

during many years of their travels around the country playing championship basketball. It explains their personal relationship, as Bill Bradley can do. He explains also what a team is all about. We, both in the majority and minority, are always working with our team. I recommend this as reading for everyone.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the speech given by Bill Bradley at the funeral of Dave DeBusschere be printed in the RECORD.

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

EULOGY OF DAVE DEBUSSCHERE

Geri, Michelle, Peter, Dennis, DeBusschere sisters and family.

Today, Willis asked me to speak for him, for Clyde, Earl and all the Knicks who loved Dave. The moment I heard the news last Wednesday, it was as if a lightning bolt hit my heart. It was so shocking, so unexpected, so final.

When I saw the newspaper stories after Dave's death, one photo caught my eye. It was of Dave driving to the basket, the ball in his left hand, legs sturdy, shoulders strong, shock of dark hair matted with sweat, and a face full of his unique determination. As I looked at it, I was reminded of a time when we were all younger, and there was a magic about life. A magic about life—there is no other way to describe those years on our Knick teams. How it felt to hear the roar of the Garden crowd, to know the satisfaction of a play well-executed, to feel the chills of winning a championship, to share the camaraderie, even brotherhood, of working in an environment of mutual trust, with people you respected, each of whom had the courage to take the last second shot.

Dave's strength, his dedication, his unselfishness, his fierce desire to win, and, above all, his commitment to the team, were all at the core of that success. He seemed to say, "What's the point of achieving anything in basketball if you can't share it?" That's the beauty of having teammates. They know what it takes to get through a long season, to recover from a loss, to pull out a win when you're hurt or tired. Dave believed that once good players have put on their uniforms, everything else about them—race, ethnicity, personal history, off-court style—fades into the background. It's time to play—together. And we did.

Dave DeBusschere left all of himself on the court every game. He held nothing back. I can remember those nights on the road in late February. Dave, his face drawn from the long season; and Willis, with his brow furrowed, and heating packs on each knee. They would look at each other in the locker room of the fourth town in five nights, and their glances alone seemed to say, "I'm tired to my bones. I don't want to go out there, but if you do it, I will too." And they always did. Together they set the character tone for the team in a kind of shared leadership that rarely needed words.

If I had \$100 for every night Dave played hurt, I could buy a nice car. One night, Dave caught an elbow in the face that broke his nose. The pain was obvious. I didn't see how he was going to play the next night. But, there he was, ready to go, when the buzzer sounded—with a strip of plastic over his nose, held in place by white adhesive tape forming an "H" above and below his eyes.

I think the fans loved Dave because they sensed what his teammates already knew: he was the real thing. No pretense. He hated phonies. No guile. He told you exactly how

he felt. No greediness. I never heard him talk about points. No excuses. He always took responsibility for his mistakes.

Dave was a man of action, not words. He was above the petty things in life, and he wasn't impressed easily. Power, fame, money, were not the currencies he traded in. Friendship, loyalty, hard work, were what he placed the greatest value in. If Bush or Madonna or Rockefeller walked into a bar, I bet he'd barely look up from the beer he was sharing with a friend.

There was a time when I'd slept in a room with Dave DeBusschere more than I had with my wife. We were roommates on the road for six years. That's about 250 games, 250 cities, 250 hotels.

If the truth be told (as Geri knows), on many occasions Dave woke me up with his snoring. I'd say, "Dave." To no avail. I'd shout, "Dave!" Still no success. Finally I'd get out of bed, put my hands on his back and push him over on his side. He still wouldn't wake up, but the snoring would stop. And I'd get a few hours of sleep . . . until the next time.

You get to know someone when you're with him that much. You hear about his life; you meet his friends and family; you know what he likes to eat, what he likes to do in his downtime, what forms his daily habits; you learn what he admires in people and what he can't stand.

You can learn a lot of from your roommate, too, especially if he's an experienced pro and you are not. It was my second year in the NBA. I had just made the Knicks starting team as a forward, and we had lost a close one in Philadelphia on a bad pass I made when the Sixers were applying full court pressure. After the game I was dejected. Back at the hotel. Dave, who had joined the team from Detroit two months earlier, saw how I felt and put me straight. "You can't go through a season like this," he said. "There are too many games, Sure, you blew it tonight, but when it's over, it's over. Let it go. Otherwise you won't be ready to play tomorrow night." It was NBA lesson #1; Don't make today's loss the enemy of tomorrow's victory.

On occasion, Dave, Willis and I would go to dinner on the road, and Willis would begin telling hunting stories—what weapons he used, where he used them and what the weather was, how he tracked the animals, what his gear consisted of, the angle at which he shot with his gun, or his bow and arrow, and so forth. Dave and I were not hunters, but once Willis got started, it took him more than a little while to finish. After one such evening when we got back to our room, Dave said, "You know, I think Willis likes to hunt!"

Dave also was not above practical jokes. Once after a championship season, the DeBusscheres, Kladis's and Bradleys chartered a boat to tour the Greek islands. One day we pulled up off an island beach, and Dave and I dove off the boat to swim ashore. As we were coming out of the water, we found a lone man, laying on a towel. An American. He watched us emerge from the sea, and shouted, "DeBusschere—Dave DeBusschere. Bradley. Oh my God! Wait til my family sees this!" and he took off. Dave looked at me; I looked at him, and with a grin he said, "Let's go." We swam back to the boat, hid behind towels and watched as the man, his wife and kids behind him, ran back onto the beach. "Honest they were here!" We could hear him shout. "I saw them! Really! They were here I swear it."

It's been a long time since the Knicks were champions and I roomed with Dave. But time has only deepened our friendship. I always looked forward to our one-on-one lunches, our dinners with Ernestine and the irrepres-

ible Geri, our family visits to Long Island, and on occasion a game like the one last spring when Willis, Dave, Earl and I went to New Jersey for a Lakers/Nets playoff game with loyalties split between Willis's Nets and Phil's Lakers.

Over the years I commiserated with Dave about the way the Garden treated him when he was G.M. I spoke at Peter's college graduation. I shared the pride that he and Geri felt as Michelle, Peter and Dennis grew into spectacular young adults.

And, I will never forget when he told me how proud he was to be sitting in the gallery the day I was sworn into the Senate. Over the years he made campaign appearances in New Jersey on my behalf, attended fundraisers to add star power, and sloughed through the snows of Iowa and New Hampshire in 2000. Whenever I asked him to do something, he was there; and every place he went, he made people feel good.

Until last Wednesday, one of the most enjoyable things in life was talking basketball with Dave DeBusschere. The players and the teams, the rules and style of play have all changed, but the sharpness of his insights never diminished. What he said was always so clear and simple that I'd ask myself afterwards, "Why didn't I think of that?"

Championship teams share a moment that few other people know. The overwhelming emotion derives from more than pride. Your devotion to your teammates, the depth of your sense of belonging, is something like blood kinship, but without the complications. Rarely can words express it. In the nonverbal world of basketball, it's like grace and beauty and ease, and it spills into all areas of your life.

So I say to my big brother: Be proud. You brought all these things to the many lives you touched. Goodbye, we'll miss you, #22. May God grant you a peaceful journey.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE—S. 14

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, with respect to the Graham amendment No. 884, to which we are going to proceed in the morning, and the hour of time we have, that Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator BOXER, and Senator CANTWELL each control 15 minutes of the 60 minutes.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FITZGERALD. 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 CRISIS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to express my concern about the horrific violence which has erupted over the past few days in the Middle East. The world is distressed to see the images on T.V. of today's suicide bombing in Jerusalem and the attacks in Gaza. Condolences are extended to all of those who continue to pay the price of this intolerable seemingly uncontrollable cycle of violence in the Middle East.

This human suffering must be brought to an end. Once again I take the floor of the Senate to call on both sides both Israel and the Palestinians to take the initiative to invite NATO forces to undertake a peacekeeping role and to help provide a measure of stability needed to allow the "road map" process to maintain a momentum forward.

President Bush is to be commended for his personal commitment to bring the Israelis and the Palestinians together on a path toward peace. Last week, President Bush, joining with world leaders, gave new impetus to the Middle East peace process. He met with the Israeli and Palestinian prime ministers at Aqaba, Jordan, where these two leaders agreed to begin to implement the early steps of the "road map" to peace.

In Aqaba, both sides agreed to a step-by-step process whereby each takes positive steps and makes some concessions to achieve the stated goal of an Israeli and a Palestinian state, living side-by-side in peace.

Unfortunately, there are third parties, such as Hamas and other radical groups, that are making every effort to continue the violence and disrupt the path to peace. These groups must not be permitted to hijack the peace process.

How can others help the Palestinian leadership gain control of the security situation on its side?

The Israeli and Palestinian leaders should be urged first to fulfill their commitments to establish and help to enforce a cease-fire; and, second, to ask the North Atlantic Council to consider sending a peacekeeping contingent as soon as practical.

I have spoken before on this subject here on the Senate floor, and have written to President Bush, about my idea concerning how NATO might play a useful role in the quest for Middle East peace. I ask that my letter to President Bush and his reply be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2003.

President GEORGE W. BUSH,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I would like to commend you on the step you took today to give new impetus to the Middle East peace process by announcing that it was time to share with Israel and the Palestinians the road map to peace that the United States has developed with its "Quartet" partners. This is a welcome and timely initiative, given the complex way in which the Middle East conflict, Iraq and the global war against terrorism are intertwined.

The festering hostilities in the Middle East are an enormous human tragedy. Along with you, and many others, I refuse to accept that this is a conflict without end. You have articulated a vision of an Israeli and a Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security. That is a bold initiative that deserves strong international support. With

the Israeli elections concluded, and the imminent confirmation of a Palestinian Prime Minister, you are right to refocus international attention on the Middle East peace process.

Mr. President, in August 2002, I wrote to you to propose an idea concerning the possibility of offering NATO peacekeepers to help implement a cease-fire in the Middle East. I have spoken of this idea numerous times on the Senate Floor. I am now even more convinced that the United States and its NATO partners should consider an additional element for the "road map" concept: NATO should offer, and I stress the word "offer," to provide a peacekeeping force, once a cease-fire has been established by the Israeli Government and the Palestinian Authority. This NATO force would serve in support of the cease-fire mechanisms agreed to by Israel and the Palestinian Authority. The NATO offer would have to be willingly accepted by both governments, and it in no way should be viewed as a challenge to either side's sovereignty. The acceptance of this offer would have to be coupled with a commitment by Israel and the Palestinian Authority to cooperate in every way possible to permit the peacekeeping mission to succeed.

I fully recognize that this would not be a risk-free operation for the participating NATO forces. But I nonetheless believe that the offer of peacekeepers from NATO would have many benefits. First, it would demonstrate a strong international commitment to peace in the Middle East. Second, it would offer the prospect of a peacekeeping force that is ready today. It is highly capable, rapidly deployable, and has a proven record of success in the Balkans. A NATO peacekeeping force is likely to be acceptable to both parties, given the traditional European sympathy for the Palestinian cause and the traditional United States support of Israel.

Third, this would be a worthy post-Cold War mission for NATO in a region where NATO member countries have legitimate national security interests. It could even be an area of possible collaboration with Russia through the NATO-Russia Council. A NATO peacekeeping mission in the Middle East would be wholly consistent with the Alliance's new Strategic Concept. Approved at the NATO Summit in Washington in April 1999, the new Strategic Concept envisioned so called "out-of-area" operations for NATO.

Given the fractious debate in NATO over Iraq and the defense of Turkey, it would be important to show that NATO can work together to make a positive contribution to solving one of the most challenging security issues of our day.

There will be many detractors to the idea of sending NATO peacekeepers to the Middle East to help implement a cease-fire. But I think there is broad agreement on the imperative to giving new hope to the peace process and redoubling diplomatic efforts to keep Israel and the Palestinians moving on the road to peace. Peacekeepers coming from many NATO nations could give new hope and confidence to the peoples of Israel and Palestine that there could soon be an end to the violence that overhangs their daily lives.

Mr. President, I hope that you will receive this idea in the constructive spirit in which it is offered.

With kind regards, I am
Respectfully,

JOHN WARNER,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 29, 2003.

Hon. JOHN W. WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S.
Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your letter about the proposed roadmap to Middle

East peace, and your suggestion concerning a NATO peacekeeping force. I understand your view that such an offer could be a further inducement to the parties to reach agreement.

As you know, the issues dividing Israelis and Palestinians are deep, complex, and hotly contested. The security arrangements of any settlement are one important element among many. Ultimately, our goal is for two states living side by side in peace. Over the long term, such an arrangement must be sustainable without the presence of outside peacekeeping forces. As we engage the parties in our effort to forge a peace agreement, I will keep your proposal under consideration.

I also agree with your comments about the importance of NATO's role as we face the security challenges of the 21st Century. As you know, at the NATO Prague Summit, Allied leaders joined me in launching an ambitious agenda for modernizing NATO, including the creation of a NATO Response Force, reforming the command structure, and bringing in new members who are committed to democracy and collective defense. I appreciate your strong support for this important effort.

We have begun steps to increase NATO's role in Afghanistan, and have asked NATO to consider assistance it could provide in post-war Iraq. I welcome your support on these matters as well.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. BUSH.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I spoke today with the press about the idea that NATO, if requested, might provide a peacekeeping force to support a cease-fire previously agreed to by the Israeli Government and the Palestinian Authority. NATO peacekeepers would have to be invited by both governments, and in no way should be viewed as a challenge to either side's sovereignty. The acceptance of this offer would have to be coupled with a commitment by Israel and the Palestinian Authority to cooperate in every way possible to permit the peacekeeping mission to succeed.

I fully recognize that this would not be a risk-free operation for the participating NATO forces, some of which could be American. But I nonetheless believe that the offer of peacekeepers from NATO would have many benefits.

First, it would demonstrate a strong international commitment to peace in the Middle East. By their presence, NATO peacekeepers might give hope to people on both sides that violence will be curtailed.

Second, it would offer the prospect of a peacekeeping force that is ready to go, today. It is highly capable, rapidly deployable, and has a proven record of success with peacekeeping in the Balkans.

Third, a NATO peacekeeping force is likely to be acceptable to both parties, given the traditional European associations with the Palestinian people and the traditional United States associations with the people of Israel.

Fourth, it would be a worthy post-Cold War mission for NATO in a region where NATO member countries have legitimate national security interests. In 1999, NATO adopted a new Strategic

Concept that envisioned NATO operations, including peacekeeping operations, taking place outside of Europe.

There will be many detractors to the idea of sending NATO peacekeepers to the Middle East to help implement a cease-fire. There is, I acknowledge, a historical record of outside forces being unsuccessful in security mission in this area. But I invite the debate, first and foremost among the NATO members themselves.

I think we can all agree on the imperative of redoubling our efforts to keep Israel and the Palestinians moving on the road to peace, and of offering an alternative that may break the tragic cycle of violence. This is the responsibility not only of the United States, but indeed, of the entire international community.

Progress on Middle East peace would help us to continue the gains we have made in Iraq to spread peace in the Middle East and to address the underlying causes that have given rise to terrorist groups like al-Qaeda.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to talk about something that is unrelated to any of the subjects we have been discussing today. I rise to talk about the news we just heard about an explosion in Israel and the killing of 13 to 15 people—and it is going to be more because, in addition to that, there are over 50 who have been seriously injured. We have witnessed an attack like this on innocent civilians by mad men who encourage a son, a daughter, a brother, or a sister to blow themselves to smithereens, and their mission is to simply kill innocents.

For a few moments, let's review a scenario that perhaps would be better understood in our country. Think about a shopping mall or a busy street in New York, Detroit, Minneapolis, Los Angeles, or Louisiana, and think about people who might be on the bus, youngsters going to school, people going to the doctor, people going to work, people carrying on commerce, and imagine that someone came along with a bomb in one of those cities, Washington, DC, and created an explosion that killed 700 people at one shot. That is the equivalent, if we take the size of Israel, about 6 million people—we have 280 million—it is about 45 to 1, so just do the multiplication. We are talking about 700 people who would die in this senseless attack. What would our response be in America? We would call out the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the FBI, the police, every agency that could retaliate, either to capture or gun down the leader of an organization that would seduce a young person to sacrifice their life for such a heinous purpose.

Purportedly this was a response to a tragic accident that took place as the Israelis were pursuing the leader of Hamas, the organization that took credit today for killing those innocent people and that takes credit for lots of attacks on innocent people in Israel. So there was a pursuit by the Israelis

of the leader of Hamas because Hamas was an organization that helped take five soldiers' lives in Israel on Sunday night. Unfortunately, the hunt went awry and some innocent people were tragically killed.

When an attack such as that takes place, it is in response, it is in retaliation, to the violence that was visited upon the citizens in Israel. When these attacks take place, there is only one mission. They are not hunting criminals. They are not trying to capture somebody. What they are doing is killing innocent people—young people, old people, it does not matter.

Today's horrible attack on Jerusalem is another illustration of why Hamas has no place in any peace process. Hamas is a terror organization, has always been a terror organization, and desires to continue as a terror organization. I think it is time for the world to recognize that Hamas is in the same league as al-Qaida, and we know what we did when our people were attacked. We did the right thing. We sent our troops out. We were looking to capture the leader of that organization.

We would not stand by 5 minutes and accept it. And Israel should not stand by 5 minutes and accept it. We cannot look at the equal violence on both sides of the issue in Israel and with the Palestinians. They are not the same. Israel's attacks are always in retaliation for violence that was put upon Israelis. The other side delights in recording the fact that a suicide bomber took 8, 10, 12 lives, their count—600 people, or whatever the number is, in equivalence in America.

It is time to understand what is going on there. I strongly believe the peace process has to continue, but it should continue with Palestinian leaders who have demonstrated that they are interested in peace, as is now Prime Minister Mr. Abbas. I commend the administration for deciding to re-engage in the Mideast conflict by introducing and promoting a roadmap, a design, for Middle East peace.

President Bush's recent visit to the region was an important first step in renewing U.S. commitment to this endeavor, and the administration has to remain committed to peace in the area. President Bush must forcefully deliver a message to the Palestinians about their need to reconstitute and consolidate their security agencies in order to fulfill their stated goal to deter and punish terrorists such as Hamas, and he has to tell the Israelis that they have the right to defend themselves. They have made very important overtures, especially when it comes to talk about dismantling some of the settlements.

Mr. Abbas' clear statement that the violence of the intifada was a betrayal of the Palestinian cause is the most important reason that there is hope for progress in the Middle East. I am also encouraged that as a goodwill gesture Israel has opened its borders to Palestinian workers, released about 100 Pal-

estinian prisoners, and has begun to dismantle some outposts. They are important first steps.

Israel and the settlers have to come to terms with the inevitability of dismantling some settlements in order to allow for the eventual creation of a contiguous Palestinian state. I was gratified to hear five Arab leaders—President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt, Crown Prince Abdullah of Saudi Arabia, King Abdullah of Jordan, King Hamada of Bahrain, and the new Palestinian Prime Minister, Mahmoud Abbas—release a statement last Tuesday, June 3, clearly asserting that they oppose terrorism and will not finance or arm extremist Palestinian groups.

This statement was long overdue. Right now the Arab leaders must translate this statement into action through one central task, and that is strengthening the hand of the new Palestinian Prime Minister, Mahmoud Abbas.

This means conferring on Mr. Abbas the authority they once gave Yasser Arafat and condemning violent groups such as Hamas and their rejectionist agendas. Only a united international front critical of terrorists and supportive of Mr. Abbas' plan for the Palestinians' future can facilitate the implementation of the roadmap.

The United States should continue exerting pressure on Syria to shut down its support for Palestinian terrorists, Hezbollah, and other organizations, the organizations that have no function except to disrupt the prospect for peace. They should encourage the withdrawal of the Syrians from occupied Lebanon and stem any production or research on weapons of mass destruction.

Sometimes it is hard to understand why an embattled country like Israel will be so effective, so hard, in its response. It is only hard to understand if you have not been there. This is a country that seeks peace more than any other place on Earth that we can imagine. They have lost thousands of people, perhaps hundreds of thousands in the equivalent American counts. There is a history of the people there that says they are always the subject of some cruelty, some attacks, some injury, some dead, from outsiders.

The last century saw the killing of millions of Jewish people. That sets a tone. That tone says, make peace, make life satisfactory. Do the things you have to do to create a society, a country. Do what we can do about fighting disease, research what can be done about turning arid lands into farm lands, do what can be done to make life more livable. Yet, these criminal organizations continue to press their attack on Israel.

I make this suggestion. If the people in Paris or London or Berlin or other capital cities around the world had an attack such as this, we would have a response from the U.N. and everybody else. But when it comes to attacks on Israel, there is a notable silence, except for the only friend that Israel has

in the world, and that is the United States and the American people.

We look with horror and grief at what took place this day. Unfortunately, this is not an unusual occurrence as far as Israel is concerned. We have to say that we in the United States of America will not tolerate this kind of violence, that we are going to let Israel fight back as hard as she has to, to defend herself and force the communities in the Middle East to understand that there will be no peace for anybody. That is very dangerous. That conflict could escalate into a major confrontation in other parts of the world.

We send our sadness and condolences to the people of Israel. We wish them well in the future and hope peace will soon be the only confrontation that takes place, and that would be across the table.

I yield the floor.

HONORING UWE E. TIMPKE

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following resolution from the HELP Committee be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS, U.S. SENATE, JUNE 11, 2003, IN RECOGNITION OF UWE E. TIMPKE

Whereas, Uwe E. Timpke has faithfully served the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions since September, 1972 as a Detailee, Assistant Editor, and Editor, working under six chairmen of both parties; and

Whereas, he has worked conscientiously on behalf of the 74 members of the Senate who have served on the committee during his tenure; and

Whereas, he has upheld the highest standards of the Senate and of the committee in his professionalism, unflinching courtesy, and unflagging dedication to his work; and

Whereas, his knowledge of all aspects of printing and editing committee documents has earned him the respect and admiration of all those with whom he worked on the committee and throughout the Senate; and

Whereas, his willingness to make time in a busy schedule to meet the special needs of the individual members of the committee, as well as his fellow staff members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions expresses its deep gratitude to Uwe E. Timpke for his over thirty years of tireless service to the committee and to the United States Senate; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the United States Senate express their sincerest wishes that Uwe E. Timpke will enjoy a happy and well-deserved retirement.

AMERICA'S WORSENING FISCAL SITUATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the new Congressional Budget Office, CBO, budget deficit numbers announced Monday should trouble us all.

Only 1 month ago CBO, estimated that the Federal deficit would be \$300 billion—an alarming number considering that when President Bush took office the Federal Government was running a surplus. Now, CBO has notified Congress that the deficit will be a record \$400 billion.

CBO now projects that the federal government is likely to end fiscal year 2003 with a deficit of more than \$400 billion, or close to 4 percent of gross domestic product. The deterioration in the short-term budget outlook stems from continued weakness in revenue collections and from enactment of the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003, which will add an estimated \$61 billion to this year's deficit in the form of tax cuts, refundable credits, and aid to states. The recent extension of unemployment benefits will boost outlays by another \$3 billion this year. For the first eight months of 2003, the government ran a deficit of \$291 billion, CBO estimates, about twice the shortfall it incurred in the same period last year.

When President Bush entered the White House in January 2001, the Nation was enjoying a record budget surplus that was built with hard choices and determination over the previous 8 years. With breathtaking speed, this administration's fiscal irresponsibility has quickly turned those record surpluses into record deficits. In 3 short years, these policies have driven us further into debt, transferred a greater share of tax receipts to the pockets of the Nation's most privileged, and turned millions of hard-working Americans out of their jobs.

In fact, the Labor Department recently reported that the Nation's unemployment rate rose to 6.1 percent last month, the highest level in 9 years. Since the economy began slumping in early 2001, nearly 2.5 million jobs have disappeared.

In 2001, I voted against the President's first tax plan because it was too skewed toward the wealthiest Americans and it was too fiscally irresponsible. Since then, we have gone from record surpluses to red ink, and the economy is still adrift.

Yet Congress passed a budget this year—including another ill-advised tax plan of \$350 billion—that will only further deepen our deficits and pump up the national debt. I voted against the tax bill again this year because it is so clearly harmful to the economic health of our country, especially with the cost of the war in Iraq and the ever-increasing peacekeeping expenses.

The budget plans this administration has sent to Congress each year have been full of misguided priorities and squandered opportunities. The President's plans have severely underfunded essential health, employment training and education efforts. They have contained enormous Government giveaways to wealthy corporations and the wealthiest individuals instead of providing relief for hard-working Americans and their families. And they have been wholly inadequate to meet the domestic security needs of the first-responder agencies that we are counting

on to defend against and prepare for future acts of terrorism.

The President's economic plan is not about growing the economy or creating jobs. It is a fiscally irresponsible plan that threatens to economically divide our country. Cutting taxes is a popular thing to do, and I am delighted to vote for tax cuts when they make good fiscal sense. But it is not always the right thing to do for the country and for the security and economic well-being of the American people.

The 1993 budget bill set the framework to eliminate the Federal deficit and passed by the narrowest of margins. It was a tough vote for everyone who voted for that plan and many Senators and Congressmen lost their seats in the subsequent election before the benefits of the plan could be fully realized. That momentous vote set this country on a course of surpluses, budget discipline and fiscal responsibility unmatched in American history. Unfortunately, the current administration—with its lack of fiscal responsibility—has blown all of the progress that many worked so hard to achieve. And the proof is in the latest CBO deficit figures.

Earlier this year, the President said we should not pass on our fiscal problems to future Presidents, Congresses, and generations. On that point, I agree with him. Regrettably, year after year his budgets have driven us deeper into debt, and his policies will do exactly what the President says we should avoid: They will burden our children.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. On May 1, 2003, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred on November 10, 2001. In San Antonio, TX, two people in ski masks robbed and beat the female owner of a small Persian restaurant, leaving behind racial slurs on the walls. The attackers forced open a back door. One of them bound the victim's hands and legs with duct tape and beat her to the ground. The second attacker sprayed hate messages on the walls.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.