

ROTC. His friends remember him as a fun-loving teenager with a passion for motorcycles. His fellow soldiers will remember him as a hero whose quick actions may well have saved the lives of others.

Jesse Halling will be missed.

Army Private Shawn Pahnke of Shelbyville was killed on June 16 in Baghdad, felled by a sniper round fired in the dead of night at the Humvee he was riding in. Shawn was 25 years old. He had joined the Army to become a crew member on an M-1 Abrams tank and was serving with the 1st Armored Division in Germany before deploying to Iraq.

Shawn leaves behind a wife, Elisha, and a 3-month-old son, Dean Patrick, whom he never had a chance to see. Shawn was in Germany when the baby was born, but the staff at Major Hospital in Shelbyville hooked up a phone connection to the delivery room so that Shawn could hear his child's first cries.

Shawn Pahnke will be missed.

All of Indiana mourns for the loss of these brave young men. Our hearts go out to these families.

HONORING COMPANY A, 8TH TANK BATTALION,
MARINE FORCES RESERVE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on behalf of the State of Indiana, I wish to recognize Maj. William P. Peeples of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserves and his fellow marines of Company A, 8th Tank Battalion, on the successful completion of their mission while serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Major Peeples is from Indianapolis, IN, and it is with sincere pride that I congratulate him on a successful tour of duty leading his division through its service in Iraq.

The unit was among the first involved in fighting when Operation Iraqi Freedom began this March. Some members from the 3rd Platoon also assisted special forces with the rescue and recovery of PFC Jessica Lynch and other remembers of her unit.

We are indebted for the many contributions and tremendous sacrifices, past and present, that the men and women of the Marine Corps have made in service to our great Nation. The strength, courage, and character they exemplify can only inspire the admiration and appreciation of all Americans.

Through their rapid mobilization and superior performance in the line of duty, the marines of Company A, 8th Tank Battalion, serve as shining examples of the Corps' motto "First to Fight." I know I speak for all Hoosiers when I thank the returning members, and welcome them back home.

HONORING PRIVATE SHAWN D. PAHNKE

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart and deep sense of gratitude to honor the life of a brave young man from Shelbyville, IN. Private Shawn D. Pahnke, twenty-five years old, was killed in Baghdad on June 17, 2003 when he was shot in the back by an Iraqi sniper. Shawn joined the Army with his entire life before

him, with a young wife and a newborn son at home. He chose to risk everything to fight for the values Americans hold close to our hearts, in a land halfway around the world.

Shawn was the eighth Hoosier soldier to be killed while serving his country in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Today, I join Shawn's family, his friends, and the entire Shelbyville community in mourning his death. While we struggle to bear our sorrow over his death, we can also take pride in the example he set, bravely fighting to make the world a safer place. It is this courage and strength of character that people will remember when they think of Shawn, a memory that will burn brightly during these continuing days of conflict and grief.

Shawn Pahnke wrote to his family only weeks before his death, telling them that he was proud to serve in the Army and to follow in the footsteps of his father, a Vietnam War veteran, and his grandfather, a World War II veteran. Shawn grew up in Manhattan, IL and graduated from Lincoln Way High School in New Lenox, IL. He then joined the Army and served as part of the 1st Armored Division's 1st Brigade. Shawn leaves behind a wife, Elisha and their three-month-old son, Dean Patrick, who was born after Shawn was sent to Friedberg Army Base in Germany. He also leaves behind his parents, Tom and Linda Pahnke and two older brothers.

As I search for words to do justice in honoring Shawn Pahnke's sacrifice, I am reminded of President Lincoln's remarks as he addressed the families of the fallen soldiers in Gettysburg: "We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say her, but it can never forget what they did here." This statement is just as true today as it was nearly 150 years ago, as I am certain that the impact of Shawn Pahnke's actions will live on far longer than any record of these words.

It is my sad duty to enter the name of Shawn D. Pahnke in the official record of the United States Senate for his service to this country and for his profound commitment to freedom, democracy and peace. When I think about this just cause in which we are engaged, and the unfortunate pain that comes with the loss of our heroes, I hope that families like Shawn's can find comfort in the words of the prophet Isaiah who said, "He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces."

May God grant strength and peace to those who mourn, and may God bless the United States of America.

THE BUDGET DEFICIT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it is said that editorialists can editorialize

but can't take criticism. Not true. Chairman Donald Graham and editorial page editor Fred Hiatt readily accepted the following Washington Post editorial this morning for which I profoundly thank them. Otherwise, since I referred to Pete Peterson, in fairness let me also include his column in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent the articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 8, 2003]

DEFICITS AND DYSFUNCTION

(By Peter G. Peterson)

I have belonged to the Republican Party all my life. As a Republican, I have served as a cabinet member (once), a presidential commission member (three times), an all-purpose political ombudsman (many times) and a relentless crusader whom some would call a crank (throughout). Among the bedrock principles that the Republican Party has stood for since its origins in the 1850's is the principle of fiscal stewardship—the idea that government should invest in posterity and safeguard future generations from unsustainable liabilities. It is a priority that has always attracted me to the party. At various times in our history (especially after wars), Republican leaders have honored this principle by advocating and legislating painful budgetary retrenchment, including both spending cuts and tax hikes.

Over the last quarter century, however, the Grand Old Party has abandoned these original convictions. Without every renouncing stewardship itself—indeed, while talking incessantly about legacies, endowments, family values and leaving "no child behind"—the G.P.O. leadership has by degrees come to embrace the very different notion that deficit spending is a sort of fiscal wonder drug. Like taking aspirin, you should do it regularly just to stay healthy and do lots of it whenever you're feeling out of sorts.

With the arrival of Ronald Reagan in the White House, this idea was first introduced as part of an extraordinary "supply-side revolution" in fiscal policy, needed (so the thinking ran) as a one-time fix for an economy gripped by stagflation. To those who worried about more debt, they said, Relax, it won't happen—we'll "grow out of it." Over the course of the 1980's, under the influence of this revolution, what grew most was federal debt, from 26 to 42 percent of G.D.P. During the next decade, Republican leaders became less conditional in their advocacy. Since 2001, the fiscal strategizing of the party has ascended to a new level of fiscal irresponsibility. For the first time ever, a Republican leadership in complete control of our national government is advocating a huge and virtually endless policy of debt creation.

The numbers are simply breathtaking. When President George W. Bush entered office, the 10-year budget balance was officially projected to be surplus of \$5.6 trillion—a vast boon to future generations that Republican leaders "firmly promised" would be committed to their benefit by, for example, prefinancing the future cost of Social Security. Those promises were quickly forgotten. A large tax cut and continued spending growth, combined with a recession, the shock of 9/11 and the bursting of the stock-market bubble, pulled that surplus down to a mere \$1 trillion by the end of 2002. Unfazed by this turnaround, the Bush administration proposed a second tax-cut package in 2003 in the face of huge new fiscal demands, including a war in Iraq and an urgent "homeland

security" agenda. By midyear, prudent forecasters pegged the 10-year fiscal projection at a deficit of well over \$4 trillion.

So there you have it: in just two years there was a \$10 trillion swing in the deficit outlook. Coming into power, the Republican leaders faced a choice between tax cuts and providing genuine financing for the future of Social Security. (What a landmark reform this would have been!) They chose tax cuts. After 9/11, they faced a choice between tax cuts and getting serious about the extensive measures needed to protect this nation against further terrorist attacks. They chose tax cuts. After war broke out in the Mideast, they faced a choice between tax cuts and galvanizing the nation behind a policy of future-oriented burden sharing. Again and again, they chose tax cuts.

The recent \$10 trillion deficit swing is the largest in American history other than during years of total war. With total war, of course, you have the excuse that you expect the emergency to be over soon, and thus you'll be able to pay back the new debt during subsequent years of peace and prosperity. Yet few believe that the major drivers of today's deficit projections, not even the war on terror, are similarly short-term. Indeed, the biggest single driver of the projections, the growing cost of senior entitlements, are certain to become much worse just beyond the 10-year horizon when the huge baby-boom generation starts retiring in earnest. By the time the boomer age wave peaks, workers will have to pay the equivalent of 25 to 33 percent of their payroll in Social Security and Medicare before they retire just to keep those programs solvent.

Two facts left unmentioned in the deficit numbers cited above will help put the cost of the boomer retirement into focus. First, the deficit projections would be much larger if we took away the "trust-fund surplus" we are supposed to be dedicating to the future of Social Security and Medicare; and second, the size of this trust fund, even if we were really accumulating it—which we are not—dwarfed by the \$25 trillion in total unfinanced liabilities still hanging over both programs.

A longer time horizon does not justify near-term deficits. If anything, the longer-term demographics are an argument for sizable near-term surpluses. As Milton Friedman put it, if you cut taxes without cutting spending, you aren't really reducing the tax burden at all. In fact, you're just pushing it off yourself and onto your kids.

You might suppose that a reasoned debate over this deficit-happy policy would at least be admissible within the "discussion tent" of the Republican Party. Apparently, it is not. I've seen Republicans get blackballed for merely observing that national investment is limited by national savings; that large deficits typically reduce national savings; or that higher deficits eventually trigger higher interest rates. I've seen others get pilloried for picking on the wrong constituency—for suggesting, say, that a tax loophole for a corporation or wealthy retiree is no better, ethically or economically, than a dubious welfare program.

For some "supply side" Republicans, the pursuit of lower taxes has evolved into a religion, indeed a tax-cut theology that simply discards any objective evidence that violates the tenets of the faith.

So long as taxes are cut, even dissimulation is allowable. A new Republican fad is to propose that tax cuts be officially "sunsetting" in 2 or 5 or 10 years in order to minimize the projected revenue loss—and then to go out and sell supporters that, of course, the sunset is not to be taken seriously and that rescinding such tax cuts is politically unlikely. Among themselves, in

other words, the loudly whispered message is that a setting sun always rises.

What's remarkable is how so many elected Republicans go along with the charade. The same Republican senators who overwhelmingly approved (without a single nay vote) the Sarbanes-Oxley Act to crack down on shady corporate accounting of investments worth millions of dollars see little wrong with turning around and making utterly fraudulent pronouncements about tax cuts that will cost billions, or indeed, even trillions of dollars.

For some Republicans, all this tax-cutting talk is a mere tactic. I know several brilliant and partisan Republicans who admit to me, in private, that much of what they say about taxes is of course not really true. But, they say it's the only way to reduce government spending: chop revenue and trust that the Democrats, like Solomon, will agree to cut spending rather than punish our children by smothering them with debt.

This clever apologia would be more believable if Republicans—in all matters other than cutting the aggregate tax burden—were to speak loudly and act decisively in favor of deficit reductions. But it's hard to find the small-government argument persuasive when, on the spending front, the Republican leaders do nothing to reform entitlements, allow debt-service costs to rise along with the debt and urge greater spending on defense—and when these three functions make up over four-fifths of all federal outlays.

The starve-government-at-the-source strategy is not only hypocritical, it is likely to fail—with great injury to the young—once the other party decides to raise the ante rather than play the sucker and do the right thing. When the Democratic presidential contender Dick Gephardt proposed in April a vast new national health insurance plan, he justified its cost, which critics put at more than \$2 trillion over 10 years, by suggesting that we "pay" for it by rescinding most of the administrative tax legislation. Oddly, it never occurred to these Republican strategists that two can play the spend-the-deficit game.

Not surprisingly, many Democrats have thrown a spotlight on the Republicans' irresponsible obsession with tax cutting in order to improve their party's image with voters, even to the extent of billing themselves as born-again champions of fiscal responsibility. Though I welcome any newcomers to the cause of genuine fiscal stewardship.

I doubt that the Democratic Party as a whole is any less dysfunctional than the Republican Party. It's just dysfunctional in a different way.

Yes, the Republican Party line often boils down to cutting taxes and damning the torpedoes. And yes, by whipping up one-sided popular support for lower taxes, the Republicans pre-empt responsible discussion of tax fairness and force many Democrats to echo weakly, "Me, too." But it's equally true that the Democratic Party line often boils down to boosting outlays and damning the torpedoes. Likewise, Democrats regularly short-circuit any prudent examination of the single biggest spending issue, the future of senior entitlements, by castigating all reformers as heartless Scrooges.

I have often and at great length criticized the free-lunch games of many Republican reform plans for Social Security—like personal accounts that will be "funded" by deficit-financed contributions. But at least they pretend to have reform plans. Democrats have nothing. Or as Bob Kerrey puts it quite nicely, most of his fellow Democrats propose the "do-nothing plan," a blank sheet of paper that essentially says it is O.K. to cut benefits by 26 percent across the board when the money runs out. Assuming that Democrats

would feel genuine compassion for the lower-income retirees, widows and disabled parents who would be most affected by such a cut, I have suggested to them that maybe we ought to introduce an "affluence test" that reduces benefits for fat cats like me.

To my amazement, Democrats angrily respond with irrelevant clichés like "programs for the poor are poor programs" or "Social Security is a social contract that cannot be broken." Apparently, it doesn't matter that the program is already unsustainable. They cling to the mast and are ready to go down with the ship. To most Democratic leaders, federal entitlements are their theology.

What exactly gave rise to this bipartisan flight from integrity and responsibility—and when? My own theory, for what it's worth, is that it got started during the "Me Decade," the 1970's, when a socially fragmenting America began to gravitate around a myriad of interest groups, each more fixated on pursuing and financing, through massive political campaign contributions, its own agenda than on safeguarding the common good of the nation. Political parties, rather than helping to transcend these fissures and bind the country together, instead began to cater to them and ultimately sold themselves out.

I'm not sure what it will take to make our two-party system healthy again. I hope that in the search for a durable majority, Republicans will sooner or later realize that it won't happen without coming to terms with deficits and debts, and Democrats will likewise realize it won't happen for them without coming to terms with entitlements.

Whether any of this happens sooner or later, of course, ultimately depends upon the voters. Perhaps we will soon witness the emergence of a new and very different crop of young voters who are freshly engaged in mainstream politics and will start holding candidates to a more rigorous and objective standard of integrity. That would be good news indeed for the future of our parties.

In any case, I fervently hope that America does not have to drift into real trouble, either at home or abroad, before our leaders get scared straight and stop playing chicken with one another. That's a risky course, full of possible disasters. It's not a solution that a great nation like ours ought to be counting on.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 19, 2003]

DELUSIONAL ON THE DEFICIT

(By Ernest F. Hollings)

Nobody is paying any attention to the budget deficit. Last month the House Budget Committee's Democrats forecast a deficit of nearly \$500 billion, and The Post reported the story on Page A4. Last week the Congressional Budget Office reported that the deficit would balloon to a record \$400 billion-plus, and The Post again buried the story on A4. Spending trust funds, such as Social Security, is what keeps the estimate at \$400 billion. The actual deficit will be approximately \$600 billion.

That's a win for Mitch Daniels. The goal of the departed Office of Management and Budget director was to keep any news that could hurt President Bush's reelection prospects off the front page, and The Post willingly aided and abetted him. In fact, when Daniels left two weeks ago to run for governor of Indiana, he told The Post that the government is "fiscally in fine shape." Good grief! During his 29-month tenure, he turned a so-called \$5.6 trillion, 10-year budget surplus into a \$4 trillion deficit—a mere \$10 trillion downswing in just two years. If this is

good fiscal policy, thank heavens Daniels is gone.

Congress is no better than the press. Republicans, totally in control of this town, just casually raised the limit on the national debt by a record trillion dollars so the president could borrow more money to pay for tax cuts. I say casually because the seriousness of this move was passed over and hardly debated. In *The Post*, this story wasn't even worthy of A4. It was relegated to A8.

Bush and Daniels used to talk about how they would repay the nation's debt more quickly than any administration in history. Before Sept. 11, 2001, the president bragged that his budget reserved \$1 trillion for unforeseen circumstances. Perish the thought that the war on terrorism, Afghanistan and Iraq cost \$1 trillion. Those factors had an impact, but the real culprit, according to the nonpartisan Concord Coalition, is that this president has cut \$3.12 trillion in revenue since taking office. These are the largest tax cuts in history, yet the administration claims they have no relationship to the record deficits reported on Page A4. Amazingly, he asks for more.

The London-based *Financial Times*, in a front-page lead story, recently reported the Treasury Department projection that at the present rate, fixing the deficit would require "the equivalent of an immediate and permanent 66 percent across-the-board income tax increase." The White House deep-sixed the Treasury study. *The Post* ignored it.

Former commerce secretary Peter Peterson, a lifelong Republican, says that every time this administration faces a choice, it chooses tax cuts. Between fiscal responsibility and tax cuts, it picks tax cuts. Between preserving Social Security and tax cuts, it picks tax cuts. Between providing necessary funds to fight the war on terrorism and tax cuts, it picks tax cuts. "Again and again," Peterson says, "they choose tax cuts."

The question: How huge must the deficit grow for this A4 story to make the front page, and for the public to scream for relief? Across the country teachers are being laid off, there are more kids per classroom, the school year is shorter, and tuition is up at state colleges. Bus service is being cut off, volunteers are running park systems, prisoners are being released, and subsidies for the working poor are being slashed.

How much more must we dismantle before the public cannot stomach this? Will it take a shutdown of all the national parks? Or the release of all federal prisoners because we can't afford to guard them? Or will workers need to pay half their salaries to keep Social Security and Medicare from the chopping block?

I dread to think how bad it has to get before Bush makes some changes. But the Republican leadership in Congress is in lock-step. They've just passed a budget calling for a \$600 billion deficit each year, every year, for the next 10 years.

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 in Hamilton, NJ. On September 16, 2001, an Arab-Amer-

ican man and his son were verbally accosted and attacked by a man shouting ethnic slurs and wielding a knife. The victim was able to use his cane to protect himself and his son until he was able to wrestle the knife away from the attacker. The perpetrator was eventually arrested by the police.

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.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

WHIZ KIDS

• Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise to tell my colleagues about an extraordinary volunteer program that is dramatically impacting the lives of underprivileged, underachieving students in Denver, CO.

It is called Whiz Kids and, frankly this program is a classic example of what happens when men and women of faith, who love kids, decide to make things happen.

Each week, over 700 volunteers tutor elementary students in the Denver, Aurora, and Jefferson County school districts. Most of the tutoring takes place at urban churches, but at each of 44 sites, Whiz Kids provides books, computers, snacks, club time-spiritual values, a sense of community and, most of all, the love of men and women who care enough about the kids to invest a few hours a week to help them read.

The results have been nothing short of fantastic—the average youngster in Whiz Kids improves his or her reading ability by 1-3 grades each year, according to tracking by Denver Public Schools. The target for Whiz Kids is schools and students with scores below average in CSAP, Colorado's statewide student testing program.

Whiz Kids is an 11-year-old, nonprofit organization which is supported by over 700 volunteer tutors and more than 80 other key volunteer leaders. Each tutor make a 1-year commitment to the program and the tutor retention rate is an amazing 95 percent with 60 percent of volunteer tutors re-upping from one year to the next.

Whiz Kids operates on a shoestring—the total cash budget is only \$360,000 per year. But the dramatic results of this tutoring program, and its commendable cost efficiency, have called forth tremendous support from over 150 churches of many denominations.

The Colorado business community has also pitched in to help by donating 120 computers and other in-kind contributions and financial support from companies such as AV Hunter, Best Buy, Janis, JD Edwards, Kinder Morgan, King Soopers, Houghton Mifflin, Western Union, and others.

Additional support comes from the Anschutz Family Foundation, Coors Foundation, Daniels Foundation, El Pomar, Fund for Colorado's Future, Jack A. Vickers Foundation, PK Foundation, Sam S. Bloom Foundation, the Schlessman Family Foundation, Schramm Foundation and TYL Foundation.

The Denver Nuggets donated the entire Pepsi Center to Whiz Kids for a 1-day Slam Dunk Saturday event at which 2,000 mentors and kids gather for basketball clinics and drills. Then, mentors and kids are guests of the Nuggets for the evening game. This is the largest gathering of its kind in the NBA. The Nuggets donate additional tickets for tutors, kids, and their parents throughout the season.

The Denver Broncos donate tickets to their kids camp. Whiz Kids has received the Denver Broncos Quarterback Award 2 years in a row. The Colorado Rapids annually donate game tickets for kids and tutors.

Each year, Whiz Kids holds its year end Run to Read event at Denver's City Park. More than a thousand tutors and kids gather for games, music, and fun to celebrate achievements of the year. Last year, this event also raised pledges of more than \$20,000 from tutors to buy additional supplies for the following school year.

From start to finish, kids and tutors have a lot of fun, but the main purpose is completely serious—to get kids who are falling behind in reading back on track. It is a program that is working.

Whiz Kids has been called one of the top three faith-based tutoring programs in America by Tony Campbell of America's Promise. And no wonder, it is already being copied in eight other States.

I hope my colleagues will take a moment to read a recent letter from the Denver Public Schools which describes why Whiz Kids is such an "excellent model of collaboration" between the public schools and the private sector.

"To Whom It May Concern: In support of the Whiz Kids Tutoring Program, this letter shall serve to detail the collaborative relationship between our organizations. Whiz Kids Tutoring operates in partnership with the Denver Public Schools Office of Community Partnerships, as an independent agency providing services to our students. Because of this partnership by acting as the interface between the program and the principals and teachers of our district. At the beginning of each school semester, we assist the program by identifying students and facilitating student participation, and by coordinating the participation of DPS liaison teachers. Our office provides additional salary compensation for liaison teachers, based upon the number of sessions attended in a given school year. This compensation totaled over \$29,000 for the 2001-02 school year. In addition, our office provides Colorado Bureau of Investigations background screening for all incoming volunteers to the program, and we assist