Maiden Speeches

OF U.S. SENATORS

IN THE 108TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

S. DOC. 108–16

Maiden Speeches

OF U.S. SENATORS

IN THE 108TH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 2005

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Compiled under the direction
of the
Joint Committee on Printing
Trent Lott, Chairman

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

CONTENTS

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Order for Printing Maiden Speeches

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all maiden speeches by new Senators from the 108th Congress be printed as a Senate document, provided further that Senators have until the close of business tomorrow, Friday, November 19, to submit such statements.

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

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Senate Historical Minute—April 19, 1906

Benjamin Disraeli never forgot his first attempt to deliver a speech as a brand new member of the British House of Commons. It was, perhaps, a legislator's worst nightmare. As he began to speak, other members started laughing. The more he spoke, the harder they laughed. Finally, humiliated, he gave up and sat down. As his parting shot, this future two-time Prime Minister pledged, "The time will come when you shall hear me."

From the Senate's earliest days, new members have observed a ritual of remaining silent during floor debates for a period of time—depending on the era and the Senator—that ranged from several months to several years. Some believed that by waiting a respectful amount of time before giving their so-called maiden speech, their more senior colleagues would respect them for their humility.

In 1906, Wisconsin Senator Robert La Follette was anything but humble. A 20-year veteran of public office, with service in the House and as his State's Governor, he believed he had been elected to present a message that none of his more seasoned colleagues was inclined to deliver. La Follette waited just 3 months, an astoundingly brief period by the standards of that day, before launching his first major address. He spoke for 8 hours over 3 days; his remarks in the *Congressional Record* consumed 148 pages. As he began to speak, most of the Senators present in the Chamber pointedly rose from their desks and departed. La Follette's wife, observing from the gallery, wrote, "There was no mistaking that this was a polite form of hazing."

A year later, in 1907, Arkansas Senator Jeff Davis shocked Capitol Hill by waiting only 9 days. The local press corps, keeping a count of such upstart behavior, jokingly noted that Davis was the fourth new Senator in recent years who "refused to wait until his hair turned gray before taking up his work actively."

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Today, of course, this ancient Senate tradition survives only in part—that part being the special attention given to a Member's first major address.

Although new members of the British House of Commons, perhaps recalling the Disraeli precedent, may still withhold their oratorical debut, that practice has long since vanished here. As one seasoned observer of Senate customs notes, "the electorate simply wouldn't stand for it."

RICHARD A. BAKER
U.S. Senate Historical Office

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Introduction

[FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, MARCH 4, 2003]

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, first of all, I thank the new Senators who are here. I heard my distinguished colleague from Nevada talk a little bit about what we are about to embark upon. It is a rich tradition of this body. In the last few years, we have gotten away from having what we call a "maiden speech." It is not the first time we have heard from our freshmen Senators on both sides of the aisle, but it does give Members an opportunity to focus, as we just heard, on issues that are important to individual Senators, but also are important to the American people in the broadest sense.

In this body, because we are always on a particular piece of legislation or in Executive Session, this gives us an opportunity to pause for a moment and shine that spotlight and that focus on an initial speech or discussion.

I am delighted we are reaching to the past—not the distant past—to something we have gotten away from in the last several Congresses, and as an initiative by our new Senators, are embarking upon what I know will be a great and very meaningful and powerful experience for all of us.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

MAIDEN SPEECHES

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Lamar Alexander

TUESDAY, *March 4, 2003*

Mr. President, I first thank the majority leader (Mr. Frist) for his comments and his friendship and his encouragement of the new Senators in these first addresses. I thank the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Reid) for his encouragement and his willingness to join me in co-sponsoring the legislation that I hope to talk about. I thank my colleagues for taking the time to be here today.

From the Senate's earliest days, new Members have observed, as we just heard, the ritual of remaining silent for a period of time, ranging from several weeks to 2 years. By waiting a respectful amount of time before giving their so-called "maiden speeches," freshmen Senators hoped their senior colleagues would respect them for their humility.

This information comes from our Senate historian, Richard Baker, who told me that in 1906 the former Governor of Wisconsin—I am sensitive to this as a former Governor—Robert La Follette, arrived here, in Mr. Baker's words, "anything but humble." He waited just 3 months, a brief period by the standards of those days, before launching his first major address. . . .

From our first day here, as the majority leader said, we new Members of the 108th Congress have been encouraged to speak up, and most of us have. But, with the encouragement of the majority leader and the assistant minority leader, several of us intend also to try to revive the tradition of the maiden address by a signature speech on an issue that is important both to the country and to each of us. I thank my colleagues who are here, and I assure all of you that I will not do what the former Governor of Wisconsin did and speak for 3 days.

Mr. President, I rise today to address the intersection of two urgent concerns that will determine our country's future, and these are also the two topics I care about the most: the education of our children and the principles that unite us as Americans. It is time we put the teaching of American his-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

tory and civics back in its rightful place in our schools so our children can grow up learning what it means to be an American. Especially during such serious times when our values and ways of life are being attacked, we need to understand just what those values are.

In this, most Americans would agree. For example, in Thanksgiving remarks in 2001, President Bush praised our Nation's response to September 11. "I call it," he said, "the American character." At about the same time, speaking at Harvard, former Vice President Al Gore said, "We should fight for the values that bind us together as a country."

Both men were invoking a creed of ideas and values in which most Americans believe. "It has been our fate as a nation," the historian Richard Hofstadter wrote, "not to have ideologies but to be one." This value-based identity has inspired both patriotism and division at home as well as emulation and hatred abroad. For terrorists, as well as those who admire America, at issue is the United States itself—not what we do but who we are.

Yet our children do not know what makes America exceptional. National exams show that three-quarters of the Nation's 4th, 8th, and 12th graders are not proficient in civics knowledge and one-third do not even have basic knowledge, making them "civic illiterates."

Children are not learning about American history and civics because they are not being taught them. American history has been watered down, and civics is too often dropped from the curriculum entirely.

Until the 1960s, civics education, which teaches the duties of citizenship, was a regular part of the high school curriculum. But today's college graduates probably have less civic knowledge than high school graduates of 50 years ago. Reforms, so-called, in the 1960s and 1970s, resulted in widespread elimination of required classes and curriculum in civics education. Today, more than half the States have no requirement for students to take a course—even for one semester—in American Government.

To help put the teaching of American history and civics in its rightful place, today I introduce legislation on behalf of myself and co-sponsors Senator Reid of Nevada, Senator Gregg, Senator Santorum, Senator Inhofe, and Senator Nickles. We call it the American History and Civics Education Act. The purpose of the act is to create Presidential academies for teachers of American history and civics, and congressional academies for students of American history and civics. These residential academies would operate for 2 weeks, in the case of teachers, and 4 weeks in the case of students, during the summertime. Their purpose would be to inspire better teaching and more learning of the key events, the key persons, and the key ideas that shape the institutions and democratic heritage of the United States.

I had some experience with such residential summer academies when I was Governor of Tennessee. It was a good experience. In 1984, we began creating Governor's schools for students and for teachers. We had a Governor's School for the Arts. We had a Governor's School for International Studies at the University of Memphis, a Governor's School for Teachers of Writing at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, which was very successful. Eventually there were eight Governor's schools in our State, and they helped thousands of Tennessee teachers improve their skills and inspired outstanding students in the same way. When those teachers and students went back to their own schools during the regular school year, their enthusiasm for teaching and learning the subject they had been a part of in the summer infected their peers and improved education across the board. Dollar for dollar, I believe the Governor's schools in our State were the most effective popular education initiatives in our State's history.

We weren't the only State to try it; many did. The first State Governor's school I heard about was in North Carolina, started by Terry Sanford when he was Governor in 1963, and then other States have done the same—Georgia, South Carolina, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee. In 1973, Pennsylvania established the Governor's Schools of Excellence, with 14 different programs of study. Mississippi has done the same. Virginia's Governor's School is a summer residential program for 7,500 of the Commonwealth's most gifted students. Mississippi and West Virginia also have similar programs. They are just a few of the more than 100 Governor's schools in 28 States. Clearly, the model has proved to be a good one.

The legislation I propose today applies that successful model to American history and civics by establishing Presidential and congressional academies for students and teachers of those subjects.

The legislation would do one more thing. It would authorize the creation of a national alliance of American history and civics teachers to be connected by the Internet. The alliance would facilitate the sharing of the best practices in the

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

teaching of American history and civics. It is modeled after an alliance I helped the National Geographic Society start in the 1980s. Their purpose was to help put geography back into the school curriculum.

This legislation creates a pilot program, up to 12 Presidential academies for teachers, 12 congressional academies for students, sponsored by educational institutions. The National Endowment for the Humanities would award 2-year renewable grants to those institutions after a peer review process. Each grant would be subject to rigorous review after 3 years to determine whether the overall program should continue or expand or be stopped. The legislation authorizes $25 million annually for the 4-year pilot program.

There is a broad new basis of support for and interest in American history and civics in our country. As David Gordon noted in a recent issue of the *Harvard Education Letter*:

> A 1998 survey by the nonpartisan research organization Public Agenda showed that 84 percent of parents with school age children say they believe the United States is a special country and they want our schools to convey that belief to our children by teaching about its heroes and its traditions. Similar numbers identified the American ideal as including equal opportunity, individual freedom, and tolerance and respect for others. Those findings were consistent across racial and ethnic groups.

Our national leadership has responded to this renewed interest. In 2000, at the initiative of my distinguished colleague Senator Byrd, Congress created grants for schools that teach American history as a separate subject within the school curriculum. We appropriated $100 million for those grants in the recent omnibus appropriations bill, and rightfully so. They encourage schools and teachers to focus on the teaching of traditional American history and provide important financial support.

Then, last September, with historian David McCullough at his side, President Bush announced a new initiative to encourage the teaching of American history and civics. He established the “We The People” program at the National Endowment for the Humanities, which will develop curricula and sponsor lectures on American history and civics. He announced the “Our Documents” project, run by the National Archives. This will take 100 of America’s most prominent and important documents from the National Archives to classrooms everywhere in the country. This year, the President will convene a White House forum on American history, civics, and service. There we can discuss new policies to improve the teaching and learning of those subjects.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

This proposed legislation takes the next step by training teachers and encouraging outstanding students. I am pleased today that one of the leading Members of the House of Representatives, Roger Wicker of Mississippi, along with a number of his colleagues, is introducing the same legislation in the House of Representatives. I thank Senator Gregg, the chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, for being here and also for agreeing that the committee will hold hearings on this legislation so we can determine how it might supplement and work with the legislation enacted last year in this Congress and the President's various initiatives.

In 1988, I was at a meeting of educators in Rochester when the President of Notre Dame University asked this question: "What is the rationale for the public school?" There was an unexpected silence around the room until Al Shanker, the president of the American Federation of Teachers, answered in this way: "The public school was created to teach immigrant children the three R's and what it means to be an American with the hope that they would then go home and teach their parents."

From the founding of America, we have always understood how important it is for citizens to understand the principles that unite us as a country. Other countries are united by their ethnicity. If you move to Japan, you can't become Japanese. Americans, on the other hand, are united by a few principles in which we believe. To become an American citizen, you subscribe to those principles. If there were no agreement on those principles, Samuel Huntington has noted, we would be the United Nations instead of the United States of America.

There has therefore been a continuous education process to remind Americans just what those principles are. In his retirement at Monticello, Thomas Jefferson would spend evenings explaining to overnight guests what he had in mind when he helped create what we call America. By the mid-19th century it was just assumed that most Americans knew what it meant to be an American. In his letter from the Alamo, Col. William Barrett Travis pleaded for help simply "in the name of liberty, patriotism and everything dear to the American character."

New waves of immigration in the late 19th century brought to our country a record number of new people from other lands whose view of what it means to be an American was indistinct—and Americans responded by teaching them.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

In Wisconsin, for example, the Kohler Company housed German immigrants together so that they might be Americanized during non-working hours.

But the most important Americanizing institution, as Mr. Shanker reminded us in Rochester in 1988, was the new common school. *McGuffey's Reader*, which was used in many classrooms, sold more than 120 million copies introducing a common culture of literature, patriotic speeches and historical references.

The wars of the 20th century made Americans stop and think about what we were defending. President Roosevelt made certain that those who charged the beaches of Normandy knew they were defending freedoms.

But after World War II, the emphasis on teaching and defining the principles that unite us waned. Unpleasant experiences with McCarthyism in the 1950s, discouragement after the Vietnam war, and history books that left out or distorted the history of African-Americans made some skittish about discussing "Americanism." The end of the cold war removed a preoccupation with who we were not, making it less important to consider who we are. The immigration law changes in 1965 brought to our shores many new Americans and many cultural changes. As a result, the American way became much more often praised than defined.

Changes in community attitudes, as they always are, were reflected in our schools. According to historian Diane Ravitch, the public school virtually abandoned its role as the chief Americanizing institution. We have gone, she explains, from one extreme—simplistic patriotism and incomplete history—to the other—"public schools with an adversary culture that emphasizes the Nation's warts and diminishes its genuine accomplishments. There is no literary canon, no common reading, no agreed-upon lists of books, poems and stories from which students and parents might be taught a common culture and be reminded of what it means to be an American."

During this time many of our national leaders contributed to this drift toward agnostic Americanism. These leaders celebrated multiculturalism and bilingualism and diversity at a time when there should have been more emphasis on a common culture and learning English and unity.

America's variety and diversity is a great strength, but it is not our greatest strength. Jerusalem is diverse. The Balkans are diverse. America's greatest accomplishment is not its variety and diversity but that we have found a way to

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

take all that variety and diversity and unite as one country. *E pluribus unum*: out of many, one. That is what makes America truly exceptional.

Since 9/11 things have been different. The terrorists focused their cross-hairs on the creed that unites Americans as one country—forcing us to remind ourselves of those principles, to examine and define them, and to celebrate them. The President has been the lead teacher. President Bush has literally taken us back to school on what it means to be an American. When he took the country to church on television after the attacks he reminded us that no country is more religious than we are. When he walked across the street to the mosque he reminded the world that we separate church and state and that there is freedom here to believe in whatever one wants to believe. When he attacked and defeated the Taliban, he honored life. When we put planes back in the air and opened financial markets and began going to football games again we honored liberty. The President called on us to make those magnificent images of courage and charity and leadership and selflessness after 9/11 more permanent in our everyday lives. And with his optimism, he warded off doomsayers who tried to diminish the real gift of Americans to civilization, our cockeyed optimism that anything is possible.

Just after 9/11, I proposed an idea I called "Pledge Plus Three." Why not start each school day with the Pledge of Allegiance—as we did this morning here in the Senate—followed by a faculty member or student sharing for 3 minutes "what it means to be an American." The Pledge embodies many of the ideals of our National Creed: "one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." It speaks to our unity, to our faith, to our value of freedom, and to our belief in the fair treatment of all Americans. If more future Federal judges took more classes in American history and civics and learned about those values, we might have fewer mind-boggling decisions like the one issued by the Ninth Circuit.

Before I was elected to the Senate, I taught some of our future judges and legislators a course at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government entitled "The American Character and America's Government." The purpose of the course was to help policymakers, civil servants and journalists analyze the American creed and character and apply it in the solving of public policy problems. We tried to figure

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

out, if you will, what would be "the American way" to solve a given problem, if such a thing were to exist.

The students and I did not have much trouble deciding that America is truly exceptional—not always better, but truly exceptional—or in identifying the major principles of an American creed or the distinct characteristics of our country; such principles as: liberty, equal opportunity, rule of law, laissez faire, individualism, *e pluribus unum*, the separation of church and state.

But what we also found was that applying those principles to today's issues was hard work. This was because the principles of the creed often conflicted. For example, when discussing President Bush's faith-based charity legislation, we knew that "In God We Trust" but we also knew that we didn't trust government with God.

When considering whether the Federal Government should pay for scholarships which middle- and low-income families might use at any accredited school—public, private or religious—we found that the principle of equal opportunity conflicted with the separation of church and state.

And we found there are great disappointments when we try to live up to our greatest dreams. For example, President Kennedy's pledge that we will "pay any price or bear any burden" to defend freedom, or Thomas Jefferson's assertion that "all men are created equal," or the American dream that for anyone who works hard, tomorrow will always be better than today.

We often are disappointed when we try to live up to those truths.

We learned that, as Samuel Huntington has written, balancing these conflicts and disappointments is what most of American politics and government is about.

If most of our politics and government is about applying to our most urgent problems the principles and characteristics that make the United States of America an exceptional country, then we had better get on with the teaching and learning of those principles and characteristics.

The legislation I propose today, with several co-sponsors, will help our schools do what they were established to do in the first place. At a time when there are record numbers of new Americans, at a time when our values are under attack, at a time when we are considering going to war to defend those values, there can be no more urgent task than putting the teaching of American history and civics back in its right-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

ful place in our schools so our children can grow up learning what it means to be an American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *Record* several items: A syllabus from the course that I taught, an article from the *National Association of Scholars*, and memoranda outlining the various Governors' schools in our State and other States.

I also highly commend to my colleagues a report from the Carnegie Corporation and CIRCLE titled "The Civic Mission of Schools."

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

THE AMERICAN CHARACTER AND AMERICA'S GOVERNMENT: USING THE AMERICAN CREED TO MAKE DECISIONS

(Professor Lamar Alexander, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Spring 2002)

OBJECTIVE OF THE COURSE

To help future decision-makers use the principles of the American Creed to solve difficult, contemporary public policy problems. Students will first explore America's "exceptionalism": how an idea-based national ideology makes the United States different from other countries—including other Western democracies. Then, each session will analyze one value of the "American Creed"—and how it conflicts with other values and/or creates unrealized expectations—in the solving of a specific problem. Students will simulate realistic policy-making situations and produce professional products as assignments: concise memos, outlines and briefings.

RATIONALE FOR THE COURSE

In Thanksgiving remarks President Bush praised the nation's response to September 11. "I call it," he said, "the American Character." At KSG Al Gore said, "We should [fight] for the values that bind us together as a country." Both men were invoking a creed of ideas and values in which most Americans believe. "It has been our fate as a nation," Richard Hofstadter wrote, "not to have ideologies but to be one." This value-based national identity has inspired both patriotism and division at home, both emulation and hatred abroad. For terrorists as well as for those who admire America, at issue is the United States itself—not what we do, but who we are.

Yet Americans who unite on principle divide and suffer disappointment when using their creed to solve policy problems. This is because the values of the creed conflict (e.g., liberty vs. equality, individualism vs. community) and because American dreams are loftier than American reality (e.g., "all men are created equal," "tomorrow will be better than today"). Samuel Huntington has said that balancing these conflicts and disappointments is what most of American politics and government is about. That is also what this course is about.

AUDIENCE

The Course is designed for future policy makers, civil servants, and journalists. A general knowledge of American politics is helpful but not re-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

quired. It should be useful for both U.S. and international students seeking to learn more about the American system of government and how it differs from that of other countries.

Instructor

Lamar Alexander, The Roy M. and Barbara Goodman Family Visiting Professor of Practice in Public Service, has been Governor of Tennessee, President of the University of Tennessee, and U.S. Education Secretary. He co-founded Bright Horizons Family Solutions, Inc., now the nation's largest provider of worksite day care. His seven books include *Six Months Off*, the story of his family's trip to Australia after eight years in the Governor's residence. In 1996 and 2000 he was a candidate for the Republican nomination for President of the United States. For more see www.lamaralexander.com. Office: Littauer 101; Telephone: (617) 384–7354; E-mail: lamar__alexander@ksg.harvard.edu.

Office Hours

Office hours will generally be on Tuesdays and Wednesdays. A sign up sheet will be posted outside Professor Alexander's door. Appointments may also be made by e-mailing kay@lamaralexander.com

Course Assistant

Matt Sonnesyn will be course assistant for PAL 223 and may be reached by e-mail at matthew__sonnesyn@ksg02.harvard.edu.

Expectations

This is a graduate level professional course and will have the corresponding standards and assignments: attendance at all scheduled classes, assignments completed on time, and evaluation according to students' preparation of professional products—crisp and realistic decision memos, memo outlines, and policy briefings. All briefings are conducted in class and all decision memos and weekly outlines are due at the beginning of the corresponding class session. There is no final exam, but there will be a final paper.

Grading

Briefings (2): team exercise 20 percent. Two times during the course each student will participate in a team briefing on that week's subject.

Memos (2): team exercise 20 percent. Two other times during the course each student will participate in a team preparing a three-page decision memo on that week's subject. The student may select these from among the class topics.

Weekly Outlines (6): 20 percent. Six other times during the course each student will prepare a one-page analysis of the week's problem. (This will be during those weeks when the student is not involved in preparing a team briefing or team memo.) As a result, for ten of the twelve class sessions, each student will have an assignment (other than reading) that requires preparation outside of class—either a team briefing, a team memo, or an individual weekly memo outline.

Class participation and attendance: 15 percent.

Final Paper: 25 percent.

Final grades will be determined by students' overall position in the class as measured by performance on each of the assignments and will conform

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

to the Kennedy School of Government's recommended range of grading distribution.

MATERIALS

The course relies primarily on course packets to be made available for sale at the Course Materials Office. There will be 125–150 pages of reading each week. There are three required textbooks:

(1) Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, translated and edited by Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop, The University of Chicago Press, 2000.

(2) Seymour Martin Lipset, American Exceptionalism, W.W. Norton & Co., 1997 (paperback).

(3) Samuel P. Huntington, "American Politics: The Promise of Disharmony," The Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1981.

All three books are available for purchase at the Harvard Coop. Copies of all three books are on reserve in the KSG library.

Note: Readings from the three required textbooks or readings which are readily available online are not included in the course packet. (Hypertext links to the online readings may be found within the syllabus that is posted on the KSG website.)

ENROLLMENT

The course has a limited enrollment. Auditors are permitted with permission of the instructor.

COURSE OUTLINE AND REQUIRED READINGS

2/5: My "ism" is Americanism—American Exceptionalism. One hundred and one ways Americans are different. So what?

Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America, edited by Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2000, pp. 3–15, 90, 585–587, 225–226.

G.K. Chesterson, What I Saw in America, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1922, pp. 6–12.

Daniel J. Boorstin, "Why a Theory Seems Needless," The Genius of American Politics, 1953, The University of Chicago Press, pp. 8–35.

Samuel P. Huntington, "The American Creed and National Identity," American Politics: The Promise of Disharmony, 1981, pp. 13–30.

Albert Hourani, A History of the Arab Peoples, 1991, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, pp. 46–58.

Samuel P. Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations, Simon and Schuster, 1996, pp. 40–55, 68–78, 301–308.

Seymour Martin Lipset, American Exceptionalism, pp. 17–34.

2/12: " . . . where at least I know I'm free . . . "—Liberty. Should Congress repeal President Bush's executive order allowing non-citizens suspected of international terrorism to be detained and tried in special military tribunals?

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 239–242, 246–249, 301, 639–640.

U.S. Constitution and amendments, 1787. http://memory.loc.gov/const/constquery.html.

John Stuart Mill, "The Authority of Society and the Individual," On Liberty, 1859, Hackett Publishing Co. edition, 1978, pp. 73–91.

Carl Brent Swisher, American Constitutional Development, Greenwood Press, Connecticut, 1954, pp. 276–292, 1017–1025.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Samuel P. Huntington, “The American Creed vs. Political Authority,” American Politics: The Promise of Disharmony, 1981, pp. 31–60.

Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, Thinking in Time, The Free Press, pp. 232–246, 1988.

An Executive Order of President George W. Bush, “Detention, Treatment and Trial of Certain Non-Citizens in the War against Terrorism,” November 13, 2001.

Jeffrey Rosen, “Testing the Resilience of American Values,” The New York Times Week in Review, Sunday, Nov. 18, 2001, pp. 1 and 4.

Laurence H. Tribe, Statement before U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, December 4, 2001.

“American Attitudes Toward Civil Liberties,” public opinion survey, by Kaiser Foundation, National Public Radio and Kennedy School of Government, December 2001. http://www.npr.org/news/specials/civillibertiespoll/011130.poll.html.

2/19: In God We Trust . . . but we don’t trust government with God—Christianity, pluralism and the state. Should Congress enact President Bush’s faith-based charity legislation?

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 278–288.

John Locke, “A Letter Concerning Toleration,” Diane Ravitch and Abigail Thernstrom, The Democracy Reader, NY: HarperCollins, 1992., ibid., pp. 31–37.

Thomas Jefferson, “Notes on the State of Virginia,” Ravitch and Thernstrom, ibid., pp. 108–109.

James Madison, “Memorial and Remonstrance against Religious Assessments,” 1785, The Writings of James Madison, NY: Putnam, 1908.

“Separation of Church and State in America Brought about by the Scotch-Irish of Virginia,” Charles. A. Hanna, The Scotch Irish, Vol. II, 1985, Genealogical Publishing Co., Baltimore, pp. 157–162.

Philip Schaff, America: A Sketch of its Political, Social and Religious Character, 1961, The Belknap Press of Harvard University, pp. 72–83.

Engel vs. Vitale, 370 U.S. 421 (1962).

Marvin Olasky, “The Early American Model of Compassion,” The Tragedy of American Compassion, Regnery Publishing, Washington, D.C., 1992, pp. 6–23.

Lamar Alexander, “Homeless, not hopeless,” We Know What to Do, William Morrow, New York, 1995, pp. 35–51.

Two Executive Orders of President George W. Bush, “Establishment of White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives” and “Agency Responsibilities with Respect to Faith-based Community Initiatives.” January 29, 2001.

2/26: “Leave no child behind”—Equal Opportunity. Should the federal government pay for scholarships that middle- and low-income families may use at any accredited school—public, private or religious?

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 41–42.

Horace Mann, “Report of the Massachusetts Board of Education, 1848” in Daniel J. Boorstin, An American Primer, Meridian, 1995, pp. 361–375.

Charles Leslie Glenn, Jr. The Myth of the Common School, The University of Massachusetts Press, 1988, pp. 146–158.

Lamar Alexander, “The GI Bill for Kids,” The John Ashbrook Lecture, presented at Ashland (O.) University, 9/12/92. http://www.lamaralexander.com/articles.htm.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Thomas J. Kane, "Lessons from the Largest School Voucher Program," Who Chooses? Who Loses?, edited by Bruce Fuller and Richard F. Elmore, Teachers College Press, 1996, pp. 173–183.

Michael W. McConnell, "Legal and Constitutional Issues of Vouchers," Vouchers and the Provision of Public Schools, The Brookings Institution, 2000, pp. 368–391.

Eliot M. Mincberg and Judith E. Schaeffer, "Grades K–12: The Legal Problems with Public Funding of Religious Schools," Vouchers and the Provision of Public Schools, pp. 394–403.

Diane Ravitch, "American Traditions of Education," Terry M. Moe, A Primer on America's Schools, Hoover Institution Press, 2001, pp. 1–14.

Paul Peterson, "Choice in American Education," A Primer on America's Schools, pp. 249–283.

Diane Ravitch, "Ex Uno Plures," Education Next, Fall 2001, pp. 27–29.

3/5: Equal at the starting line . . . but what about those with shackles?—Individualism. Should the federal government pay for race-based college scholarships?

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 326–334, 347–348; 482–488.

The Declaration of Independence, 1776. http://memory.loc.gov/const/declar.html.

Abraham Lincoln, Second Inaugural Address (1865). http://www.bartleby.com/124/pres32.html

Frederick Douglass, "What to the Slave is the Fourth of July?" http://douglass.speech.nwu.edu/doug__a10.htm.

Martin Luther King, Jr., address at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C., August 28, 1963. http://douglass.speech.nwu.edu/king__b12.htm

Excerpts from University of California Regents v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 265 (1978).

Testimony of Lamar Alexander, U.S. Education Secretary, Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 102nd Congress, 2nd session, Feb. 20, 1992, pp. 39–46, 82–89, 99–102.

Seymour Martin Lipset, "Two Americas," American Exceptionalism, pp. 113–150.

Abigail Thernstrom and Stephen Thernstrom, America in Black and White, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1997. pp. 530–545.

Cornel West, "Malcolm X and Black Rage," Race Matters, Random House, Vintage Books, New York, 2001, pp. 135–151.

3/12: A nation of immigrants . . . but all Americans—E Pluribus Unum. Should illegal aliens have Illinois driver's licenses? discounted tuition at state colleges? free medical care? should their children attend public schools?

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 29–30, 32, 34–37, 268.

J. Hector St. John de Crevecouer, "What is an American," Letters from an American Farmer, 1782, Penguin Books edition 1986, pp. 67–90.

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Disuniting of America, W.W. Norton, New York, 1991, pp. 9–43.

Carlos E. Cortes, "Limits to pluribus, limits to unum," National Forum, Baton Rouge, Winter, 1992. pp. 6–10.

Samuel P. Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations, Simon and Schuster, 1996, pp. 198–206.

J. Harvie Wilkinson, "The Medley of America," One Nation Indivisible, Addison Wesley, 1997, pp. 3–21.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Griffin Bell, "The Changing Role of Migrants in the United States," Address to the International Leadership Issues Conference of State Legislative Leaders Foundation, Budapest, October 4, 2001.

David Cohen, Chasing the Red, White and Blue, New York, 2001. St. Martin's Press, pp. 218–236, 250–260.

Morris P. Fiorina and Paul E. Peterson, The New American Democracy, Longman, 2002, pp. 99–108.

3/19: Suspending the constitution in order to save it—Rule of Law. Should the governor-elect seize office three days early to prevent the incumbent governor from selling pardons for cash?

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 229–231.

US Constitution, 25th Amendment. http://memory.loc.gov/const/constquery.html.

Tennessee Constitution Article 3, Section 12. http://www.state.tn.us/sos/bluebook/online/section6/tnconst.pdf (p. 12).

Tennessee Acts Section 8–1–107.

Lon Fuller, "The Morality that Makes Law Possible," The Morality of Law. Yale Law School Press, 1964. pp. 33–44.

John D. Feerick, The Twenty-Fifth Amendment: Its Complete History and Earliest Applications. Fordham University Press, 1976. pp. 3–23, 193–206.

Bush v. Gore, 2000. http://www.supremecourtus.gov/florida.html.

Al Gore, address to the nation, December 13, 2000. http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2000/transcripts/121300/t651213.html.

Paul F. Boller, Jr., "Picking the Day," Presidential Inaugurations, Harcourt, Inc., 2001, pp. 23–31.

James W. Torke, "What Is This Thing Called the Rule of Law?" Indiana Law Review. Volume 34, 2001. pp. 1445–1456.

Dotty Lynch, "Back to Abnormal," Sept. 28, 2001, from CBS News Site. http://www.cbsnews.com/now/story/0,1597,312915-412,00.shtml.

Tim McGirk, "Wahid's In, Megawati's Out," Dec. 8, 2001, from Time Asia. http://www.time.com/time/asia/news/interview/0,9754,168569,00.html.

Gordon Silverstein, "Globalization and the Rule of Law," mimeo, The University of Minnesota, 2001.

3/26: Harvard break.

4/2: "Ask not what your country can do for you . . ."—Community. Should all high school graduates perform one mandatory year of community service?

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 56–58, 577–578, 489–492.

Robert N. Bellah, et al., Habits of the Heart, University of California Press, 1985, pp. vii–xxxv, 275–296.

Daniel Boorstin, "From Charity to Philanthropy," Hidden History, Vintage, New York, 1989, pp. 193–209.

Barry Alan Shain, The Myth of American Individualism, Princeton University Press, 1994, pp. xiii–xix.

Lamar Alexander, "What's Wrong With American Giving and How to Fix It," Philanthropy, Summer 1997. http://www.lamaralexander.com/articles__03.htm.

Robert D. Putnam, Bowling Alone, Simon & Schuster, 2000, pp. 15–28, 48–64, 116–133, 402–414.

4/9: Why Americans don't trust Washington, D.C.—A government of, by and for the people. Should the U.S. create a citizen congress: cut their pay and send them home six months a year, adopt term limits and two-year federal budgets?

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 53–55.

Aristotle, “Politics,” from Ravitch and Thernstrom, pp. 9–12.

Edmund Burke, “On Election to Parliament,” Ravitch and Thernstrom, ibid., pp. 50–51.

Samuel P. Huntington, “The American Creed and National Identity,” American Politics: the Promise of Disharmony, 1981, pp. 36–41.

E.J. Dionne, “The Politics of the Restive Majority,” Why Americans Hate Politics, Touchstone, New York, 1991, pp. 329–355.

Lamar Alexander, “Cut Their Pay and Send Them Home,” 1994, address to The Heritage Foundation.

Seymour Martin Lipset, American Exceptionalism, pp. 35–46.

Joseph S. Nye, et al., Why People Don’t Trust Government, Harvard University Press, 1997, pp. 253–281.

Mark Kim, David King, Richard Zechhauser, “Why State Governments Succeed,” mimeo, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 2001.

4/16: “Work! For the night is coming . . . ”—Laissez Faire. Should the federal government pay all working Americans “a living wage”?

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 506–508, 555–557, 606–608.

Herbert Croly, The Promise of American Life, 1909, Northeastern University Press, pp. 1–26.

Kevin Phillips, “The Triumph of Upper America,” The Politics of Rich and Poor, Harper, 1991, pp. xvii–xxiii.

C. Vann Woodward, “The Pursuit of Happiness,” The Old World’s New World, Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 40–62.

Seymour Martin Lipset, “Economy, Religion and Welfare,” American Exceptionalism, pp. 53–76.

David Neumark and William Washer, “Using the EITC to Help Poor Families: New Evidence and a Comparison with the Minimum Wage,” NBER Working Paper #7599 March 2000, pp. 1–4, 24–27. http://papers.nber.org/papers/W7599.

Charles Handy, “DeTocqueville Revisited: The Meaning of American Prosperity,” Harvard Business Journal, January 2001, pp. 5–11.

David Neumark, “Living Wages: Protection For or Protection From Low-Wage Workers,” NBER Working Paper #8393, July 2001, pp. 1–7, 25–27. http://papers.nber.org/papers/W8393.

David Cohen, Chasing the Red, White and Blue, New York, 2001. St. Martin’s Press, pp. 52–80.

Harvard Living Wage Statements. http://www.hcecp.harvard.edu/report.htm and http://www.hcs.harvard.edu/~pslm/livingwage/portal.html.

4/23: “Pay any price, bear any burden . . . ”—Exporting American Values. Putin shuts down last remaining independent Russian TV station (owned 25% by Ted Turner), expels 100 foreign journalists for “inaccurate reporting” including all Fox News personnel. What does U.S. do?

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 217–220.

George Washington’s Farewell Address, 1795. http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/washing.htm.

John F. Kennedy’s Inaugural Address, 1961. http://www.bartleby.com/124/pres56.html.

Samuel P. Huntington, American Politics: the Promise of Disharmony, pp. 240–262.

Graham T. Allison, Jr. and Robert P. Beschel, Jr., “Can the United States Promote Democracy,” Political Science Quarterly, Volume 107, No. 1, 1992, pp. 81–89.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Henry Kissinger, "The Hinge: Theodore Roosevelt or Woodrow Wilson," Diplomacy, New York Simon & Schuster, 1994, pp. 29–55.

Lamar Alexander, "In War and Peace," We Know What to Do, pp. 95–107.

Samuel P. Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations, pp. 309–321.

Samantha Power, "Bystanders to Genocide," The Atlantic Monthly, September 2000, pp. 84–108.

Walter Russell Mead, Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How it Changed the World, Alfred A Knopf, New York, 2001, pp. xv–xviii, 3–29.

4/30: Anything is possible—Unbridled optimism. Should there be a $1,000 limit on individual federal campaign contributions?

Alexis de Tocqueville, ibid., pp. 187–189.

Larry J. Sabato, "PACs and Parties," Money, Elections and Democracy: Reforming Congressional Campaign Finance, 1990, Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press.

Todd Eardensohn, A Review of the Alexander for President Campaign Budget (1995–1996).

Samuel P. Huntington, The Clash of Civilizations, Simon & Schuster, 1996, pp. 308–321.

Seymour Martin Lipset, American Exceptionalism, pp. 51–52, 267–292.

Lamar Alexander, "Should Tom Paine Have Filed with the FEC?," January 21, 1998, address to The Cato Institute.

Andrew Del Banco, The Real American Dream, 1999, Harvard University Press, pp. 103–118.

Lamar Alexander, "Put More Money Into Politics," August 27, 1999, The Wall Street Journal. http://www.lamaralexander.com/articles__01.htm.

Alexander, "Keeping the Dream Alive," We Know What to Do, ibid., pp. 165–180.

[From the National Association of Scholars]

Today's College Students Barely More Knowledgeable Than High School Students of 50 Years Ago, Poll Shows

Princeton, NJ, Dec. 18, 2002.—Contemporary college seniors scored on average little or no higher than the high-school graduates of a half-century ago on a battery of 15 questions assessing general cultural knowledge. The questions, drawn from a survey originally done by the Gallup Organization in 1955, covered literature, music, science, geography, and history. They were asked again of a random sample of American college and university students by Zogby International in April 2002. The Zogby survey was commissioned by the National Association of Scholars.

There were variations in the pattern of responses. The contemporary sample of seniors did better than the 1950s high school graduates on four questions relating to music, literature, and science, about the same on seven questions pertaining to geography, and worse on four questions about history.

The answers given by today's seniors were also compared to those provided to the Gallup questions by college graduates in 1955. Although the relatively small number of college graduates in the latter sample limits the degree of confidence one can have in the comparisons, the consistency and size of the knowledge superiority displayed by the 1950s college graduates strongly suggests that it is real.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

The overall average of correct responses for the entire general knowledge survey was 53.5% for today's college seniors, 54.5% for the 1955 high school graduates, and 77.3% for the 1955 college graduates.

(Removing three questions about which, for reasons indicated in the full report, the earlier respondents may have had more "extracurricular" sources of knowledge, the figures become 50.3% for the 2002 seniors, 46.4% for the 1955 high school graduates, and 67.8% for the 1955 college graduates.)

In addition, the 2002 college seniors were asked two questions dealing with the reading and musical interests that were asked of national samples of the American population in 1946 and 1957. With respect to interest in high literate and musical culture, the answers fail to show impressive or consistent differences between the two groups.

On a question inquiring whether or not they had a favorite author, 56% of 2002 college seniors, as opposed to 32% of the general population in 1946—the great majority of whom had only an elementary or secondary school education—answered affirmatively. For both groups, however, most of the authors specifically mentioned were writers of popular fiction. When only responses naming "high-brow" and canonical writers were tabulated, the differences between the two groups shrank considerably: 17% of the national sample falling into a "high-brow" classification in 1946, as opposed to 24% of the 2002 college senior sample. Not a particularly large difference given the college senior's great advantage in formal education.

Asked whether or not they would like to collect a fairly complete library of classical music on LPs or CDs, the 1957 sample of owners 33 rpm-capable phonographs (37% of a national survey sample) provided a more affirmative response than did the 2002 college seniors, 39% of the former, and only 30% of the latter, responding "Yes".

On the other hand, the contemporary college seniors were more likely (69%) to have studied a musical instrument than were the members of the population as a whole (44%) in 1957. The type of instrument studied also differed, the 1957 national sample more heavily favoring the violin and piano than did the 2002 college seniors.

"The results," said NAS president Stephen H. Balch, "though somewhat mixed and based on a limited number of questions, are hardly reassuring. America has poured enormous amounts of tax dollars into expanding access to higher learning. Students spend, and pay for, many more years in the classroom than was formerly the case. Our evidence suggests that this time and treasure may not have substantially raised student cultural knowledge above the high school levels of a half-century ago."

"Worst yet," he continued, "the high cultural interest and aspirations of today's college seniors are neither consistently nor substantially more elevated than yesteryear's secondary school graduates. Creating such interests and aspirations has traditionally been considered a core element of the collegiate experience. If the last fifty years have in fact witnessed few gains in this respect, it represents a real disappointment of once widespread hopes."

GOVERNOR'S SCHOOLS APPENDIX

Virginia Governor's Schools for Humanities and Visual & Performing Arts:

Established in 1973;

Takes place in more than 40 sites throughout Virginia;

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

"The Governor's Schools presently include summer residential, summer regional, and academic-year programs serving more than 7,500 gifted students from all parts of the commonwealth";

Funded by way of the Virginia Board of Education and the General Assembly (no specific figures readily available).

Pennsylvania Governor's Schools of Excellence:

Established in 1973;

Program is broken up into 8 schools (Agricultural Sciences-Penn State University, Global Entrepreneurship-Lehigh University, Health Care-University of Pittsburgh, Information Technology-Drexel University/Penn State University, International Studies-University of Pittsburgh, Teaching-Millersville University, the Arts-Mercyhurst College, the Sciences-Carnegie Mellon University);

Funded by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Mississippi Governor's School:

Established in 1981;

Program is hosted by the Mississippi University for Women;

Major academic courses change yearly, however, all courses are designed to provide "academic, creative leadership experiences."

West Virginia Governor's School for the Arts:

"Brings 80 of West Virginia's most talented high school actors, dancers, musicians, singers and visual artists to the West Liberty State College campus for a three-week residential program."

Arkansas Governor's School:

Established in 1980;

Program is hosted by Hendrix College and attended by approximately 400 students yearly;

Areas of focus include "art, music, literature, film, dance, and thought in the sciences, social sciences, and humanities";

This 6-week program is funded by the Arkansas General Assembly.

Governor's schools for Montana, Massachusetts, and Connecticut not found.

Alabama Governor's School:

Established in 1987;

Program is hosted by Samford University;

Academic courses stress fieldwork and problem-solving; the arts, humanities and sciences are also explored;

Major and minor areas of study include, "The Legal Process, American Healthcare, and Urban Geography."

Delaware Governor's School for Excellence:

One-week summer program;

Open to academically and artistically talented sophomores from Delaware high schools;

Students attend either the academic program or the visual and performing arts program.

Kentucky Governor's Scholars Program:

Established in 1983;

Held on the campuses (2003) of Centre College in Danville, Eastern Kentucky University in Richmond, and Northern Kentucky University in Highland Heights;

Five-week long summer program;

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Students may choose from over 20 subjects, including engineering and cultural anthropology;

Students selected attend the program free of cost.

Kentucky Governor's School for the Arts:

Provides hands-on instruction for Kentucky's dancers, actors, and musicians;

No charge to students because it is paid for by the State;

Open to sophomores and juniors in high school.

Missouri Scholars Academy:

Three-week academic program for Missouri's gifted students;

330 students attend each year;

Held on the campus of University of Missouri-Columbia;

Administered by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, in cooperation with University of Missouri officials;

Funds to support the Academy are appropriated by the Missouri Legislature following state Board of Education recommendations;

Academy focuses on liberal arts and numerous extra-curricular activities.

A Glance at Tennessee Governor's Schools

Governor's Schools

Background

The Governor's School concept and practice began in North Carolina in 1963 when Governor Terry Sanford established the first one at Salem College, Winston-Salem, North Carolina. The first school was initially funded through a grant from the Carnegie Corporation. Later it came under the auspices of the North Carolina Board of Education of the North Carolina Department of Education.

Upon the establishment of the first school, several states, including Georgia, South Carolina, Arkansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee established similar schools. As of 1996, there were approximately 100 schools in 28 states.

Tennessee Governor's Schools

Background

The 1984 Extraordinary Session of the Tennessee General Assembly mandated the Governor's School program as a way of meeting the needs of Tennessee's top students. For many years this program has been included in the Appropriation Bill of the General Assembly.

The Governor's Schools started with 3 schools (100 students each) in 1985:

1. Humanities at U.T. Martin increased to 150 (2000 = 123; 2001 = 113).
2. Sciences at U.T. increased to 150 (2000 = 119; 2002 = 107).
3. Arts at M.T.S.U. increased to 300 (2000 = 226; 2001 = 226).

Added in 1986 International Studies at U. of Memphis originally served 150 (2000 = 115; 2001 = 106).

Added in 1987 Tennessee Heritage at E.T.S.U. originally served 80 (2000 = 57; 2001 = 51).

Added in 1991 Prospective Teachers at U.T. Chattanooga originally served 30 (2000 = 25; 2001 = 22).

Added in 1996 Manufacturing at U.T. originally served 30 (2000 = 26; 2001 = 21).

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Added in 1998 Hospitality and Tourism at TSU originally served 60 (2000 = 60; 2001 = 0).

Added in 1999 Health Sciences at Vanderbilt originally served 25 (2000 = 20; 2001 = 0).

Discontinued in 2001 Hospitality and Tourism (per legislature).

Discontinued in 2001 Health Sciences (per legislature).

Added (but not held) in 2002 Information Technology Leadership at T.T.U. originally served 30.

Suspended for 2002 All Governor's School Programs.

During the 2001 Governor's Schools session 646 students attended.

2001 total amount allotted to the Governor's Schools: $1,411,000.00 (1999 = $1,981.08 per student; 2000 = $2,037.61 per student; 2001 = $2,180.83 per student)

Governor's Schools today

Today, there are 8 Governor's Schools across the state, serving several hundred students and teachers each year. Although funding for the schools was cut last year during a budget crisis, support has been restored this year.

As stated earlier, there are currently 8 Governor's Schools across the state. Each school is held on a college campus during the summer months. Listed below is a table of all of the schools, including subject area that is taught, the location, and the dates for the 2003 session.

The School for the Arts—June 15–July 12, 2003—held on the Middle Tennessee State University campus in Murfreesboro, and located only 30 miles from Nashville and the Tennessee Performing Arts Center.

The School for the Sciences—June 15–July 12, 2003—held on the campus of the University of Tennessee in Knoxville, near the Oak Ridge National Laboratories, Tremont Environmental Center, and in the heart of TVA.

The School for the Humanities—June 15–July 12, 2003—held on the campus of the University of Tennessee at Martin, in the center of Shiloh Battleground and the sociological cultures of the Mississippi and Tennessee Rivers.

The School for International Studies—June 15–July 12, 2003—held on the campus of the University of Memphis, in the heart of Tennessee's growing international corporate center, home to Federal Express, Holiday Inns, and Schering-Plough.

The School for Tennessee Heritage—June 15–July 12, 2003—held on the campus of East Tennessee State University—in Johnson City—surrounded by the area where Tennessee's history began and only a few miles from Jonesborough, the state's oldest existing city.

The School for Prospective Teachers—June 15–July 12, 2003—held on the campus of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga—with access to many schools throughout the area.

The School for Manufacturing—June 15–July 12, 2003—held on the campus of the University of Tennessee in Knoxville—focuses on the importance of manufacturing as an integral part of the culture and economy of Tennessee.

President's School for Information Technology and Leadership—June 15–July 12, 2003—this self-funded school will be held on the campus of Tennessee Technological University in Cookeville. It focuses on developing a complete business plan for an information technology-based business and enhancing student's knowledge of information technology and business leadership.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

The Tennessee Governor's Schools offer selected gifted and talented high school students intensive learning experiences in the Humanities, Math and Science, Arts, International Studies, Tennessee Heritage, Prospective Teaching, Manufacturing and Information Technology Leadership. Admission to the various programs are highly competitive, as 1,250 applications have been received thus far for the 2003 year for The School for the Arts, and only 300 spots are available. Additionally, The School for the Sciences has received 800 applications thus far, for 125 spots.

Students in the 10th and 11th grades who are interested in participating in the programs receive information from their school's guidance counselor and then proceed with the application process.

Students selected to attend these highly competitive schools are provided housing and meals for the duration of the program, which is about a month long. Students participate in a variety of courses that are offered. For example, there were 14 academic courses offered to the 115 scholars at the Governor's School for the Humanities in 2001. All of the scholars were enrolled in courses at 9 a.m. and 10:15 a.m. This particular curriculum was designed to expose the scholars to a rich selection of humanities courses including literature, philosophy, religion, ethics, poetry, history and media studies. In addition to the required morning classes, the scholars were given the opportunity to participate in afternoon electives, such as the yearbook staff and the student newspaper. In the evening hours at the Governors School for the Humanities, students were offered a broad-range of humanities-related speakers and activities.

Governor's Schools make a difference

The scholars' satisfaction with the 2001 Governor's School for the Humanities program is reflected in the overall rating of the program, with 94% of the scholars rating the program as either "excellent" or "very good."

This satisfaction is also evident from the feedback the students were asked to write upon completion of the 2001 Governor's School for the Humanities program. Some examples of the feedback from the program are as follows:

"I had the fortunate chance of coming here, and I am glad I came. The cool thing about the people here is that I got along with everyone, and I especially got along very well with my roommate. My favorite class was Lord Chamberlain's Men. I better developed my acting skills and overall understanding of what goes on in a play production. This campus is so beautiful. The people, activities, and atmosphere are unbelievable. I have had the time of my life here, and I would especially come to this campus again for a future GS, but I doubt that is possible. I love the freedom I get from being here. The classes were challenging for me and I believe I am prepared for my classroom experience now. There are some very strange people that came here who I wouldn't even think would be accepted to Governor's School. I have learned to accept all different types of people and their views and lifestyles since coming to GS. I love the fact that Tennessee is rewarding me and everyone here that is smart with the opportunity to become a better person. This experience was wonderful. I speak for a lot of people when I say that I don't want to leave!"

"I honestly would have to say that Governor's School has been one of the best experiences I have ever had. By coming here, I have met so many people from different backgrounds, and I learned to grow as a person. I learned so much in and out of class, both from the staff and students. I really enjoyed all the activities because I had fun and because I was able to be my-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

self. The atmosphere was so receptive and nurturing, and the teachers showed that they wanted us to learn and grow. I feel that the variety of electives offered allowed each person to pick what he/she was interested in and enabled each person to show their talents and abilities. The time in which I was here flew by, but so many wonderful things happened. It sounds funny, but every time I would write or call home, I couldn't help but smile as I told my parents about the fun I was having. This may or may not seem relevant to the Governor's School experience, but it helped me to see that I can go off to college in a year and I will be fine. Overall, I feel that this was a positive growing experience, and I can't wait to take back home all that I have learned. Thank you all so much!"

Other Governor's Schools around the country

The Arkansas Governor's School is a 6-week summer residential program for gifted students who are upcoming high school seniors and residents of Arkansas. State funds provide tuition, room, board, and instructional materials for each student who attends the six-week program on the site of a residential college campus, leased by the State. The Arkansas Governor's School is a non-credit program. Students are selected on the basis of their special aptitudes in one of eight fields: choral music, drama, English/language arts, instrumental music, mathematics, natural science, social science, or visual arts.

The Virginia Governor's School Program provides some of the state's most able students academically and artistically challenging programs beyond those offered in their home schools. With the support of the Virginia Board of Education and the General Assembly, the Governor's Schools presently include summer residential, summer regional, and academic-year programs serving more than 7,500 gifted students from all parts of the commonwealth. There are three types of Governor's Schools that provide appropriate learning endeavors for gifted students throughout the commonwealth: Academic-Year Governor's Schools, Summer Residential Governor's Schools, and the Summer Regional Governor's Schools. The Virginia Department of Education and the participating school divisions fund the Governor's School Program.

The Georgia Governor's Honors Program is a six-week summer instructional program designed to provide intellectually gifted and artistically talented high school juniors and seniors challenging and enriching educational opportunities. Activities are designed to provide each participant with opportunities to acquire the skills, knowledge, and attitudes to become lifelong learners. The program is held on the campus of Valdosta State University, in Valdosta, Georgia. The GHP teacher-to-student ratio is usually 1:15.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for this time. I yield the floor.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Saxby Chambliss

WEDNESDAY, *February 5, 2003*

Mr. President, today I rise in support of Miguel Estrada, the nominee for the 12th Circuit Court of Appeals.

It is an honor to serve my State of Georgia in this great institution, and I am pleased that the work we are undertaking today pertains to such an important issue for our country—filling the vacancies in our courts with good and honorable judges.

One of the most important burdens that has been placed on the shoulders of the Senate is the sanction of Federal judges. I relish this task because it grants us an opportunity to have a hand in the future of the laws that govern this great land. And there is no better way to help craft the America of the next generation, the America to be served by our children and our grandchildren.

Before I came to Congress, I practiced law for 26 years and I can say that it is rare to meet someone as qualified for the bench as Miguel Estrada. The American Bar Association unanimously rated Mr. Estrada as "well qualified." I understand that some of my colleagues in the past have referred to this rating as the "gold standard" for judicial nominees. It seems then that a unanimous "well qualified" rating should speak volumes about Mr. Estrada's merit.

Some critics have said that Mr. Estrada should not be confirmed because he lacks judicial experience. I would simply highlight the examples of Justice White and Chief Justice Rehnquist. Both men had no prior judicial experience when they were appointed to the Supreme Court. Also on the same court that Mr. Estrada would join, five of the eight sitting judges had no prior judicial experience, two of which were nominated by President Clinton.

Mr. Estrada, however, has had exceptional experience both in the government and in private practice. From 1992 to 1997, he served in the Clinton administration as Assistant to the Solicitor General in the Department of Justice. He has argued 15 cases before the Supreme Court and is widely re-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

garded as one of America's leading appellate advocates. He is currently a partner for a leading law firm with their appellate and constitutional law practice group. I believe that this represents sufficient experience for his nomination.

Another argument made by some is that Mr. Estrada has refused to produce confidential memoranda that he wrote when he was with the Solicitor General's Office. I would argue that this request, if met, would have a debilitating effect on the ability of the Department of Justice to represent the United States before the Supreme Court and I have a letter signed by every living former Solicitor General—Democrat and Republican alike—saying the same. I would ask unanimous consent to print this letter in the *Record*.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the *Record*, as follows:

WILMER, CUTLER & PICKERING,
WASHINGTON, DC, JUNE 24, 2002.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY: We write to express our concern about your recent request that the Department of Justice turn over "appeal recommendations, certiorari recommendations, and amicus recommendations" that Miguel Estrada worked on while in the Office of the Solicitor General.

As former heads of the Office of the Solicitor General—under Presidents of both parties—we can attest to the vital importance of candor and confidentiality in the Solicitor General's decisionmaking process. The Solicitor General is charged with the weighty responsibility of deciding whether to appeal adverse decisions in cases where the United States is a party, whether to seek Supreme Court review of adverse appellate decisions, and whether to participate as amicus curiae in other high-profile cases that implicate an important federal interest. The Solicitor General has the responsibility of representing the interests not just of the Justice Department, nor just of the Executive Branch, but of the entire federal government, including Congress.

It goes without saying that, when we made these and other critical decisions, we relied on frank, honest, and thorough advice from our staff attorneys, like Mr. Estrada. Our decisionmaking process required the unbridled, open exchange of ideas—an exchange that simply cannot take place if attorneys have reason to fear that their private recommendations are not private at all, but vulnerable to public disclosure. Attorneys inevitably will hesitate before giving their honest, independent analysis if their opinions are not safeguarded from future disclosure. High-level decisionmaking requires candor, and candor in turn requires confidentiality.

Any attempt to intrude into the Office's highly privileged deliberations would come at the cost of the Solicitor General's ability to defend vigorously the United States' litigation interests—a cost that also would be borne by Congress itself.

Although we profoundly respect the Senate's duty to evaluate Mr. Estrada's fitness for the federal judiciary, we do not think that the confiden-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

tiality and integrity of internal deliberations should be sacrificed in the process.

Sincerely,

On behalf of: Seth P. Waxman, Walter Dellinger, Drew S. Days, III, Kenneth W. Starr, Charles Fried, Robert H. Bork, Archibald Cox.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Also, as we have heard, Mr. Estrada has a great story; he is accomplished, competent, and experienced. This man came to America to seek the American dream and he is now living that dream. He came to the United States from Honduras when he was 17 years old and has spent his life gaining credibility as a Hispanic man of distinction. If confirmed, Mr. Estrada would break a glass ceiling by being the first Latino judge to serve on the DC Court of Appeals. However, if he is not confirmed, it would not just be terrible for the District of Columbia, but it would send the wrong message to Hispanic communities in my home State of Georgia and across the Nation. But I would say to my colleagues that you should not vote for Miguel Estrada because he is Hispanic, you should vote to confirm him because he is a world-class lawyer and he will make a world-class judge.

He has the qualifications, the capacity, the integrity, and the temperament to serve on the Federal bench. I was happy to support his nomination last week in the Judiciary Committee and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the President's nominee for this important position.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Norm Coleman

WEDNESDAY, *January 22, 2003*

Madam President, I thank the Senator for yielding the time.

I rise in support of the Cochran amendment. Last year when I was running for the U.S. Senate, I promised to get something done in the way of relief for Minnesota farmers. The picture the distinguished Senator from North Dakota showed is a picture that is close to the heart of Minnesotans who suffered disasters. They have suffered flooding. They have been hurt. They have suffered losses.

Last year, the House and the Senate attempted to pass the Daschle legislation, but it never became law. Those two bills looked good on paper, but they never became law. They never lightened the load of one farmer. They never comforted one farm family. They never provided a single auction.

I never promised to vote for something that everyone knows is going nowhere, and then shrug my shoulders and say: Gee whiz, I tried. I promised to shoot straight for the people back home and to be honest about what I think can be done and then help it become law. No one believes the alternative disaster package now scored by the Congressional Budget Office at nearly $7 billion has support to become law. I think it is irresponsible to raise hopes and expectations to that level.

I was elected to get something done. I have some serious concerns about the $3.1 billion disaster package in the Cochran amendment. In my view, the help provided in this bill needs to be better targeted to farmers hit by disaster. I was among a number of Senators who expressed concerns to the chairman of the Agriculture Committee. He went back to the drawing board. He made some changes to better target the help. Although he didn't go as far as I would like, we are going to get something done for Minnesota farmers. Farmers can't produce cashflow on promises alone. They need help now. I am told this $3.1 billion relief package can get help to our farm families within weeks. I am going to support this

$3.1 billion package. I was elected to get things done. The Cochran amendment gets things done. Let's pass it and let us move on.

I yield the floor.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

John Cornyn

WEDNESDAY, *February 5, 2003*

Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the seven men and women of the Space Shuttle *Columbia* who dedicated their lives to the future of this Nation and our Nation's space program. In particular, seven men and women who knew the risk of strapping themselves on top of a rocket, leaving the Earth behind and exploring the heavens. Seven men and women who knew what they were doing but, nevertheless, volunteered for an extremely dangerous but critically important mission: Shuttle Commander Rick Husband, Pilot William McCool, Payload Commander Michael Anderson, Mission Specialist Kalpana Chawla, Mission Specialist David Brown, Mission Specialist Laurel Blair Salton Clark, and Payload Specialist Ilan Ramon.

These brave seven showed the Nation, indeed they showed the entire world, that our thirst for knowledge and exploration is not yet quenched and, God willing, will never be. These brave seven are shining examples of the courage, enthusiasm, and awe that runs through the veins of all of the men and women associated with our space program, as well as the eager children across this Nation who look to the stars and see the beginning, not the end, of their dreams.

These brave seven and their colleagues throughout the space program inspire not only our Nation and our children, they inspire the entire world. Their actions, bravery, and achievements are a challenge to all humankind, a challenge to dream more, to achieve more, and to reach farther than ever thought possible.

As we know and as the President observed yesterday, high achievement is inseparable from great risk. These seven proved that in a terrible and tragic way.

I would also like to take a moment to honor the men and women in my State of Texas—the police, fire, and emergency services, as well as thousands of local volunteers who have worked so hard on the ground in the aftermath of this terrible disaster to prevent further tragedy. In addition, they

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

are in the process of collecting important evidence that will ultimately, we trust, lead to the determination of what caused this terrible tragedy so it will never ever happen again.

Literally within minutes of the tragedy, ordinary Texans did extraordinary things. By working together, they helped to ensure the safety of their neighbors, and they helped speed the investigation so that heroic astronauts on future space missions will return home safely. These volunteers are still onsite working together with law enforcement personnel. I want to express my gratitude, as I know the Nation does, for their efforts.

The fact that America and the world delight in every takeoff and hold their collective breath at every landing is a testament to the power and hope embodied in our Nation's space program. The heroes who create, maintain, and fly these amazing machines are a testament to the fact that dreams are the beginning and not the end of the possible.

I would also like to remind my colleagues that more than one nation mourns this tragedy. The nations of Israel and India and the rest of the world share in our grief as they share in our hope for the future.

Our space program inspired a young girl in the small town of Karnal, India, to look to the heavens and see her future. Kalpana Chawla came to the United States, studied hard, worked hard, and became part of the greatest exploration force in the history of the world. Her efforts have inspired thousands of schoolchildren, and her example will inspire countless more in the future. She, in particular, has inspired schoolchildren in her hometown to watch in awe as she achieved what they only dreamed.

In Israel, Ilan Ramon was the hope of a nation and the inspiration for the next generation of scientists, fliers, and adventurers in the nation of Israel. And he no doubt inspired many young people in that country to reach beyond what now seems impossible—to dream beyond the unrest in that troubled area of our world and to dream about achieving the impossible. He is a hero, there and here, and an inspiration to all who dream of the stars.

As we mourn these fallen heroes, let us also take the opportunity to look forward to the future when shuttle flights are as common as air travel and the marvels of the space program are missions the mind has yet to imagine.

I yield the floor.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Elizabeth Dole

THURSDAY, *June 5, 2003*

Mr. President, I first thank the majority whip, Senator McConnell, and the Democrat whip, Senator Reid, for their very kind comments this morning. Then I thank you, Mr. President, and other members of the leadership, for your unwavering support of this freshman class.

I also recognize Senator Frist for the traditional courtesies of a maiden speech to be extended to the new Senator and express my appreciation for his commitment to the rich history of this great tradition.

Tradition is held that, by waiting a respectful length of time, senior colleagues would appreciate the humility shown by a new Member of the Senate who would use the occasion to address an issue of concern.

I come in that sense today to share my thoughts on a matter that weighs heavily on my mind. Hunger is the silent enemy lurking within too many American homes. It is a tragedy I have seen first-hand and far too many times throughout my life in public service. This is not a new issue.

In 1969, while I was serving as Deputy Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, I was privileged to assist in planning the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health. In opening the conference, President Nixon said:

> Malnutrition is a national concern because we are a nation that cares about its people, how they feel, how they live. We care whether they are well and whether they are happy.

This still rings true today.

On National Hunger Awareness Day, I want to highlight what has become a serious problem for too many families, particularly in North Carolina.

My home State is going through a painful economic transition. Once thriving textile mills have been shuttered. Family farms are going out of business. Tens of thousands of workers have been laid off from their jobs. Entire areas of textile and furniture manufacturing are slowly phasing out as high-tech manufacturing and service companies become the dominant industry of the State. Many of these traditional manufacturing jobs have been in rural areas where there are fewer jobs and residents who are already struggling to make ends meet.

In 1999, North Carolina had the 12th lowest unemployment rate in the United States. By December 2001, the State had fallen to 46—from 12 to 46. That same year, according to the Rural Center, North Carolina companies announced 63,222 layoffs. Our State lost more manufacturing jobs between 1997 and 2000 than any State except New York.

Entire communities have been uprooted by this crisis. In the town of Spruce Pine in Mitchell County, 30 percent—30 percent—of the town's residents lost their jobs in 2001. Ninety percent of those layoffs were in textile and furniture manufacturing. These are real numbers and real lives from a State that is hurting.

Our families are struggling to find jobs, to pay their bills, and, as we hear more and more often, to even put food on the table. In fact, the unemployment trend that started in 1999 resulted in 11.1 percent of North Carolina families not always having enough food to meet their basic needs. That is according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture. And North Carolina's rate is higher than the national average. This means that among North Carolina's 8.2 million residents, nearly 900,000 are dealing with hunger. Some are hungry, others are on the verge.

My office was blessed recently to meet a young veteran, Michael Williams, and his family. Michael served his country for 8 years in the U.S. Army before leaving to work in private industry and use the computer skills he had gained while serving in the military. He was earning a good living, but after September 11 and the terrorist attacks, he and his wife Gloria felt it was time to move their two children closer to family back home in North Carolina. As he said, "It was time to bring the grandbabies home."

But Michael has found a shortage of jobs since his return. He worked with a temp agency but that job ended. It has been so hard to make ends meet that the family goes to a food bank near their Clayton, NC, home twice a month because with rent, utilities, and other bills, there is little left to buy food.

Their story is not unlike so many others. Hard-working families are worrying each day about how to feed their children. As if this were not enough, our food banks are having a hard time finding food to feed these families. In some in-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

stances, financial donations have dropped off or corporations have scaled back on food donations. In other cases, there are just too many people, and there is not enough food.

At the Food Bank of the Albemarle in northeast North Carolina, executive director Gus Smith says more people are visiting this food bank even as donations are off by 25 percent. Thus Gus says, "We just can't help everybody at this point in time." To try to cope, they recently moved to a 4-day workweek, meaning the entire staff had to take a 20-percent pay cut just to keep the doors open.

America's Second Harvest, a network of 216 food banks across the country, reports it saw the number of people seeking emergency hunger relief rise by 9 percent in 2001 to 23.3 million people. In any given week, it is estimated that 7 million people are served at emergency feeding sites around the country.

These numbers are troubling indeed. No family—in North Carolina or anywhere in America—should have to worry about where they will find food to eat. No parent should have to tell their child there is no money left for groceries. This is simply unacceptable.

I spent most of the congressional Easter recess going to different sites in North Carolina: homeless and hunger shelters, food distribution sites, soup kitchens, farms, even an office where I went through the process of applying for government assistance through the WIC Program, the Women, Infants, and Children Program.

I was also able to meet, on several occasions, with a group known as the Society of Saint Andrew. This organization, like some others across the country, is doing impressive work in the area of gleaning. That is when excess crops that would otherwise be thrown out, are taken from farms, packing houses, and warehouses, and distributed to the needy.

Gleaning immediately brings to my mind the Book of Ruth in the Old Testament. She gleaned in the fields so that her family could eat. You see, Mr. President, in Biblical times farmers were encouraged to leave crops in their fields for the poor and the travelers. Even as far back as in Leviticus, chapter 19, in the Old Testament, we read the words:

> And thou shalt not glean thy vineyard, neither shalt thou gather every grape of thy vineyard; thou shalt leave them for the poor and the stranger.

So gleaning was long a custom in Biblical days, a command by God to help those in need. It is a practice we should utilize much more extensively today. It is astounding that the most recent figures available indicate that approximately

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

96 billion pounds of good, nutritious food, including that at the farm and retail levels, is left over or thrown away in this country.

It is estimated that only 6 percent of crops are actually gleaned in North Carolina. A tomato farmer in North Carolina sends 20,000 pounds of tomatoes to landfills each day during harvest season.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present an example of produce on the Senate floor.

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

Mrs. DOLE. Sometimes the produce cannot be sold. Sometimes it is underweight or not a perfect shape, like this sweet potato I show you in my hand. This would be rejected because it is not the exact specification. Other times it is simply surplus food, more than the grocery stores can handle, but it is still perfectly good to eat.

Imagine the expense to that farmer in dumping 20,000 pounds of tomatoes each day during his harvest season. And this cannot be good for the environment. In fact, food is the single largest component of our solid waste stream—more than yard trimmings or even newspapers. Some of it does decompose, but it often takes several years. Other food just sits in landfills, literally mummified. Putting this food to good use, through gleaning, will reduce the amount of waste going to our already overburdened landfills.

I am so appreciative of my friends at the Environmental Defense Fund for working closely with me on this issue. Gleaning also helps the farmer because he does not have to haul off and plow under crops that do not meet exact specifications of grocery chains, and it certainly helps the hungry, by giving them not just any food but food that is both nutritious and fresh.

The Society of Saint Andrew is the only comprehensive program in North Carolina that gleans available produce and then sorts, packages, processes, transports, and delivers excess food to feed the hungry.

In the year 2001, the organization gleaned 9.7 million pounds—almost 10 million pounds—or 29.1 million servings of food. It only costs a penny—1 penny—a serving to glean and deliver this food to those in need. Even more amazing, the Society of Saint Andrew does all this with a tiny staff and an amazing 9,200 volunteers.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

These are the types of innovative ideas we should be exploring. I have been told by the Society of Saint Andrew that $100,000 would provide at least 10 million servings of food for hungry North Carolinians.

I set out to raise that money for the Society in the last few weeks, and thanks to the compassion of a number of caring individuals, companies, and organizations, we were able to surpass our goal and raise $180,000—enough for over 18 million servings of food. More than ever, I believe this is a worthy effort that can be used as a model nationwide.

I am passionate about leading an effort to increase gleaning in North Carolina and across America. The gleaning system works because of the cooperative efforts of so many groups, from the Society of Saint Andrew and its volunteers who gather and deliver the food, to the dozens of churches and humanitarian organizations that help distribute this food to the hungry. Indeed, gleaning is, at its best, a public-private partnership.

Private organizations are doing a great job with limited resources. But we must make some changes on the public side to help them leverage their scarce dollars to feed the hungry. I have heard repeatedly that the single biggest concern for gleaners is transportation. The food is there. The issue is how to transport it in larger volume.

I want to change the Tax Code to give transportation companies that volunteer trucks for gleaned food a tax incentive. And there are other needed tax changes. Currently, only large publicly traded corporations can take tax credits for giving food to these gleaning programs. But it is not just large corporations that provide this food; it is the family farmers and the small businesses. Why should a farmer who gives up his perfectly good produce or the small restaurant owner who gives food to the hungry not receive the same tax benefits? The Senate has already passed legislation as part of the CARE Act that would fix this inequity. Now the House of Representatives needs to complete work on this bill.

However, the answer to the hunger problem does not stop with gleaning. That is just part of the overall effort. There are other ways we can help, too.

This year we will be renewing the National School Lunch Program and other important child nutrition programs, and there are some areas I am interested in reviewing.

Under School Lunch, children from families with incomes at or below 130 percent of poverty are eligible for free meals. Children from families with incomes between 130 and 185

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

percent of poverty can be charged no more than 40 cents. This may seem to be a nominal amount, but for a struggling family with several children the costs add up. School administrators in North Carolina tell me that they hear from parents in tears because they don't know how to pay for their child's school meals.

The Federal Government now considers incomes up to 185 percent of poverty when deciding if a family is eligible for benefits under the WIC Program. Should we not use the same standard for School Lunch? Standardizing the guidelines would even allow us to immediately certify children from WIC families for the School Lunch Program. It is time to clarify this bureaucratic situation and harmonize our Federal income assistance guidelines so we can help those most in need.

The School Lunch Program is the final component of our commitment to child nutrition, and we must do everything to maintain and strengthen its integrity so that it works for those who need it and isn't viewed as a government giveaway.

There are a lot of interesting ideas being discussed such as adjusting area eligibility guidelines in the Summer Food Program. But these need to be looked at carefully, and we need to ask important questions such as how many people would be affected and what is the cost. I have discussed many of these ideas with groups such as America's Second Harvest, Bread for the World, the Food Research and Action Center, and the American School Food Service Association. I look forward to the opportunity of exploring them further during reauthorization of these important programs in the Agriculture Committee, on which I am honored to serve.

Our work cannot stop within our own borders. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations says hunger affects millions worldwide. During my 8 years as president of the American Red Cross, I visited Somalia during the heart-wrenching famine. In Mojada, I came across a little boy under a sack. I thought he was dead. His brother pulled back that sack and sat him up and he was severely malnourished. He couldn't eat the rice and beans in the bowl beside him; he was too malnourished. I asked for camel's milk to feed him.

As I put my arm around his back and lifted that cup to his mouth, it was almost as if little bones were piercing through his flesh. I will never forget that. That is when the horror of starvation becomes real, when you can touch it.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

There are many things that will haunt me the rest of my life. When I visited Goma, Zaire, which is now Congo—this was a place where millions of Rwandans had fled the bloodshed in their own country but they stopped at the worst possible place, on volcanic rock. You couldn't drill for latrines so cholera and dysentery were rampant. You couldn't dig for graves, so I was literally stepping over dead bodies as I tried to help those refugees. Those bodies were carried to the roadside twice a day. They were hauled off to mass graves.

Former Senators Bob Dole and George McGovern are the architects of the Global Food Program, which has a goal of ensuring that 300 million schoolchildren overseas get at least 1 nutritious meal a day. The Department of Agriculture estimates that 120 million school-age children around the world are not enrolled in school in part because of hunger or malnutrition. The majority of these children are girls. The Global Food for Education Program is now operating in 38 countries and feeding 9 million schoolchildren.

I want to see this program expanded. I plan to work on appropriations to advance that goal. Just helping a child get a good meal can make such a difference in developing countries. Feeding children entices them to come to school which allows them to learn, to have some hope, some future. And improved literacy certainly helps the productivity, thereby boosting the economy.

This problem deserves national discussion. Hunger affects so many aspects of our society. In the spirit of that landmark conference held by the White House in 1969, I am asking President Bush to convene a second White House conference so that the best and brightest minds can review these problems together.

I am honored to work with leaders of the battle to eradicate hunger: Former Congressman Tony Hall, now the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. food and agricultural programs, and former Congresswoman Eva Clayton from my own State of North Carolina, now an assistant director general for the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome. Both were champions on hunger while in Congress. And there are many others. Former Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman, a leader on gleaning; Catherine Bertini, Under Secretary General of the United Nations who was praised for her leadership to get food aid to those in need throughout the world; Congresswoman Jo Ann Emerson, cochair of the Congressional Hunger Center who carries on the legacy of her late husband Bill who was a dear friend and leader on this issue.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Here in this body, my chairman on the Agriculture Committee, Thad Cochran, and ranking member Tom Harkin, Dick Lugar, Patrick Leahy, Pat Roberts, and Gordon Smith are leaders in addressing hunger issues.

Partisan politics has no role in this fight. Hunger does not differentiate between Democrats and Republicans. Just as it stretches across so many ethnicities, so many areas, so must we.

As *Washington Post* columnist David Broder wrote yesterday: America has some problems that defy solution. This one does not. It just needs caring people and a caring government working together.

I get inspiration from the Bible and John, chapter 21, when Jesus asked Peter: Do you love me? Peter, astounded that Jesus was asking him this question again, says: Lord, you know everything. You know that I love you. And Jesus replies: Then feed my sheep.

One of North Carolina's heroes, the Reverend Billy Graham, has often said that we are not cisterns made for hoarding; we are vessels made for sharing. I look forward to working with Billy Graham in this effort. Indeed every religion, not just Christianity, calls on us to feed the hungry. Jewish tradition promises that feeding the hungry will not go unrewarded. Fasting is one of the pillars of faith of Islam and is a way to share the conditions of the hungry poor while purifying the spirit and humbling the flesh. Compassion or karuna is one of the key virtues of Buddhism. This issue cuts across religious lines, too.

I speak today on behalf of the millions of families who are vulnerable, who have no voice, for this little Sudanese girl in this picture, stumbling toward a feeding station and so many like her. I saw this picture some years ago in a newspaper. It broke my heart. I went back to find that picture today because, as I recall the story, she had been walking for a long, long way and she had not yet reached that feeding station. That has been emblazoned on my mind since that time.

Anthropologist Margaret Meade said: Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has.

One of my heroes is William Wilberforce, a true man of God. An old friend John Newton persuaded him that his political life could be used in the service of God. He worked with a dedicated group. They were committed people of faith. His life and career were centered on two goals: abolishing slavery in England and improving moral values. He knew

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

that his commitment might cost him friends and influence but he was determined to stand for what he believed was right. It took 21 years and Wilberforce sacrificed his opportunity to serve as Prime Minister. But he was the moving force in abolishing slavery and changing the moral values of England.

In my lifetime, I have seen Americans split the atom, abolish Jim Crow, eliminate the scourge of polio, win the cold war, plant our flag on the surface of the Moon, map the human genetic code, and belatedly recognize the talents of women, minorities, the disabled, and others once relegated to the shadows. Already a large group of citizens has joined what I believe will become an army of volunteers and advocates.

Today I invite all of my colleagues to join me in this endeavor. Let us recommit ourselves to the goal of eradicating hunger. Committed individuals can make a world of difference, even, I might say, a different world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter to President Bush be printed in the *Record*.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2003.

President GEORGE W. BUSH,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health, convened by President Richard Nixon on December 2, 1969, may well have been one of the country's most productive and far-reaching White House conferences. At the time, President Nixon said that the conference was "intended to focus national attention and resources on our country's remaining—and changing—nutrition problems." In hindsight, it achieved that and more.

So much has been accomplished since that historic White House conference. With bipartisan support in Congress, the food stamp program has been reformed and expanded, school nutrition programs have been improved and now reach over 27 million children each school day, WIC was created, and nutrition labels now appear on most food items.

At the same time, however, the mission is not complete. There are children who qualify for reduced price meals in North Carolina, and throughout the country, but their families cannot afford even this nominal fee. And while 16 million children participate in the free and reduced school lunch program, in the summer many children go without. America's Second Harvest, an extraordinary organization, reports that demand often exceeds the supply of food in local communities. Further, the country is challenged by the paradox of hunger and obesity.

Mr. President, it is time, I believe, for another White House conference to assess the progress we have made in the fight against hunger and to recommit the country to the remaining challenges. I was pleased to work with

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

President Nixon on the 1969 conference; I would be honored to work with you on a second historic conference.

There is a very special tradition in America when it comes to fighting hunger. Perhaps it is a function of our agricultural bounty, the famines in Europe that led to early migration, or the teachings of all major religions, but Americans are intolerant of hunger in our land of plenty.

Mr. President, I hope you will convene a second White House conference with the business, civic and charitable organizations, educators and advocates who continue to work tirelessly to address hunger in America and around the world. Hunger is not a partisan issue and I know that we can work together, with our colleagues on both sides of the political aisle, to address the problems and needs that still exist. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH DOLE.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Lindsey O. Graham

WEDNESDAY, *March 19, 2003*

Madam President, I have a housekeeping chore. I would like to submit to the clerk a modification to my amendment and ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified.

No modification is needed, I am told. Thank you.

Madam President, Social Security is not only hard to solve, it is also hard to get before the Senate. So I apologize for the confusion.

I understand the concern of my colleague from North Dakota, but having a bit of time to talk about Social Security I think is very appropriate.

The budget resolution process is a roadmap to make sure we can understand what we are doing as the year progresses in terms of spending and taxes and what provisions to take up and when. I applaud both the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Oklahoma for working together to try to make this as painless on the body as possible. But this amendment, hopefully, can be accepted in some form, either voted on or accepted by the body.

If you are going to have a roadmap for America this year or any other year, it is time we start putting Social Security on that roadmap. Social Security is a system that Democrats and Republicans embrace as being vital to the Nation. It is a system that working Americans pay into every year. Millions of Americans receive a substantial part, if not all, of their retirement income from Social Security, after years of paying into the system.

This amendment is part of this roadmap for America that we are talking about. It lays out some findings and some facts that are not Republican spin, not Democratic spin, but come from the Social Security trustees themselves, the people in charge of telling us, in managing the program—"us" being the House and the Senate—the state of affairs with Social Security.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

We are on the verge of a war. Only God knows what will happen here shortly. But it is my belief, unless there is some major miracle, we will be involved in hostilities with young men and women in harm's way protecting our freedom. I know one thing every Member of the body can agree on is that these young men and women deserve our support and our prayers if ordered into battle. And they will get that support and those prayers in a bipartisan way because what they are doing is very noble, in my opinion, trying to preserve our freedom and bringing about more stability in the Middle East.

We can argue about the nuances of the diplomacy and lack thereof in some people's opinion that got us to being on the brink of war, but once hostilities begin, I am sure everybody will come together and say a prayer for our troops and support our President the best they can.

That same dynamic needs to exist with Social Security, because there is a big, gaping hole in America's domestic agenda. You can talk about the size of the tax cuts, whether we should have one, whether it should be $750 billion or $350 billion or 30 cents or $2 trillion. Whatever opinion you have, I respect, and I have my own about that; and that is a point of debate.

One thing we need to understand and come together on quickly, in my opinion, is certain facts surrounding Social Security.

In 75 years—I know that seems forever. But my predecessor, Senator Thurmond, turned 100 a few months ago. He is going to be a first-time grandfather. Our State's former junior Senator, now senior Senator, is 81. So in South Carolina, 75 years is not long in politics. It seems forever, but it is not, really.

In 75 years, our trustees, the people in charge of the Social Security Trust Fund, tell us we will be $25.3 trillion short of the money necessary to pay benefits. I want to repeat that. I know there are a lot of important votes to come on ANWR and tax cuts, and this roadmap is about this year; and we are trying get through this day to make sure we can get on with the business of the Senate. And that is the way politics is, probably to a fault sometimes: getting through this day, getting through this amendment, so we can get on with the next event of the next day. We are in the middle of an international crisis, and our hope is we can get through the coming days as quickly as possible and resolve it.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Time is not on our side in solving Social Security structural problems. You could say: Well, 75 years is a long time. But between now and 75 years from now, for the obligations of the trust fund, and the money to pay those obligations, there will be a $25 trillion gap. And I ask, simply, the following question: Where does the money come from?

People want to know how much the war is going to cost—and the occupation. The truth is, it is going to be billions of dollars over several years. As we try to find out where the money comes from to get us through this day and this year, I hope we will start focusing on, in a bipartisan fashion, where does the money come from to keep Social Security solvent?

Seventy-five years from now, if nothing changes—if all we do is run ads against each other and belittle opportunities to fix it in a partisan way; if the Democratic and the Republican parties stay on track, based on the last campaign cycle, of trying to use the Social Security issue as a way to capture power for the moment—then we are going to allow one of the best programs in the history of the Nation not only to become insolvent but create a financial crisis in this country that we have not experienced, ever.

Another date I would like to point out: In 2042, which seems forever, but it is not, a problem occurs with Social Security. Seventy-five years from now, the unfunded liability in obligation will be $25.3 trillion. But before you get to that point in time, the next major event, according to the trustee report released yesterday, is 2042.

What happens in 2042? In 2042, the amount of money available to pay benefits will be such that benefits will be reduced for the average recipient by 28 percent. I want to say that again. If we do nothing different, if we just collect the same amount of money, and get the same growth rates, in 2042 you are going to reduce benefits for everybody on Social Security by 28 percent. The other option is, according to the trustees, raise payroll taxes of the workforce in existence then by 50 percent. These are two very dramatic and unacceptable options, in my opinion.

Now, in 2042, I doubt if I will be here. But if the history of my State stands the test of time, I will be here because I will turn 100 in 2055. If I can do what my predecessor has done, which I very seriously doubt, I will have another term left. I doubt if that will happen in my case, but somebody is going to be here in 2042 from South Carolina and every other State represented here today.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

My hope is that during my time in the Senate, I can join with my colleagues of like mind on both sides of the aisle to make life a little better for the American public, the taxpayer, and those who will be doing the job we are engaged in today a little better than the trustees tell us of what is going to happen in 2042.

I would like to recognize certain Members of this body: Senator Gregg, Senator Breaux, and many others, Senator Moynihan, a former Member of the Senate, who have brought ideas to the table, have worked in a bipartisan manner, along with President Bush. I compliment President Clinton for putting the issue of Social Security on the table. I didn't particularly like his solution to better growth rates, but he acknowledged that growth rates were a problem. So there is the foundation being laid in the last couple years to do something constructive.

I compliment everybody in this body who has been part of that process. As a Member of the House for four terms, I tried to be a constructive Member dealing with Social Security over there.

The temptation to achieve political power is great when the Senate and the House are so closely divided. Every issue is looked upon as the issue that can get you back in the majority or the issue that may cost you the majority. My concern is that if we have that approach to reforming and solving Social Security—I know the Senator from North Dakota who is managing the minority side of the bill is a fine Member who loves his country as much as I do—if we keep this partisan atmosphere going that has existed in the past and has been bipartisan in the demagoguery, we will run into a problem. So in 2042, I would like us to avoid what is coming our way. The only way to do is to start now.

Another date the Social Security trustees tell us is a very important date is 2018. I have gone from 75 years now to 2042 to 2018. What happens in 2018? In 2018, for the first time in the history of the program, we will pay more in benefits than we collect in taxes. What is going on here? There are a lot of young folks working in the Senate—pages, interns. We are really talking about their future more than anything else.

In 2018, we pay out more in benefits than we collect in taxes. What is wrong with Social Security? Why is it mounting up this unfunded obligation? Why are we beginning to pay more in benefits than we collect in taxes? Why do we

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

have to cut benefits in 2042, and why are we $25 trillion short in the money to pay everybody 75 years from now?

Well, it is not a Republican or a Democratic problem in terms of politics. It is just the way the country has changed. I was born in 1955. In 1950, a few years before I was born, there were 16.5 workers to every retiree. According to the trustees, in 1950, there were 16.5 people working paying Social Security taxes for every retiree. Today there are 3.3 workers to every retiree. Twenty years from now, there are going to be two workers for every retiree. That is not a Republican problem. It is not a Democratic caused problem. That is not because we can't get along up here. That is because the ratios have changed. There is no reason to believe they will go back the other way.

My father and mother are deceased now, but I think in my mother's family there were nine members of her family, and my father had eight. I am not married. I don't have any kids. My sister has one. I sort of reflect what is going on in the world. I hope to help solve the problem later down the road. If I do what Senator Thurmond has done, 23 years from now, I would have my first child. I doubt if that will happen, either.

But as we kind of mark these points in time and make it personal, the problem is that the demographic changes in America have put Social Security at risk. It is nobody's fault, but it is everyone's problem. You cannot keep the program solvent when the ratio has gone from 16.5 workers to 1 in 1950 to 20 years from now being 2 to 1. There is just not enough money coming into the system.

Now, when you talk about Social Security spending and what to do and the idea that we are spending Social Security surpluses to run the government, you get everybody upset. And they should be. I came to the House in 1995. One of the first things we tried to do was isolate Social Security money surpluses and make sure we did not use the Social Security dollars paid into the system to run the government. That has been a practice that has been going on for 30 or 40 years. Both parties have engaged in that practice.

Every year we collect more in Social Security taxes than we pay in benefits. That extra money is called surplus. We have borrowed that extra cash, given the trust fund IOUs that have to be redeemed in the future. That has allowed us to grow this government without a direct tax on people.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

That is a bad practice. It is not good government. It is not good business. For several years we have been able to avoid doing that in a bipartisan way.

You remember in the last debate there was the lockbox. Let's put everything related to Social Security in this lockbox. In my last campaign for the Senate, I constantly heard it: If you just left Social Security money alone and you didn't take it out to run the government, if you kept it in a lockbox and left it alone, most of these problems would go away.

That is not true. As much as you would like to believe that, that is not true. If you took every penny collected from Social Security and you dedicated it totally to the trust fund and totally to the benefits to be paid, you are still $25 trillion short in 75 years. It still runs out of money in 2042. The problem is that two workers paying into the system will not be able to support the massive number of baby boomers coming into the system.

Having said that, I would like to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do a better job of protecting Social Security. I don't believe there is any party that has been in power for the last 40 years that could look the American public in the eye and say that they have not been guilty of using the surpluses in some fashion for other than Social Security.

In September of last year, I wrote a letter to the Social Security Administration asking 17 questions. Here is one of the questions I asked: Some have proposed a Social Security lockbox; would a lockbox, by itself, extend the solvency of Social Security beyond the year Social Security is expected to become insolvent? In a nutshell they said, the implementation of a Social Security lockbox would not alter this commitment and thus would have no direct effect on the future solvency of Social Security.

Having said that, I do believe we should isolate Social Security dollars and dedicate those dollars to the payment of Social Security Trust Fund obligations. That is just good government. But please do not tell your constituents back home that will fix this problem because it most certainly will not.

After having heard my rendition, there is probably not much good news you have heard yet. The good news: there is a way, in my opinion, to make up the $25 trillion shortfall over 75 years, to change the fact that you will have to reduce benefits by 2042 by 28 percent—that is all the money you will have to pay benefits by then—and to even change the

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

dynamic of paying more out in benefits than you collect in taxes by 2018.

The good news—just like everything else in Washington, there is a bad news/good news part of what I am about to say—is that the growth rates for Social Security, the amount of return you get on your FICA tax dollars or Social Security tax dollars taken out of your paycheck for younger workers, people born in the 1980s, it is less than 2 percent. If you happen to be a minority in this country, born in the 1980s, it is less than 1 percent.

Let me say that again. This is not Lindsey Graham saying that. The Social Security trustees have reported back to me in this letter.

I ask unanimous consent to print the letter in the *Record*.

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

SOCIAL SECURITY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ACTUARY,
Baltimore, MD, September 26, 2002.

Hon. LINDSEY O. GRAHAM,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GRAHAM: Thank you very much for the opportunity to answer the questions you have posed in your letter of September 6, 2002. The answers below are based on the intermediate assumptions and projections presented in the 2002 Annual Social Security Trustees Report and estimates that we have provided for a number of reform proposals over the past several years.

Many of the questions that you raise are very complex and the answers are subject to considerable uncertainty and even debate. I am providing brief answers reflecting my understanding of these issues based largely on the work done in the Office of the Chief Actuary for the Trustees, the Administration, and the Congress. I hope these responses will be helpful. I look forward to working with you, and Aleix Jarvis and Jessica Efird of your staff in the effort to develop proposals to reform Social Security and restore long-term solvency for the program.

(1) Based on the Social Security Administration's projections, in what year does Social Security begin to pay more out than it takes in?

Answer. Under the current intermediate assumptions of the 2002 Annual Report of the Social Security Board of Trustees to the Congress, and assuming that current law is not changed, we project that annual cash flow for the Social Security program will remain positive through 2016 and will turn negative for calendar year 2017 and later. Annual cash flow is defined here as the excess of income (excluding interest) over expenditures.

(2) Based on the Social Security Administration's projections, in what year is Social Security expected to become insolvent?

Answer. Under the intermediate assumptions, full benefits would continue to be payable after 2016 and part of the way through 2041 by augmenting current revenue from taxes with revenue from redeeming special United States Treasury obligations held by the Trust Funds. During 2041, the theoretical combined Old-Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) and Disability In-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

surance (DI) Trust Funds are projected to become exhausted and full scheduled benefits would no longer be payable on a timely basis. This condition is referred to as insolvency of the Trust Funds, because available tax revenue would then be sufficient to cover only about 73 percent of the cost of scheduled benefits. In fact, the OASI and DI Trust Funds operate separately and the projected dates of insolvency are 2043 for the OASI Trust Fund and 2028 for the DI Trust Fund. For simplicity of analysis, the date for theoretical combined Trust Funds is usually considered.

(3) Assuming current growth rates remain the same would benefits have to be reduced or taxes increased to keep Social Security from insolvency? If so, how much?

Answer. The intermediate assumptions for the Annual Trustees Reports reflect the Trustees' best judgment about the continuation of current trends in demographic and economic variables like birth rates, death rates, average wage increases and price increases. Assuming the intermediate assumptions of the 2002 Trustees Report are realized, Social Security will require either a reduction in benefit levels or an increase in revenue starting in 2041 for the combined OASDI program (and in 2043 for the OASI program and 2028 for the DI program). If benefits were reduced to meet the shortfall in revenue for the combined program, the reduction would need to be 27 percent starting with the exhaustion of the Trust Fund in 2041 and would rise to 34 percent for 2076. Alternatively, if additional revenue were provided beginning in 2041, revenue equivalent to a payroll tax rate increase of about 3.3 percent (from 12.4 percent under current law to about 15.7 percent) would be needed for the year. The additional revenue needed for 2042 would be equivalent to a payroll tax rate increase of about 4.5 percent. Thereafter the amount of additional revenue needed would gradually rise, reaching an amount equivalent to an increase in the payroll tax rate of about 6.4 percent for 2076. There is, of course, a great variety of ways in which benefits could be reduced or revenue increased for the Social Security program. Many different combinations of provisions to reduce benefits and or provide increased revenue from taxes could be developed to avoid insolvency of the OASDI Trust Funds throughout the 75-year projection period, and beyond.

(4) If Social Security surpluses were not diverted from the general budget, how would that affect the system? Would it avert a future insolvency?

Answer. I assume you are referring to the fact that for most years in which Social Security has taken in more tax revenue than it has paid out in benefits and other expenses, the rest of the Federal budget has operated in deficit. In these years, the Social Security tax revenue not currently needed for benefit payments has, by law, been invested in securities backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government. In practice, this revenue has been invested in special issue United States Treasury securities. These securities represent a commitment to redeem these investments, with interest at the market rate, when the Social Security Trust Funds are in need of revenue. Such commitments to the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds have always been met in the past and should be expected to be met in the future regardless of the fiscal operations of the rest of the Federal Government. Therefore, the trust funds are in no way compromised in their role of maintaining solvency as a result of being invested in special Treasury securities. However, redemption of these Treasury securities held by the Trust Funds does require the Treasury to allocate General Revenue for this purpose, and this allocation must be met by increasing taxes, reducing other federal spending, or increasing borrowing from the public.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

(5) Some have proposed a Social Security "lock box." Would a "lock box" by itself extend the solvency of Social Security beyond the year Social Security is expected to become insolvent?

Answer. As suggested above, the Social Security Trust Fund investments represent commitments of the United States Treasury that should be expected to be met when the Trust Funds need to redeem these investments. The implementation of a Social Security "lock box" would not alter this commitment and thus would have no direct effect on the future solvency of Social Security.

However, if the effect of a "lock box" were to require that the non-Social-Security Federal budget be in balance or surplus for the years in which Social Security makes investments, then the amount of borrowing from the public might be reduced. In this case the difficulty of generating General Revenue for the redemption of Trust Fund investments in the future would likely be diminished.

(6) How many South Carolinians do you project will be receiving Social Security benefits when the program becomes insolvent? How many South Carolinians currently receive benefits?

Answer: In December of 2001, about 704 thousand South Carolinians were receiving Social Security benefits. This represented about 1.5 percent of all Social Security beneficiaries at that time. If this percentage remains the same in 2041, when the combined Social Security Trust Funds are projected to become exhausted, we estimate that about 1.4 million South Carolinians will be receiving Social Security benefits at that time.

(7) What is the ratio of workers per retiree when the program began, in 1940, 1950, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, today, 2010, 2020, 2030, 2040?

Answer: The table below provides the historical and projected numbers of Social Security covered workers and beneficiaries. Ratios of covered workers to beneficiaries are shown both where beneficiaries include all beneficiaries and where beneficiaries are limited to retired workers. The number of beneficiaries was extremely small in 1940, the first year that monthly benefits were payable, because only workers with some work in 1937 through 1939 could qualify. This resulted in a very high ratio of covered workers to beneficiaries at the start of the program, which required several decades to mature.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

SOCIAL SECURITY (OASDI) COVERED WORKERS, BENEFICIARIES, AND RATIOS—1940–2080

[In thousands]

Beneficiaries			Ratio of Covered Workers to—	
Covered workers	Retired workers	Total	Retirees	All beneficiaries

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

1940	35,390	112	222	316.0	159.4
1950	48,280	1,771	2,930	27.3	16.5
1960	72,530	8,061	14,262	9.0	5.1
1970	93,090	13,349	25,186	7.0	3.7
1980	113,649	19,564	35,118	5.8	3.2
1990	133,672	24,841	39,470	5.4	3.4
2002	152,461	29,123	46,239	5.2	3.3
2010	165,443	34,126	52,865	4.8	3.1
2020	172,848	48,324	68,699	3.6	2.5
2030	178,131	61,740	84,070	2.9	2.1
2040	184,433	66,895	90,068	2.8	2.0
2050	189,845	69,692	94,109	2.7	2.0
2060	194,568	74,937	100,177	2.6	1.9
2070	198,687	80,635	106,723	2.5	1.9
2080	202,238	85,939	112,895	2.4	1.8

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Note.—Projections are based on the intermediate assumptions of the 2002 Trustees Report.

(8) What is the sum of the total cash shortfalls that Social Security is projected to experience from now through 2075, from 2025–2050, and from 2050–2075? (in constant and in present-value dollars)?

Answer. Combining financial values over substantial periods of time is generally done taking into account the "time value of money." This is accomplished by accumulating or discounting the separate annual values with interest to a common date. Values combined in this way are referred to as present values as of the date to which they are accumulated or discounted.

In present-value dollars (discounted at the OASDI Trust Fund interest rate to January 1, 2002) the total net OASDI cash flow for years 2002 through 2076 is projected to be nearly −$4.6 trillion. When the Trust Fund balances of over $1.2 trillion at the beginning of 2002 are added to this value, we get a financial shortfall (or unfunded obligation) for the 75-year period of $3.3 trillion. This unfunded obligation indicates that if an additional $3.3 trillion had been added to the Trust Funds at the beginning of 2002, the program would have had adequate financing to meet the projected cost of benefits scheduled in current law over the next 75 years. It should be noted that if the dollar amount of this unfunded obligation is accumulated with interest to the end of 2076, and then expressed in constant (CPI-indexed) 2002 dollars we get $33 trillion.

The present-value net cash-flow of almost −$4.6 trillion for the period 2002 through 2076 can be separated into the three 25-year sub-periods: +$0.4 trillion for the period 2002 through 2026, −$2.7 trillion for the period 2027 through 2051, and −$2.3 trillion for the period 2052 through 2076. If only years of negative cash flow are included then the value for the first 25-year sub-period is −$0.5 trillion and the total for the 72-year period is −$5.5 trillion.

Summing constant 2002-dollar values from several different years is equivalent to taking their present value and assuming that the operative real interest rate is zero. This may result in values that are difficult to interpret. Constant-dollar values are generally used for comparing separate values over time rather than for combining them. A comparison of constant-dollar values for a series covering many years is helpful in illustrating the extent of real growth in the series over time. There is no meaningful interpretation of the result from summing constant dollar values from many different years.

Expressing the combined values discussed above in terms of simple sums of constant 2002 dollars (CPI discounted dollars) results in quite different results from present value because much greater weight is placed on more distant future years than would be indicated by current market interest rates. Using this approach produces constant-dollar cash-flow sums of +$0.1 trillion for 2002 through 2026, −$8.6 trillion for 2027 through 2051, −$15.3 trillion for 2052 through 2076, and −$23.8 trillion for the entire 75-year period. The sum for the first 25-year period with only negative values included is −$1.1 trillion. The sum for the 75-year period including only negative annual values is −$24.9 trillion.

(9) As a demographic group, do African-American males receive the same proportional return from the retirement portion of Social Security as other demographic groups?

Answer. Due to the nature of the Social Security program it is difficult to look at retirement benefits in isolation. The payroll tax rate is specified

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

in two components, one for retirement and survivor benefits and the other for disability benefits. In addition, a significant portion of the benefits payable from the retirement and survivor tax, for years after reaching normal retirement age (NRA), is actually attributable to the fact that many become eligible for disability benefits before reaching retirement age. However, there are some observations that we can make.

To understand the tradeoffs, first consider the comparison of returns on retirement and survivors taxes for men and women. Men tend to die younger and have higher career-average earnings than women. These factors tend to make the return on contributions for retired worker benefits alone lower for men than for women. However, most men marry, and many have spouses with lower career earnings who receive spouse or widow benefits based on the earnings and contributions of their husbands. This tends to raise the relative return for contributions made by men. Finally, men have higher disability rates than women and thus are more likely to have a shortened career, lessening their lifetime payroll tax contributions without materially affecting their monthly benefit level when retirement and survivors benefits become payable. Thus, with all these factors taken into account it is less clear whether men get a lower return on their retirement and survivor taxes than do women.

For African-American males the situation is even less clear. Life expectancy for African-American males is lower than for white males. But average career earnings are also lower. These factors have at least partly offsetting effects. Because African-American males have higher death rates, they are also more likely to leave a widow beneficiary if married. Importantly, African-American males are also more likely to become disabled than are white males.

Some recent studies have suggested that African-American males get a lower return from Social Security retirement benefits. But these studies have not sorted out many of the complicating factors mentioned above. In particular, many of these studies consider actual case histories of individuals who work successfully without becoming disabled up to retirement. For such individuals, life expectancy at retirement is clearly greater than for those who have been disabled prior to that time, but these studies use overall population death rates. Because African-American males are relatively more likely to become disabled, this distortion of overstating death rates for those who do not become disabled is relatively large for them. This is a significant shortcoming that causes a disproportionately large understatement in retirement returns for African-American males. We are working on a more complete model that we hope will address these concerns and will inform you of our progress in the future. But for now, the evidence on this question appears to be inconclusive.

(10) What is the average current return on investment for FICA tax contributions for someone born before and after 1948?

Answer. Actuarial Note Number 144 "Internal Real Rates of Return Under the OASDI Program for Hypothetical Workers" authored by Orlo Nichols, Michael Clingman, and Milton Glanz in June 2001 addressed this issue. This note provides extensive estimates of real internal rates of return for a wide variety of cases.

The most representative of these hypothetical cases presented may be the married couple with a husband and a wife, each having medium career earnings. For this case, assuming a realistic earnings scale through the working lifetime, the real internal rate of return was computed to be 3.50 percent for those born in 1920, declining to 2.33 percent for those born in

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

1943. Assuming that present-law scheduled benefits would be payable in the future with no change in the payroll tax rate, this real rate of return is projected to decline gradually, reaching 2.20 percent for those born in 1964, and then rising gradually as life expectancy rises. However, the current payroll-tax rate is projected to be inadequate to finance scheduled benefits in the long run. Under the hypothetical assumption that payroll tax rates would be increased as needed to finance scheduled benefits in the future, future real rates of return are projected to decline more rapidly, reaching 1.95 percent for those born in 1985 and 1.63 percent for those born in 2004.

In general, real rates of return are higher for married couples with one earner and for workers with low earnings. Rates are generally lower for single workers and for high earners.

(11) Have policy proposals been introduced that keep Social Security from insolvency, allow for personal accounts, and do not change benefits for those already receiving Social Security benefits?

Answer. Absolutely. A number of Congressional proposals would accomplish these goals. At a hearing before the House Ways and Means Committee in June 1999, ten plans were presented by Congressional sponsors. The sponsors of these plans were, Archer/Shaw, Kolbe/Stenholm, Nadler, Moynihan/BKerrey, Gregg/Breaux, PGramm, NSmith, Stark, MSanford, and DeFazio. We estimated that all ten of these proposals would restore solvency for the Social Security program for at least the full 75-year projection period. None of these proposals would reduce benefits for current beneficiaries, but three of them would slow growth in benefits for current recipients by reducing the size of the automatic cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) either directly, or indirectly (through modifying the CPI). Seven of these proposals provided for individual accounts on a voluntary or mandatory basis.

Since 1999 additional proposals have been developed that would meet these criteria, including the Armey/DeMint plan and Models 2 and 3 of the President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security.

(12) Have there been any proposals introduced that would create personal accounts, to avert a future insolvency of Social Security, without reducing benefits or increasing taxes? Have there been any proposals without personal accounts introduced that would avert a future insolvency of Social Security without reducing benefits or increasing taxes?

Answer. The financial shortfalls projected for the Social Security program can only be eliminated by reducing the growth in benefit levels from what is scheduled in current law, or by increasing revenue to the program. In the long-run, additional revenue can be generated by expanding the amount of advance funding either in individual accounts or in the Social Security Trust Funds. All of the proposals mentioned above pursue this approach to some degree. However, creating additional advance funding requires additional revenue for a period of time. This additional revenue may be generated by (1) reducing Social Security benefits paid from the Trust Funds, (2) directly increasing the amount of payroll tax or some other tax, or (3) providing transfers or loans from the General Fund of the Treasury. Whether General Revenue transfers or loans represent an indirect increase in taxes depends on a number of complex factors many of which are generally unknown in the context of Social Security reform, so no definitive answer can be given.

All of the plans that we have analyzed in recent years provide for one or more of the three measures to generate additional revenue both to restore solvency for the Social Security Trust Funds and to provide for additional advance funding. This is true for plans that include individual accounts as well as for those that do not.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Sincerely,

STEPHEN C. GOSS,
Chief Actuary.

Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina. They have laid out the rates of return for people born after 1980.

As I have told you, they are less than 2 percent. Over time, they go down because the problem, over time, gets worse. As you pay into the system as a young worker, the obligations of the system get greater, and there really will be no rate of return. As a matter of fact, by 2042, not only does your money not work for you, it is not enough to pay benefits to people who are already in the system.

Here is the good news. If we could, in a bipartisan fashion, work together, I am confident we could construct a program for younger workers—voluntary in nature—that would allow them to take part of the money they pay into Social Security, invest it in a different system—equity and nonequity, depending on what they want to do—that will dramatically outpace a 1.8 percent return.

Here is what I suggest to you as reality. If you had a business and you wanted to sell an annuity to young people in America, and you laid out the program of that annuity and it mirrored Social Security, nobody in the country would invest in it simply because they can get a better rate of return leaving it in a checking account.

Now, everything about Social Security is not total retirement. There is a component of Social Security that pays for people who have been disabled and injured. That aspect of the program is extremely important also.

But a better business view of Social Security is necessary. If we could achieve better growth rates—and the trustees tell us that if you achieve better growth rates, every dollar in additional growth, every time the fund beats that 1.8 or 1.6 rate of return, that extra dollar allows benefits to be paid without raising taxes.

We are going to argue about the tax cut and how to stimulate the economy. I remember in my last campaign, when I presented this idea, the ad was that "Lindsey Graham is going to take your Social Security tax dollars and put them in Enron stock." Well, I didn't wake up one day and think investing in Enron with Social Security was a good idea. That is not what this program is designed to do.

There is bipartisan support for personal accounts, allowing individual Americans the opportunity, if they choose, to invest in plans to get better growth rates. There are visitors

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

here from all over the country, most likely, and I welcome them here. One thing about being a Member of the Senate, or the House, or a Federal employee in any fashion, is that you have the opportunity, if you choose, to invest in the Thrift Savings Plan. It is a pretty good deal. I, as a Senator, can invest up to about $10,000 of my salary into a thrift plan. It is a government-sponsored plan, administered by the private sector, where I can choose between three or four different investment options, based on the risk I want to take. There are stock funds, mutual funds, bond stock funds, Treasury notes, which I can choose based on the risk I want to take.

All of these funds are supported by the government in the sense that we are going to stand behind them and not let them collapse. It is even better than that. The government puts in 50 cents on the dollar up to the $10,000 I put in, and they do the same for every Federal employee.

I suggest something like that should exist for the average working person in this country because under the current tax system, the average American will pay more in Social Security taxes than in any other form of tax, because this comes out of our paycheck—6.5 percent—no matter what our income is, up to a certain level.

For middle- and low-income workers struggling to get by, 6.5 percent—I think that is the correct number—comes out of your paycheck to go into the Social Security Trust Fund. For younger workers, we are taking that money from you. We are giving you no options to invest it. We are controlling it for you, and you are going to get that 2 percent—eventually less than 1 percent—over time.

I think that is wrong for the people paying taxes. But here is the big crime of it all: That system locks in failure for Social Security. Some Senate, somehow, someday—if we don't do something relatively soon—is going to be dealing with a trust fund that is $25 trillion short of the money necessary to pay the obligation, and it is going to be dealing with a trust fund from which somebody gets a letter one day saying: That check you got last month will be reduced by 28 percent, and I am sorry we don't have the money to pay you.

I don't know who will be occupying this seat then—I doubt if it will be me—but I would like to take some of that burden off their shoulders and off the working families and the working people in this country, in terms of taking their money and getting a better rate of return for it.

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

So the hope and purpose of this amendment is to put into the record this year, 2003, let it be said—if there is a record that stands the test of time, let it be said that in 2003 the Senate will soon adopt facts that I think are irrefutable, nonpartisan in nature, that lay out the future of Social Security solvency in a very honest, dramatic, and chilling way.

I congratulate my colleagues who are willing to accept this amendment as part of the roadmap for the budget this year. The facts are real. They are not going to go away unless we make things happen differently.

One thing I remember from President Clinton—and it was a good line—is that the definition of insanity is doing an event the same way and expecting different results. So I think it is insane politically for us to keep this system in place expecting different results to fall out of the sky. They will not fall out of the sky.

Our freedom is about to be strengthened because some young man and woman chose to volunteer to serve their country and risk their life for our freedom. You can debate all you would like whether this is an appropriate thing to do. But they have taken on that sacrifice, and they will accept the order, if given, to go forward. That model is the model that has kept us free for over 200 years—average, everyday Americans who are willing to do their part, willing to risk their sons and daughters, their own lives, to make sure the next generation can have the blessings of liberty that we have enjoyed.

There was an interview I heard today of a family with twin sons serving in the same Marine unit, both of them ready to go tomorrow, if that is the day chosen. The mom and the dad were very worried but bursting with pride about the fact that both of their sons have chosen to serve in the Marine Corps and both of them are on the tip of the spear. What they were trying to tell the commentator was that they are proud of them because they are willing to serve their country and protect their way of life. The parents mentioned the fact that their hope is that life will be better for their kids than it was for them, and that truly is the American dream. That is what keeps us all going, trying to make sure that we pass on to the next generation a future with a possibility, with hard work, to be better than the one we have experienced.

I can say with all the confidence in the world that if we don't act soon, and act decisively, and if we are not willing to sacrifice politically and make some structural reforms to

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Social Security, we are committing political malpractice, and the future of Social Security is dismal and the ability to maintain the system is going to be unbelievably costly, and you can wind up with a Social Security pension plan and the military, and no money to do anything else. That is what awaits us as a nation.

But I am just as confident that we will rise to the occasion, and I cannot see how right now—it is beyond my ability as a political person to see how all this is going to come together. I am telling you that, based on faith, I know it will. The problems facing our troops—there are so many scenarios that face them in the aftermath of Iraq. There are thousands of different scenarios of "what if that." I can only tell you I have the same faith that at the end of the day we will be successful and the sacrifices will be made.

Unfortunately, some people, most likely, will lose their lives or be injured. We are going to get through this thing at the end of the day stronger rather than weaker. We are doing the right thing.

I have faith in our troops and in our President that the dictator, Saddam Hussein, will be gone soon. I have faith that this body, starting this year—I hope it is this year—will come together to address the looming problems that face Social Security. This amendment lays out those problems. It puts it as part of the road map for this year's budget and, at the end, it encourages all to work together with the President to come up with solutions to avoid raising taxes and cutting benefits. It is a small step that will hopefully get us to the right place one day.

I am standing on the shoulders of people who have gone before me who have addressed problems of Social Security, such as Senator Moynihan and other Senators in this body from both parties. I do not know how long I will be here. Only the Good Lord and the voters know that. I can tell my colleagues one thing for certain: While I am here—I consider it to be an honor to be here—I want to do as many constructive activities for my country as possible. I think one of the best things I can do is to come up with an approach my colleagues from the other side can buy into, which means a give and take, to put in place a plan that begins to turn around the dynamics that are facing Social Security.

The good news is if we work together, if we start now, we can beat this problem, we can solve this problem. The bad news is if we continue to do what we have done for the past decade, we are going to pass on to the next generation of po-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

litical leaders and taxpayers a dismal picture. I would argue that would be the first time in the history of the country that political leaders passed on a country that was diminished, not enhanced. I am confident we will not be the first ones to make that mistake.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Frank Lautenberg

TUESDAY, *June 7, 1983* [1]

Mr. President, I rise today to make my first speech on the Senate floor and I do so with gratitude and awe.

I am deeply grateful to my fellow citizens in the State of New Jersey for entrusting me to serve them in this great center of debate and decision.

I am in awe of the brilliance of our forefathers who wrote the Constitution for a Nation that welcomed those seeking freedom and a new way of life. Their wisdom enabled my parents to be brought here by their families searching for refuge and opportunity.

It was their pattern of sacrifice that served as my critical learning experience. All that followed whether at university, business, or life in general was molded by the framework provided by these new citizens.

I am grateful also to those who preceded me in this Chamber for their contribution to this beloved democracy, and to those colleagues with whom I presently share this honor for the advice and encouragement they regularly impart to me.

In particular, I am deeply indebted to the senior Senator from the State of New Jersey, Senator Bradley, with whom I share common interest and goals, and to the Democratic leader, Senator Byrd, who has extended to me every courtesy and whose respect for the history and traditions of this institution set a high standard for a new Member like myself.

Mr. President, not very long ago, our Nation entered what many call the information age: a period during which information-serviced industries have become predominant in our economy. They have eclipsed manufacturing, just as manufacturing surpassed farming decades ago. The change has been gradual, but undeniable. Some 60 percent of our work

[1] Senator Lautenberg served from the 98th Congress through the 106th Congress, retired, then returned in the 108th Congress. Although he is a member of the class of the 108th Congress, his maiden speech was delivered in the 98th Congress on June 7, 1983.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

force is employed in creating, storing, processing, or distributing information. Who does that include? Office workers, salespeople, secretaries, people at work in telecommunications, computers, in education, research and science, financial services and insurance, to name a few. People applying information technology to make the production of goods more efficient.

Technological innovation has brought vast changes in our society, in our workplaces, in our homes and schools.

Innovation and change are accelerating. This will drive the future growth of our economy and alter the character of our society. Mr. President, this Nation can ride the wave of the information age, or be swamped by it. Great challenges accompany the promises of change. In responding to those challenges, we must draw on the best of our values and ideals. In a Nation that is plugged into computers, questions of success and failure may become questions of who is on-line and who is off-line. In an economy where technology will dominate our future, how do we cope with businesses, people, and places still tied to the past?

Mr. President, these are issues I hope to address in the Senate. They are issues of equity and opportunity in the 1980s and the 1990s and beyond. They are issues that trouble my State. I am proud that New Jersey has been the home of many of the inventions that are the foundation of this new age. But New Jersey was also the birthplace of American manufacturing—and many of its factories and plants are in decline. New Jersey was third in the Nation in new patents last year. But it lost 46,000 jobs in manufacturing. For those workers there is no end to the recession.

The suburbs of my State are enjoying great growth, tied to service- and research-based industries on the rise. But New Jersey's cities are being stripped of the industry around which they were built. The unemployment in some of our cities is about the highest in the Nation.

In reflecting on these contrasts, I feel compelled to offer a personal note. I myself am the son of a millworker. My father worked in textile mills that have long since shut down. But I made my mark in a computer-based company, a company that advanced in tandem with technology. I crossed into that future because my country gave me the chance. It gave me an education. It afforded me opportunity.

I pledged to the people of my State that one of my main missions would be to work to provide employment and economic opportunity. We must work to ensure that everyone shares in what is to come. Already, we can see the kinds of challenges we face. Already, we can identify the tasks that lie ahead, to ensure that the promises of the future are promises for all of us.

There is a broad consensus that we must place increased emphasis on training in math and science. There are proposals to enhance the quality of teaching, to enrich the opportunities for students at all levels. Most of our new jobs will be information related. They will require new skills, constantly upgraded over a worker's lifetime. New demands will be placed on our educational and training systems and on our people. The capacity to use and work with computers is becoming essential, almost as essential as being able to read and write clearly.

The concept of computer literacy in turn defines a new type of illiteracy, and the potential for new and distressing divisions in our society. From fall 1980 to spring 1982, the number of microcomputers and computers available to public school students tripled. Growth in the use of computers in the schools is accelerating. By January 1983, more than half of all schools in the United States were using microcomputers in instruction. But where is the growth occurring?

According to one study, Title I schools—schools with programs for the economically and socially disadvantaged—average 25 percent fewer computers than non-Title I schools. Almost 70 percent of wealthy schools have microcomputers; almost 60 percent of poor schools do not. These statistics are ominous.

Numbers raise other questions as well. The same schools that lack the resources to buy computers very likely lack the resources to enrich the skills of their teachers, to buy the software, and design the programs and provide the faculty necessary for effective teaching. In an age that demands computer literacy, a school without a computer is like a school without a library. And the same patterns extend to the home. The Office of Technology Assessment says that the number of computers in homes has doubled from 1982 to 1983. Those computers are being acquired by the affluent, reinforcing disparities in opportunity.

As we address the issue of education in an information age, we must address the question of equal opportunity. There will continue to be debate over what is the appropriate Federal role when it comes to education. I believe that a major responsibility is to even out the inequities, to ensure equal opportunity. The Congress is considering various pro-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

posals to ensure an education appropriate to our times. We have to make sure that all students have an equal chance to get the education they need to grow and succeed in America today.

Mr. President, we face other issues of equity. Telecommunications networks will be the new infrastructure: Satellite networks to conquer the physical isolation of rural communities; networks that link computers and businesses in a national web; networks that channel more information, at faster speeds than ever before. Who will be connected, and who will not?

The American Telephone & Telegraph Co., our national phone system, is being broken up. Local telephone companies will be spun off and will provide basic telephone service.

For years, profits from long distance and equipment charges have held down the cost of local telephone rates. But that day is ending. We are fast approaching a time when local telephone users will have to pay the full cost of local service. Local rates may double or triple. In my State, regulatory officials predict that basic telephone rates could rise as much as 150 percent by early 1984.

The effect could be devastating. For every 10 percent rise in price, we can expect that 1 percent of telephone users will drop their service. Projected price increases could lead to a fall off of telephone service to more than 10 percent of the population. Further increases will cut millions more from the most basic of our information networks—the telephone system.

Cut off will be the poor, the sick, and the elderly, in need of telephone service for emergencies, for contact with the outside world.

Cut off will be the unemployed, who will become further isolated from job opportunities.

Cut off will be whole areas of our poorest cities, adding another impediment to their revival.

Our concern for equity in the information age must also extend to heavy industry and industrial workers. While we should encourage the growth of service opportunities, we cannot turn our backs on basic industries or the people and places affected by job loss. Monumental changes occur in the life of an individual and his or her family when unemployment hits, when new skills must be acquired, when a new job must be found and a new life made, perhaps far from a person's home. And substantial distress is experienced by old

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

cities with so-called sunset industries—when the tax base and infrastructure built around declining industries erode.

Advance notice, information about job markets, and opportunities for retraining help workers adjust more easily to change. Targeted incentives and appropriate planning help many cities attract the makings of new industry—information-based service industry and new jobs. As a matter of responsibility, we must ease the process of adjustment.

We cannot stand back and permit our industrial base to disappear. We cannot concede these jobs to our foreign competitors. We must encourage change in our manufacturing and industrial plants to make them competitive. This can be done through changes in tax policy, in trade policy, and other incentives—and by promoting partnership among management, workers, and government. The Democratic industrial policy task force, on which I serve, is studying these questions to shape a legislative agenda to address them.

Mr. President, in my own State, there is growth and prosperity directly tied to the coming of the information age—jobs in research, science, and financial services. But at the same time there are areas in deep decline, cities where unemployment is pervasive, and industry on the wane.

In welcoming the information age, we must not leave these people and communities behind.

Mr. President, our Nation has long stood for opportunity, equality, and fairness. I would not be here today, were it not for the opportunities granted me. A child of the Depression, I was given the chance to get an education, to go forth, and make a mark. We are in the midst of substantial changes in our economy and our society. Industries are transforming. Tasks are changing. Demands are shifting. In our efforts to seize the best the new age has to offer, we must not ignore the call of our conscience, to ensure that we go forward together, as a united people sharing the potential of this new age.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Lisa Murkowski

TUESDAY, *March 18, 2003*

Mr. President, it is actually quite fortuitous I am standing before you tonight. I have not spoken on the floor but once since I have been here in my new role as the junior Senator from Alaska. But I stand before you tonight to do the one thing I have been asked by the residents, the people of Alaska to do, and that is to work for jobs, for a sustainable economy for my State and for my constituents. So to stand tonight to talk about ANWR [Arctic National Wildlife Refuge] and what ANWR means not only to my State but to all of America is, as I say, significant because ANWR is about jobs, it is about the economy, it is about economic security, domestic energy production. It is also about Native rights in my home State, and it is about common sense.

I have been listening very closely to the comments that have been made tonight, some by my fellow colleague from Alaska, quite passionately arguing the facts. We have seen some beautiful pictures, and we have seen some numbers thrown around. I think it is so important that we put into perspective what ANWR really is, what it means. To do that, we have to go back a bit in history. We have to look to the history of ANWR.

We have known about ANWR's oil potential since the early 1900s. It was in 1913, 1914, that the U.S. Geological Survey found strong indications of oil. So we have known that oil reserves, strong oil reserves, are on the North Slope.

This area now known as the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was originally created in 1960 by Executive order under the Eisenhower administration. This Executive order has been pointed to a couple times tonight. It seems that it has been construed that it was recognized by this order that somehow ANWR, the Coastal Plain, should be reserved as some wilderness or should be put off limits. It is important to go back to the language of that Executive order so we understand clearly what President Eisenhower recognized in 1960.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

The order states:

> For the purposes of preserving the wildlife, the wilderness, and the recreational values described in northeastern Alaska containing approximately 8.9 million acres, is hereby subject to valid existing withdrawals, withdrawn from all forms of appropriations under the public land laws, including mining, but not the mineral leasing laws.

This is where people are failing to read the rest of that order: “but not the mineral leasing laws.”

In 1960, through Executive order, was the first time it was recognized that the potential for mineral and oil was significant on the Coastal Plain.

I have a chart that details exactly what is in the refuge. The Coastal Plain, which is 1.5 million acres, was created in 1980 under ANILCA. The wilderness area in yellow was also set out in ANILCA. When the initial refuge was set up, it was this portion, additional refuge land, which is not wilderness, which was created under section 303 of ANILCA. It added this section.

When we talk about ANWR, the refuge, and the wilderness and the 1002 area, it is important to keep in mind that we are talking about different animals, if you will. The Coastal Plain, the 1002 area, is separate and distinct from the wilderness area that has been created and separate from that refuge.

In 1959, Alaska had become a State with certain rights guaranteed to it under the Statehood Act. Within that act was a recognition by President Eisenhower—again through the Executive order—that the North Slope had vast oil and gas potential and that it should remain available at all times for domestic use.

There was a recognition in 1960 that something was different about the Coastal Plain—a Federal recognition that the oil and gas potential along the plain is too important to lock it up.

Go forward 13 years when Congress authorized through the Trans-Alaska Oil Pipeline Authorization Act the construction of the Trans-Alaska pipeline. This pipeline was to carry up to 2.1 million barrels of oil from the North Slope to the tidewater in Valdez for export to the lower 48. This was the next recognition, if you will, of the potential for reserves in the North Slope.

Our pipeline spans 800 miles from the north of the State all the way down to the southern terminus in Valdez. It goes through some of the most rugged and beautiful country one is ever going to see, and this pipeline carries the oil safely

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

and efficiently without harm to the environment or the wildlife. It survived the biggest earthquakes the designers could have foreseen. We had a 7.1 earthquake in November. It was a construction marvel that pipeline worked the way the designers had envisioned it would.

Our pipeline is an amazing wonder of American ingenuity and spirit. This pipeline has been around for three decades now, and it has been doing a good job. As Senator Stevens pointed out earlier this evening, our pipeline is half full. We need additional oil deposits to maintain operations.

I have said this is an 800-mile pipeline, but again I think it helps to put things in perspective if one is not from the State of Alaska. This pipeline covers a span of country equal to the distance between Duluth, MN, and New Orleans, LA. To date, it has carried over 14 billion barrels of Alaska oil to the lower 48—day in, day out.

This pipeline was constructed in 1973. We have been transporting oil in it ever since. In 1980, Congress enacted the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act, which is commonly known as ANILCA. This bill was a culmination of 5 years' worth of legislative negotiations spanning three separate Congresses. There was an agreement reached, which Senator Stevens mentioned earlier, between Senator Scoop Jackson of Washington and Senator Paul Tsongas of Massachusetts, two Democrats and two protectors of the environment. The bill included language which was agreed to by Alaska to ensure access to the Coastal Plain for oil and gas exploration.

This is where we get the phrase or why we keep referring to this parcel as the 1002, because it came from section 1002 of ANILCA. It specifically set forth the requirements for exploration and development of oil and gas reserves in this small portion of ANWR, consistent with the protections for wildlife.

With ANILCA, we doubled the size of President Eisenhower's Arctic National Wildlife Range. This was the range initially. We doubled the size by adding the refuge and changed the name to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Through ANILCA, we put half of the land in refuge, 8 million in wilderness and 1.5 million reserved as an energy bank for the United States. Again, I point out, it is important to mention that the 1002 area is technically not part of the refuge. It lies within the outer boundaries of the refuge, but it is technically not part of it. It is essentially an area in legal limbo waiting for Congress to fulfill the statutory re-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

quirements that were set out in section 1002 of ANILCA, and to fulfill the promises that were made to Alaska on statehood.

It is not really in the refuge, but it is definitely not a part of the wilderness, and it is not part of the wilderness by definition or in just the everyday sense of the word.

If one looks up "wilderness" in Webster's, it is defined as an unsettled and uncultivated region. The Coastal Plain does not meet this definition of wilderness, because for years we have had military installations that have been involved in monitoring Soviet and cross polar activity. We have a community. We have the village of Kaktovik which sits right within the 1002 area. These people call the area home. They have their homes there. They have a school there. They have community centers there. They have hospitals. They have a community. This is not a wilderness.

Some of the pictures we have seen lead one to believe there is nothing up there, but when you take your camera, you can look in whatever direction you want to prove your point. So I think we need to keep in mind, let's envision what we have up there. We have made offers to people. If they have not seen ANWR, come up and see what we are talking about. See what the Coastal Plain is. See what drilling looks like in Alaska.

At the outset, I mentioned this also had to do with Native rights issues. Under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, some Alaska Natives were given the right to select lands on the North Slope. A group of Alaska Natives from the North Slope region selected 92,000 acres within the boundaries of the 1002 area specifically for its oil and gas potential. Those Natives who have selected those lands are denied any opportunity to develop. Through the 1971 act of Congress, they were given the right to select those lands. They selected them, but there is nothing further they can do with them. They are being denied the right to do with the land what they feel should be done. If they need jobs and opportunities, we are denying them that opportunity.

This refusal to allow the Natives to use their land is another example of the hand of government falling upon Natives and Indians in America, because government knows how to do it best. So that is kind of our preliminary history lesson about ANWR.

Let's get to some of the facts, though, that have been mentioned this evening. We are importing nearly 11 million barrels of oil every day from other countries. Most of them are from countries that are not so very friendly or not so very stable. Alaska is producing 1 million barrels of oil per day, when the pipeline can carry twice that amount. We are wasting this national asset. We have a pipeline that is half full.

Prior to the last gulf war, Alaska produced nearly 2.1 million barrels of oil per day, all of it destined for West Coast ports in the lower 48. Now, rather than move to open a small portion of the Coastal Plain to responsible oil and natural gas development, our opponents are suggesting we can basically conserve our way out of the reduced dependency in an economically responsible manner.

I will be the first to tell my colleagues we must work on our conservation efforts, but we must be realistic about what it is we can and cannot do. I have heard those who state that ANWR is a false choice when compared with higher CAFE standards, that that is the way we need to go. But desiring tougher standards at the expense of more domestic production is the real false choice. It is a false choice because we have to do both. We have to pursue conservation, but we have to pursue increased domestic production if we are going to get our energy situation back on track.

To suggest we do not do any more, that we cut it off, that there is no need for any more oil, that we are going to go to this wonderful hydrogen-based society and we are all going to be able to power our vehicles on something other than gasoline, it is not today, it is not tomorrow, it is probably not 10 years. Having said that, should we not work toward it? Sure, that is fine, but let's keep in mind that we use gasoline for more than powering our vehicles. We use gasoline in a whole host of ways.

I was talking to a group of students this morning. They said, gasoline is used for cars, and if we change the way our vehicles are fueled, surely we will not need to rely on gasoline.

But it is used for home fuel oil, jet fuel, petrochemicals, asphalt, kerosene, lubricants, maritime fuel, other products. If we look at this chart, of the gasoline that we consume, one barrel of oil makes 44.2 gallons of economic essentials. So 44 percent of a barrel of oil is going into the gasoline component. The remainder, 56 percent, is going into all of these other things.

So the kids wanted to know, what are all of these other things? They are plastics, CDs, crayons, contact lenses, panty hose, photographs, roofing material, dentures, shaving

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

cream, perfumes, umbrellas, golf balls, aspirin, bandages, deodorant, tents, footballs.

To suggest we need to cut back on oil because we do not want to have a society that is dependent on oil for our vehicles is one thing. We can look to alternatives for how we might power our vehicles. But we have to recognize we are oil-dependent: 56 percent, 58 percent of the oil we consume in the United States is imported oil. That is not a good place to be, particularly when we can do better domestically. We want to be able to do that.

Alaska has been a proud supplier of 20 percent of this country's oil production for the past 25 years. We produce this oil in the harshest environment imaginable. We do it better and we do it safer and we do it in a more environmentally sound and scientific manner than anywhere on Earth. Every spill on the North Slope is reported. Every drop. If a can of soda pop is dropped, it is reported. We are conscious. We know what is going on. We are being careful and cautious.

The National Academy of Sciences 2 weeks ago released a report on the cumulative impact of North Slope oil development. What did they find about oil spills on the North Slope? No major oil spills had occurred. There was no cumulative effect. The discussion about how to drill and where to drill is moot because we are in a situation where we have essentially a professional environmental community that says no development at all anywhere. They are using ANWR as their rallying cry.

What they are doing by stopping development in ANWR and by saying you cannot go there, is shutting down not only oil development but human progress. There is a community in Kaktovik, a community on the North Slope in Barrow, existing because of oil. Their school, their hospital, their community exists because they have jobs and a resource base. That is human progress that most would see as positive.

There was an interesting article in the *Washington Post* a few days back. Phillip Clapp, president of the National Environmental Trust, summed up what today's modern professional environmental movement is about, talking about drilling in ANWR and talking about the technology and whether cumulative impact had been good or bad. He noted, even if new technology has lessened the environment damage, it is not the drilling itself but the other activities, such as road building, housing for workers, the infrastructure needed to support them, that cause damage.

If you think that through, if it is the school, if it is the house, if it is the road that causes the damage, it is not necessarily the drilling. They are doing the drilling fine. The road is that way or the house is blocking the wind and causing snow to drift and that will accumulate and then melt and puddle in the spring; that is a negative change. We are going to have all kinds of problems. By Mr. Clapp's standard, the elementary school in Fayetteville, AR, causes a negative impact.

We have to be realistic. We deal with this not-in-my-backyard syndrome and it seems this NIMBY is now morphing into BANANA, build almost nothing anywhere near anyone. If you carry it further to a little more ludicrous level, you have the term NOPE: not on planet Earth.

We in Alaska are starting to feel cut off from the rest of the world, that the rest of the world or the rest of the country would just as soon lock us up and say nothing, nada, zip, you cannot do anything. You are not responsible enough to carry on development because we are concerned about the environment.

Again, I challenge Members to come up, see the oil development, how we bring oil out of the ground safely every single day and deliver it to the rest of the lower 48. We do a good job. Give us credit.

We had a bit of an example about the technology used on the North Slope now. The comment was made earlier when we first began producing in Prudhoe Bay, the size of the oil fields, the pads, the footprint was bigger, but the technology in the past 30 years has brought us to a remarkable place where we can drill, and for all intents and purposes you do not know we are there. We have a picture that shows when the drill is complete there is a stump put in the ground. That is what you look at at the end. You do not have a huge infrastructure.

I had a meeting this afternoon with an independent oil company working in Alaska, explaining to us some incredible new technology that allows for construction of modules on the tundra, elevated so the tundra is not affected by any warmth or heat coming off the building. These modules are supported on beams not made from ice but inserted in an ice sleeve so when drilling is complete, when the project is complete, they melt the ice, pick everything up, and they are out of there. The technology we have today is so remarkable, so incredible, we can go in, we can do the job, and we can do it in a manner that does not disturb the environment.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

The point was made earlier about the size we are talking about. The maps of Alaska do not do justice to the size or the expanse. The development of the Coastal Plain would use an area of land smaller than the Little Rock airport. It was mentioned that in the area of drilling we are looking to do in the 1002 area, six drills would fit within Dulles Airport. Conceptualize this: An area 290 times smaller than Ted Turner's private ranch in New Mexico. I have not been there, but I can visualize it. Or an area the size of George Washington's Mount Vernon when he first inherited the property in 1761.

This is what we are talking about, a tiny sliver on the Arctic Coastal Plain. Yes, we did see lovely pictures taken during the summer when the tundra is abloom. Those flowers do exist. I have seen the purple flowers. But most of the time it looks like the moon. It is white, it is deserted. Most days you cannot tell the sky from the land. This is the world that we are talking about. It is frozen 9 months out of the year. It is windswept. It is bitter cold. It is not hospitable country. Yet small groups of Alaskan Eskimos have chosen to call this home and want to be able to stay there, have decent jobs there. This is what we are talking about when we talk about ANWR.

I was going on about the size of ANWR. It was pointed out to me that the amount of land we need is the same size as the world famous Pinehurst Golf Resort in North Carolina, home to eight world-class golf courses. In fact, a new golf course opens every day in the United States, which means that the amount of land that we need to produce billions of barrels of oil for the American consumer is gobbled up in just 8 days by golf courses nationwide.

It seems kind of silly to be comparing ANWR and the incredible contribution you are going to be getting from ANWR and its resources to a golf course, but I think it helps to put it in perspective. First, think about the size we are talking about and think about our land use. This is not an area where you would want to go and have a round of golf.

Also tonight there has been discussion about the wildlife up in the 1002 area. Since Alaska oil production began nearly three decades ago, the caribou herds have increased an average of 450 percent; duck, geese, and other migratory birds are flourishing. As has been mentioned, there are more caribou in Alaska than there are people. The caribou are doing fine. They hope it is not going to be another bad bug year, but the caribou are thriving.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

When we get right down to what ANWR is about to the Alaskan people, it is about economic opportunity; it is about real jobs for them. But I don't suggest that only my State is going to benefit, that the only reason we should open ANWR is so people in the State of Alaska can have jobs. This is jobs for the Nation. This is jobs for America.

By opening the Coastal Plain as intended by President Eisenhower, we would create hundreds of thousands of jobs nationwide, employ thousands of union and nonunion members in many States, and produce $2.1 billion in the first few years alone for the Federal Treasury.

Going back to the jobs I mentioned, it is not just Alaska. There was a study done in Alaska by probably the most reputable analyst in the State, the McDowell Group. They did an assessment of ANWR-developed-related employment throughout the United States. They base their numbers on $36-a-barrel oil. But given that price range throughout the 50 States, it is estimated that a total of 575,000 jobs would be created across the country.

We are talking today, tomorrow, and the following day about the President's economic stimulus plan, the economic growth plan. I am here to tell you, if we want economic growth, if we want economic stimulus, we need jobs. And 575,000 jobs across the country is nothing to shake a stick at.

It is not just jobs on the west coast. Just pick a number here. Pennsylvania: 27,000 jobs; Tennessee—the good Senator was here speaking earlier: 11,000 jobs are estimated to be available in Tennessee.

The sponsor of this amendment from California—California will see 63,000 jobs. The Senator from Washington was here earlier: 10,000 jobs in Washington.

You can go down the list. There is no State that somehow or other does not stand to gain if we are able to open ANWR.

You say, how are we really getting 10,000 jobs in Washington or 63,000 jobs in California? We are going to need the pipes, the valves, the drill bits, the trucks—everything else that goes along with drilling and opening a new field and connecting these pipes. So these are real.

It is not an accident that this is included in this budget resolution. It is part of the President's priority and agenda because this is about jobs.

Many of the unions across the country have truly identified this as a jobs issue and are working very hard on this

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

issue. To many of the families who are struggling, this is a family issue.

We talk about the caribou and we are concerned about the caribou and we care for the wildlife. But the fact is, you have to have money to buy your kids shoes and put food on the table, and only the jobs can provide that.

The jobs that will come will be real jobs with real wages for people in my State. To hear the opponents of ANWR talk, you would think that they want Alaska to be locked up and to be just this big, beautiful tourist attraction so they can come and visit. That is nice. We want to have visitors to our State. We want people to come up and see Prudhoe Bay. We want them to come and see the good job that we do.

But this thought process implies that they want California or Massachusetts or New York or other States to produce tangible items for our economy. The jobs Alaskan residents, my constituents, will get are carrying bags for these people when they come to visit as a tourist. Those are not the kinds of jobs that I want for my constituents. Those are not the kinds of jobs that Alaskans want. We want real jobs. We want the ability to create real jobs.

It is demeaning and it is unfair to say that Massachusetts can keep its 20,000 petroleum-based jobs; that New Jersey can keep its 27,000 petroleum-industry jobs; and New York can keep its 36,000 petroleum-industry jobs, while Alaska supposedly looks to other alternatives. Why is it OK for everybody else to do it, and yet in Alaska for some reason we are not responsible, we can't handle it, we don't do it right, we need to lock it up and preserve it because it is the last Serengeti?

By opening ANWR, we are trying to save the 11,000 petroleum-industry jobs that we have in Alaska. We want to provide other States with similar opportunities.

When it comes to resource development in Alaska, we are not looking to spoil the environment. We want the environmental safeguards. We want to make sure we do it right. We want to make sure that we, those of us who choose to live there, are going to continue to want to stay there because it is the quality of life that attracts us. We don't want to circumvent any environmental requirements or processes. We want to use the most safe and most clean and most expensive technology available to get this oil out of the ground.

I have lived my whole life in Alaska. I was born there. I am third generation. In fact I am the first person to represent Alaska in the Congress who was actually born in the

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

State. I was born during territorial days. I have no desire to see the environment of my State ruined.

My husband came to Alaska because he was attracted by the beauty of the State, by the fishing, by the wildlife. My husband and I are raising two sons who live for hunting and fishing and camping. This is why we are in Alaska. I would be the last person to suggest that we should do anything to ruin our environment.

But I have seen what we can do. I know we can do it right. And we can balance the development with the environment. They are not contradictory terms.

It is difficult to stand here as a new Senator and go over these arguments, but I cannot imagine what it must be like to stand in the senior Senator's shoes, and having had this argument and this discussion and this debate about opening ANWR for the past 20, 25 years, and to hear the same concerns and the same argument and the same discussion, and still our oil is locked up. It is a long time to be talking about this. It is a long time.

If we had been successful—actually, they were successful in 1995, when ANWR passed the Congress, but President Clinton vetoed that ANWR legislation in 1995. If he had not vetoed that, the oil from ANWR would soon be on its way down the existing Alaska oil pipeline in time for who knows what lies ahead.

I have mentioned we have a lot to look forward to in the years ahead, and it is not necessarily an oil-based economy. We have mentioned that the President's initiative, the hydrogen initiative to power our cars, is out there. We are looking forward to that. But we have also talked about the need to continue with our oil reserves for all those other resources and products that we have out there.

I have not touched on the desire, the concern, the request from Alaskans. Alaskans are looking at ANWR and saying: Well, wait a minute. Why is it so difficult? If we are willing to accept the development in our State, why can't we move forward with this?

We listen very well and very closely to the arguments and concerns in other locales. In the Midwest, right now, they are saying: No, don't drill in the Great Lakes. We don't want to do that. And I would say: If you don't want drilling in the Great Lakes, and you are the people who live there, and you say, no, we don't want it in our area, then, no, there is no need to go there.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

But in Alaska, we have said: We accept it. We want it. We are here to help. Yet we are being turned down. We are being refused. We are being blocked by outside interests that seem to think they know better than Alaskans about what we need to do.

In Alaska, we do not have this NIMBY syndrome. We are saying: Put it in our backyard. We will accept it. We will be responsible stewards for this environment and for this resource. Let us help you.

We respect and defer to the opinions of those in other parts of the country who do not want drilling near them. All that we ask is that same deference be afforded to us.

I agree with many of my colleagues that we need to increase our use of renewable fuel sources. We have had some good discussions with several Senators about biodiesel, ethanol. But the Senators from those States also need to recognize that in order to grow the crops necessary to make these renewable fuels, they are going to need fertilizers.

Fertilizers come from natural gas. I have been talking, for most of the evening, about oil. But we need to also keep in mind that ANWR has vast deposits of natural gas, as much as 10 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that could be used to mitigate the unusually high natural gas prices we are seeing.

Yesterday we received a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation. In it the Farm Bureau requests support of environmentally sound energy development in ANWR and supports its inclusion in the Senate budget resolution. They recognize it is critical, it is important, for the farmers of America. If they are going to get the fertilizer they need, they are going to need that natural gas from somewhere. They are projecting ahead; they are anticipating that demand, and asking that we assist with the supply. And ANWR can assist with the supply.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter from the American Farm Bureau be printed in the *Record*.

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

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2003.

Hon. LISA A. MURKOWSKI,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MURKOWSKI: The American Farm Bureau Federation requests that you support environmentally sound energy development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and support its inclusion in the Senate Budget Resolution.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

America's farmers and ranchers utilize numerous energy sources in the most efficient ways possible to grow the products that help feed and clothe the world. Current world circumstances have clearly pointed out this nation's over-reliance of foreign sources to meet our energy needs. American agriculture will spend from $1–2 billion more this year than last and that is just to complete the planting season and to get a crop in the ground. The instability of current energy prices negatively affects each and every aspect of agricultural production. From the fuel we use directly to the natural gas that is turned into fertilizer for crops to the diesel used in the locomotives and barges to transport agricultural commodities to processors and consumers; we are all reliant on affordable energy.

A balanced national energy agenda, complete with new technology advancements, renewable energy allowances and a significant increase in the domestic production of oil and gas supplies will help meet the energy needs of America's growing economy and population while providing a more reliable, affordable and environmentally responsible energy supply.

AFBF supports the environmentally sound energy development in ANWR and urges you to oppose any attempt to remove this language from the budget resolution.

Sincerely,

BOB STALLMAN,
President.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I was commenting a moment ago about the desire or the willingness of Alaskans to take on ANWR development, that we are receptive to it. Earlier, on the floor this evening, the good Senator from California mentioned, and I believe had printed in the *Record*, a statement of opposition to drilling from a tribal entity. I have not seen that. I am not certain from where it came.

But I would like to also have in the *Record* that the Alaska Federation of Natives, which is the federation of all the Natives in the State of Alaska, has passed a resolution in support of the opening of ANWR and urging the Congress "to adopt legislation to open the Coastal Plain area of ANWR to an environmentally responsible program of oil and gas leasing and development." I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the *Record*.

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

ALASKA FEDERATION OF NATIVES, INC., BOARD OF DIRECTORS, RESOLUTION 95–05

Whereas, the members of the Alaska Congressional Delegation, as representatives of the people and in their capacity as newly elected Chairmen of the Senate and House Committees having jurisdiction over matters related to Alaska Native people and the management of the energy and natural resources on public lands, have requested the Alaska Federation of Natives' Board of Directors to adopt a resolution in support of the opening of the Coastal Plain; and

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Whereas, the Governor of the State of Alaska has requested the Alaska Federation of Natives' Board of Directors to adopt a resolution in support of the opening of the Coastal Plain of ANWR, with a proviso for the protection of the Porcupine Caribou Herd and the subsistence needs for the Native people of Alaska; and

Whereas, the Alaska State Legislature has adopted a resolution calling upon the U.S. Congress to adopt legislation that would open the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to responsible oil and gas leasing and development, with protection for the Porcupine Caribou Herd and the subsistence needs for the Native people of Alaska; and

Whereas, North Slope oil production has declined from more than two million BD in 1990, to less than 1.6 million BD today; and

Whereas, revenues from oil production have been providing about 85 percent of the State's revenues to fund programs to meet the educational, social welfare, and other needs of Alaska's people; and

Whereas, the small 1.5 million acre Coastal Plain study area of ANWR, adjacent of Prudhoe Bay and other producing fields is the nation's best prospect for major new oil and gas discoveries; and

Whereas, opening the Coastal Plain area to an environmentally responsible and carefully regulated program of environmental oil and gas leasing would provide important revenue benefits to the U.S. and to the State of Alaska; and

Whereas, opening the Coastal Plain will create new jobs for Alaska Native people, new contracting opportunities for Native-owned companies, and stimulate the State's local and regional economies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the Board of Directors of the Alaska Federation of Natives calls upon the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation to open the Coastal Plain area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to an environmentally responsible program of oil and gas leasing and development.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, this is, obviously, an issue that generates a lot of passion. We have seen that on the floor this evening. It has generated a lot of facts and figures. I would caution people to look critically at the facts. Make sure they add up.

We have heard discussion from a couple of different individuals tonight about the amount of oil that is out there. And is it a 6-month supply? And, if so, we surely should not open up ANWR.

As was pointed out by my fellow Senator from Alaska, that is assuming there is no other source produced domestically or used domestically. It is an overt effort to skew the facts to one side's advantage.

In a debate such as this, it is critical that we know that our facts are sound, that our science is sound. So I ask people not to be swayed by the emotion. Caribou are beautiful animals, but I can tell you, we are caring for the caribou, our caribou are doing fine, our caribou are multiplying at a wondrous rate, and they are doing it around the areas of development.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

So it is important to try to show the rest of the country what ANWR is. But keep in mind, these little, tiny brief snapshots of a flowered field, with beautiful mountains in the background, are not where the 1002 area is that we are intending to drill. We are intending to drill an area that is the size of the Pinehurst Golf Resort in North Carolina, in an area that looks like the Moon.

I appreciate the hour. I appreciate the attention to this issue because in my State there is nothing more important that is happening. I would certainly encourage my colleagues tomorrow to listen intently to the debate.

I hope we move forward on oil and gas exploration along Alaska's Coastal Plain and oppose the Boxer amendment.

Mark Pryor

THURSDAY, *February 27, 2003*

Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue that is important to many people throughout the State of Arkansas and indeed throughout this country. I rise to express my disappointment with the budget as it pertains to law enforcement programs and, in particular, community policing.

I believe the budget shortchanges smaller communities and grossly underfunds programs that have put more police officers on the street, reduced crime in rural areas, curbed drug abuse, and put at-risk youth back on the right track.

Mr. President, this budget cuts funding to the Community Oriented Policing Services—known by its acronym COPS—by 85 percent. That is 85 percent. This program was funded at $1.1 billion in fiscal year 2002. President Bush proposes only $164 million for the COPS Program in fiscal year 2004. The administration's budget request for COPS represents a 100-percent cut to the COPS Universal Hiring Program, and a 100-percent cut to the "COPS in School" Program. In fact, the only program that is funded under this budget is the COPS technology program, and even that has been cut by 66 percent.

From its inception, COPS has awarded just over $8 billion to local and State law enforcement agencies across the country. With grant money, departments have hired over 110,000 community police officers, in addition to purchasing technological upgrades and equipment.

The COPS Program was established to focus on crime prevention and community engagement. This breaks with traditional notions of law enforcement by moving from reactive responses to proactive problem solving, focusing on the causes of crime and disorder. Community-oriented policing requires much more interaction on the neighborhood and community level than previous policing efforts.

In Arkansas, we have been able to hire over 1,300 additional officers with the $83 million we have received. We

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

have also used that money to combat methamphetamine use and to implement the COPS Program in schools.

A February 3 article in the *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*, my State's largest newspaper, stated the reason given by this administration for cutting funding is that COPS has "not produced conclusive results in lowering crime."

I speak today not only as a Senator, but also as the former chief law enforcement officer of Arkansas, and I wholeheartedly disagree with this administration's assessment of these very important programs.

I have worked closely with law enforcement officers of my State to make Arkansas a safer place and a better place to raise a family. They are strong leaders in their communities and demonstrate the character and the courage that define us as a nation. Together, we are able to keep over 1,000 criminals off the street due to their work on the front lines.

Oftentimes, these police officers work in smaller rural communities. They operate under tighter budgets with smaller staffs than most of their urban counterparts. Nonetheless, they put their lives on the line every single day. They make real differences in people's lives, and they do it with professionalism and an attitude of public service. They do it because it is the right thing to do. They do not do it because it is easy or because it is pleasant, and, Lord knows, they do not do it for the money. They are not asking for much in return.

I wish to take this time to thank all law enforcement officials for the work they do. I especially thank Sheriff Marty Montgomery of Faulkner County, Sheriff Ron Ball of Hot Spring County, and Sheriff Chuck Lange of the Arkansas Sheriffs' Association. They are in Washington today as part of their national association's meeting. I thank them not only for their commitment to public service and to keeping our communities safer—combined they have 87 years of law enforcement experience—but I also thank them for sharing with me their insights into the COPS Program and helping to demonstrate just how important the program is to them and other local law enforcement.

You see, Mr. President, to them, this funding could mean the difference between life and death. This past Saturday at 7:30 p.m., Faulkner County sheriff's deputy, Brad Brocker, was called to investigate a suspicious person call in a high drug-use area. When Deputy Brocker arrived on the scene, he was met with three bullets to the heart in the upper chest. Luckily, he was wearing his bulletproof vest, but he risked his life to make his community and, yes, even his Nation, safer and better. But there is more to the story.

The Kevlar vest he was wearing was paid for by Federal grant money, and Deputy Brocker was originally hired as a deputy under the COPS Program. Putting this Federal money back into our communities works. In fact, Faulkner County, with its 90,000 citizens and spanning 700 square miles, has used COPS funding to hire 12 officers in the past few years. Twelve may not sound like a lot, but it constitutes half of the Faulkner County sheriff's police force. It has made a difference.

In the last 7 years, the arrest rates for burglary, robbery, and methamphetamine production have all gone up. Any one of my colleagues who lives in a rural State can surely tell you about their problems with the use and the production of methamphetamine. It has become an epidemic throughout rural America.

Last year alone, the Faulkner County Sheriff's Office seized 44 labs and shut them down for good. Sheriff Montgomery is proud of that accomplishment, as he should be, but he warns that by cutting law enforcement programs, such as COPS, the steps they have taken forward will be lost, and they cannot sustain the manpower and law enforcement presence in their county.

I believe we have a duty to support legislation, programs, and budgets to address the challenges facing law enforcement agencies in rural areas in Arkansas and all across the country, in communities such as Malvern, a small city in southwest Arkansas. Richard Taft is the police chief of the Malvern Police Department. Mr. Taft has 32 years of experience in law enforcement and 10 years as Malvern's police chief. When Chief Taft took over in 1993, the Malvern police force consisted of 14 people responsible for protecting a city of over 10,000 citizens. As Chief Taft put it to me one day: I didn't have enough officers to protect my officers, much less the citizens of Malvern.

In 1993, according to Chief Taft, crime was rampant. Robberies, drive-by shootings, and burglaries occurred on a weekly basis. Since instituting the COPS Program and utilizing its grant funding, crime is down. The Malvern police force today is 22 people strong. With the additional manpower, Malvern has assembled a special crime team with the ability to respond to critical incidents, including chemical spills and missing persons. They did not have that ability before. COPS funding has allowed the Malvern Police Depart-

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

ment to free up some of their money for other necessities, such as computers and radios.

Chief Taft says: "Without the COPS Program, I wouldn't have a police force."

Yet this administration says there is no conclusive evidence that the COPS Program works? I disagree with that. More important, there are scores of law enforcement officials who would also stand up to dispute that claim.

In 1993, Little Rock, AR, had the highest violent crime rate per capita in the country. By working with the Federal Government, using the COPS Program, and their own additional hires, the Little Rock Police Department bolstered their force and violent crime has dropped by 60 percent.

Chuck Lange, the head of the Arkansas Sheriffs' Association, knows the significant impact the COPS Program has had statewide—and I am sure sheriffs in other States can tell you the same thing—by putting more police officers on the street. He knows that more officers have helped shorten response time. That is especially important in sprawling rural communities. He knows that time is not a luxury afforded to crime victims. I know it as well. It may be because my grandfather, my great-grandfather, and my great-great-grandfather were all sheriffs of Ouachita County.

Hot Spring Sheriff Ron Ball told me that in his county the COPS Program has enabled him to direct more time and resources to curbing domestic violence.

He knows that if his department doesn't do a better job of protecting the abused, they have nowhere else to turn.

And these law enforcement officers all know and have all told me that if we let these drastic COPS funding cuts stand, rural America will suffer.

The list of law enforcement officials opposed to these cuts is long, but the opposition is not only limited to law enforcement. There are many mayors, community activists, and school administrators who also realize the importance of this program; school administrators like Dr. Benny Gooden.

Dr. Gooden is the superintendent of schools in Fort Smith, AR. He oversees 26 schools with 12,500 students. Dr. Gooden knows how successful the COPS in Schools Program has been. He knows that COPS is an asset to this community and to his schools. The presence of friendly, approachable police officers, known as school resource officers, on their campuses and in their neighborhoods has had a calming effect on Fort Smith schools.

Since the implementation of the COPS Program in Fort Smith schools, Dr. Gooden has witnessed a decline in violent incidents. Over the past few years suspensions have decreased by 65 percent. Expulsions have been reduced by 80 percent. The drop-out rate has been cut in half.

When talking about the positive effect of the COPS in Schools Program, Dr. Gooden calls it a powerful relationship; a win-win for both the schools and the community. Because the police officers are in the community and in the schools and are connected to the students and their families, officers can better identify and proactively defuse any potential problems there may be.

Oftentimes problems that are found in schools begin in the neighborhood and in the home. Police officers in Fort Smith recognize this and are in a better position to resolve such problems.

Dr. Gooden has also witnessed, first-hand, the affirmative impact of this program on a child's educational experience. The officers interact with students. Some officers have offices in the schools. They are invited to school activities. These officers do not just show up when there is trouble, they are positive role models for Fort Smith's children and are involved in their lives. They spend time with students and in the community when there is no trouble and that presence can make all the difference.

These positive results are not limited to Fort Smith nor are they only appreciated by the administrators. As Arkansas Attorney General, I spent a lot of time in schools talking to our young people, and more importantly, listening. Over and over the students told me how much they liked having school resource officers on campus. It made them feel safer, it provided a needed role model and it oftentimes provided an adult they could talk to. It showed our children that their community cared about them and gave them a much better perspective on law enforcement.

We must also not forget the importance of these police officers as an integral part of our homeland defense and as first responders in the case of terrorist attacks. September 11 changed a lot of things for our country. It woke us to the need of genuine partnerships that involve all segments of our communities, and all levels of government. We all have a role in keeping our community safe, and overall when we talk about homeland security, we need to give serious thought to our law enforcement needs.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Unfortunately, we saw how September 11 strained the resources, and the budgets, of many towns and cities. The administration's law enforcement budget does not help that problem. Our civilian authorities must be able to respond to whatever may confront them in the future, but how can they properly respond, when they are given a budget that cuts deep into their existence? The irony is that I have heard Secretary Ridge speak many times about how important local law enforcement agencies are to homeland security, but at the very moment when our Nation needs them most, we are drastically cutting assistance to them.

The Federal Government must ensure that local governments are given the resources to complete their task and that we share the responsibilities for homeland security wisely and fairly. I know that Democrats and Republicans alike agree with this. I know Secretary Ridge agrees with this. I know that President Bush agrees with this.

President Bush said on February 20 regarding the 2003 omnibus appropriations that he was concerned that the Congress had failed to provide over $1 billion in funds for State and local law enforcement and emergency personnel. He went on to lament that the shortfall for homeland security first responder programs was more than $2.2 billion.

For the record, I share President Bush's concern, but shortchanging our local law enforcement efforts by underfunding the critical, popular and effective COPS Program is not the answer. I take a line from Chief Taft of the Malvern Police Department, who put it best when he said: "Doing away with the COPS Program, when we are so concerned with homeland security, is the wrong thing to do." I could not agree more.

Much is made of the word "hero." Before September 11, to pick up a magazine or to put on the television, hero was synonymous with professional athletes, movie stars, or musicians. But September 11 reminded us that real heroes are right in our own backyard. While everyone was rushing out of the World Trade Center, EMT, firefighters and police officers were rushing in. That is the definition of "hero."

Local law enforcement officers protect our communities, our homes and our families from the threat of violent crime. Simply put, they stand up for justice. I believe we must do more to stand up for them. They need funding to do their jobs properly and deliver the same quality service that our citizens expect and deserve, whether they live in New York City, or Des Arc, AR.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

During the upcoming budget debate, I will support increasing funding for the COPS Program and other law enforcement programs. I would urge my colleagues to do the same. I also plan to be a proud co-sponsor of Senator Joe Biden's legislation to reauthorize the COPS Program.

We need to build on what we know works and develop initiatives that respond to the law enforcement needs of our communities. The COPS Program works and deserves adequate funding. These communities who benefit from this program deserve it as well.

I yield the floor.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

John E. Sununu

WEDNESDAY, *February 5, 2003*

Mr. President, today I join my colleagues and millions around the world to express our enormous sorrow at the loss of the crew of the Space Shuttle *Columbia* and to extend sympathy to the crews' families and friends.

This tragedy, like the loss of the Space Shuttle *Challenger* 17 years ago, has left an empty space in our hearts. We struggle for the words that might help to make sense of the events we witnessed last Saturday.

A return to Earth that we have come to view as "routine," instead has reminded us of the fragility of life. We are all subject to the flaws of man and the vagaries of nature. Yet these seven brave men and women accepted great risk as they strove to expand the intellectual capital of all mankind.

For thousands of years, the heavens have inspired, intrigued, and called us to explore their boundaries. This unending quest for knowledge is the very essence of what makes us human. It is a flame that burns so bright. It burns so bright that not even the depth of this tragedy or the shock of our loss can quench the desire to learn, to seek and to explore.

There is no doubt in my mind that we will move forward to expand and strengthen America's space program. And through the investigation that has just begun, we will find out what caused this accident and then we will fix it. But today, we mourn for those whom we have lost and offer comfort to those who have been left behind.

The astronauts who fly the space shuttle are a unique and unparalleled breed of men and women. They inspire us with courage and intellect, and they sacrifice in service to their country and profession. But perhaps their greatest service of all is rendered when they reach out to future generations and plant the seeds of curiosity in a young student's mind.

I have visited classrooms in the company of astronauts to see faces of children alive with wonder and awe. Like any one of us, our children want to know what it is like in space,

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

what it is like to be a scientist, what it is like to be an explorer.

Seventeen years ago when the *Challenger* was lost, among the seven astronauts was a teacher from New Hampshire, Christa McAuliffe, who was dedicated to nurturing and inspiring students not just in New Hampshire but all across the country. Her spirit and enthusiasm has been captured for future generations in the Christa McAuliffe Planetarium in Concord, NH.

Each time I visit the planetarium, I am reminded that a child's curiosity grows into a lifetime search for answers to the great questions of our age. As long as we have astronauts to engage this curiosity, the quest for knowledge will endure and our space program will thrive.

Generations of Americans have been inspired by their courage and vision, but today, thoughts and prayers of millions are with the families and friends of *Columbia*'s crew. The sadness of this moment may well one day fade, but the memory of these seven heroic figures will remain forever strong.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

James M. Talent

FRIDAY, *August 1, 2003*

Mr. President, it is my pleasure to speak to the Senate today about a subject on which I have risen to speak before, a very important piece of legislation that I think has the potential to solve what is probably the No. 1 problem that small business people and their employees confront today. I am talking about the bill which I have co-sponsored along with Senator Snowe, who is the chairman of the Small Business Committee, and others. It is a bill to allow small business people to create association health plans.

This bill is not a government program. In a time of great deficits, it does not require us to spend any money. It is going to take a long step toward solving the problems of the uninsured, reducing the number of the uninsured, and getting working people better health insurance at less cost. It does not cost the taxpayers anything because all it does is allow people to work together and do for themselves, as small business people and employees of small businesses, what big companies and employees of big companies can already do.

Most people in the United States who have health insurance are a part of a big national pool—almost everybody is. You are either in Medicaid or Medicare or the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan or covered by a labor union plan or a multi-employer plan with a labor union or you work for a big company. If you are in any of those situations, you are covered by health insurance, and it is health insurance where you are a part of a big national pool.

The only people who are not in that situation are people who work for small businesses. I define that very broadly. That includes farmers. It includes people who are self-employed consultants operating out of their own home. They are in the small group market. They have to buy insurance. If they own or run a small business or a farm, they are buying insurance for small groups of people, 5 people or 10 people or 20 people or 25 people.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

Insurance works better when you spread the risk across as large a pool as possible. It doesn't take an advanced degree to understand that. All association health plans do—and it is very important what they do—is simply allow the employees of small businesses to get the same efficiencies and economies of scale that employees of big business already enjoy. All I would do is allow trade associations—the Farm Bureau, the NFIB, the Chamber of Commerce, the National Restaurant Association—to sponsor health insurance coverage nationally the same way the human resources side of a big company would do.

Let's take a big company such as Emerson Electric, a great company in Missouri, or Sprint, or Anheuser Busch, all headquartered there. They have a human resources side, an employee benefits side. They contract with insurance companies nationally; they may have a self-insured side. Then their employees all over the country can enjoy an option in different plans as part of pools of 5 or 10 or 20 or 30,000 people. The administrative costs of such plans are much lower because they are spread across a much wider base of employees. They have much greater purchasing power and negotiating power when dealing with the big insurance companies. They have the competitive possibilities of self-insurance. So insurance is better in that situation and it costs less.

It doesn't mean they don't have problems, but you are a lot better off there than you would be and are right now if you are struggling as a small business owner or the employee of a small business.

Of the 44 million people uninsured in the country, about two-thirds either own a small business or work for a small business or are dependents of somebody who owns or works for a small business. I am including farmers. Then there are tens of millions of other people who may have health insurance through a small business, but it is barebones health insurance. It is not what it should be because the costs are so high, and they are going up every year.

There is a human side to this. Senators who have not done this—I imagine most Senators have—go out and talk to people who work in small businesses or run small businesses. I guarantee you, they will tell you the No. 1 problem they are confronting, short and long term, is the rising cost of health insurance and increasing unavailability. This hits people where they live.

We have had too many layoffs in Missouri. We have lost more jobs in Missouri in a 1-year period than any other

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

State. There are a lot of bad results connected with the layoff, obviously. But I think maybe the first that hits a family when they lose a job or are concerned about losing a job, particularly if it is a family with kids, is: What about my health insurance? What do I do for that? It is as important as people's wages.

Folks in the small business sector, employees of people in the small business sector have labored too long in a market that does not work. It is dominated by a few companies, and they are acting more and more like monopolists, raising prices higher and higher, providing fewer and fewer services, less and less quality insurance. We need to do something about it. We can do it, if this Senate will pass association health plans. It passed in the House by 100 votes last month—strong bipartisan support. It has passed several years in a row in the House. The President supports it. We in the Senate ought to pass it.

I fought on the floor of the Senate for it. I will continue to do so. It is a great bill. We have great sponsors. We will take up the debate again in the fall. I am very hopeful we can pass it.

It is no secret—and Senators know this because I have been talking to them and I know how strongly they are being lobbied on both sides, lobbied in opposition to association health plans. Who is at the core of the lobbying effort against association health plans? It is the Blue Cross Insurance Company. It is no secret why. Blue Cross is dominant in many States. It is one of the few big insurance companies in almost every State that currently provides health insurance to small businesses. They have a big stake in not having association health plans enter the market to compete. It would be a huge competitive force. It would take business away from them or cause them to lower their prices in order to keep the business.

I don't begrudge them or anybody else their opportunities or rights to lobby on legislation that comes before this Senate. They have lobbied. They spent $4.3 million last year on lobbyists. I don't know how much of that was spent on association health plans. We do know this is the No. 1 priority for that company—to stop this bill. We can all infer why. I don't begrudge them that. But the debate ought to be done honestly, and it ought to be done within the limits of fair play. That is not happening. I want the Senate to know about it.

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

First, I said it is not being done within the limits of honesty. The No. 1 charge being brought against association health plans is not only not true, it is exactly the inversion of the truth. It is exactly the opposite of the truth. If you want to fool somebody, tell them something that not only isn't true but is the opposite of the truth. Try and sell them on that.

The No. 1 charge against association health plans is that they would result in cherry picking; that is, that small businesses that are healthy would want to go into the association health plans; small businesses with employees who are sick would not want to go into association health plans. That is the exact opposite of the truth. I think everybody who currently is trapped in the small group market is going to want to be a part of an association health plan. Who would not want to get insurance through a big national pool as opposed to a small group of 5 or 10 people, if you could do it? It is simply economics—more efficient operation, better operation, lower costs for everybody. By our estimates, it will lower costs for small business, on average, 10 to 20 percent and reduce the number of uninsured by millions. It will provide good quality health insurance to others who right now are laboring with bare-bones insurance because the market is so difficult. Everybody is going to benefit. The people who will benefit especially are people who are trapped in small groups where somebody has become sick.

I have talked about this subject and toured scores and scores of small businesses. I have brought up this charge of cherry picking. I say to people: If you had a history of medical problems and you had a choice of working for a big company which provides health insurance the way an association health plan would or, on the other hand, working for a small company which is trapped in this small group market and that was all you knew about the two opportunities—big company, national pool; small company, small group market—and you were sick, for which one would you want to work? I have never had a single person say: I want to work for the small business; I think I am going to get better health insurance there.

One of the big competitive advantages big businesses have over small businesses is that generally they offer better health insurance. Everybody in the job market knows it. I have had a lot of small business people tell me: We have lost employees to big companies on the health insurance issue. We have not been able to hire people we want because they

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

went to work for a big company because they thought they would get better health insurance.

I don't begrudge the larger companies. But why should small businesses and their employees not have the same opportunities? This will benefit everybody in the small business market, but it is going to benefit most the people who are ill, or employers who are struggling along with people who are ill and are doing the best they can to provide good health insurance.

Here is another reason it is not association health plans that will cherry pick. The legislation requires that they take everybody, all comers. Must offer/must carry. Join the association and you get the health insurance. They cannot screen you out because you have somebody who has cancer or heart disease or something like that.

Mr. President, it is the big interest companies now who are cherry picking. Just talk to people who run small businesses. When somebody in their business gets sick and files a claim, their rates get jacked up or they get canceled. Everybody knows it. I could give a lot of examples. One example is Janet Poppen, a small business owner from St. Louis. Like many small business owners, she wants to do right by her five employees, so she tries to provide them health insurance. How many hours and hours does Janet and people like her spend just on the administrative details? It is hours they need to spend running their small business.

If we had an association health plan, they would join the trade association, and the trade association has done all that work. It just sends them the papers and they sign up their employees. She had health insurance through Blue Cross/Blue Shield, and one of her employees had the temerity to get sick with non-Hodgkins lymphoma. As soon as she started getting treatment for the cancer, Janet's premiums increased by 16 percent. That is on top of the substantial premium increases that had occurred the year before. Her premiums had gone up 35 percent over 2 years.

This is not an uncommon story. Everywhere I go, small businesses say that premiums are going up 15, 20, 25 percent a year, doubling over 3 years, going up by a third over 2 years. That happened to Janet Poppen, and she is insured by Blue Cross. They are the ones cherry picking. Association health plans are the remedy, and to say otherwise is the exact opposite of the truth.

One other point, and then I will close. I have trespassed on the Senate's time enough. We ought not to turn this de-

(Trim Line)
(Trim Line)

bate, which is one of the most important ones we are going to have in the Senate, into a sweepstakes. Blue Cross is doing that. They have sponsored a Web site. There are other problems as well, but on that Web site they have a sweepstakes. You can enter the sweepstakes to win a trip to Washington for four people, and they will give you $300 cash on top of it. Do you know what you have to do to enter the sweepstakes? You have to click on the place where you can send an e-mail to your Congressman and Senator opposing association health plans. Then you get in the sweepstakes. Then you get a chance to win a trip to Washington—if you will just click on the e-mail and send a letter to Washington opposing association health plans. You don't get anything if you send in a letter supporting association health plans. I will show the Senate where it says enter to win.

Here is a chart, and this is the Web site now. It says that you can make your voice heard by sending a free fax to Congress. That is what they tell people. They don't tell you what the fax is about, that the fax has to oppose association health plans and support their business interests. Then they have some misrepresentations about association health plans.

Go to the third chart. This is what you get if you do it. At least you have a chance at this. It is a drawing. The grand prize is a trip for four to Washington, DC, including round-trip coach class air transportation at the U.S. airport nearest the winner's home, double occupancy, standard hotel accommodations, two rooms, a 4-hour Washington, DC, bus tour, shuttle bus airport transfers, and a total of $300 in spending money. It has an approximate retail value of $4,000.

All you have to do is join Blue Cross, sending in an e-mail opposing the association health plans. You don't get to join if you decide you want to support them. You don't get a chance at the sweepstakes then.

I always encourage people to contact their Congressmen and Senators. I like it when people contact me, even if they disagree with me on something. That gives me a chance to write back and explain my position. I have had great exchanges with constituents that way. But we ought not to give people a monetary incentive one way or another because that means the opinions we are getting are not unnecessarily unbiased, are they?

I don't blame anybody who wants a shot at a $4,000 trip and participates in a sweepstakes in order to get it. But I sure blame the people who have sponsored that Web site and

(Trim Line)

(Trim Line)

are distorting the debate on this serious issue before the Senate. And this is a serious issue.

There are millions and millions of people in this country who don't have health insurance and who need it. Most of them are stuck in a market that isn't working and is dominated by a few competitors, and we have a chance to change that. It doesn't even cost the taxpayers anything. I hope we can do it. They have done it in the House with a bipartisan vote. I hope we can do it in the Senate. At the very least, we need a debate that is conducted honestly, conducted fairly, and that doesn't turn health care into a sweepstakes. I hope after this we will have it.

I yield the floor.