Government. That is what Hamilton was worrying about in the Federalist Paper No. 25, which I read earlier this afternoon.

But now about this money that I talked about, it has been said here there is $743 million in the President's request. But we are talking about 3 years—3 years; that if it were $743 million a year, that would be something like $2.1 or some such billion. Yet the estimated cost for the third year here, as I am told, as I am hearing here, is $3.1 or $3.2 billion. So it seems to me that is $1 billion short there.

Mr. KYL. If I could respond to the Senator, the $3.2 billion is the estimated total cost over the 3-year period of time. And as Senator BROWNBACK said, the request would not come in three equal tranches. So you would not multiply $743 million times 3. The administration would have to include in its next budget an amount of money to make up the difference.

Now, there is, we are informed, $327 million not yet expended from the $40 billion supplemental, some or all of which might be made available in the first year, which comes close to meeting the $1 billion amount. But the Senator from West Virginia is correct, there will have to be an amount included in the budget in the subsequent year to reach the $3.2 billion. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I do not have any assurance that money is going to be included. We do not have any assurance it will be. The President only requested $37 million, I believe it was, in his supplemental, out of $27 billion; $35 million for border security—I mean, for the INS. So there we are.

Mr. KYL. If I could respond to that, to some extent, it is a chicken-and-egg proposition. You have to have an authorization before you can have an appropriation. And the administration merely has the benefit of both. It can put something in the budget which then encourages us to do an authorization or it can respond to an authorization which the Congress passes.

The intent here, since we have been working with the administration, is for the Congress to authorize a program which the administration then is supposed to carry out, and that would include an inclusion in the next budget of an amount of money sufficient to fund the authorization that we provide.

Then the chairman of the Appropriations Committee would have the jurisdiction to determine how much of that to fund in the appropriations request.

But the idea here is to authorize the program, which gives direction to the administration as to what we want it to do. Hopefully, that direction would be then to include that money in the budget. I certainly would be encouraging them to do that.

Mr. BYRD. I am sure the Senator would.

If I may, Mr. President, just take a further minute.

For fiscal year 2003, the President has proposed increasing nondefense programs by only 1 percent. He has threatened to veto appropriations bills that have ''excessive spending.'' For the INS, he has proposed an increase of only $150 million or about a 2-percent increase.

That is not even enough to cover inflation. So if we must do more for the INS, what are we supposed to cut? What are we going to cut if we do more than that for the INS? Veterans programs? Are we going to cut veterans programs? Are we going to cut education programs, highways, programs to promote our energy independence, programs dealing with the environment? What do we cut? If we don't do that, we run afoul of the President's threat to veto appropriations bills.

I thank all Senators for listening. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from West Virginia, is it correct that it was not only defense but homeland security that is above and beyond the 1 percent; and if that is the case, then could not this money be included within the homeland security part of the budget?

I am not certain, but I believe the 1 percent does not include the homeland security requirements.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is correct, but if we do more for homeland defense, then we are restricted by the President's figures, what he has asked. Then we have to take the money out of something else. So what does it come out of? Veterans programs, education, the environment, energy? That is our dilemma. I thank the Senator.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5:30 today, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 579, Terrence L. O'Brien to be a United States Circuit Judge; that the Senate immediately vote to confirm the nomination; that upon confirmation the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that the Senate return to legislative session, with the above occurring without intervening action or debate.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask that it be in order to request the yeas and nays on this nomination.

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

Mr. REID. I do request the yeas and nays on the confirmation of Terrence L. O'Brien.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second. There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRO-ISRAEL RALLY

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment briefly about a rally which was held this afternoon on the west side of the Capitol, a pro-Israel rally. Some estimated the gathering at 100,000. I believe the group was substantially larger than 100,000. There were many people of all denominations represented—all colors, creeds, and racial diversity.

The purpose of the rally was to support Israel's right of self-defense. The gathering was attended by many luminaries. I had not seen so many people wait so long to speak so briefly at any time that I could recall.

I stood, as a matter of fact, with Governor Pataki. We waited an hour and a half in the blistering sun to make our presentations.

The spirit of the gathering was very emotional, very strong. The essential issue at hand was Israel's right of self-defense.

In the brief remarks that I made, I emphasized the basic point that the suicide bombers who are plaguing Israel today are identical with the suicide bombers who attacked the United States on September 11. The only difference was that the suicide bombers who attacked the United States were more sophisticated. They hijacked planes and they crashed them into the World Trade Center towers. One of the planes was, I think, headed for this very building, the Capitol, which went down in Somerset County, PA, my home State. It was speculative, to some extent, as to where it was headed, but many indicators say it was headed for the Capitol. The plane which struck the Pentagon, by many indicators, was headed for the White House.

The people of the United States were outraged by that terrorist attack, just as the people of Israel are outraged by the suicide bombers that have attacked civilian populations. The United States responded, as is well-known, by mounting a powerful military offense, which went to Afghanistan and crushed the Taliban and al-Qaida in a matter of a few weeks—an undertaking that the Soviets could not accomplish in 10 years and the Brits could not accomplish many years before. Just as we

would not expect anybody to question our right to go after the al-Qaida terrorists who killed thousands of innocent American civilians, that was the theme today in raising Israel's right of self-defense.

President Bush has said that there will not be any daylight between the United States and Israel and he has been a strong supporter of Israel. I applaud his decision to send Secretary of State Colin Powell to the Mideast. It is a very difficult assignment that the Secretary of State now has. It is my hope there may be some moderate Arab leaders who will come forward to be able to have meaningful negotiations. President Mubarak of Egypt has, for over the past two decades, been a tower of strength. Of course, he has been the recipient of approximately $2 billion a year for more than the past two decades, totaling close to $50 billion at this point.

On a recent trip I made to the Mideast, I had the opportunity to visit with King Abdullah of Jordan, a vibrant young man in his late thirties, who is taking over the mantle of his father, King Hussein, and is ready, willing, and able to be a voice of reason in the Mideast. I also met with the King of Morocco, who is also in his late thirties. He also has promise. So there is a new generation of leadership in the Mideast.

When I was in the Mideast on Tuesday, March 26, I had an opportunity to be briefed by General Anthony Zinni, our chief negotiator there, and then had an opportunity to meet with Israel's Prime Minister Ariel Sharon. Late that evening, I traveled to Ramallah to meet with Yasser Arafat. I carried forward the administration's message, and that is for Arafat to make a clear, unequivocal statement in Arabic to stop the suicide bombers. As usual, Chairman Arafat said he would. Of course, again, as usual, nothing has ever been done by him.

Then the next day, Wednesday, March 27, there was the suicide bombing at the Passover seder in Netanya. Hundreds were wounded and 27 people were killed. It had been my hope that the Saudi peace plan would come to some fruition if the Saudis would stand up. I was really chagrined to see Saudi Arabia have a telethon for Palestinians and gather some $92 million. The thought on my mind was: When was Saudi Arabia going to have a telethon to raise money for the families of the thousands of victims who perished on September 11 in a terrorist attack, with 19 terrorists, 15 of whom came from Saudi Arabia?

So in the midst of these very difficult times, this was a large gathering assembled at the west end of the Capitol—a larger group than customarily meets for the inauguration of the American President. Here, the crowd went beyond the statue on horseback. The crowd was on all sides. It was very emotional, and a very enthusiastic showing of support for Israel.

I thought it might be useful, in the absence of any other Senator, to make this brief report for those who may not have captured it on C–SPAN earlier, to get some of the flavor of the passion, emotion, and determination of this cavalry of more than 100,0000 people.

I thank the Chair and 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. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, apparently, there are people who believe that we are cynical in raising the question of the rights of the steelworkers and coal workers to their medical costs, and some attempt to find a cash stream that will help in making the transition for the steel industry as it is consolidated.

I want the Senate to know that the motivation for thinking about steel and the steelworkers came from the provisions in the House bill H.R. 4, that contains ANWR, that allocated a portion of the bid moneys from the opening of ANWR to some conservation objectives. We looked at this problem and decided there were some moneys that could be used and what should be used as far as stimulating the future of our own State.

The Alaska gas pipeline is the real focal point of our future development. ANWR is an addition—that is, the drilling in the 1002 area on the Arctic coast, that million and a half acres there—and is the immediate objective. But the long-term objective is to find a way to transport the natural gas that has been reinjected into the ground since 1968.

As oil was produced in the Arctic, the natural gas was separated and it was reinjected into the ground. We know there is in excess of 50 trillion cubic feet of gas there—maybe 75 trillion cubic feet of gas. But the point is, as one who is interested in national security, I believe there are three major industries in this country of great concern to us in time of national problems of a military nature or security nature. One is agriculture; the second is oil; and then there is steel. When we look at the steel industry, it is the real backbone of our manufacturing infrastructure. But it has huge challenges right now, including dumping from overseas producers, and high internal costs have caused bankruptcies. Over 30 steel companies in this country have entered bankruptcy since the year 2000. That has impacted 60,000 workers. These 30-plus companies represent more than 21 percent of the domestic steel-producing industry.

In 1980, there were more than 500,000 U.S. steelworkers. By 2000, the number of steelworkers fell to 224,000. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that this number will fall to 176,000 by the end of this decade. That would be a 22-percent reduction in steel-related jobs. Domestic steel shipments were down 14 percent in the first quarter of 2001. In the last 3 years alone, 23,000 steel jobs have been lost. Those who remain employed in the industry help pay for a portion of the 6,000 retirees and their benefits. Those benefits represent a promise that was made to previous workers for their contribution to building America's military-civilian infrastructure.

Our steel industry must undergo consolidation now, but it can only take place if the existing cost structures are addressed. That primarily means taking care of the health care costs for retirees. Failure to address that issue will not only impact retirees, it threatens current workers who are faced with the prospect of more mill closings and more lost jobs.

Forty-seven percent of the steelworkers are unemployed in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana. Forty-five percent of the steel jobs relate directly to production. Consolidation is an absolute must if we are to protect those jobs and failure to address this issue impacts steel States.

Why should I be interested in steel? One is defense, as I said. Steel is required to build tanks, fighters, transport planes, helicopters, ships, missiles, and other military items.

During hearings in the House and Senate last month, Robert Miller, chairman and CEO of Bethlehem Steel, testified on the problems of the steel industry. He told Senators integrated producers provide the highest quality steel for steel applications.

Bethlehem Steel is the only domestic company with the capacity to provide the special steel plate that was required to repair the U.S.S. *Cole*. Unfortunately, Bethlehem Steel is currently in chapter 11, about ready to go into chapter 7 bankruptcy. What are we going to do for sales for our military ships if we lose our own domestic steel production?

Our interest is in the gas pipeline. Alaska's natural gas pipeline will be over 3,000 miles long, almost as long as the Great Wall of China. It will be the most expensive project financed by private capital in the history of man. It will be totally privately financed.

The gas pipeline requires over 3,000 miles of 52-inch pipe that cannot be made in the United States at the present time. It requires an additional 2,000 miles of gathering pipelines and production facilities. It will take 5.2 million tons of steel. It will take $3 billion to $5 billion in steel orders. That cannot be done by the United States steel industry today. They cannot even hope to participate in the building of that pipeline. They will not participate unless the issue of the health care costs for retired employees is settled.