

chart. This comes from the President's own document. It shows in the period we are in now that the deficits, although they are record levels, are going to get much bigger. As we approach the retirement of the baby boom generation and as we approach the full phasing in of the President's proposed tax cuts, at the very time the cost of the Federal Government explodes, the retirement of the baby boom generation, the cost of the President's tax cuts explode, sending us right off the cliff into deficits and debt that are totally unsustainable.

The other day one of our colleagues on the other side said Democrats were proposing spending that he suggested was just out of control. This chart shows the Democratic alternative we offered. This is a comparison of spending with the Republican plan, which is the green line, 18.8 percent of GDP; the blue line is our spending, 19.3 percent. One of the big reasons there is a difference is because we put the money in to pay for the war. We put the money in to pay for increased homeland security. So certainly we have more spending. We have more spending because we have responded to the President's call to put the spending in for the war. Our friends on the other side did not.

Let me go to the next chart quickly. He also showed what he called the Democrat spend-o-meter. We can look at the Republican debt-o-meter because what they are doing is running up the debt.

When the President took office, he told us that by 2008, there would only be \$36 billion of debt left. In his 2002 budget, he said—

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CONRAD. Let me complete this thought first, and then I will be happy to yield.

He had the debt run up to \$1.2 trillion after adopting his plans; in August of 2001, \$1.6 trillion. In February of 2002, with the President's 2003 budget, the debt is up to \$3.2 trillion. And if we adopt his budget for 2004, the debt by 2008 will be \$5 trillion.

I conclude by saying when we proposed additional spending to fund the war, to fund homeland security, and to improve education, we did it in a controlled way, every bit of it paid for, but we added deficit reduction so that we would have less deficit, less debt, a stronger economy, and more opportunity for the American people.

When I see in the newspapers the President in his plan is down to \$350 billion of tax cuts, oh, no, they are only looking at half the proposal. Right now the budget resolution that is before us has \$852 billion in tax cuts, not the \$350 billion that has been widely reported. When they are talking about the \$350 billion, they are talking about the reconciled tax cuts, those that will be given special consideration which cannot be filibustered. So the total tax cuts in this plan are \$852 billion.

I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland to a question.

Mr. SARBANES. I ask the ranking member of the Budget Committee, with these record deficits and this incredible buildup of debt which would flow out of the administration's policy, who is going to carry the burden of that debt? Will not the same men and women who are now fighting out in the Middle East, when they come home, have that debt settle upon them? And in the meantime, very big tax cuts are being given to very wealthy people. What sacrifice are the people who have been most favored in our society economically making in order to meet this economic crisis? There is no sacrifice on their part.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from New Mexico.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE BRAVE

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the brave men and women who are serving our country in both Iraq and Afghanistan, three individuals in particular. First, I will speak briefly about SP Joseph Hudson. He is a 1998 graduate of Alamogordo High School in my State. He is a member of the 507th Maintenance Company out of Fort Bliss, TX, who was captured this past Sunday. His image was seen on a videotape by his wife and high school sweetheart, Natalie, and young daughter Cameron, and his mother Anecita, also of Alamogordo, as well as everyone around the world watching the television coverage of this war. Like them, we wait anxiously for any word about his well-being, and pray for his safe return.

While our attention is focused on the fierce conflict in Iraq, it is important to remember that there are also young men and women putting their lives on the line every day in the conflict in Afghanistan as well. Many of us in New Mexico got a terrible reminder of that on Sunday, when two young people with strong ties to New Mexico were killed attempting to help two Afghan children.

Air Force 1LT Tamara Long Archuleta was the copilot of the helicopter that crashed while on a rescue mission, killing all six aboard. Tammy was from Adelino, near Belen, NM, and her life was a shining example of the power of discipline, drive, and determination. Tammy was valedictorian of her class and a world karate champion. She graduated from the University of New Mexico with honors, and while there became involved with Air Force ROTC. She had wanted to become a fighter pilot, but instead decided to do rescue work. Her grandfather was a Navy pilot and her uncle a pararescue man, and Tammy had been strongly influenced by her family's dedication to service.

Tammy had a 3-year-old son and was to marry a fellow Air Force pilot soon. Sadly, she was scheduled to return

home in a mere 2 weeks. Words cannot express the grief many New Mexicans are feeling about the loss of this extraordinary young woman.

I would also add that New Mexico was twice touched by this tragedy, the loss of this helicopter. Another young man killed in the crash, SSG Jason Hicks, met his future wife, Cristy Nolan of Rio Rancho, NM, when he was in training at Kirtland Air Force Base in Albuquerque. We honor his memory as well as Tamara's.

We hope this is the end of the casualties and problems we see for the young men and women of our State.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

#### IMMINENT DANGER PAY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, it is the nature of our debate on the budget resolution that there is a very limited amount of time available to discuss amendments which we will be offering. I am taking this opportunity this morning to describe to my colleagues and those following the debate an amendment which I plan to offer this morning to the budget resolution.

All of us are transfixed by images that come over the television, as we listen to the radio, and as we read the newspaper about the war in Iraq. We are reminded on a minute-by-minute basis of the heroism, bravery, and determination of our Armed Forces.

Last week, there was a resolution commending the Armed Forces for their efforts, as well as standing, by the President as Commander in Chief as he leads these forces into battle. That resolution was enacted by a vote of 99 to 0, with all Senators present voting in favor of it—all Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. It is an indication of the solidarity in this Chamber behind the men and women in uniform.

The amendment which I will offer during the course of the budget resolution debate today will be further evidence of our solidarity behind the men and women in uniform. My colleagues may be surprised to learn that those who are serving in the military in Iraq are eligible for what is known as imminent danger pay, combat pay. It is one of those rare moments in military life when we know these men and women put their lives on the line and we give them a bonus, an imminent danger pay bonus, above their ordinary compensation. One might ask themselves, well, how much is combat pay for those who are serving? Combat pay today is \$150 a month, \$5 a day. Combat pay to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and Coast Guard is less than the minimum wage for one hour in America for each day they are in battle in harm's way. That was last changed in 1991, when it was raised to \$150.

The amendment I will propose, the imminent danger pay increase amendment, will raise the monthly amount to \$500 a month. Make no mistake,

there is no compensation in dollar amounts we can give these men and women for their heroism and sacrifice, but I think it is important that we step forward with this increase so that combat pay is \$500 a month.

There is a second part to the amendment. We also say when we activate someone into a war theater that we help their family at home. That is known as family separation allowance. How much do we give the family of these service men and women back home during the period of time their loved ones are in combat? The family separation allowance is \$100 a month. I met with some of those families at the Rock Island Arsenal in my State last Saturday. They are facing extraordinary challenges for child care, for the expenses of their families they had not anticipated. We should do better for them. I am suggesting as part of my amendment that \$500 should be the monthly compensation for the family separation allowance. That is the nature of my amendment.

I ask all my colleagues in the Senate who stood shoulder to shoulder, 99 to nothing behind the men and women in uniform, to do the same now when we raise combat pay to \$500 a month and the family separation allowance to \$500 a month as well. That will be a clear demonstration that our commitment to these troops goes beyond words and goes to the budget, so we can provide them and their families the resources they need to not only come home safely but without the hardships that would be part of this service if we did not do our part to help them.

I hope my colleagues on a bipartisan basis will join as we did on the resolution.

I might add, there are some procedural hurdles being thrown in my path. People are saying the procedures may not allow you to offer this amendment. I beg my colleagues on both sides, as our men and women in uniform cannot hide in the deserts of Iraq, we should not hide on the floor of the Senate behind procedural niceties when it comes to fair compensation for our men and women in uniform and their families waiting dutifully at home.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider their opposition to this amendment. This is the right thing to do, and we should do it today.

I yield the floor.

#### THE GUARD AND RESERVE

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, in just a few moments as we get underway to debate a series of amendments to the budget bill, I am going to be offering an amendment. Under the rules, I will have just a minute to speak on it, so I thought I would take this time while we are getting organized to describe a little more detail about the Landrieu amendment regarding the Guard and Reserve.

There have been any number of articles—I see the chairman of the Armed

Services Committee here, and he is well aware of this—there have been any number of articles written as of late about the tremendous weight the National Guard and Reserve are carrying in our current war against terror, whether it be the campaign underway in Iraq, the supporting of a civilian government in Afghanistan, the carrying out of our missions in Bosnia and Kosovo, or guarding the homefront right here; whether it is in New Orleans or Baton Rouge or sites in Maryland or Virginia or your home State, Mr. President, or overseas.

The Guard and Reserve are doing a magnificent job. These are men and women who maybe served part of their time in the military for a few years and then, because of other family commitments or other calls on their talents, went into the private sector. Some of them started their own businesses. They come from a wide range of backgrounds. You yourself, Mr. President, served in the National Guard and Reserve. There are several Members of Congress who have not only carried out their job here, serving as Member of Congress, but also serve in this capacity.

You are to be commended. I know you have spoken out, Mr. President, on many instances about the problems that are arising in the sense that we are calling on the National Guard and Reserve over and over again. Their deployments are longer and our compensation to them, our benefit package to them, the way we supply them equipment, in my opinion—and an opinion that I think you share and is shared on both the Republican and Democratic sides—is not supportive to the degree that they, basically, are supporting us. I guess I could put it that way.

We ask these men and women to go for longer deployments, more frequent deployments, and not only put their life on the line but their livelihood on the line. We need to keep up our commitment on the benefit compensation end, on the financing side. In a moment—I know I only have a minute or so—whenever the leadership feels it appropriate for my amendment to be taken up, I am going to suggest we make a very modest change in the budget submitted to us by the President. Of course, there are parts of that budget I support. There are some parts that I think could be improved. That is what the amendment process is all about.

This is one of those areas that I think can be improved, to take \$10 billion out of the tax cut portion that is not the stimulative part but the unreconciled portion of the tax cut, and add basically \$1 billion a year over 10 years to provide critically needed equipment for our Guard and Reserve units.

There are two units now that are being forward deployed to Iraq that, under the President's budget as submitted—and I believe one unit is from

Georgia and one unit, I say to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, is from Virginia—those units will be decommissioned. There is not even enough money in the current budget we are debating to keep those units fighting and forward.

That is what my amendment attempts to do. It adds money. I would like to get more, but we are trying to be reasonable in this request because the Guard is really carrying a tremendous weight. They are happy to do it. They are proud to serve. They are not whining and complaining. But we should be supporting them. I think that is what we should be about today.

I thank you for letting me explain the Landrieu amendment. At the appropriate time, it will come up in the list of amendments. But now, more than ever, we are depending on them. Let us let them know they can depend on us.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 23, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the managers of the bill are working with Senators DURBIN and LANDRIEU to try to get something resolved there.

We know Senator WARNER wants to speak. He should be given whatever time he needs to respond to the Senator from Louisiana. But I would indicate that as soon as we get this resolved, and Senator WARNER has a chance to talk, rather than going directly to the Landrieu amendment, I think we should go to Dayton and get that out of the way.

In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Virginia be recognized to speak for up to 6 minutes to speak on the Landrieu amendment, which will be offered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I commend our distinguished colleague from