I look forward to continuing this relationship with those who enable libraries to provide the unique and vital services available to all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that the attached op-ed by Carla Hayden, ''Don't Take Libraries for Granted,'' be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baltimore Sun, Apr. 9, 2003]

DON'T TAKE LIBRARIES FOR GRANTED

(By Carla D. Hayden)

Americans have several beacons of light in what seem to be dark and fearful times, among them libraries.

The Enoch Pratt Free Library is proud to join the American Library Association in celebrating all that libraries have to offer during National Library Week this week.

Every day, more than 120,000 librarians nationwide connect students, families, senior citizens, businesspeople, teachers and professors with the information they need to be successful in a swiftly changing and increasingly troubled era.

Americans rely on libraries for help in finding jobs, using the Internet, demystifying technology, getting free access to thousands of books and videotapes and connecting with their neighbors and colleagues. And this couldn't be more relevant in Baltimore City, where more than 23 percent of our residents live at or below the poverty level.

The staff at the Pratt works to meet the needs of the community by providing seminars on race relations, building personal assets, entrepreneurship, computer training and more.

As the State Library Resource Center for Maryland, the Pratt is dedicated to assisting residents across the state in finding information they need 24 hours a day, seven days a week. We are a major support of the new ''Ask Us Now'' statewide library reference service, an invaluable resource. And it's all free of charge.

Librarians are committed to freedom of access to information and are fighting to ensure that such freedom remains intact so that no one is afraid to search for answers to important questions. It is often easy to take our libraries and librarians for granted.

Carla D. Hayden is the executive director of the Enoch Pratt Free Library and president-elect of the American Library Association.

DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to Daniel Patrick Moynihan, a man for whom I had the utmost respect.

One of the first times I was presiding in the Senate, Senator Moynihan was speaking from the floor. What he had to say and the way he said it made a lasting impression on me. The next day I asked for a copy of the statement and have kept it in my desk ever since. Senator Moynihan began: ''Mr. President, it is agreed that I will begin these brief remarks in order that our chairman might conclude the debate and proceed to the vote which I think has every prospect of being prodigious in its majority.'' He continued to explain one of the most complicated and difficult issues that we will deal with here in the Senate in a clear and concise manner. ''In very short order, I would simply like to recapitulate the four simple steps which will put Social Security on an actuarially sound basis for the next 75 years. They are: 1. Provide for an accurate cost-of-living adjustment. In 1996, the Boskin Commission originally estimated that the CPI overstates changes in the cost-of-living by 1.1 percentage points; now they say it is 0.8 of a percentage point; 2. Normal taxation of benefits; 3. Extend coverage to all newly hired State and local workers; 4. Increase the length of the computation period from 35 to 38 years.''

I don't know if this is the answer, but I will always refer to it when the topic of Social Security comes up. He laid out a plan with professorial clarity and a complete grasp of the issue. Whether you agreed or disagreed with Senator Moynihan, you had to appreciate his style.

Although I did not have a close working relationship with Senator Moynihan, I am truly impressed with the depth and breadth of his career achievements. From his pioneering work on Social Security reform, his almost encyclopedic knowledge of fiscal policy, to his championing of environmental and transportation issues, Senator Moynihan was the kind of Senator worth emulating. I also admired his ability to always look at the long view of the steps taken today and their impact on future generations. Senator Moynihan had an unwavering commitment to care for all people in need and was willing to cross party lines to accomplish his goals. His work as advisor to Presidents of both parties is testament to the high regard that official Washington had for his intellect and integrity.

As a dear friend of my father's for over 25 years, my strongest sense of the Senator comes from hearing my dad speak of Senator Moynihan with reverence and true admiration. Upon my father's passing, Senator Moynihan included an excerpt from a wonderful poem by W.B. Yeats, ''The Municipal Gallery Revisited,'' in his tribute. Those kind words were a great comfort to our family.

In the words of another poem by the poet W.B. Yeats:

The man is gone guided ye, unweary, through the long bitter way,
Ye by the waves that close in our sad nation,
Be full of sudden fears,
The man is gone who from this lonely station
—Has moulded the hard year . . .
Mourn—and then onward, there is no returning
He guides ye from the tomb;
His memory is a tall pillar, burning
Before the gloom

Our Nation will mourn, but Senator Moynihan would insist that we move on. On behalf of my mother and the Chafee family, we send our sincere condolences to Liz and all her family.

JEFF MADRICK ON ''THE U.S. ECONOMY AND THE IRAQI TIME BOMB''

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last Sunday's magazine section of the New York Times contained an excellent and insightful article by Jeff Madrick on the Nation's troubled economy as a result of huge tax cuts, the stalled economy, and the cost of the war and the reconstruction of Iraq. His article emphasizes the severe consequences we will face if we fail to bring the exploding deficit under control. Mr. Madrick's article, ''The Iraqi Time Bomb,'' will be of major interest to all of us in Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times Magazine Section, Apr. 6, 2003]

THE IRAQI TIME BOMB

(By Jeff Madrick)

The denial of economic reality that permeated Wall Street a few years ago has now migrated to Washington. On Wall Street, when companies did not generate the promised profits to justify the bubble in stock prices, many analysts told investors that profits did not matter. A new economy would be gauged by other measures, they insisted. Today, in similar fashion, as the federal budget has plunged into the red over the past two years, President Bush's economic team is telling the nation that deficits no longer matter.

At first, perhaps, the claim seemed plausible. Damage to the economy was not yet evident. And I, for one, am not a deficit hawk. At times, deficits are necessary to stimulate economic growth, and their dampening impact on private investment is occasionally exaggerated. But because of the Bush administration's policies and a weak economy, deficits are now approaching unmanageable levels, as they did in the 1980's. In fact, the federal government's fiscal health has deteriorated at a pace so stunning that few have yet caught up with the facts.

Here are some of those facts. Even without a war, the budget deficit would have exceeded $300 billion this year—just three years after the budget experienced a surplus of nearly $240 billion. (This was in the midst of a four-year run of substantial surpluses.) But with war costs escalating and revenues falling as a result of the flat economy, this year's deficit could rise to $400 billion. In fiscal year 2004, it is likely to be higher.

The president has asked Congress for $75 billion to finance war-related costs, but many think a more realistic estimate of the combined costs of war and reconstruction will be closer to $200 billion. More alarming is the decline of government revenues over the long run. Instead of generating $5 trillion to $6 trillion in surpluses over 10 years from rising tax revenues on growing incomes, the government will now probably come up nearly $2 trillion short through 2013. That recession and slower growth have shrunk tax revenues is predictable enough. But the sinking stock market has taken more of a toll than expected: there are no more outsize capital gains to tax. These yielded fat revenues in the late 1990's, when stocks were soaring, exaggerating the fiscal health of the nation. Now the train is running in reverse.

Finally, the Bush tax cuts have made long-term financial prospects significantly worse. Occasionally, tax cuts make sense. But the

$1.4 trillion tax-cut package passed in 2001 would have been more productive if it had been temporary and applicable to more taxpayers. Instead, it was skewed to the rich (who are prone to save rather than spend) and will be permanent—far from disappearing should the economy improve, the tax cut will grow larger. The administration proposed a second major tax cut in early January, estimated to cost $726 billion over 10 years, and it appears to be even less effective as a near-term stimulus: more than half of the total results from the elimination of taxes on dividends, an idea raised at Bush's economic summit in Waco, Tex., last August by a stockbroker, Charles Schwab. In addition, the Bush administration followed up this tax plan with a new budget that would extend the 2001 cuts three years past their expiration, costing another $600 billion.

The Senate has since voted to reduce the $726 billion budget request by half, but last week it was still far from clear that this change would prevail, given that the House passed a budget resolution that assumed the president's tax cuts.

The consequence of all these steps? Budget deficits as far as the eye can see. When Bush took office, his budget team estimated there would be a cumulative surplus of some $5.6 trillion over the next 10 years. Now, in light of the 2003 tax cuts and the new Bush budget, the Congressional Budget Office, the nonpartisan economic research arm of Congress, calculates that a long-term surplus will turn into a $1.8 trillion deficit between 2004 and 2013.

Unfortunately, economists outside the government estimate that the deficit will be even larger. William Gale and Peter Orszag of the Brookings Institution figure the deficit is likely to approach $2.5 trillion. The Wall Street economists William Dudley and Edward McKelvey of Goldman Sachs say that the deficit will exceed $4 trillion by 2013.

The timing of this looming deficit could not be worse. The retirement of baby boomers is about to begin en masse. In 10 years, the costs of Social Security and Medicare will start rising rapidly. By the 2020's, these costs will begin to reach roughly 12 to 15 percent of gross domestic product, compared with about 6.8 percent today. To put this in perspective, consider that all current federal expenditures now come to only 20 percent of G.D.P.

The concern about large deficits is that they reduce long-term economic growth and produce even less revenue for social programs. When large enough, government deficits require so much federal borrowing that they can displace private investment and push up interest rates on mortgages, consumer credit and business borrowing to levels that thwart home buying, consumer purchases and capital investment. (If interest rates should stop falling, home refinancing, which has recently been a principal source of more money for consumers, will be less attractive.) Big deficits also make the U.S. economy especially vulnerable to the loss of capital investment from overseas. Because Americans save so little, and because the nation imports much more than it exports, the United States must attract close to $500 billion of foreign capital annually to finance its growth. High budget deficits could easily reduce the confidence of foreign investors, who already own 36 percent of U.S. government debt. If they sell some of those securities, they will drive down the value of the dollar and U.S. investments will become even less attractive. Over the last year, the dollar has already fallen by 20 percent against some major currencies.

The slower growth that results from large deficits affects everybody. It leads to lost jobs, lower wages and fewer business opportunities. A return to the sluggish economy of the 1980's and early 1990's is not only possible but likely.

Straitened conditions are being felt already. States, starved for revenues because they cannot borrow to make up for the deficits caused by the economic downturn, are now cutting education, health and poverty programs aggressively. State and local governments are also complaining that money promised by Washington for homeland security has not arrived. And the president recently told the states that there's no extra money for them.

Given the pinch, how can we explain the administration's fiscal choices? Some economists in the Bush camp claim that lower tax rates and the elimination of taxes on dividends will both motivate people to work harder and investors to invest more. The economy will grow faster than traditional economic models anticipate, producing tax revenues that will reduce projected budget deficits. But most economists say there is a large measure of ideological wishful thinking here, reminiscent of the supply-side economists who advised President Reagan. Bush's economic advisers argue, for example, that the dividend tax cuts may generate more growth than any conventional economic model can predict by making investment in stocks more attractive; rising stock prices will in turn encourage investment. Few economists agree, however that eliminating dividend taxes will have more than a modest impact on stock prices. And even a 20 percent boost in stock prices from current levels does not restore them to their recent highs.

Narrow politics, of course, can partly account for the Bush administration's tax proposals. The tax cuts disproportionately benefit the wealthy, which, after all, is Bush's natural political constituency. But Bush's policies may, in fact, best be explained by another, more radical agenda. Extensive tax cuts will require Congress to limit the growth of social programs and public investment and undermine other programs altogether. If that is your vision of the best direction America can take, the strategy makes some sense. So, we were wrong about how dividend tax cuts stimulate growth, you can almost hear the Bush advisers thinking. No problem. Rising deficits will inevitably force Congress to starve those ''wasteful'' social programs. The prospective high deficits may even make it imperative to privatize Social Security and Medicare eventually. Social spending is the problem, goes the argument, not tax cuts.

The Bush administration has been inconsistent about its economic rationales since it earliest days in office. First, President Bush justified his $1.4 trillion tax cut in 2001 by claiming the government should return surpluses to taxpayers when the economy is strong. He found a convincing ally in Alan Greenspan, chairman of the Federal Reserve, whose influence was critical to the tax cut's passage. Then, as the economy appeared to be weakening, Bush argue that a tax cut was needed for an entirely different reason. It would stimulate the weak economy inherited from Bill Clinton. This made sense, but as noted, the tax package was not a short-term stimulus package.

When, by early 2003, there was no escaping the fact that the federal budget would remain in long-term deficit, the Bush administration's budget office did not issue the customary 10-year forecast. Instead, it only forecast a five-year budget. Beyond that, the Bush team said, economic events were too uncertain.

The Congressional Budget Office, however, does not enjoy such flexibility. It produced its standard 10-year outlook, which spelled out the obvious. But to give the Bush administration its due, a more recent C.B.O,. analysis also tried to take into account the possible growth incentives of the tax cuts. Based on at least seven different approaches to how government policies may affect future finances, none of the Congressional Budget Office's economic projections eliminated the future deficit. To the contrary, they all clustered around the original $1.8 trillion deficit figure that the office had calculated earlier. (The number of possible approaches to these forecasts alone suggests how little is truly known about the impact of such changes.) There would be a significant budget deficit every year through at least 2013, and, by implication, for many years after.

Can we live with these new deficits? If they remain as low as the budget office predicts, they will come to less than 1 percent of gross domestic product in the last few years of the forecast. Even so, this will probably impede economic growth. And by 2014, when baby boomer liabilities begin to rise rapidly, there will be no easy way to finance them. As Lee Price, the chief economist of the Senate Budget Committee Democrats, points out, by 2010 or even earlier, the nation will have to start gearing up to pay for the baby boom retirement. This will require either a very large tax increase or substantially reduced benefits. The financial markets will force the government to become more responsible about spending, or interest rates will be driven to damagingly high levels.

And that's based on a moderately optimistic forecast, one that assumes the economy grows at a healthy rate. Specifically, it assumes that productivity—the output per hour of work that is the primary source of growth—will rise by 2 percent year. That is a rate slower than that of the booming late 1990's, but it is considerably faster than the average pace between 1973 and 1995.

The C.B.O.'s projection incorporates only changes proposed in the Bush budget. But other costly adjustments will be necessary. Most important, tax cuts will subject as many as 40 million taxpayers to the higher alternative minimum tax. (The A.M.T. forces taxpayers, whose payments would be very low on account of large deductions, to pay at least a minimum rate.) The government will almost certainly change that, further reducing tax revenues. Also, some expiring tax provisions will surely be extended. Gale and Orszag of the Brookings Institution find that these factors add another $700 billion to the 10-year deficit. This does not include war expenditures.

Dudley and McKelvey of Goldman Sachs reach their estimated $4.2 trillion 10-year deficit by adding war and reconstruction estimates. They also expect that Congress will pass a substantially higher provision for reimbursement of prescription drug costs under Medicare than Bush has proposed, and that economic growth will be slower than anticipated.

These and several other realistic assumptions result in a federal deficit that is unquestionably a terrible burden. The deficits will require so much borrowing that the Goldman economists figure that the size of the federal debt will rise from 33 percent of gross domestic product to 49 percent. This, even more than annual deficits, alarms economists. The federal revenue needed just to pay the interest will be enormous.

Even this estimate does not take into account a realistic view of the costs of war and a new foreign-policy doctrine that could mean military involvement elsewhere. The $75 billion in appropriations that the Bush administration recently asked for covers only the first six months in Iraq. As for the costs of peace, it is hard to make any sensible assessment. Some military experts claim that the presence of only 50,000 troops will be required. Gen. Eric Shinseki, the Army chief of staff, estimates that as many as 200,000 troops will be needed. That could well cost $50 billion a year. There are wide-eyed hopes that Iraq's oil revenues will defray most of the cost of reconstruction, but it will take several years to bring production to its full potential, as well as billions of dollars—and that's assuming there is complete peace. Some put the estimates of maintaining peace and building democracy in the hundreds of billions of dollars.

And implementing the new world vision Bush has discussed recently will require still more money. An ongoing presence in the Middle East beyond Iraq will soak up additional billions; potential crises in Korea and elsewhere will demand expensive attention. As I understand it, since even before the war started, the Defense Department has been spending money so fast it can't keep track of it. In sum, the new defense commitment looks open-ended.

The budget resolution the House passed last month makes clear the dollar amount of cuts in domestic programs that would have to be made in order to retain something close to fiscal balance in Washington in 10 years. They will involve deep cuts in programs from Medicaid to school lunches to college loans to, perhaps most cynically in the current environment, veterans' benefits. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities calculates that reductions in mandatory programs for the elderly, veterans and the poor would come to $265 billion over 10 years. Another $210 billion would be lopped off of discretionary programs. The total of $475 billion is about equal to the tax reduction the president is requesting for the top 1 percent of earners in America.

To make this politically palatable, the reductions would be phased in. Average reductions would be only 1 percent in the first year, but they would rise rapidly and would average 4 percent over 10 years. In the worst years, the budget for Medicaid would be cut by 7 percent.

But the House bill is based on the C.B.O. projections. If other economists are right, and the deficits are considerably larger, still greater cuts will be required to balance the budget over time—in fact, perhaps double the amount. The Bush administration insists that it can live with the budget deficits and still maintain many of these programs. Denial has become almost a ritual. But it cannot have anticipated how quickly America's finances have turned to red, and it is not very likely that it is prepared to face the reality that the financial markets, if not Congress, will eventually impose on it. If there is no growth miracle on the horizon that would raise government revenues, the Bush administration's options will be limited not only domestically, which may be part of its design, but also militarily. The administration may well be compromising its own dearest goals.

The longer we wait, the harder it will be to correct the nation's finances. Most of us will be hit from both ends. Incomes will not rise the way they did in the late 1990's, and it will be difficult to save for retirement. The rising costs of education and health care will be harder for the typical family to meet. Meanwhile, government will not have the money to help. Programs may be cut across the board. And consider what was not accomplished in the 1990's, despite the nation's prosperity. More than 40 million Americans still have no health insurance. The United States has the highest proportion of children born into poverty in the developed world. The quality of education remains grossly unequal. Even two-worker families cannot afford quality day care. Much remains to be done.

There is time for a course correction. But the longer the nation waits, the harder the problems will be to fix. Forecasting the economic future, as everyone knows by now, is no sure thing. But the federal government simply cannot indefinitely spend so much more than it takes in. At some point, the nation will either raise taxes significantly or make painful cuts in cherished federal programs.

But as long as the full consequences of Bush's extravagance are not immediate, and war limits serious public criticism, the president may for now get away with promising guns and a little butter. And we will all pay for it.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE PIKEVILLE HIGH SCHOOL FRESHMAN CHEERLEADERS

● Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the Pikeville High School Cheerleaders of Pikeville, KY. The squad won the freshman division of the Universal Cheerleading Association's National High School Cheerleading Championship earlier this year.

The 23 members of the Pikeville High School Freshman squad were awarded the top prize in the freshman division in Orlando, FL. This is no easy feat and the citizens of Pikeville should be proud to have the members of the Pikeville High School Freshman Cheerleading Squad living and learning in their community. Their examples of hard work and determination should be followed by all in the Commonwealth.

I would like to congratulate the following members of the squad for their success: Lora Cleary, Leann Clevenger, Amanda Combs, Stephanie Combs, Amelia Crum, Amanda Hall, Olivia Harris, Jessica Justice, Kristen Kendrick, Olivia Kinney, Chelsey Kurkowski, Colby Kurkowski, Collins Kurkowski, Chelsi Lawson, Mackenzie Lewis, Leigh Brittany Lynn, Griffin Myers, Jordan Shull, Taylor Stone, Ali Tucker, Bianca Vanhoose, Bridget Walsh, and Erin Wheeler. But also, I want to congratulate their coaches, Mrs. Lisa Wheeler and Ms. Kendra Hamilton, and choreographer, Mr. Hank Light, along with their peers, faculty, administrators, and parents for their support and sacrifices they have made to help meet those achievements and dreams.●

COMMENDING FINDLAY HIGH SCHOOL

● Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, on April 26, 2003, more than 1,200 students from across the United States will visit Washington, DC, to compete in the national finals of the ''We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution'' program, the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I am pleased and proud to announce that a class from Findlay High School from Findlay, OH, will represent our state in the upcoming national event. These young scholars have worked conscientiously to reach the national finals by participating at local and statewide competitions. As a result of their experience, they have gained a thorough knowledge and deep understanding of the fundamental principles and values of our constitutional democracy.

The 3-day We the People national competition is modeled after hearings in the Congress. The hearings consist of oral presentations by high school students before a panel of adult judges on constitutional topics. The students are given an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge while they evaluate, take, and defend positions on relevant historical and contemporary issues. Their testimony is followed by a period of questioning by the judges who probe the students' depth of understanding and ability to apply their constitutional knowledge.

The We the People program provides curricular materials at upper elementary, middle, and high school levels. The curriculum not only enhances students' understanding of the institutions of American constitutional democracy, but it also helps them identify the contemporary relevance of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. Critical thinking exercises, problem-solving activities, and cooperative learning techniques help develop participatory skills necessary for students to become active, responsible citizens.

Furthermore, independent studies by the Educational Testing Service, ETS, revealed that students enrolled in the We the People program at upper elementary, middle, and high school levels significantly outperformed comparison students on every topic of the tests taken. Another study by Richard Brody at Stanford University discovered that students involved in the We the People program develop greater commitment to democratic principles and values than do students using traditional textbooks and approaches. Researchers at the Council for Basic Education noted:

> [T]eachers feel excited and renewed. . . . Students are enthusiastic about what they have been able to accomplish, especially in terms of their ability to carry out a reasoned argument. They have become energized about their place as citizens of the United States.

The class from Findlay High School is currently preparing for their participation in the national competition, and it is inspiring how these young people advocate the fundamental ideals and principles of our government—ideas that identify us as a people and bind us together as a Nation. I send these fine young constitutional experts my best wishes as they compete in the We the People national finals.●