

In 1954, four members of a Puerto Rican nationalist group entered the House gallery and fired more than 16 shots with .38 caliber pistols at the 243 Members who were then on the floor. Five Congress Members were injured.

In response to each of these attacks, the Capitol Police Department strengthened its training procedures, and strengthened its ability to prevent and respond to such attacks.

The fact that schoolchildren and other visitors can sit in the galleries today and watch their Government in action is a powerful symbol of America's commitment to democracy, and a testimony to the skill and courage of the Capitol Police.

Given the risks, it seems almost miraculous that the department did not lose a single member in the line of duty until 1984, when Sergeant Christopher Eney was killed in a training exercise.

And we all remember the terrible Friday afternoon, July 24, 1998, when Officer JJ Chestnut and Detective John Gibson were killed preventing a severely mentally ill man with a gun from entering the Capitol and killing others. We still honor and miss them today.

Their deaths brought into sharp relief how difficult it is to protect "the People's House" and keep it open to the people at the same time. It is a complex balancing act that few other police departments in the world even attempt, and none performs better.

On September 11 and during the anthrax attacks, the Capitol Police reacted with great courage and professionalism under circumstances few people could have imagined even a few years ago.

Since then, the department has undergone an intensive process to be able to prevent, and respond to, the new threats posed by global terrorism.

Capitol Police officers continue to work long days and long weeks in order to respond to the need for increased vigilance. It is not unusual to see an officer guarding a door to the Capitol when we arrive in the morning—and see that same officer, still on duty, when we leave at night.

Without them, we could not do our jobs. And this Capitol could not keep its doors open to the more than 1 million people who visit it each year from across this Nation and the world.

Over the years, many fine men and women have served on the Capitol Police Force—including my dear friend, the assistant minority leader, HARRY REID.

As they prepare to celebrate 175 years of proud service to our Nation, we thank them all for their devotion to duty, their great skill and professionalism, and for their unyielding courage and sacrifice.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE ECONOMY

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the depleted condition of our national economy and what we ought to do.

It is timely to point out that next week this Chamber, the U.S. Senate, will consider legislation raising the debt limit; that is, the limit set by law under which the Federal Government can borrow money that is a debt obligation of the United States. That debt limit is approximately \$6.3 trillion. Next week, we will consider the House bill which has been sent to us to raise that by the largest amount ever in the history of the Union, almost \$1 trillion. Specifically, \$984 billion will be the vote that we will cast next week to raise the debt limit.

The Federal Government has to pay its obligations. So by law we have to raise the debt limit so that the Federal Government can pay its obligations. But it is illustrative of the fact that the national debt is growing larger and larger, and we are adopting fiscal policies that add to that national debt each year by increasing the deficit financing that we engage in by the budgets we adopt and then all of the legislation with which we implement those budgets—the tax cuts, the spending bills, financing the war, all of those necessary expenditures. But a fiscal policy has been advocated by the White House, one of dropping off over the next 10 years tax revenues by some \$720 billion. And what is likely to pass the Senate is the commitments that were made several weeks ago that that level will be in the range of \$350 billion over 10 years instead of the level passed by or to be passed by the House of Representatives in the range of about \$550 billion over 10 years.

Is any elected official not for tax cuts? Of course, we are. But that is not the decision with which we are confronted. What we are confronted with is, what do we do to better stabilize a sick economy and to get our economy moving again? Almost unanimously, the economists—I say almost unanimously because it is probably a ratio of 9 to 1 among the economists, including statements issued yesterday by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan—are basically saying: Watch out. If you deficit finance, long-term interest rates are going to go up. It is going to depress the economy coming out of this near recession. It is going to be difficult for us to get the economy moving again.

That is particularly true of the financial condition in which we find ourselves now. In the first 6 months of this fiscal year, the Government has had to go out and deficit spend to the tune of \$250 billion. Annualized, that means we

will deficit finance, if that trend holds up, a half a trillion dollars.

What does deficit financing mean? That means we are going to adopt budgetary policies of spending and tax revenues by which we are going to spend a half a trillion dollars, \$500 billion, more than we have coming in in tax revenue. And you wonder why the stock market is languishing so much. The stock market is a reflection of the American people's confidence in the future of the economy and economic activity. So is it any wonder the stock market just keeps kind of languishing along? Do people have the confidence we are going to come out of these economic doldrums and get the economy moving again? I think you see how they are voting with their pocketbooks on the stock market. The people do not have that confidence. Why should they if, in this year, we are going to spend a half trillion dollars more than we have coming in in tax revenue?

This leads me, then, to next week. Next week, in addition to taking up the debt ceiling bill of raising the debt almost a trillion dollars more so we can pay our bills, we are also going to take up the tax bill. The tax bill, as presented to this body, is at least going to be \$350 billion. There are many in this body who would like that tax bill to be even more over a 10-year period.

To me, it is not wise fiscal policy if that causes our deficit financing to go up continually, just like we are seeing in this present fiscal year. If that debt keeps getting added to the national debt, then it won't be too long—another couple years—and we will be right back here asking to raise the debt limit from about \$7.3 trillion—another trillion dollars—up to about \$8.5 trillion. That is not sound fiscal policy.

That is not going to bring us back on the road to economic recovery. What we can do is balance interests. We can have some tax cuts that will get the economy moving again, that will provide economic growth, that will provide jobs so we get more dollars into the economy and circulating to offset the sickly economy, offset the lack of economic activity, some of which has been brought on by September 11 but some of which has also been brought on by an economic policy that is embracing deficit financing.

I will never forget over two decades ago when I was in the House of Representatives. One of the most prolific writers and great speakers who had articulated balanced budgets suddenly changed his tune and started speaking the message that we will not worship at the shrine of balanced budgets anymore. Well, in the early 1980s, that kind of worship didn't work. The fiscal policies adopted in the early 1980s were so out of whack with the deficits annually soaring up to as high as \$250 billion in 1 year, finally those policies had to be reversed—not once but three times.

Now we have a situation that is double the annual deficits ever experienced

in the 1980s. We best get about the process of getting our economic and fiscal house in order if we want America to have the economic prosperity our citizens should enjoy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SUNUNU). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE HIV/AIDS EPIDEMIC

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, a number of us had the honor of attending an event at the White House on Tuesday in which President Bush urged Congress to act quickly in passing an emergency plan for global HIV/AIDS relief.

I come to the Senate floor this afternoon to applaud the President for his remarks and for his continuing commitment to ease the worldwide suffering caused by the HIV/AIDS epidemic around the world.

I also want to thank Secretary of State Colin Powell and also my colleagues in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate for their leadership in fighting this dread disease. There are so many people to thank. Let me commend Senators LUGAR, BIDEN, FRIST, SANTORUM, DURBIN, and KERRY for their tireless efforts and their dedication to this fight, as well as Congressmen HENRY HYDE and TOM LANTOS for their great leadership and their great vision. I am encouraged by what they have done with their leadership.

I believe we will soon pass a comprehensive global AIDS relief initiative. As the President said, time is not on our side. It is imperative that we in the U.S. Congress move quickly. As President Bush so correctly said on Tuesday:

Fighting AIDS on a global scale is a massive and complicated undertaking. Yet, this cause is rooted in the simplest of moral duties. When we see this kind of preventable suffering—when we see a plague leaving graves and orphans across a continent—we must act.

The President of the United States is absolutely right. This is a moral issue. We as a nation and as a people have an obligation to act. We as a nation and we as a people have the ability to fight this disease. We have the tools. And it is our duty and it is our obligation to help ease this grave and global public health crisis.

In February, I made my 12th trip to Haiti and my first visit to Guyana, both nations in our hemisphere that President Bush has cited as countries in dire need of our assistance to fight this HIV/AIDS problem. We traveled there to learn more about the AIDS situation and determine what kind of health infrastructure is in place to

fight the disease. What we saw in these visits was devastating, with so many children and adults dying of this horrible disease and too few drugs to go around to help treat them and keep them alive.

Without question, HIV/AIDS is a human tragedy of grave proportions—not just in Africa but right here in our own backyard in our own hemisphere.

When you travel to the AIDS-infested regions of the world, as my wife Fran and I have, and as so many of my colleagues here in the Senate have, such as Majority Leader FRIST, Senator INHOFE, Senator DURBIN, Senator NELSON of Florida, and Senator CHAFEE, when you see the children with AIDS, when you hold them, when you touch them, when you talk to the people who care for them, when you know that these children will in all likelihood die, it truly does change you forever. Then when you leave those countries, and when you leave those children, you know you cannot just leave; you know you have to try to do something to help.

Our trip in February reinforced what we already knew about the devastation of the disease in Haiti, and allowed us to see what efforts are now underway in Guyana.

This afternoon, I would like to take a few minutes to tell my colleagues about what we learned on that visit.

I was pleased that Senator CHAFEE and his wife Stephanie were able to join Fran and me on that trip. We learned a great deal about what is and what is not being done in both of these impoverished nations.

We were fortunate to have Senator DURBIN and Senator NELSON of Florida and his wife Grace and Congressman KENDRICK MEEK join us on an earlier trip to Haiti in January, where we saw the tragic effects of the abject poverty and disease that engulfs Haiti today.

While there is certainly some miraculous work being done in Haiti to ease the suffering—work done by people such as Father Tom Hagan and his organization Hands Together—there remains so much work to be done.

When you view the HIV/AIDS rates in Haiti and Guyana in the context of the disease's overall prevalence rate in our hemisphere—Haiti has the highest rate and Guyana, either the second or third highest rate—the moral imperative of helping these two troubled nations becomes absolutely crystal clear.

In Haiti today, a nation of approximately 8 million people, 300,000 currently live with AIDS—300,000 people out of a country of 8 million people.

Guyana follows close behind. In Guyana, a nation of roughly 800,000 people, 35,000—35,000—have been identified as HIV positive or as having AIDS. Of those 35,000 people who have been identified as HIV positive or as having AIDS, only 200—less than 1 percent—are getting antiretroviral drug treatment. Of those 200, only one—only one—is a child. So virtually none of the children in Guyana are getting any

kind of drug treatment at all—virtually none. Only one child in all of Guyana is getting any drug treatment for AIDS. What a great tragedy.

Consequently, the disease is having a devastating impact on these nations, and especially on the children.

In Haiti, there are more than 150,000 orphans due to AIDS. This number has been increasing for over a decade and is expected to rise even more. Specifically, the percentage of Haitian AIDS orphans has gone from 7 percent in 1990 to 43 percent in 2001 and is estimated to increase to 49 percent by 2010. That will be a sevenfold increase in 20 years.

Rates are equally troubling in Guyana. In 1990, there were no children orphaned due to AIDS, none, but by 2001, 21 percent of the orphans were the result of AIDS, and that number is projected to double to 41 percent by 2010.

Not only is AIDS orphaning these children, but many of them are also suffering from the disease.

Today, in Haiti, there are hundreds of orphanages spread throughout the country, hundreds actually just in the capital of Port-au-Prince, but there are less than just a handful that are serving or even taking care of children who have AIDS or who are HIV positive.

We visited one of these orphanages in February, one of the orphanages that is taking care of children with AIDS. It is a wonderful place. It is a place called Arc en Ciel or "Rainbow House Orphanage." This is a place that is doing just wonderful work.

A Canadian couple—Danielle and Robert Penette—came in and restored the home there, and today it is a wonderful, bright, cheery, clean, and beautifully maintained orphanage for about 37 Haitian children. I think about 30 of them actually are HIV positive or already have AIDS.

What we saw there was truly inspiring: children playing, laughing, and learning in the classroom. They sang songs for us. They were happy and healthy and content. They did not seem like orphans at all really but more like one big happy family—one healthy family. It was hard to imagine that any of these little children were sick at all.

But of the HIV-positive children at the Rainbow House Orphanage, about 15 of them are currently in need of antiretroviral drugs. Those 15 children, fortunately, are now receiving these drugs.

One of the important lessons we learned about these children and about the Rainbow House is that by providing these drugs, and by providing love and consistent nutrition—this good health care—clean water, the Penettes, this wonderful couple, are making an unbelievable impact on the quality of life for these very sick children.

What they, in effect, are doing is prolonging the time it takes before these children actually need to be on AIDS treatment drugs. So half the children are not even on the drugs yet. Half of them are on the drugs.