

DASCHLE, and BOXER be added as co-sponsors and the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Wednesday, March 19, 2003, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. KERRY. As all of us know, there are 42 million people living with AIDS worldwide. The Senate has addressed this issue previously, but the amount of money annually allocated falls short of the promises almost every single year. We have been working in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to develop bipartisan legislation. What I ask our colleagues to do today is to provide the amount of money that we will authorize in that legislation, in order to combat the AIDS epidemic. It simply increases the funding level included in the budget resolution to match the spending levels that will be in the authorization bill by \$800 million.

In addition, I tell all my colleagues, this is completely in line with the legislation Senator FRIST and I wrote and put together and that the Senate passed last year. So it is not a change; it is what we did before, but it meets the promise of the Senate and does not fall short. It also dedicates \$800 million for deficit reduction.

I ask my colleagues to help us fulfill a promise that has been too long in coming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, we adopted an amendment yesterday, offered by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator LUGAR, to restore spending to international affairs programs next year by over \$1.1 billion, from the committee's level. The bipartisan Lugar-Biden level would fund the President's proposal next year for global AIDS prevention. The resolution now accommodates \$15 billion in spending over the next 5 years for those countries hardest hit by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. This is the largest commitment made by any country in the world to address this specific problem.

This administration is taking a very bold step, which we support, to combat HIV/AIDS. I therefore rise in opposition to the Kerry amendment which would increase by nearly 80 percent the amount of money provided by this function of the budget. It would also increase taxes by nearly \$1.6 billion, further undermining the growth package now assumed in the resolution.

I have been working with Senator LUGAR and others on this important issue and will devote my full resources to the effort to combat the scourge of HIV/AIDS.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added to the amendment as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. NICKLES. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 281. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask unanimous consent this vote be limited to 10 minutes.

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

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID: I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER), is necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), is attending a family funeral.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 104 Leg.]

YEAS—47

|          |             |             |
|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Akaka    | Durbin      | Levin       |
| Baucus   | Edwards     | Lieberman   |
| Bayh     | Feingold    | Lincoln     |
| Bingaman | Feinstein   | Mikulski    |
| Boxer    | Graham (FL) | Murray      |
| Breaux   | Harkin      | Nelson (FL) |
| Byrd     | Hollings    | Nelson (NE) |
| Cantwell | Inouye      | Pryor       |
| Carper   | Jeffords    | Reed        |
| Clinton  | Johnson     | Reid        |
| Conrad   | Kennedy     | Rockefeller |
| Corzine  | Kerry       | Sarbanes    |
| Daschle  | Kohl        | Schumer     |
| Dayton   | Landrieu    | Stabenow    |
| Dodd     | Lautenberg  | Wyden       |
| Dorgan   | Leahy       |             |

NAYS—51

|           |             |           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| Alexander | DeWine      | McCain    |
| Allard    | Dole        | McConnell |
| Allen     | Domenici    | Murkowski |
| Bennett   | Ensign      | Nickles   |
| Bond      | Enzi        | Roberts   |
| Brownback | Fitzgerald  | Santorum  |
| Bunning   | Frist       | Sessions  |
| Burns     | Graham (SC) | Shelby    |
| Campbell  | Grassley    | Smith     |
| Chafee    | Gregg       | Snowe     |
| Chambliss | Hagel       | Specter   |
| Cochran   | Hatch       | Stevens   |
| Coleman   | Hutchison   | Sununu    |
| Collins   | Inhofe      | Talent    |
| Cornyn    | Kyl         | Thomas    |
| Craig     | Lott        | Voinovich |
| Crapo     | Lugar       | Warner    |

NOT VOTING—2

Biden Miller

The amendment (No. 281) was rejected.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The Senator from Oklahoma.

RECESS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, we are making good progress. We only have a few amendments left. To give staff a chance to work out a couple of amendments—I thank my colleagues for working together with us on the amendments—I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 1:40.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:04 p.m., recessed until 1:45 p.m.,

and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HAGEL).

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. CLINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. DOLE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 403

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 403, offered by our colleague from Oklahoma, Senator INHOFE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 403.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of Friday, March 21, 2003, under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, this is something we are all familiar with, except perhaps new Members. Back in the fifties, we had a program to replace some of the money that was taken away when land was taken off the tax rolls. It is called impact aid.

Over the years, people started taking money out of this program. It is an easy place to grab money. It has gotten down to 40 percent funding. We are now up to 70 percent. The current legislation would leave it at 70 percent. This amendment will increase it by \$112 billion, bringing it up to \$1.3 billion, 76 percent. That keeps us on track to have it fully funded 5 more years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, maybe my ears deceived me. I heard the Senator say \$112 billion. My reading on the amendment is \$112 million.

Mr. INHOFE. That is what I said.

Mr. CONRAD. I heard the Senator say \$112 billion.

Mr. INHOFE. We are used to using the B's around here. It is \$112 million.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator. My further understanding is this is

funded by an across-the-board cut in all other functions.

Mr. INHOFE. That is right.

Mr. CONRAD. So there are no new discretionary funds available through this amendment. With that understanding, there is no objection on this side to the Senator's amendment. He is quite correct that impact aid is underfunded, and it is important to virtually all our States and all our communities.

Mr. INHOFE. I appreciate that. I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I encourage our colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 403) was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The senior assistant bill clerk continued with the call of the roll.

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

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

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I believe the Senator from Alaska has an amendment to send to the desk.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, we have been negotiating for some time, trying to resolve two or three amendments. I think we have done that.

I thank Senator WARNER, Senator CHAMBLISS, Senator DURBIN, and Senator LANDRIEU because I think they have cooperated. They came up with amendments I think all of us can be supportive of.

I ask on this amendment, and this amendment alone, there be 4 minutes equally divided so all the principal players can have a moment to speak on this amendment.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

AMENDMENT NO. 429

Ms. LANDRIEU. I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator DURBIN, Senator WARNER, and Senator CHAMBLISS, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Ms. LANDRIEU], for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CHAMBLISS, proposes an amendment numbered 429.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: Provide additional pay and benefits for active duty, guard, and reserve forces, such as augmenting Imminent Danger Pay and Family Separation Allowance, and for modernization of equipment, weapons, and technology needs of the National Guard and Reserves in recognition of those currently involved in conflict operations and the need of their family members left behind)

On page 8, line 23, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 8, line 24, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 46, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by \$3,000,000,000.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator STABENOW and Senator LINCOLN be added as original cosponsors.

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

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I thank my colleagues and particularly Senator DURBIN for his work in working out this amendment. It is for the Guard and Reserve units that have been called up.

This amendment is crucial. It is important that we adopt it for a number of reasons. No. 1, from 1945 to 1990, a period of 45 years, our Guard and Reserve units were called up four times. In the last 13 years they have been called up eight times. They represent a growing and necessary component of our force protection for our Nation, both abroad and at home.

Unfortunately, our commitment to their budget has not kept up with the contributions they are making. This amendment attempts to begin to fill that gap.

I submit for the RECORD, because this is a \$1 billion amendment, a list of equipment needs that could be provided by this amendment. I suggest the \$1 billion could be for this or something comparable to it. I ask unanimous consent that be printed in the RECORD.

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

STRATEGIC EQUIPMENT, WEAPONS, AND TECHNOLOGY NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE

| Service           | System   | Cost   |
|-------------------|--|--|
| Air Force Reserve | WC-130J Radar—Upgrades Reserve Radar to specifications needed by Active forces   | \$50,000,000.                                |
| Air Force Reserve | F-16 LITENING II AT Upgrade Modification—Provides Reserve Tactical Fighters with same radar upgrades as active forces; reserve fighters flying same missions.  | \$16,200,000.                                |
| Air Force Reserve | F-16 LITENING II AT Pod Procurement—Provides Reserve Tactical Fighters with same radar upgrades as active forces; reserve fighters flying same missions.   | \$14,400,000.                                |
| Air Force Reserve | A-10 TARGETING PODS—Provides Reserve Tactical Fighters with same radar upgrades as active forces; reserve fighters flying same missions.   | \$48,000,000.                                |
| Air Force Reserve | B-52 TARGETING PODS—Provides Reserve B-52s with same radar upgrades as active B-52s; performing same missions  | \$4,800,000.                                 |
| Air Force Reserve | TACTICAL RADIOS—Provides radio upgrades for interoperability with active forces  | \$14,900,000.                                |
| Air Force Reserve | LAND MOBILE RADIO INFRASTRUCTURE   | \$12,000,000.                                |
|                   | Total  | \$169,300,000.                               |
| Navy Reserve      | VAW-78, EC-2 Squadron—Funding Prohibits decommissioning in FY05 of this currently deployed unit  | \$10,160,000; Allen/Warner.                  |
| Navy Reserve      | VFA-203, F/A-18 Squadron—Funding Prohibits decommissioning in FY04 of this currently deployed unit   | \$20,110,000; Chambliss/Miller.              |
| Navy Reserve      | Littoral Surveillance System—Procures one additional system to upgrade port surveillance by Navy Reserve   | \$14,500,000; Lott/Cochran/Specter/Santorom. |
| Navy Reserve      | F/A 18 Advanced Targeting FLIR—Procures radars for 5 squadrons to make compatible with Active Navy   | \$14,700,000; Bond/Talent.                   |
| Navy Reserve      | P-3 Aircraft Improvement Program (AIP)—Would upgrade 28 of 42 Reserve P3s to have same capabilities as Actives; AIP allows P-3s to better operate against surface combatants and improve surveillance and targeting. | \$29,700,000; Snowe/Collins.                 |
| Navy Reserve      | P-3 Block Modification Upgrade Program (BMUP)—Brings all Reserve P-3s into compliance with each other, not Actives—gives all Reserve P-3s similar computers and acoustics sensors.                                   | \$33,000,000; Snowe/Collins.                 |
| Navy Reserve      | F/A 18 ECP 560 Precision Guided Munitions Upgrade—Provides 1 Reserve F/A Squadron with precision guided munitions similar to Active F-18s.   | \$33,240,000; Kyl; McCain.                   |
| Navy Reserve      | CBR-D Equipment Storage and Logistics—Funds shortfall of 10,000 bio-chem suits for Navy Reservists   | \$8,000,000.                                 |
|                   | Total  | \$163,410,000.                               |
| Army Reserve      | High Frequency Radios (Interoperability for Special Ops Reservists)  | \$57,138,816.                                |
| Army Reserve      | M-4 Rifles   | \$1,200,000.                                 |
| Army Reserve      | M-16 Rifles  | \$1,200,000.                                 |
| Army Reserve      | Tactical Electrical Power (5-60KW) TQG   | \$5,404,000.                                 |
| Army Reserve      | Tactical Electrical Power (3KW) TQG  | \$3,000,000.                                 |
| Army Reserve      | Truck Tractor Line Haul  | \$12,420,000.                                |
| Army Reserve      | Improved Ribbon Bridge   | \$22,400,000.                                |
| Army Reserve      | Truck Cargo PLS 10X10 M1075 (T40999)   | \$6,936,000.                                 |
| Army Reserve      | Trailer PLS 8X20 M1075 (T93761)  | \$1,320,000.                                 |

STRATEGIC EQUIPMENT, WEAPONS, AND TECHNOLOGY NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE—Continued

| Service              | System   | Cost   |
|----------------------|--|--|
| Army Reserve         | Spreader Bituminous Module PLS 2500 Gal. (S13546)                      | \$2,080,000.   |
| Army Reserve         | Mixer Concrete   | \$1,375,000.   |
| Army Reserve         | Dump Body Module   | \$3,496,000.   |
| Army Reserve         | Engineer Mission Module Water Distributor                              | \$9,630,000.   |
| Army Reserve         | Airborne/Air Assault Scraper (S30039)                                  | \$7,575,000.   |
| Army Reserve         | Distributor Water Self-Propelled 2500 Gal.                             | \$2,970,000.   |
| Army Reserve         | Truck Transporter Common Bridge (CBT) (T91308)                         | \$8,360,000.   |
| Army Reserve         | Truck Dump 20 Ton  | \$7,215,000.   |
| Army Reserve         | Generator Smoke Mechanical   | \$11,667,600.  |
| Army Reserve         | Tent Expandable Modular (Surgical)                                     | \$729,000.   |
| Total                |  | \$166,116,416.   |
| Army Nat'l Guard     | Black Hawk Helicopters   | \$223,200,000; Santorum, Specter, Chambliss, Ensign, Frist, Alexander. |
| Army Nat'l Guard     | SINGARS (Radio Systems)  | \$34,900,000.  |
| Air Nat'l Guard      | F-16 Targeting Pods  | \$35,100,000; Talent/Bond.   |
| Air Nat'l Guard      | A-10 Targeting Pods  | \$70,200,000.  |
| Air Nat'l Guard      | C-130H2 AN/APN-241 Radar   | \$24,500,000.  |
| Air Nat'l Guard      | F-15 AIFF/IFF (Data Link Systems)                                      | \$31,300,000; Smith (OR), Talent, Bond.                                |
| Air Nat'l Guard      | F-15 220E Engine Kits  | \$98,000,000 Smith, Talent, Bond.                                      |
| Total                |  | \$517,200,000.   |
| Marine Corps Reserve | Reserve Training Center Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Mobile, AL       | \$8,000,000; Sessions/Shelby.  |
| Marine Corps Reserve | Reserve Tank Maintenance Facility, Columbia, South Carolina            | \$3,800,000; Graham (SC).  |
| Marine Corps Reserve | Reserve Training Center Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Camp Lejeune, NC | \$8,100,000; Dole.   |
| Marine Corps Reserve | Uniform and Equipment needs  | \$13,200,000.  |
| Marine Corps Reserve | Weapons System Repairs   | \$7,300,000.   |
| Total                |  | \$40,400,000.  |
| Grand Total          |  | \$1,047,426,416.   |

Ms. LANDRIEU. This amendment is supporting the Guard and Reserve for equipment, as well as for pay and compensation, and Senator DURBIN will explain the second part of this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty seconds.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank my cosponsors, Senators MIKULSKI, DAYTON, BOXER, SCHUMER, CLINTON, and FEINGOLD.

What we are seeking to do here is to raise combat pay, the imminent danger pay for those who are serving overseas. It will be raised from \$150 a month to at least \$250 a month, and to increase the family separation allowance from currently \$100 a month to at least \$250 a month.

Senator WARNER was generous enough to talk about \$3 billion here, which will accommodate the needs for the Guard and Reserve that Senator LANDRIEU has raised and also bring the combat pay and separation allowance figures up to where they should be. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the distinguished managers of the bill and our two colleagues on the other side of the aisle. I think this is an amendment each Senator not only can but should vote for. I hope we get 100 votes because it is a consensus across the aisle about the imminent needs of the men and women of the Armed Forces, indeed the Guard and Reserve which in historic numbers have rallied to the call to serve side by side with the Active Force in the conflict, not only in Iraq but also elsewhere in the world.

I strongly support it and yield the remainder of my time to my colleague from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Madam President, I, too, thank my colleagues, Senators

WARNER, LANDRIEU, and DURBIN for their strong leadership on this issue. We now have a significant number of Guard and Reserve personnel who are in harm's way, protecting freedom and democracy. It is only right that we address some shortfalls in the way in which these folks are compensated.

In addition to that, we have provided within this budget number for the ability of the authorizing committees to come back and purchase needed equipment from a hardware perspective, as well as to look after the families of our brave guardsmen and reservists.

I think this is a good amendment. I echo what Senator WARNER said. I hope we get 100 votes so we can send the right message to all our Guard and Reserve and Active duty personnel that we are concerned about them and we want to make sure we treat them fairly and equitably. This does so.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to add Senator KENNEDY as an original cosponsor.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 429.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 105 Leg.]

YEAS—100

|           |           |             |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Akaka     | Carper    | Dorgan      |
| Alexander | Chafee    | Durbin      |
| Allard    | Chambliss | Edwards     |
| Allen     | Clinton   | Ensign      |
| Baucus    | Cochran   | Enzi        |
| Bayh      | Coleman   | Feingold    |
| Bennett   | Collins   | Feinstein   |
| Biden     | Conrad    | Fitzgerald  |
| Bingaman  | Cornyn    | Frist       |
| Bond      | Corzine   | Graham (FL) |
| Boxer     | Craig     | Graham (SC) |
| Breaux    | Crapo     | Grassley    |
| Brownback | Daschle   | Gregg       |
| Bunning   | Dayton    | Hagel       |
| Burns     | DeWine    | Harkin      |
| Byrd      | Dodd      | Hatch       |
| Campbell  | Dole      | Hollings    |
| Cantwell  | Domenici  | Hutchison   |

|            |             |           |
|------------|-------------|-----------|
| Inhofe     | McCain      | Schumer   |
| Inouye     | McConnell   | Sessions  |
| Jeffords   | Mikulski    | Shelby    |
| Johnson    | Miller      | Smith     |
| Kennedy    | Murkowski   | Snowe     |
| Kerry      | Murray      | Specter   |
| Kohl       | Nelson (FL) | Stabenow  |
| Kyl        | Nelson (NE) | Stevens   |
| Landrieu   | Nickles     | Sununu    |
| Lautenberg | Pryor       | Talent    |
| Leahy      | Reed        | Thomas    |
| Levin      | Reid        | Voinovich |
| Lieberman  | Roberts     | Warner    |
| Lincoln    | Rockefeller | Wyden     |
| Lott       | Santorum    |           |
| Lugar      | Sarbanes    |           |

The amendment (No. 429) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, for the information of our colleagues, we are making good progress. I again thank my colleagues for their cooperation in working out the last two or three amendments.

I now call upon the Senator from Alaska to introduce an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 430

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Ms. MURKOWSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 430.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 45, line 24, increase the amount by \$47,904,000,000.

On page 46, line 1, increase the amount by \$18,768,000,000.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator withhold for a moment.

I think it would be wise for us to get in place an agreement on the amendment that would either be in the second degree or be side by side at this moment so that that is prepared at the end of the presentation of the Senator

from Alaska. Otherwise, the second-degree amendment would be offered. I think it would be better if we did not do it that way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the Murkowski amendment, Senator CONRAD or his designee be allowed to introduce a sense of the Senate relative to the Murkowski amendment.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, the current budget resolution assumes the growth package will immediately raise the \$600 child tax credit to \$1,000. My amendment is going to require that the growth package extend that \$1,000 child credit until the year 2013. The child credit is currently \$600, and it is scheduled to go up to \$1,000 in 2010. The problem we have with this, however, is that in the year 2011, you are going to have a child credit of \$1,000. But the following year, that is going to drop in half to \$500. In other words, families with two children will face a \$1,000 tax increase in the year 2011. A family of three is going to face a tax increase of \$1,500. I don't think any of us would suggest that is fair. This is to help the families, particularly in times when we have some economic difficulties. This is an amendment that will help America's families.

I urge Members' support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, let me just say to my colleagues, the amendment of the Senator from Alaska has nothing to do with the child tax credit—zero. The amendment increases the tax cut by \$47.9 billion and increases the instruction to the Finance Committee for outlays of \$18.8 billion. It has nothing whatever to do with the child tax credit because the budget resolution does not make those decisions, as the chairman has indicated over and over.

There will be a subsequent amendment by the Senator from Arkansas that will make clear there is plenty of room in the underlying tax cut to accommodate the child tax credit the Senator from Alaska is advocating. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this increase to the tax cut.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask unanimous consent that the vote on this amendment and subsequent amendments be limited to 10 minutes.

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

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 430.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 106 Leg.]

YEAS—48

|           |             |           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| Alexander | DeWine      | Lugar     |
| Allard    | Dole        | McConnell |
| Allen     | Domenici    | Miller    |
| Bennett   | Ensign      | Murkowski |
| Bond      | Enzi        | Nickles   |
| Brownback | Fitzgerald  | Roberts   |
| Bunning   | Frist       | Santorum  |
| Burns     | Graham (SC) | Sessions  |
| Campbell  | Grassley    | Shelby    |
| Chambliss | Gregg       | Smith     |
| Cochran   | Hagel       | Specter   |
| Coleman   | Hatch       | Stevens   |
| Collins   | Hutchison   | Sununu    |
| Cornyn    | Inhofe      | Talent    |
| Craig     | Kyl         | Thomas    |
| Crapo     | Lott        | Warner    |

NAYS—52

|          |             |             |
|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Akaka    | Durbin      | Lincoln     |
| Baucus   | Edwards     | McCain      |
| Bayh     | Feingold    | Mikulski    |
| Biden    | Feinstein   | Murray      |
| Bingaman | Graham (FL) | Nelson (FL) |
| Boxer    | Harkin      | Nelson (NE) |
| Breaux   | Hollings    | Pryor       |
| Byrd     | Inouye      | Reed        |
| Cantwell | Jeffords    | Reid        |
| Carper   | Johnson     | Rockefeller |
| Chafee   | Kennedy     | Sarbanes    |
| Clinton  | Kerry       | Schumer     |
| Conrad   | Kohl        | Snowe       |
| Corzine  | Landrieu    | Stabenow    |
| Daschle  | Lautenberg  | Voinovich   |
| Dayton   | Leahy       | Wyden       |
| Dodd     | Levin       |             |
| Dorgan   | Lieberman   |             |

The amendment (No. 430) was rejected.

Mr. NICKLES. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DASCHLE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I believe there is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment that is going to be offered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield time to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for the purpose of offering another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 431

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN] proposes an amendment numbered 431.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding extending the \$1,000 child credit for three additional years (2011–2013))

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE \$1,000 CHILD CREDIT.

It is the sense of the Senate that extending the \$1,000 child credit for three additional years (2011–2013) can be accommodated within the revenue totals and instructions of this resolution.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I compliment my colleague from Alaska for the intent of the previous amendment. Many of us in this body have children. We understand what it takes to raise our children. Across this country, we want to provide all families, all parents the ability to do as much as they possibly can for their children. I again compliment the Senator from Alaska for the intent of her amendment.

My amendment expresses that it is the sense of the Senate that we should extend the refundable child credit for 3 years and that this can be accommodated within the revenue totals in the resolution as it currently exists.

As the Senator from Oklahoma has said several times during this debate, we cannot write the tax cut on the budget resolution. The previous amendment was simply an attempt to increase the size of the tax cut, nothing more, nothing less.

Although the intent of the amendment of the Senator from Alaska I think was good, I do think it is important that we make sure this tax cut actually goes in the child credit and we understand that the money already exists to do it. I ask for my colleagues' support of this amendment.

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

Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, this amendment is a sense of the Senate. It may provide political cover—I compliment my colleague from Alaska for her effort to help American families—but this is a sense of the Senate, so it does not change any revenue numbers. It may give political cover.

I have no objection to this amendment. I hope we accept it by a voice vote. Almost all of the sense-of-the-Senate amendments have been accepted by voice vote. Regardless, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and provide ample political cover for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DASCHLE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 431. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 107 Leg.]

YEAS—99

|           |         |          |
|-----------|---------|----------|
| Akaka     | Baucus  | Bingaman |
| Alexander | Bayh    | Bond     |
| Allard    | Bennett | Boxer    |
| Allen     | Biden   | Breaux   |

|           |             |             |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Brownback | Feingold    | McCain      |
| Bunning   | Feinstein   | McConnell   |
| Burns     | Fitzgerald  | Mikulski    |
| Byrd      | Frist       | Miller      |
| Campbell  | Graham (FL) | Murkowski   |
| Cantwell  | Graham (SC) | Murray      |
| Carper    | Grassley    | Nelson (FL) |
| Chafee    | Gregg       | Nelson (NE) |
| Chambliss | Hagel       | Nickles     |
| Clinton   | Harkin      | Pryor       |
| Cochran   | Hatch       | Reed        |
| Coleman   | Hollings    | Reid        |
| Collins   | Hutchison   | Roberts     |
| Conrad    | Inhofe      | Rockefeller |
| Cornyn    | Inouye      | Sarbanes    |
| Corzine   | Jeffords    | Schumer     |
| Craig     | Johnson     | Sessions    |
| Crapo     | Kennedy     | Shelby      |
| Daschle   | Kerry       | Smith       |
| Dayton    | Kohl        | Snowe       |
| DeWine    | Kyl         | Specter     |
| Dodd      | Landrieu    | Stabenow    |
| Dole      | Lautenberg  | Stevens     |
| Domenic   | Leahy       | Sununu      |
| Dorgan    | Levin       | Talent      |
| Durbin    | Lieberman   | Thomas      |
| Edwards   | Lincoln     | Voinovich   |
| Ensign    | Lott        | Warner      |
| Enzi      | Lugar       | Wyden       |

NAYS—1

Santorum

The amendment (No. 431) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, for the information of our colleagues, we are very close to finishing. I expect we will have a vote on final passage in probably about 10 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Michigan has a sense-of-the-Senate amendment to be called up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

AMENDMENT NO. 407

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 407.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW], for herself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. KOHL, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. REED, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DODD, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. WYDEN, proposes an amendment numbered 407.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the final budget conference agreement should not take or propose any actions that reduce the level of funding provided for domestic nutrition assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture below current baseline spending levels for the programs)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR DOMESTIC NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) domestic nutrition assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture—

(A) have a long history of bipartisan support;

(B) have an accomplished record of preventing health problems for children and promoting the health, growth, and development of children;

(C) provide United States agricultural producers and food manufacturers with important and substantial markets through which they can obtain and sustain livelihoods; and

(D) are due to be reauthorized and improved during the 108th Congress; and

(2) the budget proposed by the President for fiscal year 2004—

(A) maintains current levels of funding for child nutrition;

(B) extends and improves nutrition assistance programs, including—

(i) the school breakfast program established by section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773);

(ii) the school lunch program established under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.); and

(iii) the child and adult care food program established under the section 17 of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766); and

(C) renews and fully funds the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children established by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786).

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the final budget conference agreement should not take or propose any actions that reduce the level of funding provided for domestic nutrition assistance programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture below current baseline spending levels for the programs.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, this amendment is a sense of the Senate declaring that there will be no cuts to important domestic nutrition programs in this year's budget. I am very pleased to have letters of support from the American School Food Services Association and a number of other nutrition organizations. This is a bipartisan amendment cosponsored by Senators FITZGERALD, HARKIN, LEAHY, JOHNSON, MURRAY, DAYTON, KOHL, CORZINE, JACK REED, CLINTON, BINGAMAN, DODD, and WYDEN.

Our concern is that the House budget resolution will cut child nutrition funding by an estimated \$5.9 billion. These cuts would have a devastating impact on important child nutrition programs such as the School Lunch Program, breakfast programs, child and adult care feeding programs, and WIC.

We, in the Senate, have a long tradition of working together in a bipartisan way on nutrition programs. I hope we can adopt this sense of the Senate and, once more, show that we are very supportive that reauthorization of child nutrition programs is one of the Agriculture Committee's top priorities this year.

Frankly, Mr. President, we need more funding for child nutrition, not less. I ask for the Senate's support.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Ms. STABENOW and my other colleagues today in offering this amendment to express the sense of the Senate that the final conference agreement on the budget resolution should not reduce funding for domestic nutrition programs below the current baseline levels. The reconciliation instructions included in the House Budget Resolution to cut mandatory funding in the areas of domestic nutrition assistance would be devastating to the children and families who count on

these programs to meet their daily food needs. In these difficult economic times, we must not put the basic needs of low-income Americans—particularly children—on the chopping block in order to make room for an ill-advised tax cut package this country cannot afford. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in support of the amendment.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I believe we adequately take care of many of the functions that our colleague from Michigan mentioned in her statement. We have no objection to accepting her amendment by a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 407) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the majority leader for comments about the former chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, who did such a superb job over so many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I take this opportunity, before we enter into the final vote on the resolution, to congratulate the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator NICKLES, first, on bringing before this Chamber a budget resolution, and for the last 7 days of his very diligent work. My thanks to him and his staff for the long hours of hard work and their dedication.

I also thank the ranking member, Senator KENT CONRAD, for his cooperation here on the floor, as well as that of the Democratic assistant minority leader and the minority leader. We have not agreed on many issues over the last several days, but it has, nonetheless, been a respectful debate. And I think the will of the Senate will have spoken in a sound way when we adopt this resolution today.

I will have more to say about the resolution after adoption, but I did want to take just a few moments to pay tribute to the former chairman and former ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator PETE DOMENICI.

For many in this Chamber who have been through the budget wars over the last nearly three decades, it has been a little strange over the last 7 days not to see the senior Senator from New Mexico right here and down in the well managing this resolution. But I also know he trained his successor—and all of us—well, and we have all benefited from his counsel and guidance.

With the start of this Congress, Senator DOMENICI stepped down as the longest serving chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. I should note, under our conference rules, he could have served as chairman of the Budget Committee but chose, rather, to pursue

another of his passions, energy policy. He gave up the chairmanship of Budget to take on another with the Energy Committee. I know he will devote his extensive talents and energies to help the country craft a sensible and reliable energy policy, as much as he devoted them to the process over the last 28 years in the field of the budget. Both remain major challenges.

Senator DOMENICI has been a member of the Budget Committee since 1975—1 year after it was created with the enactment of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act. History will also show that shortly after his first coming to this Chamber in 1972, he and a group of other Senators, including the very distinguished Senator BOB BYRD of West Virginia, saw a need to put some order into what was then an even more chaotic budget and appropriations process. Indeed, it was through this freshman Senator PETE DOMENICI's efforts and prodding that the Budget Act became a reality.

Until Senator NICKLES took over the reins in January, Senator DOMENICI had been the only Republican chairman in the committee's history, holding that position for 12½ years, and the ranking member position for 9 years. Over 21 years—three-quarters of the committee's history—Senator DOMENICI has been at the forefront of setting and guiding fiscal policy in this country.

I am proud to say, in my first 8 years in this body, I had the honor to call Senator DOMENICI my chairman, as I served on that committee, learning the complexities of the Federal budget.

Senator DOMENICI has always been known for his tireless devotion to the budget process, his ability to patch together coalitions, and even a moodiness on fiscal policy that led another majority leader from Tennessee, Howard Baker, to dub his good friend Senator DOMENICI as the "Hamlet of the Senate" in the 1980s.

What has been accomplished under his leadership? Over the period, Senator DOMENICI has participated in the adoption of 26 concurrent budget resolutions, 27 Senate-passed budget resolutions, 26 committee-reported budget resolutions, and 17 major budget reconciliation bills. Conservatively, we estimate that he has taken over 1,000 votes on the Senate floor during the budget debates, and countless additional votes on motions to waive the Budget Act when enforcing the budgets he helped to craft.

He has been at the center of all debates and legislation to modify the Budget Act over the years, with the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, better known as the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings Act. When differences between the Senate, House, and President seemed to doom the budget process, he took the Senate lead in putting it back on track with its major budget summits in 1987, 1990, and, of course, the 1997 historic bipartisan balanced budget agreement.

Many of these agreements were not always popular, even with some of his fellow Republicans. But he has always—always—stood on principle and what he thought was best for the country at the time. Those principles and convictions to sound public policy have been evident in this debate on this resolution, specifically related to ANWR and the Federal energy policy in this country.

Despite the impressive record on the budget, the one statistic no one will ever challenge in the Senate's entire history, and the one statistic he is probably most proud of, is the fact that in 1986, while serving as a Senator, Senator DOMENICI had seven children in college and graduate school at one time. This son of an Italian immigrant grocer has always been devoted to his family through the good and the tough times. His wife Nancy has been loving support and inspiration to her husband throughout their 45 years of marriage. But I also know that Nancy, in her own right, has been a dedicated public servant, working to improve health care throughout the country, and particularly in New Mexico.

So, Mr. President, I did not want this occasion to pass, as we are about to complete another budget resolution, without paying tribute to the former chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee for his years of service and devotion to this process, to his family, to his State, and to his country.

Thank you, Senator DOMENICI.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, momentarily we will be voting on final passage. We have a couple of additional things to do.

I believe we are trying to work out a McConnell sense of the Senate. That will take just a moment. And then we will be voting in just a few minutes.

I also wish to join the majority leader in complimenting Senator DOMENICI for his many years of service, either as chairman or ranking member of this committee. I have a much greater appreciation for its challenges. He passed resolutions when we had a majority and minority, even when we were 50–50. My compliments to him. He is "Mr. Budget" as far as I am concerned. Plus, as evidenced in some of the debates, he proved that he knows this act unlike any other on the floor.

So I thank our friend and colleague.

Mr. DOMENICI. Thank you.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 432

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I send a sense-of-the-Senate resolution on behalf of Senator MCCONNELL to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES], for Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 432:

(Purpose: To provide for future consideration of a possible free trade agreement with the United Kingdom)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

"It is the Sense of the Senate that the President should negotiate a free trade agreement with the United Kingdom."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it has been said that the United States and the United Kingdom are a common people separated by a common language. But we also share a unique cause for freedom, and to preserve that we should also share a common market.

Today I am offering an amendment that ensures that our economies become as integrated as the other common causes that we share. The amendment will provide for a Free Trade Agreement to be negotiated between the United States and United Kingdom similar to the North America Free Trade Agreement.

Specifically, this amendment will create room in the budget for Congress to consider, and the President to successfully negotiate with, the United Kingdom for a Free Trade Agreement with the United States.

The world is witnessing once again the unique brotherhood of freedom and the special bond between America and United Kingdom. Those who know and enjoy the benefits of freedom are willing to join together and pay freedom's price. With so much at stake, America and United Kingdom should do all we can to ensure our common cause stays strong for the benefit of generations to come. With this United Kingdom—United States Free Trade amendment, our mutual bond will only become stronger.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I hope our colleagues will agree with this. We can agree with it by voice vote. It is a sense of the Senate that we should negotiate a free trade agreement with the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom has proved to be a very valuable ally, certainly in this latest conflict, but they have been for a long time. I compliment Prime Minister Blair and his leadership team and compliment Senator MCCONNELL for his amendment and also thank the cooperation of the staff of the Finance Committee for working with us to make this an acceptable resolution. I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. We have no objection on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 432) was agreed to.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to explain why I had to oppose Senator CORZINE's amendment to increase funding for environmental and natural resource programs in the budget resolution.

Let me be clear that I fully support the goals of Senator CORZINE's amendment. While it is true that we are facing a tight budget situation, protecting our environment and the health and well-being of our citizens should remain a top priority. That includes setting aside adequate funding for programs such as the Superfund and Brownfields programs.

But I was forced to vote against Senator CORZINE's amendment because of another concern. My concern with mounting deficits. The budget resolution brought before us includes tax cuts that total \$1.3 trillion. The budget also proposes that \$725 billion of these tax cuts be enacted immediately, under the reconciliation process.

Two years ago, we passed a \$1.3 trillion tax cut. I supported that tax cut. But those were different times. We had a surplus. We did not foresee the significant decline in revenues. Or the deficits that followed.

This is not the time to reduce revenues by \$725 billion. It would hurt our budget and our economy.

Why is \$725 billion in tax cuts inappropriate at this time? The most crucial problem is that it is not paid for. The budget resolution brought before us forecasts enormous deficits for almost the next decade. Reducing revenues by \$725 billion adds to the already mounting deficits. In order to prevent the passage of tax cuts that would drive up the deficit and hurt our economy, I believe that we must reduce the size of this tax cut.

I joined three of my colleagues in a letter that laid out these concerns—we pledged that we would not agree to tax cuts above \$350 billion. This is crucial. The Budget Committee approved \$725 billion in tax cuts, and brought it to the Senate floor. Along with my colleagues, I promised to vote to bring this number down by \$375 billion.

In a narrowly divided Senate, it is important that both parties work together to come up with the appropriate spending and revenue targets for the budget. That is why I worked with both Democrats and Republicans. Together, we came up with a target of \$350 billion for this tax cut, and we agreed that we would all stick to that number.

As part of our commitment to try to reduce the size of the tax cut approved by the Budget Committee, we also agreed that we would not try to reduce the size of the tax cut below \$350 billion. That means I am forced to make difficult decisions. In order to keep my commitment to a more responsible tax cut, I have to vote against funding priorities.

During tough times, we must make tough choices. I chose to commit to a responsible tax cut. A tax cut that will prevent worsening deficits that would hurt our economy.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution, S. Con. Res. 23.

Although I believe this budget, as amended on the floor of the Senate, is better than the resolution passed by the Budget Committee, it is still fiscally irresponsible, and I cannot support it at this time.

This budget, if passed, would increase the fiscal year 2004 budget deficit by \$138 billion above the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, baseline, to \$338 billion. This does not include the cost of the war or the reconstruction of Iraq, which is likely to push the budget deficit above \$400 billion.

The resolution contains a \$350 billion tax cut which we cannot afford, and which would be financed entirely through deficit spending.

The resolution does not adequately address numerous domestic spending priorities, such as education and homeland security.

Despite having been amended to reduce the size of the tax cut from \$726 billion to \$350 billion, this budget would still add more than \$1.3 trillion to our national debt over the next 10 years when interest costs are included.

Our budget deficit this year alone is likely to surpass \$400 billion, even before the new tax cuts proposed in this budget go into effect. While the administration pushes for new tax cuts, our fiscal situation continues to deteriorate.

Just last night, CBO released a report that indicates that even with no changes in tax law, the Government will take in \$30 billion less in 2003, and \$60 billion less between 2004 and 2008.

In the same report, CBO estimated that the President's tax cut package would have at most a small stimulative effect on economic growth, and might not increase growth at all.

While the effect this budget will have on the economy is uncertain, we can be certain that it will increase our debt. In fact, net public debt will exceed \$5 trillion by the end of the decade, and interest payments on the debt will double over the next 10 years, from \$155 billion this year to \$310 billion in 2013.

Only at the very end of the 10-year budget period, and under the most optimistic scenario, would we return to surplus.

There is an urgent need to fund many priorities which are not dealt with in this budget, and those needs are not likely to disappear over the next decade.

Those priorities include, among others: The war in Iraq and the subsequent reconstruction of Iraq, the President's No Child Left Behind education initiative, homeland security, and a full prescription drug benefit in Medicare.

Thanks to the success of an amendment offered by Senator FEINGOLD, the

budget does include a \$100 billion war reserve fund to be used to cover the cost of the war in Iraq. The reserve fund is not paid for, however, and will increase the deficit substantially in fiscal years 2003 and 2004.

Moreover, the ultimate costs of the war and postwar reconstruction are still unknown, and could be substantially higher than \$100 billion.

With regard to domestic spending, the limits set out in this budget are extremely low. The President's No Child Left Behind initiative would go largely unfunded, and funding for homeland security is not adequate to meet the security needs of cities, towns, and counties across the country.

Many priorities that are important to Californians are either cut or eliminated altogether, most notably funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program. If that program is eliminated, the burden of processing and incarcerating criminal aliens will fall entirely on thinly stretched State law enforcement budgets.

I believe that bipartisan cooperation is crucial to the Federal budget process, and such cooperation requires both sides to forgo certain new spending initiatives and new tax cuts.

In an attempt to bridge the gap, I co-sponsored a bipartisan amendment offered with Senators CARPER, CHAFFEE, LINCOLN, and LANDRIEU.

Unlike the final resolution being voted on today, our substitute budget included significant tax relief for low- and middle-income families that is paid for over a 10-year period by freezing future tax cuts for taxpayers in the two highest income tax brackets.

That budget would have balanced the budget in 2009, 3 years before the underlying resolution.

That budget would have required tough choices with regard to discretionary spending, but it would have been entirely revenue neutral over the 10-year budget period and would not have added any new debt whatsoever.

When faced with the choice between supporting a bad budget and no budget at all, I must choose the latter.

I support a budget which faces our fiscal needs head on, even when an economic downturn forces us to make tough choices, and which resists the temptation to further increase the debt burden on future generations of taxpayers. Mr. President, this is not that budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the fiscal year 2004 budget resolution.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is sadly ironic that at the same time we are asking our young people to fight a war for our security, Republicans are passing a budget that will force those same young people to pay the bill for the reckless fiscal policies of this administration and the Republican Congress. Democrats are proud that we were able to make an irresponsible budget a little less irresponsible. But by showering the most privileged among us with hundreds of billions of



dollars in tax breaks and running up more than a trillion dollars in debt, this amended budget still poses a serious threat to the long-term economic well-being of the Nation.

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. With this budget, Republicans have turned their backs on the problems of American families. Instead of offering new ideas and fresh solutions, the administration continues to push a tired ideology that has turned our economy into a job-destroying machine. This budget will hang more than a trillion dollars of debt around the necks of our children and grandchildren. They will be paying for this mistake for decades to come. The President's own chief economist, in his academic writings, agrees that the chronic deficits perpetuated by this budget will raise interest rates and cut off economic growth for the future.

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's not to fund the war or the rebuilding of Iraq that will follow.

It is not to honor our men and women in uniform. Republicans voted against funding for health care for reservists.

It is not to strengthen our homeland defense. Republicans continue to short-change 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 stimulate the economy now.

This budget is not about meeting the challenges of the moment or the future. Its focus is on 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.

Democrats have been able to restore a small measure of sanity to this budget. And we are going to keep fighting to make sure that government's resources are used responsibly to meet the fundamental needs of our country. We are going to keep fighting to get our economy moving today with a broad-based tax cut that stimulates job creation; to fund homeland security; to provide a real Medicare prescription drug benefit, and to honor our commitment to our students and teachers. 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 fiscally responsible budget that reflects the very best of our Nation, the spirit that our soldiers exemplify, the spirit of honor, community and duty in the service of a better future for us all.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we are now coming to an end in our debate on this year's budget resolution.

I congratulate the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, Senator NICKLES for producing this resolution and reporting it from his committee in an expedited manner. We are doing the Nation's business on time.

I know that this resolution has put extraordinary pressure on the committee and floor staff, and I want them to all know my appreciation for their long hours of work. We are not done, but we will take a major step forward with the passage of this resolution today.

I also want to thank the ranking member, Senator CONRAD, who, while certainly not supporting this resolution, did cooperate in the scheduling of this resolution both in the committee and here on the floor.

Having been a member of the Budget Committee my first 8 years here in the Senate, I know how difficult it is to craft a budget resolution.

These are challenging times for our great country—certainly challenging on the international front and equally as challenging in setting a fiscal path for the future. Clearly how the war unfolds with Iraq can impact our economic outlook. But as we move forward on this budget resolution, we are also confronted with longer-term challenges of slow economic growth and the increasing demands of an aging population.

In the near term we will provide whatever resources are necessary to our troops in Iraq to bring that conflict to a quick, expeditious, and victorious end. I also believe that the completion of that conflict and the liberation of the Iraqi people from its dictator will not only provide freedom and economic growth for that country but also lift this cloud of uncertainty that has hung over our economy and depressed investment, growth, and job creation here at home.

For the long term, economic growth remains the key to an expanding economy. Real economic growth will provide the resources necessary to address the demographic changes that confront us both in the Social Security and Medicare programs. We should never forget that for these two programs, it is not the size of their trust fund that matters, it is the size of the economy that matters.

It is for this reason that the President's economic growth and job creation proposal is critical to setting a path toward future economic growth. I will continue to press for the largest growth package possible that will allow us to fully consider the growth

legislation later this spring. But for now this is just the beginning, not the end of the process.

S. Con. Res. 23, as amended, and before us today is a blueprint. It is the start of the process. Once adopted later today in the Senate and conferred with the House, this budget blueprint will guide the fiscal policy for the remainder of this first session of the 108th Congress. Unfolding events over the next many months may require modifications to the resolution. I believe emergency provisions built into this resolution will allow it to be flexible and adjust to changing events.

The failure of the last Congress to even consider here in the Senate chamber a budget resolution undermined the budget process and created significant problems. The failure to even consider a budget left the process in shambles and resulted in the failure to complete action on 11 of 13 annual must-do appropriations bills.

We all know the result. Less than 6 weeks ago, with one-quarter of this fiscal year already over, we finally passed an omnibus spending bill for FY 2003.

We must not repeat that mistake of the last Congress. We must pass a budget resolution and then get on with the business of enacting legislation that follows the budget's outline.

Beyond making it possible for considering an economic growth package later this spring, this resolution will provide resources requested by the President to win the war on terrorism, to protect the homeland, to modernize the Medicare program with a prescription drug benefit, increase funding for both IDEA and Title 1 education programs, increase veterans health funding, and provide over \$450 million next year for global AIDS programs.

Equally as important this resolution reinstates the tools we need here in the Senate to provide fiscal discipline. It establishes discretionary spending caps for this year and the next two. It puts a limit on the budgetary gimmick of advance funding. It extends the discipline of pay-go beyond its expiration date of April 15, and it reestablishes the supermajority points of order against spending that is not truly emergency spending.

Once again I congratulate the Chairman and the members of the Budget Committee on all their work that has brought us to this point. We will pass a budget and the legislative, budget and appropriation process will go forth as it should.

LOCAL HEALTH EMERGENCY REIMBURSEMENT  
ACT OF 2003

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to briefly address a health care issue of great importance to Arizona, all other southwest border States, and numerous other States. Hospitals in Arizona and throughout the country incur uncompensated costs of over \$1.5 billion annually to provide federally mandated emergency health treatment to undocumented immigrants.



MTG Corporation, a Texas-based firm, and the Border Counties Coalition, through a congressionally directed study, determined that the 24 counties along the Southwest border alone incur unreimbursed costs of over \$200 million per year to provide emergency health treatment to undocumented aliens. Based on these estimates, MTG Corporation has concluded that nationwide hospitals, ambulances and other providers incur costs of over \$1.5 billion per year.

Arizona, as an example, is indicative of the problems that all States and their providers are facing. The cost to Arizona and its providers for providing these services might well be close to \$200 million. These unreimbursed costs, and other health-related issues, have put hospitals around the country in a state of dire fiscal emergency. As a result of these costs, many doctors are simply choosing to practice medicine in such a way that they do not have to provide emergency room treatment—in Phoenix, AZ, depending on the time of day, if you have a specific emergency a specialty doctor might not be available to treat you. Some emergency rooms have closed, or are in danger of having to close, their emergency rooms either temporarily or permanently because of these costs.

I have introduced legislation, along with Senators MCCAIN, FEINSTEIN, DOMENICI, CORNYN, HUTCHISON, CLINTON, and SCHUMER to provide \$1.45 billion in funding annually to reimburse providers for these federally mandated, but uncompensated, costs.

It is my understanding that there are resources in the budget for the Finance Committee to consider a measure to provide reimbursement funding for health providers that currently provide federally mandated, but uncompensated, emergency medical treatment to undocumented aliens, be it in the Finance Committee allocation, its reserve fund for the uninsured, or any other appropriate funding stream.

Mr. NICKLES. That is correct. I appreciate the important information that Senator KYL has brought to the attention of the Senate, and I will work with Senator KYL and other interested Members to address this issue.

Mr. KYL. I would ask the Finance Committee, in its consideration of legislation dealing with welfare reform, Medicaid, and issues regarding uncompensated care, to work with me to provide for consideration of legislation to provide for this reimbursement funding.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will work with both Senators and other interested Members to provide for consideration of legislation to provide reimbursement to health providers who provide federally required, but uncompensated, emergency health treatment to undocumented aliens.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Senator for taking the time to help me clarify this important issue.

## PAYMENT LIMITATIONS

Mr. COCHRAN. Can the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee offer me assurance that budget resolution agreement will leave policy decisions regarding payment limitations to be resolved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. NICKLES. I provide that assurance.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Senator for his cooperation.

## SUPERFUND

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am in support of Senator LAUTENBERG's amendment to replenish the superfund trust fund, by reinstating the superfund taxes that expired in 1995. The trust fund is running dangerously low, and that is just not acceptable.

As I've stated before, I remember very clearly when Congress debated the original superfund law, and I remember thinking what an incredible legacy Congress could leave the Nation by enacting that historic legislation.

Seeing how successful superfund has been over the last 25 years, particularly in Libby, MT, reinforces my belief that we did the right thing for the people of this country when we created the superfund program.

The superfund program brought millions of dollars to Montana for clean up activities, to protect the health and well being of Montana's citizens and create good paying jobs in the local communities left with a contaminated site. For example, more than \$34 million has been spent in Libby alone in an effort to remove asbestos contamination caused by the now defunct WR Grace vermiculite mine, as well as to provide health screenings for Libby residents. Hundreds of millions have been spent in the Clark Fork basin to remedy decades of industrial pollution. Millions more will be spent to clean up the Berkeley Pit and other sites in the State.

Some of this money will come from an identifiable, solvent responsible party, but much of it will not, as companies go out of business or declare bankruptcy. And, Montana is not alone. That is why maintaining the integrity of the superfund trust fund is so important.

I'm extremely concerned that the more we fall behind in securing the funding necessary for clean-up activities at sites in Montana and around the country, the worse off we're going to be in future years. This has serious implications for the future stability of the superfund program.

I don't believe it's fair to solve this problem by forcing the average taxpayer to pick up the tab for the clean up of toxic sites that were created by private entities, and which threaten our health and our children's health. That's why I strongly support reinstating the superfund tax, and why I support Senator LAUTENBERG's amendment.

A Superfund designation is not a trivial event for the communities in-

involved—it invokes real fear and uncertainty in people about the future, about the future economic health of their community, and about the future effects of any contamination on their health or their children's health. These communities cannot shoulder the immense burden of cleaning up highly contaminated sites by themselves, or forcing a responsible party to pay for the clean-up. The Federal Government is a necessary and important partner in this effort through the Superfund program.

Superfund is a success; we should build on that success, not allow it to fall apart.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I express my strong opposition to a provision in the budget resolution that proposes to shift \$1.4 billion in mandatory spending over the next 10 years from agricultural programs, budget function 350, to the Conservation Security Program, budget function 300, compared to projected mandatory spending under the Agriculture Committee's jurisdiction under current law. I am pleased that the budget resolution does not require the Agriculture Committee to report legislation reducing mandatory spending pursuant to a budget reconciliation instruction, nonetheless this proposal amounts to a policy recommendation that the Agriculture Committee shift spending away from agricultural programs and towards the Conservation Security Program.

More importantly, as I understand it, the \$1.4 billion in agricultural program savings is to be achieved by reducing farm support program payment limitations below those that were agreed to as part of the 2002 farm bill, the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002, FSRIA. Specifically, the proposal would reduce statutory payment limitations for farm program payments to producers of covered crops—wheat, feed grains, oilseeds, cotton, and rice—from \$40,000 to \$20,000 for direct payments and from \$65,000 to \$30,000 for counter-cyclical payments. In addition, the proposal would include certificate transactions and loan forfeitures under the marketing loan program's payment limitation.

I oppose this proposal for a number of reasons. First, the FSRIA, enacted less than a year ago, has already reduced farm program payment limits compared to the 1995 farm bill. Second, the FSRIA, established a Commission on Application of Payment Limitations which is to analyze and make recommendations related to this issue to the President and to the House and Senate Agriculture Committees in a report that is due on or before May 13, 2003. Clearly, the Senate should consider the Commission's findings before it endorses a further policy change in this area. Third, the budget resolution should provide us with a broad plan for Federal revenues and expenditures but leave policy decisions within that budget framework to the Appropriations Committee, in the case of discretionary spending, and to the various

authorizing committees such as the Agriculture Committee, in the case of mandatory spending. This proposal violates that principle by attempting to dictate policy to the Agriculture Committee without having any impact on the overall level of Federal expenditures. Fourth, because their crops cost more to produce, southern cotton and rice farms tend to be larger, on average, than wheat, corn, and soybean farms in other regions. The payment limit proposal would reduce Government payments to larger farms, hurting southern cotton and rice producers the most. It is unclear, at best, what the proposal's changes to the marketing loan program would mean for our farmers. This is a program that has been highly successful in helping our farmers remain internationally competitive without undue Government involvement in the marketplace.

Taken together, the proposal's payment limitation changes could seriously undercut the farm safety net that was a principal goal of the FSRJA, particularly for southern producers of cotton and rice. I strongly oppose this provision.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, our Nation is at war. Our Federal budget faces unprecedented deficits. According to the Congressional Budget Office, counting the cost of that war, the deficit will be \$587 billion this year alone. And we are on the threshold of a crisis in the funding of our Social Security system as the baby boom generation begins to retire in the next decade.

Yet this budget resolution calls for fully \$850 billion in tax cuts, all of which will be borrowed from that Social Security system. In my 30 year career in the Senate, I cannot recall a more reckless or irresponsible proposal.

Instead of a careful, conservative approach to our finances, instead of caution and a sense of responsibility in these dangerous times, this budget throws caution to the wind and simply dumps the bill for our actions today on our children and grandchildren.

These are no ordinary times. We are now fully engaged in a war in Iraq, a war that will not be truly over until the reconstruction of that nation is accomplished. The \$75 billion that the President has just requested is just the first installment on that commitment. We cannot know the full costs of that undertaking, which could take many years to complete. At the same time, the global war on terrorism must be fought here at home as well as in the farthest corners of the globe. The costs of that commitment will be substantial and could well represent a permanent change in the way we do business.

This budget simply ignores those new realities and treats the Social Security system like a broken piggy bank, grabbing the savings the system will soon need for its own obligations to paper over the costs not only of our new security responsibilities, but hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars of

tax cuts as well. But those bills will come due, as the baby boom generation retires, and this budget plants a time bomb in a Social Security system that already faces a serious future imbalance.

Beyond those profound problems, the massive loss of revenues called for in this budget means that we do not have the funds available for such fundamental priorities as homeland defense, health care, or education.

I was glad to see that we fixed some of the problems in this resolution. Senator FEINGOLD's amendment rescued \$100 billion from those tax cuts to set aside to pay for the war now being fought in Iraq. That will be just the beginning of the resources we will need to fully cover the cost of that conflict and the massive reconstruction that will follow.

I am glad that we were able to reduce by half the size of the tax cuts that will be protected by a special budget fast-track procedure. We need to stimulate our sagging economy and restore the growth and job creation we have lost in the past 2 years. But at \$350 billion, half the original amount that was protected by budget rules, that tax cut is still far too large given the other obligations that we face.

But on top of the \$350 billion in tax cuts protected by special budget rules, this resolution still contains an additional \$500 billion in other tax cuts, for a total of \$850 billion in revenue losses. Counting the additional interest we will have to pay on the debt we will pile up, that is another trillion dollars that will not be available for our national security and homeland security obligations, not available for health care, for education, for law enforcement. Nor will it be there when we need to restore balance to Social Security.

We have made some progress during this debate to restore funding in some of those areas, but not enough to meet the needs and priorities of the vast majority of Americans. This budget resolution is the first step in our consideration of priorities this year, and it is a big step in the wrong direction, one that I fear we will regret.

I hope my colleagues will join me in rejecting this resolution. We can and must do better. We can hardly do worse.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I cannot support this budget resolution. In my judgment, this budget, like the President's budget which it reflects, represents the wrong priorities. A close look reveals too many ill-advised cuts in too many critical areas in order to help pay for a tax cut which is too large, too inequitable, and which will worsen our fiscal situation without providing our economy the jump-start it needs.

The proposed budget cuts in education are particularly troubling. While I am pleased that the Senate passed an amendment I introduced that increased education funding by over \$2

billion by proposing to close down two egregious tax haven loopholes, that increase doesn't come close to making up for the shortfalls.

Other priorities are similarly underfunded. The transportation request is less than what was allotted in 2002 and 2003. This year Congress plans to reauthorize TEA-21, the highway reauthorization bill, yet the budget resolution as proposed would limit our ability to increase the program to meet our Nation's transportation needs. The budget would provide inadequate funding for State sewer and water programs, and would cut funding to the Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, Program, which has helped fund more than 3,300 police officers in Michigan. The proposal provides no funding for the community access program, which improves health care coordination for the uninsured, or for extending unemployment benefits for those whose benefits have expired, even though the number of unemployed in our country has increased by about 40 percent since January 2001.

While I am pleased that we were able to reduce the President's fiscally irresponsible tax cut proposal, the tax cut package in the existing budget resolution is still too large, and likely will increase in conference committee with the President's party in charge of both Houses.

In January 2001, the Office of Management and Budget was projecting a 10-year surplus of \$5.6 trillion. Now we are back into a huge deficit ditch and will be for the foreseeable future. In fact, the President's proposed budget and tax cuts would lead to more than a trillion dollars in deficits over the next 5 years, including record deficits of over \$300 billion this year and next. The right type of tax cuts could stimulate the economy by being effective in the short term and going to working families and small businesses that will spend the money now instead of mainly going to the wealthiest among us who don't need tax cuts. But tax cuts that drastically worsen our long-term fiscal situation, that won't help out in the short term, and that would require cuts to many other priorities are not what our economy needs.

Surely, simple equity as well as economic stimulus needs suggest that if we are going to have tax cuts they should be broad-based tax cuts, providing, for instance, every working family of four with an immediate tax cut of \$1,200. And we should also extend unemployment benefits for those whose benefits have expired and weren't previously extended, provide short-term incentives for businesses to invest immediately, and provide some assistance to our struggling States for education, homeland security, Medicaid, and highway and other infrastructure improvements.

These measures would be better for our economy today, our fiscal situation in future years, and the many other challenges that lay ahead. They also

would address today's problems today without passing the bills onto future generations.

In addition, the Senate is asked by the majority to pass a budget without including any estimated costs of the war in Iraq and its aftermath, even though such estimates exist. Yesterday the President sent a \$75 billion funding request regarding Iraq to Congress in the form of an emergency supplemental. That request is not included in the current 2004 budget resolution before us. There is no reason that the costs of the war and its aftermath after September 30, 2003, should be omitted. While there is no question that we will fully fund our troops, we are asked to approve massive tax cuts and huge deficits while totally ignoring the large additional expenditures which will be required by the war in Iraq. In my view, it is both reckless and irresponsible to intentionally keep those costs out of this budget resolution.

This budget emphasizes the wrong priorities, burrows us deeper into the deficit ditch, continues our reliance on the Social Security surplus, and fails to provide the stimulus needed to improve our sputtering economy. I cannot support it.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the administration's budget was wrong for the Nation when the President proposed it in February. It is even worse for the Nation now that we are at war. I will oppose it, and I hope that reason and common sense will prevail in the remaining steps of the budget process to prevent this package from doing lasting damage to the economy and to our communities.

As incredible as it might seem, this budget plan would worsen the fiscal and economic harm done by the administration's 2001 economic package, which, in one fell swoop squandered the hard-won budget surpluses and converted them to ever-deepening deficits and debt. Making matters all the worse, this budget would compound this squandering while the Nation is at war.

Can anyone seriously argue, just for instance, that it makes fiscal or economic sense to borrow money to pay for a tax cut package which itself is steeply tilted to the wealthiest individuals?

This budget plan is misguided in its priorities. It severely underfunds essential health, education and employment training programs; it contains an enormous government giveaway to wealthy corporations and the wealthiest individuals that will skyrocket our Nation's debt; and it is wholly inadequate to meet the domestic security needs of the first-responder agencies that are our first line of defense against terrorism.

Even before the war, when the President unveiled his budget proposal in February, his priorities were sharply out of kilter with the Nation's needs. By severely underfunding education and other domestic needs, and by mak-

ing a nearly \$700 billion tax package the focus of his budget, the President compounds the irresponsible policies of the last 2 years that have traded record surpluses for record deficits.

Let me cite just a few examples of how bad the President's budget is for Vermont: The \$6.7 million cut in after-school programs that will leave 9,566 children in my State without after-school activities; the \$2,405,259 cut in Clean Water Act funding, at a time when Vermont has nine toxic waste sites on the National Priorities List; the \$524,673 cut in the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) that helps Vermonters who need assistance with the electricity and heating bills; the \$793,220 cut in the Community Services Block Grant that provides local organizations in Vermont with funds to help reduce poverty, revitalize low-income communities, and offer families the help they need to become fully self-sufficient; and the elimination of the COPS police-hiring program that has put 245 officers on our streets. And I could go on and on.

In 2001, I voted against the Bush tax package because it was too skewed toward the wealthiest Americans and it was fiscally irresponsible. Since then, we have gone from record surpluses to red ink, and the economy is still floundering. Leading economists have repeatedly made clear that the elimination of taxes on dividends paid to investors, the centerpiece of the President's tax-cut proposal, will do little if anything to spur economic growth or to reduce the Nation's jobless rate.

As Congress shapes an economic package, fiscal responsibility needs to be a priority. We need to be smart about how we proceed, and we need to be fair about it. The tax cuts the President has proposed not only will worsen our Federal deficit, but it will also eliminate \$16 million in revenue from the State of Vermont. Congress now has the responsibility to bring stability and sensible fiscal policies back into the budget process. We must work to reestablish a balanced budget and to restore our country's economic health.

Our Nation is at war. We have nearly a quarter of a million troops in the Middle East. We have five carrier battle groups in the region. And we have National Guard units being called up all across the country. Yet the President has only recently submitted an estimate to Congress about the cost of this war. The \$75 billion he requested on Monday does not adequately address our country's homeland security needs and is likely just a start in funding all of the United States operations in Iraq.

I was disappointed that the Senate did not adopt my amendment to boost funding for first responders. We are in a two-front war, overseas and here at home, and we need to fund both. First responders are on the front lines in defending against and preparing for terrorist attacks. The White House has refused to adequately fund homeland se-

curity, and these added responsibilities have become unfunded Federal mandates that are severely straining our police, fire and rescue agencies. Every time the alert level is raised, it costs our communities and states millions more. Everyone recognizes the vital role of first responders, but the White House is overdue in acting accordingly. The sooner we help first responders help us in the war on terrorism, the better.

In his State of the Union Message, the President was right when he said we should not pass on our problems to other Congresses, other Presidents and future generations. Unfortunately, that is exactly what this budget plan would do. The White House's own documents predict the deficit will hit highs of \$304 billion this year and \$307 billion in 2004. Over the next 5 years, deficits would total \$1.08 trillion. Even these staggering numbers are short of the real mark because the administration will surely need hundreds of billions of dollars more in Iraq-related spending that is not counted here.

This administration has been in a rush to war, but it has been in no hurry to substantively deal with the poor economy that millions of Americans are coping with today.

This budget was a bad plan for the Nation before the war began. It is an even worse plan now.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial by Emerson Lynn that appeared in the March 21 edition of the St. Albans Messenger be printed in the RECORD.

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

IT'S WRONG TO TIE PATRIOTISM TO MASSIVE  
TAX CUT

There is the distinct sense that the American people cannot do two things at once, that we cannot separate our thoughts of the war with our thoughts of how the government spends and collects our taxpayer dollars. Worse, there is the conviction that one should be labeled unpatriotic if the attempt is made to draw the distinction.

This contradiction was played out yesterday in the House of Representatives which passed largely along party lines the president's proposed budget, including his budget busting tax cuts. The cuts were thought to be in jeopardy a month ago, particularly with the Congressional Budget Office's assessment of unending budget deficits as far as the eye can see.

Why the miraculous turnaround? Because, as partisan Republicans said, it would be wrong to embarrass the president just as war is being waged in Iraq. In other words, one's budget sense should be placed at the mercy of the president's polling numbers.

Hmmm. If there is a sense of discomfort in having the budget resolution being debated while war is being waged, then why not delay discussion of the budget? If the president's experts are to be believed, the war will be over in less than a week or so. Why the hurry?

Was the pressure applied because the Republican leadership (and the White House) are concerned about conflicting messages of domestic support, or is it because they saw the opening moments of the war as the most propitious time to push the president's \$726

billion in tax cuts, a proposal most Republicans a month ago thought would be beyond their reach?

Guess.

Today, the same arm-twisting efforts will be applied in the U.S. Senate. Again, it was thought only a week or so ago that the entire tax cut proposal had no chance of being approved, particularly with several moderate Republicans proposing a plan to shave the tax cut in half. The ground has shifted, Senate insiders now believe the president has a good chance of winning it all. Again, it's the war and the pushed thought that a good American supports whatever the president wants right now. We must stand together.

Dear Mr. President: We are smart enough to distinguish between a necessary war and an unnecessary tax cut. Too, our patriotism remains intact; in fact, it is with ease that we can argue that being opposed to the \$726 billion in tax cuts is utterly patriotic. How else to avoid an endless string of swollen budget deficits? How else to protect the integrity of legislative branch's responsibility to be acting on behalf of its constituents?

We find it incredible that we have a president who lost the popular vote and today rules as if it was his divine right, as did the kings in Shakespeare's time. And, yet, we are impressed. Highly impressed. In terms of sheer accomplishment, he has achieved more in two years than Bill Clinton did in eight. An it was thought that the balance of power between the Democrats and the Republicans would largely result in legislative stalemate. The Democrats could only wish.

What is most upsetting, however, is understanding how completely backwards the argument before congress is. The primary focus is on the war and stalwart Republicans are using the emotion of the moment to wash away all other thoughts. In truth, what happens in Iraq, while terribly important, pales in comparison to the long-term effects of the president's decision to essentially strip this Congress and all future Congresses of the resources needed to address essential issues such as health care, Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare. The war will not last long, and even the rebuilding efforts afterwards will be short in duration when compared to huge tax cuts that keep on taking, and taking, and taking.

So you say, just elect a Democrat as president. A year from now the primaries will be in full swing. We could have a change in leadership within 24 months.

Think again.

Politically, it is almost impossible for Congress to raise taxes. Our representatives can oppose the cuts to begin with, which is what we hope happens, but once they are in place, good luck turning back the clock.

That's why today's vote in the United States Senate is so important. Although it is a budget resolution and does not have the effect of law, it does pave the way for acceptance later. Let's hope common sense prevails and that our legislators act as if they are capable of distinguishing between what needs to happen in Iraq and what needs to happen here.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise to day to discuss several issues related to agriculture funding in the budget resolution proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee.

While there are no specific reconciliation instructions for agriculture in this proposal, the summary documents issued by the committee indicate an assumed savings of \$80 million from the crop insurance program.

I have been one of the strongest defenders of this program in the Con-

gress, and I have fought hard to improve the program for producers throughout the country.

Simply put, cutting \$80 million from this program is exactly the wrong thing to do at this time. As budgets continue to tighten, both the administration and Members of this congress have said that producers must do more to rely on crop insurance as their primary risk management tool and decrease reliance on emergency disaster assistance programs.

Last fall we also saw the collapse of the largest seller of crop insurance in the country. This was the result of several factors, but the significant drought we have suffered took its toll as indemnity payments to producers added up. And, several other companies are not in strong financial positions for the same reason.

Finally, the entire insurance industry has struggled with reinsurance since 9/11. This is also true in the crop insurance industry, and the difficulties of obtaining reinsurance have been compounded by the drought.

The bottom line is this: We have worked hard to make crop insurance the primary risk management tool for producers. But, crop insurance is struggling along with the entire insurance industry, and this cut many be something it can not recover from. It could put several of the smaller companies out of business and lead to further consolidation in the industry and concentration in agriculture.

I urge the chairman to omit this specific cut in any reconciliation instructions that may come out of the conference with the House.

Finally, I understand that an amendment was offered during committee discussion of the resolution that shifted funds from commodity programs to the conservation budget. I am not going to discuss the merits of the proposal that accomplished this shift. I think that is a discussion best conducted within the Agriculture Committee.

However, if we are going to shift funds to the conservation program, I believe they should go to our well-established programs that benefit producers throughout the United States. These include the Environmental Quality Incentives Program, the Conservation Reserve Program, the Wetlands Reserve Program, and the Farmland Protection Program.

I do not think these funds should go to the Conservation Security Program—a program that will divert the largest portion of the funds to only a couple States that can undertake farming practices that simply do not work in regions of the country where the land is not on the river bottom and the rain comes down sideways with a 50-mile-per-hour wind.

Lets put the money where it will actually work and achieve real conservation benefits.

I thank my colleagues for listening to my views on these issues, and I hope

they will continue to consider them as this process toward a final budget agreement progresses.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, it does not seem like all that long ago that efforts were under way to reauthorize the 1996 farm bill. Many of you know that we spent over 2 years listening to ideas and formulating the model for this legislation. I am pleased that I was able to be a part of yet another farm bill that provides planting flexibility, price stability, and allows producers to receive a decent return on their investments.

The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 is a balanced 6-year farm bill which met specified budget requirements and was adopted by Congress. The farm bill provides an adequate financial safety net in times when prices are depressed. This safety net allows crops to be priced competitively in the domestic and world markets.

The farm bill is less than 1 year old. The United States Department of Agriculture, USDA, is still working to fully implement some of the remaining provisions. However, the actions taken by the distinguished Senator from Iowa during the markup of this budget resolution was an effort to unravel this carefully drafted legislation. I am referring to a provision that was adopted in the Senate Budget Committee which shifts the Senate Agriculture Committee's mandatory spending, totaling \$1.4 billion, from agriculture programs, budget function 350, to the Conservation Security Program, budget function 300.

I want to express my strong opposition to this provision as it negates the carefully crafted payment provision during the farm bill. The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 contains specific limitations on program benefits and adds an adjusted gross income test that makes participants with substantial nonfarm income ineligible for program benefits. In addition, program participants are required to meet detailed eligibility requirements regarding contributions of management and/or labor requirements. My colleague's further efforts to make these limitations even more restrictive only adds additional transitional costs which producers must absorb and creates additional administrative costs for USDA.

As a result of this provision, my distinguished colleague ultimately discriminates against southern crops which are more expensive to produce. Farms in the South tend to be larger than those in the Midwest and other areas of the country where the cost of production is much less. Further restrictions on payment limitations only hurt southern commodity producers.

The farm bill has been debated in the Senate Agriculture Committee, passed by Congress, and signed into law by the President of the United States. This provision reopens the farm bill—the farm bill should not be reopened during

the budget process—that results in bad farm policy. And it should not be reopened during the appropriations process—that results in bad farm policy. Therefore, I strongly oppose this provision in the Senate budget resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the American people recognize the importance of the family farmer to our Nation and the need to provide an adequate safety net for family farmers. In recent years, however, assistance to farmers has come under increasing scrutiny.

Critics of farm payments have argued that the largest corporate farms reap most of the benefits of these payments. What's more, farm payments that were originally designed to benefit small- and medium-sized family farmers have contributed to their own demise. Unlimited farm payments have placed upward pressure on land prices and have contributed to overproduction and lower commodity prices, driving many family farmers off the farm.

Last year, the Senate agreed, by an overwhelming vote of 66 to 31, to a bipartisan amendment sponsored by Senators DORGAN and myself to target Federal assistance to small- and medium-sized family farmers. The amendment would have limited direct and counter-cyclical payments to \$75,000. It would have limited gains from marketing loans and LDPs to \$150,000, and generic certificates would have been included in this limit. That would have limited farm payments to a combined total of \$275,000.

That amendment was critical to family farmers in Iowa and indeed farmers across the Nation. I feel strongly the farm bill failed Iowa and failed all of our farmers when it failed to effectively address the issue of payment limitations.

A solid majority in the Budget Committee voted last week in favor of a payment limitation provision to limit total payments of all kinds to a combined limit of \$300,000. This is more than I think is necessary. It is \$25,000 more than the limit that won over two-thirds of the Senate. But in the interests of compromise it seems like a fair approach. The most important thing is that loopholes in the payment limitation law be closed so that the limitation at whatever level is actually the real, effective level.

The Budget Committee voted to apply the savings from this reasonable payment limit proposal against the reductions suffered by the Conservation Security Program, CSP, during consideration of the agricultural disaster package in the fiscal year 2003 omnibus appropriations bill.

This new conservation initiative from the 2002 farm bill will reward farmers and ranchers who voluntarily implement effective conservation on their working lands. Farmers and ranchers will receive public support as they provide public benefits to the Nation's natural resources and environment. This program allows family

farmers to solve critical resource problems, with graduated rewards for increasing efforts. The CSP is an innovative new program in the Federal agricultural conservation toolbox and its full funding should be restored as soon as possible.

The Budget Committee endorsed payment limitation reform including a combined maximum cap of \$300,000 and endorsed restoring funds to the Conservation Security Program. Payment limitation reform is long overdue, a fact reflected in the vote of the Budget Committee. If cuts should be ordered in the final budget resolution emerging from conference, payment limitations would be the most logical place to look for savings. I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 4 minutes equally divided between myself and the ranking member for closing debate on the resolution.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I urge our colleagues to vote in favor of the resolution. I thank all of our colleagues. We have conducted a number of rollcall votes. By the time we have final passage, there will have been 51 rollcall votes; we will have had 29 voice votes, for a total of 80 votes on this resolution. That may be an all-time high, one I hope we don't repeat next year.

The budget process, in my opinion, is somewhat flawed. It is not easy to pass a budget. That is one of the reasons I wanted to compliment my friend and colleague, Senator DOMENICI, because he did it year after year. It is not easy to do. I understand we didn't get it done last year. I don't want to be too critical, but we didn't pass a budget last year. And because we didn't pass a budget, we didn't get appropriations bills done. We didn't do a prescription drug bill, a Medicare bill. We didn't do anything to help grow the economy. The budget does lay the blueprint for the next Congress, certainly for the rest of the year. So we need to pass a budget. I have told my colleagues, we need to pass a budget regardless of the size of the growth package.

I readily admit this growth package is not what I wanted. It is about half a loaf. That is better than none.

We could have done better. We didn't; we tried. We let the legislative process work. With 80 votes, the legislative process did work. The Senate did speak.

I thank my colleagues for their participation. I happen to believe the level of debate was good. I think it was a healthy debate. I thank colleagues on all sides for their cooperation in making that happen.

I also especially thank my friend and colleague, Senator CONRAD, and his staff. They have been a pleasure to work with in a very challenging environment, particularly on Friday

evening. Also, I thank our staff as well, Hazen Marshall and Stacey Hughes and our entire staff. They worked very hard to put together a budget process that will work, a budget that will lead us to a balanced budget, a budget that will have deficits declining, substantially declining in the next couple of years, the percentage of GDP substantially.

We need to be in balance. We will work to do that. That is not easily done since we have inherited a situation where revenues have declined substantially in the last 2 years. We need to figure out ways to grow the economy. I look forward to working with my colleagues to try to make that happen. I appreciate very much their cooperation and support throughout the challenging last several days. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, first let me thank the outstanding staffs on both sides. Hazen Marshall, staff director for Senator NICKLES, and his able staff, thank you for the really good attitude that you all brought to this task and challenge. I thank also on our side my staff director, Mary Naylor, who has done such a superb job holding us all together. I think part of the reason this was well organized was because of Mary's talents. And to Jim Horney and Sue Nelson and Lisa Konwinski and all of the other staff members of the Budget Committee, thank you.

Special thanks to the chairman of our committee. Thank you for the effort to organize these votes in a way that was comprehensive and that was understandable to people. Thanks, too, for the attitude and the tone you brought to the debate because we have had significant differences. But I think we have conducted ourselves in the way that our forefathers intended the Senate to be conducted—real debate on real differences without personal rancor of any kind.

While this budget resolution has been substantially improved, we have now reduced the President's proposed tax cut of \$1.6 trillion to \$850 billion. Still I believe it is fatally flawed. I don't believe we can afford \$850 billion of tax cuts that will add in this budget resolution over a trillion dollars of deficit to our country when we are already in record deficit and when we are right on the brink of the retirement of the baby boom generation.

That does not make sense to me. I believe it threatens the long-term economic security of our country. I don't believe it will grow the economy. That view is buttressed by the report of the Congressional Budget Office today. They applied dynamic scoring and what they said is, the one thing that is going to grow under this budget is the deficits and the debt of our country. I urge my colleagues to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator's time has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, as amended. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 108 Leg.]

YEAS—56

|           |             |             |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| Alexander | Crapo       | McConnell   |
| Allard    | DeWine      | Miller      |
| Allen     | Dole        | Murkowski   |
| Baucus    | Domenici    | Nelson (NE) |
| Bayh      | Ensign      | Nickles     |
| Bennett   | Enzi        | Roberts     |
| Bond      | Fitzgerald  | Santorum    |
| Breaux    | Frist       | Sessions    |
| Brownback | Graham (SC) | Shelby      |
| Bunning   | Grassley    | Smith       |
| Burns     | Gregg       | Snowe       |
| Campbell  | Hagel       | Specter     |
| Chafee    | Hatch       | Stevens     |
| Chambliss | Hutchison   | Sununu      |
| Cochran   | Inhofe      | Talent      |
| Coleman   | Kyl         | Thomas      |
| Collins   | Landrieu    | Thomas      |
| Cornyn    | Lott        | Voivovich   |
| Craig     | Lugar       | Warner      |

NAYS—44

|          |             |             |
|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Akaka    | Edwards     | Lieberman   |
| Biden    | Feingold    | Lincoln     |
| Bingaman | Feinstein   | McCain      |
| Boxer    | Graham (FL) | Mikulski    |
| Byrd     | Harkin      | Murray      |
| Cantwell | Hollings    | Nelson (FL) |
| Carper   | Inouye      | Pryor       |
| Clinton  | Jeffords    | Reed        |
| Conrad   | Johnson     | Reid        |
| Corzine  | Kennedy     | Rockefeller |
| Daschle  | Kerry       | Sarbanes    |
| Dayton   | Kohl        | Schumer     |
| Dodd     | Lautenberg  | Stabenow    |
| Dorgan   | Leahy       | Wyden       |
| Durbin   | Levin       |             |

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 23), as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

(The concurrent resolution will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I wish to thank all of our colleagues for their cooperation. We did finish the budget resolution by 4 p.m. on Wednesday, as we committed to do. That would not have happened if it had not been for the cooperation certainly of Senator CONRAD and his staff.

I wish to thank Mary Naylor and their entire team, as well as Hazen Marshall, Stacey Hughes, Beth Felder, and our team. The staffs had to work extremely hard over the weekend. This lasted about 2 or 3 days longer than is usual for the budget process. I hope maybe we can streamline it next year a little bit more.

I thank all the staff for their hard work. They put in a lot of hours. We produced a product that is not perfect but it is a significant improvement over no budget. Again, I thank my colleagues for their cooperation.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of staff Democrats and Republicans be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE

Amy Angelier; Lauren Baylor; Dan Brandt, Economist; Cara Duckworth; Beth Smerko

Felder; Ron Floyd; Megan Hauck; Jim Hearn; Jody Hernandez; Stacey Hughes; Rachel Jones; Don Kent; Hazen Marshall; David Myers; Maureen O'Neill; and David Ortega.

Gayle Osterberg; Anne Oswald; David Pappone; Roy Phillips; Cheri Reidy; Margaret Stewart; Bob Taylor; Jennifer Winkler; Lee Greenwood; Letitia Fletcher; Tim Nolan; Lynne Seymour; George Woodall; Shelley Amdur; Steve Bailey; and Rock Cheung, Jr. Jim Esquea; Tim Galvin; Lawrence Hershon; Jim Horney; Mike Jones; Erin Keogh; Lisa Konwinski; Sarah Kuehl; Jessie LaVine; Stu Nagurka; Mary Naylor; Koby Noel; Steve Posner; Lee Price; John Righter; Dakota Rudesill; and Barry Strumpf.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, first, I congratulate the chairman of our committee on successfully passing a budget resolution. As strongly as I disagree with the contents of this resolution, I feel equally as strongly about the way this process was conducted, and the chairman's leadership both in the committee and on the floor in terms of the tone that he set and in terms of the attitude he brought to the job. It makes a big difference, and we appreciate it.

I will now take a moment to thank staff: Mary Naylor, my staff director; Jim Horney and Sue Nelson, my deputy staff directors; Lisa Konwinski, my counsel; Shelley Amdur, who handles education and appropriations; along with John Righter, who is our chief numbers man and handles appropriations as well; Steve Bailey, who does taxes; Sarah Kuehl, who handles Social Security and transportation; Jim Esquea, who handles Medicaid, welfare, and veterans; Tim Galvin, who handles agriculture; Mike Jones, homeland security and energy issues; Dakota Rudesill, who handles defense; Rock Cheung, international affairs; Lee Price, our chief economist; Koby Noel, our chart master—as my colleagues know, we produced a lot of charts—and Stu Nagurka and Steve Posner, in charge of communications for me; and Jessie Lavine, Erin Keogh, and Lawrence Hershon, our staff assistants. We appreciate very much their hard work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 95; all after the resolving clause is stricken and the text of S. Con. Res. 23 is inserted in lieu thereof, the resolution is adopted, the Senate insists on its amendment and requests a conference with the House, and the Chair appoints conferees.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. ENZI) appointed Mr. NICKLES, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. SARBANES, conferees on the part of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95), as amended, was agreed to.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CONRAD. I now ask there be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today with great honor and pride to pay tribute to the men and women of our Armed Forces, tens of thousands of whom are deployed right now in the Middle East in military action against Iraq. I encourage all my colleagues in the Senate, and in the Congress, that we take a few moments out of each and every one of our days we are engaged in this conflict to come to the floor and speak to our constituents, speak to the American people, and speak to the servicemen and servicewomen who are so valiantly out there defending our freedoms and this great country that we believe in. We are going to take a few moments here today to talk about how important are these men and women in service to our country. We would like to encourage, again, all Members of Congress to come to the floor and spend a few minutes out of their day or out of their week to talk about the incredible lives of these individuals who are there on our behalf, defending our freedom.

Over the course of the last week, since hostilities began in earnest on March 19, our troops have made tremendous progress toward the objectives of their mission. At the same time, we have seen a few setbacks, but these do not detract from what has been accomplished. For that, we have no one to thank but the courageous, hard-working men and women of the American service arm and the coalition of Armed Forces.

We hear a great deal about the technology behind this war—missiles, aircraft, telecommunications devices, weaponry, and other equipment of battle. But we should all remember that even the best equipment and the best technology is of little value without the best soldiers and commanders to make it useful.

Today we have over 230,000 troops representing air, sea, and land forces in the theater, with our allies in the coalition contributing an additional 45,000. These young men and women are serving in a wide variety of capacities but with a unifying mission—to liberate the Iraqi people from the brutal regime of Saddam Hussein, and to destroy his weapons of mass destruction which threaten our globe. They are separated from their families and their friends, placing themselves in great personal danger in order to provide for a safer, more secure world for all of us.

I myself have a young man from my staff who is serving in the Middle East.