



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2001

No. 150

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, November 5, 2001, at 2 p.m.

Senate

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2001

(Legislative day of Thursday, November 1, 2001)

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DEBBIE STABENOW, a Senator from the State of Michigan.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, thank You for another day to live for Your glory by serving our Nation. We accept the Psalmist's admonition as our motto for the day: "Be of courage, and the Lord will strengthen your heart."—Psalm 31:24. Your fresh supply of strength gives us courage to live fearlessly today. You replenish our diminished strength with intellectual creativity, emotional stability, and physical resiliency. The tension of these frightening days on red alert have made us all much more alert to Your presence and power. The more we place our trust in You, the more the springs of tension within us are released and unwind until we feel a profound peace inside. As this workweek draws to a close, we thank You for Your protection and we renew our commitment to live by faith and not be beset by fear. Your perfect love casts out fear. We relinquish our worries to You and our anxiety is drained away. We say with the Psalmist, "But as for me, I trust You, O Lord; I say, 'You are my God. My times are in Your hand.'"—Psalm 31:14-15a. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable DEBBIE STABENOW led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, November 2, 2001.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DEBBIE STABENOW, a Senator from the State of Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Ms. STABENOW thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, we will be in a period for morning business today. A number of Senators have ex-

pressed a desire to speak. For the information of all Senators, we are going to have a vote at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, so Senators should be prepared for that. We should have a very busy week next week. We hope it is the week prior to our recessing for the year. We will do our very best to do that. That would be 2 weeks from today.

If we complete the Labor-HHS bill on Tuesday, the only appropriations bills we will have left is DC, plus the big Defense appropriations bill. So we are moving right along. We have a lot to do, though.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Wyoming.

TRIBUTE TO JONN J. EDMUNDS

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, for the last week, I have been trying to figure out how to pay tribute to a young man from Wyoming whose funeral I attended last Saturday. I am pleased to have the opportunity this morning to

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S11399

address his life and our country as well.

Last Saturday, it was evident to many people in Cheyenne, WY, that ground zero had come to our State. Jonn Edmunds—that is spelled J-o-n-n; he is named after his dad who is Donn, D-o-n-n—was killed in Pakistan. He was a member of the Rangers, the 3rd Battalion, 75th Regiment, and he was killed in a helicopter crash. Suddenly, the war got closer to all of us in Wyoming.

During Desert Storm, there were not very many people killed, but one of them was from Gillette, WY, Manuel Davilla, and we remember him.

In this war, not many have been killed: Two, one from Montana, one from Wyoming. Again, Wyoming, according to its population, has given an inordinate number, but if you are the parents of anyone killed as a result of the terrorist attacks and in the military, for you that is a 100-percent loss. It is a much greater loss. It was not just the parents who lost in this instance, it was also a wife.

One of the things that struck me at the funeral, which was attended by Army Rangers who helped with the funeral—it was a grand ceremony with all the military honors—what struck me was the youth of these soldiers. I remember one time watching a show put on by Channel 1. It was called “The Kids Who Saved the World.” It was designed to show today’s generation that the people who fought in World War II were kids. It took some of the people attending reunions, which is what most of the people see of the military, and went back to the picture of them as they participated in D-Day, to emphasize that it is kids who are out there saving us.

Jonn Edmunds would have had his 21st birthday on January 3. He would have had his second wedding anniversary on December 27. The first song they played as a part of the service was the song that he and his wife were going to play at their anniversary. Next to the podium, next to the picture of Jonn was a white board, a message communicator they used in their home. Jonn left his last message to his wife on that white board. It said:

“Anne, I will be OK. I’m going to come back to you. I love you, and I will think about you all the time. Be strong while I’m gone and never forget that I love you.”

And then he paid the ultimate price. He left a family and a wife and an emphasis in Wyoming. We appreciate the sacrifice that he made and that his family made. It is important we remember that.

The service was extremely patriotic, thanks to the help of his fellow soldiers. Something that was read during that service I want to read here. It gives us an idea of the dedication, the focus, the goals, and the understanding that these young men have when they go into battle. It is called the Ranger Creed. The Rangers are a special group of young people.

The Ranger Creed:

Recognizing that I volunteered as a Ranger, fully knowing the hazards of my chosen profession, I will always endeavor to uphold the prestige, honor and high esprit de corps of my Ranger Regiment.

Acknowledging the fact that a Ranger is a more elite soldier who arrives at the cutting edge of battle by land, sea or air, I accept the fact that as a Ranger my country expects me to move further, faster and fight harder than any other soldier.

Never shall I fail my comrades. I will always keep myself mentally alert, physically strong and morally straight and I will shoulder more than my share of the task whatever it may be. One hundred percent and then some.

Gallantly will I show the world that I’m a specially selected and well trained soldier. My courtesy to superior officers, neatness of dress and care of equipment shall set the example for others to follow.

Energetically will I meet the enemies of my country. I shall defeat them on the field of battle for I am better trained and will fight with all my might. Surrender is not a Ranger word. I will never leave a fallen comrade to fall into the hands of the enemy and under no circumstances will I ever embarrass my country.

Readily will I display the intestinal fortitude required to fight onto the Ranger objective and complete the mission, though I be the lone survivor.

Rangers lead the way.

That is a creed they live by and they recite as they go into battle.

I also want to share a poem. The poem was written by Jonn Edmunds’ English teacher and was dedicated to his memory at the funeral.

The title of it is: “So This Is How It Feels.”

So this is how it feels to know the pain of war, the ineffable sorrow deep in your gut, beyond tears, beyond consciousness.

Elements of disgust, horror and anger, and finally fear, all mixed and meshed inside.

So this is how it feels to mourn native sons, the inscrutable sadness for one so young, their future laid bare, barren yet not futile.

Elements of patriotism, pride, honor and heroism, and the thoughtful thankfulness for their service, all conglomerate there.

So this is how it feels to know the dark of evil, the vague uncertainty of its source made real in the shed blood of our own.

Elements of emptiness, apprehension and instability rocking our faith, and finally that fear again.

Yet the good will out, our fears will form into faith, history will record how America, though humbled now, held its course as she has through other wars when she knew all too well how it felt.

About a week after the September 11 events, my wife and I had an opportunity to attend a dinner. There happened to be a number of ambassadors from other countries at the dinner. It was very reassuring to talk to them. Their message involved the spirit of the American people.

There were a lot of people from a lot of countries around the world who thought a major tragedy hit the United States that had been caused by somebody else and we would go to pieces. Instead, what they saw was the American people in a new form of unity and spirit that they had not seen for decades—people coming together, volunteering,

helping out, the spirit of America alive again.

It is that spirit of America that these young people in our service already know, already recognize. It is the reason they volunteered, that they have put their life on the line to serve our country. Thank goodness we have them. Let us always remember those who have given all.

I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper articles referring to Jonn Edmunds be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wyoming Tribune-Eagle, Oct. 28, 2001]

CHEYENNE SON LAID TO REST

(By Ilene Olson)

CHEYENNE.—Before going overseas to help fight in Operation Enduring Freedom, Spc. Jonn J. Edmunds left a simple note for his wife Anne on a memo board:

“Anne, I will be OK. I am going to come back to you. I love you and I will think about you all the time. Be strong while I am gone, and never forget that I love you.”

Those words, framed and displayed at his memorial Saturday, tell their own story of a young life lost and a young love cut tragically short.

Edmunds, 20, was an Army Ranger in the 3rd Battalion of the 75th Ranger Regiment. He was killed in a helicopter crash in Pakistan on Oct. 19 while providing rescue relief for American troops in Afghanistan.

Thirteen Army Rangers from the 2nd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, marched in slowly and somberly. Six stopped at the left side of the gym and lined up in two rows of three, remaining there motionless for more than an hour until their services as casket bearers were needed. The other seven lined up diagonally on the right side, rifles ready for a 21-gun salute.

Edmunds was remembered by those who knew him as an intense, competitive youth, a loving and devoted husband, and a dedicated soldier.

The Rev. Janet Forbes told the story of Edmunds’ life, based on her conversations with his family.

Forbes said Edmunds met Anne Costello when the two were paired on a bowling lane. After a second bowling date, the two were inseparable.

“Jonn and his dad took a long walk together just before Jonn left Cheyenne for basic training,” Forbes said. “He told Donn about his intentions concerning Anne:

“Dad, I really love her, and I want to marry her.”

“Jonn, you’re too young.”

“No, Dad, I’m not.”

“This went on for several rounds,” Forbes said.

“And then Donn reflected, and he looked at his son closely, remembering his intelligence, clarity of purpose and maturity, and said, ‘No, son. You’re not.’”

The couple married Dec. 27, 1999, before a justice of the peace.

“Jonn’s life began when he met her,” Mary Edmunds told Forbes. “He was never happier.”

Forbes said Anne remembers Jonn for the strength of his character: strong, concerned, hard-working, dedicated, loving; for the beauty of his person: good-looking, physically fit; and for his lively sense of humor: funny, light-hearted and easy to talk to.

Jonn and Anne Edmunds planned to renew their vows at a wedding on Dec. 15. “It’s Your Love,” the song they planned to be the

first number at their wedding dance, was played for his funeral instead.

Edmunds and his father, Donn, shared "an alphabetical connection" of double Ns in the spelling of their first names—and the frustration of never having them spelled correctly, Forbes said.

Mary Edmunds told Forbes that her son began training for his life's vocation at the age of 3. "He was all action—running, running, running."

"He had what we call older brother's syndrome," Forbes added. "He was always picking up his younger brother Seth, carrying him on his shoulders and dragging him around."

"Their play began with squirt guns, then moved to laser tag. Seth, always the youngest competitor would take refuge in the house."

Paintball was the favorite, and Jonn was always victorious.

"One time, Dad joined the game," Forbes continued. "He lifted his head slightly above his hiding place and Jonn got him—right across the top of his head."

Forbes said Edmunds enjoyed playing and coaching soccer.

"He liked coaching because he got to yell," she said. "It seems one of the things he hated about basic training in the Army was getting yelled at. He liked the leadership role better—being the yellor instead of the yellee."

Forbes said Edmunds' younger sister Alyssa remembers her brother as a tease who loved to chase her and put June beetles in her hair.

Alyssa, as introspective as her brother was, had confided, "Jonn would have hated all this attention."

Forbes said one teenager in her congregation read Edmunds' obituary, finishing with the survivors, "all of Cheyenne."

"She interpreted this statement to mean that all of Cheyenne are indeed survivors," Forbes said. "It was touching, comforting and reassuring that John gave his life so that all of the citizens of Cheyenne may survive."

Chaplain Capt. Paul Lasley of the 75th Ranger Regiment in Fort Lewis, Wash., said Edmunds personified the Ranger Creed every day.

"Living the creed is a way of life. One must struggle to balance a devotion to duty with a corresponding devotion to one's family," Lasley said.

"It is the essential uniqueness of the Ranger Creed that turns a drab, black and white understanding of a ranger's life into a colorful masterpiece."

Staff Sgt. William Bader of the 3rd Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment in Fort Benning, Ga., worked directly with Edmunds.

"When I think of Jonn, I think of all the little things," Bader said. "Jonn never let me down."

Once, after a difficult operation, "I looked at the rest of my boys. I could see that they were tired. Then I looked at Jonn. He still had that intense look on his face."

"That is the way I choose to remember Jonn."

The song, "I'm Proud to Be an American," played near the end of the memorial. It had a powerful effect on the audience, which stood in a spontaneous salute of Edmunds and the country he served. Several joined hands over their heads in a show of unity. Applause burst forth at the song's conclusion.

Sen. Craig Thomas R-Wyo., read a statement from Wyoming native Vice President Cheney.

"I will not presume to offer comfort," Cheney had written. Instead, he thanked the Edmundses for their son's patriotism and courage.

Sen. Mike Enzi, R-Wyo., presented President Bush's statement to Anne Edmunds.

"I am deeply saddened by the loss of your husband," Bush had said. "I hope you will find solace in the knowledge that his sacrifice will not be forgotten. The nation is grateful for Jonn's service to our country. We pray for comfort and healing in this difficult time."

At the end of the service, an intense silence fell in the facility as the waiting rangers removed the flag from the casket, folded it ceremoniously and presented it to Edmunds family.

During the flag ceremony, people in the audience stood quietly, barely breathing. Many dabbed at their eyes, and their grief was palpable.

The intensity of the silence was broken by two bugles playing "Taps," then countered by the equally loud 21-gun salute.

A startled child cried, and the audience seemed to take a collective breath.

Following the memorial, family members were escorted quietly from the room while people in the audience stood reverently. The family's grief was reflected in many of their faces.

Lasley summed up the purpose of the memorial: "Jonn Edmunds is not honored today exclusively for how he died."

"We honor Jonn Edmunds for how he lived."

[From the Wyoming Tribute—Eagle, October 23, 2001]

GROUND ZERO IN WYOMING

(By Ilene Olson)

CHEYENNE.—A grieving Donn and Mary Edmunds stood in their driveway Monday to give Americans—and the world—a glimpse of their son and the tragedy of his death.

Spc. Jonn J. Edmunds, was a member of Company B, 3rd Battalion, 75th Rangers. He died Friday in a helicopter crash in Pakistan while providing rescue backup for U.S. troops entering Afghanistan.

Donn Edmunds, occasionally fighting tears, spoke for the family during the news conference:

"Jonn decided in his senior year of high school to join the Rangers because they were an elite force, because he felt he was up to the challenge and because he wanted to join the military for their college benefits."

"He was extremely proud of his achievements as was the rest of his family. He was a tough, determined, competitive young man who only accepted the best of himself and wanted to give his best for his country."

Donn Edmunds read an excerpt from a paper his son wrote while in high school:

"In 10 years I see myself still in the Army. I believe I will make a career out of the Army, which would mean staying in for 20 to 25 years. I will be contributing to myself as well as the defense of this country and the betterment of the world."

Despite his short time in the Rangers, Jonn Edmunds was the leader of a four-to-five-member team, supervising half of his squad of 10 to 11 members. Lt. Col. Scott Keller of the Army Headquarters in Denver said Monday.

Donn Edmunds, who characterized his home as "ground zero in Wyoming," said while their son's death has hit them hard, it hasn't changed his family's attitude toward the current war on terrorism.

"Even in this time of loss, our family wants to express our continued support for our president and his policies regarding the actions in Operation Enduring Freedom," he said.

The Edmunds family also expressed sympathy for the family of Pfc. Kristofer Stonesifer, 28, of Missoula, Mont., the other Ranger killed in Friday's crash.

In a news release Monday, Gov. Jim Geringer added his condolences to those offered Sunday by other political leaders.

"Jonn Edmunds symbolizes the thousands of young men and women who wear the military uniform," he said. "He was a model high school student who voluntarily chose to serve his country through service in the military."

* * * * *

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I thank my friend from Wyoming for his remarks. He and I attended the funeral of Jonn Edmunds together. It was a moving experience. I submitted my statement earlier in the week. We carried messages from President Bush and Vice President CHENEY to the funeral. It was a very moving event.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I want to talk a moment about a couple of subjects that I think are current certainly. One of them is the subject of energy. Energy has been with us for a long time. We have been talking about a policy on energy. We have been talking about doing something to strengthen our domestic production so that we become less dependent on imports particularly from the Middle East.

We have talked about the need to do something to help our economy, and energy has something to do with it. So it is an issue of security. We are now nearly 60 percent dependent on foreign oil.

Oil, of course, causes the movement and transportation not only in our economy but in defense, so it becomes even more important we deal with that issue as we talk about a stimulus for the economy. And we will be coming up with a number of proposals we hope will have an impact on the economy. Energy, of course, probably has one of the greatest impacts on the economy. The idea we could move into doing some development of facilities, we could do some new efforts to produce oil, would all have some impact on jobs and on our economy.

We have been talking about it for months now. We have had a number of meetings out in the swamp that were attended and supported by the administration, by the President, by the Secretary of Energy, by the Secretary of Interior, to move forward with something. The House, of course, has already passed an energy bill.

We have been supported by groups of seniors, and I think understandably so. When utility rates go up, seniors on fixed incomes are the ones who suffer the most, and that is an experience we have all been through. Certainly, we have had also the support at these various meetings from labor unions, particularly the teamsters who have been there time after time.

We have been joined by Native Americans from Alaska who are dealing with that portion of energy. So we have had support from a great many people.

Yesterday there was a two-page ad in the Hill newspaper of all the people who are supporting doing something with energy policy. So there is very wide support for it.

We have not, however, gotten support from the majority leader to bring it to the floor. We believe that is one of the legislative efforts that should have a high priority before we can finish our work, which I hope we will do relatively soon.

So there is much that needs to be done. A policy in energy, of course, has to do with conservation, how we in our homes and in our cars can do more to conserve energy. It has to do with renewables. We need to put an emphasis on renewables so we can strengthen that aspect of production. We certainly need to do more on research so that we can find, for instance, ways to even more cleanly use coal and other kinds of volume resources.

We have to talk about production. We have to talk about access to public lands. We can have production. We have shown that in Wyoming one can go into an area and have production without destroying the environment, and we should do it in a very careful way, and indeed we will.

So despite the need for both the economic boost and for the defense and security aspect of it, we have not been able to cause the majority to bring this before the Senate. We urge it be done and done quickly. We need to bring this bill forward and deal with it. Perhaps we will deal with the House bill, but we need to bring it up and make some judgments.

AIRLINE SECURITY PERSONNEL: FEDERAL OR PRIVATE

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, on another item I want to comment on that I have heard quite a bit about, the House passed last night the airport security bill, and I am glad they finally did. Of course, the big controversial issue was whether or not those personnel that are in airports would be Federal employees or whether they would be civilians overseen by a Federal agency.

First of all, often, particularly in the media, there has been the impression that we either have Federal employees or continue to do it the way it is being done.

That is not the case. What is being talked about, if it is done without Federal employees, is the Federal Government would have oversight and the authority to authorize these kinds of activities; they would be overseen by a Federal agency, hopefully a law enforcement agency. There would be criteria for employees, there would be tests for employees, there would be measurements to be taken, all enforced by the Federal Government. The idea that would continue to be what it is, unless it is Federal employees, is not true.

The other interesting point is there has been a lot of reference, both by the

media and also by the Members in the House pushing for Federal employees, to it passing 100-0 in the Senate. It did, indeed, but the reason is there are lots of things in that bill in addition to the matter of what kind of employees we have for airport security. Many Members would have preferred to have seen what the House put in, but we knew we did not have the votes. We wanted to pass the bill because of what it contained. The idea that it passed 100-0 does not mean there are not people in the Senate who would like to see this done in the manner as passed by the House.

As we go to a conference, I hope we can do that quickly. That is one of the most important and timely things to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

APPRECIATION FOR EFFORT OF SENATOR THOMAS

Mr. ENZI. I take this opportunity to thank the senior Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, for all of the efforts he has made in three areas, as well as a lot of other areas, but particularly in three areas.

Energy, of course, of which he spoke, he has been one of the Members pushing for an energy policy for this country since I have known him, which has been quite a while. It looks as if we have the opportunity to get that done soon. It will be largely due to his efforts on the committee and on the floor.

I also thank him for the effort he is making in the agricultural area. Our State is very dependent on agriculture. He serves on the Agriculture Committee. I think he is the first person from Wyoming to serve in 40 years. He got in it at a particularly crucial time, as we were redoing the farm bill. I know that is extremely difficult work. When there are 10 Senators together, they offer 20 opinions. Trying to mold those into one bill can be extremely difficult.

Of course, the Senator serves on the Finance Committee, as well. That is from where the stimulus package is coming. Again, there are multiple opinions regarding that package.

I appreciate the efforts and leadership of the Senator in all of those areas. I look forward to the great packages we will have as a result.

RACE FOR THE CURE

I also mention another effort led by his wife, the Race for the Cure, the breast cancer effort in our State. The four honorary chairs are his wife—definitely not an honorary chair; she spends a great deal of time all year working to raise funds to make people more aware of the need for breast cancer testing, treatment, and early detection. She is an honorary chair, along with our Governor's wife, Sherri Geringer, my wife, Diana, and Congresswoman BARBARA CUBIN's husband,

Fritz. They all work a lot of time during the year.

Last weekend, we were at a function that kicks off the next year's Race for the Cure. It is well underway. It is a great effort. It saves life, both men's and women's lives. That evening we were in Rock Springs, WY, for a different function called Cowboys Against Cancer. This event is not limited to any particular type of cancer. Rock Springs puts on an annual fundraising event where anyone in the community with cancer receives funds from this foundation, up to \$1,000, to help offset some of their expenses during the year. It is a great community effort to help out neighbors.

They asked me to emphasize that, even though we have this focus in the United States on terrorism, anybody who comes down with cancer has a form of terrorism. It is important we keep giving the ways we have been giving, as well as giving in new ways. The American people are the most giving people in the world. This is a time when we need to give in new ways, but we need to continue the old ways, as well.

When somebody in your family comes down with cancer, you have ground zero in your home, too. That is the potential for a total loss. I hope everybody keeps up all of those efforts, as well as the new emphasis.

I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator for his kind comments and I certainly enjoy working together.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TROUBLING TIMES

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam President, these are, for all Americans, troubling times. While we are defending our Nation at home and abroad, we find ourselves with conflicting emotions. We are by nature a peaceful people but a people of enormous resolve, with a great love of our Nation, our culture, and each other. We respect each other's faiths. We respect the faiths and cultures of those of other nations.

This mix of emotions has placed us in an extraordinary position. Two principal issues arise from this dilemma. First, in the midst of a military campaign in Afghanistan, we now find the religious holidays of the Muslim faith upon us, the celebration of Ramadan. It is a central date on the Islamic calendar.

The second issue is the extent to which our military operations in Afghanistan involve the inevitability and the tragedy of civilian casualties. I

would like to address both of these concerns for a moment.

It speaks well of the American people that we would have a concern about engaging in military activities during the religious holidays of some of our own citizens, and more important, those of other nations. In a nation that is overwhelmingly Christian but with large Jewish and Islamic populations, it is a tremendous statement about America that even in the waging of conflict we want to be deferential to the religions of others. Indeed, it speaks well of our President that there is even a consideration of the postponement of military activities in our air campaign in Afghanistan during Ramadan.

I strongly urge the President, despite his best instincts, that the bombing campaign should not be postponed—not for a minute, not for a day. What happened on September 11 and the motivation of those who might have orchestrated this campaign from Afghanistan is all the evidence that is required that bin Laden, al-Qaida, even the Taliban are not practicing Islam.

The massive loss of life at the Pentagon and the World Trade Center in the name of that faith is not only not in keeping with the teachings of Islam, it is blasphemy. It is blasphemy against the teachings of Mohammad and the Koran. It is an insult to every person of Islamic faith in the world.

For the United States to hesitate or suspend our military operations against al-Qaida because of Ramadan is to suggest that these people are actually legitimately practicing their faith or even, in fact, are of the Islamic faith. Their practice of Islam that engages in terrorism, the massive loss of life, the use of assassination and terror against their own people and the United States, their declaration of war against people simply because they hold a different religious faith or live in a different culture, is not the legitimate practice of Islam. It is against everything written in the Koran.

Not only should this bombing campaign not be suspended in deference to Ramadan, indeed—it is the policy of our Government that bin Laden and al-Qaida are not practicing the faith at all—suspension would be to give a cloak of legitimacy that indeed they are practicing a religion rather than that they are an aberration. They are a cult, mindlessly pursuing some horrible vision of exercising personal power, the teachings of which are not legitimately accepted by any faith.

No, the bombing campaign should not be suspended. Indeed, it must continue to underscore that this is not a war against Islam, and the people we are fighting are not practicing Islam.

Second is the issue of civilian casualties. It is a wonderful statement about our people that even in the face of horror and the massive loss of life of Americans, that there is a concern that people in another nation, as we seek justice, might inadvertently and tragically lose their lives as we pursue al-

Qaida and bin Laden. It is right we should have this concern, but it cannot deter us.

I hope my comments are not misunderstood. I do not want them to seem overly harsh. But there is something missing from this debate, from those abroad, and those within our own Nation who are understandably concerned about this loss of life. There is not a question that there is going to be a loss of civilian life. That happened on September 11. If you want to see civilian casualties, come to New York. We have thousands of bodies still not recovered.

Concerning the issue of whether there is going to be an innocent loss of life, that already happened. We want nothing but the best for the people of Afghanistan. But it is impossible to engage in large scale military hostilities, to find thousands of al-Qaida fighters where they are being shielded, without some loss of Afghan life. Every loss of life of an Afghan citizen is regrettable but unavoidable. We can minimize it, but we cannot avoid it.

We have responsibilities. Our first responsibility is to bring to justice those who killed our people and attacked our Nation. An equally great responsibility is to ensure that if American soldiers enter Afghanistan to find bin Laden, we minimize the loss of American lives. Anything that is done that avoids the possibility of the loss of an American soldier is our highest priority. If we can do that while minimizing the loss of Afghan citizens, it is the right thing to do.

I speak, now, directly and bluntly. The people of every nation bear some responsibility for those who govern it. That is obviously true in a democratic society, where governments rule with the consent of the governed. But, indeed, it is true in all societies.

I know the Afghan people are powerless. I know the Taliban rules against the wishes of many Afghans. But, nevertheless, as a historic principle, they are accountable for their government. It is a fact that their government has harbored terrorists who have attacked our greatest city, declared war on our Nation, and killed thousands of our citizens. This is not to suggest that I believe that we, by design, would ever take their innocent lives. But it is to put in context the fact that, if inadvertently, against our policies and our desires and our prayers, Afghan lives are lost in the hunt for bin Laden and the search for justice, it may be regrettable, but it is historically and legally and morally defensible.

By historic parallels, a third of the German people voted for the Nazi Party.

Virtually none of the Japanese people as a matter of right could have been held accountable because they were directly responsible for Tojo's government in Tokyo. But I don't believe it would have been legitimate then any more than it would be legitimate now to have said somehow the

people of those countries do not bear responsibility for their government no matter how they came to power. The innocent Afghan people who regrettably now lose their lives, as the people of all nations, bear some responsibility for those who govern them—by the ballot box wherever it is possible, by force of arms where it is necessary, or by whatever means that might be required to free themselves, or to ensure that their governments are either not engaged in actions against other people or harbor those who would harm other people. Responsibility rests on all of us who are citizens of nations.

I hope the loss of civilian life is minimal. But our Nation is at war. This is not some gentlemanly understanding between the government of the United States and the Taliban government of Afghanistan. This is not a problem of languages or cultures. This is a fundamental judgment by the government of Afghanistan to harbor a terrorist element that has come to the judgment that they cannot coexist with Western society.

Either their government falls or ours falls. There is not something here to be negotiated. It is not some misunderstanding that we reconcile. There is nothing to be discussed. Their government falls or ours does. We are vulnerable to them or they are vulnerable to us. Bin Laden lives or some of our people die.

Sometimes, even in a complex world which has seemingly advanced so far, some things are so simple. That is the nature of this conflict.

It has been called a war on terrorism. It isn't a war on terrorism. Terrorism is a methodology of warfare. Had they attacked the World Trade Center with fighter planes or used the most modern technology available, we would be grieved nonetheless. They used terrorism. But it isn't their methodology that we are fighting. It is them.

This is a small group in a remote place that has come to the extraordinary conclusion that they cannot coexist with Western society. As a matter of our faith, our culture, and the means by which we choose to live our lives, they have come to a judgment that they cannot share this planet with us because of who we are and what we believe.

None of us wants any loss of life. There is a wonderful strength of our country. We can fight an enemy and still worry about his wounds.

I leave you with a simple reminder as our country debates whether to pursue this war during Ramadan and whether we lose our nerve because of loss of life of Afghan citizens. It has been a long time since this country fought a war seeking an unconditional result. Indeed, it has been more than half a century. War is different. It is different than a misunderstanding. It is different than a military action. It is different than a police action. It is different than the Persian Gulf or Vietnam or even Korea that had limited objectives.

This has no limited objective. This is unconditional.

Those people will not stand. We don't want to talk to them. We don't want to negotiate with them. We don't want to work out a misunderstanding with them. They will not stand.

The judgment about whether to fight during Ramadan and pay them the respect that they are actually of the Islamic faith should be debated in that context because they are not Islamic. They are not exercising their faith. They are blasphemists of their own alleged religion.

Civilian casualties need to be debated in this context because, though regrettable, they are inevitable and a part of unconditional war in a threshold that was already crossed, and then finally all of us coming to recognition of what it is we fight—terrorism, bin Laden. We fight against people whose weapons are not the principal concern. Their methodology is not our principal concern. Our concern is the profound judgment that they reached: that our presence and our lives are somehow a central threat.

Before the Senate left for this week, I wanted to share these thoughts knowing that we will revisit these issues again and again in what promises to be, unfortunately, a long and difficult engagement in Afghanistan, knowing that among the many strengths of our people, patience is not the greatest of American virtues. But we did not seek this war. We did not want it. We would have done anything to avoid it, but it was not our choice. It was thrust upon us. The decision to take lives was made by others. We only have one thing to do—no decisions, no choices, no judgments—just to win. That takes time. It takes sacrifice. Sacrifices we have made before. Now we will make them again.

I hope our country simply can steady its nerves and muster the patience to see this to the end. That will involve a great price, but there is no choice.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, it is only on a Friday that we can make sense. That is my attempt here this morning with respect to the upcoming stimulus bill. We have more than enough deficit stimulus already in the pipeline, almost, without a stimulus bill.

The point is that, yes, we are going to have to spend, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has pointed out, for home security. The Senator has outlined our spending on homeland defense to the tune of some \$20 billion, including airport security; Amtrak security; Federal, State, and local antiterrorism enforcement; infrastructure security; highway security; clean and safe drinking water; bioterrorism response; border security. Actually, we have to add, necessarily, unemployment compensation and health care.

So let's say definitely all of us will be supporting—and should—deficit stimulus; otherwise, it makes no difference to the economy. It must be spent for home security with respect to the initiative of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

For starters, we are beginning this fiscal year with a horrendous deficit. I think of Mark Twain who once said that the truth is such a precious thing, it should be used very sparingly. That is the credo when we come to Government finance here in Washington. Specifically, we count Social Security revenues—I want to be specific in my limited time—twice. Sure, the government receives the well over \$500 billion that payroll tax payers pay in to the Social Security Trust Fund. The American people paid that amount in fiscal year 2001 for a surplus of—other than paying

out the regular benefits, \$163 billion. But the Social Security law, section 201, says, wait a minute, we don't want that money to languish and sit there, we want to gain interest on it.

So we issue T-bills, you and I buy the T-bills—the money comes into the Government, and what do they do? They count that again as revenues. So you count the money first as it comes in from the payroll tax payers, and you count it a second time from the purchase of the Treasury bills, in compliance with section 201.

Now, let's understand it. We ended the fiscal year with a \$133 billion deficit. I encourage my fellow Senators and the American public to view the public debt to the penny as issued by the Secretary of the Treasury on September 28, 2001 at: <http://www.publicdebt.treas.gov/opd/opdpenny.htm>.

Madam President, you can see that the national debt went up from the end of fiscal year 2000—the end of September in the year 2000—from 5 trillion 674 billion some odd dollars to 5 trillion 806 billion some odd dollars. It will show on the chart a \$133 billion deficit. That is verified in the final monthly Treasury statement made for fiscal year 2001. You can access this report at: <http://www.treasury.gov>.

Madam President, immediately it highlights a half truth because they show a surplus, and that is how they talk about the surplus and how it is diminishing. But don't bother with that. Go down to page 20, the particular culmination of all their moneys, and you find out how much revenue the Government took in and how much was spent. Every year since Lyndon Johnson's day, we have ended up with a deficit. Not just the \$133 billion deficit as of the last fiscal year, only a month ago. I will ask unanimous consent to have this particular document printed in the RECORD, the budget realities.

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

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES

Presidents and fiscal year	U.S. budget (outlays in bil- lions)	Borrowed trust funds (bil- lions)	Unified deficit with trust funds (bil- lions)	Actual deficit without trust funds (bil- lions)	National debt (billions)	Annual in- creases in spending for interest (bil- lions)
Truman:						
1946	55.2	-5.0	-15.9	-10.9	271.0	
1947	34.5	-9.9	4.0	+13.9	257.1	
1948	29.8	6.7	11.8	+5.1	252.0	
1949	38.8	1.2	0.6	-0.6	252.6	
1950	42.6	1.2	-3.1	-4.3	256.9	
1951	45.5	4.5	6.1	+1.6	255.3	
1952	67.7	2.3	-1.5	-3.8	259.1	
1953	76.1	0.4	-6.5	-6.9	266.0	
Eisenhower:						
1954	70.9	3.6	-1.2	-4.8	270.8	
1955	68.4	0.6	-3.0	-3.6	274.4	
1956	70.6	2.2	3.9	+1.7	272.7	
1957	76.6	3.0	3.4	+0.4	272.3	
1958	82.4	4.6	-2.8	-7.4	279.7	
1959	92.1	-5.0	-12.8	-7.8	287.5	
1960	92.2	3.3	0.3	-3.0	290.5	
1961	97.7	-1.2	-3.3	-2.1	292.6	
Kennedy:						
1962	106.8	3.2	-7.1	-10.3	302.9	9.1
1963	111.3	2.6	-4.8	-7.4	310.3	9.9
1964	118.5	-0.1	-5.9	-5.8	316.1	10.7
Johnson:						
1965	118.2	4.8	-1.4	-6.2	322.3	11.3

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES—Continued

Presidents and fiscal year	U.S. budget (outlays in bil- lions)	Borrowed trust funds (bil- lions)	Unified deficit with trust funds (bil- lions)	Actual deficit without trust funds (bil- lions)	National debt (billions)	Annual in- creases in spending for interest (bil- lions)
1966	134.5	2.5	-3.7	-6.2	328.5	12.0
1967	157.5	3.3	-8.6	-11.9	340.4	13.4
1968	178.1	3.1	-25.2	-28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	0.3	3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
Nixon:						
1970	195.6	12.3	-2.8	-15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	-23.0	-27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	-23.4	-27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	-14.9	-30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	-6.1	-17.6	483.9	29.3
1975	332.3	4.8	-53.2	-58.0	541.9	32.7
Ford:						
1976	371.8	13.4	-73.7	-87.1	629.0	37.1
1977	409.2	23.7	-53.7	-77.4	706.4	41.9
Carter:						
1978	458.7	11.0	-59.2	-70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	504.0	12.2	-40.7	-52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	-73.8	-79.6	909.1	74.8
1981	678.2	6.7	-79.0	-85.7	994.8	95.5
Reagan:						
1982	745.8	14.5	-128.0	-142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	-207.8	-234.4	1,371.7	128.7
1984	851.9	7.6	-185.4	-193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.5	-212.3	-252.8	1,871.5	178.9
1986	990.5	81.9	-221.2	-303.1	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,004.1	75.7	-149.8	-225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.5	100.0	-155.2	-255.2	2,601.3	214.1
1989	1,143.7	114.2	-152.5	-266.7	2,863.3	240.9
Bush:						
1990	1,253.2	117.4	-221.2	-338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,324.4	122.5	-269.4	-391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,381.7	113.2	-290.4	-403.6	4,002.1	292.3
1993	1,409.5	94.2	-255.1	-349.3	4,351.4	292.5
Clinton:						
1994	1,461.9	89.0	-203.3	-292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,515.8	113.3	-164.0	-277.3	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,560.6	153.4	-107.5	-260.9	5,181.9	344.0
1997	1,601.3	165.8	-22.0	-187.8	5,369.7	355.8
1998	1,652.6	178.2	69.2	-109.0	5,478.7	363.8
1999	1,703.0	251.8	124.4	-127.4	5,606.1	353.5
2000	1,789.0	258.9	236.2	-22.7	5,628.8	362.0
2001	1,853.0	254.8	281.0	+26.2	5,602.6	369.0

* Historical Tables, Budget of the U.S. Government FY 1998; Beginning in 1962 CBO's 2001 Economic and Budget Outlook, March 14, 2001.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The document takes us from President Harry Truman right on up to the Johnson Administration. You can see that, in 1968-69, when I had the privilege of serving here and worked on that with George Mahon over on the House side, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee at that time. We cut it back again another \$5 billion. We called over to Marvin Watson in December of 1968 because President Johnson was very sensitive about guns and

butter—paying for the war in Vietnam and the Great Society. So we cut it back another \$5 billion, and we ended up with a true surplus that particular year, a \$2.9 billion surplus. But you can see the minus marks coming through.

This particular chart shows that the Congressional Budget Office projected by March 14 of this year that we would have a \$26.2 billion surplus. Truth: We ended up with a \$133 billion deficit.

Where do you find that truth out? Turn to page 20 of 'Final Monthly Treasury Statement,' and you will see

that at the beginning of fiscal year, 2001, we had a debt of \$5,674,178,000,000.

By the close of the fiscal year last month, the debt had already gone up to \$5,807,463. So it has gone up some \$133 billion. We ended up with a deficit of \$133 billion.

I ask unanimous consent that page 20 of the "Final Monthly Treasury Statement" be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 6.—MEANS OF FINANCING THE DEFICIT OR DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS BY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT, SEPTEMBER 2001 AND OTHER PERIODS
[\$ millions]

Assets and liabilities directly related to budget off-budget activity	Net transactions (—) denotes net reduction of either liability or asset accounts			Account balances current fiscal year		
	This month	Fiscal year to date		Beginning of		Close of this month
		This year	Prior year	This year	This month	
LIABILITY ACCOUNTS						
Borrowing from the public:						
Treasury securities, issued under general Financing authorities:						
Debt held by the public	— 1,508	— 110,688	— 218,382	3,449,998	3,340,818	3,339,310
Intragovernmental holdings	39,096	243,973	236,289	2,224,180	2,429,058	2,468,153
Total Treasury securities outstanding	37,588	133,285	17,907	5,674,178	5,769,876	5,807,463
Plus premium on Treasury securities	— 32	62	697	2,699	2,793	2,761
Less discount on Treasury securities	— 4,176	— 8,555	— 5,157	75,541	71,162	66,986
Total Treasury securities net of Premium and discount	41,731	141,902	23,761	5,601,336	5,701,507	5,743,238
Agency securities, issued under special financing authorities (see Schedule B, for other Agency borrowing, see Schedule C)	394	— 661	— 832	27,672	26,617	27,011
Total federal securities	42,125	141,240	22,929	5,629,009	5,728,124	5,770,249
Deduct:						
Federal securities held as investments of government accounts (see Schedule D)	39,122	232,995	246,455	2,235,763	2,429,635	2,468,757
Less discount on federal securities held as investments of government accounts	— 1,007	1,633	719	16,867	19,508	18,500
Net federal securities held as investments of government accounts	40,130	231,361	245,736	2,218,896	2,410,128	2,450,257
Total borrowing from the public	1,996	— 90,121	— 222,807	3,410,113	3,317,996	3,319,992
Accrued interest payable to the public	11,677	— 4,728	1,608	44,211	27,806	39,483
Allocations of special drawing rights	4	— 44	— 440	6,359	6,312	6,316
Deposit funds ¹	— 127	4,160	— 1,248	2,625	6,912	6,785

TABLE 6.—MEANS OF FINANCING THE DEFICIT OR DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS BY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT, SEPTEMBER 2001 AND OTHER PERIODS—Continued
[\$ millions]

Assets and liabilities directly related to budget off-budget activity	Net transactions (–) denotes net reduction of either liability or asset accounts			Account balances current fiscal year		
	This month	Fiscal year to date		Beginning of		Close of this month
		This year	Prior year	This year	This month	
Miscellaneous liability accounts (includes checks outstanding etc.)	– 3,966	4,160	– 404	4,140	12,266	8,301
Total liability accounts	9,584	– 86,571	– 223,291	3,467,448	3,371,293	3,380,877
ASSET ACCOUNTS (DEDUCT)						
Cash and monetary assets:						
U.S. Treasury operating cash: ²						
Federal Reserve account	4,263	1,337	1,818	8,459	5,533	9,796
Tax and loan note accounts	33,627	– 9,776	– 5,618	44,199	795	34,423
Balance	37,890	– 8,440	– 3,799	52,659	6,329	44,219
Special drawing rights:						
Total holdings	7	603	33	10,316	10,913	10,919
SDR certificates issued to Federal Reserve Banks		1,000	4,000	– 3,200	– 2,200	– 2,200
Balance	7	1,603	4,033	7,116	8,713	8,719
Reserve position on the U.S. quota in the IMF:						
U.S. subscription to International Monetary Fund:						
Direct quota payments				46,525	46,525	46,525
Maintenance of value adjustments	29	– 330	– 3,336	1,691	1,332	1,361
Letter of credit issued to IMF	3,089	7,017	– 5,194	– 35,827	– 31,899	– 28,810
Dollar deposits with the IMF	– 18	– 4	4	– 117	– 103	– 121
Receivable/Payable (–) for interim maintenance of value adjustments	6	– 1,966	2,234	1,418	– 554	– 548
Balance	3,106	4,717	– 6,292	13,690	15,301	18,407
Other cash and monetary assets	656	8,309	954	24,937	32,590	33,246
Total cash and monetary assets	41,659	6,190	– 5,105	98,401	62,932	104,591
Net Activity, Guaranteed Loan Financing	2,145	4,319	– 4,438	³ – 22,013	– 19,839	– 17,694
Net Activity, Direct Loan Financing	– 2,852	19,090	21,566	105,459	127,402	123,549
Miscellaneous asset accounts	4,582	1,564	– 1,603	⁴ – 119	– 3,137	1,445
Total asset accounts	45,534	31,163	10,419	181,729	167,357	212,891
Excess of liabilities (+) or assets (–)	– 35,950	– 117,734	– 233,710	+ 3,285,720	+ 3,203,935	+ 3,167,986
Transactions not applied to current year's surplus or deficit (see Schedule A for Details)	560	– 9,430	– 3,207		– 9,990	– 9,430
Total budget and off-budget federal entities (financing of deficit (+) or disposition of surplus (–))	– 35,390	– 127,165	– 236,917	+ 3,285,720	+ 3,193,945	+ 3,158,555

¹ Includes the cash balances only and does not include any investments held by funds.² Major sources of information used to determine Treasury's operating cash income include Federal Reserve Banks, the Treasury Regional Finance Centers, the Internal Revenue Service Centers, the Bureau of the Public Debt and various electronic systems. Deposits are reflected as received and withdrawals are reflected as processed.³ Includes an adjustment of \$943 million in September 1999 to reflect additional reporting by the Department of Education.⁴ Includes an adjustment of \$11 million in September 1997 to reflect additional reporting by the Department of Treasury.

. . . . No Transactions.

Note.—Details may not add to totals due to rounding.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that “The Debt to the Penny” be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE DEBT TO THE PENNY

Current month and amount:

11/01/2001; \$5,817,190,945,192.56.
 10/31/2001; \$5,815,983,290,402.24.
 10/30/2001; \$5,821,971,462,166.69.
 10/29/2001; \$5,822,039,361,288.25.
 10/26/2001; \$5,824,411,453,143.54.
 10/25/2001; \$5,823,620,074,112.16.
 10/24/2001; \$5,820,311,931,563.74.
 10/23/2001; \$5,821,675,171,748.09.
 10/22/2001; \$5,819,200,893,343.94.
 10/19/2001; \$5,819,139,910,042.71.
 10/18/2001; \$5,819,279,815,278.59.
 10/17/2001; \$5,820,599,313,961.29.
 10/16/2001; \$5,820,976,918,375.44.
 10/15/2001; \$5,818,887,492,619.52.
 10/12/2001; \$5,813,332,736,265.82.
 10/11/2001; \$5,811,762,115,860.32.
 10/10/2001; \$5,805,746,196,414.92.
 10/09/2001; \$5,808,819,610,348.90.
 10/05/2001; \$5,810,495,191,205.19.
 10/04/2001; \$5,803,751,789,864.65.
 10/03/2001; \$5,797,694,485,722.59.
 10/02/2001; \$5,815,899,927,829.86.
 10/01/2001; \$5,806,151,389,190.21.
 Prior months and amount:
 09/28/2001; \$5,807,463,412,200.06.
 08/31/2001; \$5,769,875,781,034.48.
 07/31/2001; \$5,718,303,095,621.12.

06/29/2001; \$5,726,814,835,287.17.
 05/31/2001; \$5,656,181,958,605.26.
 04/30/2001; \$5,661,347,798,002.65.
 03/30/2001; \$5,773,739,939,951.53.
 02/28/2001; \$5,735,859,380,573.98.
 01/31/2001; \$5,716,070,587,057.36.
 12/29/2000; \$5,662,216,013,697.37.
 11/30/2000; \$5,709,699,281,427.00.
 10/31/2000; \$5,657,327,531,667.14.
 Prior fiscal years and amount:
 09/29/2000; \$5,674,178,209,886.86.
 09/30/1999; \$5,656,270,901,615.43.
 09/30/1998; \$5,526,193,008,897.62.
 09/30/1997; \$5,413,146,011,397.34.
 09/30/1996; \$5,224,810,939,135.73.
 09/29/1995; \$4,973,982,900,709.39.
 09/30/1994; \$4,692,749,910,013.32.
 09/30/1993; \$4,411,488,883,139.38.
 09/30/1992; \$4,064,620,655,521.66.
 09/30/1991; \$3,665,303,351,697.03.
 09/28/1990; \$3,233,313,451,777.25.
 09/29/1989; \$2,857,430,960,187.32.
 09/30/1988; \$2,602,337,712,041.16.
 09/30/1987; \$2,350,276,890,953.00.

Source: Bureau of The Public Debt.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, you can see we are already in the red \$8.5 billion. The debt is on the way up.

What had happened in August was the Congressional Budget Office came over to the Budget Committee and Mr. Crippin projected a \$104 billion deficit for fiscal year 2002. In the last couple of weeks, he has come back and amended that to some \$140 billion more. He said the downturn has been far more ex-

treme than he ever expected. So he adds another \$140 billion to the \$104 billion, which is \$244 billion. We start off with \$244 billion, without the stimulus, without the moneys for defense that we are bound to pass before we leave in the next few weeks, without the moneys for education that we are bound to spend, without the moneys for agriculture for the farm bill that we are prepared to provide. I am looking at all of that, and I made this comment at the Cabinet table just last week to the Vice President—the President had to excuse himself to receive a head of state—but I said: Mr. Vice President, we are starting off now knowing at the very beginning of fiscal year 2002 that we have over some \$300 billion in the pipeline of stimulus that people are not looking at.

I will bet anybody any amount of money anytime—give me whatever odds you want—that the deficit for fiscal year 2002 will exceed \$300 billion. I want to see my colleagues in the Senate take me up on that bet. We are still talking surpluses, is my point, and we know the truth is that we are going to have at least a \$300 billion deficit.

Yes, let us take care of home security, if it is \$20 billion, \$25 billion, \$30 billion—whatever it is. But none of

these fast forward tax cuts and calling it stimulus, because it is a political opportunity: We will give you what spending we want, and we will take what tax cuts we want. That game has to stop.

The cold sobriety of the moment is, this country is at war. We have to sacrifice, and we will sacrifice in the context of the economy, trying to hold the line as much as we can; specifically, let's not take anymore loss of revenues and call it stimulus. Let us go forward with strengthening home security and appreciate the reality that we are in trouble. The ox is in the ditch. We have fooled ourselves all year long. I pointed it out time and again.

I have such a high regard for our distinguished chairman in the Senate, KENT CONRAD of North Dakota, who is doing an outstanding job as our chairman, that I hate to appear as the dog in the manger constantly bringing up the record, the record, the record, showing the deficit, the deficit, the deficit. But we have had a deficit. We ended up with one, as I said we would, as of last year of \$133 billion. We are already going into the red, and we have not even started the level of spending that will be required. Let us hold tight to home security, unemployment compensation, and health care, and stop right there to hold down the long-term interest rates. That is what is stultifying any kind of economic comeback from the recession we are in.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

AMENDMENT NO. 2044

Mr. KYL. Madam President, I rise this morning to speak to an amendment which I believe is the pending business before the Senate, and that is the Daschle amendment No. 2044 relating to collective bargaining of public safety employees. This is an amendment that has been offered to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill which is the pending business of the Senate. I understand a cloture vote will be scheduled for next Tuesday on this particular amendment.

I want to speak to this issue for a moment because I think this is an unfortunate time to be bringing this amendment forward, especially since it has nothing whatsoever to do with the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. I regret an effort has been made to inject this rather emotionally charged issue into the appropriations bill we are going to be asked to vote on early next week.

I also think the timing is unfortunate. I understand why, at a time when all of America is willing to and desirous of expressing its appreciation to our firefighters and other rescue workers, especially as they have worked day and night, literally, at the site of the World Trade Center in New York City,

to find ways of recognizing their contribution to our country and to the people of New York. I do not think this particular amendment is the way to do that because the amendment seeks to, for the first time, force the U.S. Government's heavy hand into State and local government labor relations with police, fire, and a whole host of other workers—first responders, ambulance, paramedics, EMTs, and a whole group of other people who, for the first time, would be required to comply with Federal procedures regarding collective bargaining rather than the traditional approach, which has been for the State and local governments to make their own determinations as to how to deal with their various employees, including fire, police, and other first responders to emergencies.

The timing is unfortunate, as I say. I think there are many better ways for the United States to express its appreciation to these employees than to have a very partisan and contentious issue of labor relations inserted into the appropriations bill under the guise of finding a way to support our police and firefighters. This is not the way to support our police and firefighters.

This is an item that has been on the agenda of some people for a long time. To try to insert it into the debate on an appropriations bill at this time I think is most unfortunate.

Let me say parenthetically, there are some wonderful police and fire folks in Arizona with whom I have worked over the years. They have been tremendously helpful to me. Arizonans went back to New York City to help in that effort. There is not anybody who appreciates more the work that our police, firefighters, and other first responders do than I.

As I say, in particular, the folks in the various organizations that provide police services in Arizona have helped me in more ways than I can tell, but I really do not think this collective bargaining bill, as an amendment to the appropriations process, is the way to recognize their efforts. Here is why.

This amendment would require the State and local governments to implement collective bargaining for this group of employees, and it is not limited to paid employees. Volunteer firemen, for example, would be just as subject to this collective bargaining requirement as would the employees of the towns' or counties' police or fire department, for example, because it applies to either paid or unpaid law enforcement officers, firefighters, rescue squads, ambulance crews, as well as paramedics, EMTs, rescue workers, ambulance personnel, hazardous materials workers, first responders, and individuals providing out-of-hospital emergency medical care, both on a paid or voluntary basis.

It mandates many categories of individuals that would now be subject to collective bargaining for the first time under Federal rules because under this amendment, within 180 days of enact-

ment, the Federal Labor Relations Authority must determine whether a State provides the following rights—and there is a whole long list: The right to form and join a labor organization; to recognize employees' labor organizations; commit agreements to writing; bargaining over hours, wages, terms of employment, arbitration, enforcement through State courts, and so on.

This is obviously an arbitrary list of rights that would be imposed under the authority of the Federal Government. If the FLRA determines that a State does not substantially provide for these rights—and over half of the States do not, by the way, they are right-to-work States that do not mandate collective bargaining—then the FLRA, under this legislation, shall establish collective bargaining procedures for these covered individuals. That has to be done within 1 year of the date of enactment.

So the bottom line is it imposes on States, even those which do not currently have collective bargaining laws, a new set of Federal requirements for collective bargaining for these people, including, as I said, even voluntary firemen. It would force this Federal system on those States.

It is not just an unfunded mandate, although there is obviously a cost associated with this as well, but it would override all of the local and State laws that currently apply. Twenty-one States do not currently require this kind of collective bargaining. It would literally force upon those governments collective bargaining over these public safety officers, who are nonunion members, to accept the union as their official bargaining agent.

This is such a total break from all of the tradition in this country. Some States are right-to-work States. Some States are not right-to-work States. Some States have options for collective bargaining for local jurisdictions, for example, such as my State of Arizona. We have never felt it was appropriate to mandate from the Federal Government how each of these municipalities and States would conduct their labor relations.

The bill has a provision that says if you have less than 25 full-time employees, then your police department or fire department would not be covered. Stop and think about all of the towns and the counties throughout our country that may have 26 or 27 or 28 employees. They would be covered. For the first time, the heavy hand of the Federal Government would come down and tell them what to do.

It is no wonder that county sheriffs in Arizona and some mayors in some relatively small towns have contacted my office and said: Do not impose this on us. We are getting along fine. We have great relations with our employees, and for the Federal Government to step in is not only going to increase our costs but, frankly, create some bad relationships. We do not need that. We have enough trouble responding to all

of the problems that have resulted from September 11 to have to deal with this.

This is not an appropriate response to the events of September 11 for us to force this on our State and local communities.

In my own State of Arizona, for example, our law provides that public safety employees can present their proposals to their employers but does not require as an obligation that collective bargaining be the result. This, of course, would require the State agencies and local governments to bargain with labor unions on behalf of the public safety employees. This is why the sheriffs as well as some police chiefs have contacted me and said it interferes with their ability. The Arizona sheriffs and police chiefs, the league of cities and towns, all of them have expressed their opposition to this legislation.

I think the problem is in opposing it, there is somehow a notion we are therefore against police and firemen. That is what bothers me the most. There is a big difference between the Federal Government mandating labor policies on our towns and counties on the one hand and expressing our support for police and firefighters on the other. We have done that in the Senate in resolutions we have passed.

I hope in many other ways to show support for the police and firemen in my State with whom, again, I have had such a great relationship. They have helped me, and I hope I have been able to help them. In fact, I know I have through several appropriations that we have received to help them in fighting drugs, for example. It has been a great relationship, and I hope I do not have to prove my loyalty to these folks by supporting an amendment which has no place in this bill, which is a very political amendment, which creates huge problems with respect to federalism and forcing for the first time this new Federal mandate on these local communities, at a huge cost.

By the way, the cost is estimated at \$44 million by CBO over the next 4 years. CBO says it will cost \$3 million just to set up the FLRA to develop the regulations to determine State compliance and enforce those compliances.

This is simply not the right response to the events of September 11. I regret this issue has been infused into the Labor-HHS bill.

So I say to my friends in the volunteer fire departments in the small towns throughout Arizona and even in the larger communities, which of course do have these collective bargaining arrangements, for the most part, the best way we can respond to the incident of September 11 is to keep focused on the job ahead of us, and that is to train up and be ready to respond as first responders to any emergency within our local communities; to support our local firefighters and police so that in the myriad false alarms they are now responding to we provide them

the resources necessary for them to do their job; to support them in any issues they have with respect to the Federal Government in terms of getting funding for programs and the like; but not to respond by creating a new Federal mandate on every community in our States that now they are going to have to be required to engage in collective bargaining when that has been a matter of local option in the past.

It seems to me this is the wrong approach, and I hope we can find other ways of supporting our local fire and police than by this particular amendment.

I intend to vote no if the question of cloture comes up. To explain that very briefly, the point is: Should we be taking up this amendment on this unrelated bill? Sixty Senators will have to say yes before we will be permitted to do that next Tuesday. I hope at least 40 Senators will say, no, this is not the place to do it, this is not the way for us to express our support for fire and police. There are more practical ways we could do that given the events of September 11.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. KYL. I ask unanimous consent that we stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:28 a.m., recessed until 11:48 a.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. REID).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CANTWELL). The Senator from New Jersey.

ECONOMIC STIMULUS

Mr. CORZINE. Madam President, today I rise to discuss a critical need for our Nation to unite in what I think is an immediate effort to strengthen our economy. This morning you probably saw that our Nation's unemployment rate jumped a full half of 1 percent to 5.4 percent—one of the largest increases in any given month in history. We lost 415,000 jobs over the last month. Within that context, there are many more layoffs in the offing, that have been announced by companies, yet to be executed.

GDP has declined. Consumer prices, actually, within the GDP numbers, declined for one of the first times since the 1950s. Manufacturing indices and other statistics indicate that we are in a recession.

Over 40 years ago, the brother of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, President John Kennedy, issued a dramatic and now immortalized challenge to all Americans. He said: "Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

We are now having a debate about an economic stimulus program, about the state of our economy, and what we should do next. Four decades later, it is

again time to ask Americans to come to the support of our country in a practical sense. This is particularly true for those of us in the Congress.

Today, we have not one but two great challenges. First, of course, we need to win the war against terrorism at home and abroad. To this end, we are remarkably united. Most Americans are on the same page in responding to the Nation's needs.

But at the same time, we need to reinvigorate our slumping economy, an economy profoundly impacted by the cowardly acts of September 11, and the subsequent uncertainty surrounding bioterrorism events. Here America's response is not quite so clear. To this challenge, we still appear focused on something more than the Nation's real needs.

Let me be clear: My views of stimulus are premised on the near certainty that we are in the midst of a serious national recession and I think also, importantly, a global one. Increasingly, we see our neighbors across the globe suffering from much of the same kind of weakness we see in America. This view is shared by most economic analysts and political leaders. Today's report only reinforces that view.

For all of us, the primary risks from this point forward are how deep, how much further will this economic erosion go? The signs, statistically and anecdotally, are everywhere that this will be a long and deep slowdown.

Therefore, we need an immediate and substantial fiscal response. We need an insurance policy, and we need to put it in place now.

I agree with what the President says: It is time for us to go to work. The question is, How should we organize that work?

This economic challenge will require the same type of bipartisan cooperation, the same sense of resolve, the same sense of national unity that we have enjoyed in the war effort. In truth, that should not be all that hard. After all, when it comes to designing an economic stimulus package there is broad consensus among economists about the principles we should follow. Chairman Greenspan agrees. Bob Rubin agrees. And the chairs and ranking members of the Senate and House Budget Committees—Democrat and Republican alike—agree. We should follow those straightforward principles and get on with working out the details. This should not be a political argument but an objective pursuit of the most certain actions to reinvigorate our economy.

In the short term, we need actions that quickly generate real economic activity, real economic growth. For the long term, we need actions that promote fiscal discipline. It is a simple formula, very simple: Short-term stimulus, long-term discipline.

It should not be that hard if we are willing to move beyond ideological debates and special interests. In fact, as I have said, there is a fairly broad consensus among economists about how to

achieve these goals. For example, to maintain fiscal discipline, any stimulus package should include items where costs are primarily temporary; otherwise, the incremental benefit of new spending or tax cuts could be more than offset by higher interest rates which undermine housing, business investment, all kinds of activity in the real economy.

Permanent tax or spending programs undermine our long-term fiscal health. And we already face a serious erosion in our budget baseline and long-run risks because of the demographic sea change that is coming in the next decade.

Another point that would be obvious to most economists is that targeting benefits to those with modest incomes will be more powerful in stimulating the economy than benefits targeted to those with high incomes. This isn't a matter of ideology or politics; it is really just common sense. It is basic economics, particularly in the short run. People with lower incomes have an objectively measurable higher marginal propensity to consume.

If we give a dollar to those who are stretched financially, they are likely to spend it. By contrast, if we give a dollar to those with significant wealth and assets, they are likely to save it, particularly in uncertain times. So if we want to generate economic activity now—the whole point of a stimulus package—the most efficient approach is to target aid to those who need it most.

There are several ways to offer tax breaks for those with modest incomes. Frankly, I am skeptical about the policy that seems most popular in Washington—maybe on both sides of the aisle—and that is giving out rebates.

Most economists will tell you that one-time rebates do not work that well because people tend to save their checks, unless they are unemployed. This certainly was the case this summer when only 20 cents on the dollar was spent of the first round of rebates. That is not getting much bang for our buck, but it is consistent with past experience. And I think it should guide us today as we put together our stimulus package.

Clearly, there are more effective ways to stimulate the economy and benefit those with low and moderate incomes. I think the principle ought to be: How do you get one dollar of benefit flowing from one dollar of tax activity?

In my view, a better approach would be to reduce payroll taxes for a short period, perhaps a year or two—what I would call a payroll tax holiday, or a partial holiday. This would target working Americans and promote needed consumption by increasing take-home pay. And we should offset any reductions in trust fund revenues with a commitment to replenish those funds from the general fund once the economy gets back on track and budget surpluses return.

Changing a person's income stream over a period of time changes how they

think about their spending patterns and what their budgets are about. It tends to lead to greater expenditures than one-time shots.

Similarly, we could expand the 10-percent rate bracket to apply to a wider range of incomes. Right now we stop it at \$12,000 for a married couple. I think we should move it up to \$20,000. This also would increase take-home pay for a broad range of low- and moderate- and middle-income families, and would provide the kind of stimulus that would change how people budget. Senator BOB GRAHAM and I have advocated this change since the first of this year, and I think it is an idea that still should fit in a stimulus package. At a minimum, we could bring forward the full 10-percent bracket that still has some facets yet to be implemented.

Another way to stimulate consumption would be to establish a sales tax holiday, as some of my colleagues have proposed. This approach has a lot of merit and could be effective in promoting economic activity—again: one dollar of expenditure will lead to one dollar of activity—if it is limited to a short duration, and if we can overcome the significant administrative hurdles and uneven application of sales taxes across the Nation. Certainly, sales taxes weigh most heavily on low- and moderate-income Americans. In fact, I think sales taxes define the idea of regressive taxation.

Beyond providing tax cuts for those who have modest incomes, most economists would tell you that to inject money into the economy most rapidly, the best approach—contrary to a lot of political hype—is for Government to spend money directly, as long as we are able to implement such plans quickly. Can we get the shovel in the ground in the short run or are we going to have debates? Are we going to have long-term planning? If we could, we could get the real bang for our buck: one dollar spent, having real stimulus in the economy now. I especially think this is a far more attractive way to stimulate the economy than having additional tax cuts for the wealthy—sort of a trickle-down view. Savings is an admirable process for the long-term objective. It leads to growth in the capacity of the economy. But we have a shortrun need, with a very weak economy today. Programs that will promote savings over some long period of time will not strengthen our economy today. It can really run contrary to what we need to accomplish today—stimulus. The Government can make, though, investments that can put money into the economy immediately.

Unlike a dollar in tax cuts, a dollar of investment, as I said, can yield a full dollar's worth of economic activity now. If those investments are wisely targeted, they can also expand America's long-term capacity and productivity and have a multiplier effect, if you will, through job creation through the exporting and purchases that are necessary to implement the programs.

A very straightforward, simple concept is that if we put money into the economy, it will generate jobs and generate activity and lead to growth in the economy. We need to do that.

If you look at the productivity growth of America after we implemented our national highway program in the 1950s, we went on for about 20 years and we had the highest productivity rates at any time in America's history other than in the last 5 years. So there is no automatic correlation of Government spending leading to a decline in productivity or growth in the economy. We had one of the healthiest periods in our history, and I think we need to follow that concept in the current environment.

These investments can be made to happen quickly. They can be implemented quickly. If we ask our young men and women to stand tall in Afghanistan, if we want to celebrate the heroism of our first responders climbing the stairs in the World Trade Center, we also ought to get it together so that we can move quickly on those investments, those actions that will benefit our Nation now.

There are many ways to use Government spending to stimulate the economy. The most important in today's wartime environment is to make investments that increase our Nation's security, particularly our homeland security. We need to make a major commitment to fight bioterrorism by strengthening our public health system, buying vaccines, and investing in laboratory testing and research. We need to beef up security for our Nation's airports, rail systems, and ports. We need to provide substantial new resources to our law enforcement agencies and our firefighters. There has been a bill circulating in Congress for the last 4 years called the FIRE bill—\$3.5 billion worth of requests for fire equipment for our Nation's first responders. And we have appropriated a mere \$100 million once in that period of time.

There are enormous needs for us to follow. In New Jersey, we have literally hundreds of millions of dollars of requests for resources in these public security, public safety, public health areas. Let me be clear. These are not porkbarrel projects. They meet real needs and serve the public beyond the current economic situation. So we are not only stimulating the economy today, but we are setting up a stronger society for a long period of time to come; and these are investments, just as investments in the private sector, and can have high rates of return. We can have high rates of return in public sector investment. I think we need to do that.

I commend the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, and the distinguished assistant majority leader, Senator HARRY REID, for their leadership in putting together a package of investments that ought to be a part of any stimulus program. Frankly, I

think it ought to be a bigger part. Their proposal provides for \$1.6 billion for local police and firefighters, \$1.7 billion for Federal law enforcement, \$2.4 billion for airport, mass transit, and Amtrak security, and additional funds for nutrition and other programs.

In fact, I personally really do believe we should have gone larger with that program. I might have slightly rearranged it. But this is the direction we should be taking as a nation if we want to make sure we stimulate our economy now and provide for the public safety and security. This initiative will provide that real stimulus, and I hope we all will come together on this program and get out of this dogma of complaining and denigrating the idea that public investment doesn't have real public return. These dollars can be spent now, and they can be spent on very important projects that will serve our Nation.

Beyond the types of investments proposed by Senators BYRD and REID, another effective way to use Government spending to boost the economy would be to expand our system of unemployment insurance. For example, many States now fail to provide benefits for those seeking part-time work, such as working mothers who need to spend part of their days with their children. Today's unemployment report shows that over the last year, those who work part time have lost those opportunities. It has grown to over a million persons, most of whom are women. This discrimination against working moms, by leaving them out of the unemployment system, is both bad social policy and foolish economic policy. We ought to do something about it.

Similarly, we should increase the level of unemployment benefits if we want to make sure that those who are temporarily out of the job force have the ability to continue to function. The unemployed are almost certain to spend money we offer them. Again, \$1 expended gets \$1 of input into the economy. So beefing up their benefits is just good stimulative economic policy. This is where we should be helping out, not focusing on those who have already done well and are well situated in the economy.

Unemployment expenditures also have the advantage of when the economy grows, they go away; they are temporary. They meet a need, but when they are no longer necessary because people go back to work, they end. We really should be focusing on making sure that our unemployment compensation system is updated for the 21st century, brings more folks in and is more appropriate for the circumstances of today. It is a real stimulus program. We have supported corporate America through any number of tax and safety net programs. It is time to focus on people. Under current circumstances, this is a classic win-win.

Another way to use Government spending to improve the economy is to help the unemployed, or other Ameri-

cans, afford health care. That is why I support proposals to increase support for those who lose their jobs and who should buy health care through COBRA extension also. It is good health care policy and good economics. It will certainly avoid the runup of expenditures on uninsured at hospitals, charity care that will follow if we don't have these systems in place.

After all, when people lose their jobs, they should not be forced to choose between basic needs such as housing, education, health care, and senior support at home. They should confidently be seeking future employment, and this program should be robust, in my mind. I believe strongly that we ought to be offering a 75-percent payment in support of COBRA premiums. Again, this is money spent today that goes into the economy and will be stimulative as we go forward.

Beyond tax cuts for those with modest incomes, and direct Government spending—and I see the two leaders of that concept on the floor today, and I want to make sure they know I compliment them on their suggestions—there are tax breaks for businesses that can help, provided that they are well-designed and they produce an immediate corporate response.

In particular, I support providing tax credits to encourage businesses to make investments in the short-term. Recently, Bill Gale of the Brookings Institution suggested that we provide the most benefits to those who make such investments in the very short term—say, by the end of the first quarter of 2002—and then gradually phase out the benefits over the remainder of the year. This is a very simple concept. If you are going to have a sale, you want to encourage people to use it now. I think this makes great sense.

It is an encouragement to businesses to speed up investments in the public sector. It would target benefits to many businesses that already have plans on the table. They are just holding them off because of the uncertainty of the environment and the times.

I also make clear that this is a one-time benefit and would reduce political pressure to turn the Tax Code into a permanent support program that may be unneeded in the long run.

The final approach to economic stimulus I want to mention is the critical need to address the fiscal problems facing our States. There is an article in the paper today that shows across this Nation our States are moving into budget deficits, maybe out of poor economic planning, but the reality is that many of the steps they will be taking can be countervailing to the steps we may take at the Federal level.

It does no good if the Federal Government provides significant stimulus and the States move in just the opposite direction; they offset each other. We may very well be moving into one of those situations.

Unfortunately, because of the rigid balanced budget requirements, many

States are looking at significant spending cuts and/or tax increases. We need to consider ways to prevent this conundrum.

I would support establishing targeted revenue sharing to States in need—and I do mean targeted—so that this money is not used for further tax cuts. They would be serving the particular needs that Congress may have mandated in other areas, and we ought to be very clear about it.

Ideally, such a system could work both ways: Shifting money to States during times of economic slowdown and shifting money back during periods of economic growth.

Having said that, given the need to act quickly, it may be the more practical way of accomplishing this is through the Medicaid match provided to the States. This would use an existing regulatory structure and could be implemented very rapidly where a revenue-sharing program might take longer to be implemented.

In any case, we cannot ignore this conflict that may very well negate the efforts we take here and having the States be a drag on our economy just when we need most to lift up the economy.

All the proposals I have outlined today would provide real help to our economy, and most economists would agree, I believe, we should structure a program that errs on the side of being aggressive as opposed to wondering whether we are dealing with serious downside risks.

We need an insurance program against the kinds of actions that we measure, that were reported today in the unemployment statistics, and we see across the Nation. I believe we ought to make our mistakes by being certain that we have a strong economy, as opposed to being insecure about that. I hope we will take that into consideration, and if there are choices to be made, I believe we ought to do those on the stimulative side now.

While I believe we should pursue those stimulative short-term policies, we should take affirmative steps to address fiscal imbalances in the long term—again, the basic formula I talked about: short-term stimulus, long-term discipline. In particular, it is critical that we revisit—and I truly believe we must revisit—the tax cut that was enacted earlier this year. If left fully in place, this legislation will drain significant revenue from the Treasury and, in the long-term context, substantially weaken our financial condition just as the baby boomers are about to retire.

I know many of my colleagues believe these tax cuts were affordable when we debated them earlier this year. We can have a debate about whether they were or were not at that point in time, but the times have changed and they have changed dramatically. We now face a substantially weakened economy, dramatically lower productivity in our economy, and huge

costs for a long-term war against terrorism.

Given these changed conditions, I hope some of my colleagues will reconsider their views on the full tax-cut package and recognize the need to suspend some of the provisions that are set to be implemented in the future.

By the way, 65 percent of those cuts come after year 5 because, as most economists would agree, maintaining fiscal discipline in the long term is just as important as stimulating the economy in the short run.

Unfortunately, while there is broad, if not universal, consensus among economists about the principles that should guide fiscal policy, many in Washington think they know better, and they are pushing proposals that, in my mind, simply make no sense and really do challenge whether we are all working together in an economic sense to strengthen this country the way we are working in our war on terrorism.

The House of Representatives and Senate Republicans are promoting a stimulus package that would do very little to immediately stimulate the economy. The House and Senate Republican bills masquerade the stimulus, but they are both little more than an ideological repetition of programs designed to help those who need it least and favor special interests—a giveaway with limited economic benefits.

According to an analysis by the non-partisan Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the House bill would provide between 80 and 90 percent of its tax cuts to higher income taxpayers and corporations. It is just the opposite of how we get stimulus into the economy today.

The bill eliminates the corporate alternative minimum tax, or AMT. AMT is designed to prevent corporations from avoiding taxes entirely through the use of deductions and various other tax benefits. Repealing the AMT will not generate real economic activity. There is no guarantee it will do anything other than change the bottom line of the corporations.

Many corporations may well apply some of these savings to reducing debts, mergers, acquisitions, or increasing their bottom line, but there is no guarantee they will invest. That might benefit the shareholders, but it will not stimulate the economy.

The House and Senate Republican bills would also reduce capital gains taxes. Reasonable people can and do disagree about the effect of such a reduction on long-term economic growth but, regardless of one's view about the ultimate merits of reducing capital gains taxes, I do not know a single economist who would argue that it is a powerful way to stimulate economic activity in the short term, at least compared with any of the other possible approaches.

This same analysis applies to other provisions in the House and Senate Republican bills. It would accelerate a re-

duction in tax rates for those with higher incomes, just the opposite of where we should be for our long-term economic stability. We need to focus on how we are going to manage our fiscal affairs when these baby boomers start retiring.

Accelerating a reduction in tax rates is going to exacerbate a problem we already put in place with this previous tax cut.

In any case, regardless of one's view about the merits of cutting taxes for those with higher incomes, it is simply not credible to argue that of all the possible approaches to stimulating the economy, these are the most beneficial, and one cannot argue these are the most powerful. Such a claim is just not credible and does not relate to objective facts.

I also emphasize the provisions in the House bill are not temporary measures; they are permanent tax cuts with huge long-term costs, just exactly what the budget chairmen in both Houses and the ranking members argued we should not do, and as such they undermine the fiscal discipline and almost certainly will put pressure on long-term interest rates over some period of time.

I have spent most of my life as a business person and as a bond trader, someone who worked in financial markets looking at these kinds of policies as they worked their way through the marketplace. I can assure my colleagues that fiscally irresponsible tax cuts, such as the ones that are on the table in the House of Representatives, will affect investors and will undermine the long-term health of our financial system, if not our economic system broadly. The end result will be higher mortgage rates, less business investment, and a weaker economy.

Meanwhile, the House stimulus bill puts very little money into the economy directly.

There is no investment in our infrastructure, no investment in our Nation's security, only tax cuts for those who are already doing well—mostly for corporations and mostly for those that are doing well.

To be blunt about it, I think this is wrong-headed economic policy. Perhaps because of my private sector background, I find it especially alarming.

Our Nation faces an economic emergency. We need to be addressing it in an objective and legitimate way so we do not turn our backs on a need that is very obvious to everyone and get into political debates. We need to deal with it directly.

I think we are fiddling while Rome is burning. We simply cannot afford to continue business as usual. We have to pull things together, minimize differences and focus on what is important to get the job done. Our economy is at stake. We are all in this together. We cannot let the events of September 11 get us off the track of this great Nation, this great economy—doing those things which were done throughout the

1990s and continued as we started this century.

We need to move with a bipartisan, objective package that will lead to real economic growth, and we need to do it now.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be closed.

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

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3016) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Daschle amendment No. 2044, to provide collective bargaining rights for public safety officers employed by States or their political subdivisions.

Gramm modified amendment No. 2055 (to amendment No. 2044), to preserve the freedom and constitutional rights of firefighters, law enforcement officers and public safety officers.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk read as follows:

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate on the Daschle-Kennedy amendment No. 2044 to H.R. 3061, the Labor, HHS appropriations bill:

Maria Cantwell, Joe Biden, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patrick J. Leahy, Patty Murray, Paul Sarbanes, Debbie Stabenow, Max Cleland, Joe Lieberman, Bill Nelson Harry Reid, Paul Wellstone, Barbara Boxer, Jack Reed, Daniel K. Akaka, Kent Conrad, Tom Daschle.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2001

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of Monday's session, the Senate

stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 6; that on Tuesday, immediately after the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for use later in the day, and the Senate then stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.; that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived and that the Senators have until 1 p.m. on Tuesday to file second-degree amendments to the Daschle amendment notwithstanding the recess of the Senate.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, for the information of the Senate, by virtue of the agreement just entered, the cloture vote on the Daschle amendment will occur at 2:15 p.m. on Tuesday, November 6.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to a period for morning business, and that Senators allowed to speak therein for a period not to exceed 10 minutes.

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

LIHEAP AMENDMENT TO THE LABOR-HHS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to speak on my amendment that would express the sense of the Senate regarding the release of emergency funds for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. I thank the administration for the significant release of LIHEAP funds 2 weeks ago. As OMB Director Mitch Daniels and I discussed just before the funds were released, this money is critical to Maine and the Nation. I thank both Mr. Daniels and the President for releasing \$750 million in fiscal year 2002 LIHEAP funds to help low-income American families heat their homes this winter.

While I am grateful for the release of these funds, I also call upon the administration to release the \$300 million in fiscal year 2001 emergency funds provided in the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2001. This amount was \$150 million greater than the administration's request. The report language specifically directed that at least \$150 million of these funds were to be used to address unmet needs resulting from last winter's high energy prices. The other half of the money was directed to be used to meet the most critical needs arising from energy costs increases, significant increases in arrearages and disconnections, and increases in unemployment, among other things. Despite this direction, the money still has not been released.

Let me explain why those extra funds are necessary. Last winter was a very difficult winter. The price of home heating oil was \$1.56 last winter, com-

pared to \$1.03 the winter before and just 78 cents the winter before that. In short, heating oil prices jumped 100 percent in just 2 years. In many cases we saw even worse spikes in the price of natural gas.

At the same time, the average LIHEAP benefit fell by over \$100, from \$488 in 1999 to \$350 in 2000. Because so many people were in need of assistance, the CAP agencies simply didn't have enough money to provide the same benefit that they had in prior years. The result was that the average LIHEAP benefit bought less than half the oil in 2000 than it did in 1999.

That made for a very difficult winter for many people. In fact, many people are still trying to recover last winter's high energy prices. This past summer, some families had their power cut off because they were unable to pay back their high wintertime heating bills. In Maine, 26,000 people received disconnect notices in the month of July alone.

While I am grateful for the administration's recent release of LIHEAP funds, that money will do little to help people recover from last winter. In the State of Maine, regular year fiscal year 2002 LIHEAP money cannot be used to address arrearages or disconnections that occurred prior to October 1, 2001. That is one of the reasons we put an extra \$150 million in the Supplemental Appropriations Act, and included language in the conference report directing that the money be spent on arrearages, disconnections, and unmet energy needs resulting from the high price of energy last winter.

Some States allow fiscal year 2002 funds to be spent on prior year expenses. While that may provide short-term assistance, spending this year's funds on last year's winter is likely to lead to a shortage of funds this winter as well. It is not a real solution.

I am also concerned that States will be able to provide less weatherization assistance this year. Since an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, Maine typically spends the maximum allowable amount of LIHEAP funds to weatherize homes. But when we are still struggling to recover from the prior winter, less money is available for weatherization.

My amendment expresses the sense of the Senate that the President should immediately release the \$300 million in emergency LIHEAP funding provided by the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 2001. I am very pleased that Senators CHAFEE, KERRY, SNOWE, WELLSTONE, and SARBANES have also joined me on this amendment. This money was intended to help people recover from the high energy prices of last winter. It will help many of those families most in need of assistance. In these difficult economic times, there is just no reason not to release money that has already been appropriated that will help people get through the winter. I would like to thank the managers of the bill, Senator HARKIN and

Senator SPECTER, for accepting this amendment.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred November 5, 1997 in Hollywood, CA. Two male transvestites were accosted by two men who attacked them and used anti-gay epithets. Joshua Urena, 21, was sentenced to 180 days in jail and David Miller, 20, was sentenced to 220 days in jail. Both were placed on three years of probation.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GLORIA MARGARET GILLESPIE

• Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to a Kentuckian who recently passed away after a long-battle with cancer. Ms. Gloria Margaret Gillespie was a friend to many on Capitol Hill. She worked as a hairdresser in the United States Senate, cutting the hair of many Members of Congress and staff, including a few of my own. You could always count on Gloria being in a good mood. Her great smile and southern charm lit up the halls of the Russell Senate Office Building. During her years on the Hill, she made many friends, including her fellow colleagues in the Senate Barber Shop who have many fond memories of Gloria. We all grew to love her, and she will be missed.

For 29 years, Gloria worked as a hairdresser in the beauty salon that served the Senate. My staff loved going to see her because they said she had magic scissors, great stories, and a wonderful southern accent. I loved to hear about their conversations with Gloria, and how she loved Kentucky and her family and friends back home in Berea. She made my staff feel right at home in her barber chair. Gloria kept them informed on what was going on back home. She enjoyed talking about Berea, and her true love, the University of Kentucky Wildcats. Gloria was one of the biggest Wildcat fans on Capitol Hill, and it was always a treat to hear her stories the day after a big game. Gloria loved the Cats, and if you

ever wanted to know anything about them, she was the one to ask.

Before moving to Capitol Hill, Gloria attended Eastern Kentucky University in Richmond, KY, and eventually she ended up in beauty school. After finishing beauty school, she decided to pack her bags and leave Kentucky for the Nation's Capitol. Once arriving in Washington, she landed a job in the U.S. Senate beauty salon where she cut the hair of Senators and their staffs.

Gloria is survived by her parents C.H. and Mary Frances Gillespie of Berea, and many family and friends in Kentucky and here in Washington, DC. I ask that my colleagues in the Senate, many of whom spent a lot of time in her chair, join me in honoring the memory of Gloria Margaret Gillespie. She was an outstanding Kentuckian, and she will be missed.●

TRIBUTE TO CURTIS HAGE

● Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to Curtis Hage of Sioux Falls, SD, on the occasion of being installed as Chairman of America's Community Bankers. The people of the great State of South Dakota share my pride in Curt's accomplishments, and I know they join me in congratulating him on becoming the first South Dakotan to rise to the Chairmanship of this important organization.

Throughout his long and distinguished career, Curt has worked to provide financial opportunity to South Dakota. For the past 30 years, Curt has guided Home Federal Savings Bank in new and innovative directions. Home Federal was named South Dakota's Best Bank by Money Magazine in 1995, when Curt was President & CEO. Under Curt's direction as Chairman, Home Federal in 1997 became the first bank in South Dakota to introduce Internet Banking. From its humble beginning in 1929, Home Federal has grown to over 30 branches, and Curt has played a critical role in that success story.

In addition to his professional dedication, Curt is a true leader in the South Dakota community, and has earned the respect and friendship of so many of us fortunate to spend time with him. Curt represents the goodness and diligence that we find in so many of our South Dakotans, and he will do us proud as Chairman of America's Community Bankers.●

CONGRATULATING ROBERT W. GILLESPIE OF CLEVELAND, OH, ON HIS RETIREMENT FROM KEYCORP

● Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, I would like to take an opportunity to recognize the years of dedicated service of Robert W. Gillespie as a leader in the business community and a friend to the City of Cleveland over the years.

This year, after fourteen years as President and CEO of KeyCorp, Bob decided to separate from the financial in-

stitution that has benefitted from his vision and experience in the business world. Under his leadership, KeyCorp was built into one of the Nation's largest financial service companies that now reaches more than 3.8 million households and commercial clients and operates in 13 States, with assets of \$84 billion.

Bob began his association with KeyCorp when it was known as Society National Bank. He started with the company on a part-time basis while completing his graduate studies at Case Western Reserve University. After time, Bob rose through the ranks and eventually served as the executive vice president and the vice chairman, and later the chief operating officer of the corporation and the bank.

During a time when Cleveland needed a friend, Bob, along with many other business leaders, joined forces with us at City Hall to form public-private partnerships, which proved to be crucial to the city's turnaround.

Cleveland also benefitted from the leadership skills Bob demonstrated while at the helm of Key Corps, with his roles on the boards of Cleveland Tomorrow, the Greater Cleveland Growth Association and the Cleveland Museum of Art.

Bob's vision of a revitalized Cleveland included the contribution of his time and resources to help build the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame and the Great Lakes Science Center.

I wish Bob and his wife Ann the best that life has to offer during this next phase of their lives. On behalf of the people of Cleveland and the State of Ohio, I offer my most sincere thanks and appreciation.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:24 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that pursuant to section 313(2)(a) of Public Law 106-554, and upon the recommendation of the minority leader, the Speaker has appointed the following member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Center for Russian Leadership Development for a term of 3 years: Mr. ROBERT E. "BUD" CRAMER, Jr., of Alabama.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2925. An act to amend the Reclamation Recreation Management Act of 1992 in order to provide for the security of dams, facilities, and resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation.

The enrolled bill was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment:

S. 1275: A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants for public access defibrillation programs and public access defibrillation demonstration projects, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 107-93).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1628. A bill to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers, to enhance resource conservation and rural development, to provide for farm credit, agricultural research, nutrition, and related programs, to ensure consumers abundant food and fiber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

S.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution suspending certain provisions of law pursuant to section 258(a)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; to the Committee on the Budget.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1493

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1493, a bill to forgive interest payments for a 2-year period on certain disaster loans to small business concerns in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks perpetrated against the United States on September 11, 2001, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for small business concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 1505

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1505, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to establish a Travel and Tourism Promotion Bureau.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 1628. A bill to strengthen the safety net for agricultural producers, to enhance resource conservation and rural development, to provide for farm credit, agricultural research, nutrition, and related programs, to ensure consumers abundant food and fiber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. HARKIN. Madam President, today I am pleased to introduce the Agriculture, Conservation and Rural Enhancement Act of 2001. The legislation is a solid starting point for the next farm bill. This bill represents a comprehensive, balanced approach that protects farm income, promotes conservation, expands production of farm-based renewable energy and creates new economic opportunities in

rural communities. The bill is the right approach to farm policy in the 21st Century because it builds on successful core farm programs and charts a new, conservation-oriented agriculture policy for the future.

My legislation uses a four-pronged approach to make good on our commitments to American farmers and rural communities. These four components—promoting conservation, protecting and boosting farm income, expanding jobs and economic opportunities in rural communities and increasing renewable energy production—provide the solid foundation we need to help ensure our farm families and rural areas prosper.

First, conservation is a cornerstone of the bill, including the creation of the Conservation Security Act, (CSA). This program provides flexible incentives for farmers to engage in new conservation practices on working agriculture land and rewards farmers who already employ them. In addition to CSA, the bill increases acreage for the Conservation Reserve Program and Wetlands Reserve Program. It also increases the funding for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program as well as the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program. The bill also expands the farm land protection program, enacts a new grassland reserve program and permanently authorizes the Resource Conservation and Development program.

While rewarding farmers for conservation practices that benefit all of society is an important way to meet our commitment to farmers, providing solid income protection is equally important. The bill will improve farm income by increasing loan rates for most commodities, setting a floor on those rates, continuing fixed direct payments and creating a new counter-cyclical income protection system.

As all of my colleagues are aware, the farm bill must address the needs of others in addition to farmers and ranchers. This legislation will improve the quality of life for all of America's rural communities by creating jobs and economic growth in rural areas. The Rural Development title of this bill provides grants and loan programs to help create and expand businesses to provide jobs and assists communities by helping improve their community facilities. The title also expands grants for farmer-based groups, to help them add value to their production, helping to boost farm income and create jobs, it provides funding to expand broadband access for rural Americans, and provides grants to improve firefighter and first responder training.

The fourth prong of the my approach is increasing renewable energy production. This proposal provides a full range of initiatives designed to help and encourage farmers and ranchers to develop renewable energy projects including wind, solar, biomass and geothermal sources. These projects will help boost farm and rural incomes, improve air quality and promote the nation's energy security.

While the bill emphasizes a four-pronged approach, it is comprehensive in nature. The bill also includes important titles on nutrition, research, forestry, credit, competition, and trade that when taken together form a proposal that moves farm policy in the right direction in the 21st century.

I hope the Senate will be able to move quickly on this legislation. I will continue to work with members of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry in an open process to help meet our commitments to farm families and all members of rural communities.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a summary of the legislation.

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

A SUMMARY

TITLE I—COMMODITY PROGRAMS

The bill authorizes the Secretary to enter into contracts with producers of wheat, corn, grain sorghum, barley, oats, rice, soybeans, minor oilseeds, and upland cotton that entitle producers to receive direct payments on eligible cropland for the 2003 through 2006 fiscal years and counter-cyclical payments on eligible cropland for the 2002 through 2006 crop years. The bill establishes the direct payment rate and a target revenue per crop acre for each of the covered commodities. Producers will report their crop acreage and yields during the base period of 1998 to 2001 to determine updated base acres and payment yields.

Nonrecourse loans are available for all covered commodities plus extra long staple cotton, wool, mohair, honey, dry peas, lentils and chickpeas. Loan rates are increased from current levels for all covered commodities except oilseeds. The soybean loan rate is decreased by 6 cents per bushel and the loan rates for minor oilseeds are fixed at current rates. The marketing loan provisions and loan deficiency payments of current law are continued. The bill limits loan eligibility across all loan commodities by establishing a maximum number of units eligible for the loan.

To be eligible for contract payments or loan benefits producers must meet conservation compliance and wetlands protection. Further, contract acreage must use the land for an agricultural or conserving use and can be planted to any crop except most fruits and vegetables.

The bill extends the milk price support program at \$9.90 per hundredweight through 2006. It eliminates the marketing assessment on sugar and authorizes the Secretary to implement allotments on domestic sugar production. The bill extends the current peanut program.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION

The Conservation title provides a comprehensive, national approach to voluntary conservation. For the first time, all farmers and ranchers and livestock owners will have the full range of options for employing conservation practices on their lands in production and for lands taken out of production. The title enhances the existing proven conservation programs by increasing funding and including important policy changes. Two new programs, a broad-based incentive program for all land-based production and a grasslands easement program, complete the array of agricultural conservation programs.

The centerpiece of the new conservation title is the Conservation Security Act (CSA),

a broad-based voluntary locally-driven incentives program for conservation on working land. Farmers receive payments for maintaining or adopting conservation practices. Providing incentive payments to farmers to maintain conservation practices ensures retaining the important environmentally successful accomplishments already occurring on farms and ranches. Using the CSA, farmers and ranchers will have the tools to enhance wildlife habitat and implement environmentally-sound practices on land in production leading to improved water, air and soil quality and increased wildlife populations.

The bill also increases funding for current conservation programs with a proven record of enhancing natural resources. The bill increases acreage for the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) to 40 million acres from the current 36.4 million acre limit and reserves 4 million acres for the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program and lands enrolled through the continuous program. The Secretary had the discretion to enroll up to 3 million acres as permanent easements. The lands removed from production and enrolled in CRP have helped to create important habitat for wildlife, improve water quality and reduce soil erosion.

Through the bill, the up to 250,000 acres of valuable wetlands may be enrolled annually in the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) for a 10 year total of 2.5 million acres. WRP has helped to restore over a million acres of wetlands which provide critical wildlife habitat and improve water quality.

Funding for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) is increased up to \$950 million a year, by the fourth year of implementation. These funds includes a \$100 million annual fund for livestock operations to obtain loans for the construction of livestock manure management facilities.

Funding for the Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program ramps up to \$100 million annually. In addition to the current provisions to provide cost-share assistance for restoration of wildlife habitat, the Secretary will have the discretion to enroll lands under long-term and permanent easements.

The Agricultural Land Protection Program (formerly the Farmland Protection Program) is expanded to include the purchase of non-development easements on prairie and ranch land. Over four years, the annual funding ramps to \$250 million.

A new grassland reserve program to purchase permanent and long-term easements on up to 1 million acres of grass and prairie lands is created.

The bill further permanently authorizes the Resource Conservation and Development program to encourage stronger local-federal partnerships for increased conservation and resource-based programs to enhance rural economies and increases access and funding for technical assistance to help farmers implement the conservation programs on agricultural lands.

Creates the first comprehensive, voluntary approach to conservation incentive payments that provides income to producers who adopt or maintain conservation practices on working lands, including rewarding good actors and open to crop and livestock producers for land-based practices.

TITLE III—TRADE

The trade title meets the objectives that Senator Lugar and I agreed to last month—to help develop new export opportunities abroad in commercial markets, and improve the operation and capacity of U.S. food aid programs. The title spends about \$2.1 billion over the ten-year period, roughly split between the commercial export programs and food aid programs.

While we have seen in recent years that export markets do not serve as a reliable safety net, trade is and will continue to be a key outlet for U.S. agricultural products. Our export programs, such as the export credit programs and the Market Access Program, which we expand and improve in this bill, play an important role in our ability to compete internationally. We also put additional resources into the Cooperator program, which helps our agricultural groups service customers in overseas markets.

Over the last several decades, the United States has been the world's leading donor in international food aid programs. I firmly believe that our humanitarian activities throughout the developing world must be an important component of our long-term effort to combat terrorism.

Toward that end, the bill establishes the International Food for Education and Child Nutrition program for a four-year period. This proposal was introduced last year by George McGovern and Bob Dole, our former colleagues who once sat in this very chamber. It is based on the simple yet powerful notion that a well-nourished child is more likely to learn, and that the availability of food is more likely to bring that child of a poor family into school in the first place, and out of the factories, fields, and sweat shops of the Third World. The UN's World Food Program estimates that there are 300 million children worldwide in such a situation.

The trade title provides more resources for the existing Food for Progress program. It also reforms and streamlines the operations of all food aid programs run by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the U.S. Agency for International Development. These changes should allow the private voluntary organizations who conduct these projects to devote their energy to helping people on the ground rather than to pushing papers through bureaucracies.

TITLE IV—NUTRITION

Title IV includes nutrition provisions. Representing the largest of the Federal nutrition programs and up for reauthorization in 2002, the Food Stamp Program is the primary focus of the title. The program mainly assists children (50%), older Americans (10%), and Americans with disabilities (10%). Most of the other participants are individuals in working families. The Food Stamp Program is essential to transition from welfare to work. However, data show that reforms to the program are needed. These include simplifying the program, ensuring a more smooth transition from welfare to work, reforming the quality control system used to evaluate a state's performance, improving outreach efforts to make sure that people who qualify for the program are able to participate, and extending benefits to certain groups made ineligible by welfare reform. Between 1994-98 the number of people who were eligible for the program but did not participate increased by 12 percentage points, while the reliance in emergency feeding sites like soup kitchens and food pantries increased dramatically.

Some of the provisions that aim to simplify the Food Stamp Program include: allowing the states to conform Food Stamp income rules with those in TANF cash assistance or Medicaid and resource rules with those of TANF; simplifying the way in which housing costs are calculated; encouraging the states to adopt standard deductions, including ones for utility allowances and for people who live in certain group living arrangements; amending the procedure for determining earned income; extending semi-annual reporting to all households, and not just those who have earnings; better con-

forming to recertification rules in Medicaid, SSI, and SCHIP by allowing periodic redetermination.

Provisions that will help participants to more successfully transition from welfare to work include: an increase in the standard deduction to adjust for family size and will provide larger families with additional benefits and increasing the length of time that a household can receive transitional benefits when they stop receiving TANF cash assistance. The title also includes provisions that help us to reach out to other people with needs. For example, the bill prohibits cutting off benefits for participants, like the elderly, who tend to be eligible for a small amount of benefits and may want to save them up for up to 6 months before using them. It also allows able-bodied adults without dependents to participate in the Food Stamp Program for 6 out of 24 months, rather than the current 3 out of 36 months, to give them more time to successfully find employment but the bill also eliminates the provision that 80% of all education and training funds made available through the program be made available for this population only. Pilot programs to improve on outreach and access are also included in the bill.

The quality control system used to assess the states' performance is revamped to be less punitive. The bill does institute new sanction procedures and rewards based on low error rates, compliance with a number of deadlines, and a state's enrollment of working families. Other provisions in the Food Stamp subtitle include expanding the definition of food products to include vitamin-mineral supplements, eliminating federal cost-neutrality rules for Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) systems, and several administrative provisions.

The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 eliminated the ability of most legal aliens to participate in the Food Stamp Programs. Over time, a number of bills have restored some of these benefits to some children, older adults, and disabled adults who were in the United States prior to August 22, 1996. This bill concentrates on particularly vulnerable groups by restoring benefits to all legal alien children and the disabled. It also removes a 7 year cap on the ability of refugees/asylees to participate in the program. Finally, it reduces, from 40 to 16 quarters, the length of time that individuals have to work in this country before they are eligible to participate in the Food Stamp Program.

The title also reauthorizes a number of programs like the Food Distribution on Indian Reservations, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, the Community Food Projects, it consolidates the American Samoa block grant and the Puerto Rico Nutrition Assistance Programs and reauthorizes them, and it reauthorizes and increases the funding by \$40 million per year, for the Emergency Food Assistance Program. A Congressional Hunger Fellowship is established, a pilot program through which some schoolchildren will receive free fruits and vegetables is conducted. A separate title includes funding for the Senior Farmers' Market Program as well as for additional commodities for the School Lunch Program.

TITLE V—CREDIT

The credit title reauthorizes all USDA farm direct and guaranteed loan programs and increases the loan authorization levels: \$3.75 billion for each fiscal year; with \$750 million for direct loans annually—\$200 million for farm ownership (FO) loans and \$550 million for farm operating (OL) loans; and \$3 billion for guaranteed loans—\$1 billion for FO loans and \$2 billion for OL loans.

The main emphasis of the title is to make credit more accessible to beginning farmers and ranchers. Among other things, the title broadens the eligibility for direct ownership loans to those who have participated in the business operations of a farm operation for at least three years, as opposed to being the sole manager of the operation. The title provides the Secretary the authority to refinance "bridge loans" made by a commercial lender to a beginning farmer or rancher who has been approved for a USDA farm ownership loan but is awaiting funding. The title increases the limit on direct farm ownership debt for a beginning farmer or rancher from \$200,000 to \$250,000 and indexes the amount to inflation. The title provides that as part of the down payment program for beginning farmers and ranchers, USDA shall finance 40 percent of the loan (current law is 30 percent) and provide a repayment term of 20 years (current law is 10 years). The title directs the Secretary to create a pilot program in which the Secretary will guarantee loans made by a private seller of a farm or ranch to a qualified beginning farmer on a contract land sale basis. The title provides that beginning farmers and ranchers receive an additional 1 percent interest rate subsidy (capped at 4 percent) over non-beginning farmers (capped at 3 percent) who participate in the program and increases the maximum amount of funds for this program to \$750 million and provides that 25 percent of the program's subsidized funds are reserved for assisting beginning farmers and ranchers until April 1 of each fiscal year.

The title also makes other changes to provisions of the Consolidate Farm and Rural Development Act to improve the USDA farm lending programs. Among other things, the title allows the Secretary to waive term limits for a farmer or rancher, one time only, for a period of two years. The title allows the Secretary to waive term limitations for Native American farm operations on tribal lands if she determines that commercial credit is not generally available for such operations. The title expands USDA's authority to allow the interest rate on a direct loan that is being rewritten to be the rate in effect on the date that a borrower applies for servicing. The title reduces paperwork requirements by raising the low documentation loan amount for a guaranteed loan from \$50,000 to \$100,000. The title makes permanent the interest rate reduction program. The title provides that the Secretary work with the State Conservationists to consider selling or granting easements on inventory land for the purpose of farmland preservation. The title also provides those who owe recapture amounts on shared appreciation agreements or those who have amortized the recapture amounts, the option of providing farmland protection and conservation use easements on their land in return for forgiveness of the recapture amount.

Finally, the title amends the authorities provided to Farmer Mac and the Farm Credit System. The title increases the number of Farmer MAC Board of Directors from 15 to 17 and provides that the chairperson of the board will be elected by the board. The title provides the Farm Credit System authority to finance agriculturally related equipment and goods overseas irrespective of whether these goods will be used on the farm in the importing country. The title provides the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation the ability to recognize the lower risk associated with the certain guaranteed loans and to adjust premiums charged to the Farm Credit System accordingly. The title also eliminates certain "territorial concurrence" requirements on Farm Credit System lenders so that the lenders can participate in syndicated or "participation" loans in other

Farm Credit System geographic territories without seeking the permission of the Farm Credit System lender in that territory.

TITLE VI—RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Rural Development Title focuses on need to improve the ability of rural businesses to acquire capital, particularly equity capital. It provides considerable assistance to help communities develop and economic development strategies and it provides for improved facilities, particularly to make broadband access far more available in Rural America. I am particularly pleased to include a provision to provide for training for fire fighters and first responders.

The limited availability of equity capital is a significant obstacle to business development and growth in rural communities. The Rural Development Title addresses this problem by establishing two new programs to spur equity investment in rural America. First, the National Rural Cooperative and Business Equity Fund provides up to \$150 million in federal funds, to be matched by funds from private investors. The Secretary of Agriculture will guarantee 50% of the investments by private investors up to a total guarantee of \$300 million. The Fund will make equity and semi-equity investments in a variety of rural businesses, with a significant share of those being smaller enterprises.

Second, the Rural Business Investment Program is modeled on the Small Business Administration's Small Business Investment Program. It creates Rural Business Investment Companies. It also provides grants for technical assistance.

Both new equity investment programs are based on business development programs administered by SBA, which have been successful in spurring economic growth but have not adequately addressed the needs of rural communities. Both new programs make use of SBA expertise by requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to work with SBA to administer the programs.

The Rural Development Title expands eligibility for Value-Added Agricultural Market Development Grants and provides \$75 million a year in funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out the grant program. It also creates a 5% reserve within the program for certified organic agricultural products. It broadens the business and industry loan guarantee program. It funds a new microloan program to assist rural entrepreneurs in starting new businesses with small loans and continuing technical assistance. It establishes a simplified "low documentation" application process for certain rural development loan and grant programs to reduce administrative burdens for participants. It insures continued funding for the Rural Economic Development Loan and Grant Program, which provides loans and grants to Rural Electric Cooperatives, through fees on guarantees of RUS qualified bonds. It authorizes grants to multigovernmental organizations to provide assistance to local governments.

This Title also promotes improvements in rural infrastructure and emergency response capabilities by: providing \$100 million a year in funding for loans and grants to improve access to broadband in rural areas, and \$75 million over the life of the bill to improve access to local television in rural areas; providing full funding to eliminate the backlog in pending applications for certain rural development loan and grants; creating a Rural Endowment Program that provides initial planning and development grants to rural areas that develop long-range, comprehensive community development strategies to improve infrastructure and promote economic development; reserving funds within

the community facilities program for day care and senior care facilities; authorizing grants to regional development organizations; and providing \$30 million a year in funding for training of firefighters and emergency medical personnel.

TITLE VII—RESEARCH

The Research Title extends existing research authorizations until 2006. Examples of these programs include: grants and fellowships for food and agricultural sciences education, education grants programs for Hispanic-serving institutions, funding for policy research centers, and research equipment grants. The special authorization for biosecurity planning and response is amended to create a special account for appropriations for agricultural research, education, and extension activities for biosecurity planning and response. Under this section funds may be used under any authority available to the Secretary in order to reduce the vulnerability of the United States food and agricultural system to chemical or biological attack.

The Research Title increases funding for the Initiative for Future Food and Agriculture Systems. This program directs research funding to agriculture priority areas through a competitive grant system.

The Research Title creates a new program for Rural Research funded at \$15 million a year. The program authorizes a fund for rural policy research on topics such as: rural sociology, effects of demographic change, needs of groups of rural citizens, rural community development, rural infrastructure, rural business development, rural education and extension programs, and rural health. These programs will help discover the policy tools necessary to create a solid foundation within rural communities which will sustain long-term growth.

The Research Title creates a new program for beginning farmers and ranchers at a level of \$15 million a year. The program will provide competitive grants to support new and established local and regional training, education, outreach, and technical assistance initiatives aimed at beginning farmers or ranchers. Among other advantages, this program will allow new farmers or ranchers to acquire entrepreneurial, financial, and other business skills; conservation assistance; risk management education; innovative farm and ranch transfer strategies; and basic livestock and crop farming practices. In addition, 25 percent of the funds are set aside to be used to support programs and services that address the needs of limited resource and socially disadvantaged beginning farmers or ranchers.

TITLE VIII—FORESTRY

Federal forestry assistance for non-federal landowners has been a part of US Department of Agriculture programs for more than a century. We continue the Department's longstanding commitment to provide important forestry assistance to private landowners in the forestry title of the farm bill.

With over nine million non-industrial private forest landowners owning over 330 million acres nationwide, their ability to have access to technical, financial, and educational assistance from government sources will largely determine the quality of those forests and associated public benefits such as clean water and watersheds, wildlife preservation, recreational resources, soil quality, reduced erosion, and forest health and productivity.

There are several new programs to address a wide array of private forest land issues. The sustainable forest management program will provide cost-share assistance to non-industrial private forest landowners around the country. The program is administered by

the Secretary, acting through the State foresters, and in coordination with the State stewardship committees. The program affords states flexibility to address a variety of multiple resource objectives, including soil, air and water quality, soil erosion, agroforestry, fish and wildlife habitat, the control of invasive species, forest health and productivity and the threat of forest fragmentation and catastrophic wildfire.

There is also a new program to assist in the development of sustainable forestry cooperatives at least 50% farmer or rancher owned. The program will create new income streams for farmers or ranchers by allowing them to pool their limited forest resources, and sell value added forest products.

Other important initiatives include a community and private land fire assistance program to focus federal efforts in firefighting at the Federal, State and local levels and a watershed forestry assistance program to prevent water quality degradation, and address watershed issues on non-federal forest land.

TITLE IX—ENERGY

Today we face major national problems of low farm income, energy shortages and price spikes, and environmental problems of air pollution and global warming. Renewable energy from farms will play a major role in solving all three problems. Moreover, renewable energy and energy efficiency programs will enhance the nation's energy security, reduce our dependence on foreign oil supplies, and promote rural economic development across the country.

The federal government has a major role to play in the transformation to reliance on domestic farm and rural based alternative energy. The energy title establishes several new programs providing incentives to farmers, ranchers and rural small businesses to develop renewable energy and biomass energy supplies on their lands and to increase energy efficiency.

A competitive grant program is established to have eligible entities provide farmers, ranchers, and rural small businesses energy audits which will provide cost-effective recommendations for energy savings and to examine the potential for renewable energy development.

A complementary grant and loan program is also established so that farmers, ranchers, and rural small businesses can purchase renewable energy systems and make energy efficiency improvements. Energy savings of 30% or more can often be achieved through implementing energy audit recommendations, and renewable energy systems, such as wind turbines, photovoltaic systems and methane digesters can significantly reduce energy costs and help clean up the environment.

The title includes a federal agency biobased products purchasing requirement if they are comparable in price, performance, and availability to traditional products. In addition, the Agriculture Department will develop a labeling program for biobased products based on the successful Energy Star program for energy efficiency. This initiative will stimulate the demand for biobased products, such as soybeans, corn, and other commodities and at the same time provide environmental benefits.

A competitive grant program is also established to support the commercialization of new and emerging technologies for the conversion of biomass into petroleum substitutes. Just as we refine petroleum into gasoline, diesel, propane, and other products, we can refine agricultural wastes into ethanol, plastics, hydrogen fuel, and perhaps products not yet invented.

A new research and development program to promote understanding of carbon sequestration in agriculture and forestry is also a

part of the title. It includes plans to establish benchmarks and best measurement techniques, and includes funding for demonstration projects for monitoring carbon sequestration. This will allow farmers and others to better understand how to store dangerous greenhouse gases, perhaps earning extra income to provide this public benefit.

TITLE X—COMPETITION

The Competition Title amends the Agricultural Fair Practices Act of 1967, the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, and the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946.

The Competition Title includes a subtitle that makes a number of amendments to the Agricultural Fair Practices Act (AFPA) to address unfair and deceptive practices in agricultural commerce. The subtitle establishes the Office of Special Counsel for Competition Matters within the USDA to investigate, prosecute, and promulgate regulations under the AFPA and any other Act the Secretary deems appropriate. The subtitle requires covered persons with annual sales of over \$100,000,000 to annually file with the Secretary a report that describes strategic alliances, ownership, joint ventures, subsidiaries, brand names, and interlocking boards of directors in other covered persons. The subtitle defines "covered persons" to include a dealer, handler, contractor, processor, or commission merchant of agricultural commodities with sales of over \$10,000,000 per year. The subtitle prohibits unfair and deceptive practices on the part of covered persons in the marketing, purchasing, and contracting of agricultural commodities. The subtitle prohibits covered persons from engaging in specific practices in bargaining with producers and producer associations, such as restraining, coercing, retaliating against, or refusing to deal with any producer who exercises his or her right to join and participate in a producer association. The subtitle provides minimum standards in agricultural contracting, including: a requirement to act in good faith in the performance and enforcement of agricultural contracts, and a requirement to include a cover sheet that discloses provisions of the contract including, among other things, duration, factors in payment, renewal and renegotiation standards, and responsibility for environmental liability. The subtitle provides requirements specific to production contracting, including: the right to cancel a production contract within three business days after the date at which the production contract is executed; allowing contract producers to file production contract liens and to receive a security interest in the agricultural commodity or other property of the covered person as allowed in the applicable State law provisions based on Article 9 of the Uniform Commercial Code; requiring the contract producer who made at least a \$100,000 investment because of the production contract receive at least 90 days for the contract producer to cure an alleged breach before the covered person terminates the contract, and prohibiting a contractor from requiring additional investments during the term of the contract unless the additional investments are offset by additional consideration and the contract producer agrees in writing that there is an acceptable and satisfactory consideration. The subtitle provides that any aggrieved person may seek injunctions for acts or practices prohibited by the Act; allows any person injured in the business or property of the person by reason of any violation of this Act may sue for a violation to recover damages and recover an additional penalty of up to \$1000 per violation.

The court allows the court to provide reasonable attorney's fees to the prevailing party, and sets the statute of limitation at two years. The subtitle provides that when the Secretary has reasonable cause to believe that any covered person has engaged in any act or practice that violates the Act, she may bring a civil action in the U.S. district court to request preventative relief. The subtitle provides that a producer of an agricultural product or service may execute, as a clause in an agricultural contract, an assignment of dues or fees to an association of producers authorized by contract and requires the covered person to deduct the portion from the contract and make a payment to the producer association on behalf of the producer.

The Title amends the Packers and Stockyards Act to provide the Secretary with jurisdiction over live poultry dealers who deal in all types of poultry, not just poultry for slaughter and provide the Secretary the authority to bring administrative actions against live poultry dealers. The title also allows the Secretary to seek outside counsel in the enforcement of the Packers and Stockyards Act.

The Title includes a subtitle to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to require that retailers notify consumers at the final point of sale of the country of origin for beef, pork, lamb, ground beef, ground pork, ground lamb, perishable agricultural commodities, and whole farm-raised fish. The subtitle provides that the Secretary may require that any person that prepares, stores, handles, or distributes a covered commodity for retail sale maintain a verifiable record-keeping audit trail that will permit the Secretary to ensure compliance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary. The subtitle provides that section 253 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 shall be the enforcement provision of the subtitle.

The Title also requires the Secretary to conduct a referendum among persons covered by an order in effect under a commodity promotion law to determine whether the persons favor the termination of the order at least once every five years. The referenda would be conducted in accord with the terms and conditions of the applicable order and commodity promotion law consistent with this section. The title allows eligible persons to vote in a referendum by mail ballot or by such other method, instead of in-person voting, prescribed by the Secretary as will reduce the burden on voters and ensure the integrity of the referendum.

The Title also amends the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act to allow the Secretary to initiate investigations of alleged violations of PACA.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

S.J. Res. 28. A joint resolution suspending certain provisions of law pursuant to section 258(a)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; to the Committee on the Budget.

S.J. RES. 28

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress declares that the conditions specified in section 254(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are met and the implementation of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, chapter 11 of title 31, United States

Code, and part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 are modified as described in section 258(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 529, the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate return to legislative session.

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

The nomination was considered and confirmed as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Jo Anne Barnhart, of Delaware, to be Commissioner of Social Security for the term expiring January 19, 2007.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2001

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, November 5; that on Monday immediately following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired and the time for the two leaders be reserved for use later in the day; that the Senate then proceed to a period for morning business until 5:45 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designee; that at 5:45 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 515, Larry Hicks, to be a United States district judge; that there be 15 minutes for debate on the nomination with the time equally divided and controlled between the chairman and ranking member or their designees; that at 6 p.m., without intervening action or further debate, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination; that following the vote, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 3 P.M.
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2001

Mr. REID. Madam President, pursuant to the previous order, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand adjourned.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:24 p.m., adjourned until Monday, November 5, 2001, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by
the Senate November 2, 2001:

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

JO ANNE BARNHART, OF DELAWARE, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2007.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.