The president himself must make the argument, or all else is in vain. If he is unwilling to risk his political capital and his presidency to undo the damage of the past eight years, then in the fire next time his name will be linked with that of his predecessor, and there it will stay forever.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask consent I be given 10 minutes to address the Senate.

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

OFF-SHORE DRILLING

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong opposition to oil and gas exploration off the coast of Florida. Specifically, the issue at hand is the sale of Lease Sale 181. I am certainly not alone. There are 16 million Floridians who join in this opposition. Senator BOB GRAHAM as well, Florida State elected officials, certainly the legislature of Florida and most of the Florida congressional delegation opposes any drilling in Lease Sale 181.

Lease Sale 181 may not be included in the current moratorium on lease sales off the coast of Florida, but in the hearts of all Floridians it is part of the moratorium. Moreover, there has never been a production drilling rig actually producing off the coast of Florida because Floridians unequivocally oppose offshore drilling because of the threat it presents to the State's greatest natural and economic resource: our coastal environment.

Florida's coastal waters provide an irreplaceable link in the life cycle of many species, both marine and terrestrial. Florida's beaches, fisheries, and wildlife draw millions of tourists each year from around the globe, supporting our State's largest industry, tourism. Florida's commercial fishing industry relies on these estuaries as nurseries for the most commercially harvested fish. Nearly 90 percent of the reef fish resources of the Gulf of Mexico are caught on the West Florida Shelf and contribute directly to Florida's economy.

Oil spills would be devastating to Florida's beaches, coastal waters, reefs, and fisheries. The chronic pollution and discharges from drilling would detrimentally effect the shallow, clean water marine communities found on the Florida outer continental shelf. For these reasons, I cannot sit back and watch as my State, one of our nation's environmental jewels, is degraded.

I know some may have differing views because other issues or concerns consume their constituents; and I respect those views. However, in Florida the environment and tourism are of paramount importance. The beaches, the abundant fisheries, and the pristine waters make Florida what it is today; and the people of Florida want it to stay that way. Just as drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would not solve the administration's claimed energy crisis, drilling in Lease Sale 181 will not either. Increased conservation and increased fuel efficiency in our cars would do more to meet our country's energy needs than drilling in Lease Sale 181. For these reasons, I must adamantly object to and vigorously oppose the sale of Lease Sale 181; and I hope the rest of this body listens to the pleas of Floridians.

All of the oil and gas that would come out of this proposed lease sale would only give about 2 months worth of energy for the country. That is simply not a viable tradeoff for the damage it would do to our economy and our environment. We are not willing to make that tradeoff in Florida. As a matter of fact, as you talk about drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, isn't it interesting. If you put it into the context of all the barrels of oil that are projected to be pumped from that wildlife refuge, that energy consumption could be replaced if we but increased all new vehicles in their energy efficiency by 3 miles per gallon. That puts the crisis in context.

Conservation is considerably important. The use of research and development to produce more energy-efficient appliances, more energy-efficient automobiles—there is no reason why this country that has the technological prowess cannot produce a car that is economical and that will get 80 miles per gallon. We have that within our grasp. Think what that would do to our energy consumption.

As a matter of fact, when you look at the uses of energy by this Nation, the transportation sector is the sector that consumes most of that energy. Just think what future energy-efficient automobiles could do for us.

But that is a subject of larger proportions. Today, I rise on behalf of a State that has ecologically pristine beaches and the need to be kept just that way. This proposed lease sale for oil and gas drilling clearly jeopardizes the future economy and ecology of Florida.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SENATE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, just prior to the Easter recess, the Senate completed action on the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution. I voted in favor of final passage of the budget resolution, recognizing that it does not reflect everything that I wanted. However, I am thankful the Senate-passed resolution does contain a fair amount of what President Bush had originally proposed in his budget plan.

Nevertheless, it is my hope that when the Senate does go to conference with the House—which has passed a more stringent budget resolution—the end result will yield a budget resolution more in-tune with the President's more responsible package.

As it was originally put forward, I felt the Bush budget plan provided much of the fiscal responsibility I have long sought from Washington prior to, and since, becoming a Member of the Senate. Specifically, it restrains the growth of spending, reduces the debt as fast as is prudent, and allows for meaningful tax cuts. This is what I like to refer to as a ''three-legged stool'' approach. For this package to work, however, we have to insist on a balanced approach, because fiscal responsibility, like a three-legged stool, cannot stand if one leg is significantly longer or shorter than the others.

Unfortunately, if we characterized the Senate budget resolution as a three-legged stool, it would be rather wobbly right now since under the Senate budget resolution, discretionary spending increases at 8 percent, and that is double the amount the President suggested.

People often forget the President's proposal increased spending by a modest 4 percent at a time when inflation is approximately 2.8 percent, meaning it contains a real increase of 1.2 percent. In contrast, the Senate budget resolution, in real terms, results in a spending increase of 5.2 percent. That is a 333-percent higher rate of growth than what the President proposes.

These increases may sound like small numbers in the grand scheme of things, or in the Senate, but do not be fooled. It adds up to tens and hundreds of billions of dollars in more spending over time.

If we continue to spend money at this rate, we will have less resources to address important national needs, such as reforming Social Security, reforming Medicare, or providing a prescription drug benefit.

Indeed, according to calculations by the Concord Coalition, the Senate budget resolution includes new and expanded entitlement spending that is going to cost $600 billion over 10 years, and discretionary spending that may total $240 billion over 10 years.

Coupled with the resulting increased interest cost of $550 billion, this package of amendments to the budget resolution could reduce the on-budget surplus by $1.4 trillion over 10 years.

I say to my colleagues, enough is enough. We have to stop this rampant

spending and, instead, prioritize what we ought to be doing with the taxpayers' money. We need to sit down and make some hard choices about where to allocate taxpayers' money, where we want to increase spending, where we want to make cuts or maybe where we want to flat-fund.

For example, with regard to the National Institutes of Health, the President has included a generous increase in the amount of money that the NIH will receive in its budget, boosting NIH spending $2.8 billion. That is a 13.8 percent increase. The Senate, not wanting to be outdone, added an additional $700 million in NIH funding. Therefore, under the Senate's plan, NIH funding will be increased 17.2 percent over last year. In other words, the Senate wants to boost the rate of spending increase some 25 percent faster than the President.

Do I think we should spend money on important health research? Absolutely. But how much is enough?

The true cost is not just the dollar figure, it is what you give up, or what you could have purchased with that money. Economists call the concept ''opportunity cost.'' When the Senate thinks about spending money on one thing, we need to recognize that we are giving up the ability to use the money for other worthy purposes.

If we follow through with the Senate's budget resolution, that means we will have fewer funds to conduct necessary Medicare reform, undertake education efforts aimed at preventive health care, provide greater access to rural health care, or fully fund the social services block grant.

Think about the social services block grant for a moment. Congress promised a funding stream of $2.8 billion for this program, but funding has actually eroded $1 billion over the past 6 years. I hear a lot about that from our county commissioners in the State of Ohio.

What most people do not realize is the fact that funds from the social services block grant go towards providing health care services for children, prenatal to age 3.

There are tough choices and dilemmas: Do you give more to NIH to fight disease, or do you give more money to the social services block grant, a program that gives children the nutrition and health services they need so they do not develop the diseases that the NIH is trying to fight?

Another thing we need to remember in figuring opportunity costs is the fact that we have a number of unmet Federal needs—needs that are a Federal responsibility, and which we should address as part of our full and balanced approach to the Federal budget.

Do we spend Federal dollars on school construction, which is a State and local responsibility, or do we prevent flood and storm damage from ravaging people's lives? As former chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee, I personally know we have $39 billion of water resources development projects that the Army Corps of Engineers needs to fund, and yet we only provide $1.3 billion each year for such projects. Let's get serious. We will never deal with that backlog at this rate.

Addressing such unmet needs does not sound important until there is a flood situation such as the folks along the Mississippi River are enduring right at this very moment.

In addition, we have serious unmet needs in our Nation's wastewater treatment and sewer infrastructure. The costs are going up astronomically in the State of Ohio to comply with mandates from the U.S. EPA for sewer and water treatment. We have a responsibility to participate in helping to alleviate those costs.

My point is this: We should allocate our financial resources on a very deliberate and prioritized basis and make the hard choices instead of the reckless last-minute spending that has often characterized the Senate over the last 3 years.

I cannot believe what the Senate has done the last couple of years. I cannot believe it. If I as a Governor or as a mayor or as a member of a board of county commissioners spent money the way we did during the last couple of years, they would have run me out of office very quickly.

I would remind my colleagues that just last year alone, we increased nondefense discretionary authority by an astounding 14.3 percent. Think about it. This is unsustainable. In my view, we need to stiffen our backbones and bring an end to this spending habit. Families need to carefully budget their resources. So do cities and States, and so, too, should the Federal Government.

It is one of the reasons I wanted to get two points of order agreed to in the budget resolution to prevent further game playing with tax dollars. One point of order I offered would have helped stop abuses of emergency spending, and another would have prevented ''directed scoring,'' a process used to circumvent the budget process.

I am glad 51 Senators joined me and my cosponsors, Senators GREGG and FEINGOLD, in supporting this measure. It is my hope the next time we will get the 60 votes we need for adoption.

I also wanted to offer an amendment that would have extended and strengthened the current caps on discretionary spending. Unfortunately, that amendment would never have passed muster due to the excessive spending in the amendments of the budget resolution. We blew that out before I even had a chance to bring it up.

While the Senate's version of the budget resolution did not do enough, in my opinion, to keep spending in check, the silver lining is the fact that it provides for two tax cuts. I am hopeful, therefore, that we can, first, get this budget resolution to conference and that it emerges looking more fiscally responsible and that the conferees pare-down the spending; and second, that the Finance Committee begins work immediately on developing an $85 billion tax cut which I call a ''balloon-payment'' approach, using the fiscal year 2001 on-budget surplus.

I suggest this money go toward an immediate fiscal stimulus in the form of a cut in marginal rates; a cut that people will see in their paychecks directly through a change in their withholding.

We need to get the money in the people's hands right now. If we are serious about getting this reduction in marginal rates done soon, I honestly think we could get legislation considered and passed in the Senate and the House and on the President's desk by Memorial Day and the American people could see the benefits this summer. Let's get it done.

I think we are all agreed that something needs to be done to restore people's faith in the economy and bolster consumer optimism. It is at the lowest level in my State since 1992. In my view, the balloon payment is probably one of the best ways to show the doubting Thomases that the money is there and that we are doing something in Congress to address the issue. Further, I believe we need to enact a long-term marginal rate tax reduction as proposed by the President, which economists say will have a tremendous impact on stimulating our economy.

Given our economic situation, we in Congress need to follow a balanced three-legged stool approach. If we can control the growth of spending, reduce the debt and achieve quick passage of a balloon payment and implement both a long-term and short-term marginal tax cut, it will give a gigantic boost to consumer confidence and help us return to economic normalcy. We can quibble about how to distribute the balloon payment. Let's just work it out. The main thing is, get it done and connect to it a true marginal rate tax reduction.

However, there is one thing that I fear could torpedo any recovery and that is our inability to address our Nation's energy crisis. While we have already seen unprecedented home heating bills this past winter, I am concerned the worst is yet to come. Indeed, we are already seeing gasoline prices move toward the $2-per-gallon range, and it is far from the peak summer driving season. What's more, the cost of energy is skyrocketing and supplies are scarce or unreliable. We can expect California's problems to intensify and likely be duplicated in other areas across the Nation.

It is not as if we didn't see this coming. The storm clouds have been brewing for many years. Still, there has been no action on the part of Congress to consider a comprehensive energy policy along the lines of what Senator MURKOWSKI has proposed in his bill, S. 388. I fear if we don't get moving, we will not get that done, either.

We need to act on these issues quickly. The American people are watching to see if we intend to bring this Nation out of our economic downturn and back on the road to economic prosperity, or if we are going to continue to fiddle around while the country burns. I hear that from the folks back in Ohio: ''You are fiddling around in the Senate, and you are not getting anything done. Don't you understand how bad it is on the street?''

They want us to make the hard choices about spending. They want us to work together to develop solutions to our energy crisis, to pay down our debt, and provide quick and measurable tax relief. They want us to put aside the partisan bickering and the gamesmanship and act in the best interests of the Nation. After all, that is what they think they elected us to do.

We need to act in the spirit of the old Rogers and Hammerstein song from Carousel—many remember that—''You'll Never Walk Alone,'' so that the American people know that ''at the end of the storm there is a golden sky and the sweet silver song of the lark.''

Now, more than ever before, we have to restore people's faith and their confidence in the economic future of our Nation. It is in our hands.

GOVERNOR MELDRIM THOMSON

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to my dear personal friend and political mentor, former New Hampshire governor Meldrim Thomson, who passed away last Thursday. Mel, who was 89, was one of the greatest governors in the history of the State of New Hampshire.

Mel Thomson left a lasting legacy. His legacy of country, state, family, and God will not soon be forgotten by those of us whose lives he touched so deeply. He was not only a gentleman but a gentle man, a loving husband to Gale, father of six, grandfather, and great-grandfather. He was one of my closest and most treasured friends. In politics, loyalty and friendship mean everything.

In 1993, Governor Thomson wrote a book, ''100 Famous Founders,'' for which I was honored to have written the introduction. Among the first of the Founding Fathers to step forward and put his life, property, and honor on the line for his country by signing the Declaration was Josiah Bartlett of New Hampshire. Dr. Bartlett later served as the Governor of New Hampshire. It is fitting that this magnificent book of profiles of our Nation's one hundred foremost Founders was written by one of Josiah Bartlett's most distinguished and patriotic successors as Governor, Meldrim Thomson.

Meldrim Thomson had the same trust in God, love of family, steadfast dedication to his country and state, and sense of honor that characterized the Founders about whom he wrote. Indeed, had he lived in Josiah Bartlett's time, Meldrim Thomson certainly would have been a Founder too. Had he lived during the American Revolution, he would have stood shoulder-to-shoulder fighting for the cause alongside George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Sam Adams, and General John Stark.

Meldrim Thomson, Jr., took the oath of office as the 91st Governor of New Hampshire on January 3, 1973, and served until January 4, 1979. He is the only Republican to have served as Governor of New Hampshire for three consecutive two-year terms.

Meldrim Thomson's road to the governorship began in 1954, when he moved his publishing business and his family from New York to a new home in Orford, NH. Although he was not a native son, Meldrim Thomson's strongly independent nature and his bedrock conservative principles were right for New Hampshire. In spirit, then, he quickly became a son of New Hampshire.

Plunging into New Hampshire politics, Meldrim Thomson waged an unsuccessful campaign for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1964. That same year, though, he won election to New Hampshire's Constitutional Convention.

With characteristic grit and determination, Meldrim Thomson did not let his defeats in the 1968 and 1970 New Hampshire Republican gubernatorial primaries discourage him from continuing to seek our State's highest office. His commitment paid rich dividends in 1972, when he won election as Governor. He ran and won again in 1974 and 1976. In waging his victorious campaigns, Meldrim Thomson proved himself to be a true populist. Running on the slogan ''ax the tax,'' Governor Thomson took his campaigns to the people of New Hampshire in their living rooms and meeting halls.

As Governor, Meldrim Thomson did not shrink from difficult decisions. As the spiritual descendant of the Founding Fathers, he had the courage to take grave political risks on behalf of his unfailingly conservative principles. Meldrim Thomson fought tirelessly for low taxes and strict fiscal discipline. As a result, during his time as Governor, the economy of New Hampshire enjoyed a prosperity that was unknown in the rest of New England. Attracted by the state's low taxes, significant new businesses moved their operations to New Hampshire. Wages and salaries increased Old manufacturing centers such as Manchester and Nashua demonstrated new signs of life.

Beyond his great economic successes, Meldrim Thomson did not hesitate to use his platform as Governor to speak out on vital national and international issues. He did not hesitate to criticize the foreign and domestic misadventures of the Administration of Jimmy Carter. In fact, Governor Thomson ordered New Hampshire State flags flown at half-staff to protest President Carter's pardon of Vietnam era draft resisters. It deeply offended Governor Thomson's profound sense of patriotism that a President of the United States would take such an unprecedented action to shield those who refused their country's call from the rightful legal consequences of their acts.

I have so many personal, inspiring memories of Mel Thomson. In our private moments, of which we shared many up at the farm in Orford, he would affectionately call me ''son''. I thought of him like a father, both personally as well as politically.

He always inspired me with his words of wisdom. He often said ''put principle above politics.'' He heeded his own words. Like Lincoln, Churchill and so many great men, he was unfairly criticized, but rose above it all to do what was right. He was a dedicated conservative, who was as solid as the granite in our mountains.

Mel Thomson's impact on the state, patriotism, and commitment to his values and his family will not be forgotten. I will miss him terribly, as will those many New Hampshire citizens whose lives he touched. Rest in peace, my friend. You have earned it. It has been an honor to represent you in the U.S. Senate.

COMMENDING NAVY LT. SHANE OSBORN AND HIS CREW MEMBERS FOLLOWING THEIR DETAINMENT ON HAINAN ISLAND, CHINA

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to commend in the strongest possible terms the members of the United States Navy crew who were detained on Hainan Island in China for 11 long days earlier this month. I think I speak for our entire nation when I say how much we admire their dedication and the extraordinary level of professionalism they exhibited throughout their ordeal.

Under the command of Lt. Shane Osborn, this crew of 24 servicemen and women left Kadena Airbase in Okinawa, Japan, on the evening of March 31 for what was to have been a routine mission over the South China Sea.

As we all now know, what happened after they left Okinawa, and for the next 11 days, was *not* routine. It was *heroic*. The entire world witnessed the strength, discipline and courage of our Navy crew.

Every man and woman on that plane is a hero.

I am especially impressed with the skill and character of a remarkable young man who first dreamed of flying as a 3-year-old watching a small Cessna on a South Dakota farm.

We are fortunate that Lt. Shane Osborn pursued his dream to fly. And we are doubly fortunate that he put that dream to work in service of his country.

Lt. Osborn says, modestly, that he was just what he'd been trained to do when he landed his damaged aircraft safely. Others see it differently. A Pentagon spokesman described the landing