



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 2003

No. 54—Book II

Senate

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT TO SUPPORT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE OPERATIONS IN IRAQ FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003—Continued

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, there is no doubt that major cities, such as Philadelphia, with airports and seaports and Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell, have much higher costs than cities which do not have these facilities.

I have discussed the issue with Mayor Street. The letter which I have had printed in the RECORD is a succinct summary, so we can observe this very short time limit which has been agreed to.

Similarly, I have conferred with Mayor Tom Murphy of Pittsburgh, who, again, makes the comment about the additional costs.

I have had an opportunity—actually, I was called by Mayor Bloomberg of New York City about the very substantial increases in costs there, and during the markup in the Appropriations Committee earlier this week commented about these factors and have sought to increase the funding from the \$100 million for high-risk urban areas to a total of some \$600 million.

Again, it would be highly desirable if we had more money, as suggested by Senator SCHUMER, but that simply cannot be accommodated within the current budget constraints.

In the conversations with Mayor Bloomberg, he pointed out about the

fact that police cost some \$5 million a month, and there are other costs in the range of \$8 million a month for the United Nations, with a very heavy imposition of costs on New York City, commenting in a way very similar to the mayors of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

There is no doubt these costs really ought to be borne principally by the Federal Government. In the bill, language was inserted by Senator GREGG and language by myself which would require the Secretary of Homeland Defense to make a report to the Congress within 60 days to identify what are the costs in safeguarding airports, seaports, landmarks such as Independence Hall, such as the Liberty Bell, and to make a recommendation as to an allocation by the Federal Government, and whether such costs, in part, should be borne by other entities. That will enable us to make a determination as to how this \$600 million will be spent, and to have a rationale for what the expenses will be with the specification of the costs involved and an allocation between the Federal Government and other governmental agencies if it is determined that would be appropriate.

EXHIBIT 1

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Philadelphia, PA, April 2, 2003.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
9400 Federal Building,
Philadelphia, PA.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: In Fiscal Year 2002, the City of Philadelphia spent \$21.2 mil-

lion in increased domestic security costs. These costs include overtime incurred by the Police, Fire and Public Health employees associated with the formation of Rapid Assessment Teams. These teams, consisting of employees from each department responded to all critical incidents citywide. Additionally, \$8 million was allocated for security improvements to city facilities. These improvements include installations of bollards around the perimeter of City Hall, installation of security access and surveillance systems in the One Parkway Building and installation of security cameras and metal detectors at other facilities. The Police Department enhanced coverage in Center City and provided enhanced security staffing at the Philadelphia Stock Exchange, Red Cross Headquarters and the City's Emergency Operations Center. An intensive training was given to a team of police officers and supervisors that may be called upon to respond to a hazardous materials incident.

Going forward, the Police Commissioner formed the Bureau of Counter-Terrorism absorbing the Detective Bureau's Organized Crime Unit as its foundation. The 76 member Bureau is developing new methods and initiatives to pursue counter-terrorism preparedness. These initiatives include strategic and tactical training, equipment purchase, inter-agency and regional cooperation and coordination, and community outreach. The Bureau meets regularly with task forces such as the FBI's Joint Terrorism Task Force, the US Attorney's Anti-Terror Task Force and the US Coast Guard Task Force to keep current with the latest counter-terrorism strategies. These initiatives are likely to cost about \$10 million annually.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. STREET,
Mayor.

SECURITY COSTS IN RESPONSE TO SEPTEMBER 11TH

	Full year			Total
	Personnel	Purchased Services	Matrl., Supplies & Equipment	
Police Department (General Fund)	3,949,187	47,006	1,400,437	5,396,630
Police Department (Airport)	3,288,784			3,228,784
Fire Department	2,810,271			2,810,271
Public Property	891,000	360,000	17,000	1,268,000
Office of Fleet Management	54,034	102,770		156,804
Public Health	340,178			340,178
Triplex Security		8,000,000		8,000,000
Total	11,273,454	8,509,776	1,147,437	21,200,667

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4789

SECURITY COSTS IN RESPONSE TO SEPTEMBER 11TH—Continued

	Full year			
	Personnel	Purchased Services	Matrl., Supplies & Equipment	Total
Total General Fund	8,044,670	8,509,776	1,417,437	17,971,883

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, how much of my 15 minutes remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have asked for a portion of the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania because we had worked to try to reach an agreement between the two amendments so that they would be put together and have an amendment we could adopt. We are unable to do that.

I am compelled to state I will oppose the first-degree amendment of Senator SCHUMER. It is a situation where, as far as I am concerned, there is ample money in the House bill, if we are compelled to raise the amount that is in our bill. But it is the kind of situation where we prefer to have this amendment not be adopted now, so we can find a way to work the matter out with the House.

We have \$100 million in the bill. The Schumer amendment, as I understand it, as drafted, now adds \$600 million. I oppose going to that height. That would, in effect, take it to the level of the House. And the administration opposes the level in the House bill.

Mr. SCHUMER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I believe I have time. I will yield 3 minutes to myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I heard my friend from Pennsylvania speak on—

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt for a problem that has come up.

Mr. SCHUMER. Please.

Mr. STEVENS. The problem has come up in connection with the unanimous consent agreement. There was no time allocated to those who might want to oppose the Specter amendment. And, as I understand it, a Senator on the Democratic side wishes to oppose the Specter amendment. In fairness, I ask unanimous consent she be given 5 minutes to speak; and if it raises additional items the Senator has not spoken to that he wishes to speak to, I would allocate an additional 5 minutes to Senator SPECTER, so there would be a comment back and forth. All right. I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I heard my friend from Pennsylvania speak for his amendment. I will support that amendment because it is better than what is currently in the bill, although I wish it had more money. I wish it had money for the FIRE and COPS Programs, which the amendment I am offering with my colleagues from New York and Maryland, does. And I wish it gave more funding to high-threat, high-need areas, and to all other areas. I also wish that it ensured, as my amendment does, that the Department of Homeland Security would be required to provide the funds within 30 days and that the amendment would guarantee an 80/20 split of those funds between the States and localities.

The Schumer amendment is the amendment that provides sufficient funding for police, for fire, for first responders all across the country. We all know how beleaguered they are. We know how stretched they are. We know whether they be in a large city like New York City, or a medium-sized city like Rochester or Syracuse, or a suburb, or even a rural area, our police and firefighters have been pushed to the limit. They must meet their regular law enforcement and public safety responsibilities, but now have new responsibilities under 9/11, and from the Iraq war.

And many police and fire departments have to do more with fewer people and fewer resources, because of the terrible budget deficits at the State and local level, and because many are in the Reserves and have been called up and are proudly serving our country.

So we have an obligation. If we are going to fight the war on terrorism at home, we have to vote for this amendment. We cannot just fight the war on terrorism overseas and not fight it at home. Our first responders, our police and fire, in a very real sense are on the front lines.

So I hope we will get support for the Schumer amendment. I hope we will back up our police and firefighters. I hope we will back up our local governments and our first responders.

The idea that we can win the war on terror just by fighting it overseas and giving it all the money for needs overseas—I am for that and support that proudly—but not do what we need to do domestically makes no sense. We will rue the day.

I ask my colleagues to vote for an amendment that really provides sufficient funding. Again, I am for the Specter amendment. It is an improvement.

I salute my colleague from Pennsylvania for offering it. But if you really want to give the dollars to police and fire in the way that they need them, then the Schumer amendment is the answer. It is not a Democratic or Republican amendment. It is supported by police and fire organizations, both management and union throughout the country. It is supported by local governments. It is what our badly strapped local governments need in this post-9/11 world.

Again, a good team needs a good offense and good defense. Our soldiers overseas are providing the offense. But it is our police, our firefighters, our first responders who are providing the defense. We need to back them up and back them up fully as well.

I urge support of the Schumer amendment and yield 3 minutes to my colleague who has been with me all along on this issue, the Senator from New York, Mrs. CLINTON.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I support the Schumer-Clinton-Mikulski amendment because I believe it more accurately reflects the needs that have been conveyed. Even in the materials that the Senator from Pennsylvania has entered into the RECORD, the kind of requests we are hearing from mayors and county executives and police chiefs and fire chiefs far exceed what is available. It has been now 18 months where we have failed to arrive at an understanding of what our local communities and our States require in order to fulfill their obligations on the front lines of this second front.

Once again, I believe we have an opportunity to do what is needed, but we are not taking it. The Schumer amendment provides the kind of thoughtful analysis and disbursement of funds that will most guarantee that the money, No. 1, gets out of the Federal Government within 30 days—something not in the Specter amendment—and that once it gets to the States, it has to be distributed within 60 days. And we appreciate that. But one of the problems we have had is getting the money out of the Federal Government to the States, and we also have to assure that the money gets where it is most needed—to our first responders.

I urge our colleagues to support the Schumer amendment as being far more reflective of the overall needs our country confronts when it comes to homeland security.

Across the country, there are common sounds that should trigger an alarm in all of us: the sound of a firehouse door closing for the final time; a police officer turning in his or her badge as it slides across the desk; or an ambulance door locking. In the cities

and the towns in the States we represent our first responders are losing their jobs.

States and cities are trying to deal with budget deficits—some the worst in a generation, and they simple do not have the money to keep paying for additional homeland security costs.

We need to work together—Republicans and Democrats—to provide them with the resources they need to strengthen our domestic defense.

Yes, we have made progress since September 11, but we have not done enough. That same message echoes from report after report, from our experts, from independent commissions, from our police commissioners, fire chiefs, mayors, doctors and nurses—we have not done enough to prevent and respond to another terrorist attack.

I cannot find a single credible security expert who has said, “We’re fine. We’ve done enough.” “There’s no need to guard our chemical plants and nuclear plants. It’s okay if we only check 2 percent of the containers that come through our ports. Don’t worry about hiring border guards they don’t need the extra support. We don’t need to give our police officers, firefighters, and emergency response personnel the equipment they need. We’re fine, and ‘All’s Quiet on the Homefront.’”

You asked last week, the President was asked about how long the war in Iraq would take and he responded correctly, “How ever long it takes.”

That’s the same attitude we need to use for homeland security—“whatever it takes” to protect the American people. This isn’t a new public work project or an example of frivolous spending; this is about securing our country on the frontlines here at home. And for 18 months our cities and States and counties have been shouldering this burden alone. Homeland security is a national priority and these costs and these responsibilities should be shared by the Nation.

So what are we doing?

What we are doing 18 months after that tragic day in September when nearly 3,000 Americans lost their lives still debating homeland security?

Still debating whether or not we should not take the steps we need to take in order to prevent another day like that from ever happening again. Still talking about whether or not we should provide our first responders with the support they need.

Homeland security is a concern we all share. We should not allow politics to prevail over our Nation’s protection. We should not let it get in the way of strengthening our border and port security, improving security at our chemical and nuclear plants, and providing critical support for our police officers, firefighters, emergency personnel, and public health officials.

Why would some in this Chamber willingly say “no” to critical steps that would improve our domestic defense? Why would our colleagues who care just as much about their constitu-

ent’s safety as I care about the people of New York say, “no, this isn’t the right vehicle for these investments. No, this isn’t the right time for homeland security because this supplemental bill is for spending that’s an emergency-it’s for the war.”

This is the right vehicle. This is the right time. This is an emergency. This is funding that does go toward winning the war against terrorism here at home. And this would be the right moment for Washington to send a clear message to the millions of first responders across this Nation who have sacrificed in order to keep us safe—we support you too.

This amendment that I am proposing with Senator SCHUMER and Senator MIKULSKI would provide \$4.3 billion for critical first responder funding. It includes \$3 billion for grants to States and local governments; another \$1.045 billion for high-threat areas like New York City; \$155 million for the FIRE Act, and \$130 million for the COPS Program.

Yes, the President’s proposal last week was a good start, but it is not nearly enough for what we need to do here at home in order to fight this two-front war.

This amendment would provide \$3 billion to Office of Domestic Preparedness at DHS for grants to States and Local Governments:

\$2.5 billion of this funding would go toward equipment, training, exercises, planning, and first responder personnel costs.

The Federal Government must pass the money to States within 30 days.

States must pass on at least 80 percent of this money to local communities within 30 days of the date they receive it.

And States and local governments may use up to 20 percent of this \$2.5 billion for first responder personnel costs, including overtime.

For the last 18 months, our majors, fire chiefs, police commissioners, and public health officials have been telling me that they need more help from Washington to better protect the American people. This amendment provides that help. It guarantees that the Federal resources will get out of Washington and to the state houses and to our local first responders quickly so that they can continue to do what they do best—keep America safe.

In January I gave a speech at John Jay in New York City to talk about how our country needed to renew its commitment to strengthen our domestic defense. I also released a report that showed how 70 percent of New York cities and counties had not received any federal homeland security funding.

I continue to work with the U.S. Conference of Mayors, national police organizations, firefighters, and emergency medical technicians from across the country to find the best way to support our first responders. And I spoke with Secretary Ridge the other

day to talk about improving this formula to meet our country’s needs, and he agrees.

Within the \$3 billion for State grants, \$500 million is set-aside for States and local communities to secure critical infrastructure security—bridges, nuclear and chemical plants, water treatment facilities, communication centers to name a few.

All of this money may be used for first responder personnel costs, including overtime. The States must provide 80 percent of this funding to local communities, with states allowed to use 20 percent. And again, the federal government must send this money to the States within 30 days, and the States must pass through 80 percent of the funds to local communities within 30 days.

These ideas follow my block grant proposal of 2001 and I am very pleased that the leadership has adopted my other proposal to put aside more than \$1 billion for high threat areas. And I want to thank my colleague Senator BYRD for understanding that New York’s needs are different because it is the top target for terrorists.

The \$1.045 billion for high-threat areas would be disbursed based on whether or not there is a credible threat, over-all vulnerability, critical infrastructure that is important to the Nation, population, and the needs of public safety organizations.

This isn’t just good for New York City and DC; it’s good for all of our Nation’s most vulnerable targets. This applies to Arizona and the recent threat against the nuclear power plant. This amendment would help cover extra security costs. Recent news reports suggested that al-Qaida was targeting the Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor. This would help Hawaii cover costs and take precautions. It would assist Las Vegas Nevada where the population doubles Friday through Sunday. This would benefit Florida and help them cover costs to secure Disney World.

These are high-threat areas. They are different and they need extra assistance. Let’s look at recent “code orange” costs. According to the U.S. Conference of Mayors, they estimate that cities are spending an extra \$70 million a week. In six months, when this supplemental runs out, that’s \$2 billion in costs. \$2 billion they don’t have, but costs they will incur because they are honoring their commitment to protect this country.

During the “code orange,” New York and New York City are spending a total of \$12 million a week. In the supplemental, the President set aside only \$50 million to cover such costs for every high-risk area. New York will have exhausted those resources by the end of next week. That’s why we need this extra \$1 billion for high-threat areas. And we cannot forget that it’s not just in our cities where extra security steps are being taken. Who would have thought that a terrorist cell was working in Lackawanna, NY? This could

have been a small town in Missouri, Texas, or Pennsylvania.

I know that some of my colleagues believe that their State isn't a target—they may think that because their state is small, it's safe. I bet the chief of police in Lackawanna, NY, would beg to differ about the likelihood of terrorists turning up in small towns. He would say we cannot forget that the terrorists continue to plot and plan against us, and we can't predict exactly where they will turn up.

Yesterday, the FBI issued a new warning to their field agents to look out for people making chemicals like Ricin. Yesterday, the Wall Street Journal reported that the Bush administration was getting ready to launch a plan to increase chemical plant security. The Department of Homeland Security's spokesman said, "We realize that voluntary efforts alone will not be sufficient to assure the appropriate level of security across the chemical sector."

And in the last few weeks, we heard Secretary of State Powell, FBI Director Mueller, Secretary Ridge and CIA Director Tenet all state that another attack by al-Qaida is not a matter of "if" but "when."

We can all hope for the best, but I think it's best to plan and prepare for the worst.

Why would any of us want to take a risk that "when" that day comes, it would be in someone else's back yard—a tragedy in another state across the Continental Divide and not my problem. When any city or State or American interest abroad has been attacked like we were. America was attacked and Washington and the country united to deal with that aftermath.

Again, we have to do that today to pass this amendment and improve our domestic defense.

I believe that Retired Colonel Randy Larsen, from the ANSER Institute said it best when he testified about the Hart-Rudman report on November 14, 2002. He said, "All of us want what is best for America. But we do not have much time. We must get it right—or close to right—very soon. I cannot repeat often enough: America is at war. We need to act like it while there is still time to prepare."

But they way to prepare, the way to fund homeland security isn't by taking money from existing traditional first responder programs. That's why this amendment also includes \$155 million for the FIRE Act, and \$130 million for the COPS Program. We need to fully fund every traditional first responder program. Since 1994, COPS has helped nearly 12,950 jurisdictions through 27 different grant programs. As of September 2002, COPS had provided funding for 116,573 community policing professionals across the country.

It has played a critical role in reducing crime. It has worked well in the past, and it will continue to work well in the future to help our communities fight crime. And it should not be used to fund homeland security.

The same applies to the FIRE Act. The \$155 million here ensures full funding—\$900 million—for the FIRE Act for FY 2003. This program assists fire departments in protecting communities and fire fighters' health and safety. Local communities may use the funding for training, equipment and additional staffing.

Currently, 2/3 of this Nation's fire departments do not meet the standards for adequate staffing. Congress would never allow our Army to engage in a war with 2/3 of its divisions understaffed.

But this is exactly what we are asking our fire fighters to do. To date this grant program has received requests totaling more than \$2 billion. The program's funding levels only allow it to award grants that a small percentage of that need. In the event of a terrorist act, fire fighters are the troops on the front lines. And they deserve our full support.

So when we think about all of the good that comes out of this amendment and the others that strengthen our domestic defense, why wouldn't every leader support these steps?

There are some who may try to defeat domestic defense funding by saying that the only dollars that should be included in the emergency supplemental are those that go toward winning this war. I agree, we should only be talking about funding to fight the war, but I believe we need to fight the war on all fronts that it is being waged.

Every support that our troops in Iraq need to win will have the full support of Congress. We cannot forget about our men and women who continue to fight al-Qaida in Afghanistan—they too deserve every resource they need. And so do our domestic troops, our police, firefighters, and EMT's, on the frontlines here at home. The President's proposal last week was a good start, but it is not nearly enough. The Congress and the administration have the opportunity to do so much good for our first responders and strengthen the domestic defense of our Nation. It would be a shame if we did not take advantage of this moment, use this as the moment Washington turned the page and said the time has come, whatever it takes, we will give it our all to secure our country.

But instead of using this as a chance to do more for our country, we're hearing phrases like "beat them straight up." "We will fight it out." "Defeat them." Those aren't words meant for Saddam Hussein or al-Qaida. Those are fighting words against those of us who are trying to get more homeland security funding, new masks for firefighters, extra patrols along our borders and at nuclear power plants, guards at tunnels and bridges, new high tech equipment to track radioactive material, and more help for the Coast Guard.

We seem to have gotten stuck in a dialogue that eliminates our ability to look at a great American tradition

that is at stake in this debate. Some of our country's greatest successes reside in our ability to do whatever it takes to do what is right for the greater good of our country.

Imagine if George Washington had decided at the battle of Brooklyn that it was too much of a challenge for the army to retreat to Manhattan that night? That decisive act saved the majority of our army, made victory inevitable, and this debate possible.

What about Lewis and Clark? What if they turned back just after they had embarked on their journey? Or imagine if Jefferson believed that it would take too long and that it was too much for two men to search for that path to the Pacific? But his belief in them, the task at hand, and that expansion and exploration was critical to a young nation.

What about Josiah Chamberline, a professor from Bowdoin College in Maine and what he did for our country at the battle of Gettysburg. He and his regiment stood their ground at Little Round Top. Against overwhelming odds and the future of the Union resting on his shoulders, Chamberline charged. His regiment followed, they prevented the south from taking that hill, and our Union was preserved.

Or when President Lincoln gave the final speech about Reconstruction in April 1865, he did not buckle at the great challenge of uniting a divided and partially destroyed country.

Or today, what if we as a Congress decided to only partially support our troops in Iraq? What kind of victory would follow if we balked at the challenge? So then why would we not do the same for our domestic defense? Why wouldn't we support our first responders?

Again, our country's success rises and falls in our ability to confront great challenges. On September 11th, we were tested once again. The new challenges that came out of that tragic day are what we are debating today. These are the stakes.

The Senate has a choice to meet the new demands against the war on terrorism at home, to finally give it our all to protect this country, and to carry on this tradition of never giving up and doing what it takes to do what is right.

Or we can bow our heads, look the other way and pray that tragedy does not strike again on our shores and hope that if the alarms do ring in our fire stations and police stations, our brave men and women in uniform here at home are ready to answer the call to 9-1-1.

I urge my colleagues to make the right choice and support this amendment.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senators SCHUMER, CLINTON, and MIKULSKI in offering this amendment that addresses funding shortfalls for the Federal, State, and local first responders who are on the front lines of the war on terrorism. I

am disappointed that since 9/11, the administration has failed to provide adequate funding for local governments to prepare for the possibility of new terrorist attacks.

This funding is critically important to Hawaii. The Hawaii State Civil Defense estimates that a response to a weapons of mass destruction attack would challenge the State's emergency response system. As with all States, in the event of a terrorist attack, Hawaii would rely on Federal, State, and local officials. However, unlike all States but Alaska, external assistance from the U.S. mainland is not immediately available. Hawaii's geographic location makes mutual aid from mainland States or from other Pacific jurisdictions impossible.

As a result, Hawaii's State Civil Defense estimates that each of the State's four counties need the capability to sustain an effective response to any weapons of mass destruction attack for up to 72 hours.

Independent experts and government officials have repeatedly warned that first responders do not have sufficient resources. A Council on Foreign Relations Task Force Report entitled "America—Still Unprepared, Still in Danger" concluded that first responders are not prepared for a weapons of mass destruction attack. According to the same report, first responders lack the training and equipment to protect themselves and the public in an emergency and do not have radios that can communicate with one another. In fact, the National Fire Protection Association estimates that only one-quarter of the Nation's fire departments have equipment to communicate with State and Federal emergency officials.

Our amendment takes important steps to respond to funding shortfalls by providing \$4.3 billion for first responders, including \$3 billion for State and local first responders.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of Senator SCHUMER's amendment, which I am proud to cosponsor.

We spent much of last year on the Senate floor talking about how to reorganize our Federal Government to meet and beat the challenge of terrorism. In the end, we passed a bill creating a Department of Homeland Security that for the first time is refocusing and reorganizing the Federal Government to make America safer.

But we have said all along that while better organization is a necessary prerequisite to making us safer, it isn't enough. We need to put dollars where the danger is. You can't protect your house in a dangerous neighborhood with a jerry-rigged lock or no lock at all. A "Beware of Dog" sign isn't good enough. You need to spend some money. You need to buy a real lock. You need to get a decent dog.

The President often says that America has the resolve it needs to win this war against terrorism. And that is true. Americans are resolute. They are

courageous. They are prepared to face down danger and do what it takes to overcome it. That is especially true of the men and women in our fire departments, police departments, emergency medical offices, and hospitals the men and women we call first responders.

Resolve, however, will only go so far if it isn't matched by real resources. Can resolve buy interoperable communications equipment? Pay for firefighters' overtime? Install a security system at a port? Upgrade the information sharing databases in local communities? Dramatically improve public health systems to deal with biological or chemical attacks? No all those urgent improvements and others demand more than resolve. They demand resources.

Right now the resources are nowhere to be found. This administration seems determined to do homeland security on the cheap adding just \$300 million to the budget for next fiscal year for homeland security. And the reason boils down to one reason and one reason only. The administration is committed to protecting \$2 trillion in unfair, unfocused, and ineffective tax cuts, at all costs. On this, it will not budge. It will not yield. It will not reconsider a single digit or a single dollar.

That irrational and ideological commitment to those unaffordable tax cuts has squeezed out every other priority. It has raided the national cupboard at a time when we desperately need new resources to tackle new threats.

America has the greatest military in the world, and that is because we have paid for it. Generation after generation, we have worked together across party lines and every other division to invest in our Armed Forces and the men and women who dedicate their lives to the common defense. We are truly, to recall President Kennedy, willing to pay any price and bear any burden to deter and defeat foreign threats.

There is no way around this: If we want the best domestic defenses, we will have to pay for them, too.

At the State and local level, where fiscal crises are already forcing cuts in services, the Federal Government's failure to invest is especially serious.

The amendment under consideration today addresses the critical shortfalls facing our local communities by providing \$3 billion in first responder grants to States in the wartime supplemental budget, and over \$1 billion for grants to high threat urban areas. In addition to these first responder grants, the amendment provides \$155 million in grants to fire departments to fully fund the \$900 million authorized level, and an additional \$130 million to the COPS Program, which will fund additional police costs.

This is the least we can provide. As you may know, I have called for a still greater investment—\$7.5 billion for our first responders above and beyond the President's proposal in next year's

budget—and \$16 billion overall in that budget above and beyond the paltry \$300 million increase.

But this amendment, along with the other amendments I am proud to cosponsor that will come before the Senate today, is a good start, a necessary start. Let me give you a few examples of the urgent needs throughout America today that it would begin to address:

New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg said his city is currently spending \$5 million a week to post armed units at potential targets like Times Square, conduct bioterrorism detection, and prepare police in the five boroughs to operate as independent departments should the Manhattan headquarters be disabled in an emergency.

According to The Washington Post in an article published April 1—and, no, unfortunately it wasn't an April Fool's joke—Los Angeles "has grown so desperate waiting for federal money that last week it reluctantly raided a municipal trust fund for \$4.5 million and bought 1,000 chemical protection suits for firefighters and police." L.A. has also reduced staffing at its 24-hour emergency operation center in part to save money on security costs.

According to The Baltimore Sun, the mayor's office in Baltimore estimates that the city needs to spend another \$8.4 million on new communications and hazmat equipment, protective gear, and training, not to mention another \$122 million to upgrade water treatment plants, build a new emergency operations center, and more.

The list goes on. My own home community of New Haven, CT, has been able to outfit about 10 percent—just 10 percent—of its 300 firefighters with protective equipment that will be needed to respond in the event of a chemical or biological attack.

Let's face it. Meeting those needs and others will take more money from Washington, plain and simple. But some don't seem to understand that. The majority leader, Senator FRIST, was quoted in CongressDaily as saying that, "It is unnecessary and wasteful to spend more money at the federal level. The problem is not the federal availability of money. It's getting it down to the local level."

With all respect, that is just not the case. In fact, according to the National Governors Association, States have already obligated or spent more than 90 percent of their Federal funds. And to complicate things, many States have been spending their own money for 15 months but have yet to be reimbursed by the slow and cumbersome process through which money flows from the Federal Government to States and localities. This is only exacerbating budget crises at the State and local level, where many communities are actually laying off and reducing the number of first responders—so we are going backwards. The reality is that we need to get more funding to first responders, and we need to get it to them as quickly as possible.

The bottom line is this: We must get our first responders more resources and we need to do it without further delay. Enough posturing, enough politics. Let's rise above partisanship and put the national interest first.

The strain on our local first responders has put them in a fiscal strait-jacket of historic proportions—one we must relieve now if we are to protect Americans from terrorism.

Nevertheless, let's be fair. Let's realize that, yes, we have made some progress in the 18 months since September 11. Today we are better equipped to handle a second September 11. Our skies are safer. The FBI has announced major reforms, which are in progress. I hope we are beginning to tackle the problem of intelligence coordination that plagued us in the weeks and months leading up to that dark day.

But the terrorists constantly change their methods. Next time, the threat isn't likely to come in the form of airplanes crashing into buildings. The weapon might only be visible under the microscope. Instead of arriving with a loud crash and flames, it might come quietly, secretly, surreptitiously. Just as September 11 challenged our police officers and firefighters as never before, a biological or chemical attack would challenge our public health first responders as never before.

The reality is, if that happens, we are nowhere near ready. As resolute and resourceful as our public health professionals are, they lack the support, the capabilities, and the funding they need to detect these deadly diseases swiftly and protect us effectively. We need significant new investment today to improve our readiness tomorrow.

Look at the reaction to the recent outbreak of Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome, or SARS. An unknown microbial agent. A mysterious name. Those harrowing pictures of children with surgeon's masks covering their mouths and noses. The slow but consistent spread throughout Asia, and now around America. Travel warnings from the World Health Organization placing large swaths of the world off limits. This, by all accounts, is simply a serious disease with which we are unfamiliar—but the profile of the outbreak is frighteningly close to what we imagined a bioterror attack might look like.

The public health officials in our local communities are well informed and well trained. But working together with the CDC, they just don't have the tools to determine what is causing SARS. They don't have the tools to treat the victims. They don't have the tools to try to stop the spread of the disease in its tracks.

If SARS is 4-percent lethal, what will we do with a disease that is 80 percent lethal? What will we do with a disease that spreads faster and is harder to diagnose? Let's not cross our fingers and hope. Unfortunately, that is exactly what we are forced to do under the ad-

ministration's budget, which short-changes investment in our local public health systems and hospitals.

As a result, our hospitals—already constrained by drastic budget cuts, are now rubbing quarters together when they need to be building substantial new capabilities to contend with the new threats. Time magazine put it this way: "Speed and calm, both critical in a state of emergency, can be taught without special gear, but training in certain techniques and life-saving equipment, like \$25,000 protective suits, don't come cheap. That means most of America's hospitals are ill-prepared to face a major disaster."

According to the Greater New York Hospital Association, hospitals throughout the State have spent more than \$200 million on security and emergency response improvements that they never imagined would be necessary before September 11—with plans to spend more than that in the coming year. What has Washington's contribution been? About \$8 million in new funding—less than the hospitals will spend on the new smallpox vaccination program alone.

These new demands are only further straining emergency rooms that are already stretched to the limit. Dr. Cai Glushak, director of emergency medicine at the University of Chicago, described the state of Chicago's hospitals this way: "The hospitals are vastly lacking in resources and have yet to address major things with brick and mortar to create truly adequate facilities to deal with a major contamination issue." He went on to say of his hospital, "If we had an onslaught of 20 people in this emergency room, it would be a catastrophe. It would be sending an external disaster on top of an internal overload."

How can we expect our hospitals, clinics, labs, and public health departments to protect us from unknown bioterrors when they themselves are on the verge of being fiscally bedridden?

Now, of course money isn't all that local hospitals need from the Feds. They also need information, expertise, and guidance. They are getting some of that from the CDC. But a sustained improvement in our bioterror defense demands more than that. It demands a real investment. It demands Federal leadership. Those are sorely lacking in the budget requests that we have seen from this administration.

For the next fiscal year, I have called for \$3 billion in new homeland security funding over and above the president's proposal to shore up bioterror preparedness. Mr. President, \$1 billion of that increase would increase CDC grants to help State public health departments care for and track infectious disease outbreaks, \$500 million would help local hospitals increase capacity, training and supplies, and \$1.5 billion would help get new medical research as quickly as possible from "bench to bedside"—meaning, from the discovery phase into actual use.

Hand in hand with these efforts, we simply must jumpstart efforts to spark private sector production of the drugs, antidotes, and countermeasures we need to fight unknown chemical and biological agents. Again, the SARS example is instructive here as well.

We have no antidote for this disease. No vaccine. No countermeasure. No diagnostic. It is possible that the only effective medical response will turn out to be quarantine.

Imagine a biological weapon that spreads twice as fast and is twice as deadly. Do we really want quarantine to be our only answer? No—we need real medical shields to fight back against the biological and chemical weapons our enemies might use.

And we can't simply hope and pray for these to appear. Stocking our medicine cabinet with the right drugs to protect people from SARS will take months or years of research, months or years of investment, months or years of hard work by private and government professionals.

That is why we need to begin today—not in 6 months, not in a year—engaging every national resource we have to develop the drugs, vaccines, and antidotes we may need in the event of a biological attack. We know of dozens upon dozens of deadly agents for which we currently have no defense, and this does not even count the hybrid or genetically modified organisms we may see in the future. America is blessed with thousands and thousands of brilliant researchers in universities and companies across the country. Why not harness their ingenuity to develop those antidotes, those vaccines, those medicines? Senator HATCH and I have proposed legislation that would do exactly that.

I do not believe that Project Bio-shield, the limited incentive program the President has proposed, is remotely enough. At best, it focuses on short-term procurement of existing countermeasures, not on long-term research to deal with the threats for which we have no countermeasure. It will not lead to development of a broad-spectrum antibiotic, or to the development of powerful new research tools that will enable us to quickly develop an antiviral to deal with a new threat like SARS. It is a start, but it is late and it does not reflect the urgency that is warranted by the threat.

The bill Senator HATCH and I have introduced will put in place a broad range of incentives our private sector needs to start filling our medicine cabinet today so our public health first responders are not caught emptyhanded tomorrow, as they have been caught with SARS.

We are at war against terrorism. Our first responders—whether they go to work in firehouses, police precincts, hospitals, or laboratories—are our first line of defense. Let's not frustrate and condemn to failure those whose job it is to protect us—many of whom risk their lives—by failing to provide them

the resources they need to meet and beat the new and unfamiliar threats to our homeland.

The war against terrorism cannot be won with a magic wand, tough talk, or wishful thinking. It will take talent, training, and technology. It will take real, not rhetorical, partnership among every layer and level of government. It will take bipartisan action in Congress. It will take money. To begin providing our Government the resources it needs to protect us from terrorism, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by Senators SCHUMER, CLINTON, MIKULSKI, and others. I am proud to join them as a cosponsor of this amendment that will provide desperately-needed funds directly to State and local governments to boost the emergency preparedness capabilities of our Nation's first responders. The amendment also provides much-needed funding for high threat urban areas, FIRE grants, and COPS.

Our Nation is at war, and we find ourselves facing enormous challenges, both at home and abroad. The American people have responded to those challenges and are performing with skill and determination and valor on both fronts.

We have nearly a quarter of a million troops in the Middle East. Our soldiers and marines have been engaging tenacious guerilla fighters in Iraq's harshest weather conditions. Our sailors are superbly executing their complex missions. Our Air Force already has performed thousands of missions over long distances amid withering ground fire, eliminating threats to all our troops. And we have National Guard units being called up all across the country to prepare for what could turn into a lengthy assignment overseas.

Here on the homefront, our first responders and thousands of dedicated Federal workers are giving their all to preparedness and prevention. Police officers, firefighters, and emergency medical response providers are being pushed to the limit with added duties, longer shifts, and cancelled time off. The new responsibilities they are shouldering in guarding against and preparing for terrorism have become largely unfunded mandates on them and on their States and communities. Every time the threat alert level is raised, it takes millions more in local and State costs to respond.

The administration readily accepts the need to fund our antiterrorism efforts abroad, but the administration continues to downplay and minimize the real needs in real communities across the Nation for adequate resources to meet homeland defense needs here at home. That must change. We need to do both we need a robust response to terrorism on both fronts, here and abroad.

This supplemental spending plan the President submitted to the Congress

addresses costs in Iraq and other locations overseas but misses the mark by a mile in funding our needs on the homefront. We are fighting a two-front war, yet the President's request mostly only addresses the war in Iraq—as well as the needs of a few coalition allies.

It is frustrating, as well as more than a little ironic, that after all of the repeated requests from Congress and State and local officials, over a period now of a year and a half, about the need for taking care of the fight against terrorism at home, the administration has decided to request almost \$8 billion in assistance on behalf of the foreign nations that it considers helpful in the war against Iraq, but only \$2 billion for first responders. The Nation's Governors and mayors have made abundantly clear the urgent need for that same level of funding, \$8 billion. Our hometown heroes need help now.

In recent months, the Nation's first responder needs have grown increasingly urgent. I have repeatedly joined with congressional leaders like Senator BYRD, Senator DASCHLE, and others in asking the President, in this supplemental request for appropriations, to include at least \$5 billion for our State and local first responders. But the administration has fallen far short in this bill, including only \$2 billion to assist State and local governments to support federally mandated terrorism preparedness during this time of heightened threats and insecurity. The amount included in the supplemental is inadequate.

No Federal agencies are doing the jobs that we need first responders to do. When terrorists attack, the first call that is made is not to a Federal agency in Washington. It is to 9-1-1, for their State and local first responders. The responsibility now falls to the Congress to boost funding for our first responders. We are in a two-front war, overseas and here at home, and we need to fund both.

The sooner we help first responders help us in the war on terrorism, the better. I hope you will agree that our Governors and mayors know what their States and communities need to be safe from and respond to terrorist attacks. My colleagues and I who introduce this amendment have heard their pleas and responded. I hope the Congress will respond accordingly, even though the administration so far has not.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, September 11, 2001, taught us that the Nation is vulnerable to terrorist attacks on our own soil. In Massachusetts, almost 200 families lost loved ones on that day, and they bear an especially heavy share of the burden of that vulnerability.

Here in Congress, we are each committed to do all we can to see that 9/11 never happens again. We need to work together to provide the resources to prevent terrorists from attacking the cities, the towns, the villages, and the communities we all care so much about in our States and across this country.

Yet we failed to live up to our responsibility yesterday during the debate on Senator HOLLINGS' needed proposal to strengthen the protection of our seaports. It would have provided \$1 billion to begin to protect our Nation's notoriously porous and vulnerable ports. Yet during the debate on the amendment, opponents questioned "where will it end?" as if this was such an extravagant investment. It was defeated, and I cannot understand why.

One billion dollars was proposed to secure our seaports against sabotage, dirty bombs or worse in cargo containers. Was that really too much—even though the President has pledged \$9 billion in aid to other nations to help them protect their own citizens?

These entryways into the United States are responsible for 95 percent of all U.S. international trade, but only about 2 percent of all cargo is now being inspected. An urgent proposal to do more, and do it now, should certainly get a unanimous vote in the Senate. The stakes are too high. September 11 taught us what can happen.

Obviously, we don't have unlimited funds. Obviously, we can't make ourselves 100 percent free of the terrorist threat. But can we really say that we are doing all we can when the overall bill before us provides only \$2 billion to help State and local governments meet their new security requirements? Facing serious budget reductions of their own, the Nation's cities are spending an additional \$70 million a week on direct homeland security costs, and tens of millions more in indirect costs.

But can we really say we are doing all we can when Federal assistance for homeland security has, to date, provided the entire State of Massachusetts with only \$11 million, the entire State of Pennsylvania with only \$18.5 million, and the entire State of California with only \$45 million?

Can we say we are doing all we can—let alone all that we should—when the bill before us provides the grand total of only \$100 million to protect all the high-level-threat urban areas in the country?

How many of these high-level-threat urban areas are there?

Is \$100 million enough—or is it only a drop in the bucket—when we are talking about the security of Atlanta or Austin or Baltimore or Boston or Charleston or Cleveland or Chicago or Dallas or Denver or Detroit or Houston or Las Vegas or Los Angeles or Miami or Milwaukee or Minneapolis or New York City or New Orleans or Philadelphia or Phoenix or Portland or Pittsburgh or Seattle or St. Louis or St. Paul or San Diego or San Antonio or San Francisco or Tampa or Washington, DC, or dozens of other American cities that can legitimately be called high-threat areas.

Mr. President, \$100 million for high-level urban threat areas—just for the 29 cities I mentioned above, that works out to \$3.3 million for each city. That won't go very far in New York City,

where the mayor is spending \$5 million a week.

It won't go very far in Boston, which is struggling to meet its security obligations while confronting a potential 2-year State-aid cut of \$153 million. As a result of these cuts, and declining tax revenues brought about by the recession, there will be no incoming class of police officers for Boston this year. No incoming class, when the threats to the city are unprecedented and when 18 of Boston's officers are serving their country in Iraq.

Is Boston supposed to take on these new challenges, with only token financial support from Washington?

Apparently, Boston is to go it alone in its efforts to prevent a terrorist attack on any of the 61 hazardous material storage facilities that dot its waterfront. Boston alone is supposed to protect the home heating oil depots along its expressway. And Boston alone is supposed to prevent terrorists from commandeering any one of the hundreds of cruise vessels that stop in our port every year.

Instead of wondering where it will end, a better question for us to be asking ourselves today is: How can we go back to our States without doing all we can to protect our communities?

Last week, half of the Senate had no problem voting for a massively excessive tax cut for the wealthiest Americans on the flimsiest of economic justifications. Yet now we have voted down \$1 billion to protect our seaports—even though their vulnerability could have immediate and devastating effects on our economy—and we are reluctant to add another \$2 billion to secure our communities.

The amendment before us is modest. It does not try to change the fundamental fiscal relationships between the Federal, State, and local governments. It simply says that we can do more. We can do more than the bare minimum that the President's Budget Director says is absolutely necessary. We can do more so that our Nation's homeland security isn't entirely dependent upon property taxes, lottery revenues, and car washes.

The amendment before us would increase assistance to first responders by \$1 billion, provide a total of \$1.05 billion for assistance to high threat urban areas, \$155 million for firefighter's equipment grants, and \$130 million for staffing and overtime expenses for COPS Program activities.

In the context of an unprecedented supplemental appropriation request of \$74.8 billion, and with the backdrop of heightened domestic security, can anyone really pretend that these investments are unwise or unnecessary?

Today, I spoke to 17 mayors in Massachusetts by conference call, all of whom are struggling to meet the challenges of post-September 11 security—and none of whom know how they can go on bearing these costs alone. Their obstacles are impossible to overcome.

Mayor Fred Kalisz of New Bedford, a city of 94,000 people and home of the

Nation's highest value commercial fishing fleet, has incurred \$500,000 in specific homeland security expenses to date and has come up with list of \$3.4 million in essential capital security requests to protect his city's port, its commercial fishing fleet, and key public facilities. He has no way to pay for these costs. He recently had to suspend drug and alcohol prevention programs for New Bedford's youth.

Mayor John Barrett of North Adams, a city of only 14,000 people, has to deploy his small town police force to secure two nuclear powerplants—including 533 spent radioactive fuel rods—against terrorist attack.

In Everett, a city of 38,000 people located just outside Boston, Mayor David Ragucci spends \$10,000 a day to secure facilities containing 685,000 gallons of propane, 95 million gallons of jet fuel and a 1500 megawatt powerplant from terrorist attack. In the wake of a \$4.5 million budget cut, Mayor Ragucci deserves a combat medal for his efforts to protect these facilities which are within 5 miles of nearly 1 million people.

Mayor Bill Whelan of Quincy, a city of 88,000 people, has been hit with over \$300,000 in overtime and other personnel costs responding to over 300 anthrax and hazardous materials calls since 9/11. He also has had to begin patrolling the city's 27 miles of open coastline, and begin providing 24-hour police protection for a Muslim place of worship. And he is staring at \$4.3 million of State local aid cuts in the face.

In Fall River, with 92,000 people, Mayor Ed Lambert has done a good job so far balancing a very difficult situation. With a reservoir that serves 200,000 people and the State's largest bridge within city limits, Mayor Lambert has had to dramatically increase security at both these critical sites. But, he has had to do it while cutting back his police and fire forces in response to difficult budget shortfalls. Over the last 18 months, Fall River has lost 15 percent of its police force and 10 percent of its firefighters because of budget cuts.

In Brockton, Mayor Jack Yunits has been trying to meet the challenges confronting his city of 94,000 while dealing with the loss of 17 police officers. Another six will soon be retiring, and there is no funding to replace them. Among the mayor's chief homeland security challenges is the safety and well-being of the 6,000 students and faculty who attend Brockton High School each day, the largest high school this side of the Mississippi River. His difficulties will soon be compounded if the proposed State cut of \$2.9 million from his budget becomes law.

In Lowell, with a population 105,000, six of its police officers and a fireman have been sent to Iraq. With a police force of 220, Lowell may have to insist on 30 early retirements this year to meet its budget constraints. City Manager John Cox tells me that for the first time in recent memory, there will be no new recruits from the police academy.

Worcester is Massachusetts' second largest city, and Mayor Tim Murray tells me that he has lost over 80 police officers and 86 firefighters due to budget difficulties.

All these mayors have their backs against the wall. They are trying as hard as they can to protect their security, but they are not being given the help they need.

I think Mayor Yunits from Brockton said it best "Our first responders are fighting for their jobs, while they continue fighting to protect us."

They will keep at it, I am sure, because they care about this country. They care about their city. They care about protecting their citizens. They care about doing every last thing possible to prevent another disaster on American soil.

Shouldn't we in the Senate—with our responsibility to protect the American people—at least try to help ease this burden?

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and send a message to the Governors and mayors of America that they are not alone, that they can count on Congress to provide more than mere photo opportunities as they confront the threat of domestic terrorism in their communities.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, first, let me thank Senator SCHUMER for offering this amendment to immediately provide more resources to our local first responders. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment.

This amendment is vital to our first responders at the State and local levels of government. We must increase the resources available so that our police, firefighters, and other emergency personnel can help prevent and respond to terrorist acts.

This amendment makes \$2.2 billion available to the Office for Domestic Preparedness in the Department of Homeland Security.

This \$2.2 billion is for direct grants to States and local governments. This funding will be passed to the States, and then on to local governments within 45 days.

This expediency is an important concern of many States, including my State of California. We have all heard about the budget shortages that many States are facing. These budget shortages then affect cities and counties.

My State of California is facing a budget shortfall of between \$26 and \$35 billion. In California, revenue from vehicle license fees helps communities pay for the equivalent of 12,000 police officers or 15,000 firefighters for one year. But, because of the State shortfall, this funding may not be passed on to local communities.

Already, the financial crunch is taking its toll. For example, the city of Marysville faces a \$700,000 budget shortfall. This shortfall will affect the police payroll, which accounts for 60 percent of the city's budget. The cities of Santa Cruz, and Napa have also made cuts in police and fire departments. This amendment will assist cities like Marysville, Santa Cruz and

Napa to have full teams of first responders.

On top of this budget crunch, the Federal Government has handed additional responsibilities and a heightened terror alert to already troubled State and local governments. The states are paying for security costs that the Federal Government has asked them to cover. In California, the Governor estimates \$500 million in statewide homeland defense costs for the State and local governments. These estimates are probably low, especially if the war in Iraq goes on for several months.

The city of Los Angeles spent an additional \$4.2 million just during the 20 days of code orange to meet the demands of heightened security. The city of Fresno is spending between \$15,000 and \$20,000 per week on homeland security costs. On average, the city of San Francisco is spending \$2.3 million per week, second only to New York City. In fact, of the five cities nationwide that are spending the most money on protecting the homeland, two of them—San Francisco and Los Angeles—are in my State.

This amendment is vital for our communities, vital for our local police, vital for our local firefighters, vital for the protection of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to another sponsor of the amendment, somebody who has fought long and hard for first responders and localities, the people of Maryland, the Senator from Maryland, Ms. MIKULSKI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 3 minutes.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with my colleagues, Senators SCHUMER and CLINTON, who have been working steadfastly to get the resources we need to properly fund homeland security. They have stood up not only for New York but for all of America because we know that homeland security cannot be done on the cheap. We are at war. We are at war in Iraq, and we need to support our troops. But we are at war here. The President of the United States, George Bush, said we are at war here in the war against terrorism and we need to support the hometown, homeland troops. They are our first responders.

Where are they? They are in local governments. They are in fire stations. They are in police stations. They are standing sentry behind the ambulances ready to respond to any emergency need. When a citizen calls 911 because of an event that has happened in their community, it happens locally.

The Schumer-Clinton-Mikulski amendment not only gives more money, which is desperately needed, but it brings money to the local communities where it is needed.

We live in the capital region, we in Maryland, whether it is Montgomery

County or Prince George's or Baltimore City. Our overtime is skyrocketing. We are spending loads of money in the protection for infrastructure. In Baltimore, every time we go to code orange we are spending \$50,000 a week on police overtime. Prince George's County needs \$50 million just to be able to talk to the rest of the State in interoperable radio equipment. Anne Arundel County is responsible for the protection of the National Security Agency, the Naval Academy, the capitol of the State of Maryland, and BWI Airport. We say: Oh, wow, we can't afford to do it.

Let me say this: When the country goes to code orange, our local communities go to red ink. Local governments have no place to turn except higher property taxes. We say no to higher property taxes. We say yes to more funds for homeland security. If we want to wear the flag, let's stand up for the flag and let's stand up for the flag by supporting our first responders in the local community and by putting the money where our patriotism is, right in the Federal checkbook.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Schumer amendment, but I also wanted to make a comment about the Specter amendment. I support the amendment of the Senators from New York and Maryland who are lead sponsors on this particular amendment. They are absolutely correct. We are not giving the resources that are necessary to first responders.

While the bill before us attempts in good measure to support the war underway, we always need to be prepared each and every day to fight the war on terrorism—which is broader than the battlefield in Iraq. The battlefield has now become in some sense the U.S. territory, and we need to do more faster. I realize we can't pay for every bill that is submitted, but we most certainly can do more than what we are doing. I intend to vote for the Schumer amendment.

I am not sure what I will do on the Specter amendment. I will say why. I think the offset is inappropriate. I understand there might be some consensus about the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, but let me say what I object to strenuously in the amendment. To fund the high threat urban areas, a portion of the money, \$150 million, is taken from State and local governments, and a portion is taken from critical infrastructure protection. So here, as a Senator from Louisiana, I have to now be forced to choose—these are tough votes and this is a job we asked for—because on one hand, I do want to add money to the overall pot, which the amendment does, but I want to call to the attention of my colleagues that part of the offset is taking it away from protection for pipelines, chemical plants, ports, and other critical infrastructure

that could be described as highways, rail, et cetera, to support high urban threat areas.

It is a dilemma. I hope, however, it is resolved. Perhaps a better offset could be found in the conference report because I agree with Senator SCHUMER and Senator CLINTON that we have to do more. I don't agree with the proposal put down by the Senator from Pennsylvania that to solve that problem, it needs to be taken from States such as Louisiana—perhaps Texas could find itself in the same situation—having a tremendous amount of critical infrastructure to protect, which I might say to my colleagues in the Senate, supplies a tremendous amount of energy for the Nation. Those critical infrastructures are all over urban as well as rural parts of Louisiana. So I rise in support of the Schumer amendment, and with great reservations about the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Michigan, who has been a great supporter of first responders.

Ms. STABENOW. I thank my colleague. I rise as a cosponsor of this amendment. I commend my colleagues for bringing it forward.

As has been said so many times, we have two front lines in the battle on terrorism. We have come together virtually unanimously in support of our troops in Iraq and for the efforts on other soils away from our country. But here at home we have not done the same. Back in Michigan, I held nine different community meetings around the State, and I heard the same thing from our urban to rural areas: They are working hard, working overtime, but they cannot do it alone.

When our country was attacked, it was not just New York or Washington. They were, in fact, attacking the United States of America. We have an obligation to our hard-working men and women, the firefighters, the police officers, the emergency medical workers, to make sure we are partnering with them to make sure they have the resources they need.

I have heard so much about the need for communications equipment, bioterrorism training, additional personnel. They are saying to me that it is very frustrating when, on the one hand, we say we are getting them more money, and then we cut the COPS Program or the Fire Grant Program.

The Senator from Louisiana raises an important point about the Specter amendment as to where the dollars come from. I will support the Specter amendment, but we have to make sure these are really new dollars and not just moving from one pot to another pot because the reality is that our first responders cannot do this without our partnership and our support.

This is the time we are bringing forth the resources to fund the war to support our troops abroad. We have troops right here. They are asking us, finally, to support them. We have tried for 18 months to provide the resources, to let them know, and today is the day.

I hope my colleagues will join unanimously to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, by way of a brief reply and comment on the arguments that have been made, I agree with a great deal of what has been said. It would be highly desirable to put in more money, but what we have seen today are efforts on the other side of the aisle to add funds, and a response on this side of the aisle, pretty much on party-line votes, to deny the addition. I have sought to find a figure that is significant, such as \$600 million, which will be agreed to by votes significantly on this side of the aisle, and with some votes on the other side of the aisle.

When the Senator from New York, Mrs. CLINTON, made the comment that there are features of Senator SCHUMER's amendment that expedite the disbursement of the funds, that is not included in my amendment because we don't really know what the formula should be. When Secretary Ridge testified before the Appropriations Committee on March 27, he agreed that the current formula on a population basis was inappropriate, that high-risk areas need more money. At the moment, we do not have a determination as to what those costs are. We have directed the Secretary to make that determination. Once he makes that determination, then we can make an allocation. I certainly would like to see more money.

I agree totally with the comments made about the bravery of the firefighters and of the police officers, and the threat of terrorism that has to be fought domestically as well as overseas. What I am looking for in my amendment is the art of the possible—to come up with a figure, and \$600 million is substantial.

It is true, as the Senator from Louisiana points out, money has been taken in other lines for \$300 million. But we have gotten the managers to agree to an additional \$200 million, so it is a matter of priorities. If you look at the high-risk areas, such as New Orleans, it is in the interest of the State of Louisiana to have this allocation.

How much of my time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCHUMER. I inquire how much time I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Louisiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wish to respond to the Senator from Pennsylvania because this is a very important debate. I thank him, first, for the effort he has made to try to bring some compromise to the issue.

I restate how difficult it is for some of us from some States that have serious needs of critical infrastructure. We supply 20 percent of the Nation's oil and gas. I have more pipelines in my State than any other State in the Union. We are happy to provide the energy. We have more chemical plants than Illinois, New Jersey, and other States. To ask us to be forced to say we don't really need money for that and we can give money to urban areas—the fact is, we need to give money to both, and to New York, Pennsylvania, New Orleans, as well as other places where pipelines run under very small communities.

I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will take seriously—and I know he does—what point I am making and perhaps work as a member of the Appropriations Committee as this bill moves through to try to find an additional remedy so we don't have to get rural areas giving up their money for urban areas, or urban areas giving up their money for rural areas, and we can try to make fair allocations to protect all of the critical infrastructure in the Nation, whether it is in rural or urban areas.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Louisiana makes a valid point on the need for more funding. We are now on the emergency supplemental. We do not know at this moment what the costs are to protect all of these interests. We will know shortly. We have asked for 60 days. We will be moving forward with more appropriations bills. We are in the process now of moving forward.

The subcommittee, chaired by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, on which I serve, will be taking it up. We will be interested to see the specifications as to what it costs to protect the interests identified by the Senator from Louisiana. But I think this is a substantial start. This is a combination of trying to get more funds in, and getting \$200 million is not easy on this side of the aisle. Making the reallocation of the \$600 million is a very material advance.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator for his comments. I look forward to working with him as we try to provide additional funding for the critical structure that is necessary throughout many places in the South and in the industrial East.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator LAUTENBERG as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey 2 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment of-

ferred by our colleagues, Senator SCHUMER, Senator CLINTON, and Senator MIKULSKI.

The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, too, is an amendment that has to be considered favorably. This amendment would provide desperately needed funds to State and local governments to bolster their emergency preparedness. I am pleased the amendment sponsors have included my proposal to reimburse State and local governments for additional costs that they are incurring because they have not replaced the first responders called to active duty in the Reserves or National Guard.

Not surprisingly, many local police and fire and rescue and emergency medical service and hazardous material disposal personnel serve in the National Guard and Reserves. More and more, these men and women are being called up for longer and longer tours of active duty, and especially now that the war with Iraq is underway. It is critical that we bolster our military capabilities here and abroad but that we not do it at the expense of our safety and security at home.

I have spoken to a lot of mayors in New Jersey. New Jersey shared the impact of the terrible assault on the Trade Centers with New York, as 700 of our citizens died that day. What perplexes them is the fact that here they are being asked to bolster the defenses at home, to make sure they cover the emergency needs, and, in many instances, it takes people away to serve either in the Reserves or the National Guard, to put them on active duty.

They do not understand—and I agree with them—why it is we cannot take care of our defenses with strength at home as well as abroad.

I am pleased that the amendment sponsors have included my proposal to reimburse State and local governments and Indian tribes for the additional costs they incur replacing their first responders who are called to active duty in the Reserves or National Guard.

The 1.2 million men and women who serve in the National Guard and Reserves are a crucial component of our military. They account for just 8.3 percent of the Defense budget but give us the capability, if necessary, of nearly doubling our armed forces.

Not surprisingly, many local police, fire, rescue, emergency medical service, and emergency hazardous material disposal personnel serve in the National Guard and Reserves. More and more of these men and women are being called up for longer and longer tours of active duty, especially now that the war with Iraq has begun.

It is critical that we bolster our military capabilities here and abroad. But we must not do it at the expense of our safety and security at home.

Our local communities must have the necessary personnel to respond to terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies.

My proposal would reimburse State, local, and tribal governments for the additional costs they incur when their "first responders" who serve in the Reserves and the National Guard are called to active duty for 6 or more consecutive months.

Reimbursable costs could include the salary and benefits associated with hiring a replacement or the overtime paid to other emergency personnel who "fill in" for the first responder called to active duty.

The effect of my amendment would be to make such reimbursements an authorized use of the \$500 million contained in the underlying provision.

Increasingly, I am hearing from State and local officials who are concerned about the toll that active duty call-ups are taking on their emergency preparedness.

According to the Police Executive Research Forum, 452 of 1,002 law enforcement agencies and departments surveyed so far have lost personnel to call-ups.

The problem is worse in rural and smaller jurisdictions where just a few call-ups can decimate a police or fire department.

State and local governments are facing their worst fiscal crisis in over 50 years. We shouldn't leave them "holding the bag" when their first responders get called up. And we should not be making our communities *less* able to respond to terrorism, natural disasters, and other emergencies.

Again, I thank my colleagues from New York and Senator MIKULSKI for accommodating my proposal. I think my language makes a good amendment even better and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

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

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the bill reported by the committee provides an additional \$2 billion in supplemental appropriations to enhance assistance to State and local first responders. It does so in a manner which builds on the State strategies; provides funding for enhanced security of critical infrastructure, and allows the Secretary to target funds to high threat urban areas.

This amendment does more than just boost funding for the Office for Domestic Preparedness. It mandates mechanisms for the dispersal of Federal funds which would dilute the impact of the supplemental funding altogether.

The amendment which has been offered requires a direct pass-through of grant funds to States within 30 days. This requirement would negate the strategic planning process the Office for Domestic Preparedness has developed and implemented with States to allocate funds to those with greatest need and it would undermine the States' regional approach which is cur-

rently supported by the majority of States.

The amendment requires that funds for grants be allocated to States based on the minimum grant requirement in the USA PATRIOT Act and the remaining amounts being distributed on a per capita basis. This is what is being done currently. However, it mandates that the funds be allocated to States within 30 days of enactment of the Act. This would not allow time for the States to submit a plan for the use of the funds requested which ensures some degree of accountability that Federal funds will be used to cover allowable costs.

The amendment further requires that not less than 80 percent of each State's funds be made available to units of local government based on population. Of the 80 percent mandated to go to localities, the amendment then requires 20 percent be used "shall be for"—"costs of law enforcement, fire, emergency medical services, and other emergency personnel, including covering overtime expenses."

In addition, the amendment allows grant funds to be used for "personnel funds". It does not define what this means. Does this mean hiring personnel or reimbursement of costs of existing personnel, or both? What is the baseline for determining this? What will ensure that Federal assistance supplement and not supplant existing levels of effort?

The amendment also does not define units of Local Government. If it truly means all local units will receive funds based on population, the Federal funding will be diluted by giving many small jurisdictions small grants. And, it will most likely cause further delay, if you consider there are over 3,100 counties, each containing townships, villages or other governmental units, and the States are required, as this amendment mandates, to disperse all these funds to this number of jurisdictions based on population within 30 days, and then to make sure that 20 percent of those funds be allocated only for specified purposes, as the amendment requires.

Where the current system relies on planning-based decisionmaking, this amendment resembles revenue sharing.

I realize that changes to the current system may be merited. Questions have been raised about the appropriate Federal share of the additional cost to States and local governments of terrorism preparedness and response efforts; what should properly be a Federal responsibility; and the formula for distributing funds, and the extent to which it properly reflects risks and vulnerabilities.

However, changes should be made after careful review by the authoring committees of jurisdiction, not done on this supplemental appropriations bill. The chairman of the Senate Government Affairs Committee has already announced a series of hearings, beginning next week, to review the Depart-

ment of Homeland Security's grant programs and their effectiveness.

I do know that with respect to making a decision on this here today, the current process is preferable to what is being proposed by this amendment. This amendment would only make things worse.

The same is true for the mechanism proposed by this amendment to deliver critical infrastructure protection funds to States. It would require funds be distributed on a per capita basis to States. Once funds are available to States, 50 percent must be made available to local jurisdictions within 30 days of receipt.

Again, it would dilute the funds being made available for security costs related to protection of critical infrastructure, which are intended to help State and local governments cover additional costs resulting from Operation Liberty Shield. Again, this is not targeted assistance, it is a revenue sharing approach to a problem.

The amendment also provides an additional \$155 million for grants under the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act. There is no indication that additional funding is needed at this time. The Department of Homeland Security is still processing applications for the \$745 million made available for fiscal year 2003.

Plus, this additional funding, as well as an additional \$130 million proposed for the Department of Justice Community-Oriented Policing Services, is proposed on top of the amendment's requirement that 20 percent of local jurisdictions' share of State grants be used for "law enforcement, fire, emergency medical services, and other emergency personnel, including covering overtime expenses."

The bill reported by the Appropriations Committee includes \$2 billion in supplemental appropriations for the Office for Domestic Preparedness to assist State and local governments to expand their capacity to prepare and respond to potential terrorist acts.

It provides an additional \$1.42 billion for grants to States, at least 80 percent of which must be passed through to local governments. This funding is for the acquisition of equipment, training, exercises, and planning. It is intended to assist States to more aggressively implement their statewide domestic preparedness strategies.

In addition, the committee-reported bill provides an additional \$30 million in direct technical assistance to states for a variety of activities, as needed, including support for plan development and implementation of exercises.

It also provides \$450 million, as requested by the President, for State grants to assist State and local governments with the costs of augmenting security at critical infrastructure facilities during the period of hostilities with Iraq. This recognizes the new requirements imposed on States and localities by the immediate need for heightened protection of critical infrastructure facilities. We understand

that the department has already reached out to States to ensure security measures are under way for the most sensitive sites and has been working with governors in developing site protection plans so that these funds can be released rapidly.

Lastly, it provides an additional \$100 million to be targeted to high-risk urban areas, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania would alter the amounts recommended in the committee-reported bill to provide total supplemental appropriations of \$600 million for assistance to high-threat urban areas and the total supplemental appropriations for the Office for Domestic Preparedness to \$2.2 billion. I support the Specter amendment, and I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment offered by Senator SCHUMER.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. STEVENS. How much time remains, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 8 minutes 16 seconds.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to make clear what I stated before. I do support the Specter amendment. By virtue of the approach the Senator from Pennsylvania has enunciated, we end up with more moneys in this area of great concern, but we increase the amount of money in the bill by \$200 million. There was already \$100 million in the committee-reported bill.

I do accept Senator SPECTER's approach to this. I am hopeful we can convince the House to recognize that this is the proper way to allocate the money the President requested and convince them that the amount we have in this bill is sufficient to meet the objectives we all seek to attain.

I urge Senators to vote for the Specter amendment. Again, reluctantly, I state I am opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York and his colleagues.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mr. SPECTER. How much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 7 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. On the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 1 minute 50 seconds.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back time if the Senator from New York is.

Mr. SCHUMER. I am prepared to yield back our time as well so we can move this along.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 515.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) would vote "yes."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "aye."

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

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 122 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Akaka	Dole	Mikulski
Alexander	Domenici	Miller
Allen	Durbin	Murkowski
Bayh	Edwards	Murray
Bennett	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Fitzgerald	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Frist	Pryor
Brownback	Graham (FL)	Reid
Burns	Grassley	Roberts
Campbell	Hagel	Sarbanes
Cantwell	Hatch	Schumer
Chambliss	Hutchison	Shelby
Clinton	Jeffords	Smith
Cochran	Kohl	Smith
Coleman	Lautenberg	Snowe
Collins	Levin	Specter
Cornyn	Lieberman	Stabenow
Corzine	Lincoln	Stevens
Daschle	Lott	Talent
Dayton	Lugar	Voinovich
DeWine	McCain	Warner
Dodd	McConnell	Wyden

NAYS—32

Allard	Dorgan	Kyl
Baucus	Ensign	Landrieu
Biden	Enzi	Leahy
Bingaman	Feingold	Nickles
Breaux	Graham (SC)	Reed
Byrd	Gregg	Rockefeller
Carper	Harkin	Santorum
Chafee	Hollings	Sessions
Conrad	Inhofe	Sununu
Craig	Johnson	Thomas
Crapo	Kennedy	

NOT VOTING—3

Bunning	Inouye	Kerry
---------	--------	-------

The amendment (No. 515) was agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, on vote No. 122, I voted aye. It was my intention to vote no. I ask unanimous consent that it be recorded as no. It does not change the outcome of the vote.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 514

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Schumer amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to table that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second on the motion to table?

There appears to be.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) would vote "yes."

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would vote "no."

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—3

Bunning	Inouye	Kerry
---------	--------	-------

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like to be able to discuss what we are going to do now. We have the managers' package that has some problems. We have to decide how to get out of it. It is my suggestion that we listen to the Senator from Arizona on some of the objections he has to items in the managers' package and see what we can do after the Senator explains his position.

How long would the Senator like to talk?

Mr. MCCAIN. Ten minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent we listen to Senator MCCAIN for 10 minutes and see what objections we can possibly remedy with the problems he has with the managers' package.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent to be recognized when he has finished.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, approximately 40 minutes ago, maybe a half hour ago, we were given a "managers' package." The managers' package, the first group was—we haven't yet received the second group of amendments in the managers' package—27 amendments. There is \$10 million for the South Pole station in the managers' package; \$10 million for NOAA; \$600 million for the Department of Agriculture expert assistance; \$500 million for the DOJ and FEMA; \$281 million for the Department of Energy; \$5 million earmarked for a Kentucky public safety communications system. I haven't finished compiling the list because we haven't even had a chance to review these amendments.

I ask my colleagues again: How do you accept a managers' package—in this case worth billions, B as in billions—worth billions of dollars without any debate, without any vote, without any discussion that I know of of any kind? How do you do that? How do you do that?

I intend to have votes on parts of the managers' package. I don't know why we need in this bill \$10 million for the South Pole station. I did not know that al-Qaida had reached the South Pole. More importantly, how can we appropriate \$500 million for the Department of Justice and FEMA without even talking about it? Couldn't we debate it? Maybe it won't be absolutely necessary. Do we need \$281 million additional for the Department of Energy? I don't think the Department of Energy is on the frontline in the war in Iraq.

I am told by the Senator from Alaska—I have the greatest respect and, believe it or not, a great deal of affection for him—that, well, they would pass anyway and this is the best way to treat it because then he will be able to reduce it in the conference.

I am not a member of the conference. Most of us are not conferees. Most of us are just ordinary Senators who have a responsibility to our constituents, not to approve of a managers' package worth billions of dollars that none of us have ever seen or read—and you would not have seen or read it if I had not demanded that the managers' package be shown to us.

Is this the way to govern? Is this the way to spend the taxpayers' dollars? It cannot be. It cannot be the right thing to do.

I have great sympathy for what the Senator from Alaska is trying to achieve by getting this bill done, paying for the war, paying for the war on terror. But how do we sit here and accept billions of dollars in a managers' package that none of us—excuse me, all but a few of us have ever seen, debated, discussed, voted on, or will ever have anything to do with?

I trust the judgment of those who go to the appropriations conference, but I don't give them the responsibility that I have to the taxpayers of my State.

I am sure many of these amendments in the managers' package will pass. At least I will be able to go back and tell my constituents that I didn't support \$10 million for the South Pole Station in the name of fighting the war on terrorism and the war on Iraq. I have greater respect for the men and women in the military who are doing the fighting than to vote for \$10 million for the South Pole in the name of helping them fight the war.

I will yield the remainder of my time, and I will object to the managers' package, and we will have a series of votes. I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have great respect for the Senator from Arizona. He provides really a service to the Senate to make us think about these issues. I have thought about all of these. In fact, a dozen Senators on either side are already carrying a grudge because they didn't get their amendment through the process to even get to the Senator from Arizona because they were rejected by someone in the committee of jurisdiction.

Let me say to the Senator, for instance, the \$10 million for the South Pole is not an add-on. We took that money off an account and put it in there because they had a disastrous winter. This is the last supplemental for this year, as far as we know. Only another tragedy and the war could bring us to another supplemental. We are going into regular bills after this bill. We will have nights such as this on some of them, probably.

The money for the Department of Energy was identified by several Members, and that is security at nuclear facilities. It was debated on the floor. It was raised here and debated. I asked them to put it into the package because it was my opinion that it was, frankly, raising the bill a little too much, and I didn't want it to look as if I was accepting those amendments. There are a few others that we accepted that go in the bill. As you say, there are times that it is possible to reduce amendments voted on the floor in conference; but when the Senate votes overwhelmingly for an amendment on the floor, it is difficult to deal with in the House—if the House doesn't want to put the full amount up and to reduce it, or negotiate it.

We have several amendments. Senator KOHL's amendment, for instance. He has been courteous in allowing us to put that amendment—it will pass, by the way; I know it will pass. I will tell the Senate that there is not an amendment in this managers' package that I believe would pass the Senate if raised individually.

Why do we have a managers' package? Because we have cleared each

amendment with the committee of jurisdiction, cleared by the majority and minority on the subcommittee involved in our Appropriations Committee, and cleared by Senator BYRD and myself, and we have cleared them or offered them to Senator MCCAIN and to Senator REID, or whoever wants to look at the package can look at it. It is a package of convenience.

By putting these amendments together on items we think would pass anyway, we might be able to go home at a decent hour tonight. I might be able to keep my commitment to the Senator from Hawaii to be in Hawaii with him when he gets his great honor on Saturday. That may not be possible because I have a job and I will stay until we do it.

It is also a problem that a couple of the Senators have already departed, and they are relying on us to put these in the package because they had other problems with family, and they are not here now. I can think of three of them who are gone who have amendments in here. We passed judgment on a collective basis. It hasn't just been myself, or myself and my colleague, or our staffs. Everybody in the system is involved in clearing a bill, including the Senator from Arizona who knows I cleared several with him as chairman of the Commerce Committee.

All I say is, I am prepared to proceed in any way that the Senate wishes to proceed with the amendments. There are 25 amendments in this package. They call it the first package. Several are being cleared that will go in this. There is a group of, I think, six that is still out there being cleared. Of these, Senator MCCAIN has agreed with 11 out of the 25. He agrees to modify four others that were not in my accounting. So we can proceed with those on a consent basis and see if the Senator wants to call up the amendments. We are going to be here for a long time if we do that, but in fairness I don't have the ability to withdraw these and say the Senators cannot offer them. They allowed us to use them in the package mechanism so we could save time for the Senate. It is obviously not going to do that. I am prepared, however, as soon as I get the balance of this, to offer them all and let the Senator object and then we will move them one at a time.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BYRD. Why don't we just finish this Tuesday?

Mr. STEVENS. If we finish this Tuesday, the bill cannot be finished by next weekend because we have to have time for both Houses to prepare a chart on a bill such as this, to see what our differences are, so we can go into conference and deal with the differences. If we pass this bill Tuesday, the House will pass it Tuesday or Wednesday, and we will not be able to get it finished by a week from Friday.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BYRD. In the request that will be propounded with respect to the appointment of conferees, how many conferees on the part of the Senate is the chairman expecting?

Mr. STEVENS. In the conference on the supplemental, following the procedures the Senator from West Virginia and I have used in the past, we will have the full committee.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Other Senators may do as they wish. This Senator is going to go home. That is my right to do. I don't have any quarrel with others who want to stay. I have cast over 16,600 votes in the Senate. I think I have been pretty loyal to my duties to my constituents. But I need to be home. I have been married almost 66 years. I have been in the Senate a little over 44 years. I have been married longer. So I think my duty is to my wife. There are only two duties that will exceed my duties in the Senate. One is my duty to my God and the second is to my family.

So I ask unanimous consent, in accordance with paragraph 2 of rule VI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, that I be granted leave to go home now and not vote any further today. I will be granted a leave of absence for the rest of the day so that I can go home and be with my wife. Others who wish to stay here may do so. I have spent my time over the years here. If others want to stay, that is fine. I don't think it is absolutely necessary to finish this tonight. I think we can wait until Tuesday. But as far as I am concerned, I thank all Senators for their staying around and completing action on this bill, but count me out. I so ask unanimous consent.

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

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, my great friend from West Virginia today told me of the difficult problems he has and wanted to leave by 5:30. I thought we might make that. Again I find myself apologizing to my friend twice in 2 days.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator does not owe me an apology.

Mr. STEVENS. I thought we would finish the bill in time for the Senator to be with his wife.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has always been courteous to me. I have no quarrel with him or any other Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I do not want to prolong the debate. The Senator from Alaska just mentioned there are six amendments still being cleared. This cannot be the way to spend the taxpayers' dollars—to pack 25, or however many amendments there are, into a managers' amendment accumulating billions of dollars.

The Senator from Alaska said "the appropriate people were notified and these amendments were discussed with them." I do not like to indulge in a show of hands, but I guarantee you, Mr. President, most of the Members of this body were not consulted on most of these amendments that are in the managers' package because I have been here most of the day and I have never heard them discussed or debated. The only reason I am seeing them now for the first time, as I say, 40 minutes before we would have had final passage on the bill is because we demanded to see them.

Again, I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee. I believe there are 20 some members of the hundred of us who are members of the Appropriations Committee. For us to simply say, I will accept a \$600 million amendment; don't worry, we will work it out in conference—I am supposed to go back to my constituents and say: I spent \$600 million of your money, but do not worry, we left it up to another Senator to work it out in conference.

We cannot govern this way. We cannot. We cannot have this kind of procedure. I apologize to my colleagues for this, but I am not the one who ran this procedure. I warned the Senator from Alaska time after time that the managers' package was the most egregious of everything that is done in the appropriations process. I will never forget a couple years ago when I asked the manager of the bill: What is in the managers' package, as everybody was standing in line to vote. He said: I don't know.

I let it go because I did not want to anger my colleagues and upset the schedules of my colleagues. Do you know what we found? We found about \$50 million in absolutely unnecessary and unrelated projects added in a "managers' amendment." We cannot do that. We cannot do business this way.

I agree with the Senator from Alaska that he will win on every one of these votes because we just saw earlier today that if we are not going to reject \$93 million for an agriculture research center and \$50 million for maritime administration guaranteed loans, which is a totally failed program—and I have forgotten some of the others—we certainly are not going to turn down amendments that have as much as \$600 million.

Here is another one. An amendment described as town meetings. Interesting, town meetings. It removes a 250,000-person threshold for Senate funding of town meetings. What is that all about? It may be, as the Senator alleges—I did not know they had more severe winters than others at the South Pole, but there may be a very legitimate reason to lift the cap on a 250,000-person threshold for Senate funding of town meetings. We do not know. We do not know, I say to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCAIN. No. I would like to finish first.

I yield to the Senator from Alaska. I yield.

Mr. STEVENS. No, I will wait.

Mr. MCCAIN. All I am saying is we do not know. There may be good reasons or there may be bad reasons. There may be good reasons, when we are trying to fight the war on terrorism and the war on Iraq, to lift the 250,000-person threshold for funding for town meetings. There may not be also. We do not know.

Mr. President, I would like to make two points. One, I propose a vote on the Kohl amendment, which is amendment No. 455, which gives an additional \$600 million for agriculture. At the conclusion of that vote, then I will be ready to go to final passage, but I want to tell my colleagues for the last time, I will not—I will not—we cannot govern this way. It is not right. We are not carrying out our duties to the people who send their hard-earned tax dollars to us to handle with care and deliberation.

So if it is agreeable with the Senator from Alaska, we will have a vote, which he will win, adding \$600 million, which was in the managers' package and never debated or discussed that I know of, and I bet most of my colleagues never knew of, and we will probably adopt it, giving an additional \$600 million to help I guess feed the troops in Iraq, and then we will go to final passage.

But I tell my colleagues who are here on the floor, I will not do this managers' package routine ever again. If the Senator from Alaska feels he will not carry something in conference because it is a losing vote, then that is how it should be, but at least every Senator will be on record and their constituents will know how they stood on town meetings and the South Pole and all of these others—Louisville/Jefferson County Public Safety Communications System, et cetera. If it is agreeable with the Senator from Alaska, I will agree to a unanimous consent request to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Arizona for that suggestion. I point out to him before we proceed—and we will proceed; I will ask Senator KOHL to be prepared to offer his amendment, and following that we will offer the managers' amendment—but just this afternoon, I was notified that travel and transportation for members of the armed services was not authorized in some circumstances. One of these amendments authorizes transportation of families of the people who have been injured to Germany, or wherever they are, so they can see their loved ones. They did not have that authority. An amendment in this bill will do that.

They also do not have the money and authorization to buy, for a young person injured and coming back not on a

gurney, but needs civilian clothes, something different to wear other than a military uniform because of the injury—we have a provision in here for the purchase of civilian attire for medical evacuation of members of the Armed Forces. Those came to me at 6 o'clock. I think they are relevant to this bill, one of the six the Senator has not seen yet. There are a lot that came up.

I suggest we proceed. The managers' package concept replaces the old litany of amendments that were offered and offered and offered. I remember one time we were here 40 hours. That is what you get into when you do not have a managers' package.

Is Senator KOHL here?

Mr. DASCHLE. We can offer it on his behalf.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Chair lay before the Senate Senator KOHL's amendment?

AMENDMENT NO. 455

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 455.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], for Mr. KOHL, for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. NELSON of Florida, proposes an amendment numbered 455.

Mr. STEVENS. 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 provide humanitarian food assistance in connection with U.S. activities in Iraq)

On page 2, after line 7, insert the following:

"PUBLIC LAW 480 TITLE II GRANTS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

"For additional expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior year's costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development Act of 1954, \$600,000,000, to remain available until expended, for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad under title II of said Act: *Provided*, That of this amount, \$155,000,000 shall be used to restore funding for previously approved fiscal year 2003 programs under section 204(a)(2) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided under this heading, the Secretary of Agriculture shall transfer to the Commodity Credit Corporation such sums as are necessary to acquire, and shall acquire, a quantity of commodities for use in administering the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust in an amount equal to the quantity allocated by the Corporation pursuant to the release of March 19, 2003, and the release of March 20, 2003: *Provided further*, That the authority contained in 7 U.S.C. 1736f-1(c)(4) shall not apply during fiscal year 2003 for any release of commodities after the date of enactment of this Act."

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the consideration of Senator KOHL's amendment, the amendments that I

shall offer en bloc be considered en bloc, and adopted en bloc as a managers' package.

Mr. HARKIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STEVENS. I withdraw the request.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REID. Would the Senator renew his request?

Mr. STEVENS. I intend to renew the request. This is a unanimous consent that the amendments we have here in the managers' package be considered en bloc following the vote on or in relation to the amendment offered by Senator KOHL.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 455

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with Senator ROBERTS in offering this amendment.

I offer an amendment to provide \$600 million for our international food aid programs. The amendment is cosponsored by Senators BYRD, DASCHLE, LEAHY, HARKIN, BIDEN, MURRAY, NELSON of Florida, DORGAN, LINCOLN, DURBIN, DEWINE, BAUCUS, ROBERTS, and DAYTON.

Our amendment is necessary because of the intense pressure the food needs in Iraq have placed on our world food programs. Already, the Department of Defense has used \$269 million from our largest international food aid program—PL-480—to feed the Iraqi people. That is \$269 million from the \$1.4 billion that was appropriated last year for other world hunger needs in places like Sub-Saharan Africa and Afghanistan. As the war progresses and the reconstruction begins, the draw on our existing food aid accounts will continue.

Specifically, our amendment replenishes the \$269 million already taken from PL-480 for Iraq. It also adds \$100 million to an emergency grain reserve—the Emerson Trust—which has recently released approximately 800,000 tons of wheat to Iraq. A final \$231 million is made available for future Iraqi draws on PL-480 as that country waits for the resumption of the UN "Oil for Food" Program.

This amendment is responsible budgeting. We are asking only for the minimum dollars we need to meet an anticipated food crisis in Iraq—a crisis that is the direct result of the war. Our actions will allow us to meet this crisis efficiently without crippling our other food aid efforts.

I do not for a moment dispute the Administration's decision to tap into

PL-480 funds to meet immediate needs in Iraq. I do dispute the position that we should not replenish those funds—thus effectively defaulting on our obligations to starving people in other countries.

There is no doubt that the war has disrupted food delivery to innocent Iraqis. And everyone agrees that, as we move to liberate the Iraqi people, we have an absolute obligation to deliver humanitarian relief.

Before the war, a full 60 percent of the Iraqi population was fed through the UN-run "Oil for Food Program"—a program that turned Iraqi oil revenues into food supplies. It provided over \$3 billion worth of food a year distributed at more than 40,000 food distribution sites throughout the country. On March 17, UN Secretary General Kofi Annan suspended the Oil for Food Program. Now, over 2 weeks later, the citizens of Iraq are nearing the end of their food stocks.

We are not just guessing that a food crisis is imminent in Iraq. The UN has stated unequivocally that there is a continuing and immediate need to feed the Iraqi people as they attempt to reestablish the Oil for Food Program. Last Friday, the United Nations petitioned the world community for \$1.3 billion to meet that need. Just Saturday, the World Food Program announced that the operation in Iraq could "evolve into the largest humanitarian operation in history." The supplemental before us earmarks no funds for that effort.

The administration has decided—I believe correctly—to use our existing food aid programs to deliver this aid to Iraq. Our amendment simply asks that we replace the funds we are removing now—and will continue to remove—from that program—funds that were budgeted for starving people in Africa, Afghanistan, Indonesia, and North Korea.

Our amendment is endorsed by a coalition of international relief agencies called the "Coalition for Food Aid." Their members include the American Red Cross, CARE, Catholic Relief Services, and Save the Children. The amendment is also supported by the American Farm Bureau, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the U.S. Rice Producers Association, the USA Rice Federation, and the Wheat Export Trade Education Committee. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these letters of endorsement.

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

APRIL 3, 2003.

Hon. HERBERT KOHL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KOHL: The undersigned organizations appreciate your dedication to restore funding for food aid and we support your amendment to the FY03 Supplemental Appropriations bill.

Your amendment comes at a critical time as the United States prepares to provide necessary food aid for the people of Iraq. Providing additional funding and replenishing

funding for current food aid programs will place these programs in a better position to meet this year's food aid needs. The amendment also provides the flexibility to purchase the mix of commodities that are needed without disrupting our own domestic market.

American agriculture is prepared and dedicated to providing U.S. commodities for those in need to help alleviate hunger. We thank you for your leadership and urge adoption of your amendment.

Sincerely,

American Farm Bureau Federation, National Association of Wheat Growers, US Rice Producers Association, USA Rice Federation, and Wheat Export Trade Education Committee.

—
AGRICULTURE, MARITIME AND CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS, SUPPORTING ADDITIONAL FOOD AID FUNDING,

April 2, 2003.

Hon. HERB KOHL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR KOHL: We appreciate and support your amendment to the FY 2003 Supplemental Appropriations Bill to restore funding for food aid programs and to provide adequate additional funds for emergency needs. By appropriating \$600 million for PL 480 Title II, including funds to partially replenish the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust, this amendment will allow the US to meet commitments to many needy countries this year and to be prepared to provide adequate humanitarian food assistance in the wake of conflict in Iraq.

Because of the gap between the amount of funds available for food aid and actual food needs, the Administration has been forced to limit funding for African emergencies and to reduce ongoing food assistance in many vulnerable countries, including Angola, Bangladesh, Uganda, Malawi, Haiti, Mozambique, Ghana, Kenya, Bolivia, Guatemala, Peru and parts of Ethiopia. The amendment assures the restoration of funds for previously-approved food aid programs in FY 2003. It is critical that these funds be provided as soon as possible to replenish these programs, since it takes a few months to buy commodities and to deliver them abroad.

The amendment also provides funds to restore the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust to 2 million metric tons, one half of the authorized level. This will replenish the value of commodities that are allocated in FY 2003 for food assistance related to the conflict in Iraq. For the rest of fiscal year 2003, it would remove the authority for the Secretary of Agriculture to sell Emerson Trust commodities on the domestic market. Because additional funds are made available by this amendment for Title II and to replenish the Emerson Trust, needed commodities can be purchased directly from the market and sales of commodities held by the Trust is unnecessary.

With America's abundant agricultural resources and long-standing tradition of helping the poor, providing funding so the United States may meet its commitments to help alleviate hunger is both appropriate and necessary. We therefore thank you for your leadership and urge the acceptance of your amendment by the United States Senate.

Sincerely,

ACDI/VOCA, Africare, American Red Cross, Cal Western Packaging Corp., Adventist Development & Relief Agency International, American Maritime Congress, American Soybean Association, CARE, Catholic Relief Services, Counterpart International, Food for the Hungry International, International Food Additives Council, International Ortho-

dox Christian Charities, Jesuit Refugee Service/USA, Maersk Sealand, and Maritime Institute for Research and Industrial Development.

National Association of Wheat Growers, National Dry Bean Council, National Milk Producers Federation, OIC International, SUSTAIN, Transportation Institute, U.S. Rice Producers Association, USA Dry Pea & Lentil Council, Wheat Export Trade Education Committee, World Vision, Colorado Potato Growers Association, Didion Milling, Inc., Global Food & Nutrition Inc., International Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots, International Relief & Development, Land O'Lakes, Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, Mercy Corps, National Corn Growers Association, National Farmers Union, North American Millers' Association, Save the Children, TECO Ocean Shipping Company, U.S. Dairy Export Council, U.S. Wheat Associates; USA Rice Federation; and Wilson Logistics, Inc.

Mr. KOHL. In the last month, we have heard many voices expressing many views of what it means to be American and at war. Among those disparate voices, there are strong, common themes: our pride in our brave troops; our burning hatred for tyranny and injustice; our undying compassion for the poor and hungry of the world.

Our amendment speaks to the last of these. It states simply that, even in times of war, America will remain a compassionate leader in the world community and a passionate combatant of hunger and hopelessness throughout the world.

To reiterate, I offer this amendment because through the Department of Defense and other agencies, \$269 million from our largest international food program, Public Law 480, and the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust, have already been obligated to meet the urgent necessity to feed the Iraqi people. That \$269 million is derived from funds appropriated or made available last year for other world hunger needs in countries such as Saudi Arabia, Afghanistan, Korea, and North Korea. We need to replenish that money which has been used to feed the people in Iraq.

I also thought we needed to provide more than an additional \$200 million for the requirements that I anticipate we will be very shortly facing in Iraq with respect to feeding their people. The Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust is an emergency grain reserve which recently released approximately 800,000 tons of wheat for assistance to Iraq at a cost of \$100 million. The replenishment of the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust, restoration of Public Law 480 funds that have been diverted from areas such as Sub-Saharan Africa, and providing resources for anticipated needs in Iraq total the \$600 million I have included in this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, as U.S. and allied forces steadfastly close on Baghdad, they come closer to liberating the people of Iraq, and closer to ridding the world of a menace to global peace. Our troops are performing magnificently. The young

men and women of our armed forces have served bravely and honorably, and have made me proud.

When the bombing stops and the war is over, the world will be a safer place. But make no mistake, the American commitment in Iraq must endure for a long haul. It is incumbent upon the United States to ensure Iraq's transition to a freedom. One element critical to post-conflict reconstruction has already begun, and must continue throughout the fighting. That element is the supply of food and humanitarian relief to the people of Iraq.

The supplemental does provide some funds for humanitarian relief, but it is not enough. The Senator from Wisconsin has offered an amendment to this legislation which would provide \$600 million in funding in emergency food relief for P.L. 480, Title Two and the Emerson Humanitarian Trust. This \$600 million the amendment provides is based on close consultation with organizations who know the situation well from their humanitarian work. The Kohl amendment is vitally important to ongoing operations in Iraq. It: restores funds diverted from other emergency food assistance provided in P.L. 480 activities—including those in Africa—that have been redirected for assistance to Iraq; restores 800,000 metric tons of Emerson Trust, another humanitarian food relief program, because of previous releases this year; and allows for at least one third of food aid needs for Iraq, as identified by the World Food Program. Historically, the U.S. provides one half of emergency food aid needs.

At the time hostilities commenced in Iraq, the U.N. Oil for Food Program provided food to over 60 percent of the Iraqi people via over 40,000 feeding stations. These feeding stations were run by the regime of Saddam Hussein. Hopefully, U.S. and coalition forces can restore the program quickly. But hope alone will not feed Iraqi families left starving by a disruption in this program. The world Food Program has just announced an overall appeal of \$1.3 billion for food aid for Iraq for the next 6 months.

We must make adequate preparations right now to provide the food assistance required of us. The Kohl amendment delivers on this moral imperative by providing funds needed for the remainder of this fiscal year in the event significant Oil for Food Program revenues are not available, or is otherwise unable to function.

In another part of the globe desperately needing food assistance, the droughts in sub-Saharan Africa have caused a massive food shortage over the last several months. The toll of this famine threatens millions of Africans and could be far worse than anything we have seen previously. The terrible epidemic of HIV/AIDS, which is currently ravaging the continent, destroys the immune systems of its victims. When further weakened by malnutrition, they are unable to fight off

even the most mild illnesses thereby exacerbating the impact of the food shortage. In addition, we know there is still about \$250-\$350 million shortfall in food assistance to Africa for this fiscal year, which the Congress was unable to provide during consideration of the omnibus appropriations legislation for 2003. It is vitally important that food assistance to this region not be short-changed, forcing us to choose which mouths to feed, on which continents.

Similarly, there have been droughts in regions of Haiti. The United States currently provides food assistance to Haiti from P.L. 480, Title Two, to the tune of about \$22 million, or about 40 percent of our bilateral assistance. This assistance is so important because it is one of the few ways in which we can help the Haitian people, without providing assistance to a corrupt government. We do not provide Haiti with other forms of assistance commonly provided to other countries, like economic support funds or development assistance. This is due to the political stalemate, almost 3 years old, and the inability of President Aristide to take any meaningful and demonstrable steps to resolve the crisis and improve conditions. Therefore, the integrity of the food assistance to Haiti must be protected and preserved in its entirety. The Kohl Amendment does so.

This provision also provides initial resources that will be needed to win the peace in Iraq. It does not specifically designate the funds for Iraq, to be consistent with the way we have traditionally appropriated food assistance governed by P.L. 480 Title II funds, but I trust that these funds will be used for the purpose for which they are intended—feeding the Iraqi people without raiding important food assistance accounts for other regions, such as sub-Saharan Africa, and Haiti.

We must act now. I urge support of the Kohl Amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin mentioned Saudi Arabia; I did not know the people of Saudi Arabia were in need.

But, again, it is unrequested by the administration. I am sure it is worthwhile. There is not an amendment that has come before us that is not worthwhile, but it was not felt urgent at this time by the administration.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I don't know of anyone on our side who asked for time on the amendment. I believe the Senator has explained it. I ask unanimous consent that when we start consideration of this vote, there be no further amendments in order, and that immediately following the vote on the managers' package, we go to third reading of this bill, and we have a procedure arranged so that we would hold this bill at the desk until the House bill arrived and it would automatically be married to the House bill and sent to conference as soon as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object, I will be very brief. I am very reluctant to do this because the chairman has been very gracious to me.

Senator COLLINS and I had worked throughout the day on a bipartisan amendment. We would like a few minutes. It has been heard by the committees of jurisdiction, and we would like a few minutes to work with the chairman because if we are going to spend billions, we certainly ought to make sure there is a repetitiveness in the contracting. The Senator from Maine, the Chair of the Governmental Affairs Committee, has done exceptional work in this area. If we could work with the chairman, I think in a few minutes we could work this out.

I am very reluctant to make this reservation.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Senator's amendment would change the procedure for every Department or Agency in the Federal Government in terms of the concept of what must be published in the Federal Register. It also has an exception for withholding publication of any document that is classified.

But in the period of time we are in right now, I don't have time to research this in terms of what does this do to the Department of Defense, what does it do to the CIA, what does it do to the FBI, what does it do to every other organization of the country. I have tried to clear this. There is a great deal of what has been eliminated, but I, too, am a member of this Governmental Affairs Committee, and I could not ever remember taking it up in the Governmental Affairs Committee. I understand what it is, but I don't understand its impact on the agencies I am supposed to protect in terms of the Department of Defense.

I cannot in good faith accept that.

I renew my request that following the vote on the managers' package, no further votes be in order and we proceed immediately to third reading under the proceedings as outlined, which will be outlined in fuller detail at that time, but it will mean that will be the last vote of the day and we will not vote past taking the bill to third reading.

The Kohl amendment comes first. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, the first amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska when we started yesterday, that is going to be withdrawn; is my understanding correct?

Mr. STEVENS. We will have a dialog here about the debt ceiling amendment, and I have given my word to the Senator from West Virginia that we would withdraw the amendment. I want to have that dialog. That can take place after the vote. I assured everyone that will be handled in a proper way. I have been asked to make a

record of why we did not proceed with the debt ceiling amendment, and I would like to do it at that time.

I renew my request.

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

Mr. STEVENS. The parliamentary situation is: We will vote on the Kohl amendment, we will vote then on the managers' package, and then the bill will go to third reading under the outline we provided at that time, and there be no further votes or amendments in order to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are four amendments pending which must be disposed of prior to third reading.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 440, 500, AND 504, WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. I would say there are amendments at the desk that have been modified or agreed to and put into the managers' package. So I ask that those be withdrawn. I believe all the Members involved know what has been done on those amendments. I ask that they be withdrawn and—there are four of them.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I will withdraw the other amendment when we have the dialog after the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALENT). Without objection, it is so ordered. The three amendments are withdrawn.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Kohl amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 455. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FRIST. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), would vote "Aye."

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Leg.]

YEAS—67

Akaka	Carper	Dole
Baucus	Clinton	Dorgan
Bayh	Cochran	Durbin
Bennett	Coleman	Edwards
Biden	Collins	Feingold
Bingaman	Conrad	Feinstein
Boxer	Cornyn	Fitzgerald
Breaux	Corzine	Graham (FL)
Brownback	Daschle	Grassley
Burns	Dayton	Hagel
Campbell	DeWine	Harkin
Cantwell	Dodd	Hatch

Hollings	Lugar	Rockefeller
Hutchison	Mikulski	Sarbanes
Jeffords	Miller	Schumer
Johnson	Murkowski	Snowe
Kennedy	Murray	Specter
Kohl	Nelson (FL)	Stabenow
Landrieu	Nelson (NE)	Talent
Lautenberg	Pryor	Warner
Leahy	Reed	Wyden
Levin	Reid	
Lincoln	Roberts	

NAYS—26

Alexander	Enzi	Santorum
Allard	Frist	Sessions
Allen	Graham (SC)	Shelby
Bond	Gregg	Smith
Chafee	Inhofe	Stevens
Chambliss	Kyl	Sununu
Craig	Lott	Thomas
Crapo	McCain	Voinovich
Ensign	Nickles	

NOT VOTING—7

Bunning	Inouye	McConnell
Byrd	Kerry	
Domenici	Lieberman	

The amendment (No. 455) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. Senator, let me thank all Members for their patience and consideration in expediting the bill. It is imperative that we complete this bill, get it to conference, and then get the bill on the President's desk. This next vote will be the last vote of the week. The Senate will not be in session on Friday. We will resume business on Monday with a vote occurring at 5 p.m. on a judicial nomination.

Next week we hope to take up and complete the CARE Act, the FISA bill, POW resolution, other nominations, as well as conference reports that become available.

I thank everyone for their attention and appreciate the hard work over the course of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators JEFFORDS and KENNEDY be added as cosponsors of amendment No. 459.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 522

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, a series of amendments. I ask that these amendments be considered en bloc and they be adopted en bloc by one rollcall vote.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I withdraw that. Is it possible we might have a voice vote? I will be happy to have a voice vote.

I renew the request that the managers' package at the desk be considered en bloc and adopted en bloc. Does the Senator want a rollcall vote? Without a rollcall vote.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I call the attention of the clerk to the fact that there are several original amendments in that package, and they will be properly handled.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask what that means?

Mr. STEVENS. It just means they were not numbered. We took out some amendments and put a new one in its place, but we did not make it a substitute for the amendment that is in place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS] proposes an amendment numbered 522.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an amendment I have offered to provide funding for the All Hazards Emergency Warning Network. If we are truly going to improve homeland defense, we must prepare Americans to respond in time of attack. And the first step towards that goal is updating our emergency warning system. We must ensure that warnings reach all Americans at risk as quickly as possible.

In the event of a terrorist attack or natural disaster, Americans must know how to respond. Unfortunately, for everything that has happened since September 11, if an attack happened again, many of us still would not know what to do. Today, our emergency alert system depends heavily on television and radio, and doesn't reach millions of Americans who aren't near a TV and radio at a given moment. In addition, the system doesn't provide all the information we need. Right now, the All Hazards Warning Network cannot effectively broadcast information about all types of emergencies, particularly terrorist attacks. That must change. We need to ensure that NOAA has the funds it needs to begin incorporating new warnings and new technologies within the national weather radio immediately.

I have proposed providing NOAA with \$10 million right now for incorporating additional technologies for disseminating terrorism warnings within the All Hazards Warning Network. There are a lot of ways that NOAA weather radio could be broadcast using existing technology. For example, cell phones could receive emergency warnings for users in a certain area even if those folks are just passing through. Pagers and beepers can achieve the same result. Televisions can be programmed to come on automatically and provide alerts in the event of a disaster. We need to encourage the development and implementation of these new technologies.

Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, NOAA needs to have full communication with emergency managers at the local level—the men and women who will be on the front lines of any emergency. The All Hazards Warn-

ing Network needs to allow emergency managers to transmit warnings about all types of disasters, including terrorism, to citizens in their area without the delays currently in place.

This is an idea I have been working on for some time. This first bill I introduced this session, together with Mr. HOLLINGS, would require the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Commerce to make sure that comprehensive, easily understood emergency warnings get to every American at risk. Today's amendment will go a long way towards reaching that goal.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am proud to offer an amendment with Senator CRAIG and five other Senators that will repeal a rider that was inserted without a vote, without debate, and without discussion into the Omnibus Appropriations Conference Report.

After the Conference Committee met and behind closed doors, this special interest rider gutted the organic standards just recently enacted by U.S. Department of Agriculture. This special interest provision was inserted into the bill on behalf of a single producer who essentially wants to hijack the "organic" certification label for his own purposes, to get a market premium for his products, without actually being an organic product.

The antiorganic rider allows producers to label their meat and dairy products "organic" even though they do not meet the strict criteria set forth by USDA, including the requirement that the animals be fed organically grown feed. This approach was considered and outright rejected by USDA last June. The entire organic industry opposed this weakening of the organic standards.

If beef, poultry, pork and dairy producers are able to label their products as "organic" without using organic feed, which is one of the primary inputs, then what exactly is organic about the product?

Opposition to this rider has been broad, deep, and extremely bipartisan. I have spoken to Secretary Veneman, who has come out publicly in opposition to the antiorganic rider. In the last month, a total of 68 Senators have joined me by cosponsoring a bill to repeal this rider.

This antiorganic rider is particularly galling because so many producers have already made the commitment to organic production. For most, this is a huge financial commitment on their part.

Now the rider has created a legal limbo for farmers. No one knows what the legal requirements for organic animal products are anymore.

I have heard from large producers—General Mills, Tyson Foods—as well as scores of farmers from Vermont and around the country who are enraged by this special loophole included for one company that does not want to play by the rules.

Our amendment simply strikes this antiorganic rider from the Omnibus

Appropriations Act, restoring the strong organic standards created by USDA. We need to send a message to all producers that if you want to benefit from the organic standards economically, you must actually meet them.

When I included the Organic Foods Production Act in the 1990 farm bill, it was because farmers recognized the growing consumer demand for organically produced products, but needed a tool to help consumers know which products were truly organic and which were not.

The act directed USDA to set minimum national standards for products labeled "organic" so that consumers could make informed buying decisions. The national standard also reassured farmers selling organically produced products that they would not have to follow separate rules in each State, and that their products could be labeled "organic" overseas.

The new standards have been enthusiastically welcomed by consumers, because through organic labeling they now can know what they are choosing and paying for when they shop. The antiorganic rider, however, has undermined public confidence in organic labeling, which is less than a year old.

This was not the first attempt to weaken the organic standards. Getting the organic standards that are behind the "USDA Organic" label right was a long and difficult process, but critically important to the future of the industry. During the rule-making process, some tried to allow products treated with sewer sludge, irradiation, and antibiotics to be labeled "organic."

The public outcry against this was overwhelming. More than 325,000 people weighed in during the comment period, as did I. The groundswell of support for strong standards clearly showed that the public wants "organic" to really mean something. Those efforts to hijack the term were defeated and this one should be, too.

Consumers and producers rely on the standard. I hope more members will support my amendment and send a message to special interests that they cannot hijack the organic industry through a rider on the spending bill.

We need to fix this mistake and restore integrity to our organic standards.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the amendment I offer today would restore fiscal year 2003 funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, SCAAP, to the level of funding Congress provided in fiscal year 2002.

Specifically, my amendment would provide an additional \$315 million in supplemental funding to the SCAAP program, to bring the total fiscal year 2003 appropriations to the same amount that was appropriated in fiscal year 2002—\$565 million.

Most of my colleagues have had to deal with the question of illegal immi-

gration. Just the sheer number of illegal immigrants in our country—estimates range from 9 to 11 million—suggests that Federal strategies to curb illegal immigration have failed.

While only a relatively small percentage of the illegal immigrant population have committed crimes, nonetheless, even that small percentage represents a significant burden on State and local governments, which are forced to apprehend, prosecute, and incarcerate those who prey on our communities.

Today most States are encountering their largest deficits in more than 60 years. Indeed, the fiscal consequences of illegal immigration have contributed to this challenge. In fiscal year 2002, for instance, States and counties incurred more than \$13 billion in incarceration expenses. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to help shoulder the burden that its failures have created. The Federal Government alleviated some of that burden by providing \$565 million to the States in fiscal year 2002.

Increasingly, States and local counties are relying on SCAAP funding to help supplement their homeland security activities.

Clearly, our local governments would spend the \$13 billion they have spent incarcerating criminal aliens on other fiscal priorities, such as homeland security.

The amendment I offer today would not only provide a more equitable level of funding to help reimburse States for the costs they incur for incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens, it would also help free up funds that State and local governments may need for their first responder activities.

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

At a time when cash-strapped State and local governments are being asked to do even more to protect our homeland, we cannot afford to eliminate vital funding that already falls far short of what local governments spend to incarcerate undocumented criminal aliens.

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

Counties and sheriffs offices across the country, and not just those along the border, are very concerned because of the severe cuts in funding this year. I have received letters from county executives and sheriffs from Virginia, Wisconsin, New York, and other States who are facing critical cuts in their law enforcement budgets because of the anticipated shortfall in SCAAP fund-

ing. Those amounts will be cut drastically.

I ask unanimous consent that I may submit for the record, a chart comparing the amount of SCAAP money States received in fiscal year 2002 to the amount they will receive with the fiscal year 2003 SCAAP allocation of \$250 million.

Our Nation is facing one of the most challenging periods in our Nation's history. And, we want, to the best extent possible, our constituents to feel secure in their homes and in their communities.

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

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

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, my amendment will increase funding by \$295 million to help meet the humanitarian and other needs that are already obvious in Iraq and that are likely to mushroom in the weeks and months ahead.

To achieve victory in Iraq, we must not only win the war, but win the peace as well. And we know that in order to do this, we will have to deal effectively from the start with all the serious problems we'll face in meeting humanitarian needs, establishing law and order, and beginning the reconstruction process there.

For the next six months, to cover the additional costs that are likely to arise in the current fiscal year, the administration has requested \$2.4 billion for humanitarian assistance and reconstruction. It's an essential down payment, and I commend the administration for including this provision.

Many of us on both of the aisle feel that we need to send a strong signal of our willingness to work with the UN in post-war Iraq, and put the recent harsh divisions that erupted in the Security Council behind us.

President Bush said that that if military force is required to disarm Iraq, the United States would "quickly seek new Security Council resolutions to encourage broad participation in the process of helping the Iraqi people to build a free Iraq." He also said that to achieve the goal of a unified Iraq with democratic institutions, we will be "working closely with the international community, including the United Nations and our coalition partners."

Lately, however, we read stories of a tug of war between the State Department and DoD over who will be in charge of the post-war effort and how. Secretary Powell has said that the UN has "a role to play in many different

ways" and that its involvement is needed to provide "international legitimacy" to the post-war efforts.

As our key ally, Prime Minister Tony Blair of Great Britain said yesterday the post-war effort "should not, in the end, be run by the Americans, should not be run by the British, should not be run by any outside force. Iraq should be run, for the first time in decades, by the Iraqi people."

These are strong statements of the importance of cooperation among our friends and allies in the major challenges facing the region and the world in the aftermath of this war.

They also make good sense. The UN will be essential in assessing, coordinating and delivering humanitarian aid, and in defusing any rage in the region over a so-called U.S. occupation.

With the resumption of the UN's Oil for Food program last week, resources will start to become available to meet the food needs of the Iraqi people. However, we still have to meet other needs, such as sanitation, health, shelter, the removal of landmines, and local emergency repairs to help civilians resume their daily lives as soon as possible. My amendment provides an additional \$225 million to meet these priorities and to prevent illness, disease, and death among the survivors of the war.

It also provides an additional \$45 million for law enforcement. The rule of law—the sense of public security and safety—is something that we often take for granted. As we learned in Kosovo, and again in Afghanistan, law and order are the indispensable cornerstones for building a functioning society. Without it, everything else takes longer, and costs more. Experts may doubt that Iraq will erupt into major civil conflicts, but most of them do expect local violence, revenge killing, and power struggles if there is no clear transitional force and stable government.

The bill before us contains funds for a civilian police force, but a full judicial team has not been included. This was a significant problem in Kosovo, and it can be avoided in Iraq by paying adequate attention to revising laws so that the effort to bring criminals to justice is not undermined. The immediate presence of a judicial team will assist in expediting this process and begin to establish adequate rules on arrests, detention, trials, and other aspects of a new legal system.

Fair treatment of the people of Iraq in the immediate weeks and months after the war will obviously help to smooth the way to peace and encourage other nations to join in meeting this responsibility.

The final provision of this amendment addresses a separate ongoing need. The Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund is our global fund for unforeseen refugee and migration emergencies. This program has been funded at \$50 million, but its needs continue to outpace the available resources. The United Nations ref-

ugee agency recently appealed to us for \$29 million to assist the refugee emergency in the Ivory Coast and another \$29 million to finance the repatriation of Angolans.

The underlying bill provides an additional \$75 million, but in the next six months, new demands for these emergency funds are likely for Afghanistan, Sudan, and the Congo. It makes sense to provide the funds now that we already know we will need for this account. With emergency relief, it is not a question of if but when. The amendment will add \$25 million to be sure that we have sufficient monies to respond to emergencies on the horizon. As we focus on the humanitarian needs in Iraq, we cannot ignore the refugee crises in Africa and other regions of the world.

We know that the whole world is watching what we do. Reports of massive anger in the Middle East and in other countries should be very troubling to us all. We need to get the Iraq reconstruction effort right the first time. Its importance cannot be underestimated, and we can't afford to leave it underfunded.

These additional funds are a start, a downpayment on the longer effort. This bill may well not be enough even for the very short term of the next six months. Far more will be needed to meet our responsibilities, and to win the peace. We ought to be planning and preparing to meet these responsibilities now.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I thank all Members for their patience and courtesy. And as the leader said, this is the last vote. We will handle the problem of moving this matter to third reading after this vote. There will be no further votes tonight. Have we adopted the managers' amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 522.

The amendment (No. 522) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 435, WITHDRAWN

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, according to the Treasury Department, the statutory limit on the national debt needs to be raised. The amendment I offered yesterday would have increased the debt limit so as to avoid the risk of a default. I understand the concerns that have been raised about this amendment by the other side, and I am willing to withdraw the amendment if the majority can be assured that the Senate will pass a free-standing bill to increase the debt limit with the cooperation of the minority and without unnecessary delay, and there will be no necessity to file cloture to bring this bill to a vote. I know the distinguished Democratic whip has discussed this with the Democratic leader and others, and I would ask if he

is able to give those assurances at this time.

Mr. REID. I would say to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that he is correct: I have discussed this matter with the Democratic leader and others, and we fully understand the importance of ensuring that the borrowing authority of the Treasury is not impeded, and we appreciate the interest of the Senator from Alaska making certain that the full faith and credit of the United States is never called into question. While we on this side cannot commit to supporting a bill we have not seen, we do assure the Senator from Alaska that when a freestanding bill to increase the debt limit in the usual form is brought to the floor, we will work with him to see to it that the bill is passed in a timely and orderly way, without any unnecessary delay. The Senator has our commitment on that.

Mr. STEVENS. I appreciate the cooperation of the Democratic whip, and given his assurances, I withdraw my amendment dealing with the debt ceiling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendment No. 435 is withdrawn.

ATAP

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to address Senator MCCONNELL, the chairman of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee, about the Antiterrorism Training Assistance Program, or ATAP.

I note that the supplemental appropriations bill includes \$52 million for the State Department to establish the Center for Antiterrorism and Security Training (CAST) in Maryland. These funds were deferred from the Consolidated appropriations Resolution for Fiscal Year 2003 with the understanding that they would be included in an appropriate vehicle, which is this bill. CAST will be a central training academy for the State Department.

It will be a while before the new center is operational, which makes it difficult for me to understand the actions of the State Department to eliminate and scale back existing antiterrorism training programs that have been successfully carried out by Louisiana State University (LSU) and the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology (New Mexico Tech) for the past several years. In fact, LSU has been carrying out this training for the State Department for over a decade. New Mexico Tech has partnered with LSU since January 2000.

The State Department has relocated the Hostage Negotiations Program from New Mexico Tech to LSU, and it has advised New Mexico Tech that it will relocate the Rural Border Operations Course to a facility on a military base in Albuquerque.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I join my colleague from New Mexico in questioning the State Department's actions on the ATAP training programs. Both

universities and the surrounding communities have made substantial investments in facilities, curriculum, and even diplomacy in welcoming foreign law enforcement officers to their communities and providing them with training courses to help them combat terrorist and other criminal activity. Yet it appears the State Department will pull all ATAP training out of New Mexico Tech by this June. I can only guess that the State Department has similar intentions for LSU in my State.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. Chairman, this makes no sense to me as this Nation continues to fight the war on terrorism and is now engaged in a war against Iraq. The antiterrorism training programs are more critical than ever, and they should continue to be carried out at LSU and New Mexico Tech, which have run successful programs for the Department of State for years.

Mr. Chairman, would you agree with me that it is premature to withdraw current antiterrorism training assistance courses out of LSU and New Mexico Tech during these troubled times?

Mr. McCONNELL. I would agree with the Senator from New Mexico that this seems to be an unusual time for the State Department to take such actions. The Foreign Operations Subcommittee has provided significant increases for the ATAP Program through the regular appropriations bill and the supplemental appropriations bill last year, and the President proposes another \$106 million for this program, an increase of nearly \$42 million above the current level.

I believe these programs with law enforcement personnel from other nations are more important than ever, and there is a significant benefit to the State Department in using the facilities at LSU and New Mexico Tech to continue these training programs. I would concur that the Department should continue to carry out these courses at these two universities.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Chairman for his direction on this matter.

Mr. LEAHY. I can understand the concerns of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from New Mexico. I join the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee in his view that the State Department should continue to carry out ATAP courses at Louisiana State University and the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for their interest in, and assistance on, this most important issue.

SURPLUS FOOD AID TO IRAQ

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago Ambassador Wendy Chamberlain of the U.S. Agency for International Development testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that there is as little as a 1-month supply of food available to Iraqi citizens. I am told that the administration has had informal discussions with the Appropriations Committee on how they plan

to spend the \$2.4 billion in the supplemental for the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund.

After hearing about these consultations with the administration, I am very concerned to learn that there is virtually no new money in this bill for food aid. Rather, the money that is being requested will be used primarily to reimburse funds that were already borrowed from other fiscal year 2003 foreign operation accounts to pay for food aid or to pay for logistics and distribution. The good news is that the Senate may be working to increase the amount of food aid in this bill and the House version of the supplemental appropriates funds for food aid.

With this food aid, we have a chance to help not only the Iraqi people, but also America's farmers. Many of America's farmers are experiencing a surplus of commodities that could provide valuable nutrition to the Iraqi people while alleviating potential crop losses for our Nation's farmers. Our high quality food products such as rice, beans, raisings, dates, dried fruit and other relatively nonperishable items are familiar foods in that region of the world and would be appropriate for inclusion in our relief supplies.

I am wondering if the chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee could tell me if this additional food aid funding can be used to purchase surplus agricultural commodities, which would both help feed the Iraqi people and benefit American farmers?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, that use is entirely permitted. I agree that we should do all that we can to help the Iraqi people and our farmers at the same time.

Mr. KOHL. I think that this is an excellent suggestion, and I would support the use of a portion of these funds to purchase surplus U.S. commodities that are appropriate to meet the dietary needs of the affected populations and that are currently authorized for inclusion under these programs.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my colleagues.
 • Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, we are currently engaged in a war with Iraq. I strongly believe that our military must have every resource at its disposal to fully prosecute and win this war. I support the Senate fiscal year 2003 supplemental appropriations bill because it provides funding for the military functions of the Department of Defense as it prosecutes the war in Iraq. The bill also includes funding for the reconstruction efforts in Iraq and funding to continue our anti-terrorism efforts. However, I am disappointed that the bill does not provide adequate funding to protect our homeland.

The bill provides more than \$62 billion to prosecute the military operations in Iraq, including replenishing munitions that have been expended and maintaining air, ground and sea operations critical to our war effort. It also provides more than \$7.8 billion to support the reconstruction of health serv-

ices, sanitation, transportation and telecommunications for the people of Iraq.

I also support the additional funds included in this bill to increase airline security. The bill provides \$1 billion to reimburse airline security costs, \$100 million to assist airlines in upgrading cockpit doors, and \$375 million for airline operating and capital costs. I believe that this funding will help maintain the flying safety of the American public.

I am grateful to both Chairman STEVENS and Ranking Member BYRD for providing \$150 million to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services to veterans of the Iraq war. I worked with Senator GRAHAM on an amendment to help pay for the health care of returning service members who are released from the military. We are not meeting our promises to our veterans. The VA has consistently received inadequate resources to meet rising medical costs and a growing demand for its health services. This funding crisis has forced the VA health system to resort to short-term fixes, such as discontinuing outreach activities in an effort to reduce enrollment and instituting new regulations that require the rationing of health care. This veteran's health care crisis has been exacerbated with the recent announcement that the VA would provide free medical services to all veterans of the Iraq war for 2 years. The additional funding included in the supplemental is crucial to insure that current veterans do not receive a further reduction in health benefits.

While this legislation contains an acceptable level of funding to help prosecute the war with Iraq, I am deeply concerned that this legislation does not meet our Nation's homeland security needs. Vulnerabilities exist in our homeland security infrastructure, and we should not squander a single day addressing them. An independent task force, chaired by former Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman, recently advised that "America remains dangerously unprepared to prevent and respond to a catastrophic attack on U.S. soil." We must act to ensure that the Federal and State agencies needed to better protect our borders, coasts, cities, and towns have sufficient resources to do so.

The bill includes approximately \$4.6 billion for increased border and maritime security to assist State and local governments in protecting our cities and our critical infrastructure from terrorism. But I believe that more should have been done to protect our homeland from the risk of terrorism. That is why, I supported an amendment offered by Senator SCHUMER which would have provided \$3 million in additional funding for first responders and \$1 billion for security in high-threat areas.

Last year I was very involved in the development of the new port security law, which included new rigorous security requirements for our ports. Given

the vulnerabilities that we know exist in our port security, I am deeply disappointed that the Senate has thus far provided insufficient funding to address these problems. I strongly supported a Hollings amendment that would have provided \$1 billion for port security and to screen vessels for radioactive materials.

I also support an amendment offered by Senator BOXER that would provide \$30 million to the Department of Homeland Security for research, development and initial deployment of technology to protect commercial aircraft from the threat posed by stinger missiles.

While I missed the votes on these amendments, I was recorded in support of each in the RECORD.

We must continue to fight both the war with Iraq and the war against terrorism and funding for these programs is a necessary component of that fight. •

Mr. LEVIN. I am pleased that this supplemental appropriations bill contains language proposed by Senator STABENOW and myself that will increase security inspections of trucks hauling municipal solid waste into Michigan from Canada. At a time when we are increasing security measures at all levels to protect our citizens, it doesn't make sense to allow 130 to 140 truckloads of waste cross into Michigan every day from Canada without inspection.

On January 1, 2003, the city of Toronto began shipping all of its municipal solid waste 1.1 million tons—to Michigan's landfills. As a result, thousands of truckloads of waste cross the Blue Water Bridge and the Ambassador Bridge and travel through the busiest parts of Metro Detroit without inspection.

Even though Customs recently issued a memo announcing that it would increase security measures for municipal solid waste trucks, citing security concerns related to September 11, it reversed that decision on February 7, 2003, the same day that the Homeland Security national threat level was raised to level orange. Therefore, these trucks will continue to be treated as a low-risk commodity, which will allow these trucks carrying tons of municipal solid waste to cross the Michigan-Canadian border with minimal scrutiny.

Our amendment, that has been included in this bill, will ensure that these trucks are inspected before they cross the Ambassador and Blue Water Bridges. Further, the amendment provides that the Blue Water Bridge will receive radiation detection equipment by May 1, 2003.

We cannot take the chance that harmful materials will be transported into Michigan on one of these trucks. Our amendment will help to prevent that scenario by ensuring the inspection of these municipal solid waste trucks at the border.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, reluctantly, I am voting for this supple-

mental appropriations bill to provide funding for homeland defense and our military campaign in Iraq. Like it or not, the war is on and we owe it to our men and women in uniform to provide them with the resources necessary to bring the war to a rapid and successful conclusion.

We have known for more than a decade that Saddam has chemical and biological weapons, but there has been little concern that these weapons pose a direct threat to the United States. Since coming to office, this administration has raised the specter that Iraq also has been developing nuclear weapons capable of causing great harm to the United States. It has focused a great deal of America's intelligence assets on the question of Saddam's capabilities, yet the administration has not presented any evidence of an active nuclear program. In fact, one of the key pieces of evidence provided to the United Nations by the administration turned out to be a forged document. Moreover, International Atomic Energy Agency experts rejected the administration's assertion that the aluminum tubing in Iraq's possession was evidence of a nuclear program. Two months of intrusive inspections by U.N. inspectors turned up no additional evidence of new Iraqi possession or production of weapons of mass destruction. In the end, the administration has failed to demonstrate that possession of such weapons by Iraq would pose an imminent threat to the United States.

My concerns with the administration's course of action are long-standing and public. I voted against the resolution to give the President the authority to go to war because I did not believe that the threat posed by Iraq was imminent. I do not believe that the administration should have abandoned the U.N. inspection regime. Its inspectors were on the ground in Iraq and achieving concrete results in actively disarming Saddam's regime. Instead of allowing the inspection process to continue, the administration turned its back on international institutions and relationships built up over many decades and pursued a unilateralist course of action with a narrow coalition of allies.

As we all know, the military campaign in Iraq is now at a critical juncture. With countless examples of Saddam's troops using the Iraqi population as human shields, the prospect of devastating consequences looms with the impending battle for Baghdad. In recognition of this fact, Gen Richard Myers today suggested that the United States military, while consolidating its encirclement of Baghdad, might attempt to isolate Saddam Hussein and cut off his communication with the rest of Iraq without bringing the military campaign into Baghdad. I urge President Bush to use this opportunity to turn to the international community, whether it be the United Nations or the Arab League, or any other suit-

able or appropriate entity, to make one last effort to seek the removal of Saddam Hussein and his cadre of supporters. Time is fleeting, but I believe we must make this effort prior to exposing American lives, and the lives of untold numbers of innocent Iraqis, to the potential devastation of a door-to-door campaign in the streets and houses of densely populated Baghdad. Accordingly, I call on the administration to hold off for a period of 3 to 4 days on the invasion of Baghdad. During this time, the United States and its military allies could continue building their forces around Baghdad and consolidating control across the rest of Iraq. However, this critical period would provide Saddam Hussein one last opportunity to spare his people the inevitable destruction and loss of life that would result from the siege of Baghdad. Such an initiative also would demonstrate to the international community, particularly to the other nations in the region, America's continued commitment to seeking the removal of Saddam Hussein from power with the least possible loss of civilian life.

President Bush campaigned for President on a pledge that America would be humble in its relations with other countries. However, on issue after issue of critical international importance, the Bush administration has governed in a very different fashion. It rejected the Kyoto Treaty, despite years of negotiation and worldwide agreement on the dangers of global warming. It has refused to join worldwide efforts to bring into force the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, despite the critical dangers posed by the spread of nuclear weapons technology. Instead of capitalizing on a Russian desire to reach agreement on deep cuts in nuclear weapons, and ensuring that Russian nuclear materials never fell into the hands of America's enemies, the President allowed his distaste for arms control to preclude agreement on real cuts in nuclear weapons. In its place we got the charade called the Moscow Treaty, a treaty that fails to remove even one nuclear warhead from either country's arsenal.

A decade ago, the United States went to war with the United Nations' blessing, a united NATO, and a broad, diverse coalition of nations by its side. Today, the United States is at war without U.N. support, in the face of direct opposition by longtime NATO allies, and with only a smattering of other major nations aligned with it. A decade ago, America's gulf war allies joined in the military action and funded the bulk of the war effort. Today, the administration has been forced to open the vault, offering untold tens of billions of dollars to enlist the support of allies that traditionally have stood by our side. And I am afraid the American people will be left picking up the tab for both the military operation and the rebuilding of Iraq.

I urge the President to take this opportunity to avert more bloodshed and

to involve the international community in the Iraqi end-game and the critically important job of rebuilding the political and economic infrastructure of Iraq.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to support this important bill that will provide \$60 billion for our troops in Iraq. I am especially proud of the Nevada sons and daughters who have been deployed to the Middle East as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom. As many of you know, Nevada has the finest military aviation training facilities in the world.

Nellis Air Force Base and Fallon Naval Air Station train the aviators serving on the front lines of this battle. Hundreds from Nellis—pilots and other mission critical personnel—are right now serving on the front lines. Hundreds trained at Fallon are there too. When you see those Navy fighters taking off from carriers in the Gulf, chances are they were trained at Fallon.

Nevada's Guard and Reserve troops are also playing a significant role. Nevada's percentage of Guard and Reserve call-ups and deployments has been one of the highest in the Nation. I understand why so many Nevadans have been called up. They are talented. They are heroes. When this action started, I promised to do everything in my power to ensure that Congress fully funds and supports the needs of our troops as this conflict proceeds. This bill provides more than \$60 billion to make good on the commitment that my colleagues and I made to support our troops.

I am also encouraged by the efforts the administration made to provide additional funds for protecting our front-line defenders here at home—the emergency responders we depend on to respond to a terrorist attack. I believe we could have done more to give cities and counties in each of our states the resources they need to ensure our homeland is as secure as it can be. I am pleased that we were able to add an additional \$150 million for securing nuclear materials at home and abroad. This amendment will provide additional resources to keep terrorists from getting the ingredients they need to make a dirty bomb. I want to thank my colleagues for completing this bill in a timely manner to help our troops as they help bring freedom to the people of Iraq.

Mr. STEVENS. Do we have the yeas and nays on final passage? I am too tired. We are going to third reading. We are finished. I am going to do that right now. We are done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the passage of S. 762, the bill be held at the desk; provided further that when the Senate receives the House companion bill to S. 762, the Senate proceed to its consideration, all after the enacting clause be stricken, the text of S. 762, as amended, be inserted in lieu thereof; provided further the bill then be read for a third time and passed, the motion to recon-

sider be laid upon the table, the Senate then insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate; finally, I ask unanimous consent that passage of S. 762 be vitiated and it be placed back on the calendar at that time and that the conferees be the entire Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Parliamentary inquiry: There is no further business to be had on that bill; right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. Good night, ladies and gentlemen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FRIST. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that if present and voting the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) would vote "yes".

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) would each vote "aye".

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Akaka	Corzine	Hutchison
Alexander	Craig	Inhofe
Allard	Crapo	Jeffords
Allen	Daschle	Johnson
Baucus	Dayton	Kennedy
Bayh	DeWine	Kohl
Bennett	Dodd	Kyl
Biden	Dole	Landrieu
Bingaman	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Bond	Durbin	Leahy
Boxer	Edwards	Levin
Breaux	Ensign	Lincoln
Brownback	Enzi	Lott
Burns	Feingold	Lugar
Campbell	Feinstein	McCain
Cantwell	Fitzgerald	Mikulski
Carper	Frist	Miller
Chafee	Graham (FL)	Murkowski
Chambliss	Graham (SC)	Murray
Clinton	Grassley	Nelson (FL)
Cochran	Gregg	Nelson (NE)
Coleman	Hagel	Nickles
Collins	Harkin	Pryor
Conrad	Hatch	Reed
Cornyn	Hollings	Reid

Roberts	Shelby	Sununu
Rockefeller	Smith (OR)	Talent
Santorum	Snowe	Thomas
Sarbanes	Specter	Voinovich
Schumer	Stabenow	Warner
Sessions	Stevens	Wyden

NOT VOTING—7

Bunning	Inouye	McConnell
Byrd	Kerry	
Domenici	Lieberman	

The bill (S. 762), as amended, was passed.

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

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I announce for Senator BYRD that at the time of final passage, he was necessarily absent, but if Senator BYRD had been here, he would have voted aye.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order for the chairman and ranking member, with the concurrence of both leaders, to be permitted to make technical and conforming changes as necessary to the supplemental appropriations bill. The bill was put together pretty quickly, and we want to do it carefully. We have cleared this with both leaders and with both sides of the aisle.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

COMPETITIVE BIDDING ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, of course, the debate throughout the day has been about the wise use of taxpayers' money. Yesterday in the Wall Street Journal, there was an article entitled "USAID Defends Secret Bids to Rebuild Iraq." At the same time, there was an article in the Washington Post entitled "Contracts to Rebuild Iraq Go to Chosen Few." "No Bidding War on Contracts in Iraq."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 2, 2003]

THE ASSAULT ON IRAQ—USAID DEFENDS SECRET BIDS TO REBUILD IRAQ
NATIONAL SECURITY IS CITED AS REASON FEW FIRMS KNEW OF \$1.7 BILLION IN CONTRACTS

(By Neil King Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—Amid worries that preparations aren't moving as fast as hoped, a top procurement official defended the government's decision to approach only a handful