

health insurance plans in the SCHIP program is that it bears remarkable resemblance to a plan originally proposed by the health care task force of President Clinton, and particularly the one that has come to be known—and I don't know whether she takes pride in this title or is offended by it, and I certainly don't mean any offense, but sometimes known as Hillary Care.

This was a plan, as we will all recall, that grew out of a task force chaired by the then-First Lady which I think states very clearly its goal to start the role of Federal control of health coverage with kids first, or children, and then to add employer groups, individuals, and then Medicaid recipients. So that instead of the current 50 percent of health care in America today paid for by the Federal taxpayer and the Federal Government, it would grow to 100 percent, which would simply preclude any private marketplace and the individual choice that goes along with it for individuals.

Mr. President, just so you don't take my word for it and that it is made clear, I will offer from that task force report page 22, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the record following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CORNYN. Clearly, in this document, you will see that it does say that this proposal phases in universal coverage starting with Kids First. It says Kids First is really a precursor to the new system, and then other populations it proposes to phase in are employer groups, individuals, Medicaid recipients, and the like.

So I think that is what a lot of us are concerned about. And perhaps Senator CLINTON, now that she is a Member of this body, will talk to us a little bit about it and what her intentions are, what the intentions of the proponents are of the Finance Committee bill because there are some very serious concerns.

I will yield in a moment to the Senator from South Carolina, who has been so active in this area, but I think, as he will explain, there are a lot of us who would like to see not just additional money being provided for children's health insurance but that literally we make as our goal to provide each and every American access to their own health insurance, along with the individual choice and the freedom and the portability that will provide.

I know the Senator from South Carolina has done an awful lot of work on it—I have learned a lot from him in this area—and I think it is an important time to start this critical debate, and not just stop with the expansion of the SCHIP program, but to seek as our goal to provide each and every individual access to health care coverage of their own choosing.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

OPTION 3: KIDS FIRST COVERAGE

Implementation Start: January 1, 1995.

Phase-in: By Population, Beginning with Children.

Universal Coverage Achieved by: January 1, 2000.

SUMMARY

This proposal phases in universal coverage, minimizes the financial burden of the program at the outset, and covers the most vulnerable of our citizens—children—as quickly as possible. Under this approach, health care reform is phased in by population, beginning with children. Other populations are phased in as follows: Employer Groups: July, 1997; Individuals: January, 1998; Medicaid: January, 2000.

States may be granted a grace period under certain circumstances.

This proposal is designed in two parts which will be implemented simultaneously:

I. The quick coverage of children—"Kids First"; and,

II. the development of structures for transitioning to the new system and the phasing in of certain population groups.

Part I, Kids First is really a precursor to the new system. It is intended to be free-standing and administratively simple, with States given broad flexibility in its design so that it can be easily folded into existing/future program structures. The Federal government, States, and the private sector will play a role in its implementation and financing.

Part II of this proposal involves the development of purchasing cooperative (PC) structures and the actual phase-in of all other population groups within the PC system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for helping to start a very important national discussion about how we get every American insured. We can see in Washington, as we expand government health care, as we continue to expand unfunded liabilities into the future, and we add administrative costs, we are not covering people who need to be covered still.

When we look at our Tax Code and realize that there has been a lot of inequity there, that we are helping some buy health insurance but only if they work for the right employer, we need to look at being fair with our Tax Code and developing a policy that will help every American have a health policy they can own and afford and keep. We will be talking a lot more about health care later.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I wanted to talk about a couple of amendments that I have to the Homeland Security appropriations bill today. First, I would like to bring up the matter of security itself and how it affects our ports. Certainly, it is unfortunate that we have to be here once again to talk about threats to our homeland, but that is the reality we face today.

The amendment I am talking about now has been filed. It is amendment No. 2481. It will help us address some of

the vulnerabilities and help secure the American people. This amendment, No. 2481, which I will bring up later today, prohibits the Department of Homeland Security from using any funds to remove items from the list of offenses that disqualifies individuals from receiving a transportation worker identification credential—what we call the TWIC card.

Mr. President, we can spend all the money in the world screening cargo and hiring security personnel, but if someone working in our seaports looks the other way when something dangerous enters our country, all of our spending and all of our work is for nothing. Serious felons are prime targets for those trying to smuggle a nuclear device or a chemical weapon into our country, and we must close that security gap.

My colleagues will no doubt recall that I have tried to address this issue two times in the past year, and both times my amendments received overwhelming support. Yet we have not yet seen a sufficient result from the effort to secure the American people's safety.

Last fall, the Senate accepted an amendment I offered to the SAFE Port Act to close this dangerous loophole by codifying the Department of Homeland Security's rules banning serious felons from gaining access to the secure areas of our Nation's ports. In effect, it would have prevented these felons from obtaining this TWIC card. It was a commonsense amendment, and I suspect that is why it was included in the Senate's bill, without any objection from any Senator here. Let me repeat. It was included in the SAFE Port Act without objection.

I also suspect that is why no Senator has come forward to this day to take credit for gutting the amendment when they went behind closed doors in a conference with the House. The amendment that left this body was a codification of disqualifying felonies, developed after an exhaustive process by the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Departments of Justice and Transportation.

The offenses listed are very similar to those that have worked well to protect our airports and hazardous materials shipments for years.

Unfortunately, the provision that came back to this body after the conference committee was a list of offenses so short and rare that the TWIC restrictions offered by the so-called SAFE Port bill are essentially meaningless. The conference committee chose not to ban murderers, rapists, arsonists, smugglers, kidnappers, and hostage-takers from accessing the most secure areas of our Nation's ports. In short, they chose to override the expressed will of the Senate and make America less secure.

I trusted that Senators chosen to sit in conference with the House would act to protect items included by the Senate; especially those items with unanimous or near-unanimous consent in

this body that are critical to our homeland security.

But that trust was betrayed last fall, anonymously, behind closed doors.

It is not only those backroom deals that bring me here to offer this amendment today, but also the episode witnessed out in the open, on the Senate floor, during consideration of the 9/11 Commission bill in February of this year.

At that time, I again offered an amendment to codify the Department of Homeland Security's final rule on TWIC disqualifying offenses. But this time, I requested a rollcall vote, since the conferees clearly gave no regard to the unanimous voice of the Senate last fall.

This should have been another non-controversial passage. However, knowing they would be forced to actually go on record this time around, a separate side-by-side amendment preferred by Democrats and, no doubt, their allies in the labor unions, was introduced. Its language was less restrictive, allowing the current or future DHS Secretary to modify—in other words, remove—disqualifying offenses on the list. It passed 58–37.

My amendment was voted on immediately after, and passed 94–2. An article in the Roll Call newspaper from July 9 recounted the episode:

In February, 13 Democrats and Senator Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) voted against an amendment offered by Senator Jim DeMint (R-S.C.) to prevent people convicted of terrorism or other felonies from getting access to secure areas of American seaports. But before the vote was over, they all switched to "yea."

What happened was Democrat leadership made it clear to their caucus that their version, allowing removal of felonies from the list, would replace my language in conference. My Democrat colleagues switched to supporting my version because they knew it was irrelevant; that it would be "taken care of" behind closed doors, just like last time. Again, the final vote in favor of my amendment was 94–2.

And it is not just the Senate that overwhelmingly supports my language. The House of Representatives, just last week, voted 354–66 to instruct conferees to include my language in the conference report.

The conference report for the 9/11 Commission bill is beginning to circulate, and I understand that the conference committee has now denied the will of the Senate and the House, by including language allowing the removal of serious felonies from the list of TWIC interim disqualifying offenses.

The language has been watered down to reopen loopholes allowing smugglers, arsonists, kidnapers, rapists, extortionists, and people convicted of bribery, money laundering, and hostage taking to obtain access to secure areas in our ports.

We have a chance now on this appropriations bill to ensure that whatever is done to weaken these provisions on

the 9/11 Commission bill, that it will not have the effect of weakening our port security this year. We must not allow our constituents to be betrayed again by deals made in secret.

That is why I am offering this amendment. Again, it prohibits the Department of Homeland Security from using any funds we are appropriating in this Act to remove items from the list of offenses disqualifying individuals from receiving transportation worker identification credentials, also known as TWIC cards. I will ask my colleagues later in the day to support this amendment, and hopefully we will have a vote on it.

Mr. President, how much time is remaining on the minority side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). Eight minutes.

Mr. DEMINT. I would also like to address my amendment No. 2482.

This amendment would prevent the Government from shutting down when regular appropriations bills are not enacted. It would do so by automatically triggering a continuing resolution that funds agencies at current levels for up to 1 year. The amendment would begin automatic funding on the first day of a lapse in appropriations and it would end on the day the regular appropriations bill becomes law or the last day of the fiscal year, whichever comes first.

This would eliminate the must-pass nature associated with regular appropriations bills which often pressures lawmakers into accepting spending bills with objectionable spending.

The Democratic leader said at the beginning of the year that he would get all of the appropriations bills done before the end of the fiscal year, but there are only 2 months left and we have not completed a single bill. This means we are going to eventually be faced with having to pass a bad bill or allowing parts of the Government to shut down. I certainly don't support that and I know my colleagues do not either. This amendment will prevent that kind of train wreck from ever happening.

The President supports this amendment as I believe any President would because it prevents their administration from being shut down. His fiscal year 2008 budget says:

In the 22 out of the past 25 years in which Congress has not finished appropriation bills by the October 1st deadline, it has funded the Government through "continuing resolutions" (CRs), which provide temporary funding authority for Government activities, usually at current levels, until the final appropriations bills are signed into law.

If Congress does not pass a CR or the President does not sign it, the Federal Government must shut down. Important Government functions should not be held hostage simply because of an impasse over temporary funding bills. There should be a back-up plan to avoid the threat of a Government shutdown, although the expectation is that appropriations bills still would pass on time as the law requires. Under the Administration's proposal, if an appropriations bill is not signed by October 1 of the new fiscal year,

funding would be automatically provided at the lower of the President's Budget or the prior year's level.

My amendment would create a safety net that would avoid crisis situations that often pressure lawmakers into supporting spending bills they would not otherwise support. This is a commonsense proposal and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I notice the presence on the floor of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, who is under the order to have a specific amount of time for debate.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee for giving me this opportunity.

Yesterday, when I heard the Senate was considering passing an additional \$3 billion in emergency spending to secure the border, I looked into the situation very carefully and calculated that, with the funding level the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee recommended, we are already going to be increasing budget authority for border protection and enforcement by roughly 23 percent over fiscal year 2007. The President's budget had recommended \$13.5 billion, an 11 percent increase in border protection budget authority over fiscal year 2007. The Appropriations Homeland Security Subcommittee, in their wisdom, decided to increase it by another \$1.4 billion, which takes it to a 23 percent increase over fiscal year 2007. If the Graham amendment passes, we will have increased budget authority for this priority by almost 47 percent over what we appropriated last year.

I let the majority leader know that I objected to having this amendment for \$3 billion in emergency spending considered by unanimous consent. I thank him for the opportunity to object to it on the basis of a unanimous consent, and I am pleased this will be scheduled for a rollcall vote, I believe at 11:30.

Mr. President, as a senior member of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, and former chairman and now ranking member of its Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia for the last 8 years, I rise today to speak against the proposal to allocate an additional \$3 billion in emergency spending for the Department of Homeland Security.

First, I want to make clear that I agree with my colleagues that we must secure our border and provide the resources to do it. Had it not been for the fact that the previous administration and former Congresses failed to provide the money needed for border security, we would not have the illegal immigration problem now facing our country.

That being said, this administration has religion and in the past several years has taken seriously the need to

secure our borders. The President has recommended the funding necessary to get the job done.

Let me remind my colleagues that the Department's overall budget has grown more than 150 percent since the Department's creation merging 22 disparate agencies; while total homeland security spending has more than tripled since 2001. Of that total, border security and immigration enforcement represents approximately one-third of the Department's annual spending.

Since 2001, Congress has more than doubled funding for border security, from \$4.6 billion in fiscal year 2001 to \$10.4 billion in fiscal year 2007. Including the \$14.9 billion recommended by the Appropriations Committee, this figure would jump to a more than 220-percent increase in border security spending since 2001.

Through the Secure Border Initiative, a comprehensive and multi-year strategic plan funded by Congress, the Department of Homeland Security is making substantial progress. I would like to take a moment to share with you the achievements to date.

The number of border patrol agents has already been increased by nearly 40 percent, from about 9,700 in 2001 to 13,360 today. Congress has appropriated funds to hire a total of 2,500 new agents this year, bringing the anticipated fiscal year 2007 year-end total to 14,819 agents. The fiscal year 2008 budget we are considering would provide funds for an additional 3,000 border patrol agents, bringing the fiscal year 2008 year-end total to nearly 18,000 border patrol agents. By the end of fiscal year 2008, we will have doubled the size of the border patrol since 2001.

As we continue to ramp up the number of border patrol agents, 6,000 National Guard personnel have been deployed to the Southwest border as part of Operation Jumpstart. These personnel continue to assist Customs and Border Protection's efforts to secure the border.

The Department of Homeland Security has already gained effective control of 380 miles on the southwest border, plans to achieve effective control of 642 miles by the end of calendar year 2008; and has a strategic plan in place to gain control over the entire southwest border by 2013.

The Federal Government has effectively ended the practice of "catch and release" through a combination of tough enforcement and increased detention capacity.

We have more than doubled the number of immigration investigators.

The Federal Government has increased detention bed space by 46 percent.

We would all like to see these efforts move more quickly, but the reality is that it takes time to build fences, and it takes time to build radar towers, and it takes time to hire and train quality border patrol agents. The executive branch has made clear that border security is a high priority and has devel-

oped a strategic plan to accomplish these goals as quickly as realistically possible.

Today, while the Senate engages in debate, Customs and Border protectorate agents will apprehend roughly 2,617 people crossing illegally into the United States. Immigration and Customs enforcement personnel will house approximately 19,729 aliens in ICE detention facilities. The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center will train more than 3,500 Federal officers and agents. These daily statistics are further evidence that progress is being made.

I recall the February 2007 hearing before the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee when Secretary Chertoff presented his budget request for fiscal year 2008. The Secretary asked for \$13 billion to strengthen border security and immigration enforcement.

In justifying the administration's request, I can assure you that Secretary Chertoff was quite clear that he took very seriously his responsibility to secure the border. His testimony detailed the progress he had made, while outlining the Department's multiyear strategic plan for continued improvements. In recognition of the challenge, the Secretary acknowledged that we still had a long way to go to objectively say to the American people that the border is secure. The amount recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee in the base bill ensures these goals will be met.

The Appropriations Committee reviewed the Department's budget request and in its wisdom decided that the President may not have provided ample resources to the Department of Homeland Security. As a result, the Appropriations Committee recommended \$1.4 billion above the President's request for border security and enforcement, at a total of \$14.9 billion, which is a 23 percent increase over fiscal year 2007. If you include 3 billion more it will amount to a 47 percent increase.

I am confident that in addition to believing more money was needed for the Department, the Appropriations Committee wanted to send a signal to the American people that we have heard their cry to secure the border.

The Department of Homeland Security requested \$35.5 billion for fiscal year 2008, but this bill provides \$37.6 billion, more than \$2.2 billion above what the Department says it needs. But now, the Senate is proposing to increase that amount by yet another \$3 billion, so that the total budget authority would surpass \$40 billion. Some Senators claim that this is OK because that \$3 billion has been designated "emergency spending," as if using the emergency label is like waving a magic wand so that it doesn't actually cost us anything. That is not true. At the end of the day, this amendment will increase the national debt by \$3 billion, regardless of what label you put on it.

I might add that the President said he would veto this bill because it includes an "irresponsible and excessive level of spending." Irresponsible and excessive—words we in Congress disregard too often. Obviously from his perspective, the \$35.5 billion in net budget authority for fiscal year 2008 that Secretary Chertoff requested from Congress was what he felt was needed to fund the Department of Homeland Security and continue the efforts to secure the border. I know the President wants to assure the American people that he has moved with urgency to secure the border before he leaves office. Border security will indeed be part of this President's legacy.

In the simplest of terms, the Federal Government continues to spend more than it brings in, and both the amendment and the underlying bill continue that practice. Over my 8 years in the U.S. Senate, I have watched the national debt skyrocket 60 percent—from \$5.6 trillion in 1999 to \$9 trillion today.

No one talks about the national debt anymore. But running the credit card for today's needs and leaving the bill for future generations should not be the policy of the U.S. Congress. It represents a recklessness that threatens our economic security, our competitiveness in the global marketplace, and our future quality of life. If we decide we absolutely need to spend \$3 billion on something—and I support adequately funding border security—then we need to either raise more revenue or cut other spending to pay for it. Simply adding it to the national debt makes our country less secure in the long run.

How does continuing to borrow and spend make us less secure? Today, 55 percent of the privately owned national debt is held by foreign creditors—mostly foreign central banks. That is up from 35 percent just 5 years ago. Foreign creditors provided more than 80 percent of the funds the United States has borrowed since 2001, according to the Wall Street Journal. And who are these foreign creditors?

According to the Treasury Department, the largest foreign holders of U.S. debt are Japan, China, and the oil-exporting countries known as OPEC. Borrowing hundreds of billions of dollars from China and OPEC puts not only our future economy, but also our national security, at risk. It is critical that we ensure that countries that hold our debt do not control our future.

Why are we taking the fiscally irresponsible act that will add to our unbalanced budget and national debt? I am glad that the administration and Congress have placed the needed focus on this important priority, but I want to ensure that we do not go too far in simply throwing money at this problem; money that cannot be effectively spent in fiscal year 2008—which begins in October.

This money is not needed in light of the money the Appropriations Committee has recommended, including the

\$2.2 billion in additional spending over which the President has threatened a veto. The Department is already spending one-third of its budget on border security and immigration enforcement—a clear reflection of its priorities.

Next year, the Senate will review the President's budget request and the Appropriations Committee will recommend funding levels. If next year, we determine that more needs to be spent to continue to improve border security and enforcement, fine. But let's not simply toss an additional \$3 billion out the window for fiscal year 2008.

I have the deepest respect for my colleagues, but I respectfully disagree on appropriating an additional \$3 billion in emergency spending. They know and I know that the sole reason for appropriating these funds would be to convince the American people that Congress cares about securing the border—even though we know this additional spending exceeds what can possibly be spent in the 2008 fiscal year.

The question I ask is: How dumb do they think the American people are? Don't they realize that the American people will see through this charade and realize we are pulling a fast one on them?

How cynical can we be? The American people want us to work harder and smarter and do more with less and will be very angry that we are simply throwing money at a problem in a manner designed to make them feel good in the short term. This is the type of game playing that has caused our approval ratings to slump to all-time lows.

When something comes along that we decide we must spend more money on—and border security could very well be one of those things—then we need to be prepared to pay for that additional spending by either bringing in more revenues or cutting other spending. I ask my colleagues not to support this fiscally irresponsible act that will surely diminish our credibility with the American people.

I thank the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security for this opportunity. I hope some of my colleagues have an opportunity to understand why I think what we are doing here today is absolutely fiscally irresponsible. I am extremely pleased that this administration and this Congress is taking border security seriously. This attention is long overdue. I know all of us are trying to convey to the public that we are finally acting to secure the border. There is no one more ardent about that than I am. But let me remind my colleagues that the Department of Homeland Security has presented this Congress with a multiyear strategic plan for improving border security and enforcement, called the Secure Border Initiative. The Appropriations Subcommittee recommendations have fully funded the Department's request for what they believe they can accomplish in fiscal year 2008.

I have been on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee since I came to the Senate. I was part of creating the Department of Homeland Security. I have spent many hours with Secretary Chertoff and other Department officials. I really believe the money that has been recommended by the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee is adequate to get the job done during fiscal year 2008, in line with the Department's multiyear strategic plan. And we will reevaluate this situation for fiscal year 2009, and fiscal year 2010, and so on. But I do not think we should go through the charade of making the American people believe we are really sincere about securing the border by spending another \$3 billion of emergency spending when the substantial funding that has already been recommended for fiscal year 2008 will get the job done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I believe under the agreement the remaining time will be controlled by myself and the Senator from Arkansas; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority has 40 seconds remaining in morning business.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2638, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2638) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Byrd/Cochran amendment No. 2383, in the nature of a substitute.

Landrieu amendment No. 2468 (to amendment No. 2383), to state the policy of the U.S. Government on the foremost objective of the United States in the global war on terror and in protecting the U.S. homeland and to appropriate additional sums for that purpose.

Grassley/Inhofe amendment No. 2444 (to amendment No. 2383), to provide that none of the funds made available under this act may be expended until the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies to Congress that all new hires by the Department of Homeland Security are verified through the basic pilot program authorized under section 401 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 or may be available to enter into a contract with a person, employer, or other entity that does not participate in such basic pilot program.

Cochran (for Alexander/Collins) amendment No. 2405 (to amendment No. 2383), to

make \$300 million available for grants to States to carry out the REAL ID Act of 2005.

Schumer amendment No. 2416 (to amendment No. 2383), to evaluate identification card technologies to determine the most appropriate technology for ensuring the optimal security, efficiency, privacy, and cost of passport cards.

Schumer amendment No. 2461 (to amendment No. 2383), to increase the amount provided for aviation security direction and enforcement.

Schumer amendment No. 2447 (to amendment No. 2383), to reserve \$40 million of the amounts appropriated for the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office to support the implementation of the Securing the Cities Initiative at the level requested in the President's budget.

Schumer/Hutchison amendment No. 2448 (to amendment No. 2383), to increase the domestic supply of nurses and physical therapists.

Dole amendment No. 2462 (to amendment No. 2383), to require that not less than \$5,400,000 of the amount appropriated to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement be used to facilitate agreements described in section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Dole amendment No. 2449 (to amendment No. 2383), to set aside \$75 million of the funds appropriated for training, exercise, technical assistance, and other programs under the heading State and local programs for training consistent with section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Cochran (for Grassley) amendment No. 2476 (to amendment No. 2383), to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish reasonable regulations relating to stored quantities of propane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11:35 a.m. shall be for debate on the Graham-Pryor amendment, with 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from Ohio, Mr. VOINOVICH, and the remainder of the time equally divided and controlled by the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, and the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. PRYOR.

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2480 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2483

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, consistent with the unanimous consent agreement, we will be talking about an amendment that was discussed last night. Senator CORNYN had some language changes to the amendment that have now been adopted. I believe it makes it a much stronger, better amendment.

What we are trying to do here is add \$3 billion to go toward securing the border, and I believe that is a homeland security event. So it is certainly an amount of money that is large in nature but goes to something that is large in nature in terms of our national security needs.

In terms of Senator VOINOVICH and his concerns about spending—I admire him greatly. He has been a constant, serious, thoughtful voice about controlling spending. This is an emergency designation, which means it is an off-budget item. I think Senator VOINOVICH has every right in the world to be concerned about how the Congress is spending money in a way for the next