cuts for those who need them least. \$100 billion of our national treasure on unfocused, unaffordable and unfair tax cuts when we are at war against terrorism here at home, forced to marshal our strength to defend against a ruthless and unpredictable new enemy. And that's to say nothing of the cost of the war to disarm Iraq, the peace that will follow, or every other critical need facing our country from healthcare to education to Social Security.

For this administration and those who support this resolution, all of those needs are down the list. Those needs can wait. Those needs can suffer. As long as someone preserves the precious new tax cuts—which will do little if anything to create new jobs—they're happy.

That's crazy. It's irresponsible. And it's downright unfair to those who are working day and night to protect us, and who desperately need new resources to do their job well.

My father ran his own small store and, like any decent businessman, he understood that making a good living and paying the bills started with sound and honest budget planning. If he needed to put a new lock on the door, he would set aside some money to do it.

Those who run our government now don't seem to get it. They underestimate or hide serious expenses. They squander money when business is bad. They overestimate revenue. And they seem to think that our security will magically fund itself, rather than setting aside money for it, as my Dad would have.

It's time for this administration and those who back this resolution to show some economic common sense. It's time for them to let go of their pet tax cuts and dedicate some resources to our critical common needs.

This amendment would do that. Rather than giving homeland security short shrift by settling for a paltry \$300 million increase, it would start to put real dollars where the danger is. After extensive study and consultation with experts, I've determined it will take \$16

billion to start truly raising our guard in the next fiscal year. That's what this amendment would provide.

How will we pay for it? It's an important question—and unlike this administration, we'll answer it. Because we understand, as the American people understand, that we can't have it all. Leadership is about making tough choices—about tradeoffs.

So we propose paying for this new investment in homeland security by re-directing \$32 billion in new tax cuts proposed by the President. Half of that money will go toward deficit reduction—to start digging ourselves and our children out of the ditch of debt in which we now find ourselves. And half of it will pay for urgent homeland security improvements.

Aren't those two common goals, both of which will broadly benefit the American people, a far, far better use of our precious resources than brand new unfocused, unaffordable, and ineffective tax cuts to those who need them least? The answer is obvious to me. I hope it's clear to others in this chamber as well.

Let me now talk about some of the critical security needs that this \$16 billion would help us meet.

Our commitment needs to start with first responders, who are our frontline troops in this homefront war. In communities across the country, our firefighters, police officers, and emergency medical technicians are struggling for the funds they need to meet the new threats we face. It's time for us to give them the support they need and their jobs demand.

This budget resolution would provide virtually no new funding for our first responders. Virtually no new funding—at this time of unprecedented need and danger. That's unacceptable. There is equipment to buy. There are professionals to hire. There are people to train. All of that—like it or not—takes money.

This amendment provides for \$10 billion in FY 04—\$6.5 billion above the President's request—to help first responders prepare for and combat terrorism, including attacks involving weapons of mass destruction. Additionally, the amendment provides for \$1 billion in FY 04 for firefighter grants, money that would be available to hire additional firefighters. This is the first installment of the SAFER Act—of which I am an enthusiastic supporter—which would provide more than \$7.5 billion over 7 years to help communities hire badly needed new firefighters. Unlike in the President's proposed budget, I believe that new funds should not come at the expense of existing programs for first responders like the COPS program, the Local Law Enforcement Grants, or the Byrne Grant program.

Within this overall commitment, \$4 billion should be dedicated to helping first responders obtain interoperable equipment—a vital challenge that has been estimated to cost \$18 billion overall.

Nor should we wait for the FY 04 appropriations cycle to help our first responders. The recently-approved FY 03 omnibus spending bill comes up far short for first responders. We will need to seize every opportunity to fix that, and I am cosponsoring amendments today to ensure that this happens. I will fight also for more money for first responders in the supplemental appropriations process.

Our second critical unmet priority is shoring up port security—which my amendment would accomplish by committing a \$2 billion investment above the pending resolution.

About 7 million containers arrive at these ports each year, yet only a tiny fraction are searched. This poses a risk not only at the ports, but also inland—as many of those containers travel many miles to their final destination without being searched.

Yet the administration's budget proposal and this budget resolution mostly ignore the physical security of our ports. The Coast Guard has estimated that it will cost \$4.4 billion to improve basic physical security at the nation's ports, starting with close to \$1 billion the first year. In addition, the Maritime Security Act mandates certain security measures without providing a funding mechanism. In an effort to jumpstart these vital improvements, this amendment provides \$1.2 billion in port security grants for fiscal year 2004.

Because the ports themselves are a potential target, we do not want to wait until dangerous containers arrive to investigate. Rather, we must "push the borders back" and identify and inspect as much high-risk cargo as possible before it enters our harbors. The Customs Service has made some valuable strides in this direction through the Container Security Initiative. This program stations Customs officers at overseas ports to allow for inspection of some containers before they begin their voyage to the U.S. Yet the Administration is not expanding this valuable program as forcefully as circumstances require. President Bush has requested \$62 million for this program in fiscal year 2004, a request that is echoed in this budget resolution. My amendment would provide an additional \$100 million to allow for aggressive and effective expansion of this program, and for related initiatives to inspect and track containers as close as possible to their point of origin.

Moving beyond physical security, my amendment would enable the Coast Guard to step up its supervision of the ports and adjacent maritime areas. I believe we must accelerate efforts to recapitalize the Coast Guard fleet—specifically, to speed up implementation of the long-planned Deepwater Initiative to upgrade and integrate the Coast Guard's fleet and related communications equipment. The budget resolution before us, following the President's budget proposal, has proposed \$500 million for this project in fiscal year 2004,

which is only enough to complete the project in 20 years or longer—the timetable outlined before the September 11 attacks. Clearly, current circumstances call for greater urgency. This amendment would provide an additional \$700 million, for a total of \$1.2 billion in fiscal year 2004, to complete the Deepwater Initiative in closer to 10 years.

In addition to the port security initiatives I have outlined, we must strengthen other components of our border security. In particular, the amendment calls for an additional \$1 billion in FY 04 to increase border personnel and to improve information technology systems for the border. On personnel, we must strengthen the presence of Customs and immigration inspectors and of Border Patrol agents in key areas. Indeed, some of these enhancements were mandated by the Patriot Act and the Border Security Act but have not been funded and filled to date. I would allocate additional funds to hire at least 2,000–3,000 new border personnel. With respect to technology, it is especially critical that we expedite implementation of the biometric document system as mandated by the Patriot Act and Border Security Act. The biometric document system will include biologically unique identifiers for immigrants, reducing the risk that immigrants will enter illegally or under an assumed identity. The budget resolution before us clearly has not allocated significant new resources to achieve this new system in the required timeframe, or anything close to it. The additional \$1 billion in my amendment would allow us to make significant progress on these border security needs.

We must also invest more in transportation security by increasing funding \$1.7 billion over the levels proposed by the administration and the pending budget resolution. As we saw tragically on September 11, 2001, terrorists can exploit weaknesses in our transportation networks to turn them into instruments of terror. The Transportation Security Administration, TSA, was created to confront that grim reality, but it cannot succeed without more support from the Administration and Congress.

The TSA has made its initial mark at our airports, overseeing passenger screening and requirements that baggage be screened for possible explosives. Now, the agency must build on that work by expanding rapidly to other transportation sectors. Unfortunately, the budget resolution before us allows for neither task. It would provide just \$4.8 billion for TSA in FY 04, a 10 percent decrease from the Administration's FY03 request of \$5.3B.

My amendment calls for \$1.7 billion in additional resources to improve transportation security. Among other things, this would restore the Administration's proposed cut to the overall TSA budget, ensure the agency can continue to fulfill its existing mis-

sions, and enable the TSA to begin to expand its work beyond passenger airline security to other critical transportation needs including bridges, railways, tunnels, subways and buses.

In addition to this general increase, the amendment would invest an additional \$500 million in FY 04 on freight and passenger rail security enhancements, based on legislation approved by the Commerce Committee last session, S. 1991. The bulk of that money would fund security improvements for Amtrak, such as protection of bridges, tunnels and key facilities. Amtrak would also receive money to help improve equipment for emergency communications equipment and other security needs, and to train personnel to detect and handle potential attacks. With respect to mass transit, the amendment would provide \$500 million for grants to address urgent transit security needs, as identified by GAO, including communications systems, surveillance equipment and mobile command centers. Additionally, the amendment would call for \$200 million in FY 04 for bus security grants, as outlined in legislation S. 1739 that won the endorsement last session of the Commerce Committee. These grants would enable carriers to improve passenger screening, training and communications, surveillance equipment and other security measures.

Next comes preparing ourselves for bioterror attacks and attacks using other weapons of mass destruction—which demands an investment in FY 04 of \$3 billion above the pending resolution. Some of the most chilling scenarios posed by homeland security experts are those of a chemical, biological or radiological attack. We are depending on our public health network to help prepare for and respond to such an assault. Yet these health providers have not been given nearly enough resources to fulfill this role.

For example, despite the scope of the threat and our relative lack of preparedness, the resolution would invest just \$940 million—flat funding—in CDC grants to help state public health departments care for and track infectious disease outbreaks. That's just not enough. My amendment would provide an additional \$1 billion in FY 04—essentially double the proposed and existing funding level—to help these departments detect and cope with a bioterror attack. Among other things, this funding could help defray the costs of administering the Administration's smallpox vaccination program.

In the same vein, my amendment would double the federal appropriation for the Health Resources and Services Administration, which provides money to help hospitals increase capacity, training and supplies. These improvements are essential if our hospitals are to be prepared for a biological, chemical or radiological event, yet, again, President Bush has proposed flat funding for this program. Instead, we should increase this account by \$500 million, for a total of about \$1 billion.

It will mean little to prepare our health infrastructure, however, if they have no tools to employ—no detective or preventive measures, or countermeasures to administer after an attack. The budget resolution would provide some new funds to confront this challenge—such as the proposed Project Bioshield—but those proposals do not go far enough and are not targeted effectively enough to provide the jumpstart we need in this area.

My amendment would call for an additional \$1.5 billion for bioterror and other key research and development countermeasures—particularly efforts to get research from “bench to bedside,” translating basic discoveries into usable products. I recommend that the money be available through the following entities: the Homeland Security Advanced Research Projects Agency, HSARPA, the National Bio-Weapons Defense Analysis Center and the Strategic National Stockpile. Increased funding of these three programs would permit adequate funding of promising countermeasures research, essential investigation of the underlying mechanism of biological threats, and procurement of needed medicines and vaccines to our defensive pharmaceutical arsenal. In addition, some of this money should be available to compensate health care workers who suffer ill effects from the smallpox vaccination program urged by the President.

The last but by no means least funding priority I want to address today is permanent protection of our critical infrastructure, which demands a half-billion increase over the pending budget resolution. Homeland security experts have increasingly highlighted the vulnerability of the nation’s critical infrastructure as one of the most dangerous gaps in our homeland defenses. About 85 percent of these resources—which include such vital systems as energy distribution grids, chemical and nuclear plants, or financial networks—are in private hands, complicating the process for assuring adequate security.

The administration, and the resolution before us, seem content to continue studying the vulnerabilities of these systems. They have requested about \$500 million for this process in FY 04. This would enable far too sluggish progress for such a vital task. My amendment calls for an additional \$500 million in FY 04 to get these assessments done at once so that we can move to create action plans and conduct needed security enhancements at the earliest possible moment.

Halfway around the world, the American military and our allies are fighting to disarm a dictator who refused to give up his weapons for 12 long years. I believe our brave men and women in uniform will accomplish their mission—and that when they do, the world will be a safer place for peaceful people, and a worse place for terrorists and tyrants.

But here at home, to guard the land beneath our feet, other men and women

in uniform are engaged in another front of the war against terrorism—and unlike the men and women of our armed forces, we have not given them all the support, the training, the technology, and the resources they need to succeed.

We owe it to our nation and ourselves to do better. On September 3, 1939, shortly after Britain declared war on Germany, Winston Churchill said, “Outside, the storms of war may blow and the lands may be lashed with the fury of its gales, but in our own hearts this Sunday morning there is peace. . . . Our consciences are at rest.”

Our consciences as Americans—and as parents to our children—will only rest when we demonstrate the leadership and invest the resources to counter the fury the terrorists seek to bring upon us. Protecting the American people in an age of terrorism demands strong leadership and enormous resources—and it demands them now.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, the significant budget challenges faced by our Federal Government demand that Congress develop proposals for sound economic growth, while also working to cut wasteful government spending. The Budget resolution before the Senate today goes a long way towards accomplishing that goal.

Even before 9/11, we know now that our current recession began in late 2000.

The attack on America on September 11, the necessary cost of the war on terrorism, and now the threat of a war with Iraq have led to a dramatic deterioration of tax revenues, huge spending increases, and the return to budget deficits.

Over the last 2 years, revenues to the Federal Government have fallen by nearly 9 percent. And spending grew by 12 percent over that same period.

Unfortunately, revenues continue to underperform in 2003.

Congress cannot ignore our struggling economy, and I believe that the resolution before the Senate today addresses many of our economic problems.

The committee-reported budget resolution increases deficits in the near-term in order to invest in the economy and fight the war on terrorism.

The resolution provides over \$725 billion during the 10-year period from 2003 to 2013 to the Senate Finance Committee for economic growth and job creation.

This tax relief is designed to let American families keep more of the money they earn. Economic growth is more easily achieved in an atmosphere where more Americans are able to save and invest their money.

Tax relief provides economic growth, and when we draft legislation, we should understand not just the cost of tax relief to the federal budget, but also the benefits that tax relief provides to the economy and the long-term increase in revenues to the Federal Government that tax relief can provide.

The amount provided for this tax relief includes enough to accommodate the President’s plans to accelerate the marriage penalty relief, increase the child tax credit, eliminate the double-taxation of dividends, and increase small business expensing limits.

Although I may not agree with all of it, I do believe the President’s tax proposal, which we included in this budget, is an overall good plan for solid long-term economic growth.

As you know, Mr. President, the Budget Committee does not dictate tax policy changes. However, the committee resolution does provide enough money for specific growth proposals, but it will ultimately be up to the Finance Committee to write the policy.

I do agree with those who are concerned about budget deficits. The Budget before the Senate today does include 9 years of deficits. The deficits do grow smaller, and eventually go back to surplus in the out years.

I want to make it clear that I do not excuse the deficits, and I would love to put us immediately into surpluses in this fiscal year. I think it is important that Congress makes the return back to surpluses a top priority. And we are not going to do that by spending.

I also believe we must be realistic in the constraints that the events of the past two years have placed on our ability to balance the budget in the immediate fiscal year.

I have confidence that the fastest way we can get back to surpluses is by fixing the economy through policy changes that encourage economic growth, coupled with a reduction in wasteful government spending. Mr. President, unfortunately, as we all know, in Washington DC we do not actually cut spending.

The best we can hope to do is control the growth of spending.

As Ronald Reagan stated during his State of the Union address on January 25, 1984, “The problems we’re overcoming are not the heritage of one person, party or even one generation. It’s just the tendency of government to grow, for practices and programs to become the nearest thing to eternal life we’ll ever see on this Earth. And there’s always that well-intentioned chorus of voices saying, “With a little more power and a little more money, we could do so much for people.”

President Reagan was right.

Once we establish a federal program, it develops a constituency and then it becomes impossible to cut. And we love to go home to our constituents and tell them about the money we brought home from Washington DC for our home state projects.

If the other side of the aisle is concerned about deficits, as they say they are, then they should join us in cutting out some of the wasteful spending in the Federal Government.

This resolution may not be the perfect blueprint to surpluses, but it makes a good start by providing both sound tax policy for economic growth, as well as a control in federal spending.

I hope that my colleagues will support this resolution today, and that we will make an effort to tighten up the purse strings around here, and start to work together during these difficult economic times to bring our budget back into balance.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise today as a cosponsor of the Dorgan prescription drug amendment to the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution.

The fact is, when Medicare was designed in 1965, the system relied on inpatient hospitalization and seldom on outpatient services, preventive care, or patient drug therapies. At that time, prescription drugs only accounted for 4 percent of all personal health care expenditures.

But as we enter the 21st century, the cutting edge of health care has shifted. Every day, as new preventive and therapeutic drugs replace outdated inpatient procedures, Medicare falls further and further behind in providing basic care.

Medicare was written to cover the most basic health care for seniors. When the original bill passed, the legislation's conference report explicitly stated that the program was designed to provide adequate "medical aid . . . for needy people, and should "make the best of modern medicine more readily available to the aged."

Well, we are not making the best use of modern medicine when millions of seniors cannot afford the prescription drugs they need. Prescription drugs that had not even been developed when Medicare was enacted are now an essential aspect of basic health care. We owe it to our seniors to live up to Medicare's original mandate and provide them the best medical care.

Unfortunately, today, beneficiaries' current drug coverage options are often expensive and unreliable. And as a result, nearly 7 out of 10 Medicare beneficiaries lack decent, dependable coverage for their prescription drug needs, and more than one-third have no coverage at all. Prescription drug expenditures for the average senior in my home state of Washington are over \$2,100 every year—over 122,000 of my seniors spend more than \$4,000 a year.

On average, \$1 out of every \$5 of every Social Security check to Washington State's seniors is spent on prescription drugs. And seniors with the most serious illnesses spend nearly 40 percent of their Social Security check on prescription drugs.

Senator DORGAN's amendment would ensure a fair and adequately funded Medicare prescription drug benefit. The budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 23, currently reserves up to \$400 billion for the Finance Committee to report legislation that strengthens and enhances Medicare, improves the access of beneficiaries under that program to prescription drugs, or promotes geographic equity payments.

This amendment would first increase the Medicare reserve fund by about \$220 billion, for a total of \$620 billion. The amendment also specifies that beneficiaries in traditional Medicare should receive a drug benefit equal to that of beneficiaries who enroll in private health plans.

The \$400 billion that is proposed in the committee resolution for the Medi-

care reserve fund is not adequate to provide prescription drug coverage for all seniors, because this funding could be used for other Medicare "reforms"—leaving even less for prescription drugs.

The Dorgan amendment would ensure adequate funding for a reliable prescription drug benefit in Medicare for all beneficiaries. Seniors should not have to abandon traditional Medicare—and join an HMO or other private health plan—to receive the prescription drug coverage they need. The Dorgan amendment ensures fairness: all beneficiaries would have a prescription drug benefit without being forced into HMOs and other private health plans.

In addition to providing a comprehensive, affordable, and adequately funded prescription drug benefit for all Medicare beneficiaries, the amendment would be fiscally responsible by including language to decrease the deficit by \$250 billion and reduce the proposed tax cut by roughly \$400 billion.

As I visit senior citizen centers in my State of Washington and discuss a prescription drug benefit, my constituents repeatedly tell me the same thing: They want prescription drug coverage to be comprehensive, simple to administer, guaranteed, stable, and based on the very best medical technology. And most importantly, seniors do not want their prescription drug benefit run through an HMO or other private insurance company.

In fact, according to a June 2002 survey by the Kaiser Family Foundation and the Kennedy School of Government, 67 percent of American people believe we should expand Medicare to pay for part of prescription drugs, but only 26 percent say we should help seniors buy private insurance to pay for prescription drugs costs.

Seniors want a prescription drug benefit run through Medicare—a program they understand and upon which they depend. The Dorgan amendment would ensure that seniors have this choice.

Despite basic Federal standards included in Bush's Medicare Prescription Drug plan, a private delivery model means that insurers can vary premium costs, benefit design, and the availability of drug coverage across the country. They can create strict formularies that limit access to prescribed drugs and bar access to local pharmacies. That's too much flexibility in a program that is supposed to guarantee help for seniors.

The very basic issue here is that the private market will not cover such a high-risk population—especially a population at such risk for adverse selection. I don't want to see this benefit be a repeat of the Medicare+Choice program. And if the private insurance model hasn't worked for the full Medicare benefit, it certainly won't work for a single benefit where utilization is expected to be high.

For seniors who choose to remain in the traditional Medicare program, the Bush plan proposes a prescription drug

discount card. The GAO estimates that the prescription drug discount cards will provide less than a \$3.50 discount per prescription. However, the National Association of Chain Drugstores estimates that the average retail cost for an outpatient prescription drug in 2001 was \$54.55.

Clearly, the prescription drug discount cards do not offer a viable prescription drug benefit for America's seniors. In addition, the low-income subsidy of \$600 to supplement the prescription drug discount cards is a false promise of assistance for seniors, who spend an average of \$2,317 on prescription drugs each year.

Seniors account for 12.6 percent of the general population—but a third of all prescription drug expenditures. And while prescriptions are expensive—in some cases, prohibitively so—these are the very same prescription drugs that keep people out of the hospital, out of the nursing home, and living vibrant and happy lives. And while it is difficult to quantify in economic terms, prescription drugs preserve health and eliminate unnecessary hospitalization—which is by far most expensive segment of the health care.

Americans are becoming increasingly reliant on more effective—and more complicated—drug therapies. Total health care spending in the United States will total more than \$1.5 trillion this year, an increase of 8.6 percent over last year, according to a March report released by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

Prescription drug expenditures are the fastest growing segment of the health care market—with spending on outpatient prescription drugs by Medicare beneficiaries alone increasing by 12 percent annually. CMS predicts that prescription drug expenditures will continue to increase faster than any other category of health care spending throughout the next ten years.

In 1970, drug expenditures in the United States were about \$5.5 billion. Now, for Medicare beneficiaries alone, the CBO projects that total drug spending will grow from \$95 billion in 2003 to \$284 billion in 2013. This is a total of \$1.8 trillion on prescription drug costs over the next ten years. Medicare beneficiaries alone will spend \$1.8 trillion on prescription drugs over the next ten years.

But while we discuss the potential cost of a new benefit, we also need to discuss national priorities. I believe we can do a fair and adequately funded prescription drug benefit while living within our budget, and we can do so by having a clear vision for our country's priorities. One of my top priorities is getting a new prescription drug benefit to the Medicare beneficiaries in Washington State. But this may mean making other tough choices.

I strongly believe that we need to include a prescription drug benefit in the Medicare program and I will continue to fight to ensure that all Washingtonians have access to the prescription medications they need.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Sarbanes-Jeffords-Mikulski-Graham water infrastructure amendment.

Our amendment is simple and straightforward: It adds \$3 billion to the 2004 budget resolution for a total of \$5.2 billion for water and sewer infrastructure in 2004. The amendment increases funding for EPA's Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund from \$1.35 billion to \$3.2 billion, and increases funding for EPA's Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund from \$850 million to \$2 billion.

Our amendment is necessary for two reasons.

First, our Nation's communities are facing enormous needs in their efforts to provide clean and safe water. The need for better sewer and drinking water systems is much greater than what we put in the Federal checkbook each year. These needs have been studied and restudied and the needs are real and valid.

In April 2000, the Water Infrastructure Network reported that our Nation's water and wastewater systems will face a funding gap of \$23 billion a year over the next 20 years. In November 2001, the general Accounting Office reported that cost range from \$300 billion to \$1 trillion over the next 20 years. In September 2002, the Environmental Protection Agency reported that demands for improved sewer and drinking water systems will outstrip current levels by \$535 billion. And in November 2002, the Congressional Budget Office reported that water and sewer costs could average as much as \$40 billion each year. The results are conclusive and the need is real and valid.

We are not putting enough funding in the Federal checkbook each year. The current level for water infrastructure is only \$2.2 billion. We can't expect communities to comply with growing regulations like arsenic, radon, and new requirements related to security, to name just a few, without increased financial assistance.

If we don't help, the entire burden falls on local ratepayers. In many urban and rural low-income areas, rate increases are just not affordable. My hometown of Baltimore is facing a \$1 billion cost in order to meet Federal regulations.

The second reason that this amendment is necessary is for job creation. The economy lost 300,000 jobs in February. Water infrastructure funding creates jobs. For every \$1 billion we spend on water infrastructure, up to 40,000 jobs are created.

This amendment is a mini-stimulus package for three reasons:

First, it will create and sustain jobs. As I stated, for every \$1 billion in SRF funding, about 40,000 jobs are created. Second, the amendment is temporary and targeted.

The amendment is a one-time, \$3 billion increase of an existing program. It does not create a new bureaucracy.

Third, the amendment does not contribute to long-term deficits because the \$3 billion is fully offset by reducing the tax cut.

This \$3 billion increase for water infrastructure is less than one-half of 1 percent of the \$726 billion tax cut in this budget resolution.

Mr. President, the Sarbanes-Jeffords-Mikulski-Graham amendment helps our communities by providing more funding for immediate water and sewer needs and by creating jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition today to speak to a \$2.8 billion amendment on behalf of Senator HARKIN, myself and others to increase the health function in this resolution. The amendment would add to the funding already included in the resolution for the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, and the Health Resources and Services Administration as well as other health programs. The amendment is offset by an across-the-board reduction in function 920. This reduction would not cut programs, but simply reduce administrative expenses, travel, and consulting services by .36 percent. This amendment would provide NIH with a \$2.3 billion increase over the fiscal year 2003 appropriation.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, I have said many times that the National Institutes of Health is the crown jewel of the Federal Government—perhaps the only jewel of the Federal Government. When I came to the Senate in 1981, NIH spending totaled \$3.6 billion. The fiscal year 2003 omnibus appropriations bill contained \$27.2 billion for the NIH which completed the doubling begun in fiscal year 1998. This money has been very well spent. The successes realized by this investment in NIH have spawned revolutionary advances in our knowledge and treatment for diseases such as cancer, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, mental illnesses, diabetes, osteoporosis, heart disease, ALS, and many others. It is clear that Congress's commitment to the NIH is paying off. Now it is crucial that increased funding be continued in order to translate these advances into additional treatments and cures. Our investment has resulted in new generations of AIDS drugs which are reducing the presence of the AIDS virus in HIV-infected persons to nearly undetectable levels. Death rates from cancer have begun a steady decline. With the sequencing of the human genome, we will begin, over the next few years, to reap the benefits in many fields of research. And if scientists are correct, stem cell research could result in a veritable fountain of youth by replacing diseased or damaged cells. I anxiously await the results of all of these avenues of remarkable research. This is the time to seize the scientific opportunities that lie before us.

On May 21, 1997, the Senate passed a sense-of-the-Senate resolution stating that funding for the NIH should be doubled over 5 years. Regrettably, even though the resolution was passed by an overwhelming vote of 98 to nothing, the budget resolution contained a \$100 million reduction for health programs. That prompted Senator HARKIN and myself to offer an amendment to the budget resolution to add \$1.1 billion to carry out the expressed sense of the Senate to increase NIH funding. Unfortunately, our amendment was tabled by a vote of 63 to 37. We were extremely disappointed that, while the Senate had expressed its druthers on a resolution, it was simply unwilling to put up the actual dollars to accomplish this vital goal.

The following year, Senator HARKIN and I again introduced an amendment to the budget resolution which called for a \$2 billion increase for the NIH. While we gained more support on this vote than in the previous year, our amendment was again tabled by a vote of 57-41. Not to be deterred, Senator HARKIN and I again went to work with our subcommittee and we were able to add an additional \$2 billion to the NIH account for fiscal year 1999.

In fiscal year 2000, Senator HARKIN and I offered another amendment to the budget resolution to add \$1.4 billion to the health accounts, over and above the \$600 million increase which had already been provided by the Budget Committee. Despite this amendment's defeat by a vote of 47 to 52, we were able to provide a \$2.3 billion increase for NIH in the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill.

In fiscal year 2001, Senator HARKIN and I again offered an amendment to the budget resolution to increase funding for health programs by \$1.6 billion. This amendment passed by a vote of 55 to 45. This victory brought the NIH increase to \$2.7 billion for fiscal year 2001. However, after late night conference negotiations with the House, the funding for NIH was cut by \$200 million below that amount.

In fiscal year 2002, the budget resolution once again fell short of the amount necessary to achieve the NIH doubling. Senator HARKIN and I, along with nine other Senators offered an amendment to add an additional \$700 million to the resolution to achieve our goal. The vote was 96 to 4. The Senate Labor-HHS subcommittee reported a bill recommending \$23.7 billion, an increase of \$3.4 billion over the previous year's funding. But during conference negotiations with the House, we once again fell short by \$410 million. That meant that in order to stay on a path to double NIH, we would need to provide an increase of \$3.7 billion in the fiscal year 2003. The fiscal year 2003 omnibus appropriations bill contained the additional \$3.7 billion, which achieves the doubling effort. We have fought long and hard to make the doubling of funding a reality, but until treatments and cures are found for the

many maladies that continue to plague our society, we must continue our fight.

I, like millions of Americans, have benefited tremendously from the investment we have made in the National Institutes of Health and the amendment that we offer today will continue to carry forward the important research work of the world's premier medical research facility.

While the budget resolution assumes some increases in chronic disease, health statistics and HIV/AIDS, cuts in other CDC programs total over \$300 million. This amendment would add \$600 million to the amount already assumed in this resolution.

Several years ago, I visited the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and was appalled at the deplorable conditions of the laboratories and buildings at the Atlanta campus. I found laboratory facilities with roofs that were leaking on high-technology equipment, equipment falling through rotted floors, and bathrooms that had been converted into labs and office space. The CDC, as the lead Federal agency responsible for promoting health and preventing and controlling disease, should have adequate facilities and equipment to carry out its mission. To address the facility and equipment needs, Senator HARKIN and I included \$175 million in fiscal year 2001 to begin renovations on campus. In fiscal year 2002, we included \$250 million and the same amount was appropriated in fiscal year 2003. The amount assumed in the budget resolution is inadequate to continue the construction work needed to make the CDC safe for workers and ensure that the next public health emergency will not overwhelm the current capacities of the CDC to respond to a biodefense attack or other illness. Additional dollars are also needed for prevention and health promotion programs such as immunization, tuberculosis, cancers and cardiovascular disease.

The budget resolution assumes a decrease of \$785 million for the Health Resources and Services Administration. This amendment would add \$400 million to restore some of the proposed cuts in health professions and provide for program increases in Ryan White AIDS, abstinence education and Children's Hospitals Graduate Medical Education.

The increases included in this amendment are essential if we are to continue to carry forward the important work at the world's premier medical research facility, ensure that the CDC has equipment and laboratories to confront any public health crisis that may occur, and provide the Health Resources and Services Administration with the dollars necessary to fund community health centers, train health care professionals, and confront the AIDS crisis.

I ask that you join Senator HARKIN and me in supporting the amendment.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise to address Senators LAUTENBERG and

CORZINE'S proposed amendment to the budget resolution. Superfund and the cleanup of pollution sites should be an important concern to all of us. We must be concerned that our future generations are not jeopardized by past inactions. But this amendment has been offered in an inappropriate forum, at an inappropriate place, using an inappropriate procedural method and I have voted no. As chairman of the Finance Committee, we will be able to consider this issue under more appropriate circumstances.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, while our thoughts are with our troops, the business of Congress continues. And we need to approach our challenges at home with the same resolve and the same seriousness of purpose with which our sons and daughters are confronting the threat abroad. It is sadly ironic that at the very time when our service men and women are inspiring us with their courage in the face of danger, this budget runs and hides from one challenge after another while showering \$1.4 trillion in tax breaks primarily to the most prosperous among us.

Month after month, more American families are suffering from the failure of this administration's irresponsible economic strategy. With the economy hemorrhaging jobs from every sector, an increasing number of Americans are losing faith that they will ever find a job. But with this budget, Republicans have turned their backs on the problems of American families. Instead of offering new ideas and new solutions, the administration continues to push a tired ideology that has turned our economy into a job-destroying machine. This budget will hang some \$1.5 trillion of debt around the necks of our children. They will be paying for this mistake for decades to come. The President's own economists agree that these chronic deficits will raise interest rates, hold back our economy today, and rob opportunity from even more Americans.

And though all Americans' thoughts are with our Armed Forces today, I would ask that they take a moment to ask, why is this Republican Congress saddling our children with record-breaking deficits and massive debt? It is not to fund the war or the rebuilding of Iraq that will follow. It is not to protect our homeland. Republicans continue to shortchange the police and firefighters who need our help to prevent or respond to a terrorist attack in their own communities, and continue to oppose funding to better secure our borders, ports, and vulnerable infrastructure. It is not to get our economy moving again. Like the President's budget, the Republican resolution before us contains very little to immediately stimulate the economy. It is not to provide all of our seniors with a real Medicare prescription drug plan or strengthen Social Security for the coming generation of retirees. This plan starves Medicare and raids the Social Security surplus. It is not to come

to the aid of States and local governments that are suffering the worst fiscal crisis in 50 years. This budget will place an even greater burden on our States. And it is not to build world-class schools so our children have the tools and skills they need to make the most of their own lives. While some schools around our country will be forced to shut their doors early this year due to budget cuts, the President's plan falls \$10 billion short of his own promise to education.

This budget is not about meeting the challenges of the moment or the future. This budget is about one thing, and one thing only. More new tax breaks for the very wealthy at the expense of everyone else. At the expense of deep cuts in domestic priorities. At the expense of record deficits that will be imposed on our children and grandchildren.

Any other year, this budget would be seen as mean-spirited and divisive. Today it is shameful. Across the globe, on display for all the world to see, young men and women are risking their lives to secure the lives and liberty of others. And yet here in this Capitol, on display for the world to see, a Republican Congress is taking money out of the pockets of our own children. It is choosing not to provide the necessary resources to make our homeland more secure. It is choosing not to give States any help to deal with their mounting fiscal crisis. It is choosing not to keep its commitments on education. It is choosing not to provide needed health care and prescription drug coverage to our most ill and vulnerable. With all those challenges and needs, this Congress instead is choosing to give hundreds of billions in new tax breaks to the wealthiest among us.

Democrats are going to keep fighting to fund homeland security, provide a real Medicare prescription drug benefit; honor our commitment to our students and teachers; restore funding to make up for Republican cuts to national defense and veterans programs, and offer relief to our States and local governments. This is not a time to shrink from our responsibilities to one another. We need to meet the test of this demanding moment in our history. This Congress should be producing a budget that reflects the very best of our Nation, the spirit that our soldiers exemplify the spirit of honor, sacrifice, and duty in the service of a better future for us all.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that no later than 4 p.m. on Monday, the ranking member of the Budget Committee provide to the chairman a list of 40 amendments, and the chairman provide to the ranking member a list of no more than 40 amendments, which would then be in order to be offered to the budget resolution; I also ask unanimous consent that the Senate then resume consideration of the budget resolution at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday and, at that time, it be in order for the majority leader or

the Democratic leader or their designees to offer amendments from the respective list, and the Senate would then proceed to votes in relation to the amendments as provided for under the Budget Act, with 2 minutes for debate equally divided prior to the vote, with relevant second-degree amendments; provided that no later than 4 p.m. on Wednesday, March 26, the Senate proceed to a vote on passage of S. Con. Res. 23, with no intervening action or debate.

I further ask consent that immediately upon passage of the resolution, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res 95, the House budget resolution; further, all after the resolving clause be stricken and the text of S. Con. Res. 23, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof, the resolution be adopted, and the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair then be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to thank all of our colleagues, especially colleagues on my side of the aisle who have a great deal of skepticism, I would say, about this particular proposal. I think it is equally clear that there is skepticism on both sides.

We have been through a good deal of debate over the last several days. I think we have made progress. This will accommodate adequate progress on both sides. I will say, as the majority leader and I have discussed on a few occasions, that this agreement requires a good deal of trust on both sides. We are trusting our Republican colleagues to work with us to accommodate the consideration of 40 amendments. They are trusting us that we will share with them those amendments, that we will be able to work through them, that they will have an opportunity to review them, and that we will complete our work at 4 o'clock.

So it does require cooperation and a level of trust that I hope will set a standard and example for other action we take later on. So I hope that our colleagues will continue to cooperate in the course of the next couple of days.

I have designated the ranking member of the Budget Committee and our extraordinary assistant Democratic leader. They have been tasked with the responsibility of determining these 40 amendments. So we will work over the weekend and we will, as this agreement requires, provide those amendments on Monday.

I appreciate very much the cooperation and the trust of the distinguished majority leader and the chairman of the Budget Committee. This certainly is the best way to accommodate the needs of both of our caucuses. I congratulate my colleagues for doing so.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will comment and then turn to the chairman of the Budget Committee. I want to briefly say this and close my re-

marks by expressing my appreciation to our caucus and to the chairman of the Budget Committee, and especially to the leadership on the other side of the aisle and the ranking member. As most people know, we have been negotiating and discussing in the last several hours how to bring to closure what we all know is a big challenge, given the number of amendments that we have before us.

We put our heads together and, after a lot of conversation and, as the Democratic leader said, basing a lot of what we are setting out to do over the next several days on trust, came up with an agreement that is not perfect on either side, but it is the best we can do to give some finite closure to this challenge.

In addition, we have had a very good week. It is late on a Friday night and our colleagues have worked very hard. Indeed, we had very good and productive discussions. We have done a number of amendments. I congratulate the ranking member and chairman in bringing those to the floor and having good debate today.

In addition to that, the resolution we agreed to sent a very important signal to our troops, our military, and our Commander in Chief: our gratitude, respect, and support.

So we have actually accomplished a lot this week. We were unable to fulfill what I had initially hoped, and that was to pass the budget resolution by late tonight. But given the fact that at this hour we still have many outstanding amendments, I am very pleased with the agreement. I thank the leadership and the chairman and ranking member.

Mr. NICKLES. If the leader will yield, I have a couple of comments. One, I appreciate the cooperation of the leader and Senator DASCHLE and Senator REID and Senator CONRAD. But just for the information of our colleagues, we are going to have a very tough couple of days, a lot of work to do on Tuesday and Wednesday. I urge our colleagues to be ready to go. I think the order called for us going into session at 9:30 Tuesday morning.

Today, we worked long and hard. We had about 15 rollcall votes, and I believe we accepted probably another 15 amendments, counting the last 7. It is going to be very challenging work. So I urge our colleagues to be notified of the fact that they need to be here at 9:30 Tuesday morning and expect a long day—a lot of votes on Tuesday and a lot of votes on Wednesday. It is going to take the cooperation of all Members for us to meet this ambitious goal. It will not be easy and it probably won't be very pretty. Hopefully, we will be successful in meeting our objectives. There is nothing in the unanimous consent agreement saying we have to agree to 40 amendments?

Mr. DASCHLE. No; we tried that, Mr. President.

Mr. NICKLES. I just wanted to make sure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, first of all, the leaders have indicated there has to be trust on both sides. The chairman of the committee has shown himself to be trustworthy in these long, difficult negotiations this whole week. We had instances last night where I had to make a decision that could have disadvantaged our side and did it because that was keeping a promise. The chairman of the committee had to make a decision today that could have disadvantaged his side, but he did it to keep faith with the commitment that he made.

I want colleagues on our side to know the chairman of the committee has repeatedly demonstrated trustworthiness. That is important to the functioning of this body. We are going to have to really work together very closely to resolve these matters.

Let me say in conclusion to our colleagues on this side, we have 135 amendments pending. We only have 40 spots. That means Senators are going to have to give up what is their right to offer amendments. That is the most precious right any Senator has. So we understand why they guard that right with real fervor at times. But I hope people understand there is no way we can fit 135 into 40. It is going to take restraint, and it is going to take trust.

I think together over these next days we will demonstrate we are worthy of this body we serve and this country we love.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in wrap-up a little bit later tonight, we will be more specific, but for our colleagues, on Monday we will not be having votes, but we will be in session. We will talk about the day. We will not be voting on Monday. We need to have everybody here on time Tuesday because we will be voting in a vote-athon, as we have come to call it, starting early in the morning. We want people to make plans accordingly.

I yield the floor and 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. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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