

So my Democratic colleagues have had unlimited opportunities to make their case on Mr. Estrada. Some of them oppose him; others support him. But one thing has remained clear through this debate: There is no good reason to deny Mr. Estrada an up or down vote on his nomination.

The time has come to end the debate on Mr. Estrada's nomination and give him and up or down vote, as the Senate will now do on Judge Prado. It is the fair thing to do.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting for Judge Prado's nomination at this time.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I am glad my friends on the Republican side now allow Judge Prado's nomination to go forward. I intend to vote for him.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Edward C. Prado, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit?

Mr. HATCH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 138 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Akaka	Dodd	Lott
Alexander	Dole	Lugar
Allard	Domenici	McCain
Allen	Dorgan	McConnell
Baucus	Durbin	Mikulski
Bayh	Edwards	Miller
Bennett	Ensign	Murkowski
Biden	Enzi	Murray
Bingaman	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bond	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Breaux	Frist	Pryor
Brownback	Graham (FL)	Reed
Bunning	Graham (SC)	Reid
Burns	Grassley	Roberts
Byrd	Gregg	Rockefeller
Campbell	Hagel	Santorum
Cantwell	Harkin	Schumer
Carper	Hatch	Sessions
Chafee	Hollings	Shelby
Chambliss	Hutchison	Smith
Clinton	Inouye	Snowe
Cochran	Jeffords	Specter
Coleman	Johnson	Stabenow
Collins	Kennedy	Stevens
Conrad	Kerry	Sununu
Cornyn	Kohl	Talent
Corzine	Kyl	Thomas
Craig	Landrieu	Voinovich
Crapo	Lautenberg	Warner
Daschle	Leahy	Wyden
Dayton	Levin	
DeWine	Lincoln	

NOT VOTING—3

Inhofe Lieberman Sarbanes

The nomination was confirmed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be notified of this action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The Senator from Illinois.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORNYN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL POLICE ON THE DEPARTMENT'S 175TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, tomorrow marks a special milestone in the history of the Capitol: The 175th anniversary of the U.S. Capitol Police Department.

Those of us who are privileged to work in the Capitol know, perhaps better than anyone, what a difficult and demanding job it is to protect the Capitol, and how extraordinarily well the men and women of the Capitol Police perform that job.

We also know how dedicated they are to their duty.

After September 11 and the anthrax attack on the Capitol itself, no one showed more courage, no one was showed more determination, and no one was more critical to ensuring that the "People's House" remained open to the people, than the members of the Capitol Police force.

We, and all Americans, owe them an enormous debt of gratitude.

Today, on the eve of the 175th anniversary of the department, we say "thank you" to Chief Gainer and all of the men and women of the Capitol Police.

When we look at the highly trained, highly skilled professionals who protect the Capitol today, it is hard to imagine sometimes that the department is descended from such humble beginnings.

The Capitol Police department traces its origins to 1801, when Congress

moved from Philadelphia to Washington. At the time, the department had exactly one member, a watchman named John Goldin, who was not armed, had no power of arrest, and was paid an annual salary of \$371.75.

In 1827, the force was expanded for the first time, to four watchmen; two to work the day shift, one to work the night shift, and one to fill in as needed.

One-hundred and seventy-five years ago tomorrow, on May 2, 1828, Congress passed a milestone piece of legislation titled, appropriately, "the Act of May 2, 1828," bringing responsibility for policing the Capitol, for the first time, under the direction of the presiding officers of the House and Senate.

This same law also empowered the Capitol watchmen with full law enforcement authority. It transformed a corps of watchmen into a police department.

In 1854, the Capitol Police were armed for the first time with heavy hickory canes.

In 1867, responsibility of the Capitol Police was transferred to the Sergeant of Arms in the House and Senate, where it remains today.

In 1873, the U.S. Capitol Police Board was formed to oversee the department.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the department had grown to 67 members.

In 1909, the department expanded to just over 100 members; a move necessitated by the construction of the Russell Senate Office Building and the Cannon House Office building. This also marked the first time the authority of the Capitol Police stretched outside the Capitol building itself.

In 1935, the Capitol Police Board, for the first time, set qualification standards for Capitol Police officers.

In 1974, the first women officers joined the force.

In 1981, the Capitol Police were authorized to protect Members and officers of Congress, and their families, anywhere in the United States.

Since September 11, all Members of the House and Senate leadership have been required to have Capitol police protection whenever we travel, and throughout the day as we go outside the Capitol building. One happy result of that, for me, is that I have been able to show off my home State to a number of officers.

And I am proud to say that a few of them now consider themselves almost honorary South Dakotans.

From the beginning, protecting the Capitol has always carried the risk of personal injury, or worse.

On 1814, during the War of 1812, the British set fire to the Capitol building.

During the Civil War, the Capitol Police kept the "People's House" open to the public from sunrise to sunset, despite the fact that military troops were stationed around, and at times even in this building.

Three times in the last century—in 1915, 1917, and 1983—bombs were exploded in the Capitol by groups seeking to advance political agendas.

In 1954, four members of a Puerto Rican nationalist group entered the House gallery and fired more than 16 shots with .38 caliber pistols at the 243 Members who were then on the floor. Five Congress Members were injured.

In response to each of these attacks, the Capitol Police Department strengthened its training procedures, and strengthened its ability to prevent and respond to such attacks.

The fact that schoolchildren and other visitors can sit in the galleries today and watch their Government in action is a powerful symbol of America's commitment to democracy, and a testimony to the skill and courage of the Capitol Police.

Given the risks, it seems almost miraculous that the department did not lose a single member in the line of duty until 1984, when Sergeant Christopher Eney was killed in a training exercise.

And we all remember the terrible Friday afternoon, July 24, 1998, when Officer JJ Chestnut and Detective John Gibson were killed preventing a severely mentally ill man with a gun from entering the Capitol and killing others. We still honor and miss them today.

Their deaths brought into sharp relief how difficult it is to protect "the People's House" and keep it open to the people at the same time. It is a complex balancing act that few other police departments in the world even attempt, and none performs better.

On September 11 and during the anthrax attacks, the Capitol Police reacted with great courage and professionalism under circumstances few people could have imagined even a few years ago.

Since then, the department has undergone an intensive process to be able to prevent, and respond to, the new threats posed by global terrorism.

Capitol Police officers continue to work long days and long weeks in order to respond to the need for increased vigilance. It is not unusual to see an officer guarding a door to the Capitol when we arrive in the morning—and see that same officer, still on duty, when we leave at night.

Without them, we could not do our jobs. And this Capitol could not keep its doors open to the more than 1 million people who visit it each year from across this Nation and the world.

Over the years, many fine men and women have served on the Capitol Police Force—including my dear friend, the assistant minority leader, HARRY REID.

As they prepare to celebrate 175 years of proud service to our Nation, we thank them all for their devotion to duty, their great skill and professionalism, and for their unyielding courage and sacrifice.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. 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 ECONOMY

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the depleted condition of our national economy and what we ought to do.

It is timely to point out that next week this Chamber, the U.S. Senate, will consider legislation raising the debt limit; that is, the limit set by law under which the Federal Government can borrow money that is a debt obligation of the United States. That debt limit is approximately \$6.3 trillion. Next week, we will consider the House bill which has been sent to us to raise that by the largest amount ever in the history of the Union, almost \$1 trillion. Specifically, \$984 billion will be the vote that we will cast next week to raise the debt limit.

The Federal Government has to pay its obligations. So by law we have to raise the debt limit so that the Federal Government can pay its obligations. But it is illustrative of the fact that the national debt is growing larger and larger, and we are adopting fiscal policies that add to that national debt each year by increasing the deficit financing that we engage in by the budgets we adopt and then all of the legislation with which we implement those budgets—the tax cuts, the spending bills, financing the war, all of those necessary expenditures. But a fiscal policy has been advocated by the White House, one of dropping off over the next 10 years tax revenues by some \$720 billion. And what is likely to pass the Senate is the commitments that were made several weeks ago that that level will be in the range of \$350 billion over 10 years instead of the level passed by or to be passed by the House of Representatives in the range of about \$550 billion over 10 years.

Is any elected official not for tax cuts? Of course, we are. But that is not the decision with which we are confronted. What we are confronted with is, what do we do to better stabilize a sick economy and to get our economy moving again? Almost unanimously, the economists—I say almost unanimously because it is probably a ratio of 9 to 1 among the economists, including statements issued yesterday by the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan—are basically saying: Watch out. If you deficit finance, long-term interest rates are going to go up. It is going to depress the economy coming out of this near recession. It is going to be difficult for us to get the economy moving again.

That is particularly true of the financial condition in which we find ourselves now. In the first 6 months of this fiscal year, the Government has had to go out and deficit spend to the tune of \$250 billion. Annualized, that means we

will deficit finance, if that trend holds up, a half a trillion dollars.

What does deficit financing mean? That means we are going to adopt budgetary policies of spending and tax revenues by which we are going to spend a half a trillion dollars, \$500 billion, more than we have coming in in tax revenue. And you wonder why the stock market is languishing so much. The stock market is a reflection of the American people's confidence in the future of the economy and economic activity. So is it any wonder the stock market just keeps kind of languishing along? Do people have the confidence we are going to come out of these economic doldrums and get the economy moving again? I think you see how they are voting with their pocketbooks on the stock market. The people do not have that confidence. Why should they if, in this year, we are going to spend a half trillion dollars more than we have coming in in tax revenue?

This leads me, then, to next week. Next week, in addition to taking up the debt ceiling bill of raising the debt almost a trillion dollars more so we can pay our bills, we are also going to take up the tax bill. The tax bill, as presented to this body, is at least going to be \$350 billion. There are many in this body who would like that tax bill to be even more over a 10-year period.

To me, it is not wise fiscal policy if that causes our deficit financing to go up continually, just like we are seeing in this present fiscal year. If that debt keeps getting added to the national debt, then it won't be too long—another couple years—and we will be right back here asking to raise the debt limit from about \$7.3 trillion—another trillion dollars—up to about \$8.5 trillion. That is not sound fiscal policy.

That is not going to bring us back on the road to economic recovery. What we can do is balance interests. We can have some tax cuts that will get the economy moving again, that will provide economic growth, that will provide jobs so we get more dollars into the economy and circulating to offset the sickly economy, offset the lack of economic activity, some of which has been brought on by September 11 but some of which has also been brought on by an economic policy that is embracing deficit financing.

I will never forget over two decades ago when I was in the House of Representatives. One of the most prolific writers and great speakers who had articulated balanced budgets suddenly changed his tune and started speaking the message that we will not worship at the shrine of balanced budgets anymore. Well, in the early 1980s, that kind of worship didn't work. The fiscal policies adopted in the early 1980s were so out of whack with the deficits annually soaring up to as high as \$250 billion in 1 year, finally those policies had to be reversed—not once but three times.

Now we have a situation that is double the annual deficits ever experienced