

economy. But we're getting stiff resistance from across the aisle. They have attacked these needed tax cut extensions and sensible spending policies.

But they offer no constructive criticism or alternative solutions. They just throw rocks and complain about our budget proposal. When they ran the Budget Committee, they couldn't even get a budget that could pass on the floor of the Senate.

We also hear complaints about Social Security. Where is their plan to grapple with the future of Social Security? Where were they when the Clinton budgets "spent" the Social Security Surplus?

As our Budget Committee chairman said this morning, this budget will treat Social Security exactly the same as past budgets. The trust fund balances are available for future benefit payments, just as they were described in the fiscal year 2000 Clinton budget, which said, "they do not consist of real economic assets that can be drawn down in the future to fund benefits." We'll keep our Social Security money in treasury bills just as we always have and in fact, are required to do by law.

I am ready to tackle the problems Social Security will face in the next several decades. I, unlike many who just complain about the problem, have spent a lot of time thinking about Social Security, particularly during my time as chairman of the Social Security subcommittee in the House. In the past, I have even drafted and introduced an option for improving the system. Very few can say that. All can complain, but few are willing to be constructive.

I hope my colleagues can look past the partisan bias and rhetoric coming from some across the aisle. We drafted in the Budget Committee a serious proposal that addresses spending levels and our economy.

I support this budget before us today because it recognizes the realities of our world, the necessity to limit spending, and the importance of creating jobs and keeping the average American on the road to economic recovery. I urge my colleagues to support the budget resolution before us.

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, as the Senate considers the fiscal year 2005 Federal budget, I want to address what I believe are the deeply misplaced priorities of the Republican budget plan and the dangerous fiscal course facing the Nation.

In 3 short years, the Nation's fiscal health has deteriorated to the point of turning a record budget surplus of \$236 billion in 2001 to a gaping projected budget deficit of \$477 billion. Instead of working to steady the country's fiscal condition, the budget plan the U.S. Senate is considering will contribute an additional \$179 billion to the Federal budget deficit over the next 5 years by permanently extending tax

cuts for the richest one percent of American taxpayers.

There is another approach. It is an approach that strengthens the fiscal integrity of the government, while addressing the pressing needs of the 40 million Americans without health insurance, ensuring the solvency of the Social Security trust fund, as well safeguarding the homeland.

On Thursday, March 4, on a party line vote, the Senate Budget Committee approved a budget that adheres too closely to the President's budget plan and sets the wrong priorities for securing the homeland, creating the conditions for job growth, and tackling the out-of-control Federal budget deficit. Under the budget plan the Senate is considering, the Federal budget deficit would actually increase \$179 billion above the Congressional Budget Office CBO baseline. To forestall a further run-up on the government's credit card, the Senate should amend the Republican budget plan by identifying a combination of spending reductions and increases in revenues that will achieve the goals of reducing deficits and strengthening the economy.

In 2001, President Bush pushed through a sweeping tax cut on the rationale that the historic budget surpluses built up during the Clinton administration justified reductions in taxes. At that time, the Federal budget was at a record budget surplus of \$236 billion and I, along with many of my colleagues in the Senate, agreed that taxes should be reduced. Now that the fiscal condition of the country has swung deep into the red, it is necessary and prudent to reevaluate permanently extending tax breaks for the highest income levels. Such an approach, in combination with focused spending discipline, could reduce the deficit that threatens the long-term fiscal health of our country.

Instead of pursuing this approach, President Bush is asking Congress to make permanent the tax cuts that have put us in this situation. Since the United States is already in red ink, obviously the money for this new distribution will require decreases in important domestic spending and borrowing from the Social Security trust fund. I believe this is a terrible idea when other pressing budget priorities are shortchanged and cut.

Our Nation's veterans are currently on year-long waiting lists to get access to VA health care, our rural hospitals and nursing homes are on the verge of closing because of inadequate Medicare/Medicaid reimbursement, our schools are struggling to stay open due to reduced budgets, and the President says we don't have the funds for South Dakota's water projects. Some may see the people affected by these cuts as "special interests." I see them as South Dakotans who should not be short-changed to provide tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit the wealthiest one percent of Americans.

I remember when being a conservative meant living within one's means,

and that is the strategy our Nation ought to return to. President Clinton had it right when he called for an secured a balanced Federal budget—that meant we were not borrowing from Social Security, we were not creating huge new debts for future generations to pay off, we were creating millions of new jobs, and we were not jeopardizing Medicare and Social Security. Government is about priorities, and the Bush administration's budget priorities are wrong in too many instances. I will continue to do all that I can to redirect our Nation's resources to an agenda that better meets America's domestic needs and our international moral obligations. •

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, we have had a good debate. I appreciate our colleagues staying this late. We have been on this bill for a little over 13 hours today. I think we have made a lot of progress. We are going to have to make a lot more progress tomorrow.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each.

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

2004 WOMEN IN SCIENCE WEEK

Mr. DASCHLE. Madam President, the degree to which our Nation prospers in the 21st century will depend on our abilities to develop scientific talent in our youth, to provide lifelong learning to a well-educated workforce able to embrace the rapid pace of technological change, and to raise the level of public scientific and technological literacy.

That is why I am proud to announce a very exciting series of events taking place this week in my home State of South Dakota.

We urgently need to upgrade American students' knowledge and skills across the educational spectrum, particularly in mathematics, science, and technology. Results of an international science and mathematics study conducted in 2000 indicate that "children in the United States were among the leaders in the 4th grade assessment, but by high school graduation they were almost last." Part of the problem is that many girls and young women in junior and senior high school lose interest in science and technological careers.

As we work to develop the finest scientists and engineers for the 21st century, our human resources policy must move beyond simply the supply and demand of personnel and address the composition of the science and engineering workforce. Achieving diversity throughout the ranks of the scientific and technical workforce presents a formidable challenge; the number of

women and minorities in science and engineering, relative even to professions such as medicine and law, remains low.

We need to draw upon the full talent pool. Quality of education and equality of educational opportunity are central to our political future as well as to producing the workforce needed to maintain American leadership in the century ahead.

To address this challenge, the National Weather Service Forecast Offices in Aberdeen and Rapid City, with the support of local and State agencies, schools, and businesses, are co-hosting Women in Science conferences in Aberdeen, Watertown, Pierre, and Hot Springs the week of March 8 through 13, 2004. Governor Rounds has declared that week to be "Women in Science Week" in South Dakota.

These conferences provide a forum for young women and girls to learn about the virtually limitless opportunities available in math- and science-related careers and to create personal connections with professional women scientists. These positive role models encourage young women to develop or continue to cultivate an interest in science and technological careers. A total of over 700 junior and senior high school students and teachers will attend these conferences.

The work of all these individuals and organizations to inspire and mentor young women, and offer role models is crucial. My special thanks and appreciation go to everyone involved in this partnership—teachers, workers, State, local, and Federal Government, academia, and businesses—who will make this a successful and an inspiring conference.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2003

Mr. SMITH. Madam 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 Enhancement 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.

In the fall of 1999 in Washington County, PA, Ira Swearingen, a 49-year-old medical consultant was abducted, beaten and murdered. After being abducted, Swearingen was stuffed inside the trunk of his car while one of the perpetrators allegedly said, "Did ya' hear it? I broke his jaw." Another perpetrator heard gurgling of blood and heard the victim screaming. They yelled "Shut up faggot!" Later, the victim was driven to an isolated area, forced to strip and marched into the woods as he pleaded for his life at which point, one perpetrator testified, he shot the victim between the eyes at close range.

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. By passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

MILITARY SURVIVOR BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. INOUE. Madam President, I rise to encourage my colleagues to support S. 1916, the Military Survivor Benefits Improvement Act. The purpose of this legislation is to correct a long standing inequity in survivor benefits paid to the widows and widowers of our military retirees and what is afforded survivors of other Federal retirees. This legislation would balance cost and equity considerations by phasing in an increased benefit for military surviving spouses, over a 10-year period, from 35 percent to 55 percent of retired pay after age 62.

The military Survivor Benefits Plan simply does not stack up with the Federal civilian Survivor Benefit Plan either in benefits to survivors or in intended Government cost sharing to help reduce premium costs. When you compare survivor benefits you find that the military Survivor Benefit Plan provides for 55 percent of retired pay until the widow is 62, then drops payments to 35 percent of retired pay. This dramatic drop can translate to as much as one third of the previous payment.

Survivors of Federal civilian retirees under the earlier Civilian Service Retirement System receive 55 percent of retired pay—with no drop in benefits at age 62. Under the newer Federal Employee Retirement System, survivors receive 50 percent of retired pay, again with no drop at age 62. When the military Survivor Benefit Plan was enacted, the Congress intended a 40-percent Government subsidy for cost of military Survivor Benefit Plan premiums. Over time, because of conservative actuarial cost assumptions, the Government's cost share has declined to 19 percent. This means that military retirees are now paying 81 percent of program costs from their retired pay versus the intended 60 percent. This contrasts with a Government Service Retirement System and 33 percent for the current Federal Employee Retirement System.

In closing, I submit that these inequities are unfair to the deserving survivors of military retirees and should be corrected by supporting this important measure.

TIBETAN UPRISING DAY

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, March 10 has been known around the world as "Tibetan Uprising Day." Today, as Tibetans remember those who died resisting Chinese occupation, we too should reflect on the struggles that have faced Tibet since that fateful day 45 years ago. The events of that day, followed by over four decades of

struggle by the Tibetan people, is a plight that has become known to many around the world.

After Chinese invasion in 1949 and despite the 1951 Seventeen Point Agreement forced upon the Tibetans by the Chinese Government, it was clear by 1958 that they had no intention of securing the preservation of Tibetan autonomy and institutions. By March 10, 1959 so many Tibetans feared for the Dalai Lama's life that they surrounded his compound as a means of protection and began protesting Chinese occupation. Only seven days later the Dalai Lama escaped to India fearing for the lives of his vigilant people. After the crowds refused orders to leave the compound and unaware of the Dalai Lama's escape, the People's Liberation Army launched an attack killing thousands of innocent civilians. It is estimated that 87,000 Tibetans were killed, arrested or deported to labor camps during the uprising. Many attempted escaping the communist persecution to India, but only a small percentage actually survived the difficult conditions.

The United States has long supported the Tibetan right to self-determination and has declared Tibet to be an occupied territory. In 2000 this very body passed a resolution recognizing March 10 as Tibetan Uprising Day. In fact, the United States has supported the Dalai Lama's commitment to a dialogue and has commended him for his 1989 Nobel Peace Prize recognizing his efforts to work for self-determination through non-violent means. In the Dalai Lama's statement today he said, and I quote,

My hope is that this year may see a significant breakthrough in our relations with the Chinese Government. As in 1954, so also today, I am determined to leave no stone unturned for seeking a mutually beneficial solution that will address both Chinese concerns as well as achieve for the Tibetan people a life of freedom, peace and dignity.

I, like the Dalai Lama, hope that this year will be a breakthrough year for the Tibetan cause. On the eve of the 60th Session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, let us not forget or neglect the plight of Tibetans who have struggled for too long.

I ask unanimous consent that the full statement of the Dalai Lama be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF HIS HOLINESS THE DALAI LAMA
ON THE FORTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF TIBETAN NATIONAL UPRISING DAY

March 10, 2004

Today we commemorate the 45th anniversary of the Tibetan People's Uprising of 1959. I pay tribute to the many brave Tibetan men and women who have sacrificed their lives for the cause of Tibetan freedom. They will always be remembered.

This year marks 50 years since my visit to mainland China in 1954 to meet with the then Chinese leaders, especially Mao Tse-tung. I remember very well that I embarked on the journey with deep concerns about the future of Tibet. I was assured by all the leaders I met that the Chinese presence in Tibet was to work for the welfare of the Tibetans