



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2005

No. 33—Book II

Senate

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERN- MENT FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2006—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. GREGG. There is 7½ minutes remaining in opposition?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. GREGG. There is story after story for everything in this country. The problem is, if we start funding all the stories, we will run out of money and tax our kids so they cannot afford it and tax ourselves so we cannot afford it.

The issue is setting priorities. The President has suggested a priority in the area of CDBGs. I suspect this Congress is not going to accept that priority, but it should function within the caps that have been set in order to decide whether it chooses that priority.

This is a reasonable approach, to set a cap and then say to the Appropriations Committee, you decide whether CDBGs make more sense than some other program that would compete for the same amount of money.

I will not vote for either of these amendments, but if I had to vote for one or the other, I would be more inclined to vote for the one from the Senator from Minnesota because he does not impact caps and takes it out of something called 800 which is the general operation of the Government which means basically a cut to IRS and other operating accounts within the Government.

I don't think that should be the way we should approach this. We should, rather, allow the Appropriations Committee to make decisions on this and we should not be arbitrarily in the Senate reallocating money from IRS over to the CDBG Program on the basis of anything, including stories.

I understood the Senator from Maryland wanted a couple of minutes.

I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for a very eloquent statement about the effectiveness of the CDBG program. Of course, he has absolutely firsthand experience with it having been a mayor of one of our great cities. I appreciate his analysis of the worth of the CDBG program.

I simply make this point, and this is a broader priorities question: The amendment I have offered derives the funding, in order to restore the money, by closing tax loopholes—the very provisions that passed the Senate overwhelmingly last year 92 to 4 on the FSC/ETI bill. A lot of these provisions were dropped in conference. The ones dropped would produce \$27 billion over a 5-year period. So there is not much argument about the necessity of closing these loopholes. The overwhelming judgment here was that ought to be done. That would then avoid cutting other programs.

There is a dilemma here. I understand that. If we are trying to keep things neutral as far as contributing to the deficit is concerned, then the question becomes, do you cut other programs in what is, I think, an already extremely tight budget. So you fund CDBG, but you would diminish the funding for housing, education, and other programs—across the board. The alternative is to find a revenue source in which there is general agreement in terms of an abuse of the Tax Code.

Now, the chairman refers to that as taxing and spending. I do not know how you spend if you do not tax unless you are going to run up a deficit. I regard that as responsible budget making.

You always have to use reasoned judgement and analysis in terms of what is fair and right. The proposal here is to close some of those tax loopholes. There has been an overwhelming judgment that those loopholes should be closed. The amount of revenue pro-

duced by closing the loopholes dropped in conference is three times what it would cost to restore the CDBG Program. Thus closing only some of them would produce sufficient revenue to restore these programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 2 minutes

Mr. SARBANES. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Maryland.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The Senator from Mississippi.

AMENDMENT NO. 208

(Purpose: to modify the designation authority for an emergency requirement)

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 208, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] proposes an amendment numbered 208.

On page 42, line 14, strike “that” and all that follows through “designates” on line 15 and insert: “that the Congress designates as an emergency requirement”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 10 minutes evenly divided on this amendment.

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Madam President, section 402 of the pending budget resolution establishes a procedure for designating emergency appropriations that I believe creates a new and unnecessary hurdle for Congress in responding to emergency situations. It distorts the balance of power between Congress and the President.

Section 402 permits an emergency designation of an appropriation to be challenged on a point of order and provides that the point of order can be waived only by a vote of three-fifths of

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2899

the Senate. That point of order has been incorporated in budget resolutions for several years now. It was put in place to curb what was seen as an overuse of the emergency designation to escape the limitations of the caps on discretionary spending. It has served successfully to impose restraint on emergency designations.

But now, in this resolution, the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee has included, in addition to that requirement, the further requirement that the President must also designate the appropriation as an emergency in order for it to escape being counted against the budget resolution caps for discretionary spending.

While it is true the Presidential designation was part of the process in the original Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, that legislation was a comprehensive measure with a number of budget enforcement provisions, and was before the three-fifths or 60-vote requirement had been imposed on the process. It seems to me we do not need both the 60-vote requirement and the new Presidential designation requirement.

Let me suggest a hypothetical situation. Let us say this provision were in place when this body takes up the President's emergency supplemental request, which has been passed by the other body. Let us say that an amendment is offered on the floor to address an emergency situation not included in the President's budget request, and its emergency designation is challenged by a point of order here in the Senate, and, further, that an overwhelming majority of the Senate votes to approve the emergency designation. Despite the size of the vote in the Senate, so long as it is over 60, and even if the President signs the bill into law, if the President declines to specifically and expressly concur with the congressional emergency designation, the appropriation will be counted against the discretionary cap by the Budget Committee scorekeepers. This is even though the President approves the appropriation.

My suggestion is by signing the bill the President approves the decision of the Congress that the funds are needed, and that they should be spent, and that they are needed to address an emergency.

So despite a substantial majority vote here in the Senate on a particular appropriation provision, despite congressional approval of an appropriations bill, including its emergency designation, and despite the President signing the bill, approving the bill with this provision in it, the President can effectively nullify the action of the Congress relative to the caps on spending set by Congress in its own budget resolution.

I believe the inclusion of this additional Presidential power should be stricken from this resolution and we should enforce our budget provisions with the 60-vote point of order as provided by our rules and under the law.

Congressionally imposed caps on spending should be set and enforced by Congress, not by the President.

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

Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I rise in opposition.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREGG. How much time would the Senator need?

Mr. BYRD. Two minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the committee, for his characteristic courtesy.

I rise, Madam President, to express my admiration for Senator COCHRAN as he assumes the duties of chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Today, I stand with Chairman COCHRAN in support of his amendment concerning the authority of Congress to designate funding as an emergency.

In the Constitution, there is no ambiguity about which branch of Government has the power of the purse. It is the congressional power of the purse which is the central pillar of the system of checks and balances under our Constitution. The budget resolution that is before the Senate includes a provision which makes the ability of the Congress to designate funding as an emergency subject to the approval of the President.

The measure that is before the Senate is a budget resolution. It is not a law. It will not be sent to the President for his approval. The Congress should not use a budget resolution to tie its own hands on spending decisions. The Congress should not tie its own hands in determining whether an expenditure for war, or an expenditure for victims of a flood, hurricane, or earthquake is an emergency. The Senate should not have to get on its knees and plead with any President for his permission to designate a provision as an emergency. The Congress is a coequal branch of Government under our Constitution, and it should jealously guard the prerogatives associated with the power of the purse, so wisely preserved for the legislative branch by our Founding Fathers.

If the Senate wants to provide emergency funding for agriculture disaster relief, or for responding to a recent flood or hurricane, or to provide additional funding to the Department of Defense for body armor, it must have that authority. The Cochran amendment makes clear Congress retains that authority.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Again, I thank the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, a lot of folks around here talk about budget reform, and this is budget reform in

that it returns us to the days when the President was treated essentially this way, back under President Clinton, under President Bush the first. I think it is important to know what the issue is.

The issue is not defense spending, because the proposed budget point of order and the Presidential involvement does not apply to defense spending. So with regard to the supplemental that is coming at us, the majority of which is defense spending, it does not affect that. It is nondefense areas where basically emergency designations are used to avoid the cap.

The cap is the enforcement mechanism on the discretionary side. There are going to be instances where we are going to have to go through the cap because there are legitimate emergencies—hurricanes, the tsunami. But the simple fact is, there are also instances where we have used the emergency designation, such as for oyster farming, where maybe they were not quite emergencies, and yet they allowed the cap to be avoided for that spending item.

This tries to put some balance back into the process of when we are going to have domestic emergencies and when we are not, and making sure the President is part of that process, which has traditionally been the way we did it around here. So I think it is reasonable change.

I understand the chairman and the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee are concerned because it may well impact them, although I suspect with this President they will be able to work out an understanding that they will agree on. But I do think it is an enforcement mechanism that is appropriate at this time.

Madam President, do I have any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 1 minute 20 seconds remaining.

Mr. GREGG. I yield that back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is yielded back.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following this debate which has just been completed, the following times be allocated specifically for Members to offer their amendments; provided further, that if the Senator is not here during the allocated time, the clock run against the time reserved for the amendment.

I send a list of those allocations to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 177

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I inquire, I believe in the order of matters it is appropriate now to consider amendment No. 177, and there is a 15-minute time limit on it. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a 15-minute time limit on the education amendment. Does the Senator call up the amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, I call up the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], for himself, Mr. DODD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. REED, proposes an amendment numbered 177.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the deficit by \$5.4 billion and support college access an equal amount by closing \$10.8 billion in corporate tax loopholes and: (1) restoring education program cuts slated for vocational education, adult education, GEAR UP, and TRIO, (2) increasing the maximum Pell Grant scholarship to \$4,500 immediately, and (3) increasing future math and science teacher student loan forgiveness to \$23,000)

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$1,446,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,606,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$1,332,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$454,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$110,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,446,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by \$7,606,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,332,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$454,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$110,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$5,389,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$5,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$15,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$25,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by \$40,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$723,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$3,803,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$666,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$227,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$55,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by \$723,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$3,803,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$666,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$227,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$55,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by \$723,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by \$4,526,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by \$5,192,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by \$5,419,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by \$5,474,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by \$723,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by \$4,526,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by \$5,192,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by \$5,419,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by \$5,474,000,000.

On page 17, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,389,000,000.

On page 17, line 17, increase the amount by \$723,000,000.

On page 17, line 20, increase the amount by \$5,000,000.

On page 17, line 21, increase the amount by \$3,803,000,000.

On page 17, line 24, increase the amount by \$15,000,000.

On page 17, line 25, increase the amount by \$666,000,000.

On page 18, line 3, increase the amount by \$25,000,000.

On page 18, line 4, increase the amount by \$227,000,000.

On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by \$40,000,000.

On page 18, line 8, increase the amount by \$55,000,000.

On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by \$1,446,000,000.

On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by \$10,948,000,000.

On page 36, line 21, increase the amount by \$8,000,000.

On page 36, line 22, increase the amount by \$8,000,000.

On page 36, line 23, increase the amount by \$93,000,000.

On page 36, line 24, increase the amount by \$93,000,000.

On page 48, line 6, increase the amount by \$5,381,000,000.

On page 48, line 7, increase the amount by \$715,000,000.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, during the last few days, we have voted on various education amendments. I want to direct the attention of our Members to some of the facts as we are coming to the final consideration of this amendment.

Fact No. 1: The chairman's mark in the 2006 budget, if you look on page 5, you will see education, training programs, and you see that there will be cut \$2.5 billion now, \$4 billion in the second year. According to the best estimate we have, from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, cumulatively over 5 years this will be \$40 billion. Those who are opposed to our amendment will say, you have a \$5 billion higher education trust fund. But as the chairman of our committee pointed out, that basically is a phony mark.

The chairman of our committee, Mr. ENZI, says that chairman's mark contains a \$5 billion reserve for new initiatives coupled with approximately \$5 billion in spending cuts. In order to get the \$5 billion in reserve funds, you have to effectively have these cuts plus the reconciliation cuts. What we are talking about basically are very dramatic and significant cuts in education.

This amendment does two basic things. First, it will ensure that we will reach \$4,500 in Pell grants. Second, it will fund the cuts that are proposed by the President in terms of TRIO and GEAR UP so that we will help the needy children in that area. Third, it will ensure that we are going to pro-

vide funding for vocational education, special skills, the adult education program, so we are going to have a continuing upgrade of American skills. That is one important part of this amendment.

The second important part is the part of the amendment that gives attention to where the United States is in terms of a global challenge. I personally believe that the greatest challenge we are facing today is globalization, and the challenge we ought to respond to is to make sure that our people will be able to deal with the global challenge. And that means investing in math and science.

This amendment will fund education for math and science teachers in a similar way that we did at the time we were threatened with sputnik in 1957. With this amendment we will effectively get 50,000 to 60,000 more math and science teachers every year.

We have seen what has happened to the United States in the area of math and science. In 1975, we were third in the world in terms of math and science and engineering degrees. By the year 2000, we were 15th in the world, and we are going down. This budget resolution will drive us down further. This amendment provides a stopgap to that and the opportunity to make significant gains. That is what this is about.

We know that the Chinese are graduating three times as many engineers as the United States will this year. India is graduating three times as many computer scientists as we are. If we just think that we can go along with business as usual, we are missing an enormously important opportunity and responsibility. We need this kind of investment. We need it so that we will be able to compete globally in terms of the economy. We need this investment so that we will be able to compete from a national security point of view. Investing in our young people is an essential part of our national security. We cannot tolerate the kinds of cuts that are included in this legislation. This amendment addresses that.

Those on the other side will say we have increased education funding by all these percentages in recent years. We have increased funding in education, but it is still totally inadequate. The fact is, most of the increase has been the result of action on this side. I wish we had been able to meet our responsibilities.

If you look at what is happening currently in terms of high school dropouts, these are three of the large high schools in Los Angeles—it is difficult to see, but you should be able to see the trend lines—Roosevelt High School, Garfield High School, and Huntington Park High School. You see the dramatic dropout that is taking place across the country. That is happening in our high schools.

Talk to any principal, talk to any school board, talk to any of those involved in education—they know what is not happening; that is, getting a good education.

Finally, for every 100 ninth graders, 68 of those graduate from high school out of every 100; 40, when they graduate, will enroll in college. Only 27 will stay enrolled as sophomores, and only 18 graduate from college on time out of the 100.

Money is not the only answer. Money in a number of instances isn't the answer. But investing in resources is an indication of our national priority. It does seem to me that we can afford the \$5.4 billion which is offset and paid for with the close of tax loopholes in a proposal that also includes \$71 billion in tax reductions for individuals. That is what this whole proposal is about. That is what this budget is about: the question of priorities. This is a \$5.5 billion investment in our children, offset—not increasing the deficit—with the closing of tax loopholes which has been accepted by the Senate in a proposal that is already providing \$71 billion in tax reductions. It does seem to me that this is more of an expression of the values of the American people. Five billion is a lot, but we know that investing in our young people, investing in math and science, is key to our future. It seems to me to be something that the American people should and will support. I hope this amendment will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, the Senator from Massachusetts is correct. Money does not solve the problem of education. If it did, the city of Washington would have the finest schools and the best academic experience in the country instead of the worst. The students regrettably score at the bottom of the Nation year in and year out. Yet on a per capita basis, more money is spent per child here in Washington than any place else in America: \$12,000 a year per child. I congratulate the present Mayor for trying to address the issue through creating choice within the school system. But that is a fact. Money does not necessarily solve education problems.

However, in the area of money, this Presidency has done a dramatically better job than the prior President in his commitment to increasing education dollars. Since coming into office, President Bush's increase in education exceeds that of President Clinton by 33 percent. His increase in funding for title I exceeds that of President Clinton by 52 percent. His increase in IDEA funding exceeds that of President Clinton by 75 percent. His increase in funding of No Child Left Behind exceeds President Clinton's areas in approximately the same programs by 46 percent. In this budget proposal, the President has proposed adding another \$500 million in IDEA, \$600 million in title I, \$1 billion in No Child Left Behind, and half a billion dollars into Pell grants.

In addition, this budget itself sets up the process for significant increases in funding in the Pell grant area so that

we can get to a \$4,150 grant next year. And if we follow the proposal of this budget, we will get to a \$5,100 grant for people who use Pell grants and go to college for 4 years and complete their schooling.

In addition, we put in \$5.5 billion, approximately, in order to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. And yes, it is paid for in large part, but it is paid for by basically ratcheting down on lenders. I suspect the Senator from Massachusetts will be comfortable with many of the pay-fors which Senator ENZI comes up with in committee. So the education commitment of this administration has been extraordinarily strong, and this budget puts forth some very creative and unique ideas for going forward on that aggressive approach.

This amendment is not the way to proceed. The Senator from Massachusetts has never been a wilting violet on the concept of increasing taxes. This amendment reinforces that fine track record as it increases taxes by \$10.9 billion. In fact, the entire other side of the aisle has not been much in the way of wilting violets on the issue of increasing taxes.

So far we have had approximately seven amendments that we have accounted for. I think there are a lot more floating around here that we have not yet accounted for that had they been passed or if they are passed—four of them were, fortunately, defeated—would have added \$47 billion. That doesn't count this \$10 billion. So we are up to almost \$60 billion of new taxes that has been proposed so far. I suspect that number is understated because I think we are missing five or six amendments that had been suggested in the last few hours late last evening.

So there is no question but there is a philosophy on the other side which this side is trying not to subscribe to, which is that you just raise taxes and you spend more money and that solves the problem. That doesn't solve the problem. The problem is that we have to set priorities, and within those priorities, some programs of the Federal Government should be funded more aggressively than others.

What the President has suggested specifically is that the core educational initiatives of the Federal Government—No Child Left Behind, title I, special education, Pell grant, higher education—will be funded extremely aggressively. The Congress may not decide to choose to follow that course of action, but at least we should go forward with the concept that we are going to set the priorities within a budget that we can afford and not break that budget and raise taxes on the American people.

Therefore, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise in support of Senator KENNEDY's amendment to increase education funding in the budget by \$5.4 billion. This amendment will provide ad-

ditional budget authority for the purpose of addressing many important education needs, including ensuring continued funding for TRIO, GEAR UP, and Perkins vocational education. In addition, this amendment will include funding to raise the maximum Pell grant award to \$4,500 this year, which is one of my top legislative priorities for this year.

Our system of higher education is in many ways the envy of the world, but its benefits have not been equally available. Unfortunately, it is still the case that one of the most determinative factors of whether students will pursue higher education is their family income. Students from families with incomes above \$75,000 are more than twice as likely to attend college as students from families with incomes of less than \$25,000.

To help remedy these inequities, the Federal Government has wisely invested in a need-based system of student financial aid designed to remove these economic barriers. Central to this effort for the past 30 years has been the Pell grant program.

The Pell grant program is the single largest source of grant aid for postsecondary education funded by the Federal Government. It provides grants to students based on their level of financial need to support their studies at the institutions they have chosen to attend.

I have long supported efforts to raise the Pell grant maximum award. I am pleased by the efforts of the Budget Committee to provide a \$100 increase in the Pell grant maximum award for this year. But I believe it is imperative that we succeed in providing a more substantial increase in the maximum grant this year.

That is why, as my first legislation of this year, I introduced Senate Resolution 8, calling on the Senate to increase the Pell grant to \$4,500 this year. I am very pleased to have Senators FEINGOLD, COLEMAN, KENNEDY, and DURBIN joining me as cosponsors of this resolution. They are all leaders in the effort to expand access to higher education.

The amendment before us builds on the efforts of my resolution, by following up to ensure sufficient budget authority to meet this goal.

While I understand that we face many difficult decisions on the budget resolution before us, I believe that a \$450 increase is an imminently reasonable and achievable goal for this year—especially in light of the fact that the Pell maximum grant has gone essentially unchanged for 4 years. After receiving a modest increase of \$50 in 2002, the maximum award has been stuck at the \$4,050 level for 2003, 2004, and 2005.

In the meantime, the cost of attending college has continued to rise. The combination of these factors over the past 4 years has led to a significant erosion in the purchasing power of the Pell grant, and has forced students to rely increasingly on loans to finance their higher education.

In 1975, the maximum Pell grant covered approximately 80 percent of the costs of attending a public, 4-year institution. Today, it covers less than 40 percent of these costs, forcing students to make up the difference by taking on larger and larger amounts of debt.

The decline in the value of grant aid and the growing reliance on loans have serious consequences for access to higher education for low-income students. The staggering amount of loans causes some students to abandon their plans to attend college altogether. According to the College Board, low-income families are significantly less willing, by almost 50 percent, to finance a college education through borrowed money than their wealthier counterparts.

That does not surprise me. Many working families in Maine are committed to living within their means. Understandably, they are extremely wary of the staggering amount of debt that is now required to finance a college education.

I also know this to be true from my experiences as a college administrator at Husson College in Maine. At Husson, 85–90 percent of students currently receive some sort of Federal financial aid, and—approximately 60 percent of students receive Pell grants.

As Linda Conant, the financial aid director at Husson told me:

You cannot imagine how difficult it is to sit with a family and to explain to them the amount of loans that are needed to finance a post-secondary degree. It scares them. That is why Pell grant aid is so important for low-income families. For these families, loans don't always work, but Pell does.

We also know that having a well-educated workforce is crucial to our economic future and competitiveness in the global economy. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has projected that over the next 10 years, there will be significant growth in jobs requiring at least some post-secondary education. So increasingly, higher education is going to be necessary to ensure employability and to prepare Americans to participate in tomorrow's economy.

That is why Pell grants are so important. Pell grants make the difference in whether students have access to higher education, and a chance to participate fully in the American dream.

Mr. President, Pell grants are targeted to the neediest of students—recipients have a median family income of only \$15,200. An additional \$450 in Pell grant aid may very well be the deciding factor on whether these students can pursue their college dreams.

The Pell grant program is the foundation of making good on the American promise of access to higher education. Now is the time for us to make a commitment to raising the Pell maximum award to \$4,500 for the upcoming award year. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor Senator KEN-

NEDY's amendment to the, fiscal year 2006 budget resolution. This amendment would ensure the necessary investment in education to secure our Nation's continued prosperity.

This amendment would focus on three areas critical to boosting educational opportunity and our economy. First, it would make college more affordable and accessible. The amendment would raise the maximum Pell grant by \$450, to \$4,500, a long overdue and necessary increase for millions of students who struggle to keep up with ever-rising college tuition. It also would restore a host of programs that give low-income Americans a lifeline to college. The President seeks to eliminate programs like TRIO, GEAR UP, and LEAP, which have opened doors for students who otherwise might never consider a college education, let alone be able to afford it.

Second, this amendment would make a crucial difference for high-need schools. We cannot remain global leaders in technology if we do not maintain a world-class standard of education in math and the sciences for all students. Yet we have a shortage of highly qualified teachers in these very areas. This amendment would use loan forgiveness as an incentive to attract and retain 57,000 teachers in math, science, and another woefully understaffed arena, special education.

Finally, this amendment would ensure the future competitiveness of the workforce by preserving investments in workforce development, adult literacy, and vocational education. In voting to reauthorize and improve the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, 99 Senators just last week recognized the indispensable nature of the act, despite the President's efforts to eliminate it. With this amendment we can restore funding for Perkins programs as well as for job training and literacy programs that give adults the tools they need to be economically productive.

The investment in these common-sense measures is one we cannot afford to forego. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 234

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENSIGN). There will now be 30 minutes of debate equally divided on the Baucus-Conrad amendment on agriculture.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. BAUCUS] proposes an amendment numbered 234.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that legislation to make cuts in agriculture programs receives full consideration and debate in the Senate under regular order, rather than being fast-tracked under reconciliation procedures)

On page 28, strike lines 14 through 20.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this amendment is critical to my home State of Montana and to most States in the Nation. It is agriculture. Agriculture is the financial engine that drives, certainly, my State's economy. It brings in \$2 billion of annual revenue plus benefits to rural communities and to our State generally. One in five Montana workers is employed in agriculture or a related field.

But this amendment is important not just to Montana; it is important to the Nation. America's agricultural producers provide us with the safest and highest quality food supply in the world. We all know that. It is worth repeating. It is worth remembering. Sometimes we take things for granted. Our agricultural producers in America provide us with the safest, highest quality food supply in the world. Americans are extremely fortunate to enjoy those benefits.

Agriculture is a small part of the Federal budget, but it is expected to shoulder huge cuts, very disproportionate cuts in this budget resolution.

The Senate budget resolution calls for a reduction in mandatory agricultural programs of \$5.4 billion over 5 years. The budget resolution puts \$2.8 billion of those savings on fast track through reconciliation.

I was one of the farm bill negotiators and supporters of that legislation, but I disagree with some of the provisions within the law. The 2002 farm bill represented a delicate balance between diverse interests. It was very tough to put that together. The 2002 farm bill was a 6-year bill, not an on-and-off bill but a 6-year bill, and people had reason to expect it settled farm policy for 6 years. People have to plan, to have a sense of what is going on. It is not just farmers, but bankers, equipment suppliers, and farm implement dealers. Producers and bankers who made financial decisions to enter into contracts with the understanding that the farm bill would not be renegotiated until 2007, that was their understanding.

If Congress proceeds with the agriculture cuts in this budget resolution, we will be cutting nutrition, not just the six basic crops in the farm bill, but cutting nutrition, conservation, and forestry programs. These cuts are not directed solely at the commodity programs. In fact, they are directed at many other segments of the whole agriculture bill.

The Senate should put off the policy discussions that are behind these cuts until we begin debate on the new farm legislation. That is the appropriate time to debate these policy discussions, not in the budget resolution to cut for the sake of cutting. The commitment

that Congress and the President made to farmers, to conservatives, and the neediest in our society should be maintained until a new farm bill is developed.

Proposed mandatory spending cuts will also unilaterally disarm our trade negotiators, especially our agricultural trade negotiators. The United States recently lost its appeal of the World Trade Organization dispute panel decision concerning domestic cotton. It is not widely known, but it should be well understood, the implications of that decision.

At the same time, we are negotiating a new global trade agreement with the WTO, of which agriculture is a critical part. That decision is going to put our agricultural producers and our agriculture program in jeopardy. We should, therefore, not commit to the substantial agriculture policy changes that this resolution would require while we are engaged in those trade talks. We should not unilaterally disarm. It makes no sense, and I cannot understand for the life of me why this budget resolution unilaterally disarms our farmers before we go into negotiations. Some argue the proposed cuts are good for our negotiators because they demonstrate to other countries that the United States is serious about agriculture reform.

I have learned through very hard, bitter experience that no country altruistically, out of the goodness of its heart, if it has any sense, is going to lower a trade barrier. They do not unless they have to. You have to provide leverage. There are many examples where the United States had to exercise leverage to get other countries to lower a trade barrier. It takes leverage. They just do not do it out of the goodness of their heart.

If we do that, think what the Europeans are going to do. They are going to say: Oh, those Americans, they have already eliminated their agriculture program, they have cut their supports, so we Europeans do not have to go quite so far. I tell you, it makes no sense, no sense whatsoever for this Congress to pass a budget resolution which cuts agriculture by such a dramatic amount.

In 2002, total EU domestic supports plus export subsidies totaled \$37 billion. What was ours? What was the U.S. comparable figure? It is about \$17 billion, and that is just actual spending.

Look at that: Europeans have twice the amount of agricultural support payments that we have, twice as much as the United States has—more than twice as much as the United States has. Yet we are coming before this body and saying we are going to cut agriculture even more, while the Europeans have close to three times the amount of subsidies we have. I do not think that makes much sense.

The total amount agreed to in the WTO Uruguay Round is \$81 billion for the EU and \$19 billion for the United States. Just think of that. That was

the Uruguay Round. That was a mistake. Mr. President, 81 for them, 19 for us. These cuts contained in the budget resolution, to which I am opposed, are, therefore, clearly ill timed. This is the wrong time to do this. Developing countries, in particular, have offered very little in agricultural talks. If we pass this resolution, they are going to ask themselves: Why should they? They can keep their sky-high tariffs on agricultural products and still get the United States to cut its support of U.S. agricultural programs.

We also lose bargaining power to push for changes to the European's agricultural policy. That policy transformed postwar Europe from the world's largest food importer to one of the world's largest net exporter of agricultural products.

Let me state what happened. This pretty much demonstrates what happened in this country, why agricultural producers in the United States are in tough shape. In the 1970s, the European Union was the world's largest net importer of agricultural products. They decided that is wrong; we have to do something about it. So they did. What did they do? They implemented massive agricultural support payments for their farmers so that in a 10-year time in the mid-1980s, Europe became the largest net exporter of agricultural products. It was a big shift from the world's largest importer to the world's largest exporter in 10 years, and that is where they stayed. That is what we face. That is why it is wrong right now in this budget resolution to further cut agricultural payments which are disproportionate right now.

Our farmers and our ranchers can compete with anybody in the world just as long as the playing field is level, but we should not put American farmers and ranchers at a disadvantage by cutting U.S. programs just as we are seeking changes in other countries' programs. We should not unilaterally disarm. We should not unilaterally disarm agriculture just as the trade talks reach a critical point. They are upcoming. To do so would not just be unwise, it would be reckless.

Agriculture is being asked to make a substantial and disproportionate contribution to spending reductions. This is unjustified. There are other cuts in this budget not nearly as great as the ones agriculture will face. I just think it is sensible to support this amendment so we do not cut agriculture the way proposed in this resolution. It makes no sense.

I see some of my colleagues on the floor who wish to speak on this amendment. I see Senator CONRAD. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate strikes the budget reconciliation instructions to the Senate Committee on Agriculture. The amendment deletes the requirement that the Senate Agriculture Committee report

legislation that reduces outlays by \$2.8 billion. It does not change the other budgetary assumptions for agriculture contained in the resolution.

The fact is, agriculture has already contributed substantially to deficit reduction. We are far below in funding what the farm bill called for. We are \$16 billion below what the farm bill anticipated. If the national media ever reported something incorrectly, they reported incorrectly the effect of the last farm bill on agriculture spending. You would have thought, reading the national press, that agriculture got an enormous increase, a 60-percent increase. Wrong. Agriculture did not get an increase, agriculture got less money. What they left out were the disaster bills we had been reporting and passing year after year. Here is the pattern of farm program spending, and this shows the spending went down. It did not go up. The national media just got it wrong.

This is in the midst of a circumstance in which our major competitors are providing far more funding to their producers than we are providing to ours. Our major competitors are the Europeans. Here is what they are doing. They are providing \$277 an acre of support each and every year for their producers. The comparable amount in the United States is \$48. So they are outgunning us over 5 to 1.

It is not just in domestic support. It is also in international subsidies, subsidies for export. Here is the European Union's part of world agricultural subsidies. They account for 87 percent of world agricultural export subsidies. This is the U.S. share—1 percent. They are outgunning us 87 to 1.

Right now we are entering negotiations with the WTO to try to level the playing field. Let me remind my colleagues, this is what Europe is doing for their farmers. These are not KENT CONRAD's numbers, these are the international scorekeepers' numbers, OECD: Europe, \$277 an acre per year per producer; the United States, \$48. On export subsidy, Europe accounts for 87 percent of all the world's agricultural export subsidy; the United States is 1 percent. They are outgunning us 87 to 1.

We are just entering negotiations to try to level the playing field. Why would we ever unilaterally disarm in the midst of a trade dispute? We would never do that in a military confrontation. Why would we do it in a trade confrontation?

Unilaterally cutting in the midst of the farm bill, in the midst of international negotiations, is a profound mistake. If anybody doubts what is happening, Europe has gone from being the biggest importing region in the world to the biggest exporting region, and they are now equivalent to us in world market share. Keep up with this strategy and America is going to become a second-class agricultural power.

This year, USDA forecasts we are going to import more agricultural production than we will export. That is a

stunning turnaround for the United States. We should not continue down that path.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleague and yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 40 seconds remaining.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from North Dakota if he might have time he can allocate to other Senators, inasmuch as the time remaining on this amendment has virtually expired.

Mr. CONRAD. The short answer is I do not. Under the agreement that has been reached, all time has been allocated among these various amendments, so there is no time remaining to allocate.

Mr. BAUCUS. I wonder if I can impose upon the very gracious generosity of the Senator from New Hampshire and ask if perhaps he could give a little time on this side.

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

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I do have 5 minutes, I have been informed, that I can allocate. Let me give that 5 minutes that I have available.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Senator. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is a critically important issue. I appreciate the work of my colleague from Montana and my colleague from North Dakota. This is about family farmers. The reconciliation instruction to take money from an account that is critically important for the survival of family farmers is just a bad instruction. My colleague from Montana wants to abolish that instruction.

Look, family farmers, in my judgment, have a lot of fights. They fight every year. They fight against bad weather, crop disease and insects, and they have to fight grain markets trying to make a living out under the yard light on the family farm. They should not have to fight the U.S. Congress and the administration.

We made a deal on the farm program. We made commitments on food programs. The family farmers should not have to face jeopardy from this Congress.

The fact is, this Congress has decided for family farmers that we want to provide a bridge across price valleys, so that when prices precipitously drop, we don't wash away all of the family farmers of this country. So we put together a farm program, an account in the budget that deals with ag. It all works together. I believe the recommendation to cut these funds is a recommendation that pulls the rug out from under America's family farmers.

Bad trade deals have undermined our farmers. Weather and insects and grain markets have undermined our family farmers. The last thing that should

happen is for us to pull the rug out from under our family farmers.

I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague, Senator BAUCUS, from Montana. I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. PRYOR.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, in 2002, this Congress entered into a contract with our farmers, and today what we are discussing is—believe it or not—actually breaking that contract with America's farmers. Let's not just focus on the farmers, because the agriculture bill is much broader than that, including children and nutrition programs, poor people on food stamps, and every consumer who buys food in this country. As it now stands, America spends less on food than any other nation in the world. If this passes, that might change.

I support deficit reduction. We know that. The farmers have already contributed over \$16 billion to deficit reduction. That is according to CBO. When you look at the numbers, they are very clear. Farm spending only amounts to less than one-half of 1 percent of Federal spending, but accounts for 17 percent of the Nation's GDP and 25 million jobs.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, there is not enough time in the day for me to talk about agriculture because it is in my veins. I do come to the floor to support my colleague from Montana. A few weeks ago, I came to the floor to note my extreme disappointment in President Bush's ag budget proposal, and really his entire budget proposal as it relates to rural America. I reiterate my support for our farmers and our rural communities by speaking in strong support of this amendment.

Our agricultural producers and the folks who live in rural America are every bit a part of the fabric of this American family. There is no reason why they should be asked to carry a disproportionate share of the sacrifice in dealing with this historic debt. I join President Bush in wanting to deal with this historic debt. But there is no reason in this world why rural communities and agricultural producers—

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, is there any of my time remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 45 seconds.

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield that to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Thank you. I do want people in this country to know that the people in rural America, whether it is ag producers, who have absolutely no certainty about the things that contribute to what they have to do; they have no control over the weather, no substantial control over trade. Yet,

they did have a role to play, as everybody in this body did, in the contract that came about in the farm bill.

This is not the appropriate place to breach that contract. It is not the appropriate place to turn on the people of rural America that support this great Nation in the safest, most abundant and affordable food supply in the world. We have an opportunity to look at what we can do for rural America.

I encourage my colleagues to support the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be added as cosponsors to my amendment: HARKIN, STABENOW, DAYTON, PRYOR, LINCOLN, SALAZAR, and CONRAD.

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

The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, I thank my chairman, who has almost an impossible job on this budget.

I rise to discuss this resolution and its impact on agriculture. I ask the Senator, is my understanding correct that this budget resolution directs the Senate Agriculture Committee to contribute toward deficit reduction by reducing mandatory program spending by \$2.8 billion over the next 5 years? Is my understanding correct?

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I appreciate the question of the Senator from Montana. Yes, the Senator's understanding is correct. We took great care to assure that this budget resolution was constructed to provide the Agriculture Committee with the flexibility needed to achieve a reduction in the deficit while ensuring continued support for programs that provide a critical safety net for farmers and ranchers, promote conservation, and reduce hunger.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the chairman. I understand the challenges of attempting to reduce the budget deficit by reducing spending. I believe we have to get a budget resolution passed, and I know that the Senator has to make some difficult choices. I also note that \$2.8 billion is a lot of money in Montana, especially given skyrocketing energy prices and the likelihood that this will be another drought year in Montana.

I ask the Senator, is it true that the House has asked their Agriculture Committee to reduce mandatory spending at a higher level than has been proposed by this budget resolution?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, the Senator is correct. I believe the House budget resolution proposes reducing mandatory spending for agriculture by \$5.3 billion over the next 5 years. I add that the President's budget proposed to reduce mandatory program spending for agriculture by nearly \$9 billion.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Senator. In a perfect world, I would prefer no reduction in spending for agriculture at all. As you know, the 2002 farm bill has already contributed significantly to deficit reduction. Over the past 3 years, farm programs spending has been about \$17 billion less than projected. So a lot of my farmers in Montana feel like they already "gave at the office."

However, we must face up to the reality of our budget situation and address this deficit. In doing so, however, reductions in spending must be proportionate. I urge the chairman, in the strongest manner possible, to keep the final budget resolution from asking for a higher level of mandatory program savings from agriculture than the \$2.8 billion that we have included in this budget resolution.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I will state that the Senator from Montana has been extremely persuasive. We started out with a budget number in this budget that essentially tracked the President's number in agriculture. But as a result of listening to the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Georgia, chairman of the Agriculture Committee, we have backed that number down rather dramatically from the original request of \$9 billion by the President's \$2.8 billion. And we have, as the Senator from Montana noted, at the request of the Senator from Georgia, given maximum flexibility to the Agriculture Committee so that they can reach that number. Remember, that is a 5-year number, not a 1-year number; the \$2.8 billion is spent over 5 years. They can reach that number however it is deemed best in looking at it through the lens of the Agriculture Committee, where the real expertise resides.

I thank the Senator from Montana for his very constructive effort in this area. I assure the people of Montana he has certainly held their interests and put their interests first and aggressively pursued it.

Mr. BURNS. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. I yield the balance of our time to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I want to start out today by acknowledging the cooperation and thanking the chairman of the Budget Committee for working together with those of us who have real concerns about agriculture and, particularly, relative to, obviously, the numbers that are contained in the President's budget and the final number agreed upon between the Budget Committee, as well as the Agriculture Committee. I thank my friend, Senator BURNS from Montana, for his outstanding input into this and his persuasive arguments. It is because of things like that that we have been able to negotiate this number down to something that we think is now fair and reasonable.

Let me, first of all, say that I, too—like my Democratic colleagues on the

other side alluded to earlier—came to the floor immediately after the President's budget was sent to the Hill. He was extremely critical of that budget relative to the requested deficit savings in agriculture.

I, too, was at the table when we negotiated the 2002 farm bill. On the House side, we felt like we had a good farm bill, and we got together with folks on the Senate side and crafted a bill that provides a real safety net for our farmers across America.

The fact is that that farm bill has worked exactly like those of us who crafted the farm bill wanted it to work—that is, philosophically. When times and yields are good and prices are up, there are very few Government payments going to our farmers. In tough times, when prices are low and yields are low, whether it be from drought or other circumstances, in agriculture country the Federal Government does extend a helping hand not to guarantee any farmer a profit, but it allows them to get through to the next year when times might get better.

That having been said, I discussed not just on the floor of the Senate my displeasure with the administration relative to their budget proposals, but I went directly to the President. I told the President face to face that I was very disappointed in the numbers that had been sent down here and that, at the end of the day, I really did feel like America's farmers and ranchers would be willing to pay their fair share for deficit reduction, but we were simply not going to pay a disproportionate amount when times are difficult in agriculture country, and when we have farmers who have depended on that 6-year farm bill and have made financial plans, whether it is the purchase or lease of land, purchase of farm equipment, or planning for the growing and harvesting of crops, as they have done, depending on that 6-year farm bill being in place.

Therefore, as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I made a commitment to our farmers and ranchers that we are going to do everything possible to make sure that the policy of that farm bill is not changed. We can do that.

The folks on the other side, frankly, have made my argument for me. That is this: They have said, correctly, that in 2002 when the farm bill was passed and signed into law, fiscal conservatives all across the country and the media really chastised those of us that crafted that farm bill for spending way too much of the American taxpayers' money on agriculture programs. We knew that if the farm bill worked right, we would never spend what was projected. In actuality, it was projected that we would spend \$52 billion on commodity programs in 2002, 2003, and 2004, and because we have had good yields and good prices in those years, we have spent only \$37 billion. That is just in one title of the farm bill. So we have achieved savings of \$15 billion in 3 years.

We also have the food stamp title, where no projected savings have been talked about at this point. Maybe some can be achieved. When I came to Congress in 1995, USDA reported that the Food Stamp Program error rate was 10 percent.

Last week, USDA testified before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture and said that the error rate has now been reduced to 6 percent. That is because of the hard work of everybody in this body on both sides of the aisle and everybody in the House on both sides of the aisle. We have squeezed that program down to where the error rate is still at 6 percent. That is too much. But still it is coming way down.

We can probably achieve some additional savings there. Also, we have the conservation title, which has not been discussed. We are going to spend about \$33 billion this year on the Food Stamp Program, about 2.5 on conservation, and projected about 18 on commodities.

Now, if we have saved \$15 billion on the commodity title alone in 3 years, am I hearing this right, that folks on the other side are saying we cannot achieve \$2.8 billion over the next 5 years, not just from commodities but from all three titles in the farm bill? I think that is kind of a ludicrous argument for us to say that when we are in tough times—times have changed since we passed this farm bill in 2002, where we were in surplus times. Times have changed because we are now in a deficit situation and we must be fiscally responsible in this body, just as our colleagues on the House side must be fiscally responsible.

I cannot imagine anybody saying that we cannot be treated fairly when we are going to be cutting and asked to be finding savings in Medicaid, in transportation, in education, and in other mandatory programs, that farmers and ranchers and their respective States are not going to be willing to participate when we have already saved an average of \$5 billion per year, that we are now being asked to save \$2.8 billion over 5 years, that our farmers and ranchers would not be willing to participate in their fair share, so long as, and I emphasize this, we do not change the policy in the farm bill.

We have entered into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee that as he goes into conference he is going to do everything within his power to make sure we hold this \$2.8 billion figure because we already know the House has come in with a number in excess of that. I would again say if the requested deficit savings on agriculture are disproportionate in any way, we need to look at it and we need to rethink where we are today. But when we look at the \$2.8 billion and the fact that we have saved an average of \$5 billion a year, I know and understand we have not been asked to share in an amount that requires that the deficit reduction requested by the President be taken out on the backs of

farmers and ranchers. I would rather not have any, but being fiscally responsible is as important as writing a good farm bill.

I close by saying that as I have gone around the country—and I have over the last 2 weeks. I have been in the far West, I have been in the Midwest, and I have been in the Southeast, talking to farmers and ranchers, and I am very pleased with the reaction that farmers and ranchers have given to me personally when we have explained to them how we are going to approach these deficit savings. What I have told them is we are going to be fair and equitable in each and every title, and that we are going to ask all of agriculture to share somewhat in the pain, but it is not going to be disproportionate, and we are going to keep the policy of the farm bill in place and we are going to find reductions in savings that will allow the greatest patriots in America—and that is farmers—to participate once again in deficit reduction, and when we do this we want to assure, in all probability, that farmers and ranchers will have this \$2.8 billion returned to them in interest savings alone, because we all know if we continue down this trail of deficit spending, interest rates are going to rise. If we act responsibly in this body and also on the House side relative to this issue of deficit spending, we can either hold interest rates in line or maybe see them reduced again, which will be of tremendous benefit to our farmers and ranchers.

I am proud to represent agriculture country. I come from the heart and soul of agriculture country in my State, and farmers and ranchers all across America are the salt-of-the-Earth people who make this country the great country it is. They have always been willing to do their fair share, and that is simply what we are asking for, nothing more.

I yield back.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I support this amendment because it would prevent the damage this budget resolution seeks to inflict on Americans throughout our country in all walks of life who benefit from the whole range of programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, where I am proud to serve as ranking Democratic member.

It is said that the cuts to these programs required by this resolution are no cause for worry, no sweat. With respect, I must say the facts are otherwise. The 2002 farm bill has already suffered serious cuts in three annual appropriations cycles. This budget resolution contains further and even deeper cuts—both in appropriations and through budget reconciliation instructions to our committee and the House Agriculture Committee. To be sure, the \$2.8 billion reconciliation instruction in this resolution is less than in the President's budget, and it is less than the \$5.3 billion reconciliation instruction in the House's version of the bud-

et resolution. However, I would note that the Senate resolution does assume additional budget reductions of \$2.7 billion, so the total assumed budget savings from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry is \$5.5 billion in this resolution.

The budget reconciliation figures in these resolutions are a direct assault on the progress we made in writing a balanced farm bill in 2002 that covered a whole range of needs from helping protect farm income, to providing food to poor families and children, to improving conservation and environmental practices, to promoting farm-based renewable energy, to increasing food and agriculture research, to assisting rural economic development and others. We need to protect that balance.

Where is the budgetary justification for making these cuts and upsetting the balance we struck and the progress we made in the farm bill? There is no justification. We have been fiscally responsible in the programs falling in our committee's jurisdiction. We were provided a budget allocation to write the 2002 farm bill and we stayed within it. We repaired Freedom to Farm and reinstated a countercyclical commodity program. Thanks to that countercyclical feature, the commodity programs have cost some \$15 billion less than they were expected to cost over the first three years of the 2002 farm bill. We also carefully and responsibly invested some of our farm bill budget allocation to strengthen programs and adopt innovative new initiatives in conservation, agricultural trade, rural development, nutrition, agricultural research and renewable energy.

The direct harm from these budget cuts would be serious enough, but in addition they can only upset carefully struck balances in the 2002 farm bill and reopen old arguments and old fault lines. We had broadly based bipartisan support for the 2002 farm bill, but this budget resolution threatens to tear that all apart. This resolution would pit one group and its interests against others—one title of the farm bill against others. As a result, we would be looking to the next farm bill with a reduced budget baseline and a fractured farm bill coalition, which would surely make it all the harder and more contentious to write the next farm bill.

Less than 3 years ago we passed a farm bill to repair our Nation's farm income protection system. It would be irresponsible to weaken that system now and create new uncertainty—especially when we need bargaining leverage in the midst of global agricultural trade negotiations in the WTO. Farm commodity programs are less than a half of a percent of the Federal budget. It is terribly misguided to propose that cutting farm income protection can significantly help solve Federal budget deficits.

Nor is there money to be spared in the farm bill's conservation, rural economic development, research or renew-

able energy initiatives—some of the most innovative and forward-looking parts of the 2002 farm bill which have already suffered the most and seem to be at the greatest risk of further cuts. These initiatives constitute investments in the future of our Nation's food and agriculture system, our rural communities and our environment and natural resources. Believe me, we are not investing too much in these initiatives. We are investing far too little.

This resolution is especially threatening to Federal food assistance and nutrition programs if history is our guide. The last time there was budget reconciliation, recipients of Federal food assistance took the heaviest hit of anyone. Think about the fairness of that. Those cuts did not come from waste, fraud, and abuse, but instead were taken from across-the-board benefit reductions that affected nearly all recipient households, including families with children, the working poor, the elderly, and people with disabilities.

This year we are hearing the same claims about waste, fraud, and abuse in Federal nutrition programs. In reality, we have worked hard to improve the program integrity of nutrition programs, and we have done it on a bipartisan basis. The error rate in the Food Stamp Program is now at an all-time low. There is not a realistic way to wring significant budget savings out of waste, fraud and abuse in nutrition programs. It is not there. Instead, this resolution would take away food from American families, most of them with children and most of them working or trying to find work. We should not add new hardship to the lives of working American families by cutting food assistance programs.

For all of these reasons, I support and am proud to cosponsor the amendment of Senator BAUCUS and urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Could I take a minute off of managers' time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, let us be very clear what this amendment is about. Agriculture represents less than 1 percent of Federal spending. It is being asked to take 9 percent of the mandatory cuts. If the Medicaid amendment is adopted, agriculture will be asked to take 16.5 percent of the cuts, and we are less than 1 percent of the budget. That is not fair. That sets a precedent.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONRAD. I will not yield.

That sets a precedent that is a profound mistake for agriculture and we will rue the day when we are in the midst of negotiations that we cut the heart out of our negotiators' ability to level the playing field for our producers. That is a mistake.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 239

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 15 minutes of debate equally divided on the Biden amendment on COPS. Who yields time?

The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk, which I do not have in my hand, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], for himself, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. SALAZAR, proposes an amendment numbered 239.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To enhance the ability of state and local law enforcement to prevent crime and terrorism by adding \$1 billion to restore funding to the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. This amendment is fully off-set by closing corporate loopholes and will generate \$2 billion in revenue with \$1 billion allocated to the COPS program and the remaining billion to reduce the deficit)

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by \$240,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by \$560,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$400,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$300,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$240,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by \$560,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by \$500,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$400,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$300,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$120,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$280,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$250,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$200,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$150,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by \$120,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$280,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$250,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$200,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$150,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by \$120,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by \$400,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by \$650,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by \$850,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by \$120,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by \$400,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by \$650,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by \$850,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 23, line 17, increase the amount by \$120,000,000.

On page 23, line 21, increase the amount by \$280,000,000.

On page 23, line 25, increase the amount by \$250,000,000.

On page 24, line 4, increase the amount by \$200,000,000.

On page 24, line 8, increase the amount by \$150,000,000.

On page 30, line 16, decrease the amount by \$240,000,000.

On page 30, line 17, decrease the amount by \$2,000,000,000.

On page 48, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,000,000,000.

On page 48, line 7, increase the amount by \$120,000,000.

On page 65, after line 25 insert the following:

FUNDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) State and local law enforcement officers provide essential services that preserve and protect our freedom and safety;

(2) with the support of the Community Oriented Policing Services program (referred to in this section as the “COPS program”), State and local law enforcement officers have succeeded in dramatically reducing violent crime;

(3) on July 15, 2002, the Attorney General stated, “Since law enforcement agencies began partnering with citizens through community policing, we’ve seen significant drops in crime rates. COPS provides resources that reflect our national priority of terrorism prevention.”;

(4) on February 26, 2002, the Attorney General stated, “The COPS program has been a miraculous sort of success. It’s one of those things that Congress hopes will happen when it sets up a program.”;

(5) the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Assistant Director for the Office of Law Enforcement Coordination has stated, “The FBI fully understands that our success in the fight against terrorism is directly related to the strength of our relationship with our State and local partners.”;

(6) a 2003 study of the 44 largest metropolitan police departments found that 27 of them have reduced force levels;

(7) shortages of officers and increased homeland security duties has forced many local police agencies to rely on overtime and abandon effective, preventative policing practices. And, as a result police chiefs from around the nation are reporting increased gang activity and other troubling crime indicators;

(8) several studies have concluded that the implementation of community policing as a law enforcement strategy is an important factor in the reduction of crime in our communities;

(9) In addition, experts at the Brookings Institute have concluded that community policing programs are critical to our success in the war against terrorism.

(10) the continuation and full funding of the COPS program through fiscal year 2010 is

supported by several major law enforcement organizations, including—

(A) the International Association of Chiefs of Police;

(B) the International Brotherhood of Police Officers;

(C) the Fraternal Order of Police;

(D) the National Sheriffs’ Association;

(E) the National Troopers Coalition;

(F) the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association;

(G) the National Association of Police Organizations;

(H) the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives;

(I) the Police Executive Research Forum; and

(J) the Major Cities Chiefs;

(11) Congress appropriated \$928,912,000 for the COPS program for fiscal year 2003, \$756,283,000 for fiscal year 2004, and \$499,364,000 for fiscal year 2005, and

(12) the President requested \$117,781,000 for the COPS program for fiscal year 2006, \$381,583,000 less than the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2004.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that an increase of \$1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2006 for the Department of Justice’s community oriented policing program will be provided without reduction and consistent with previous appropriated and authorized levels.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I only have a few minutes. I consider this, as my colleagues might guess—in all my years working on this, I sound a little like a broken record, but this amendment restores money for local law enforcement.

I want to make a stark point. In the past, we had an opportunity to deal with actually affecting violent crime. The way we did that was we passed a COPS bill that did a simple thing. It put more cops on the street in the Nation’s cities and rural communities. It had a funny effect, a profound effect. Violent crime dropped on average 8 percent per year since the bill passed in 1994.

We began to struggle with this concept and this notion even after the former Attorney General said the crime bill has worked miraculously, and then announced the administration was eliminating the funding for the COPS Program.

In that process, we went from spending over \$400 million on hiring additional cops at the local level—not we, but local law enforcement, local mayors, local town councils, local State police hired more cops, and in the year 2001 we spent over \$400 million on hiring new cops. That number is now down to zero in this budget.

All of my colleagues know, notwithstanding the fact they may subscribe to this notion of devolution of Government, meaning the Federal Government should not do anything the States can do, they have not only decimated the program that allows for hiring of law enforcement agencies locally but they have eliminated the big three, the COPS Program, the local law enforcement block grants, and the Byrne grants.

Total support for local law enforcement from the Federal Government has

gone down from \$2.2 billion we were sending to local law enforcement in the year 2002 to \$118 million this year. Will someone on this floor tell me how that possibly makes sense?

Local law enforcement is facing what I would call the perfect storm. First, the FBI has been taken out of local law enforcement. The FBI accounted for somewhere between 2 and 10 percent of all the enforcement done at the local level, depending on the jurisdiction, for bank robberies, interstate auto theft, and a whole range of other issues. But necessarily, the FBI has been taken out of that and put in counterterrorism. Violent crime task forces are gone. The Federal arm has been withdrawn.

Secondly, of the 46 or so major police agencies in the United States of America, 27 of them have had to cut the number of cops they have. In New York, it is 3,400 cops down; Cleveland, 250; Minneapolis, 140; New Orleans, 100. There are some 3,373 pending applications for additional cops from 3,373 jurisdictions in America, totaling well over a request for more than 10,000 additional law enforcement officers.

What is the last part of this perfect storm? The last part in the perfect storm is that State and local budgets are crunched. Now, I realize I only have 7 minutes so I will conclude with this simple point: I hear my friends say that Homeland Security is going to fill in the blanks. There is not one penny in Homeland Security allowing for the hiring of an additional local law enforcement officer, No. 1. No. 2, if anybody is going to find a terrorist about to put sarin gas into the heating system or cooling system of the largest mall in Little Rock, AR, or in Savannah, GA, it is not going to be some guy wearing fatigues and night-vision goggles who is a special forces officer in the U.S. military. It is going to be a local cop on his way from a Dunkin' Donut shop on his rounds behind that shopping center.

So we are making a tragic mistake. I do not understand the President's rationale. My legislation calls for funding the COPS Program at over \$1 billion to eliminate the current backlog in applications and to meet State and local needs. We do it by cutting corporate loopholes and we provide an additional \$1 billion in deficit reduction as well.

The COPS office has met its goal of funding over 100,000 cops, but it is like cutting grass. Everybody says what a great job it did. Well, when one cuts their grass this summer, the first week it looks great. Two weeks later, when one does not cut it, it looks a little ragged. Six weeks later, it is a wheat-field. That is how crime is.

The idea with an expanding population that we can use fewer resources to fight crime is absolutely mindless, and that is exactly what we continue to do.

These law enforcement officers taking this money over the years are a

victim of their own success. They made it work.

I will close with a quote from the president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police, IACP:

But when I first read President Bush's budget for 2006, I felt as if someone had punched me in the stomach.

I ask any one of my colleagues to go home and ask any one of their law enforcement agencies, State, municipal, town, county, whether they need this help. I will be dumbfounded if they find anybody who says they do not. The idea that this is not a Federal responsibility is beyond me.

Where do my colleagues think the dope is coming from that is coming into their cities and towns? It is because of a failed Federal policy on interdiction at our borders. It is because of a failed Federal policy relating to all the poppy being grown in Afghanistan, a failed Federal policy of all the cocaine coming out of the Andes.

This is a Federal responsibility. To quote President Reagan—I do not know who he was quoting, but he is most associated with the comment—if it ain't broke, do not fix it.

This ain't broke. It is working. Do not try to fix it by eliminating funding for local law enforcement from in 2002 over \$2 billion to in this budget less than \$118 million.

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

Mr. BIDEN. I yield the floor.

Mr. GREGG. To quote President Reagan: The only thing in this city that has eternal life is a Federal program.

COPS is the No. 1 poster child for that statement. Why is the COPS Program being wound down? Because when it was started, it was supposed to end after 3 years.

Mr. BIDEN. Not true.

Mr. GREGG. That was the agreement. When President Clinton offered this proposal, which I supported, which I funded—I happened to chair the subcommittee that funded this proposal—the understanding was it would be a 3-year program. The cities and towns would come in, they would get their police officers approved, and then after 3 years those police officers would be off the Federal payroll, on the local payroll, and when we got to 100,000 police officers, the program would end. In the year 2000, we got to 100,000 police officers; in the year 2001, we got to 110,000 police officers—and the program goes on and on.

There was an agreement 2 years ago that we would only fund those officers who were sort of the end of the line—in rural communities, essentially—and then we would terminate the program the way it was supposed to be originally terminated. That has not happened, either.

Finally, the President, living up to the commitment of President Clinton, has said: Enough is enough. The program did what it was supposed to do, it put over 100,000 police officers on the

street. As a result of doing that, it has succeeded. Let's declare victory relative to this program because it accomplished what it was supposed to accomplish—it added 110,000 or 120,000 officers, I guess, in the end—and let's take these funds which were being used here and move them to another account, specifically accounts which are going to be more focused on a targeted response—primarily to the threat of terrorism—versus a general response.

The police officers, obviously, have a terrorism role, but they have a lot broader portfolio when they walk on that street, from moving-vehicle crimes to, obviously, violent crimes to drug crimes. But the dollars that were being spent on the COPS Program have been moved over, essentially to homeland defense and other accounts, the purpose of which is to get the Federal role together in an area where we have a priority, which is fighting terrorism.

The officers who were put on the street by this program are theoretically still on the street because the communities that use this program to basically gear these officers up—I think we paid 75 percent the first year, 55 percent the second year, 25 percent the third year, and then it goes on the community's payroll, that officer's salary—those officers are still out there, one presumes.

It is just extremely ironic that there would be such an outcry to keep a program that the prior administration fully expected and put forward as a program that was going to be focused on getting 100,000 police officers on the street, and when it accomplished that it would terminate. It accomplished that and more, and it should be terminated.

So I hope maybe we could prove President Reagan wrong once. He has been right on just about everything he ever did as a President, but maybe we could just prove him wrong once—I'm sure it would make the other side happy—by showing all programs are not eternal in this city and we can terminate one—the COPS Program.

I yield the remainder of my time on this amendment, then, and we will move on to the next amendment, which I guess is Senator FEINSTEIN's.

AMENDMENT NO. 188

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 15 minutes of debate equally divided on the Feinstein amendment on SCAAP.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 188 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from California [Mrs. FEINSTEIN], for herself, Mr. KYL, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mrs. CLINTON, proposes an amendment numbered 188.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact a long term reauthorization of the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program and appropriate \$750,000,000 for the program in fiscal year 2006)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE STATE CRIMINAL ALIEN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Control of illegal immigration is a Federal responsibility.

(2) The State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (referred to in this section as "SCAAP") provides critical funding to States and localities for reimbursement of costs incurred as a result of housing undocumented criminal aliens.

(3) Congress appropriated \$250,000,000 for SCAAP to reimburse State and local governments for these costs in fiscal year 2003.

(4) Congress appropriated \$300,000,000 for SCAAP to reimburse State and local governments for these costs in fiscal year 2004.

(5) Congress appropriated \$305,000,000 for SCAAP to reimburse State and local governments for these costs in fiscal year 2005.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this concurrent resolution assume that—

(1) Congress will appropriate \$750,000,000 for SCAAP for fiscal year 2006; and

(2) Congress will enact long-term reauthorization of SCAAP to reimburse State and local governments for the financial burdens undocumented criminal aliens place on their local criminal justice systems.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, this is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment sent to the floor by Senator KYL, Senator HUTCHISON, Senator BINGAMAN, Senator AKAKA, Senator CORNYN, Senator SCHUMER, Senator FEINGOLD, and Senator CLINTON. It is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment to urge this Congress to reauthorize the SCAAP Program, the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program.

On every desk there is a chart that shows how much each State received for this program. What does this program do? What this program does is reimburse the State for the cost of the incarceration of an illegal alien. In other words, when someone comes to our country, commits a crime, is convicted of that crime, is in jail or is in State prison, the Federal Government—it is their responsibility for all matters pertaining to immigration—has reimbursed the State. The program reimburses the State for less than 20 percent of the actual cost to the State. The authorization is due to expire. We are asking in the sense of the Senate that it be considered for reauthorization.

Before I speak further, my main author, Senator KYL, wanted to make a few comments and then Senator CORNYN, if I might.

I yield briefly to Senator KYL.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for helping, again, to lead this effort to get adequate reimbursement to the States for

the incarceration of illegal immigrants. In the past, the amount of reimbursement had been roughly one-third of their costs. That is not enough, but at least it helped to defray the expenses of the States in housing these people who were convicted of crimes and who were ultimately the responsibility of the Federal Government.

In the last couple of years, the amount of money has gone down to the point that, as the Senator said, last year it was about 17 cents on the dollar. That is absolutely unacceptable. If the Federal Government cannot do what is necessary to control the border and prevent illegal immigration, at least it can help the States defray some part of their cost in incarcerating the people who come here and commit crimes. Surely we can authorize a program that could reimburse the States again at the level of approximately one-third of their costs. That will be our goal.

That is why I am very proud to, again, work with Senator FEINSTEIN to try to get adequate reimbursement to the States for this program. I fully support her effort. I compliment her for her leadership, and I hope my colleagues will join in accepting this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I yield my portion of the time to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I also want to express my gratitude to the Senator from California for taking the leadership on this issue again this year.

This is a common theme among those of us who represent border States, to ask the Federal Government to live up to its responsibilities. It is clear that the cost of housing aliens who are committing crimes in our country is a Federal responsibility. Yet for year upon year upon year they have thrust that burden on the States, and indeed on the counties at the local level.

In my State, about 8,700 criminal aliens have been detained at a cost of roughly three times what this provision would reimburse my State. This is about one-third of the money that is a Federal responsibility that would go back to my State and the States that bear that Federal expense.

I am all for the Federal Government living within its means, and I support this budget at the top-line number. I think part of budgeting is not only living within your means but it is making sure you fund your priorities. It is arguably a Federal priority to deal with the detention of illegal aliens who come into the country and commit crimes. It is a scandal that this sense of the Senate is even necessary again this year.

I want to express in closing again my gratitude to Senator FEINSTEIN for taking the leadership on this, and I certainly commend this to our colleagues.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I very much thank the Senators from Texas and Arizona for their support on this matter.

I know Senator KENNEDY has an urgent matter he would like to be able to present. I will not yield my time, but I would be hopeful that the President would give him time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to proceed for 1 minute.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California and others.

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE BY THE IRISH REPUBLICAN ARMY IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 84, submitted earlier today by myself, Senator MCCAIN, Senator DODD, and others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 84) condemning violence and criminality by the Irish Republican Army in Northern Ireland.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor of the resolution.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD, without intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 84) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 84

Whereas on January 30, 2005, a Catholic citizen of Belfast, Northern Ireland, Robert McCartney, was brutally murdered by members of the Irish Republican Army, who attempted to cover-up the crime and ordered all witnesses to be silent about the involvement of Irish Republican Army members;

Whereas the sisters of Robert McCartney, Catherine McCartney, Paula Arnold, Gemma McMacken, Claire McCartney, and Donna Mary McCartney, and his fiancée, Bridgene Karen Hagans, refused to accept the code of silence and have bravely challenged the Irish Republican Army by demanding justice for the murder of Robert McCartney;

Whereas when outcry over the murder increased, the Irish Republican Army expelled 3 members, and 7 members of Sinn Fein, the political wing of the Irish Republican Army, were suspended from the party;

Whereas the leadership of Sinn Fein has called for justice, but has not called on those responsible for the murder or any of those