

ago, I asked my colleagues a simple question. What is the purpose of an emergency appropriations bill? The purpose, it seems to me, is to fund unexpected priorities—emergencies that simply cannot wait for the normal budget process. The conference report largely fulfills that purpose. It covers unexpected costs associated with the war on terror, tsunami relief, and national security priorities, including funding for our troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan. I strongly support funding in these areas.

But that is not all it does, Mr. President. This conference report has also served as a magnet for non-emergency spending and includes a host of earmarks. Let me be clear: I support this conference report because of the critical resources it provides for our troops and for our other emergency priorities, including tsunami relief. But at the same time I am deeply disturbed that the Congress isn't exhibiting restraint. Knowing that this conference report was a "must pass" piece of legislation, we have once again loaded it with unrelated provisions. Let me remind my colleagues that we are experiencing enormous budget deficits. At some point, we will have to embrace some degree of fiscal responsibility.

We should start with this emergency supplemental. The scope of emergency appropriations has traditionally been limited, and for good reason. We already have a proper budget and appropriations process. We don't need another. The proper process is supposed to allow Congress to meet Federal responsibilities while closely monitoring the effect our spending has on the budget deficit and the national debt. But appropriations that are designated as "emergency" do not count against the discretionary budget ceilings that we ourselves set. They add to costs incurred by the government and cause the current budget deficit to grow. With enactment of this measure, supplemental military spending alone since September 11, 2001, will top \$200 billion. I am not questioning funding the war on terror; but I am questioning the unnecessary add-ons.

With respect to the substance of this conference report, I am pleased that it will provide the necessary resources to our troops as well as additional funds for our homeland security needs. It increases veterans benefit levels and expands eligibility, and provides higher benefits to family members of those killed in military service. This foreign affairs provisions of the conference report are remarkably, and commendably, free of pork. As one who supports ensuring that every taxpayer dollar counts, I commend my colleagues for their restraint in this area while meeting the President's request for funding for the victims of the South East Asian tsunami.

Unfortunately, this conference report also includes some unnecessary provisions, examples of which I will give in just a moment. I fully recognize that it

isn't only the fault of the appropriators that the Congress has been forced into this new pattern of adopting emergency appropriations measures. Overly partisan politics has largely prevented us from following the regular legislative order, and that fact must change.

I would ask my colleagues whether they believe the following examples—just a select few from this conference report—constitute "emergency spending": \$2,000,000 to upgrade the chemistry laboratories at Drew University in New Jersey. According to its website, Drew University has a total enrollment of 2,600 students, operates with a \$200,000,000 endowment, and draws more National Merit Scholars than many other top liberal arts colleges in the nation. A prestigious institution indeed, but I see no way in which funding for its chemistry labs is a critical national spending emergency; \$500,000 for the Oral History of the Negotiated Settlement project at the University of Nevada-Reno; \$2,000,000 to continue funding for the Southeast Regional Cooling, Heating and Power and Biofuel Application Center in Mississippi; \$4,000,000 to pay-off debt at the Fire Sciences Academy in Elko, Nevada; and \$2,000,000 for the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences in Michigan.

Additionally, notwithstanding Senate rules against legislating on an appropriations bill, the legislation before us today contains plenty of policy-related, non-appropriations language. For example: The conference report directs the Secretary of the Interior to allow oil and gas exploration underneath the Gulf Island National Seashore, a protected National Park in Mississippi. This changes current Federal policy disallowing such exploration; a line-item in the conference resolution blocks the EPA from revising how it collects fees for the registration of pesticides. For several years, similar language has been routinely added to VA-HUD/EPA appropriations legislation. Now this provision has found a new home in the emergency spending bill; it authorizes the Bureau of Reclamation to study the viability of establishing a sanctuary for the Rio Grande Silvery Minnow in the Rio Grande River; it directs the Army Corps of Engineers to complete the Indiana Harbor and Canal disposal project; and California lawmakers have seen to it that this bill provides funds for San Gabriel Basin restoration.

Mr. President, we simply must start making some very tough decisions around here if we are serious about improving our fiscal future. Let's be clear about what we are doing. The Government is running a deficit because it is spending more than it takes in. So each one of the earmarks in this bill, we are borrowing money—and saddling future generations of Americans with unnecessary debt. If we had no choice but to act in this way, this might be, a understandable, temporary method of budgeting. But the fact is that we do have a choice.

At a conference in February, 2005, David Walker, the Comptroller General of the United States, said this:

If we continue on our present path, we'll see pressure for deep spending cuts or dramatic tax increases. GAO's long-term budget simulations paint a chilling picture. If we do nothing, by 2040 we may have to cut federal spending by more than half or raise federal taxes by more than two and a half times to balance the budget. Clearly, the status quo is both unsustainable and difficult choices are unavoidable. And the longer we wait, the more onerous our options will become and the less transition time we will have.

Is that really the kind of legacy we should leave to future generations of Americans?

Referring to our economic outlook, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan testified before Congress that:

(T)he dimension of the challenge is enormous. The one certainty is that (the resolution of this situation will require difficult choices and that the future performance of the economy will depend on those choices. No changes will be easy, as they all will involve lowering claims on resources or raising financial obligations. It falls on the Congress to determine how best to address the competing claims.

It falls on the Congress, my friends. The head of the U.S. Government's chief watch-dog agency and the Nation's chief economist agree—we are in real trouble.

Dire predictions, and what are we doing about it? Are we restraining our spending? No, of course not. We are at it again, finding new and ever more creative ways to funnel money to the special interests. We have to face the facts. Congress cannot continue to spend taxpayer dollars on wasteful, unnecessary pork barrel projects or cater to wealthy corporate special interests any longer. The American people deserve better.

#### OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, when President Kennedy established Older Americans Month in 1963, he began an important tradition of designating a time for our country to honor older citizens for their many accomplishments and contributions to our Nation. Now, as we recognize May as "Older Americans Month," I welcome the opportunity to reflect on the contributions senior citizens have made in shaping our Nation and to reassert our commitment to enhancing the living standard of our senior community.

This year's theme is "Celebrate Long Term Living." Many seniors in Maryland exemplify that idea, continuing to lead vital, active lives throughout their "golden years." Bob Ray Perry Hall, from Hamilton, MD, who ran every day from April 4, 1967 until his 68th birthday on April 7, 2005, is one such example. Mr. Hall holds the longest consecutive running streak in the United States and the second longest record in the entire world, a remarkable accomplishment at any age. Ms. Evelyn Wright of Annapolis is another

senior to celebrate. In 2003, Ms. Wright was named National Master Field Athlete of the Year for 2003 and since the age of 55, she has amassed hundreds of medals and trophies as a competitor in Senior Olympic events. She started her track and field career with the softball throw, but now competes in a multitude of events including pole vault, high jump, long jump, and hammer throw. She continues to travel around the country competing and setting track and field records for her age group. Many seniors in Maryland are enjoying old age by starting new ventures. At age 68 and 66 respectively, Emily Levitas and Linda Segal decided to join forces and become co-owners of "Gotta Have Bags," a successful handbag store located in Hampden.

The list of enterprising, energetic, and active Maryland seniors and others throughout the Nation goes on and on and extends to all facets of life. We are very grateful for the enormous contributions they make day in and day out. But as a Nation, we do not always live up to our end of the bargain. There is much to be done to help seniors sustain quality long-term living. I have worked diligently in the Senate to ensure that older Americans are able to live with dignity and independence during their later years, and we will continue to fight the recent slew of misguided attacks on Social Security, Medicare, and other programs so crucial to senior citizens.

I have significant concerns about the impact of Medicaid cuts on seniors. People often forget that Medicaid is the largest funding source for long-term care services, institutional and home-based, for the elderly. Without such aid, many older Americans could not manage to pay for adequate care. Yet the Administration proposes to slash this program while extending tax cuts for the wealthiest among us. It is difficult to "celebrate long-term living" if you cannot afford to secure reasonable quality healthcare and long-term living facilities.

Another critical need that must be addressed is affordable prescription drugs. I voted against the Medicare Prescription Drug and Modernization Act of 2003 because I believed it would jeopardize promises that we as a Nation have made to seniors. I was principally concerned that the new law would fail to provide a comprehensive, consistent, and affordable prescription drug benefit to Medicare beneficiaries. Many of the concerns that I had during consideration of that measure are now coming to fruition. Indeed, as we prepare for the implementation of the drug benefit in 2006, we are just now learning that seniors will encounter the uncertainty of incomplete coverage for drug costs, along with rapidly rising pharmaceutical costs. To address these concerns, I favor proposals that provide Medicare beneficiaries with full prescription drug coverage. In addition, a number of my colleagues and I supported legislation during the Sen-

ate's consideration of the Medicare overhaul that would have controlled drug prices by allowing our Government to negotiate directly with drug companies. Unfortunately, these proposals were defeated when they came to the Senate for a full vote, but I continue to work with my colleagues on these and other proposals to bring drug prices under control.

On top of all of this, the Medicare trustees have predicted exhaustion of the Medicare Hospital Inpatient Trust Fund in 2020. With the rising costs of drugs and health care in general, and the implicit lack of means to reduce drug costs in the new law, we will be faced with hard decisions sooner than originally anticipated. The answer to the funding gap must not be to decrease benefits. A comprehensive Medicare plan and affordable pharmaceuticals are two important pieces that could help seniors live with dignity and independently, but these crucial needs remain very much in jeopardy.

Finally, our seniors deserve the guarantees promised to them after years of contributing to the Social Security program. In 1935, President Roosevelt sought to create a program that would "give some measure of protection to the average citizen and to his family against the loss of a job and against poverty-ridden old age." There are those who suggest that the only way Social Security can meet the expanding demand of future retirees is by creating private accounts and simultaneously decreasing benefits. We must work to preserve, not diminish, Roosevelt's legacy. Thus far, Social Security has been effective in improving the standard of living and reducing poverty among the elderly and disabled by providing an inflation-indexed, defined benefit, no matter how long an individual lives and regardless of the vagaries of the stock market. Throughout their lives, seniors have paid into a system with the understanding that their benefits will be there for them when they retire. We must uphold our end of the bargain and ensure that these benefits are available. The words of President Roosevelt should continue to guide our conscience.

This Older Americans Month I ask my colleagues to respect and renew our commitment to our seniors and all of our citizens. As seniors face old age, they should not face uncertainty about their living situations, about their access to health care, and about their financial circumstances. Our older Americans add great value to our Nation. We must take this month as an opportunity to redouble our efforts on behalf of this and future generations so that our older Americans can continue to "Celebrate Long-Term Living" now and well into the future.

#### TAKE OUR DAUGHTERS AND SONS TO WORK DAY

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, today I have 18 young men and women from

Louisiana and the Washington area taking part in Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day. I am going to submit all of their names for the RECORD to show that they spent a day working in the Senate with me and with some of the other Senators and have seen firsthand the work that goes on.

I want to acknowledge the MS Magazine Foundation that started Take Our Daughters and Sons to Work Day to thank them for organizing this effort where there are thousands, maybe perhaps millions, of young people who have taken a day out of their school work to go to the various places where Americans are working to contribute to making this country of ours a better country and this world a better place.

I thank these young men and women for being a part of this special day and taking their time to come and learn about the workings of the Senate:

From St. Catherine of Siena School: Gabrielle Bordlee, Metairie, LA;  
From Schriever Elementary School: Cameron Dark, Houma, LA;  
From Georgetown Day School: Alexa Dettlebach, Chevy Chase, MD;  
From St. Francis Xavier School: Brennan Duhe, Baton Rouge, LA;  
From Washington International School: Maggie Johnson, Washington, DC;  
From Holy Name of Jesus School: Ben Landrieu, New Orleans, LA;  
From Xavier University Preparatory School: Jasmine Love, New Orleans, LA;  
From Cathedral-Carmel School: Andrew Mahtook, Lafayette, LA;  
From Cathedral-Carmel School: Robbie Mahtook, Lafayette, LA;  
From Tehefuncte Middle School: William Mitchell, Mandeville, LA;  
From St. James Episcopal Day School: Dexter Righteous, Baker, LA;  
From Georgetown Day School: Molly Roberts, Washington, DC;  
From Georgetown Day School: Connor Snellings, Washington, DC;  
From Georgetown Day School: Mary Shannon Snellings, Washington, DC;  
From St. George's Episcopal School: Leah Thomas, New Orleans, LA;  
From St. Clement of Rome School: Mary Catherine Toso, Metairie, LA;  
From St. Elizabeth School: Charlie Triche, Napoleonville, LA;  
From St. Joseph Elementary: Sam Triche, Napoleonville, LA.

#### CONTRIBUTIONS OF MISS ELIZABETH BRYDEN TO THE SENATE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, in 1939, before many Members of this body had been born, Miss Elizabeth Bryden of Waltham, MA, came to Washington, D.C. to work for Congressman Robert Luce. She continued to work on the Hill, with little interruption, until the start of the 96th Congress in 1979. Today, when most Hill staffers remain here for only a few years, Betty Bryden, as she was always known, remains an example of rare dedication and extraordinary public service.

Her early employers are now mostly names for the history books. For example, Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts and Bourke Hickenlooper of Iowa, not to mention