United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2003 No. 45—Part II

House of Representatives

□ 1715

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—Continued

Here it is, very carefully worked out, using established models. In fact, Macroeconomic Advisors are retained by the CEA. We beat them two to one for one sixth of the cost in job generation and GDP growth.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). All time for general debate on the resolution has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The amendment printed in part A of House Report 108–44 is adopted and the concurrent resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of House Concurrent Resolution 95, as amended pursuant to House Resolution 151, is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 95

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds for Legislation Assumed in Budget Aggregates

Sec. 301. Reserve fund for medicare modernization and prescription drugs.
Sec. 302. Reserve fund for medicaid.
Sec. 303. Reserve fund for bioshield.

Subtitle B—Contingency Procedure for Legislation Not Assumed in Budget Aggregates

Sec. 311. Contingency procedure for surface transportation.

Subtitle C—Implementation

Sec. 321. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Restrictions on advance appropriations in the House.Enforcement Act of 1990.
Sec. 402. Compliance with section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,323,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,350,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,519,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,662,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,793,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,902,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,017,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,130,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,235,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,364,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,502,635,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $36,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $116,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $97,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $77,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $60,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $60,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $60,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $62,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $191,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $285,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $301,575,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,790,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,838,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,952,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,076,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,177,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,282,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,383,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,481,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,597,191,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,704,406,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,832,479,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,776,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,847,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,943,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,045,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,139,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,244,487,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,350,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,451,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,574,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,667,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,803,936,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $453,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $497,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $423,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $382,951,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $345,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $341,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $333,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $320,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $338,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $302,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $301,301,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $6,687,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $7,264,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $7,794,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,302,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $8,777,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $9,251,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,719,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,179,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,660,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,112,000,000,000.

Printed on recycled paper.

Fiscal year 2013: $11,564,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $3,858,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $4,179,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,416,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,597,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,720,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,819,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,889,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,926,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,963,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,949,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,918,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $392,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $420,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $440,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $460,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $480,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $462,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $494,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $480,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $507,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $522,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $536,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $551,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,541,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $28,631,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $32,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $33,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,284,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,078,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,148,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,576,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $23,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $22,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $23,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $24,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,504,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $27,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $28,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,393,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $2,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $961,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $2,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $2,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,293,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $29,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $30,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $30,945,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $31,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,463,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,600,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $26,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $26,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $24,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $24,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,293,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,781,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,390,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $23,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,413,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,637,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $8,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $9,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $8,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,952,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $828,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,056,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $64,091,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $67,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $65,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $65,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $66,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $67,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $68,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $69,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $71,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $72,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $74,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $76,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,640,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $14,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $15,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $15,702,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $16,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $16,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,288,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $86,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $84,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $84,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $86,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $88,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $90,811,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $92,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $93,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,170,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $95,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $97,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,602,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $221,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $218,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $235,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $235,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $248,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $265,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $284,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $303,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $324,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $322,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $345,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $370,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $395,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $423,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $422,447,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $248,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $266,538,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $266,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $282,932,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $322,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $319,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $344,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $370,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $396,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $424,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $452,618,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $455,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $489,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $486,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $528,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,861,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $326,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $315,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $321,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $325,921,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $331,772,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $336,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $338,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $344,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $345,993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $352,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $353,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $360,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $361,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $374,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $375,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $377,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $378,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $391,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,351,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $16,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,481,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $57,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $61,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $65,847,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $64,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $62,348,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $65,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $66,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $68,222,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $72,714,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $72,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $69,867,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $74,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,198,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $38,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $37,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $37,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $37,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $37,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $38,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $39,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $40,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,703,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $42,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,855,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $43,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $44,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,471,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $19,779,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $19,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,584,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $20,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,620,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,374,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $239,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $256,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $303,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $303,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $342,042,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $367,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $389,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $389,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $410,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $410,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $429,676,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $450,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $450,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $471,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $489,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $489,580,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$93,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$36,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$15,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$42,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$42,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$51,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$51,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$53,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$53,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$59,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$61,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,229,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX SIMPLIFICATION AND FAIRNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 11, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to—

(1) reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $35,420,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, $112,785,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, $387,719,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $662,874,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013; and

(2) increase the level of direct spending for that committee by $4,380,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003, $1,111,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $17,393,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $23,096,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the level of direct spending for that committee by $3,600,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

(b) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.—

(1) FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—(A) The Congress finds that—

(i) the Inspector General of the Department of Education has found that nearly 23 percent of recipients whose loans were discharged due to disability claims were gainfully employed;

(ii) based on data provided by the Office of Management and Budget, the House Committee on the Budget estimates that more than $8 billion in erroneous earned income tax payments are made each year;

(iii) the Office of Management and Budget estimates that erroneous payments for food stamps account for almost 9 percent of total benefits;

(iv) mismanagement of more than $3 billion in trust funds controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs led the Congress to take extraordinary measures to regain control of the these funds;

(v) in its Semiannual Reports to Congress, the Inspector General of the Office of Personnel Management has documented numerous instances of the Government continuing to make electronic payments for retirement benefits through the Civil Service Retirement System after the death of the eligible annuitants; and

(vi) numerous other examples of waste, fraud, and abuse are reported regularly by government watchdog agencies.

(B) It is, therefore, the purpose of this subsection to utilize the reconciliation process to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in mandatory programs.

(2) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 18, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (3) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget to carry out this subsection. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the

House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(3) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $600,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $5,532,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $18,618,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $261,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $2,596,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $9,421,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $2,397,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $25,265,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $107,359,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $62,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $678,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $2,864,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(E) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,072,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $10,371,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $38,319,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013. For the purposes of this subparagraph and section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, a reduction in outlays submitted pursuant to this subparagraph that results from changes in programs within the jurisdiction of other committees shall count as a reduction in outlays for the Committee on Government Reform.

(F) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The House Committee on House Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $4,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $26,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $88,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(G) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $157,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $1,293,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $4,468,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(H) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $86,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $727,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $2,404,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(I) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $40,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $345,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $1,105,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(J) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $6,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $15,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(K) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $114,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $1,099,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $3,702,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(L) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $449,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $4,221,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $14,626,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(M) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,971,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $17,704,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $61,547,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds for Legislation Assumed in Budget Aggregates

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE MODERNIZATION AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides a prescription drug benefit and modernizes medicare, and provides adjustments to the medicare program on a fee-for-service, capitated, or other basis, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate committee allocations described in subsection (c) for such committees and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed $7,500,000,000 in new budget authority and $7,500,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004 and $400,000,000,000 in new budget authority and $400,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(b) APPLICATION.—After the consideration of any measure for which an adjustment is made pursuant to subsection (a), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make any further appropriate adjustments in allocations and budget aggregates.

(c) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, there shall be a separate section 302(a) allocation to the appropriate committees for medicare. For purposes of enforcing such separate allocation under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the ''first fiscal year'' and the ''total of fiscal years'' shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2004 and the total of fiscal years 2004 through 2013 included in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution, respectively. Such separate allocation shall be the exclusive allocation for medicare under section 302(a) of such Act.

SEC. 302. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID.

In the House, if the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that—

(1) modernizes medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and

(2) reduces new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom by $9,010,000,000 for fiscal years 2009 through 2013,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase allocations of new budget authority and outlays for that committee (and make other appropriate changes in budgetary aggregates) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed $3,258,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2004 and $8,944,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR BIOSHIELD.

In the House, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes a program to accelerate the research, development, and purchase of biomedical threat countermeasures and—

(1) such measure provides new budget authority to carry out such program; or

(2) such measure authorizes discretionary new budget authority to carry out such program and the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority to carry out such program,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations for the committee providing such new budget authority, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, by the amount provided for that purpose, but, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (1), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom and $3,418,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom or, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (2), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the total such revision for fiscal year 2004 may not exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom.

Subtitle B—Contingency Procedure for Legislation Not Assumed in Budget Aggregates

SEC. 311. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—In the House, if the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

(1) for fiscal year 2004: $39,135,000,000,

(2) for fiscal year 2005: $39,786,000,000,

(3) for fiscal year 2006: $40,502,000,000,

(4) for fiscal year 2007: $41,219,000,000, or

(5) for fiscal year 2008: $42,002,000,000,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate budget aggregates and increase the allocation of new budget authority to such committee for fiscal year 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund for the applicable fiscal year caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR OUTLAYS.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations such that the total limitations are in excess of $38,496,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fiscal year for the committee reporting such measure by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

Subtitle C—Implementation

SEC. 321. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE.—In the House, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply to fiscal year 2004 and the total for fiscal year 2004 and the four ensuing fiscal years.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2005 and fiscal years 2005 and 2006 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,178,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2004 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2004.

SEC. 402. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. No further amendment is in order except the amendments printed in part B of the report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by the Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House report 108–44.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. HILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B amendment No. 1 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. HILL:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate levels for fiscal years 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Homeland security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.
Sec. 202. Increase in debt limit contingent upon plan to restore balanced budget.
Sec. 203. Review of budget outlook.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds

Sec. 301. Reserve fund for homeland security.
Sec. 302. Reserve fund for the costs of military operations in iraq.
Sec. 303. Reserve fund for additional mandatory funding for existing health and employment programs which provide assistance to States and individuals.
Sec. 304. Reserve fund for surface transportation.
Sec. 305. Reserve fund for bioshield.
Sec. 306. Reserve fund for permanent extension of tax cuts; medicare.

Subtitle B—Enforcement

Sec. 311. Point of order against certain legislation reducing the surplus or increasing the deficit after fiscal year 2008.
Sec. 312. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 313. Discretionary spending limits in the House.
Sec. 314. Emergency legislation.
Sec. 315. Pay-as-you-go point of order in the House.
Sec. 316. Disclosure of effect of legislation on the public debt.
Sec. 317. Disclosure of interest costs.
Sec. 318. Dynamic scoring of tax legislation.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

Sec. 401. Sense of Congress regarding budget enforcement.
Sec. 402. Sense of Congress on tax reform.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $1,441,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,604,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,746,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,863,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,981,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,099,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,226,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,460,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,637,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,778,210,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $30,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $12,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$6,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$18,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: −$21,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: −$33,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: −$33,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $0.
Fiscal year 2013: $0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:
Fiscal year 2004: $1,843,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,951,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,071,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,171,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,276,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,373,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,472,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,585,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,662,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,768,930,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2004: $1,851,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,942,306,000.000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,045,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,140,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,249,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,355,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,461,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,586,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,653,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,776,371,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:
Fiscal year 2004: $409,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $337,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $298,326,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $276,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $267,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $256,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $234,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $125,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $15,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $−1,839,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:
Fiscal year 2004: $7,179,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $7,621,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,048,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $8,457,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $8,861,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,258,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $9,637,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $9,911,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,082,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $10,239,283,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2004: $4,072,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,221,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,321,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,378,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,406,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,404,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,361,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,191,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $3,895,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,568,283,000,000.

SEC. 102. HOMELAND SECURITY.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 for Homeland Security are as follows:
(1) New budget authority, $41,035,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2013 for each major functional category are:
(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $420,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $440,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $460,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $480,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $462,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $494,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $480,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $507,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $522,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $536,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,884,000,000.
(A) New budget authority, $551,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,541,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $29,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $32,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $33,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $34,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $35,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $36,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $37,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $38,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $38,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,298,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $25,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $27,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $28,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,198,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $2,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,359,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $30,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $31,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $32,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $33,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $34,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $36,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $37,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $38,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,769,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $27,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $26,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $26,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $25,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $24,971,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $24,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,472,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $8,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $8,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $9,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $9,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $9,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,731,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $59,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $64,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $64,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $64,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $65,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $66,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $67,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $67,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $68,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $69,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,306,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,628,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $15,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $15,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $16,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $16,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $17,205,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,579,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $88,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $87,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $89,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $91,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $93,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $95,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $97,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $99,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $101,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $103,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,775,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $240,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $252,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $269,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $290,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $312,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $310,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $335,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $333,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $361,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $359,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $389,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $387,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $419,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $418,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $452,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $451,354,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $265,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $282,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $322,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $318,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $344,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $370,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $396,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $423,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $424,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $455,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $459,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $490,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $486,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $526,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,559,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $318,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $323,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $326,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $334,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $340,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $352,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $353,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $363,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $364,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $375,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $376,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $392,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $383,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $384,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $398,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $398,881,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $16,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $18,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,670,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $61,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $67,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,612,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $65,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $64,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $67,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $69,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $71,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $75,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $72,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $77,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,329,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $37,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $37,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $37,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $38,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $39,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $40,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $41,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $42,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $44,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $45,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,938,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $20,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $20,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $22,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,121,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $253,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $293,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $325,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $344,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $351,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $360,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $375,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $387,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $401,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $397,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $401,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $422,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $397,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,508,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0
(B) Outlays, $0.0
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0
(B) Outlays, $0.0
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0
(B) Outlays, $0.0
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0
(B) Outlays, $0.0
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.0
(B) Outlays, $0.0
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$1,116,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$2,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$2,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$5,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$3,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$6,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,040,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$45,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$45,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$55,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$55,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$57,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$57,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$58,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$58,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$61,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$66,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$66,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$68,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$68,977,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING ECONOMIC GROWTH.—(1) The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report to the House a reconciliation bill not later than April 11, 2003, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $46,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2003 and 2004 and increase the total level of revenues by not more than $49,900,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(2) It is the sense of the Congress that in complying with the instructions set forth in paragraph (1) the Committee on Ways and Means should provide immediate tax relief and economic stimulus by accelerating tax relief for middle-class families through increases in the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and reductions in individual income tax rates, provide incentives for business investment, provide immediate and permanent estate tax relief and defer tax relief for individual taxpayers with incomes above $140,000 until the budget is in balance and national security threats have been addressed.

(b) SUBMISSIONS REGARDING MEDICARE REFORM AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.—Not later than July 18, 2003, the committees named in this subsection shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revisions.

(1) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reform medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit, such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $6,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004 and $400,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(2) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that reform medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit, such that the total level of direct spending for that committee does not exceed: $6,000,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004 and $400,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

SEC. 202. INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT CONTINGENT UPON PLAN TO RESTORE BALANCED BUDGET.

(a) TEMPORARY INCREASE IN STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House shall report a bill as soon as practicable, but not later than April 11, 2003, that consists solely of changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the statutory debt limit by $150,000,000,000.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—(1) Except as provided by subsection (a) or paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that increases the limit on the public debt by more than $100,000,000,000.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the House if—

(A) the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House has made the certification described in section 203 that the unified budget will be in balance by fiscal year 2009; or

(B) the President has submitted to Congress a declaration that such increase is necessary to finance costs of a military conflict

or address an imminent threat to national security, but which shall not exceed the amount of the adjustment under section 302 for the costs of military operations in Iraq.

SEC. 203. REVIEW OF BUDGET OUTLOOK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, in the report released pursuant to section 202 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, entitled the Budget and Economic Outlook Update (for fiscal years 2004 through 2013), the Director of the Congressional Budget Office projects that the unified budget of the United States for fiscal year 2009 will be in balance, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House is authorized to certify that the budget is projected to meet the goals of a balanced budget.

(b) CALCULATING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING BASELINE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall use the discretionary spending levels set forth in this resolution, including any adjustments to such levels as a result of the implementation of any reserve funds set forth in this resolution to calculate the discretionary spending baseline.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for the Department of Homeland Security and if the Secretary of Homeland Security so requests, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Homeland Security should—

(1) conduct a homeland security needs assessment in consultation with all Federal agencies with responsibilities for homeland security and State and local governments; and

(2) submit a report to Congress with additional funding requests, if any, identified in the needs assessment, and that such report should also include a compilation of the needs assessments submitted by State and local governments.

SEC. 302. RESERVE FUND FOR THE COSTS OF MILITARY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ.

In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for the costs of military operations in Iraq, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL MANDATORY FUNDING FOR EXISTING HEALTH AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WHICH PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND INDIVIDUALS.

In the House, if the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Education and the Workforce, or the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for additional mandatory funding for existing health and employment programs which provide assistance to States and individuals, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but such revision shall not exceed $12,500,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 304. RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, if the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

(1) for fiscal year 2004: $30,340,000,000,

(2) for fiscal year 2005: $30,998,000,000,

(3) for fiscal year 2006: $31,707,000,000,

(4) for fiscal year 2007: $32,436,000,000, or

(5) for fiscal year 2008: $33,190,000,000,

and the amount of such excess in each such year is offset by reductions in the deficit caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation that changes direct spending from, or receipts subsequently appropriated to, the Highway Trust Fund, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority for such committee by the amount of such excess for fiscal year 2004 and by the total amount of such excesses for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and make the necessary offsetting adjustments in the appropriate budget aggregates and allocations.

(b) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—In the House, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes obligation limitations that, in total, are in excess of $38,496,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a), for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fiscal year for the Committee on Appropriations by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations.

SEC. 305. RESERVE FUND FOR BIOSHIELD.

In the House, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes a program to accelerate the research, development, and purchase of biomedical threat countermeasures and—

(1) such measure provides new budget authority to carry out such program; or

(2) such measure authorizes discretionary new budget authority to carry out such program and the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority to carry out such program,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations for the committee providing such new budget authority, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, by the amount provided for that purpose, but, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (1), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom and $3,418,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom or, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (2), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the total such revision for fiscal year 2004 may not exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR PERMANENT EXTENSION OF TAX CUTS; MEDICARE.

In the House, notwithstanding section 311 of this resolution, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that makes the provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 permanent or provides additional resources for a medicare prescription drug benefit in excess of $400,000,000,000 over the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, and if the chairman on the Committee on the Budget certifies that the enactment of such legislation would not cause or increase an on-budget deficit in 2013, then the chairman on the Committee on the Budget shall revise allocations to accommodate such legislation and make other necessary adjustments.

Subtitle B—Enforcement

SEC. 311. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION REDUCING THE SURPLUS OR INCREASING THE DEFICIT AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2008.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that first provides new budget authority or a decrease in revenues for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2013 that would decrease the surplus or increase the deficit for any fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House certifies, based on estimates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, that Congress has enacted legislation restoring 75-year solvency of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance Trust Fund and legislation extending the solvency of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for 20 years.

SEC. 312. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 313. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto, that provides new budget authority that would cause the discretionary spending limits to be exceeded for any fiscal year.

(b) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the House and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(8) with respect to fiscal year 2004—

(A) for the defense category: $399,683,000,000 in new budget authority and $389,746,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $392,517,000,000 in new budget authority and $429,054,000,000 in outlays;

(9) with respect to fiscal year 2005—

(A) for the defense category: $420,019,000,000 in new budget authority and $409,737,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $393,481,000,000 in new budget authority and $440,264,000,000 in outlays;

(10) with respect to fiscal year 2006—

(A) for the defense category: $440,044,000,000 in new budget authority and $422,808,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $402,256,000,000 in new budget authority and $446,992,000,000;

(11) with respect to fiscal year 2007—

(A) for the defense category: $460,309,000,000 in new budget authority and $436,164,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $412,091,000,000 in new budget authority and $455,236,000,000;

(12) with respect to fiscal year 2008—

(A) for the defense category: $480,747,000,000 in new budget authority and $460,190,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $494,853,000,000 in new budget authority and $465,710,000,000;

as adjusted in conformance with subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) CHAIRMAN.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution, the offering of an amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the adjustments set forth in subparagraph (B) for the amount of new budget authority in that measure (if that measure meets the requirements set forth in paragraph (2)) and the outlays flowing from that budget authority. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may also make appropriate adjustments for the reserve funds set forth in sections 301, 302, and 303.

(B) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in subparagraph (A) are to be made to—

(i) the discretionary spending limits, if any, set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget;

(ii) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(iii) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) AMOUNTS OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) an amount provided and designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 314;

(B) an amount appropriated for homeland security as provided in section 301;

(C) an amount appropriated for military operations in Iraq as provided in section 302; and

(D) an amount provided for transportation under section 304.

(3) APPLICATION OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments made for legislation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

(A) apply while that legislation is under consideration;

(B) take effect upon the enactment of that legislation; and

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(4) APPLICATION OF THIS SECTION.—The provisions of this section shall apply to legislation providing new budget authority for fiscal years 2003 through 2008.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of this section.

(2)(A) This subsection shall apply only to the House of Representatives.

(B) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order under this section must specify the precise language on which it is premised.

(C) As disposition of points of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the points of order.

(D) A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(E) The disposition of the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

SEC. 314. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—If a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation is enacted or if appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that the President designates as an emergency requirement and that the Congress so designates in statute, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be designated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this resolution.

(b) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under subsection (a), the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are that the expenditure or tax change is—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR USE OF DESIGNATION.—When an emergency designation is proposed in any bill, joint resolution, or conference report thereon, the committee report and the statement of managers accompanying a conference report, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the provision meets the criteria set forth in paragraph (2).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''direct spending'', ''receipts'', and ''appropriations for discretionary accounts'' means any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that provides direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) SEPARATE HOUSE VOTE ON EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—(1) In the House, in the consideration of any measure for amendment in the Committee of the Whole containing any emergency spending designation, it shall always be in order unless specifically waived by terms of a rule governing consideration of that measure, to move to strike such emergency spending designation from the portion of the bill then open to amendment.

(2) The Committee on Rules shall include in the report required by clause 1(d) of rule XI (relating to its activities during the Congress) of the Rules of House of Representatives a separate item identifying all waivers of points of order relating to emergency spending designations, listed by bill or joint resolution number and the subject matter of that measure.

(e) COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.—Whenever the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of either House (including a committee of conference) reports any bill or joint resolution that provides budget authority for any emergency, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution (or the joint explanatory statement of managers in the case of a conference report on any such bill or joint resolution) shall identify all provisions that provide budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom for such emergency and include a statement of the reasons why such budget authority meets the definition of an emergency pursuant to the guidelines described in subsection (b).

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(g) EXCEPTION FOR DEFENSE AND HOMELAND SECURITY SPENDING.—Subsection (d) shall not apply against an emergency designation for a provision making discretionary appropriations in the defense category and for homeland security programs.

SEC. 315. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''applicable time period'' means any 1 of the 3 following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(B) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(C) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as

provided in paragraph (4), the term ''direct-spending legislation'' means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ''direct-spending legislation'' and ''revenue legislation'' do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to section 201 of this resolution;

(C) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990; or

(D) any legislation for which an adjustment is made under section 302.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget as adjusted for any changes in revenues or direct spending assumed by such resolution; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted pursuant to reconciliation instructions since the beginning of that same calendar year shall not be available.

(b) APPEALS.—Appeals in the House from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—(1) It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of this section.

(2)(A) This subsection shall apply only to the House of Representatives.

(B) In order to be cognizable by the Chair, a point of order under this section must specify the precise language on which it is premised.

(C) As disposition of points of order under this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the points of order.

(D) A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by each Member initiating a point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent on each point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(E) The disposition of the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on September 30, 2008.

SEC. 316. DISCLOSURE OF EFFECT OF LEGISLATION ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Each report of a committee of the House on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain an estimate by the committee of the amount the public debt would be increased (including related debt service costs) in carrying out the bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and in the 5-fiscal year period beginning with such fiscal year (or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by the bill or joint resolution if less than five years).

SEC. 317. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST COSTS.

Whenever a committee of either House of Congress reports to its House legislation providing new budget authority or providing an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution shall contain a projection by the Congressional Budget Office of the cost of the debt servicing that would be caused by such measure for such fiscal year (or fiscal years) and each of the 4 ensuing fiscal years.

SEC. 318. DYNAMIC SCORING OF TAX LEGISLATION.

Any report of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of any bill or joint resolution reported by that committee that proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and which report includes an estimate prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation pursuant to clause 2(h)(2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall also contain an estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office regarding the macroeconomic effect of any increase or decrease in the estimated budget deficit resulting from such bill or joint resolution.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted enforcing this resolution by—

(1) setting discretionary spending limits for budget authority and outlays at the levels set forth in this resolution for each of the next 5 fiscal years;

(2) reinstating the pay-as-you-go rules set forth in section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for the next 10 fiscal years;

(3) requiring separate votes to exceed such discretionary spending limits or to waive such pay-as-you-go rules;

(4) establishing a definition for emergency spending and requiring a justification for emergency spending requests and legislation; and

(5) establishing expedited rescission authority regarding congressional votes on rescission submitted by the President and reducing discretionary spending limits to reflect savings from any rescissions enacted into law.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAX REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that the Committee on Ways and Means should—

(1) work with the Secretary of the Treasury to draft legislation reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in a revenue-neutral manner to improve savings and investment; and

(2) consider changes that address the treatment of dividends and retirement savings, corporate tax avoidance, and simplification of the tax laws.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to myself as much time as I may consume.

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog plan that we are offering today combines short-term economic stimulus and immediate tax relief for all taxpayers with long-term fiscal discipline to balance the budget by 2009 and return to saving the Social Security surplus by 2013. The Blue Dog budget has nearly $2 trillion less debt than the President's budget from the year 2003 to 2013. The Blue Dog budget calls for tough spending limits by adopting the President's overall spending levels but does not rely on unreasonable or unrealistic spending cuts from the President's proposal.

The Blue Dog budget will hold Congress accountable for the increase in the debt tax by limiting increases in the debt limit and requiring regular votes by Congress to raise the debt limit until the budget is on the path towards balance.

We strongly support the President in the war on terrorism and in keeping a strong defense. Our budget provides the President with everything he requested for defense and homeland security and sets aside a reserve fund for additional funding for homeland security if the administration requests it. The Blue Dog budget is good policy, plain and simple. For every $1,000 each taxpayer sends to Washington, an income tax roughly $180 goes to pay the interest on our national debt. The Blue Dog budget reduces that burden while the Republican budget increases that burden. That is what we call the ''debt tax.'' Eighteen percent of the Federal budget, over $2,500 per person, over $4,000 per family, and it only gets worse if we follow their plan. Bob Dole called it the stealth tax in 1996. It was mentioned in a 1995 Republican-authored resolution, and it was referenced in the first plank of the 1994 Republican Contract with America.

The debt tax is money that goes towards nothing, and it is a tax that cannot be repealed. It does not make our Nation stronger. It does not make health care more affordable. It does not make our schools better. It does not provide more jobs, and it surely does not make our economy more robust.

It is time to get back on the track towards balancing the Federal budget. We cannot and should not send our troops, our brave men and women, into battle, then saddle them with the bill. It is not the right thing to do, and everybody in this body knows it. The Blue Dog budget will restore fiscal responsibility, stability, and accountability to Federal budgeting process. A

great American from the great State of Tennessee once said that no nation has ever been free, strong, and broke.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as I may consume. I respectfully claim the time in opposition.

Mr. Chairman, obviously I support the work of the committee, the underlying resolution, the budget resolution that is forwarded today. I want to thank the Blue Dog Coalition for coming forth with yet another budget proposal this year. I believe this is a consistent track record for the Blue Dogs in providing a budget resolution for consideration. We will disagree with that budget here today as they disagree with our budget, but I want to start by complimenting them because even last year at a time when the minority did not come forward with a caucus position, the Blue Dogs did. And the so-called Blue Dogs in this instance have done so again and I want to respect that. Only people who have actually gone through the process of writing a budget know how difficult that task can be in making some of the choices one has to make in order to arrive at this.

I disagree with their approach, however, for a number of reasons. First of all, I do not believe what they are putting forward supports our economy. I believe what we need right now is a growth package. The President has put that forward. We indicated that the second most important part of our budget is providing growth to the economy to create jobs. We believe we need tax simplification. We believe we need tax reform. We believe we need to lower the tax on the American people at a time of recession, not just for the sake of lowering taxes but because we know, we have seen this happen in the past many times in history where when we reduce the tax burden on America, when we reduce it particularly to a level at or below the average of taxes and revenues compared to the gross domestic product, that that does have a growth effect, a stimulative effect, on the economy.

And so while we will agree today on national defense and homeland security, probably the biggest departure we will see between these two budgets is regarding growth in the economy and creating jobs. We just happen to believe on our side that getting a growth package through to create jobs is vitally important. We are also going to have a semantical debate here today. I do not want to throw gasoline on the fire, so I am going to try not to. But I have to say that if we are not going to continue an already-reduced reduction in taxes, I mean I do not know what we call that. I know many on my side have come down here and I know it makes my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition cringe when they hear it when we have heard on our side that that be explained as a tax increase, but you might be able to understand why you cringe when you see us cringe when a reduction in the anticipated increase is called a cut.

And time after time today we have seen Members come to the floor on the other side of the aisle and explain that we are making excruciating cuts in veterans and education and Medicare and Medicaid and all sorts of different programs when in fact that is simply not the case. One not only cannot find it within our budget document, but in fact that is not the choice that we request. What we request is that we go through the budget and we look for waste, fraud, and abuse and places where we have been spending money we did not have to, and we do not have all of them but these are just some examples that you do not ask us to go after: Foreign Assistance, the Effectiveness and Accountability of Problems Common to U.S. Programs, Taking Strategic Approach for DOD and the Acquisition of Services, Implementation of an Electronic Benefit Transfer System in the Food Stamp Program, IRS's Efforts to Improve Compliance with the Employment Tax.

I mean, all of these save money. All of these find places where we are just not doing a good job. All of these ought to be a hearing. All of these ought to be a place where we can introduce legislation and we can say that is not a cut. To go through this and to actually look at the General Accounting Office, and we pay them a lot of money. Talk about waste. If you are going to hire people to go through the programs from the General Accounting Office and then you do not even listen to them, my friend, the comptroller general, would not like my saying this, but why do we hire these folks to give us these good ideas of places we can reduce spending, not cutting benefits, not cutting services, not closing nursing homes, not cutting off senior citizens, not eliminating Meals on Wheels or food stamps or school lunches or, oh, my goodness, all of the things that people have come down here wringing their hands about today, but just going through here: Controlling the Weakness in Property Vulnerable to Improper Use, Loss and Theft. There is a real partisan issue, theft. I mean if we are stealing things from agencies, from departments, and I have heard everything from a 61-inch television; I mean, come on.

Does that balance the budget? No. We are not suggesting that alone balances the budget, but we have got to start somewhere.

I could go on. The Deteriorating Financial Outlook and the Need for Transformation in the Postal Service, Medicare, Medicaid, FAA. Here is one, let us see, Significant Weakness in the Computer Controls. And, in fact, I believe we spent $8 million trying to get the Department of Agriculture to go to a new computer system; and guess what, after I think 8 years and $8 million, they found out they could not go to the new system. So we just spent $8 million for nothing on that. Defense Acquisitions, Debt Collection, Food Stamps. Again, there is another one. But if we even look at food stamps, people will say we are somehow throwing the poor out in the street. Medicare, here we go again. Boy, do not touch Medicare, though. Do not even look there. Heaven forbid. It must be a perfect program. Just add more benefits, and it will be fine. I mean, we could go on and on. They are replete. I have got a whole pile over on this side. You do not look at that. And that is an important area where we believe it is time to challenge the committees to do the work to find the savings.

Last but not least, I believe that it is time that we do something together around here, and that is enforce the budget. I know that we are going to disagree today on a number of these topics. The thing that is so frustrating is when time after time Members, and it happens in the Blue Dogs, it happens on our side as well, where we come down here, we talk about our budgets and then during the appropriations process we blow through those things. We find different ways to come through the process without holding to the budget that we agreed to. I would hope that my friends in the Blue Dog Coalition more than anybody else, and I know they do, believe that once we have a budget, it is time to enforce it because if we cannot even enforce that, having this debate today is going to be meaningless.

So as I started off with today, we do not support just allowing these tax cuts to expire. We happen to believe that does increase the tax burden. We want to make sure that we have spending restraint. You claim to do it with interest payments; but we want to do it with actual spending, not just with interest payments; and we want to make sure that we figure out a way to grow the economy and create jobs. And for those reasons I respectfully oppose the Blue Dog budget, but wish them congratulations on actually creating one which is something that many people around here claim they want to do, but do not always accomplish.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding, but I want to use a portion of my time commending him, but I wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. NUSSLE. What?

Mr. STENHOLM. I will when it comes my time, but I will do it on my own time, but I am curious because it seems to me over the last 8 years you talk about your party has been in control. So all of the points that you make with the blue books, why have we not done it?

□ 1730

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I can tell the gentleman

why. It is a frustration of mine, and it is the reason why I put the budget out that I did this year.

When we got to surplus, and we have seen the chart, when we got to balancing and began going into surplus, particularly into discretionary spending, all of us around here very cheerfully started getting into a bidding war. We could do a little better than you in education, you could do a little better than us in health care. We went on and on and on.

Look at the charts in any of those categories. Once 1998 happened, as my friend knows, we could not say no to anything. It was very difficult to try to control that. That is just the discretionary side, which, as the gentleman knows, is only one-quarter of the budget.

On the mandatory side, think of the last time in a partisan or bipartisan way that we tried to take on an entitlement and even tried to control spending. My friend has quite a bit of control or interest in agriculture, as do I. I sit on a committee that has jurisdiction over Medicare and welfare. We did it in welfare and had some real success.

I just want us to start looking at that process again. That is the reason in this budget I challenge the committees. I do not do it myself. I do not try and tell my good friend on the Committee on Agriculture exactly where that ought to come from. But I do challenge him to look at the reports on food stamps and others and say, can we not do a better job?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I do not want to leave the impression that the Blue Dog budget is doing anything more than spending what President Bush has asked the Congress to spend, not 1 penny more.

We sometimes get the rhetoric around here, you would think we are big spenders in our budget. We are spending what the President has asked us to spend, and no more.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, that is a good point. But that is just the first year. We believe that we need to continue to control that spending in the outyears as well.

We also believe, and that is the reason why the budget was presented the way it was, that the President had some areas where we could control. This was true with President Clinton, President Reagan, President Bush, with all of them.

Congress is responsible for controlling spending under Article I of the Constitution. We like to blame the fellow down the street, but, more often than not, it is the people that we look at every day in the mirror that can do the best job at controlling spending.

As I say, I compliment the gentleman and my friends for putting together a budget. We respectfully disagree with that budget for the reasons that I state.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear more from my friends in the coalition.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Blue Dog budget plan, a fiscally responsible proposal that recognizes America's priorities at a time when our country is at war and our Nation is in debt.

The budget resolution before us today is seriously flawed. It is a step in the wrong direction that ignores the realities we are facing as a Nation. The Blue Dog budget, on the other hand, recognizes the costs of waging war, addresses the state of our struggling economy, and answers the needs of ordinary Americans across the Nation.

As we speak, men and women in uniform are fighting to disarm Iraq and are battling al Qaeda in Afghanistan. Hundreds of thousands are now serving their country after being called up, leaving their jobs and their families, many on short notice and at great financial and personal costs. Our troops are indeed making huge sacrifices.

But what about the average American who is not on Active Duty or in the Reserves? How have the rest of us been called upon to make our own contribution to the security and prosperity of the United States? The budget resolution before us includes a host of large tax cuts weighted heavily toward America's wealthiest families. Certainly this cannot be the sacrifice we are expected to make.

In every other conflict since the Civil War, the Commander in Chief has called for an increase in revenues to meet the national defense. Will we be the first generation since the Civil War to reduce revenue during wartime?

Over the last 2 years we have lost almost 2 million jobs. How can we afford to consider large and long-term cuts that will neither improve our defense, stimulate our economy, nor help those most in need?

Many of us who supported tax cuts when we were at peace and enjoying historic surpluses must now oppose any fiscally irresponsible budget with even larger cuts, now that we are at war and spiraling into severe debt. I must ask, where have all the fiscal conservatives gone? Where have they fled from the majority party?

In addition to the much-needed stimulus, the Blue Dog plan prioritizes national defense and homeland security. These priorities are fully funded at levels requested by the President.

While we provide strong support for our national defense and homeland security, we must not turn our backs on important domestic priorities. The American people are begging for a budget that invests in education, health care, and includes a Medicare prescription drug benefit. The Blue Dog plan responds to Americans across the country and provides a $400 billion plan for prescription drugs over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, this plan, the Blue Dog plan, will provide for our defense and homeland security needs, it will provide a vital economic stimulus and sustainable tax relief for ordinary Americans, and the plan will move our country forward with investments in health, education and other domestic priorities. Our plan will accomplish these goals and achieve $2 trillion less in debt than the administration's plan over the next 10 years.

Americans are a proud and generous people, more than willing to sacrifice for a worthy cause. If, instead, we give ourselves a gift no other war generation has given themselves, we will denude our ability to defend the homeland, or shift the costs to the next generation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD), a new Member, and a fine one at that.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Blue Dog budget. As a cochair of the Blue Dog Caucus, I was proud to work with my colleagues on this fine proposal. In my 22 years as a State legislator in Maine, I have always delivered a balanced budget, and I can tell you that the Blue Dog budget is a great budget.

My time is brief, so I just want to make three vital points about the Blue Dog approach.

First, this budget is balanced. We achieve a $15 billion surplus by the year 2009, and we have $2 trillion less in debt over the next 10 years than the President's budget.

Today we spend 18 cents of every dollar on servicing our debt. What a waste of money. This is a debt tax that every American pays, 18 cents on every hard-earned dollar.

We balance the budget and control the debt. The Blue Dog approach reduces waste, and it lowers the taxes that we all pay. Now, that is a tax cut that we all can agree on.

Second, this budget is fair. It funds defense at the same level as the President, it gives tax relief to everyone, and it includes $60 billion in immediate economic stimulus, including desperately needed assistance to States, States like the State of Maine, which the Committee on the Budget does not provide for.

Third, this budget is just. The Committee on the Budget resolution cuts mandatory spending in many areas. One of the most unconscionable cuts is a $15 billion reduction for veteran programs. On the very day we go to war, how can we vote to neglect our veterans like this?

Not only does the Blue Dog budget restore these cuts, but it also restores

other funding to vital domestic programs like education, child care, dislocated workers programs and homeland security, and it does all of this within a balanced budget.

I say to my colleagues that this is not a party issue, it is not a political issue. This is about keeping our commitments, investing in our priorities and meeting our responsibilities.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reach across the line that sometimes divides us and unite today for a budget that is balanced, that is fair and that is just.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER), a great American.

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Chairman, the Blue Dog budget is based on a very simple premise that basically says that our generation needs to be willing to have the courage to pay the bills that we are incurring and not pass this staggering debt on to our children.

As hard as this may be to imagine, we the people of the United States of America owe $6.4 trillion. If we follow the budget plan that the majority has put forward, that number will balloon to $10 trillion, and our country will be unable to meet its obligations. Can you imagine the richest country on Earth dead broke?

Eight months ago Congress increased the debt ceiling by $450 billion to pay for additional spending and tax cuts. Now the Treasury Department has notified us that we have reached this new debt limit, and it will have to be increased in the coming weeks.

It gets even worse. The Congressional Budget Office recently reported that the deficit for this year will be $287 billion, and that is without paying any cost of the war that has begun in Iraq. They also predicted over the next 10 years another $2 trillion of debt will be piled onto what we have already incurred.

Last year taxpayers in this country paid an accrued $332 billion in interest on revenues of $1.8 trillion. That amounts to a Federal debt tax on American families of 18 cents on every dollar. Said another way, we have an 18 percent mortgage on this country, and it is growing.

Notwithstanding the moral arguments of what we are doing to the next generation of Americans, at some point, in order to make the public investment needed to keep a world-class military, a healthy and educated workforce, and the bricks-and-mortar infrastructure that enables private enterprise in this country to flourish, we must stop deficit spending.

People since the dawn of civilization have tried to borrow themselves rich. It never worked then, and it will not work now, and it will not work in the future. That is exactly the prescription that the Republicans are asking us to follow; we can borrow ourselves rich. It will never happen.

We must stop the hemorrhaging, the hemorrhaging, from the Federal Treasury, because it is bleeding from every pore of our body. Any rational person understands that this business plan for our country is not a tenable plan and cannot be sustained over time.

Now, here we are debating today what direction our country will take. This plan includes no cuts in the veterans' programs that some have talked about. But it does something else. At this moment when our men and women in uniform are in battle, they are the only people in this society being asked to sacrifice anything, anything, and that is absolutely unfair. It is not only unfair, it is immoral. So what we have done in the Blue Dog plan is we have asked the most financially well-to-do people in this country to defer the additional tax cuts they get in addition to everybody else under our plan, we have asked them to defer their additional tax cuts in order to help pay for this war so that we do not continue to dig this hole deeper.

Now, I agree with the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) on one thing: When you say in Washington, and only in Washington, that an increase is considered a cut because it is not a projected increase, then it is considered a cut here, that is baloney, and I agree with the gentleman. I will also tell the gentleman that when you try to accuse somebody of raising taxes on a tax cut that is not yet effective, that is equally political baloney, and everybody knows it.

I just would say this: Something has got to be done. We cannot continue down this road of debt, more debt and more debt. And if we do not do something about it, we have completely abdicated our responsibility not only to our country today, but to our country tomorrow. That is why I would urge every Member who worries about the financial condition of this country and its ability to maintain the world-class military that we all desire and all of the other things I have talked about, please consider voting for and supporting the Blue Dog budget.

□ 1745

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the strongest voice in this House about the era of Federal budget deficits.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, before anyone thinks that I am trying to impress upon them that I am a biblical scholar, I will tell my colleagues I am not, but I happened to listen to one Sunday evening. His name is Father Dennis Carver, and he was in Pass Christian, Mississippi. He was talking about a civilization called the Babylonians. They were apparently a very prosperous civilization, but one of the things that was unique about them is that for the sake of their prosperity, they would literally take their children, put them on an alter, and slit their throats.

Although the gentleman from Iowa's budget does not quite do that, I will say that it is fair to say that we are burdening our children with so much debt that they cannot possibly hope to attain the sort of lifestyle that we have, or remain the world's greatest Nation.

In 1994, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, gave a speech on this House floor bemoaning the fact that at the time, every American man, woman, and child was $17,000 in debt as a portion of the national debt. The Republicans took over in 1995. I had hoped things would get better. But since 1995 through today, that same statistic is that every American man, woman, and child is now in debt $22,000. The Republicans have been in charge, the Republican Party. I had hoped they were truly fiscal conservatives. They have proven otherwise.

If we look at American history, during every single war in American history, and I challenge all of my colleagues to question me on this and look it up for themselves, in every other war in American history, they raised taxes to pay for that war. They took the attitude that those of us who were fortunate enough not to be in the front lines, not to be shot at, not to watch our comrades maimed, ought to at least be willing to pay for that. But there is a difference. Only this generation of Americans is saying that we are going to fight a war, we are going to occupy the nation of Iraq for at least 10 years, with a starting force of 100,000 people as occupiers, but, by the way, we are going to stick these young people in this room and the young people back in Mississippi, the young people in Texas, we are going to stick them with the bill, knowing that they will never have a chance to recover from that and they will continue to squander at least $1 billion a day every day of our lives as a Nation on interest on that debt.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and other members of the Blue Dog Coalition have done an admirable job of saying, we have to do better. And I have to tell my colleagues, I am going to vote for the Blue Dog budget, but I would have been willing to vote for any budget that freezes all of the tax cuts, because it is simply not fair.

Two years ago, the gentleman from Iowa and others came to this floor and said the President's tax breaks would not increase the national debt. I say to my colleagues they were $802 billion wrong. At what point do they admit to their mistakes, and at what point do they stop the bleeding?

The Federal debt is still growing. On February 28, 2003, the public debt was $6,445,790,102,794.08.

The public debt has increased by more than $802 billion since Congress passed the President's first budget plan on May 9, 2001. The debt grew $442,337,086,210.23 in the 12

months from February 28, 2002 to February 28, 2003.

There is no surplus except in trust funds. In the first four months of fiscal year 2003, the Treasury reported a budget deficit of $97.6 billion. However, the trust funds for Social Security, Medicare, military retirement, and federal employees retirement collected $90.2 billion in surpluses to fund future benefits. Outside these trust funds, the federal government ran a deficit of $187.8 billion.

During fiscal year 2002, Social Security added $159 billion to its surplus, and the trust funds for Medicare, military retirement, and federal employee retirement added to total of $68 billion in surplus funds. Outside those trust funds, the federal government ran a deficit of $386 billion. The Congressional Budget Office reported that fiscal year 2002 had the largest percentage decrease in revenues in 56 years and the largest percentage increase in spending in 20 years.

We spend almost one billion dollars per day on interest. The Treasury spent $332.5 billion on interest on the debt in fiscal year 2002. Military spending totaled $332.1 billion, slightly less than the interest expense, despite a 14 percent increase to fight the war on terrorism. Medicare spending totaled $256 billion, $77 billion less than we spent on interest.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes just to show my colleague from Mississippi, who does care about this; I do not begrudge him that at all. I just want to let him know that I also share in the concern over debt. But since he was slightly partisan about the issue, let me show my colleagues my chart that shows the difference between what the Democratic Congresses did versus the Republican Congresses.

We were the ones who paid down the national debt by almost half a trillion dollars until we hit this last crisis in 2001 involving the economy, involving the emergency spending, involving what happened with homeland security. Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues want to raise it to a partisan level of whose debt is whose, I can show my colleagues a chart that compares with the gentleman's partisan chart.

What I would rather do is say, look, we are in this together now. I can show a chart that goes back to Reagan. I can show a chart that goes back to Clinton. We can have a history lesson here all day long. We can yell and scream and point fingers at who did what.

Look, we are in a mess. My colleagues did not do it; I did not do it. I mean, there are three huge factors. We had emergency spending that no one, no one would have ever anticipated. What a huge economic sucker gut punch as a result of a recession that was made worse after 2001 and the terrorist attacks. Was there a component part of that of reducing taxes? Yes. We disagree. We deliberately reduced taxes at a time of huge surpluses because, yes, we were paying off the national debt, paid off over a half a trillion dollars of national debt.

So if my colleagues want to come down and point fingers and talk about the past, I can show my colleagues Reagan charts and Clinton charts and things like that.

I think we should talk about the future and what we are going to do about it. The Democrats have a plan. I compliment that plan, even though I disagree with it, because it does begin to address those issues. I have what we believe is a better plan. But let us talk about our plan and let us look forward. If my colleagues want to continue to point fingers on how we got here, my colleagues can take up the time for the substitute to do just that, but I believe we ought to focus on the future and what we are going to do about it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, America is at war, and the Blue Dog budget reflects this new reality.

Our plan strengthens national defense, improves homeland security, all in the context of a responsible budget.

I have always tried to support my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when they were right, but today their budget is all wrong.

In an effort to squeeze the President's tax cut package into their budget, our Republican colleagues have proposed spending levels below the President's that are highly unlikely to be attainable in the current climate of war and the need to protect the homeland from terrorism. And even after cutting the President's budget, the Republican budget continues to dig the deficit hole deeper, saddling the taxpayers of this country with a national debt of over $11.5 trillion in 2013. That is an increase of $5.1 trillion in debt in the next 10 years. That means every American taxpayer will owe approximately $5,100 every year just to pay the interest on the national debt. That is a debt tax that cannot be repealed.

In contrast, the Blue Dog budget is a realistic effort to control runaway Federal spending. It adopts the spending recommendations of our President. The Republican budget, on the other hand, turns its back on their own President's spending recommendations for veterans benefits, Medicare, Social Security, agriculture, and education.

The Blue Dog budget puts us back on a path to a unified balance by 2009 and restores the Social Security lockbox by 2013, a very significant year, because in that year, for the first time, the Social Security Administration projects that our government will begin paying out more each month in benefits than we received in payroll taxes.

By contrast, the Republican budget never restores the Social Security lockbox, turning their back on a promise made to America's seniors.

Since the Blue Dog budget adopts the total spending levels in the President's budget, my colleagues may be asking, what does the Blue Dog budget do differently than the Republican budget? It differs in one significant respect. It recognizes that long-term national security requires long-term fiscal responsibility. No nation has ever been strong and broke.

When our budget policies show that our current tax and spending plans will lead our Nation to ever-increasing debt, we are weakening our ability to respond to national security threats. At this very moment, while young men and women in uniform are courageously fighting the enemy in the deserts of Iraq, we are charging the financial cost of the war to the Federal Government's credit card. Who in this Chamber can explain to the American people why we are charging the cost of this war to the very generation that is now fighting this war? The Blue Dogs believe our generation should pay for this war.

Our Republican friends say, deficits no longer matter, and tax cuts will stimulate the economy, and tax revenues will return. We tried that in 2001 and what did we get? We saw the economy decline and a $5 trillion surplus disappear into thin air.

The Blue Dogs invite our Republican friends not to bet the whole farm on an ideologically driven supply-side economic theory, but join us in accelerating the marginal tax relief, accelerating the child tax credit, accelerating the elimination of the marriage penalty; but in the name of fiscal responsibility and national security, we should not accelerate the tax cuts for those families who have over $170,000 a year in income. Surely the top 3 percent of America's families will be proud to share in the patriotism of making this small sacrifice as those young men and women are doing in Iraq today.

We know that we should not ask those men and women in uniform to pay for the war we have called on them to fight. I invite all true fiscal conservatives to support the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD).

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time. I will be very brief.

I have a great deal of admiration for the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), the chairman of the committee. He has brought a budget resolution to the floor that his leadership has allowed him to bring, and they think they can get 218 votes out of the Republican caucus. What is wrong with that? I will tell my colleagues what is wrong with that and what the American people will say is wrong with that, and that is that the American people expect this Congress to set its priorities and to pay for those priorities, and that is something that we have been unwilling to do in the last couple of years.

What do I mean by that? It means that we have to have discipline on the spending side. We had that in 1997 when we, in a bipartisan way, sat down with the administration, which was in Democratic hands, and we sat down with the Republican-controlled Senate and House and made an agreement to set spending caps, and we made an

agreement to get this budget into balance by 2003, and we did it 3 years ahead of schedule.

So I would encourage my colleagues to vote for the Blue Dog budget and reject the Republican budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time.

I want to announce and show the audience here in the Chamber that the Concord Coalition, which is a national watchdog organization on the budget, issued a press statement today; and I want to just quote briefly from that:

''The Blue Dog budget does the best job of balancing short term concerns with long term fiscal discipline. The Blue Dog budget is clearly superior to the alternatives. It strikes a prudent balance among competing priorities by restraining spending and limiting newer expanded tax cuts to those that have an immediate impact and minimum long term cost.''

□ 1800

I hope we will set aside partisanship and listen to a respected, objective organization, the national coalition, and approve the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman Nussle) for his commitment to providing a balanced budget and for acknowledging that debt and deficits do matter.

The Committee on the Budget passed a budget last week on a party line vote. At least it was an honest budget. It said that in order for us to pass huge tax cuts when we are already projecting deficits as far as the eye can see, we must pass spending cuts. In deference to Mr. Chairman over here, he would say, find savings in all functions of government. So please understand it that way.

Over $100 billion below the President's request for discretionary spending, $262 billion in Medicare cuts are finding savings, $110 billion in Medicaid cuts are savings, $19 billion in agriculture cuts are savings, $39 billion in government employees' pensions, and $15 billion in veterans benefits at a time that we are going to war, when our domestic security is threatened and our States and local governments are in financial crisis. That is the problem with this budget, Mr. Chairman: The reductions proposed simply are not reality.

Everyone here remembers last year's appropriations process. We just completed it last month. Congress ended up spending, or appropriating, $12 billion more than the President's recommended levels. This budget proposes cuts in the President's austere request. This budget, simply for that reason, I believe, with all respect to the chairman and the committee, is not reality.

Look at what has happened the last weeks. In the face of an outright revolt on many of these cuts, what did the majority do? They restored some of the so-called spending cuts, or savings, that were found, about $200 billion in Medicare over 10 years. That is what is going to happen more and more. That is why I believe we simply cannot meet the spending levels proposed, with all respect, by the majority's budget.

This budget, because of its emphasis on tax cuts, never, I repeat, never, gets us to on-budget balance. Instead, it increases gross debt by over $5 trillion over the next 10 years. The structural deficits in this budget, Mr. Chairman, will explode gross interest payments to $3.8 trillion during the next decade. Interest, as has already been mentioned, it is the most wasteful spending we have because it commits our future generations in this country, our children and grandchildren, to paying something, a tax, what we call a debt tax.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) indicated that Senator DOLE called this a stealth tax. We call it a debt tax. It is a tax that can never be repealed because it is the interest of service on the national debt.

The Blue Dog budget cuts taxes. It provides an income tax cut for all taxpayers. It immediately eliminates the marriage penalty, accelerates the child tax credit, and on and on. Listen to the Concord Coalition, the objective voice here, endorsing the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the budget of the Blue Dogs, which I think handles our short-term needs and our long-term concerns.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Iowa for his hard work on the committee, and to thank him for allowing the Blue Dogs to make this presentation here today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I have waited 24 years for this day to shuck the tax-and-spend Democratic label and transfer it to the Republican borrow-and-spend label. I say this with a smile on my face, and I am one of those that believe when I am pointing the finger of partisanship, there are always three pointing back at me. I will take the three best shots of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), but I insist the gentleman takes my one at this time.

The gentleman said we have a difference between our two philosophies today. This chart shows it. Our budget is the green budget. The yellow budget I ran against in 1978 because I thought deficit spending was bad. I voted for the Reagan tax cuts; and this is what we got, following the same economic theory that we once again are being asked to support today.

I am for the green. The Blue Dog budget will accomplish that based on the estimates. The gentleman's budget today will keep us in Social Security for the remainder of the 10 years the gentleman is talking about.

I commend the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL) did. The budget he brought out of committee was an honest budget. It told this conference and this Congress and the American people that if they want tax cuts, they have to pay for them. They have got to do the spending cuts that they suggested.

However, the gentleman's own conference said, no. As I told the gentleman privately, and I will say publicly, if the gentleman would reconcile the cuts in a public manner on this floor first and then go to the tax cuts, he would have some support on this side. But I am skeptical, when they bring a budget that even their own conference will not support to the floor on the spending cuts, but yet we are going to have a tax cut on the floor in a very short period of time, that this is what we are going to get.

Our budget balances without using Social Security by 2013. As the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) said a moment ago, it is immoral what this Congress, these last few Congresses, are doing to our children and grandchildren.

When we talk about spending cuts, I have heard it explained that in the agricultural function it is just 1 percent. But let me remind all of us, we took 2 years writing the farm bill that passed with two-thirds support, equally divided Democrats and Republicans, and the President signed it. We stayed within the budget that they asked us to last year.

Anyone that suggests we can make the cuts that the gentleman is suggesting, assuming that it passes, without reopening the farm bill and rewriting it, is totally misinformed as to what the facts are regarding the authorizing of various programs.

I find it very interesting that today in the Committee on the Judiciary we were supposed to have passing out a constitutional amendment to balance the budget. As many know, I am for it. I am a cosponsor of it. One of the happiest days in my life was when we passed it on this floor; one of the saddest days was when it went down by one vote in the Senate.

Had that passed in the Senate, they could not bring their budget to the floor today. The only budget we will vote on today is this budget right here, the blue one, the Blue Dog line, that shows that we will balance without using Social Security in 2013. They

could not do it had we had a constitutional restraint. Yet some on the gentleman's side have the audacity to suggest that the budget is a good one; but yet we want to have a constitutional amendment to require us to do what we are not willing to do when we have a chance of doing it.

In 1999 the Republican leadership issued a statement pledging to protect the Social Security surplus: ''As leaders of the House of Representatives, we will not schedule any legislation that spends one penny of the Social Security trust fund. This leadership is committed to ending the 30-year raid on seniors and paying down the debt.''

We could not help 9–11–01, and we cannot help the fact that our economy has gone south, but we can stop digging the hole deeper as of today. That is what the Blue Dog budget does. It is the only budget that stops digging the hole deeper.

Now, one area we cut below the President, and our spending levels, I repeat, in this budget we do not spend one penny more than President Bush asked us to spend, one penny; but there is one area we want to cut below the President. We want to cut $420 billion out of the President's budget and somewhat less out of the chairman's budget for interest on the national debt. They can bring out all of the blue books, they have been there when the gentleman's party has been in charge, and some of us on this side would like to work with them. But they constantly and consistently deny us that opportunity, which, if they pass their budget today, once again, they deny us the opportunity.

We had a better budget 2 years ago. The economic situation of this country would not be as bad. I ask Members to support the Blue Dog budget.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, Mr. Chairman. I have enormous respect for the gentleman from Texas and for my friends for writing a budget, because writing a budget in Washington, D.C. for the Federal Government is not maybe the most challenging job in Washington, but it does have its moments of challenges.

Probably one of the biggest challenges in writing a budget, as my friends know, is when we have to explain to politicians who get elected by saying yes that sometimes we have to say no, or sometimes we have to do things that are difficult.

There is no question that when I wrote the original draft of this budget, I asked my colleagues to do something that was difficult. It maybe was more difficult than I had either the right to ask or the ability to ask; but I asked it, not because I thought it was easy, but because I thought it was important for us to at least begin the debate.

Particularly in Medicare, that is a debate that I recognize probably as being difficult maybe more than most Members because I have spent the last 12 years being stung by attacks from opponents back home who, in years where we did nothing to Medicare, were able to come up with phantom votes here and there suggesting that somehow, again, as a Republican, I think maybe just because I registered to vote as a Republican, that somehow I was cutting Medicare. It must be something that is just automatic when you become a Republican, it seems, these days.

But it could not be further from the truth. When it comes to our budgets in Medicare and so many of these programs, as my friends know, particularly since 1998, we have just been spending money around here like it is going out of style in every category. We almost cannot name a category that has gone down by any significant portion over the last 5 years, in particular, since we got the balance.

So it was not so much that I was saying cut, but I was saying slow down. That is all I was trying to say was slow down. That is what I was trying to say in Medicare was slow down. We had put $400 billion in. I asked them to look for that waste within Medicare. We know it is there. I have three great examples that came out of those blue books we were talking about.

The Medicare program pays as much as eight times, just think about this, I would say to my friends, eight times the cost of any other Federal agency when we pay for the same drugs and medical supplies. I do not know, maybe double would be a reasonable level; but eight times does not make much sense to me.

Medicare provides overpayments of $12.1 billion in 1 year. All right? That is just another example.

In 2002, it was estimated that improper, and that is in addition to overpayments, we are talking about just plain improper, fraudulent payments under Medicare were estimated at $13 billion. Let me quickly do the math: 13, 12, that is 25. We do not even know what the cost of the drugs are, but that is $25 billion in 1 year, as an example.

I do not know about the other Members, but that pays for a lot of prescription drugs for seniors. Just in the first year of the drug benefit that almost all of us support, we are only talking about $7 billion as a drug benefit. That is just the first year of the phase-in. That is three times, almost four times, the amount of the initial drug benefit we waste in the Medicare program. That is before we even talk about reimbursements.

My friend, the gentleman from Texas, and I have been laboring on the Rural Health Care Coalition since I think the day the gentleman walked in this place, and certainly the day I walked in. Medicare is not serving our seniors because of a crazy reimbursement system that has been out there. But we come down here to the well and we say, oh, gosh, do not touch that, it is Medicare.

Heaven forbid we would try and do something around here in any of these programs in order to try to control them, because around here in Washington our level of compassion and concern has been equal to the amount of money we are willing to put into the program.

So instead of saying to Medicare, the Defense Department, agriculture, I do not care what it is, instead of saying, where did that $13 billion go; we are not going to give it to you again next year until you find it, instead, what we say is, oh, quick, quick, let us pass a budget that puts in $400 billion more.

Let us hurry up and do that because heaven forbid we would look at a senior citizen straight in the eye and say, Do you know what? The program is not working as well as it should. It is not doing the job we promised; it is wasting money.

So that is what I was asking for. The gentleman is right, I did not get the votes for that. We will live to have that discussion another day because my guess is that in order for the actual bill to come to the floor, we are going to have to make some of those adjustments.

I could go on. That is the most politically sensitive one in the bunch. I could go on and on through less politically sensitive issues. But what I am asking us to do, and it is article 1 of the Constitution that I believe gives us that responsibility. The gentleman showed a chart that defines it by President. I could show a chart, and I know we are talking about the partisan jabs, I could show a chart that showed the exact same figures but showed them under Republican and Democratic Congresses.

□ 1815

It does not matter, as I said to my friend from Mississippi, it does not matter what happened in the past. It matters what we look to do in the future. My colleagues have got a plan. We disagree with it because it does not, we do not believe, do the one thing that we believe can help us here the most, and that is stimulate the growth in the economy that brings in so much of the revenue that we need.

The second thing it really does not do, and we disagree with the President on this, mostly not because we disagree with the President, but because it is our job to control spending. If we do not do it by the time the bill gets to his desk, it is not going to get done, and so that is why we asked for the waste, fraud and abuse within these reconciliation instructions.

Last but not least, and I think my friend wants us to yield, the balanced budget amendment, and I am a cosponsor and have been and voted for it. The one problem with a balanced budget amendment, of course, is it takes about 8 years to get it into place, and what we said in 1995 and what we are both saying here today in a bipartisan way, regardless of our plan, let us just do it. Forget about the amendment for a second. Let us do it. Let us actually go in

and balance it as opposed to just saying that we ought to have a constitutional amendment to do it.

The one thing the balanced budget amendment does provide is an exception. Two things actually. One is national emergency, and certainly I think September 11, obviously we in a bipartisan way agree that that is a national emergency; and the second is war, and clearly, we are in a war. So while I support that, I think we ought to just do it.

We put ourselves on a path under both of our plans, but we believe ours is a better path, and that is the reason.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I would just say there are 35 Blue Dogs that stand ready to work with the gentleman's side on every one of the issues in the blue books that my colleague had up. If we would have the same spirit on those issues that we have had by allowing us to have this 1 hour this year, which we were not allowed to have last year, we would have made a lot of progress on this.

The fact that my colleagues were kind enough this year to allow the Blue Dogs to have 1 hour of debate so we can have this discussion, we do think it is a better plan, but it is up to the will of the majority of the House as to whether our plan is better than my colleagues. We will stand by the will of the majority.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments.

As I say, I respectfully oppose the gentleman's and the Blue Dogs' substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HILL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 254, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

AYES—174

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Ballance
Becerra
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hill
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kind
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wu
Wynn

NOES—254

Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
English
Evans
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Matheson
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Buyer
Gephardt
Hyde
Reynolds
Thornberry
Udall (CO)

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) (during the vote). The Chair advises Members there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1838

Messrs. EVERETT, TURNER of Ohio, FRANKS of Arizona, FERGUSON, ENGLISH and GILCHREST changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. GUTIERREZ, EDWARDS, COSTELLO and Mrs. BONO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on House rollcall vote 78, on the Hill Substitute to H. Con. Res. 95, I mistakenly cast my vote as a ''no''. I intended to vote ''aye'' and support the Hill substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 108–44.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. TOOMEY

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 2 in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Mr. TOOMEY:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2013.

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For the purpose of enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal Year 2003: $1,323,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,340,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,504,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,642,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,768,142,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,872,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $1,985,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,095,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,198,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,324,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,460,635,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $36,105,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $126,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $112,759,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $97,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $85,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $90,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $92,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $97,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $228,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $325,353,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $343,575,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,790,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,811,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,888,755,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,961,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,019,225,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,072,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,144,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,209,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,297,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,371,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,463,897,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,776,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,824,619,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,880,352,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,931,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,979,840,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,033,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,110,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,178,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,272,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,333,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,433,558,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $453,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $484,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $376,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $288,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $211,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $161,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $124,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $82,879,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $73,988,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $8,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $−27,077,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $6,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $7,242,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $7,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $8,636,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $9,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $9,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,266,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $11,010,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $3,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $4,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,364,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $392,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $420,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $440,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $460,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $480,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $462,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $494,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $480,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $507,840,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $497,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $522,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $536,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $523,884,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $551,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,541,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,747,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $28,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,128,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $32,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $33,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,389,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,398,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,873,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,737,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $23,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $22,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,348,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $23,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $24,344,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $27,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $28,464,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,393,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $2,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $2,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $2,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,295,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $29,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $30,250,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $30,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $30,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,199,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $31,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,331,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,706,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $34,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,590,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,966,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $26,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $25,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,113,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $24,035,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $24,239,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $22,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,388,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,401,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,633,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $8,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $9,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,628,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,763,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $8,737,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,208,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,840,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $64,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $65,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $65,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $66,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $67,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $68,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $69,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $71,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $72,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $74,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $76,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,924,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,923,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $14,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $15,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $15,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,802,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $16,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $16,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,288,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $86,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $84,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $84,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $86,663,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $88,640,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $90,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,343,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $92,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,470,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $93,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $95,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $97,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,583,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $221,878,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $218,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $235,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $235,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $248,561,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $265,324,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $264,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $284,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $283,181,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $303,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $323,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $322,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $345,221,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $343,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $370,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $368,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $394,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $393,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $423,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $421,858,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $248,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $261,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $261,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $275,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $312,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $332,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $332,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $352,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $352,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $372,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $371,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $392,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $420,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $423,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $453,915,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $450,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $490,497,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $490,754,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $326,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,373,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $315,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $321,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $326,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,892,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $332,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $337,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $339,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $345,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $347,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $354,493,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $355,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $362,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $363,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $376,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $377,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $379,667,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $380,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $393,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,420,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $16,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $17,975,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,982,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,357,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,450,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,481,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $57,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $60,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $65,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $63,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $62,320,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $65,655,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $66,888,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $68,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $72,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $69,805,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $74,452,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,132,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $38,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $37,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $37,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $37,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $37,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $38,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $39,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $40,884,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $42,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $43,451,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $44,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,464,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $19,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $19,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,760,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $20,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,323,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $239,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $256,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $256,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $301,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $336,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $336,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $355,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $355,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $368,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $368,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $379,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $379,976,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $387,382,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $387,382,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $394,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $401,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $401,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $403,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,084,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$25,986,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$26,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$58,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$103,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$106,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$134,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$137,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$172,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$174,839,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$184,626,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$187,639,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$197,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$200,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$213,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$216,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$227,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$230,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$244,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$248,504,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$42,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$42,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$51,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$51,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, −$53,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$53,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$59,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$61,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,229,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND TAX SIMPLIFICATION AND FAIRNESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 11, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to—

(1) reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $35,420,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, $126,232,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, $512,195,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $1,599,943,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013; and

(2) increase the level of direct spending for that committee by $4,380,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003, $1,111,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $17,393,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $23,096,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the level of direct spending for that committee by $3,600,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2003 and outlays flowing therefrom.

(b) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR THE ELIMINATION OF WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 18, 2003, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The House Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,409,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $17,622,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $50,718,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The House Committee on Education and the Workforce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $613,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $8,276,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $25,665,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(C) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $3,160,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $80,495,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $292,506,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(D) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The House Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $30,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004, $390,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $381,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(E) COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The House Committee on Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $2,518,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $33,042,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $104,405,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(F) COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION.—The House Committee on House Administration shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $11,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $87,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $241,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(G) COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.—The House Committee on International Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $367,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $4,124,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $12,183,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(H) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The House Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $201,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $2,317,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $6,548,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(I) COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES.—The House Committee on Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $91,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $1,095,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $3,008,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(J) COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE.—The House Committee on Science shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $2,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $19,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $40,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(K) COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS.—The House Committee on Small Business shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $0 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $0 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $0 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(L) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $438,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $5,563,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $16,104,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(M) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,056,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $13,449,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $39,848,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(N) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that provide direct spending sufficient to reduce the level of direct spending for that committee by $8,514,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2004, $73,579,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $292,553,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds for Legislation Assumed in Budget Aggregates

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID.

In the House, if the Committee on Energy and Commerce reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that—

(1) modernizes medicaid and the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and

(2) reduces new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom by $9,010,000,000 for fiscal years 2009 through 2013,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase allocations of new budget authority and outlays for that committee (and make other appropriate changes in budgetary aggregates) by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed $3,258,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2004 and $8,944,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008.

SEC. 302. RESERVE FUND FOR BIOSHIELD.

In the House, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes a program to accelerate the research, development, and purchase of biomedical threat countermeasures and—

(1) such measure provides new budget authority to carry out such program; or

(2) such measure authorizes discretionary new budget authority to carry out such program and the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority to carry out such program,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations for the committee providing such new budget authority, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, by the amount provided for that purpose, but, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (1), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and

outlays flowing therefrom and $3,418,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom or, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (2), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the total such revision for fiscal year 2004 may not exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY.

Whenever the Committee on Ways and Means of the House reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered (in the House), or a conference report thereon is submitted that enhances retirement security through structural programmatic reform and the creation of personal retirement accounts, provided that such accounts are funded from the taxes currently collected for the purpose of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Program, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may—

(1) increase the appropriate allocations and aggregates of new budget authority and outlays by the amount of new budget authority provided by such measure (and outlays flowing therefrom) for that purpose;

(2) reduce the revenue aggregates by the amount of the revenue loss resulting from that measure for that purpose; and

(3) make all other appropriate and conforming adjustments.

Subtitle B—Implementation of Reserve Funds

SEC. 311. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2005 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,178,000,000 in new budget authority.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2004 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2004.

SEC. 402. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 403. ACTION PURSUANT TO SECTION 302(b)(1) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT.

(a) COMPLIANCE.—When complying with Section 302(b)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Committee on Appropriations of each House shall consult with the Committee on Appropriations of the other House to ensure that the allocation of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees are identical.

(b) REPORT.—The Committee on Appropriations of each House shall report to its House when it determines that the report made by the Committee pursuant to Section 301(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the report made by the Committee on Appropriations of the other House pursuant to the same provision contain identical allocations of budget outlays and new budget authority among each Committee's subcommittees.

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report providing new discretionary budget authority for Fiscal Year 2004 allocated to the Committee on Appropriations unless and until the Committee on Appropriations of that House has made the report required under paragraph (b) of this Section.

SEC. 404. CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES RESULTING FROM REALISTIC SCORING OF MEASURES AFFECTING REVENUES.

(a) Whenever the House considers a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, including measures filed in compliance with Section 4 of this Concurrent Resolution, that propose to change federal revenues the impact of such measure on federal revenues shall be calculated by the Joint Committee on Taxation in a manner that takes into account:

(1) the impact of the proposed revenue changes on:

i. Gross Domestic Product, including the growth rate for the Gross Domestic Product;

ii. Total Domestic Employment;

iii. Gross Private Domestic Investment;

iv. General Price Index;

v. Interest Rates; and

vi. Other economic variables

(2) the impact on Federal Revenue of the changes in economic variables analyzed under subpart (1) of this paragraph.

(b) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make any necessary changes to allocations and aggregates in order to conform this Concurrent Resolution with the determinations made by the Joint Committee on Taxation pursuant to paragraph (a) of this Section.

SEC. 405. PROMOTION OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 201(a) OF THIS CONCURRENT RESOLUTION.

When reporting to the House reconciliation measures in compliance with Section 201(a) of this Concurrent Resolution, the Ways and Means Committee shall not report legislation, which:

(1) proposes to provide a graduated or phased-in reduction over time in:

(a) Individual income tax rates,

(b) Corporate tax rates, or

(c) The rate of taxes collected on the proceeds from investments, including taxes collected on capital gains; or

(2) conditions any changes in tax law upon the achievement of some level of:

(a) Federal Revenue,

(b) Federal Surplus, or

(c) Level of Public Debt.

SEC. 406. PROHIBITION ON USING REVENUE INCREASES TO COMPLY WITH BUDGET ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) For the purpose of enforcing this Concurrent Resolution in the House, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall not take into account the provisions of any piece of legislation which propose to increase revenue or offsetting collections if the net effect of the bill is to increase the level of revenue or offsetting collections beyond the level assumed in this Concurrent Resolution.

(b) Paragraph (a) of this Section shall not apply to any provision of a piece of legislation that proposes a new or increased fee for the receipt of a defined benefit or service (including insurance coverage) by the person or entity paying the fee.

SEC. 407. CRITERIA FOR ADJUSTMENTS TO ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES FROM USE OF THE "EMERGENCY" DESIGNATION.

(A) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets the definition of an ''emergency'' set out in paragraph (b) of this Section.

(b) The term ''emergency'' means a situation that—

(1) requires new budget authority and outlays (or new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom) for the preventions or mitigation of, or response to, loss of life or property, or a threat to national security; and

(2) is unanticipated, which means that the underlying situation is sudden, urgent, unforeseen, and temporary.

(c) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, or conference report that contains an emergency designation under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 unless the proposed emergency requirement meets the definition of an ''emergency'' set out in paragraph (b) of this Section.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of paragraph (c) of this section.

(e) DISPOSITION OF POINTS OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE.—As disposition of a point of order under paragraph (c) or paragraph (d) of this section, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the proposition that is the subject of the point of order. A question of consideration under this section shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent of the point of order, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn or that the Committee of the Whole rise, as the case may be.

(f) EFFECT ON AMENDMENT IN ORDER AS ORIGINAL TEXT IN THE HOUSE.— The disposition of the question of consideration under this section with respect to a bill or joint resolution shall be considered also to determine the question of consideration under this subsection with respect to an amendment made in order as original text.

TITLE V—SENSES OF CONGRESS

SEC. 501. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING ELIMINATION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS TO ACHIEVE BUDGET GOALS.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004 should achieve the following key goals:

(A) ensure adequate funding is available for essential government programs, in particular

(B) defense and homeland security;

(C) Foster greater economic growth and increased domestic employment by eliminating those provisions in the tax code (these provisions include, but are not limited to, the double taxation of corporate dividends, the taxation of capital gains, the limitations on expensing, the phased-in rather than immediate reduction of personal income tax rates, and the alternative minimum tax) that discourage economic growth and job creation;

(D) Bring the Federal budget back into balance as soon as possible; (2) The Federal Government spends billions of dollars each year on programs and projects that are of marginal value to the country as a whole. (3) Funding for these lower priority programs should be viewed in light of the goals of this Concurrent Resolution and whether or not continued funding of these programs advances or hinders the achievement of these goals.

(4) This Concurrent Resolution assumes that funding for many lower priority programs will be reduced or eliminated in order to increase funding for defense and homeland security while at the same time controlling overall spending.

(b) It is the Senate of Congress that the following programs should be eliminated:

(1) Title X Family Planning;

(2) Corporation for Public Broadcasting;

(3) National Endowment for the Arts;

(4) Legal Services Corporation; and

(5) Advanced Technology Program.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING THE ABOLISHMENT OF OBSOLETE AGENCIES AND THE FEDERAL SUNSET ACT OF 2003.

(a) Congress finds that—

(1) The National Commission on the Public Service's recent report, ''Urgent Business For America: Revitalizing The Federal Government For The 21st Century,'' states that government missions are so widely dispersed among so many agencies that no coherent management is possible. The report also states that fragmentation leaves many gaps, inconsistencies, and inefficiencies in government oversight and results in an unacceptable level of public health protection.

(2) According to the Commission, there are: more than 35 food safety laws administered by 12 different federal agencies; 541 clean air, water, and waste programs in 29 federal agencies; 50 different programs to aid the homeless in eight different federal agencies; and 27 teen pregnancy programs operated in nine federal agencies; and 90 early childhood programs scattered among 11 federal agencies.

(3) According to the General Accounting Office, there are 163 programs with a job training or employment function, 64 welfare programs of a similar nature, and more than 500 urban aid programs.

(4) GAO also indicates 13 agencies coordinate 342 economic development programs, but there is very little or no coordination between them. This situation had created a bureaucracy so complex that many local communities stop applying for economic assistance. At the same time, the General Accounting Office reports that these programs often serve as nothing more than funnels for pork, have ''no significant effect'' on the economy, and cost as much as $307,000 to create each job.

(5) In 1976, Colorado became the first state to implement a sunset mechanism. Today, about half of the nation's states have some sort of sunset mechanism in effect to monitor their legislative branch agencies. On the Federal level, the United States Senate in 1978 overwhelmingly passed legislation to sunset most of the federal government agencies by a vote of 87–1.

(6) In Texas, ''sunsetting'' has eliminated 44 agencies and saved the taxpayers $720 million compared with expenditures of $16.94 million for the Sunset Commission. Based on these estimates, for every dollar spent on the Sunset process, the State has received about $42.50 in return.

(b) It is the Sense of Congress that

The House of Representatives should adopt H.R. 1227, The Abolishment of Obsolete Agencies and Federal Sunset Act of 2003.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time in opposition be divided evenly between the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and myself.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I am completely agreeable. That procedure has been our custom and practice in the past.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5½ minutes to myself.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by commending the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman NUSSLE) for the outstanding work the gentleman has done. The gentleman has worked very hard. Our committee has worked very hard, and the budget is a good budget. But I believe the alternative budget that I am going to describe right now and that the Republican Study Committee is putting forward is a better budget. I want to go over the highlights of the differences and engage in this discussion about the alternatives.

Let us look at the major differences. The big difference between the Republican Study Committee budget and the committee budget are three.

First, we provide more tax relief. We provide more tax relief than the committee budget does, we provide more tax relief than any of the alternative budgets do.

Number two, we actually cut some spending. Now the committee's budget cuts the rate of growth of spending. Our budget actually cuts nondefense, not homeland security discretionary spending.

The third thing is we run smaller deficits and we get back to a balanced budget faster than any other budget, including faster than the Blue Dog budget that we just heard a lot of discussion about. We do it in 4 years, faster than any other, and that is not accounting for the faster economic growth that would result from our budget package. Let me run through these three areas.

First on the tax front, we recognize in this budget that we are still overtaxed. The fact is that Federal taxes consume about 21 percent of national income, and total taxes from all government in our country is over a third of national income. This is well above the post-war average high. The fact is we are not undertaxed; we are still overtaxed. Many of our constituents are facing tax increases at the State and local levels. They need to have that off-set, and we can do that in our budget.

Our budget accommodates the President's entire growth package; and that is critical because we need to get this economy growing again, so we accommodate the elimination of the double taxation of dividends. This would end a great inequity in our tax system, a bias in our current code, a bias that, frankly, falls disproportionately on older Americans; and it would also stimulate economic growth.

□ 1845

If we follow the wisdom of the President's proposal and eliminate the double taxation on dividends, it has a number of positive effects for our economy. It would immediately result in higher equity prices, which is a good start. The current tax also increases the cost of capital. By lowering the cost of capital, we encourage capital formation. It also would reduce the current distortion of the allocation of capital. Abolishing the double taxation will over time release billions of dollars for more productive investment.

The bottom line is the President's proposal encourages saving and investment and capital formation, and that helps sustain economic growth. That is why we need to do it.

We also need to accelerate the phase-in of marginal tax rate reductions. When you lower marginal income tax rates, you increase the incentive to save and work and invest, and when you increase the incentives, you get more savings and work and investment. If we delay this any further, we just postpone the beneficial effects.

In our budget, we accommodate the President's entire tax relief package. Then we do something more. We do not specify exactly what that would have to be, but, Mr. Chairman, it would be large enough to accommodate a 50 percent reduction in capital gains rates, and that would also significantly encourage economic growth. That kind of capital formation is a precondition for strong economic growth.

On the spending side, as I said earlier, ours is the only budget that makes some real cuts in spending. On the discretionary side, we do not cut defense spending. We use the same number that the President has proposed and the same number that the committee has proposed. We recognize this obligation. We recognize that we are at war. We do not cut homeland security funding. On the mandatory spending side, we do not touch Social Security at all, we make no changes, and we do not actually cut anything in mandatory spending, although we do restrain the rate of growth. What we actually do cut is in nondefense, nonhomeland security discretionary spending.

Why is it important to get this spending under control? Because, Mr. Chairman, total government spending is the real measure of the burden that the government imposes on our economy. More than deficits, more than the debt, it is the total amount of money that the government sucks out of the private sector, whether it does it by borrowing or whether it does it by confiscating people's money, that is the measure of the misallocation of capital. We all know there are a lot of vital programs that have to be funded, but on the margin we know that this spending occurs through a political process where Members are spending money to try to get reelected. It is not the allocation of capital that individual consumers and businesses would allocate for stronger economic growth.

The other problem with too much spending is the enormous waste. We have heard a discussion about that earlier, but the government cannot even account for over $17 billion in spending in 2001. The Federal Government acknowledges $20 billion in overpayments. The list of ridiculous misspent money, missing money, overpayments is a very long and a very embarrassing list, frankly. We are never going to wring that waste out of government until we impose some spending discipline.

The fact is government Federal spending, discretionary spending, total spending has been growing at several times the rate of inflation, and now is the time to rein that in. If we cannot rein that in now, Mr. Chairman, when can we rein that in?

The net budgetary effects of our budget is greater tax relief, modest spending discipline, and as a result we run smaller deficits for shorter periods of time, and we get back to a balance faster than any other budget proposal.

I heard the Blue Dogs come down on this floor and talk about how much they want to balance this budget, how quickly they want to do that, why they want to do that. I am glad to hear that. I look forward to their voting for our budget because it gets to a balance faster than any others.

The other point I would make is that there can be no doubt that our combination of lower taxes and less spending would lead to stronger economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, let me start by commending the gentleman from Iowa. It is always a tough duty to try to carry a budget through the House.

I have a couple of questions. Can the chairman of the Committee on the Budget confirm that the reconciliation instructions clarify how the Committee on Government Reform will be credited with savings resulting from legislation that it submits to the Committee on the Budget?

Mr. NUSSLE. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Does this language ensure that the Committee on Government Reform will receive full credit for any savings it reports that are consistent with its reconciliation instructions?

Mr. NUSSLE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Can the gentleman confirm that the Committee on Government Reform may write legislation that also achieves significant savings in discretionary programs?

Mr. NUSSLE. That is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. And can the chairman also confirm that it is possible to meet the savings targets within the budget resolution without making any changes to Federal retirement annuities paid to participants in the Civil Service Retirement System, FERS, the Federal Employees Retirement System, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program?

Mr. NUSSLE. I believe that is correct.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. I thank the chairman for that clarification.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, my constituents find it very difficult to understand why at these times that we have economic uncertainty, that we are at war, we have large deficits and we are considering a reckless new tax cut. This amendment is even worse than the underlying bill. I oppose the underlying budget, and I oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, budgets speak to choice. What is important? I am frustrated with this new proposition that every budget priority should take a back seat to tax cuts. What is more important, funding for homeland security or tax cuts? Fiscal responsibility or tax cuts? Protecting Social Security or tax cuts? Prescription drugs for our seniors or tax cuts? Adequate funding for veterans' health and disability benefits or tax cuts? Keeping children nutrition programs or tax cuts? Adequate funding for education or tax cuts?

At a time that we are facing large deficits, it seems to me that we could find a lot better use for $1.3 trillion for tax cuts that primarily benefit the wealthy.

This plan digs a deeper hole in our Federal budget. We should treat the Federal budget with no less consideration than we would treat our own family home budget. This budget digs a deep hole in our Federal budget. It cuts vital programs that help the people in our society we have pledged to assist, our veterans, our children, our parents. It puts more pressure on our States and cities who are already under the fiscal gun, and it shows exactly the wrong kind of budget priorities.

Our budget should speak to our priorities. We must do better. We should approve the budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) that is more fiscally responsible, provides for a modest tax cut targeted to stimulate immediate growth in our economy, and provides adequate resources for prescription drugs for our seniors, education for our children, and homeland defense for all Americans.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Toomey amendment and the underlying budget resolution and support the Spratt amendment.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to lend my strong support to the Republican Study Committee budget. As chairman of the RSC, I am very proud of this budget that we have produced, and I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) for all his hard work on this. It reins in the astronomical spending increases we have had over the past few years and brings us back to balance in just 4 years. No other budget achieves balance as quickly as this one does.

When I came to Washington as part of the revolutionary class of 1995, we were determined and extremely serious to balance the budget and get us back on track, which we did. We were successful in doing that for the first few years, but lately we have presided over

some of the biggest increases in spending in U.S. history. In the last 7 years, nondefense discretionary spending has grown 66 percent. The fiscal year 2003 budget alone was a 9 percent increase in discretionary spending from the year before. I do not know of any family's budget in this country that has had the good fortune to increase 9 percent in 2003. So why should the Federal Government continue spending increases in this amount?

This RSC budget holds the government to responsible increases that will not grow faster than inflation or the family budget. Our budget proposal achieves a 1 percent savings by looking for waste, fraud and abuse and eliminating it from the Federal Government. That is only 1 penny out of every dollar. We hear folks continue to say it is impossible to find that amount of money, that amount of waste, in the government.

I would like Members to take a look at this chart. Thirty-five food safety laws administered by 12 different agencies; 541 clean air, water, waste programs; 50 programs for the homeless in 8 different Federal agencies; 163 different job training employment programs; 64 welfare programs; 500 urban aid. It goes on. You can see for yourself there is a lot there that could be simplified. Most estimates indicate there are tens of billions of dollars wasted every year. Last year alone, there were estimated to be $13.3 billion in improper payments under Medicare.

It is time Congress gets serious about reining in wasteful spending and getting our budget under control. That is what we were sent here to do. That is what the American people expect us to do. They want us to stop the business as usual and stop the excuses.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HASTERT was allowed to speak out of order.)

NOTICE OF IRAQ WAR BRIEFINGS

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Chairman, for the information of all Members, I want to report that there will be two classified Members-only briefings regarding Iraq tonight and tomorrow. First, tonight, at 7:40 p.m., Secretary Rumsfeld will brief all Members in the Armed Services Committee hearing room located in 2118 of the Rayburn Office Building.

In addition, tomorrow, Friday, at 10:45 a.m., officials from the Department of Defense, the Department of State and the Joint Chiefs of Staff will provide this briefing also. This briefing will take place at the 2118 Rayburn location as well.

I encourage all Members to attend both these important briefings, tonight and tomorrow, so that they have the latest information prior to returning to their districts.

Members will be alerted to any further details via the e-mail whip notice system.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his hard work on the budget.

As the gentleman knows, the manager's amendment on the budget resolution includes reconciliation instructions to the Committee on Agriculture for savings in mandatory programs. To clarify for my colleagues and farmers and ranchers who follow this process, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget about the reconciliation instructions.

Mr. NUSSLE. If the gentleman will yield, I would be happy to respond.

Mr. OSBORNE. It is my understanding that the Committee on the Budget will work with the Committee on Agriculture to identify specific proposals that eliminate waste, fraud and inefficiencies so that any reductions do not come from farm programs and the crop insurance program. Is that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget's understanding?

Mr. NUSSLE. That is my understanding. The budget is intended to protect farm programs and the crop insurance program. Our committee will work with the chairman and other members of the Committee on Agriculture such as yourself to ensure that we protect critical farm programs and the crop insurance program. This includes an adequate funding level for programs authorized under last year's farm bill.

Mr. OSBORNE. I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Budget for his responses to my inquiries. As I understand what the chairman is saying, the Committee on Agriculture should look to eliminating waste, fraud and abuse, and that he will work to see that there are no reductions in the current farm program and crop insurance program other than those attributable to waste, fraud and abuse.

Mr. NUSSLE. The gentleman is correct. I appreciate his help and support in this endeavor.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would simply say that these colloquies we are hearing on the House floor indicate how difficult it is going to be to achieve the kind of reconciliation cuts that have been directed to various committees. We see the committee people coming out here and saying, You are not going to cut this, are you? You are not going to cut that, are you? You are not going to cut government pensions, for goodness sakes. We will correct the procurement system and save $43 billion.

That is why I find it hard to take this budget at face value. I am sorry, but that is way I approach it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his leadership on this budget. I rise in opposition to the Toomey amendment. But before I do that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to first offer my prayers and support for all of our brave soldiers currently serving in Iraq and the surrounding regions.

□ 1900

Mr. Chairman, the Toomey amendment would provide less discretionary spending than the Republican budget resolution, which means that his amendment would keep this Nation in deficit spending far past 2007. With respect to the underlying bill, our Nation is fighting an expensive war, the costs of which are yet unknown. Thus it is unconscionable that this body would take up a budget resolution that would propose cuts in key domestic programs.

According to the National Urban League, this budget resolution clearly shows how policy can affect the gap in black and white wealth accumulation. First, the biggest tax expenditure in the Federal Government is the deduction of health insurance. African Americans do not get access to this credit, as one third of African Americans get health insurance through Medicare. Thus this budget resolution on the House floor proposes to cut $300 billion out of minority communities through Medicare cuts. Over the next 10 years, this budget resolution would cut also as much as $470 billion in programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, education, and veterans benefits. In fact, the Republican Party's budget resolution drastically cuts domestic programs by $244 billion below the amount needed to maintain the FY 2003 funding levels.

I believe we owe the American people that we must take care of their affordable health care needs, and I believe the Democratic substitute amendment and budget offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) does exactly that. My constituents want their benefits under Medicare and Medicaid protected. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) would increase the resources for homeland security and first responders.

I say vote for the Spratt amendment and vote ''no'' on the Republican budget.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond and correct what I think was a misstatement.

The fact is the cuts in spending in our Republican Study Committee budget did not result in larger deficits. They result in smaller deficits because we have got less spending, and that means less debt, and that means we get back into balance faster than any other budget that will be considered today; and I am looking forward to the enthusiastic support of the Blue Dogs, who feel very strongly about getting back into balance.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

And I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania on this for his work on this alternative budget, and I offer it my full support. It is said that we simply cannot cut anymore and that the Nussle budget that we have, a lot of people are saying it cuts too deeply. This is simply wrong. When we look across the board and we look at what we have done as Republicans, frankly, over the past 8 years, since 1996, the first year of the first Republican budget, we have increased spending for all cabinet agencies substantially, much more so than inflation. Inflation has been about 21 percent since 1996. The Agriculture Department has gone up 27.5 percent; Commerce, 40.2 percent; Energy, 34.4; HHS, 94.7; HUD, 52.6; Interior, 45 percent since 1996. The State Department has gone up 68 percent; Labor Department, 23.8; Defense Department, 43.7. And how about education? It is always said we do not spend enough on education. Try a 131.9 percent increase since 1996.

And we say we cannot cut anything. We say we cannot find waste, fraud, and abuse, 1 percent of it. Come on. Let us get serious. We just passed an omnibus bill a couple of weeks ago that had items like $3.1 million for the Inventors Hall of Fame that I did not even know we had, or how about $750,000 for the Baseball Hall of Fame? The Rock and Roll Hall of Fame got $350,000. What are we doing? $800,000 to the Grammy Foundation. That now is part of the baseline. We are adding to that and we keep adding and adding and adding and adding. Where does it end? We have got to get some fiscal sanity, and that is what the Toomey budget does. This brings our budget back into balance faster than any other budget plan outlined, in 4 years.

We know that there is a lot of waste, fraud, and abuse out there. More than $8 billion has gone out in erroneous earned income tax credit payments. There is mismanagement of over $3 billion in the Bureau of Indian Affairs trust funds, over $2 billion in erroneous food stamp payments. Two years ago there was over $1 billion in unissued medical bills for Veterans Health Administration. The list goes on and on and on. We can cut more. We can actually give tax cuts and cut spending and come into balance much faster than the budget outlined by the Democrats and the Republicans in the majority. I urge support of the Toomey amendment, the Toomey plan.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Before yielding to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), let me quote from a letter that was written to Speaker HASTERT by the head of the Paralyzed Veterans of America. He said, ''We do not consider payments toward disabled veterans, pensions for the poorest disabled veterans, and GI benefits for soldiers returning from Afghanistan to be waste, fraud, and abuse.''

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE).

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to this amendment and to the underlying Republican budget resolution and in support of the Spratt substitute that will be up shortly. The Federal budget is a statement of our Nation's priorities. It is where we put our national resources to meet our Nation's most important needs. Unfortunately, this budget has fundamental flaws and has misplaced priorities that I think shortchange the American people. Instead of investing in a strong, more prosperous America for years to come, the Republican budget neglects our economy, explodes the national debt, undermines key investments in homeland security, education, health care, and continues to spend Social Security trust funds. All of these priorities are sacrificed for another large tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. I guess it means we take from the many to give to the few.

I am most disappointed in the Republicans cuts in education, however. Prior to my service in this body, I served as the superintendent of schools for my home State of North Carolina, and I sought this office because the Republican majority under Newt Gingrich targeted public education in America, and I said I was coming to this House to fight to stop it. We have made a great deal of progress on changing the dialogue on this critical issue, but unfortunately the rhetoric is a lot more pro-education than the record.

Last Congress the President of the United States signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act, which promised to start new investments to improve schools in this country; but before teachers, students and parents get a chance to figure out the tough requirements that we passed, and, yes, I voted for that legislation, under this new law the administration has failed to fund its own program; and the fact is that this budget underfunds it with the consent of the administration, totality so far by about $20 billion to No Child Left Behind. I cannot and I will not agree to these outrageous cuts in education.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget's $400 million cut eliminates after-school initiatives in my home county for children, about 11,000 of them. It cuts teacher quality programs for every State in this country. For the State of North Carolina, $1.7 million. For the great universities and colleges we have in this country that are training our future leaders, it will cut Pell grants in these programs to make a difference; Cutting the Perkins loans money that makes a difference, having children who transfer from community college to university. This budget cuts $765 million for COPS, et cetera, et cetera.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, probably the worst example of misplaced priorities in this budget is the shameful treatment of our children of our fighting men and women. As we all know, right now Americans, men and women, are now putting up a proud fight on the other side of the world, and yet in this budget we are cutting Impact Aid to schools in this very budget that they have proposed. That is wrong. The Observer in my home county said a 14.5 percent cut will eliminate $173 million that helps pay for books and classrooms for these children, and that is absolutely wrong. We can do better.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes for the purposes of entering into a brief colloquy with the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year of 2004. First, I would like to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) for his willingness to work in partnership with me to ensure that this budget resolution lays the groundwork for a successful reauthorization of highway and transit programs. I am pleased that this resolution includes a contingency procedure for surface transportation, which will provide the flexibility we need to reauthorize our highway and transit programs. Under this contingency procedure, spending from the Highway Trust Fund for highway and transit programs will be increased above baseline levels to the extent that Highway Trust Fund receipts are increased. For every dollar increase in Highway Trust Fund receipts, a dollar increase in budget authority for highway and transit programs will be permitted. This contingency procedure is a necessary first step in our efforts to meet the infrastructure investment needs of our Nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems.

I have three concerns with the resolution I hope can be worked out in conference. First, the baseline level assumed in the resolution for the trust fund share of transit programs is frozen at the fiscal year 2003-enacted level. The reason that has been given for this assumption is uncertainty over the solvency of the transit account of the Highway Trust Fund. I want to assure the chairman that my committee intends to restructure transit programs such that the solvency of the transit account will be ensured. This restructuring, which is also proposed in the President's budget, will allow the transit account of the Highway Trust Fund to support increased spending levels.

Second, I am concerned that the resolution allocates just $3.378 billion each year for the airport improvement program. This is below the President's request and significantly below what

will be needed to meet our airport capital needs when we reauthorize aviation programs later this year.

Finally, I believe the reconciliation instructions for the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure are based on unrealistic assumptions. Most of the mandatory spending under my committee's jurisdiction results from Coast Guard and railroad industry retirement programs. I do not agree with the assumption in the resolution that these programs can be cut.

I hope to continue working cooperatively with the chairman on these concerns as the resolution goes to conference with the Senate. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Budget if he will continue to work with me to address these concerns.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I thank the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for his work in getting us to this point in time. Obviously there are a number of challenges. I will continue to work with him and members of his committee as we go to conference. We have a huge issue this year, as the gentleman knows. It is going to fall on his committee. We have challenges we need to meet in all of the transportation needs of our country. So, yes, I would be happy to work with the chairman as we move to conference on this issue, and I appreciate his support of our resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, again I thank the chairman for his work and working with me and trying to work through these important issues. I do believe we need a budget, and he has a tremendous task in front of him. He has done all he could for my area of transportation, and I urge support for this resolution.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining 9 minutes be yielded to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) as long as he does not give me another zinger here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

□ 1915

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Toomey plan, which I find even worse, if possible, than the majority Republican plan. I have been doing this now for 7 years, and every year the sense of unreality grows greater as I see charts and graphs on the other side that bear, in my opinion, very little relation to reality. The charts and graphs this year, the budgets proposed, both of the Republican budgets, seem to me totally unrealistic. The charts are misleading in an astonishing number of respects.

We are dealing with what can only be called voodoo economics. But we have to ask ourselves, among all the numbers, what is really going on here? Well, if you set aside all the numbers, and you look at all the different changes that are being made, two things are going on.

The Republican majority is determined, absolutely determined, to shift the burden of government from the Federal level to the State and local level. This is an effort to cut taxes at the Federal level and increase them at the State and local level. It is an effort to reduce the amount of money that the Federal Government provides States and municipalities for environmental issues, for health care, for education, in order to diminish the size of the Federal Government. That is it. That is what is going on. That is number one.

Number two, the second effort that is being made by the majority here is to make sure that the burden of taxation in this country is reduced from those at the upper income levels, so that it burdens those at middle income levels more than it has in the past. The way of doing this, of course, is to give little, bitty tax cuts to people in the middle of the income scale, and to give massive tax cuts to people at the upper end of the income scale. The reason for doing this, I would add, is the other side believes in a flat tax, but they do not want to argue a flat tax; they simply want to arrive there.

Look at a couple of the charts. We have heard over and over again how much ordinary citizens will benefit from eliminating the tax on dividends. Look at the chart. Here is the tax benefit. This is designed to show how people at different income groups will benefit.

Let us skip all of those who earn less than $100,000, because even if they are just below $100,000, households will only get about $300 a year. If you earn between $100,000 and $200,000, you get $885. If you earn between $100,000 and $200,000 a year, you get a total of $885. But if you move up the scale to where you are earning around $1 million, that is where the benefit comes. Then you get an average tax benefit, annually, of $45,000. That is why everything the other side says about averages makes no sense.

Then they say we need to accelerate the tax cuts passed last year and make them permanent. The same deal. If you earn between, pick a different category, pick between $200,000 and $500,000 a year, you get $2,000 a year. Below that it is not much. But if your household takes in about $1 million a year, it is $63,000 a year.

There is no moral justification for stripping this much money out of the Federal Government, cutting education, cutting veterans' benefits, in order to give tax cuts to the richest people in the country. It is an outrage.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond to the previous speaker, just to observe that under the budget that we are proposing, the Republican Study Committee, and under the President's tax plan, a family of four making $35,000 a year would pay nothing in federal income taxes. Zero. In fact, the top 50 percent of wage earners in America pay 96 percent of all Federal income taxes. When you lower taxes, it is just hard not to lower the taxes on the people who are actually paying the taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman challenged that statement, because we are hearing a lot of rhetoric here that does not track.

I continually hear from my constituents that we need to rein in runaway Federal spending. Do you know what? They are right. More government spending does not necessarily make our economy better. When we are at war, and we are, this is the exact time when we should be reducing spending, cutting taxes and getting the economy back on track.

When a family sits down to manage their monthly budget, they have to prioritize what is best for them at that time in their lives, and they usually make a list of needs and wants. A need is not the same thing as a want. For a family, a need is a roof over their head or food on the table. A want could be dinner out at a restaurant or a movie. So you fund first things first. Then whatever is left over at the end lets you fund the wants. You cannot just spend, spend, spend and hope you have enough to cover the tab.

The same needs to be done with the Federal budget. During these difficult times, when we are at war, when we need to spur the economy, we must differentiate between the needs and wants. We cannot just spend, spend, spend.

Our first need is to protect our country, so that means we fully fund defense. While this budget does not devote a full 4 percent of gross domestic product to the national security as I would prefer, it does meet the President's request for homeland security funding.

I will tell you something: This Toomey budget funds defense higher than domestic spending for the first time in many years. I think, because of our situation, we need it. Our Constitution requires us to provide for a common defense. Let us not shirk that responsibility.

Another priority is to help the economy rebound. It is a proven fact that when people can keep more of their own money, the economy grows. That is why we lower taxes. When entrepreneurs have more money, they can

use that capital to hire more employees, buy more equipment or expand their business.

This economy could use a turnaround, and letting people keep more of their own money will help our economy grow.

Frankly, I am a bit disappointed in the Republican Study Committee budget because it does not do more to rein in Federal spending. However, I think most would agree, this is a good compromise for this time.

Look, this budget makes tough choices; but that is why we are elected, to make tough choices. The good people of my district sent me here because they wanted a smarter, more efficient government, and the Republican Study Committee budget is a step in the right direction; increasing defense, lowering taxes and reining in runaway government spending. It is the right thing to do.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the budget that we have put forth by the Republican majority is almost an unbelievable exercise in fiscal irresponsibility. On the very first day of the war that we are now fighting, the majority party introduced a budget resolution that does not provide 1 cent, not 1 cent, to prosecute this war. This budget resolution contains more than $1 trillion in tax cuts that would benefit very few Americans, while endangering Social Security and Medicare.

I offered an amendment to the budget resolution to express the sense of the Congress that no new tax cuts should be passed until the Health, Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds are secured, but I was, of course, denied the opportunity to offer the amendment here tonight.

When we take a look at what is before us, when so many things are uncertain, I believe we need to pause before we pass into law huge, permanent tax cuts paid for by shortchanging essential programs, such as Medicare, education, veterans and funding for first responders. Right now we do not even know how long the war may last or what it might cost. It is irresponsible to pass a budget without taking all information into account.

If you take a look just the part on the veterans, the majority party cuts $14.2 billion over the next 10 years in benefits such as compensation for service-connected disabilities, burial benefits and GI education benefits. They are cut in this. What kind of message does that send to our troops fighting overseas? The fighting troops today are the veterans of tomorrow.

The Republican plan also fails to provide necessary homeland defense for State and local communities. It is just as important to provide homeland defense resources, training and staff for our local firefighters, EMTs, police officers and medical workers as it is to equip our troops overseas.

The Democratic substitute we will have a chance to vote on later tonight will provide $34 billion in extra money, new money, over the next 10 years for homeland security. In fact, $10 billion of this money would go to our States and local communities, right now this year.

I would urge a no vote on the budget resolution of the Republican Party as it is fiscally irresponsible. Vote no on the Toomey substitute, and support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, before yielding to the gentleman from New Jersey, I yield myself such time as I may consume to observe that although our budget grows spending every year, total spending grows, it grows at a slower rate than the alternative budgets, and that is why we are able to get back to balance faster than any other budgets, and why I look forward to the Blue Dog support, and that is why the Americans for Tax Reform and Citizens Against Government Waste have endorsed the Republican Study Committee budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the proposed amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

As elected officials, we are sent here and are supposed to be responsible to the people that send us to office, but government spending has ballooned out of control, and it is the people back home in our districts who are the ones forced to foot the bill.

Over the last 7 years, discretionary spending has grown at an average rate of 3.5 times the rate of inflation. I do not know anyone back in my district who has seen their family budget go up at such rates time and time again. Spending is growing at a rate faster than the family budgets. It must stop.

Right now people back in our districts are turning on their TVs, they are seeing our men and women, our sons and daughters, our friends and neighbors in harm's way. We are engaged in a war on terrorism. We are still experiencing the aftermath of 9/11 as it affects our economy.

So we are asking our families to tighten their belts because of that. We are asking county governments, State governments to do more with less. Is it not the responsibility of us here in Washington to lead then by example, to do the same thing, maybe to even take one step further?

We can give a lot of examples, and you have heard some already, about the waste in government: Over $8 billion in erroneous earned income tax payments; I think someone else mentioned around $13.3 billion on Medicare; around $1 billion under the veterans' programs.

Let me say, cutting wasteful spending is not enough. We in Congress must take the next step and actually begin to make the tough decisions we were sent here for in the first place.

Every single program that we vote on has someone behind it that supports it and likes that program. But we are elected to Congress to make those tough choices, to do what is the first priority of us in Congress, to make sure that our folks back at home are safe, that this is a secure Nation, and that our men and women and troops overseas have the supplies, equipment and training necessary to get the job done.

We cannot do less than sending them a responsible budget. Our children, our neighbors and our troops, they are dependent on us.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, the administration's budget cuts highway construction by $2.5 billion below this year's budget and slashes funding necessary to keep Amtrak running. The official House Republican budget cuts the discretionary transportation programs by 22 percent below the 2003 budget enacted just a month ago. The proposal before us is even worse.

The administration claims to be committed to economic growth and jobs, but this administration has the worst job growth record since Herbert Hoover. In fact, the administration's record is job loss, not growth; nearly 2 million non-farm payroll jobs lost in 2 years. On average, that is 73,000 jobs lost for every one of the 26 months of this administration. Yet cuts in transportation spending loses even more jobs tacked onto that miserable Republican economic record.

The Republican Party is only concerned about tax cuts for the already wealthy. When the economy is doing well, cut taxes for the already wealthy. When the economy is in recession, cut taxes for the already wealthy. When we are at peace, cut taxes for the already wealthy. Now while we are at war, cut taxes for the already wealthy.

Their highest priority is tax cuts for the already wealthy. They are not paying for their war, not reducing their deficits and debt, not keeping their promises to leave no child behind, not providing health care for veterans and the elderly.

Mr. Chairman, the already wealthy do not need more tax cuts. Vote no on this Republican budget and support the Democratic substitute.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to support the balanced budget alternative offered by my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

□ 1930

The Toomey budget offers several key priorities for the Nation at this time of war and economic uncertainty.

The people of Colorado sent me here to rein in out-of-control government spending, to cut taxes, and to get government off their backs. Instead of spending the people's money like there is no tomorrow, we ought to provide real leadership and real solutions to demonstrate responsible fiscal discipline.

Mr. Chairman, just as it is our duty to protect American families from cowardly acts of terrorism, it is also our duty to protect the well-being of American families by balancing the budget to grow the American economy. It is our duty to protect the people's wallets by allowing taxpayers to keep more of their hard-earned dollars. I do not want to mortgage the future of working families because we cannot say no to a government that is far too big and spends far too much. The American people will be proud of the Toomey budget because it keeps President Bush's tax cuts intact, while balancing the budget in a realistic 4-year time frame.

I ask my fellow Members of Congress to stand up and to do the right thing for America. Let us not shirk our responsibilities to future generations. Please join me in supporting the Toomey budget amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

(Mr. SHERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, both Republican budget resolutions, the leadership resolution and the Toomey alternative, give us high deficits, high interest rates, and increased trade deficits. They take capital out of the capital markets and make it unavailable for private business investment, thus resulting in slower economic growth.

Now, to sell anything that bad, one needs a commercial. This morning I brought such a commercial to the floor, but marketing experts tell us a commercial requires repetition. So here, once again, is a commercial on behalf of both Republican budget resolutions:

Allowing corporations to skip out on their American taxes just by renting a hotel room in the Bahamas: $4 billion. Ending taxes on dividends: $385 billion. Ending the estate tax, even for the largest estates: $662 billion. Knowing you can pass the entire cost to future generations: Priceless.

RepubliCard: It is everything the super-wealthy want it to be.

Also available, the Deficit Express Card, now with a $4.2 trillion credit limit. The Deficit Express Card: Don't leave the House without it.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the creative and very amusing account from my good friend who just spoke about this. However, I would remind him that if he is very concerned about the size of the deficit and the magnitude of the debt, then he will vote for the RSC budget, the Toomey budget, because that is the one that gets us back to balance quickest; that is the one with the smallest deficits and the least debt.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are at war, and I think most taxpayers understand you spend what it takes to win a war. We are in a recession as well, and taxpayers understand you spend what it takes to keep people in their jobs and to create new jobs for those who have lost them. But what taxpayers do not understand and will not accept is when we use it either to go on a spending spree that keeps us from balancing the budget, or keeps us from paying down our debt, or keeps us sending pork home to America and taking it out of their tax dollars.

This budget supports a strong national defense, promotes new jobs in a stronger economy, but it holds the line on spending. It says, let us tighten our belts in Washington; let us start to balance the budgets sooner than other budgets, and let us get people back to work.

This budget also includes a Federal sunset act, an encouragement for Congress to pass a bill to balance obsolete agencies, to eliminate duplication among our agencies, and to begin asking agencies to put up or shut up; to produce, to succeed, to support our taxpayers. What we are trying to do is conserve our dollars, identify wasteful spending within our agencies and within our programs so that we have enough dollars for a secure America, for health care, for education, and to send dollars back home.

Mr. Chairman, I support this budget. It makes a lot of sense, and perhaps because it makes sense is why it is getting so much resistance here in Washington.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield myself the remaining time.

I would just say in conclusion that if the Members of this House want to vote for a budget that gets us back in balance without balancing the budget on the backs of our children, our elderly, or our most worthy citizens, and our sick and disabled veterans; if they want to get back into balance by the year 2010, we present a budget, our own alternative, which takes us there steadily every year with a lower and lower deficit and accumulates $931 billion less in new public debt than the Republican budget.

So I would say that those who are conservative, those who want to vote for a fiscally responsible and conservative fiscal policy will have that opportunity, and I encourage my colleagues to vote for the House democratic alternative as something that achieves my colleagues' objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the gentleman from North Carolina by observing that the Democrat substitute has more spending, has higher taxes, and it has larger deficits for longer than the substitute that we are debating at this point.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, he is incorrect on all accounts, including the assignment to me to North Carolina. I am from South Carolina.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the gentleman from South Carolina. That was the one mistake I just made.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the alternative budget resolution proposed by the Republican Study Committee.

I think sometimes we get into the details of these budgets and take a look at it just on a year-to-year basis, but I think it might be helpful for us to step back just a little bit, to step back to a time when I was only 2 years old. What was the tax burden on the average family in the year 1950? In 1950, you have a mom and a dad and 2 kids, and dad would go out and earn a dollar bill. Out of that dollar bill, 3 pennies of it would go for direct State, Federal, and local taxes.

Now, about 4 years ago, what happened? Mom and dad and 2 kids. Dad goes out to earn a dollar. Now we go from 3 cents to 38 cents tax on that average American family. That average American family is paying more in taxes than they are for what they pay for food and clothing and shelter combined.

In one generation we have come a long way in the growth of big government, and at a time when State and local governments and families all across the country are tightening their belts, it is time for the Federal Government to do the same thing.

The Republican Study Committee budget freezes total discretionary spending for 1 year. That is not too unreasonable considering it grew 9 percent this last year.

One of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, my constituents sent me here was to take a look at the idea of reducing not only the size, but the scope of Federal Government, and that is the debate we should be having. It is important to get rid of wasteful spending, but it is even more important that we take a look at actually reducing the scope of some of the things that we are trying to do.

When we are talking more tax on a family than 38 percent, more than they pay for food, clothing, and shelter, we are not talking about a safety net anymore, we are talking about excessive government.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the Toomey amendment to the budget resolution. I congratulate our chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), on presenting a wonderful budget to this Congress. But indeed, there is even a better budget, and that is one that presents less government and more freedom.

Now, many people criticize this budget. They said there is not enough government spending involved in this budget. But, Mr. Chairman, over the last 5 years, we have increased VA, HUD and Independent Agencies 35.7 percent; Commerce and Justice 32.3 percent; Transportation, 79.7 percent; Education, 132 percent, and the list goes on.

How much government is enough? Does anything good happen in America that does not result from a government program? And if not, perhaps we should just double these budgets every year, or perhaps even triple them.

But let me tell my colleagues, since I have been on the face of the planet, the Federal budget has grown seven times faster than the family budget. If the family budget grew as fast as the government budget, right now that family budget would be at $79,059, instead of $51,407.

Mr. Chairman, if all of these government programs did us so much good, then perhaps we ought to look at increasing the funding for each and every one. But instead we know that HUD has spent $2.6 billion in Section 8 overpayments out of $31 billion. The National Park Service spends $800,000 for an outhouse, and it does not even work. And the list goes on and on and on.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, particularly at a time of war, and when families, hard-working American families, are having to make tough economic decisions around their kitchen table, should they not at least expect their Congress to make smart decisions? I do not think anything less should be expected out of this body. We can indeed save money without cutting needed programs and without raising taxes on the American people.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the Nussle budget, but in stronger support of the RSC Toomey budget. Let me make it clear why.

This Congress, year in and year out, faces the challenge of setting a budget for our Nation, but it seems to me this year we are divorced from reality. The reality of this Nation is that in the last 7 years, nondefense discretionary spending has grown by a staggering 66 percent. Over the past 7 years, discretionary spending has grown at three and a half times the rate of inflation. In fiscal year 2003 alone, we increase spending by 9 percent over the previous year in 1 year only.

Enough is enough. The reality is that across America, local governments, State governments, city governments, county governments are making real dollar cuts in their spending.

Now, to its credit, the Nussle budget says, we ought to scale back. It walls off certain areas, but it says we ought to at least have a 1 percent cut in some areas where we can achieve that. But the rest of the budget spends too much money.

Let us look at what we have been doing in spending. Since 1996, agricultural spending is up 27.5 percent; Commerce Department, 40.2; Energy, 34.4; HHS, a staggering 94 percent; and Education, 131.9 percent. I could go on and on.

Mr. Chairman, I was here in 1995 when we enacted real spending restraint in this Congress. We did not actually stop the growth of spending, but we sure slowed it down. What is lacking now is discipline.

I was a participant in those hearings when we went across America and we asked the American people, can you do with less government? And they looked us in the eye and they said, yes. They said, so long as the restraint in spending, the cuts which we are asking them to make, were evenly distributed across our society so that all programs took some hits, they were willing to do it.

We face a slowed economy, and we face a war. It is time for the Congress to exercise discipline. It is time for the Congress to lead. The Toomey budget does that. It says that these are not normal times. It says that we can, in fact, do with a little less.

I want to draw a parallel to American businesses. Every one of us here knows businesses back home, every one of us knows the key to business. What is the key to business in America? It is year after year doing more with less. What has made America's economy boom in the last few years leading up to the recent situation? I will tell my colleagues what made it boom. It was improvements in efficiency. It is doing more with less.

□ 1945

Yet that is a concept that we do not even think about in government. Is it impossible for us to do more with less in the government? I suggest it is not, and I strongly support the budget of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I would just make the following observation, Mr. Chairman. Most of us on both sides of the aisle talk a pretty good game about fiscal discipline. Here is the opportunity to walk the walk.

This substitute budget slows down the growth rate of government spending. It has more in tax cuts to get this economy growing again. It reaches a balance faster than any other budget that is considered today on the floor. It does so within 4 years. It is endorsed by Americans for Tax Reform and Citizens Against Government Waste.

For any of our colleagues who are serious about getting our deficit under control, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this substitute.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Republican Study Committee Budget Substitute. Former President Reagan said it best when he said, ''government does nothing as well or as economically as the private sector.'' These are trying times and our Nation faces serious challenges in the coming months. With that in mind, it is irresponsible to fund projects that deter or deviate from the original intent of government. Instead, we must plan ahead and put forth our best effort to return to a balanced budget.

The RSC Budget includes all of President Bush's economic growth package, tax fairness proposals and balances the budget in 4 years. Four years. With the decreases in capital gains taxes, we will create over 1 million new jobs. There is no better time to return hard-earned money back to the American people. And I have no doubt that any effort to remain fiscally responsible will help boost economic growth.

In 1950, we were paying 2 percent of our money to the government. Today, that figure has skyrocketed to 30 percent. A 28 percent increase. In 2001, the Federal Government made $20 billion in overpayments. Not to mention that it cannot account for another $17.3 billion. Should not the American people be permitted to spend their money as they choose? How can we expect the people of this country to tighten their belt, when we cannot impose strict fiscal discipline on ourselves?

The RSC Budget includes a reserve fund for Social Security reform. Under the current system, nearly $6 trillion would be needed just to repay the trust fund. According to the Social Security Administration, it will take only about $7 trillion to fix the system permanently. Our baby boomers deserve a secure retirement. They paid for it.

This budget retains the President's defense spending numbers and the President's funding levels for homeland security—crucial now, when our courageous military heroes are depending on our support.

It is time to return to an era of economic prosperity. Time to put an end to reckless Federal spending. Men and women in our military are sacrificing their lives for our country. We have the power to do the same in Congress by making our own sacrifices to cut back on wasteful spending and balance the budget. There is no more appropriate time to do so than now. Having said that, I commend Mr. Toomey for introducing the best budget that he possibly could at this historic time in our Nation's history.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and in support of the CBC and Democratic Alternative budgets.

I didn't think a budget resolution could be much worse than the one produced by the Majority, but then I see the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. This amendment calls for more tax cuts and more cuts in nondefense and non-homeland security spending.

Like the parent resolution offered by the Majority leadership, the budget cuts called for in the gentleman's alternative are just unrealistic. In fact, the $1.6 trillion tax cut proposed by the

gentleman's alternative, requires that domestic spending be cut by an additional $8 billion.

The budgets proposed by Republican Study Conference and the Majority leadership will force authorizing committees' to reduce eligibility requirements and benefits for people programs that service our children, veterans, farmers, federal workers and more.

Like the parent resolution, the RSC amendment provides more tax cuts for the wealthy that are bound to continue to take our economy down the glide path of additional deficits. What I don't understand is why our distinguished majority rightly calls on all Americans to support the war effort in Iraq, but is not willing to pay for its costs. That is a major disconnect.

The Democratic and CBC alternative budgets offer targeted tax cuts that are designed to stimulate the economy and produce real jobs. Up to a million jobs will be produced by the Democratic Alternative in 2003. The Majority's plan, on the other hand, creates only 190,000 jobs in 2003.

The CBC and Democratic Alternative budgets provide more money for Medicare prescription drugs. The Democratic Alternative sets aside $528 billion in new money for a prescription drug program. We deliver and the President's party doesn't.

The Democratic Alternative and Black Caucus budgets invest in education and training. These increases will enable Congress to increase funding for the ''No Child Left Behind Act.''

The Democratic and CBC Alternatives protect our men and women in war; they advance the security needs of our homeland; they increase our investment in human capital and the nation's infrastructure. And they do so in a fiscally responsible way.

Soon we will be asked to redevelop and rebuild Iraq. We will be asked to pass appropriations that will develop and modernize that country's health care delivery system, repair and build 3,000 miles of major thoroughfares; upgrade the country's maritime ports, build classrooms and provide student supplies; provide 20,000 units of housing; rebuild the country's financial system; establish a potable water delivery system; and more.

It is ironic that this administration and the majority party in this Chamber will be asking us to spend billions to invest in redeveloping the infrastructure in Iraq while it simultaneously cuts back our investment in American cities, states and individual human capital. The Members on the other side of the aisle may be able to explain that to their constituents, but I know I won't be able to explain it to mine.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the gentleman's amendment and support the CBC and Democratic Alternatives budget resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 342, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

AYES—80

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Cole
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Culberson
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Feeney
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Goode
Goodlatte
Green (WI)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Linder
Manzullo
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Pitts
Pombo
Radanovich
Rehberg
Rohrabacher
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Weller
Wilson (SC)

NOES—342

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Bass
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burns
Burr
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Castle
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Buyer
Combest
Gephardt
Hyde
John
Kennedy (RI)
King (NY)
Lipinski
Smith (MI)
Thornberry
Udall (CO)
Vitter

□ 2015

Messrs. GUTKNECHT, CONYERS, BRADLEY of New Hampshire, BONNER, SABO and Mrs. NORTHUP changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. MANZULLO changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 79 I was receiving a briefing on the war in Iraq with Secretary Rumsfeld and General Meyers. That occurred simultaneously with this rollcall.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

Stated against:

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Chairman, during Rollcall Vote 79, I was detained at a briefing from Secretary Rumsfeld on the war with Iraq. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 108–44.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. CUMMINGS

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 3 in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. CUMMINGS:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $1,510,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,684,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,831,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,958,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,075,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,197,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,327,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,511,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,707,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,863,500,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $44,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $67,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $91,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $105,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $112,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $119,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $134,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $84,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $57,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $59,300,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $1,836,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,958,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,064,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,165,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,264,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,370,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,483,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,546,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,588,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,699,400,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $1,883,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,002,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,100,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,198,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,298,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,404,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,517,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,589,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,620,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,735,800,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: −$372,800,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$317,500,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$269,100,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$239,800,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$223,700,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,197,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,327,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,511,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,707,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,863,500,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,013,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,013,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,013,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $387,995,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $396,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $395,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $406,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $416,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $399,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $427,500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $441,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $453,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $444,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $464,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $460,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $476,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $465,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $488,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $482,639,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $34,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,946,950,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $35,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,605,889,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $36,081,480,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,277,406,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $36,803,109,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,962,954,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $37,539,171,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,662,213,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $38,289,854,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,524,057,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $39,055,651,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,274,538,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $39,836,764,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,040,029,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $40,606,499,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,794,370,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $41,418,638,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,590,256,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,189,500,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $24,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,721,500,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,263,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $27,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,058,500,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $28,780,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $29,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,987,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $3,118,500,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,962,575,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $3,273,600,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,109,920,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $3,181,200,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,022,140,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,984,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,835,085,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,583,800,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,404,610,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,600,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,420,285,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,722,400,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,536,280,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,836,800,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,644,960,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,963,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,765,135,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $4,096,400,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,891,580,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $31,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $32,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $33,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $34,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $35,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $36,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $37,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $38,668,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $39,827,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $41,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,202,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,616,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,204,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $21,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $21,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $21,876,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,313,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $22,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,214,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,634,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,678,650,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,514,500,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $7,821,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,664,900,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $7,977,700,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,818,100,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $8,137,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,974,600,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,466,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,296,700,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $8,635,300,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,462,600,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,631,800,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $8,984,200,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,804,500,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,163,900,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,480,600,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $99,839,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $66,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $67,815,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,393,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $69,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $71,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,950,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $72,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $74,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $76,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $78,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $80,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,431,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,717,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $15,317,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $15,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $15,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $16,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $16,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $17,249,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,242,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $107,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $117,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $129,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $126,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $142,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $156,658,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $172,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $189,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $185,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $208,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $204,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $229,227,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $224,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $252,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $247,107,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $242,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $238,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $247,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $242,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $252,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $257,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $252,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $262,981,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $268,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $273,604,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $279,076,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $273,495,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $284,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,964,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $290,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,543,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $250,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $265,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $260,608,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $292,411,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $292,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $313,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $313,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $336,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $336,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $351,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $351,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $377,120,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $377,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $403,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,968,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $403,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $460,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $460,889,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $367,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $359,709,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $374,391,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $366,903,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $381,879,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $374,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $389,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $381,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $397,307,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $389,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $405,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $397,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $413,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $405,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $421,625,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $413,192,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $430,058,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $421,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $438,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,886,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $501,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $498,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $521,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $518,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $546,735,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $543,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $575,008,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $571,621,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $606,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $602,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $641,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $636,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $679,322,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $674,852,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $720,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $715,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $766,154,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $760,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $816,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $810,363,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $64,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $66,863,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $68,869,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,492,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $70,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $73,063,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $75,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,750,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $77,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $79,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,241,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $82,234,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,589,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $84,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,007,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $40,787,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,971,260,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $40,957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,137,860,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $41,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,387,760,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $41,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,720,960,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $41,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,137,460,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $46,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,500,420,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $47,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,913,500,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $49,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,379,660,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $50,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,876,120,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,427,460,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $19,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $19,654,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,713,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $19,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $20,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,294,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,323,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $255,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $307,866,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $307,866,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $345,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $345,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $372,992,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $400,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $425,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,477,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $452,793,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $452,793,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $478,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $478,544,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $504,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $504,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $529,542,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $529,542,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS.—Not later than June 1, 2003, the House committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the House Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive changes.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The House Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the level of direct spending for that committee by $1,043,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and $6,118,000,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(2) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in law within its jurisdiction sufficient to increase the total level of revenues by not more than: $16,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, $1,677,500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008, and $6,712,500,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from

New York (Mr. OWENS) who was the architect of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus resolution.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to first congratulate the leadership of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus for the agreement to produce this joint budget.

Our troops are in the field now, and we are going to support those troops. The best way we can support our troops is to try to bring them home by policy changes, not in body bags, but bring them home smiling on their feet. We also would like to support their families. This is a budget which we call ''Leave No Families Behind.''

Mr. Chairman, 35 percent of the members of the Army are African American. Two-thirds of the fighting force in Iraq, on the borders of Iraq, are members of working families. We want to take care of the families of the people who fight for America, and that is the gist of this budget. It is a budget for working families.

We have stayed within the requirements of the majority. Our current budget is $1.836 trillion. We have begun by adopting the Rangel shared sacrifice freeze on tax cuts, and this generated a revenue base of $1.5 trillion. This has allowed the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus to offer our current budget of $1.8 trillion. Our budget projections reached a low deficit of $72.9 billion in the year 2011, and we offer a surplus of $87.7 billion in the years 2012 and $127.7 billion in 2013.

It is the strong and overriding belief of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus that the budget and appropriations processes are the highest importance to our constituencies who make up the great majority of Americans. Budget priorities speak in a language of numbers and dollars that tell the people we represent how important their concerns and their welfare are to us. This budget was prepared against the backdrop of a recession at a time when the gap between the rich and the poor is greater in the United States than in any other Nation.

A recent report of the Federal Reserve states that the median net worth of white families went up 17 percent to $120,900, while the median net worth for minority families during the same 3-year period went down 4.5 percent to $17,000. The difference between $17,000 and $120,000 is a stark difference. Working families of all ethnic groups are included in this great gap between rich and poor, the white working families as well as minority working families.

A key component of this budget is a stimulus package which addresses the needs of all working families with proposals for extended unemployment and health care benefits immediately, and also for creating jobs as rapidly as possible. This budget also continues to focus on certain unique needs of African American and minority communities.

Mr. Chairman, I thank all Members and staff, especially Jacqueline Ellis of my staff, who worked so diligently on producing this alternative budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the CBC/CPC substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute because our reading is it raises taxes and increases spending, does not provide enough for defense, and fails to reach balance sooner. Having said that, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) wanted me to say that he knows the amount of time and effort that was put into this budget and also knows that there are important issues that will be brought out in this debate that this Chamber needs to hear.

So with that, I will just compliment my colleagues on working on this budget, say it is not a budget that we can support, but we look forward to listening to the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the chairman of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to participate with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the CBC in the drafting of this CBC/Progressive Caucus budget; and I am honored to be here with my co-chair, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for the fine work that he did in this regard.

I rise in support of the CBC/Progressive Caucus budget. This is the only budget that funds universal single-payer health care. This is the only budget that fully stimulates the economy with a $300 billion economic stimulus package. This is the only budget that fully funds education. This is the only budget that fully funds transportation. This is the only budget that fully funds housing, and the only budget that fully funds veterans programs, and the only budget that fully funds the HIV–AIDS international support programs.

The CBC/Progressive Caucus budget calls on Congress to implement H.R. 676, Medicare For All. This legislation is a single-payer, universal health care plan which will guarantee access to health care, guarantee a universal high standard of care, and lower health care costs.

Earlier this month, it was reported that 75 million Americans went without health insurance in 2001 or 2002. Our failing economy and rising health care costs are failing working families who make up the majority of the uninsured Americans. While costs continue to go up, we are not getting what we are paying for. Government expenditures account for 60 percent of total health care costs. Our government spends more money per person than countries that provide universal health care. Our citizens are so close to paying for a universal health care system, but so far from getting it.

Medicare For All would first improve the Medicare program by adding coverage for all medically necessary health services, including prescription drugs. During a transition period, Medicare would subsume other health programs like Medicaid and, finally, all Americans in nongovernment programs.

It has been estimated that Medicare For All could be paid for with the same amount of money that is currently in the system. Under Medicare For All, employers would maintain a contribution to employee health care in the form of a phased-in payroll tax. This payroll tax would be less than what employers now pay on the average. And unlike current skyrocketing health care costs, this contribution would remain stable. Medicare For All would help employers by eliminating the costs associated with providing private health care coverage, including annual negotiations, annual premium increases, and administrative tasks.

Patients would benefit because copayments, premiums, deductibles and out-of-pocket payments would be eliminated for medically necessary services. Under this plan, patients would receive a card that would guarantee two things they do not now have: access to the health care they need and a universal, best standard of medical care. This would help to eliminate disparities in health care between whites and minorities.

It is time for Congress to stop trimming around the edges of the health care system. Workers, retirees, and employers are suffering together from the burdens of illnesses and increasing costs. Congress must budget for a real solution, that is, Medicare For All that is in this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for this opportunity to participate.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican budget resolution and in support of the joint Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus budget alternative. This alternative budget, entitled the Leave No Family Behind Budget Act, focuses national attention on spending on priorities that benefit all Americans.

It does this by funding key domestic priorities which address the needs of middle-income and working families, while fully supporting the national defense and protection of our homeland.

These priorities include education, health care, housing, child care, transportation, worker safety and protection, and business development. It would immediately repeal tax cuts for the upper-income brackets and would implement tax cuts for all families earning less than $50,000 per year.

The CBC and the Progressive Caucus budget proposal involves several balanced components. It provides Medicare For All, it provides a $300 billion economic stimulus package which includes an extension of unemployment insurance, and implements state revenue sharing; and it yields a balanced budget by 2008, at least 4 years earlier than the Republican budget.

This fiscally responsible budget freezes the 2001 tax cut in order to generate greater revenue.

□ 2030

As such, our budget provides $528 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit and restores the deep cuts in education by increasing funding by $20 billion over the Republican budget proposal. This means more funding for after-school programs, Head Start, Pell grants, child care programs, TRIO, Gear Up and the Leave No Child Behind Act. This means a prescription drug benefit that our seniors so desperately need.

Mr. Chairman, our budget alternative is feasible, balanced and fiscally responsible. It will get our country on the road to recovery while funding meaningful national priorities for our children, for our seniors, for our veterans and for our communities. It reflects the guiding principle that as a Nation we must come together and share the sacrifice that is required to strengthen our economy and put us on a better fiscal footing.

Unfortunately, the Republican budget is devoid of any recognition of this required sacrifice, because it provides $1.4 trillion in tax cuts to the top 1 percent of American taxpayers. I say sacrifice this tax cut, restore funding for crucial domestic programs, and get our country back on the road to economic recovery. I have to admit that I am astonished that at a time when our economy is struggling, the Republicans continue to pursue tax breaks for the affluent at any cost. Their plan is both astounding and irresponsible. The Republican budget resolution would only prolong our country's economic downturn at a time when we need the greatest investment in our infrastructure and in our people.

Mr. Chairman, in these difficult and troubling times, we have a tremendous responsibility as a Congress to protect and provide for the needs of all Americans. But I and many of my colleagues believe that the Republican budget plan callously throws that responsibility aside. The Republican-proposed $1.4 trillion tax cut is a reckless measure to pursue at this time, especially as we face war in Iraq and a continued war on terror to defend our homeland and our hometowns.

The Republicans and the President claim that tax cuts will serve to stimulate our economy, but the evidence does not support this assertion. The trickle-down tax cuts of 20 years ago did not revitalize our economy, and similar tax cuts today will not fare better. In fact, the CBO estimates that the Republican budget will add $1.7 trillion in deficits over the next 10 years after completely depleting the surplus of the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds.

The Republican budget balances itself on the backs of Americans who can least afford it. It cuts Medicare by $214 billion over the next 10 years, Medicaid by $95 billion, veterans programs by $15 billion, while giving a meager prescription drug benefit of $28 billion to our deserving seniors. These cuts are unthinkable, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject such recklessness.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus for his leadership; also my colleagues the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH); and also to my staff, Julie, and all of our staffs who really worked many long hours to craft this very fair and balanced budget.

I rise in strong support of this budget, which really does provide a dramatic alternative to the Republican budget. As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus' executive committee, and also as cochair of the Progressive Caucus, I am doubly pleased to be a cosponsor of this joint alternative budget, which, in my opinion, represents the best alternative on the floor today.

Mr. Chairman, we are united today in our opposition to the irresponsible, unfair and warped priorities as expressed in the Republican budget. We cannot and we will not support a budget that spends more on defective technology than on school construction, safe drinking water, vocational education and the fight against HIV and AIDS combined. We cannot and will not support a budget that eliminates vital support for programs such as HOPE VI, the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program and brownfields redevelopment. We cannot and will not support a budget which slashes after-school programs, the school lunch program, veterans' benefits, housing programs, school loan programs, and ignores our Nation's vital need for a meaningful economic stimulus, including relief to the unemployed. Above all, we cannot and we will not support a budget that puts lavish and massive tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans above everything else, thereby mortgaging our children's future.

What we can and what we will support, however, is this reasonable and fair alternative. Our budget provides a real, fast-acting economic stimulus which includes $180 billion for payroll tax relief, $50 billion for Federal revenue-sharing with States, and $50 billion for infrastructure investment. Our budget provides health care for every single American, a benefit that no other budget offers.

Our budget also goes well beyond the Republicans' rhetorical commitment to education by providing serious resources. It fully funds the Leave No Child Behind Act, invests in substantial school construction, our Nation's teachers, vocational education and student loan programs. It also provides critical resources to our Nation's community development and housing programs. It creates a national housing trust fund, restores the administration's cuts to eliminate the Public Housing Drug Elimination Program, and it provides over $1 billion for economic and community development.

In addition to funding critical programs at home, our bill also commits substantial increases in funding toward fighting the HIV/AIDS pandemic abroad and commits $1.2 billion over the President's reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan.

How can our budget really afford to fund these priorities? It is really very simple. Instead of tax handouts to the wealthy, our budget freezes the tax cuts passed in 2001, closes corporate tax loopholes, and really does ignore President Bush's new tax cut proposals. In short, our budget has its priorities straight.

I encourage our colleagues to join me in supporting our budget. Let us support our troops tonight, Mr. Chairman, by passing this budget that says in no uncertain terms that we intend to bring you home to a country that places your economic security as our highest priority. I thank the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for this alternative and for their hard work.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, the GOP budget sends the message loud and clear: Weapons and tax cuts are more important than people. That is bad public policy. I know it, my constituents in Marin and Sonoma Counties in California know it, and most of the people in the United States agree. It is time to look at the entire picture and put together a budget that provides support to all American families, including the men and women in our military. That is why I rise today in support of the Progressive/Black Caucus budget. Our budget includes support that American families need and support that American families deserve.

Our budget includes affordable health care, because by providing universal

access for a high standard of health care, no parent will have to worry about taking their child to a doctor when that child is ill. Our budget recognizes that real support includes educational opportunities for every kid. It is not enough to pay lip service to the importance of education. Instead, this budget makes a firm commitment to provide $20 billion more for school construction, for teachers, for student loans and vocational education programs. No family, military or otherwise, will ever feel supported if their children are not receiving a top-notch education.

Speaking of the military, our budget recognizes that real support includes comprehensive care for members of our military when they return home as veterans. This budget recognizes that it is not enough to provide servicemen and women with bombs and missiles while they serve and then ignore the sacrifices they have made to protect our country when they return home. That is why the Progressive/Black Caucus budget provides over $3 billion more for funding of veterans programs than President Bush. We do not just support our troops with bombs and missiles, we support them along with all American families with access to quality health care and quality schools.

I urge my colleagues to join us in providing true support for our families by voting for the Owens-Cummings-Kucinich-Lee substitute.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¾ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Cummings-Owens-Kucinich-Lee substitute. The Republican budget contains no specific Medicare or Medicaid cuts, but the fact is it mandates a 1 percent cut in all mandatory spending, which translates to approximately 10-year cuts in Medicare and Medicaid of $215 billion and $93 billion respectively. For Illinois, this means 10-year Medicare cuts of approximately $10 billion and Medicaid cuts of more than $3 billion for the same period. Estimated cuts for my district alone are at least $1.4 billion; cuts in public housing, cuts in education, cuts in veterans' health care, cuts in Justice Department programs.

With the Republican budget, I am afraid that all of the bloodshed we shall see will not be in Iraq. All I am hearing about this budget is cut, cut, cut. I am afraid that when all you do is cut, cut, cut, all that you are going to get is blood, blood, blood. The blood of the American people will be on the hands of those who held the knife.

There are more than 2 million people in jails and prisons throughout the United States. More than 600,000 of them are being released each year. This poses a real threat and a real problem to many communities, especially low-income areas where they come from and return. The Justice Department reports that the cost of crime to victims is $450 billion annually. The proposed Republican House budget cuts Justice programs $4.1 billion below the amount needed to keep up with inflation and $881 million below the President's proposed budget. The Cummings-Owens-Kucinich-Lee budget restores the funding level back up to $3.4 billion for Justice programs and to expand reentry programs for nonviolent ex-offenders to help these individuals transition back into normal life, to get housing or jobs, social service help, to be reconciled with their families and communities, and to cut down on the recidivism rate, which is almost 50 percent.

This is a good budget, a responsible budget, and a problem-solving budget. I am pleased to support the Cummings-Owens-Lee-Kucinich amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, while we obviously have some disagreements with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle on the budgets and what our budget does, I understand my colleague has a number of speakers. We obviously do not have a number. I would be happy to transfer 10 minutes of our time to be controlled by the gentleman so he has an additional 10 minutes to control.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). Without objection, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) will control 10 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding that time to us.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have left with our 10 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Counting the additional 10 minutes, the gentleman has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, in his speech to the Nation on Monday, the President said, ''War has no certainty but the certainty of sacrifice.'' Many in our country are sacrificing. That list begins with the hundreds of thousands of brave young men and women who as we speak are putting their very lives on the line in Iraq out of a sense of duty to their country. But there is one small group of Americans who are not only not being asked to sacrifice, but get huge new benefits in the Republican budget. That would be the millionaires, the richest of the rich, who get most of the $1.4 trillion tax cut in this Republican budget. Warren Buffett, who opposes tax cuts, would get $300 million just from elimination of the stock dividend taxes.

Sacrifice, it seems, is only for the little people. The children sacrifice. Head Start is cut. Health insurance, college loans, school lunch programs are cut. Veterans are asked to sacrifice, again. Veterans disability, education and health care benefits, cut. Seniors, cuts in Medicaid for nursing home care, and forget a meaningful prescription drug benefit under Medicare. Not enough money in the Republican budget.

□ 2045

Homeland Security, for crying out loud, a pathetic .8 percent increase, even more when we are at orange alert and even though only when 2 percent of containers are inspected at ports.

The country is hurting from a struggling economy and war, but this Republican budget shamefully pours salt in the wound. A vote for the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus budget is a vote for America's working families.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget is simply unfair and unrealistic. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have sacrificed prudence for politics. Long-term planning for short-term gain. How else can we explain $1.3 trillion in tax cuts, most of which are given to the most privileged at a time when our schools are crumbling, our veterans are being deprived of the healthcare that they need, and a $348 billion deficit.

The Republicans have proposed cutting $51 billion for the State Children's Health Insurance Program, depriving 5.3 million children of health insurance; cutting $2 billion for the Ryan White programs, depriving people living with AIDS, medical care, and social support they need; cutting $1.5 billion for community health centers, eliminating health care for millions of low-income and uninsured people; eliminating the section 8 program that provides housing for over 300 million low-income families. Even the President's No Child Left Behind education bill, which he constantly touts as a major success, is cut by 8 percent below the inactive level of funding year 2003. Homeland Security is not properly funded. As a matter of fact, it is severely underfunded, putting our police officers, firefighters, and all of our first responders in danger. Where is the compassion that the President promised during his campaign?

I support the Congressional Black Caucus/Progressive Caucus alternative budget because it truly provides relief to Americans and it provides a stimulus to help the economy get back on its feet. Our budget provides healthcare for all Americans. It provides for vital infrastructure improvements throughout the Nation which provide jobs and protect America from potential terrorist threats. It provides $3.5 billion in relief to those inflicted with HIV/AIDS throughout the world, and importantly it provides our men and women in uniform the resources they need. It is indeed a balanced budget that does not burden our children with debt. We must resist this Republican budget, and I am going to urge my colleagues to support this alternative.

In conclusion, the Republican budget is an unjust and shameful budget. If Congress enacts this budget, many Americans will be harmed.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, my constituents have been paying attention to what has been going on with this preemptive strike; and when they heard about the billions of dollars offered to Turkey and other countries in exchange for their support, they said to me, Ms. WATERS, I thought we were broke. I thought we were in deficit. I thought we had no money. Where are you getting the billions of dollars from for Turkey and other countries that you are offering to them simply if they will support this preemptive strike?

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Throughout the time that I have been a Member of Congress, it is always the Congressional Black Caucus that has come forward with a budget that has priorities in it that describe the aspirations that I have for this Nation: the aspirations for quality health care, for education, for economic opportunity, foreclosing of the gap between the richest and the poor, between black and white. It is the Congressional Black Caucus budget that has always been the aspirational budget and again this evening, Mr. Chairman. It is the Congressional Black Caucus budget which among all of the budgets is the best budget that has been to the floor.

In a multitrillion dollar budget, there is always going to be some parts, various things in anybody's budget that everybody can agree to. But this is the best budget that we will debate this evening. It is the most honest budget that we will debate this evening because we say point blank to the American people what my constituents are saying to me over and over again: How in the world can we be cutting taxes? How can we be cutting taxes and spending from deficit spending? How can we be cutting taxes for the richest people in America when we are going to war? And my constituents ask me that all the time. I do not have any answer for them, and some of us are honest enough to say to our constituents we think this is a bad tax cut policy. It makes no sense to turn around and cut taxes and then have a Republican budget that essentially has all of our discretionary spending in every year that we are 10 years out being funded with deficit spending. That is outrageous. That is outrageous.

So this budget is honest. It sets the aspiration for universal healthcare and coverage for all American citizens. It does not play games with it; and I submit that if we pass just the health care part of this budget, there would be so substantial a savings in our health care industry that we would see the benefit of it just from healthier people, from people getting preventative health care rather than rushing to emergency rooms and getting their health care in the most expensive and least efficient manner. That is what we have forced our people to do in this country. We aspire to a better America. That is what this budget does, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me first thank the gentleman from Connecticut who has so graciously yielded time for us to express ourselves in this august Chamber, as well as the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus under the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and of course the gentleman from Baltimore, Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) and to the gentleman from New York (Mr. Owns), the architect that put it all together.

When Governor Bush was running for President, one would think that he picked up a Democratic National Committee Campaign piece of literature. He was for education, Leave No Child Behind, prescription drugs; and when he was appointed to office by the United States Supreme Court and he got there, he had a substantial surplus in the budget, the Social Security trust fund and the Medicare trust fund. It looked like it was on its way to full recovery. But the programs that he had promised, instead of getting that, what we did get was a $1.3 trillion tax cut, most all of which went to the wealthiest Americans in our country. As a result, as we stand here today, the surplus is gone. We have no prescription drugs. We expect devastating cuts in the Republican budget. And one thing that we did not know was that we would be in war. Of course we do not like talking about that because Republicans say if one talks about money and how much the war cost that one is preempting the President from declaring the war; but now that the bombs are dropping, I assume somewhere before this debate is over, somebody would be slipping some papers to us saying what the estimated cost of the war is.

Our budget says that this is the patriotic budget. This is the antiterrorist budget. This is a budget that protects our young people on the field by saying the President did not know, I do not think he knew, that he was going onto declare war before his budget, before his 1.5 trillion tax cuts. So, therefore, what we are saying from a tax policy is let us freeze everything. Let us just put a stop to the tax cuts, a stop to the flooding of our deficit, and just take a look at what America should be all about and adopt this budget as one that is the budget of patriotism, a budget that tells the terrorists that we believe that as the President is concerned with liberating and bringing democracy to Iraq, as the President has a concern about bringing democracy to the region, as the President has a concern to capture the oil fields, increase the production, and get the revenue to improve the education and health care of the people in Iraq, that the antiterrorist patriotic budget says that we have the same commitment and a stronger commitment to the people in the United States of America to provide the health care, the affordable housing, the education to make us more productive so that we can protect this democracy.

We want to give our men and women that are fighting in the Middle East all the protection that they have today; and when they come home, we will be there to say that we fought against cutting their budgets for veterans benefits, for health benefits, and for education benefits. Vote for the patriotic budget. That is the one that is on the floor now.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican 2004 budget with its $1.3 trillion tax cuts and heavy burdens on States and territories and of course in strong support for the CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget. The Owens-Cummings-Kucinich-Lee CBC/Progressive Caucus substitute advances the principles of family, hard work, inclusiveness, and national solidarity by calling for increased Federal assistance for education, health care, housing, child care, and business development. It represents the values and moral principles that have made America great.

As Chair of the Health Braintrust of the CBC, I am particularly pleased that this budget reverses many of the cuts in the President's budget which are seen as an attack on programs which would address the health needs of minorities and women. Our budget also calls for the implementation of a single-payer universal health care plan which will guarantee high-standard health care at a lower cost to every person living in the United States, its territories, and commonwealths.

My colleagues, the issue of health disparities for minorities continues to be worse. Last year the Institute of Medicine released a landmark report entitled ''Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care,'' which documented key findings in areas of health care where minorities receive less than adequate care and recommended various policy changes. These recommendations are reflected in the CBC/Progressive Caucus budget, and they include

increasing the budget of the Office of Minority Health, the budget of the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities research at the National Institutes of Health, increasing the budget of the Office of Civil Rights to reverse the low-priority status that this important office has in addressing racial and ethnic disparities in health care. It also provides increases for the health professions, including the Health Careers Opportunity program and provides scholarships and loan repayments in order to address the startling underrepresentation of people of color in the health professions.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to begin to address a number of important problems facing the majority of our constituents, while at the same time providing the resources needed to support our troops and defend our homeland.

□ 2100

Let us not give tax cuts to those who do not need them. Let us invest in the American people, as this CBC Progressive Caucus budget does.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the Owens-Cummings-Kucinich-Lee alternative.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican fiscal year 2004 budget resolution and in strong support of the CBC/Progressive Caucus alternative budget. At a time when our country is facing serious threats of terrorism, as well as waging war on Iraq, my colleagues on the other side of the isle are ignoring current economic problems by continuing to incorporate $1.3 trillion in additional tax cuts while continuing to place additional burdens on the cash-strapped states.

The Owens/Cummings/Kucinich/Lee CBC/Progressive Caucus Substitute advances the principles of family, hard work, inclusiveness and national solidarity by calling for increased federal assistance for education, health-care, housing, childcare and business development. The CBC/CPC Alternative Budget represents the values and moral principles that have made America great.

As the Chair of the CBC Health Braintrust, I am particularly pleased that the CBC/CPC reverses many of the cuts in the President's budget which were seen as an attack on programs to address the health needs of minorities and women. Our budget also calls for the implementation of a single-payer universal health care plan, which will guarantee high standard health care at a lower cost to every person living in the United States, its territories and Commonwealths.

My colleagues, the issue of health disparities for minorities continues to be worse than ever. Minorities are a quarter of our population, but make-up two-thirds of all new AIDS cases. African American infant mortality is twice that of whites. Diabetes afflicts Hispanics twice as often as whites. And African American men suffer prostates cancer at a rate twice that of white men.

Last year, the Institute of Medicine, IOM, released a landmark report entitled: Unequal Treatment: Confronting Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Health Care which documented key findings areas in health care where minorities receive less than adequate care and recommended various policy changes to eliminate these unacceptable disparities.

These recommendations included specific funding increases, which the CBC/CPC budget proposes. They include increasing the budget of the Office of Minority Health; the budget of the National Center for Minority Health and Health Disparities at the National Institute of Health and increasing the budget of the Office of Civil Rights at the Departments of HHS to reverse the low-priority status that this important office in addressing racial and ethnic disparities in health care. We also provide increases for funding for Initiatives for Health Professions including the Health Careers Opportunity program, and to provide scholarship and loan repayment relief in order to address the startling under representation of ethnic and minority groups in the health professions.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to begin to address a number of the major problems facing the majority of our constituents while at the same time provide the resources needed to support our troops and defend our homeland. We can only do this however if we do not follow the wrong lead of our majority colleagues and cut taxes for people who don't need it at a time when we must increase spending.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Republican budget and support the Owens/Cummings/Kucinich/Lee alternative budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution tonight, and I strongly endorse the Congressional Black Caucus-Progressive Caucus budget resolution and our Democratic alternative.

Immediately after the Republicans passed their budget out of committee, one of the first groups that I heard from to object to their proposal was the American Legion. Representing America's honorable veterans, the American Legion stated that, ''The budget defies common sense. There must be a better way to provide tax relief to the American people than to balance the budget on the backs of disabled veterans.''

Disabled American Veterans call the House Committee on the Budget budget ''indefensible and callous.'' They represent nearly 1.3 million disabled veterans in the country, and they believe the Republican budget asks veterans to ''swallow a bitter pill to remedy an illness of their own making.''

Republicans are calling for a $15 billion cut in veteran benefits over the next 10 years. Over $800 million will be cut in health care programs for veterans next year alone. These budget cuts will impact a very large population in my own district.

I would like to just let the Members know in my own district we have over 28,000 veterans from all former wars that are still alive that reside in my district. Many are minority veterans. Mr. Chairman, 1.4 million of those veterans live in the Los Angeles County area; 2.3 million of those veterans live in the State of California.

We must keep in mind that among our troops being sent abroad right now are many young men and women representing our State of California. I know that, because I had an opportunity to meet with many of them in my district. I met three of them, three young women, two Asian women and one Latino. One was a student enrolled in college, telling me that her dream was to come back and become a teacher. The other two were in their profession. They almost had tears in their eyes, telling me that they had actually joined up to be in the Reserve unit, not knowing they would now be faced with something that was unimaginable. I pray for them, and I pray for their families.

Mr. Chairman, I know that what we are doing here tonight is very exemplary, by supporting the Black Caucus budget, the Progressive Caucus and the Democratic alternative, because we care about families, we care about the very people that are spending their time this evening defending our Nation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me time.

First of all, let me thank the proponents of this budget. As the world watches, as the Nation watches, I believe most Americans as they pray for the troops are wondering whether or not we are caring for them and their needs.

I thank the distinguished chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, but I also thank the proponents and writers and authors of this legislation, particularly the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and any number of individuals, and, as I said, the gentleman from Maryland (Chairman CUMMINGS).

This is a budget that addresses the pain of America. It realizes that it is extremely unrealistic, Mr. Chairman, with the war looming, the needs of home-front security, to give, as the Republican budget wants to do, $726 billion in tax cuts to 1 percent of America. One percent of the rich of America will be getting the big chunk of the Republican budget.

What a tragedy that as our firefighters are laid off, police persons are not being paid and EMS services are

cut back, we cannot find the good reason to have a bipartisan budget.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget and the Progressive Caucus budget deals with the pain of America. It provides additional funds for job training and family services. It ensures that education is prioritized, and it really does support No Child Left Behind.

In addition, when we talk about defense, we have unique initiatives; a defense school readiness initiative, which provides for communications equipment and training to public schools; a strategic language and culture initiative that funds higher education initiatives for the study of key languages.

Then we deal with unemployment insurance for the thousands of individuals laid off. We give them an extension in unemployment. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you, we are going to be laying off Americans.

Then with respect to health care, we believe in funding Medicaid so that the least of those who cannot get into our various health facilities will be able to do so. And we support our veterans. We do not throw them out in the street because they do not have the money.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that America is looking to this Congress tonight to be receptive to their pain and their need. Who will stand with us and vote for this legislation? I ask my colleagues to vote for this budget and vote against the Republican budget.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for yielding me time, and especially for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus and Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, which I am proud to support.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a moment to say that there are a lot of people suffering in our Nation tonight.

The Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus believe very strongly that we must have a very balanced approach to addressing our budget concerns. On the one hand, we must be clear to protect ourselves against terrorism, and we must be clear with regard to supporting our troops. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, we must be clear in taking care of the people who have worked so hard to make this Nation the Nation that it is.

We must work hard, Mr. Chairman, and this is what the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus budget does, to help folks like Mr. Shapiro in Baltimore, who said he had been working for years on a prescription drug program, but give me something that is meaningful, because I am about to die. But maybe you can do this for my fellow people in my housing project. Or perhaps it is for the little girl in the eighth grade at West Baltimore Middle School in my district, who still is reading from a textbook where Jimmy Carter is still President. Or it might be the students who are in the honors class at another school in my district, who have no microscopes on their desks, but they are supposed to go on and become great biologists. Then the question becomes, are we taking care of all of our people?

I have often said that we have to protect ourselves from the outside, but we have to be very careful that we do not implode from the inside.

So the fact is that the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus have presented a budget tonight which is one that takes care of our health needs. It is one that truly leaves no family behind. It is one that makes sure that the young people at Morgan State University in Baltimore, where we have to let go 1,000 students every year because they do not have the money, it makes sure that they have the Pell grants that they need.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would urge the House to support the Black Caucus-Progressive Caucus budget.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding part of his time to us. We really appreciate it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would say that we appreciate the work that went into the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus substitute. We understand that they, more than most Members in this House of Representatives, know that there are people suffering tonight. So we do not dispute that fact.

But we believe that the best way to help people who are suffering is first to protect America at home and abroad with a strong national defense and a strong Department of Homeland Security, to strengthen the economy, and create jobs, and to be fiscally responsible. We really believe that is the best way to help people who are suffering.

Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague and I would both agree that we would like to have a budget that is balanced today. We might come to a different conclusion as to why we have gotten to this point. The economy has slowed; I believe that September 11, a day that I will remember in infamy, had something to do with it; and we believe that the best way to get us out of this kind of lull in our economy is to provide an economic engine, which we believe are tax cuts.

So we are providing an increase in defense spending, homeland security, Social Security, Medicare and veterans. We are asking for a 1 percent reduction, a penny on the dollar, this year, in discretionary and mandatory programs. We think this 1 cent on the dollar for 1 year is something that we can do as mature and responsible Members of the Congress. Lord knows our political colleagues in the statehouses and in local communities are having to make much more difficult decisions.

I would conclude by saying that when I hear references of who is getting the taxes, we acknowledge this: That the people who pay taxes get the tax cuts. That is true. Five percent of the American people pay 50 percent of the taxes, and 50 percent of the American people pay 96.5 percent of the taxes, and they get the tax cut. But we also know when they get this tax cut, they use it to invest in America and create jobs for all Americans.

I know we have another budget to consider, so I will conclude my remarks. I appreciate the dialogue that has taken place on the floor tonight.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to not support this budget substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GOODLATTE). All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 85, noes 340, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

AYES—85

Ackerman
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Capuano
Carson (IN)
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Honda
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Majette
Maloney
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Payne
Pelosi
Rangel
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Slaughter
Solis
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—340

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Bereuter

Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schiff
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Buyer
Dooley (CA)
Gephardt
Hyde
Lipinski
Mollohan
Thornberry
Towns
Udall (CO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain on this vote.

□ 2132

Ms. MCCOLLUM and Messrs. UDALL of New Mexico, HEFLEY, CANNON, KANJORSKI, PALLONE, and SAXTON changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Ms. MAJETTE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 108–44, as modified by the special order of today.

PART B AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

Part B Amendment No. 4 in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by Mr. SPRATT:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

The Congress declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 is hereby established and that the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 are hereby set forth.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,272,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,482,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,612,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,753,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,871,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,988,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,106,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,234,002,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,454,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,638,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,779,210,000,000.

(B)(i) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be reduced for the following fiscal years are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $87,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $25,000,000,000.

(ii) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased for the following fiscal years are as follows:

Fiscal year 2004: $15,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $12,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $17,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $25,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $27,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $40,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $27,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,831,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,867,617,000,000
Fiscal year 2005: $1,977,048,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,105,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,222,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,336,955,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,442,555,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,550,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,681,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,770,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,869,957,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,818,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,858,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,963,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,071,052,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,184,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,300,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,413,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,525,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,663,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,737,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,873,559,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $545,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $375,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $350,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $317,480,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $313,662,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $312,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $306,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $291,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $209,108,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $99,037,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $94,349,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $6,783,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $7,238,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $7,695,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,140,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $8,582,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $9,027,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,468,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $9,898,898,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,250,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,498,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $10,743,438,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $3,954,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $4,153,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,317,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,435,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,526,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,594,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,638,044,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $4,646,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,553,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $4,335,482,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $4,097,406,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $392,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $400,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $420,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,237,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $440,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,011,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $460,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $480,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $462,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $490,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $478,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $500,590,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $491,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $511,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $507,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $522,781,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $534,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $528,178,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $28,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $32,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $33,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $34,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $36,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,274,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $23,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,525,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,848,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $25,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $27,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $28,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,198,000,000.

(4) Energy (270)
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $2,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $2,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,432,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $2,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,402,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,295,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $32,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $33,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $34,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $35,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $36,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $37,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $38,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $39,958,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $40,980,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $42,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,032,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $27,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $27,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,934,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $26,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,510,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $25,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $25,441,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $25,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,695,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $8,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $8,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $9,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,723,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $9,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,468,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $9,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,878,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $64,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $66,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $67,565,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $68,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $70,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $71,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $72,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $73,783,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $75,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $77,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $79,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $79,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,732,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,935,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,479,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $15,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $15,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $16,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $16,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,906,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,914,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $17,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $17,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $18,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,079,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $82,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $89,231,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $90,187,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $92,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $94,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $96,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $98,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $100,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,155,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $102,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $104,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $107,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,956,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $231,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $227,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $238,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $236,574,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $253,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $253,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $271,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,524,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $292,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $290,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $314,333,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $312,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $337,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $335,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $363,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $360,992,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $391,476,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $389,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $422,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $420,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $455,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $453,522,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $248,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $261,750,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $262,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $276,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $319,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $351,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $351,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $379,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $379,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $409,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $409,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $441,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $442,719,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $484,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $487,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $522,221,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $518,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $565,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $565,794,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $322,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $322,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $324,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $332,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $333,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $340,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $349,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $362,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $362,757,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $373,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $374,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $386,204,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $387,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $403,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $404,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $395,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $410,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $412,578,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $16,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $18,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,011,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,213,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,511,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,494,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,395,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,660,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $57,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $62,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $67,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $65,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $64,709,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $68,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $70,492,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $72,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $77,034,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $74,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $78,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,515,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $38,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $41,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,631,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $39,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $40,192,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,133,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $40,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,510,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $42,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,668,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $43,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $44,752,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $46,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $47,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $48,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,414,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $20,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $20,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $22,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,121,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $240,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $240,447,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $257,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $257,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $300,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $300,930,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $335,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $335,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $357,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $357,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $377,426,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $377,426,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $396,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $414,220,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $430,321,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $430,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $442,545,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $442,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $449,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $449,801,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $39,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $4,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $4,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $4,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $6,600,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $6,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $4,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $4,329,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $4,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $2,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,796,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,104,000,000.
(A) New budget authority, −$42,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$42,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$51,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$51,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$53,540,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$53,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,609,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,685,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,025,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$59,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$61,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,229,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT.—In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or both committees report a bill, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report thereon is submitted, which provides a prescription drug benefit under the medicare program that is voluntary, equitable, comprehensive, affordable, dependable, protects beneficiary access to drugs, and is cost effective, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall revise allocations and adjust aggregates in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, subject to section 203.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) The term ''equitable'' means that all medicare beneficiaries shall receive comprehensive prescription drug coverage and that coverage shall be accessible to all beneficiaries regardless of where they live.

(2) The term ''comprehensive, affordable, and dependable'' means that all beneficiaries shall have access to a drug benefit that contains a defined benefit and premium and coverage at all levels of drug spending, is administered through a stable and dependable delivery system so that beneficiaries will not lose coverage or face significant premium increases from one year to the next, and provides additional assistance with premiums and cost sharing to low-income beneficiaries.

(3) The term ''protects beneficiary access to drugs'' means that the benefit shall include coverage for all medically necessary drugs and shall preserve access to local pharmacies.

(4) The term ''cost effective'' means that the benefit shall include measures that lower the cost of prescription drugs and not include measures that would encourage employers to drop existing retiree coverage.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR THE UNINSURED.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, or both committees report a bill, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report thereon is submitted, that would provide affordable, comprehensive health insurance coverage to the uninsured and builds upon and strengthens public and private coverage, including preventing the erosion of existing coverage under medicaid, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall revise allocations and adjust aggregates and in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, subject to section 203.

SEC. 203. TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS TO ALLOW FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT AND HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.

The total of adjustments allowed under sections 201 and 202 shall not increase the cumulative deficit or decrease the cumulative surplus (whether by changes in revenues or direct spending) by more than $131,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and $528,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, excluding interest.

SEC. 204. CONTINGENCY PROCEDURE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—In the House, if the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

(1) for fiscal year 2004: $39,233,000,000,
(2) for fiscal year 2005: $39,998,000,000,
(3) for fiscal year 2006: $40,841,000,000,
(4) for fiscal year 2007: $41,684,000,000, or
(5) for fiscal year 2008: $42,605,000,000,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate budget aggregates and increase the allocation of new

budget authority to such committee for fiscal year 2004 and for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 to the extent such excess is offset by a reduction in mandatory outlays from the Highway Trust Fund or an increase in receipts appropriated to such fund for the applicable fiscal year caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation.

(b) ADJUSTMENT FOR OUTLAYS.—In the House, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that changes obligation limitations such that the total limitations are in excess of $38,594,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fiscal year for the committee reporting such measure by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a).

TITLE III—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDING FOR HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the President's budget includes a total of $41.3 billion for all homeland security activities for 2004, including mandatory, discretionary, and fee-funded activities;

(2) the President's current budget does not contain any additional funding for 2003 for homeland security beyond what has already been provided; and

(3) there is need for additional homeland security resources for 2003, 2004, and subsequent years in order to protect our country against terrorist attacks.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) this resolution provides $10 billion in additional homeland security funding for 2003, and a total of $24 billion in additional homeland security funding in the years 2004-13, for a total of $34 billion above the President's request over the time period covered by this resolution; and

(2) this funding provides the resources needed to train and equip our first responders, strengthen the security of the Nation's transportation system and other critical infrastructure, increase the preparedness of our public health system, and secure our borders.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING THE CONSERVATION SPENDING CATEGORY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the fiscal year 2001 Interior Appropriations Act (P.L. 106–291), which established a separate discretionary spending category for land conservation and natural resource protection programs for the fiscal years 2001 through 2006, passed by large margins in both the House and the Senate;

(2) in establishing a separate conservation spending category, Congress recognized the chronic underfunding of programs that protect and enhance public lands, wildlife habitats, urban parks, historic and cultural landmarks, and coastal ecosystems; and

(3) the expiration of the provisions of law defining and enforcing the conservation spending category was not due to a lack of Congressional support for the programs included in the category or a loss of desire to set aside dedicated funds for those programs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that any law establishing new caps on discretionary spending should include a separate conservation spending category for fiscal years 2004, 2005, and 2006 and that total funding for that category for each of those fiscal years should be set at the levels established in P.L. 106–291.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING CONTINGENCY AND PRIORITY RESERVE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that this budget resolution provides a total of $54 billion of unallocated funds that have been counted as though spent, including the consequent cost of debt service.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the $54 billion reserve in this resolution should be considered to provide funding for any contingencies and priorities that may arise.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, we have had two responsible alternatives offered. Mr. Chairman, this substitute should pass, and it should pass with an overwhelming number of votes from both sides of the aisle. Why? Because it is the fiscally responsible alternative that remains on this floor.

The Republican budget is an appalling betrayal of America's values and fails to meet our Nation's priorities. We really have to wonder, how does this Republican Party define compassion? By taking hot lunches out of the mouths of poor schoolchildren? By forcing the elderly out of nursing homes as the result of Medicaid cuts? By skimping on a prescription drug benefit for seniors? By slashing veterans health care on the very day, on the very day that our brave Armed Forces have begun the battle to disarm Saddam Hussein?

It is clear that the President's irresponsible $1.4 trillion tax plan and the GOP's blind allegiance to it would be an albatross around the necks of the American people, as well as future generations.

To pay for it, the House GOP proposes to cut funding for Medicaid, student loans, scientific research, food stamps, education, and veterans benefits. Too often, those of us privileged to serve here speak in terms of billions or trillions. Well, tonight, Mr. Chairman, let us put a human face on these proposed budget cuts.

More than 90 students at the Eva Turner Elementary School in Waldorf, Maryland, who receive hot meals under the lunch program could have those meals eliminated.

Ervin Coleman of Prince George's County, who recently was forced to rely on Medicaid to cover the cost of his medical care, may not have that option under the Republican budget.

Rubin Hairston of Calvert County receives $654 a month in Social Security benefits, but his prescription drug cost is $519. He simply cannot afford all his medication. The meager funding set aside for a drug benefit in this budget offers him little hope of relief.

I ask Members, is that a budget that reflects America's values? Is that a budget that meets America's priorities? Mr. Chairman, the American people want and deserve better. That is precisely what this Democratic budget alternative gives them.

First and foremost, our budget includes our entire stimulus plan, which would jumpstart the economy, provide tax relief, and create 1 million new jobs. Our budget provides more funding for homeland security, $34 billion for safety here at home; more funding for education; and more funding for the environment, veterans, and other priorities. We also provide at least 35 percent more for prescription drugs.

Finally, our budget matches the President's defense request, protects Social Security, and achieves balance by 2010. Democrats urge all Americans to examine our budget and ask themselves which budget reflects America's values and meets our needs. The answer is clear.

The Republican budget is nothing more than a cynical, calculated political document designed solely to provide huge tax cuts to the most affluent. It will continue the deficit spiral and pass the debt along to the brave young men and women who are now in harm's way. That is not moral, it is not fiscally responsible, and it is pitiful policy.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the Democratic budget for America and for generations to come.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) claim time in opposition?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, this substitute. We have come forward with a budget that provides significant increases in defense, homeland security, Social Security, Medicare, veterans benefits. We ask for a 1 percent cut in discretionary spending for 1 year, one cent on the dollar. When our States and local communities are having to make 5 and 10 percent cuts to their budget, we are asking 1 percent; and then we allow our budget to go up each and every year after that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, the tax cut in the Republican proposal for 2004 is a tax cut of $1.4 trillion, which is very close to the cost of the war effort. I find that not only to be interesting, but something that we need to take a look at very, very closely.

I think, when all is said and done on all of these different budget proposals, the one thing I think is absolutely sure is we have reverse socialism. What we are doing here is redistributing the wealth of this country to the top. JOHN MCCAIN was right-on when he said that 3½ weeks ago.

We have been accused on this side of the aisle year after year of trying to manipulate the budget, to manufacture the budget, so the money is going to be shifted down to those people who are making less than $50,000 a year. This is not the case over the next 10 years. We have a redistributing of the dollar upward. That is a fact of life. Yet what we have done at the same time, not because one side of the aisle thinks more of the veterans of this country than the other, but in order to fit it into their budget, what they had to do is nickel and dime the veterans, who have already put their lives on the line. Yet we send young men and women to war. What guarantee are we going to give them when they come back that their benefits are going to be intact?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who, I would just point out, without embarrassing my colleague, is an American hero, and someone who can speak very clearly about what our men and women are going through.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I did not know if I was going to vote for this budget, but after the partisan rancor that I just heard on this floor, I am going to vote for it. It is despicable.

Talk about hurting veterans, talk about cutting Social Security. In 1993 when they had the White House, the House, and the Senate, what did they do? They spoke and talked about tax breaks for the middle class, tax breaks for the middle class. What did they do? They had the highest tax in the history of this Nation. They cut the COLAs of veterans. They cut the COLAs of our active duty military.

□ 2145

Where you said you were going to decrease the tax for the middle class, you increased the tax for the middle class. You took and utilized every dime out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and you had the gall, you have the gall to stand up here and accuse us of only for the rich.

Not a single Clinton budget after you controlled the White House, the House and the Senate ever passed this body or the other body. We brought up those budgets so that the Democrats would have to vote on them. They were so bad, and you know how many Democrats voted for it? Three. That is a fact because I will tell the gentleman, I thought we were going to have a debate, not a finger-pointing thing here tonight, and I had not planned even on speaking until I heard the speakers speak before me, and I had questions about our budget, but not after the rancor that I have heard on this floor.

You did in 1993 raise taxes. You did cut veterans' COLAs. You cut military COLAs. You raised the tax on the middle class, and now you stand here and say, oh, we want to balance a budget, and that we are responsible for the surplus, but not a single one of your policies ever passed when you had the leadership.

It is sickening to listen to this debate. The gentleman that is speaking here, normally I would and I would say even tonight his language has been honorary, and the different budgets that he has presented has been honorary, and I appreciate that, but for those that will sit up here and point fingers and say how mean the Republicans are because they want to cut veterans' COLAs or they want to hurt things is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to say that in 1993 we passed a budget. We took the deficit then in the budget, $290 billion, down every year for the next 7 years until it reached a surplus in the year 2000 of $236 billion, an exact polar opposite of what is happening right now.

Nobody in this House stands in greater admiration of the gentleman from California's (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) record in the military than I do and my personal like for the man, but I think we have to acknowledge that these fellow veterans, four different groups, have all come out in unmitigated condemnation of this budget because of what it does to veterans' benefits, and nobody shows greater indignation than the Paralyzed Veterans of America who wrote the Speaker saying, we do not consider payments to war-disabled veterans, pensions for the poorest disabled veterans and GI benefits for soldiers returning from Afghanistan to be waste, fraud and abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California may not like what Democrats are saying about the Republican budget, so let us listen to what others are saying about that budget.

Unconscionable, that is what four veterans organizations called the Republican budget. Callous, that is how the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars describe the Republican budget. Perhaps Edward Heath, Sr., the national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, said it best when he said this: ''Mr. Speaker, this budget dishonors the service of millions of service-connected disabled veterans, including combat-disabled veterans. Is there no honor left in the hallowed halls of our government?'' Well said, Commander Heath.

In just a few minutes we are going to be voting to support our troops. I must say, Mr. Chairman, to my Republican colleagues, what an odd way to support our troops when we are also going to be voting tonight, at least they are going to be voting, to cut veterans' benefits and services by $28 billion.

I would say that our veterans and our troops would appreciate it more if we supported them with our deeds, not our words, and that is why I am going to support the Spratt substitute, because the American Legion said it is a better approach. Not only does it not cut veterans' benefits, it keeps our commitments to veterans. It invests in our children's future rather than borrowing from it.

The Spratt budget, the Democratic budget, creates jobs, not deficits, for as far as the eye can see. We should vote for the Spratt budget. We should listen to the voice of the veteran leaders of America and say no to the callous budget of the Republican Party.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Democratic budget and oppose the Republican budget.

When Bill Clinton left office, we had record surpluses of $200 billion, and in two short years, we have a deficit of $300 billion, deficits as far as the eye can see.

Yes, there was a downturn in the economy. Yes, 9/11 caused part of it, but a large part of it were those tax cuts. What are the Republicans giving us now? More tax cuts for the wealthy as far as the eye can see.

Never in American history has there been a proposal for tax cuts at the time of war. This is so fiscally irresponsible that I just cannot believe it. We are leaving a legacy of debt to our children and our grandchildren, and the Republicans want to give us deeper and deeper and deeper debt and dig us deeper into a hole.

There is no economic growth in the Republican budget. There is no real drug plan in the Republican budget. The Democratic budget has $128 million more for prescription drugs, $34 billion more for homeland security. The Republican budget gives us cuts to veterans and schools and Medicaid and to our senior citizens.

The Democratic budget is responsible. The Republican budget subordinates all other priorities to additional lavish tax cuts. Vote for the Democratic budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished ranking member for yielding me the time.

We have talked a lot about what is in the budget. I would like to talk about two things that are not in the budget. The first particularly should be of interest to people who live in Washington State, my home State, Tennessee, Texas, Nevada, Wisconsin, Florida or South Dakota.

Residents of those seven States are unjustly treated in the Tax Code, and

this budget does nothing to correct it. Those States rely on sales tax to fund their State governments, but they are not allowed to deduct their sales tax from their Federal tax return as one is allowed to deduct their State income tax.

What that does is it disadvantages our State. The Federal Government essentially tells our States how we should tax our citizens. I believe it is an issue of State rights.

The Democratic Party introduced an amendment to the budget bill to fix this. Regrettably, the other side voted that down.

The second thing that is not made allowance for in this budget is fixing the Medicare payment imbalance. Forty-seven percent of physicians in my home State, in Washington, will not see new Medicare patients. Why? Because the fee-for-service rates under Medicare are unjust. This is the case in the Committee on the Budget chairman's home State of Iowa.

We had an opportunity to provide language in this bill to fix it. We managed to provide language to protect tax cuts, but we do not seem to be able to provide language to protect people for tax fairness, and we do not seem to be able to provide language to assure fair Medicare compensation rates.

I urge the people from those States to ask their Representatives, why have they left us out in the cold? Why have they not solved the sales tax inequity? Why have they not fixed the imbalance in Medicare payments?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the distinguished chair of our caucus.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his work.

The budget is more than a series of numbers. It is about priorities and values and visions and commitments. It is about the kind of America we want to build. It is about the kind of Nation we want to bequeath to our children. It is about the future.

Will we have a future of debts and deficits or a future with a balanced budget? Will we have a future where seniors have access to the medications they need, or one where they will have to choose between life-saving prescriptions and putting food on the table? Will we have a future where every child gets the education he or she deserves, or one where many children arrive into adulthood unprepared for the jobs and challenges of the 21st century? Will we have a future where Medicare and Social Security are there for our retirees, or one where the funding runs out? Will we have a future where our cities and States have funding they need to hire, train and supply our local first responders, our first line of defense against terrorism, or will we leave them and their communities defenseless? Will we have a future where our veterans have all of the benefits and services they need and deserve, or will we have a future where their sacrifices go unappreciated?

On every single count, the Democratic plan provides a future where the priorities and values of the American people are met and fulfilled, and on every single count the Republican budget shortchanges these priorities of the American people by sacrificing them on the altar of a massive round of additional tax breaks and tax cuts. Their budget makes no fiscal sense, it makes no moral sense, and it makes no practical sense.

We are, as I speak, as we debate, at war. Our men and women in uniform are fighting for our way of life, and we all stand behind them in their mission, but the Republican budget cuts $14.6 billion from mandatory veterans' benefits, including disability, burial benefits, pensions, rehabilitation, housing and education, and that is a disgrace, a disgrace. Our soldiers are fighting to protect our way of life, and Democrats believe we have a duty to protect them.

Fiscally irresponsible tax breaks are not the answer to every problem. I believe our way of life is about more than just tax giveaways. Our way of life is about educating our children, taking care of the needs of our seniors, and building an America we can all be proud of.

The Democratic budget takes care of these priorities. The Republican budget does not. It is that clear, it is that simple, and the choice for Members is to vote for a future with promise and hope, or vote for a future with massive debt and broken commitments.

I urge my colleagues to look into their hearts, make the right choice and support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me the time, and I want to agree with my friend from New Jersey, the previous speaker. This debate is about where our priorities are, and a budget is about where our priorities are in government, and we just have a disagreement on the floor of the House of Representatives. We have it year after year after year.

Clearly, my friends on the Democrat side of the aisle are willing to accept higher taxes so that Federal spending can increase at a faster and faster rate. That is their viewpoint. We, on the other hand, believe that tax restraint brings about economic growth and jobs, and that is a lot of what this debate is about tonight.

I have heard debate on this bill throughout the afternoon and evening, and I have heard things like the Republican budget slashes spending, we are taking hot meals away from schoolchildren, we are taking needed benefits away from our citizens, we are denying health care. Someone just said we are leaving people out in the cold. These are the very same arguments that we have heard year after year after year, debate after debate, on the budget resolution.

□ 2200

I would submit to my colleagues that hot meals have not been taken away from school children, benefits have not been taken away from our citizens, we have not denied health care or left people out in the cold.

With regard to slashing spending, I would like Members to look at chart number 26 which shows spending trends. Since I became a Member of this Congress in 1995, spending has gone up at a quite remarkable rate. All we are asking with regard to discretionary spending from the year 2003 to the year 2004 is just a very, very modest breather. After that discretionary spending continues to increase at a pace which probably would embarrass some of our conservatives. But this is the definition of slashing spending for some of our colleagues. So we need to decide if that is exactly what this is.

Moving to the next chart, a statement was made about the Clinton tax increase, and I hope Members can see this. I have a different view and I have a different recollection about the Clinton tax increase and the result of it. When I got to Congress in the winter of 1995, President Clinton, who had just presided over a very large tax increase, came before the Congress and proposed his budget. I did not see a balanced budget at the end of that rainbow. I saw deficits as indicated on this line as far as the eye could see. As a matter of fact, under the Clinton budget after tax increases, the deficit would have gone up to $288 billion per year.

Now Republicans in the House of Representatives and the Senate felt we could do a better job, and part of that solution was tax reductions. Indeed, we did reduce taxes. And guess what, we said we will balance the budget by restraining spending, by making some of those tough decisions which other people criticized as slashing and leaving people out in the cold. Lo and behold, in a shorter time than we even predicted, we had a balanced budget.

Looking at the last chart, we seek tax reduction for one reason and one reason only, to grow this economy. I want to remind Members of a time when we were spending a larger percentage of the gross domestic product on national defense than we are today, a larger percentage of the economy than we are having to do in this Iraq situation, and that was in 1981 and 1982 when President Reagan ushered in a very meaningful tax cut for the American people. Did we have to slash programs? As a matter of fact, revenue grew almost every year after the Reagan tax cuts because the economy grew. That is what we are trying to do with our tax policy here.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman put up the chart that was

up earlier showing Clintonomics versus the last chart and agree that perhaps spending grew in those years because revenue for the government grew as well, and perhaps that President and this Congress, Democrats and Republicans, did a darn good job of helping the economy to grow. Can the gentleman concede that point?

Mr. WICKER. Reclaiming my time, I would concede this, that President Reagan raised taxes and the very next year he was up here proposing deficits as far as the eye could see.

When we cut taxes, as President Reagan did, the economy grows. These are simply the facts. Revenues to the government grew because people had jobs and they were working. I urge a defeat of this Democrat proposal, and a ''yes'' vote on final passage.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me follow up on what the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) stated. I was here in 1993, and I voted for that. It was the hardest vote I ever made, but it worked. And it was not because of the Republican majorities in 1995. It was because of a bipartisan effort that we had a balanced budget and surpluses in the late 1990s. Now they are gone.

That is why I rise in opposition to the Republican budget and support the Spratt substitute amendment. This Republican budget does not provide enough. We know what we are going to have to pay for the military campaign in Iraq, which could range as high as $100 billion, and which programs will have to be cut to underwrite that $100 billion. What we know about this budget is it contains a monstrous tax cut that is paid for out of the expense of almost everything, including veterans, the war effort, prescription drugs for seniors. Let me repeat that. This tax cut affects some of the most critical entitlement programs, school lunches, student loans, veterans programs, and Medicaid and Medicare.

In my own committee, we are asked to cut $107 billion out of Medicaid and literally give pennies to prescription drugs to seniors. That is why the Spratt substitute is so good.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, just to walk down memory lane, during the Clinton years, we created 21 million jobs. So far, during the Bush years, we have seen 2.5 million private sector jobs disappear. In December 2000 before President Clinton left office and President Bush took office, there were 5.17 million people unemployed. This year in January 2003, it is 8.4 million unemployed.

We can go down the list. Real GDP during the Clinton years increased at a rate of 6.3 percent from 1993 through 2000. So far it has increased at a rate of 1.5 percent, and the budget every year from 1993 onward, the bottom line of the budget, the so-called deficit got better and better and better under that budget that we adopted in 1993. It went from a record deficit of $290 billion in 1992 to $255 billion the next year, $203 billion the next year, $164 billion in 1995, $107 billion in 1996, $22 billion in 1997, and balanced for the first time in 30 years in 1998. That was a record of that period of time and the result of that tough budget vote that we took in 1993.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, immoral. Immoral is the only word I can find to describe the Republican budget that is being forced down our throats this evening.

As we go to war, this Republican package includes exactly zero dollars towards the war effort. This budget includes exactly zero dollars to bolster our troops in Iraq and throughout the Middle East. And for our veterans, this Republican budget cuts funding for veterans disability pensions and veterans health care.

The Disabled American Veterans asked the question: Has Congress no shame? Unfortunately, as long as Republicans control this institution and force these types of budgets onto the American people, the answer is no, this Republican Congress has no shame.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I believe this budget is immoral, and that is the only word I can find to describe it. Tax cuts for the rich, cuts to veterans' pensions and health care and nothing for our troops. I say vote down this immoral Republican budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is getting late. It is 10 p.m., but words like ''immoral'' and not providing money to our troops is just over the edge. Our troops are going to get all the money they need to do whatever they have to do to protect themselves and achieve their objective. There is no one here doubts that issue. Not one Member. To suggest otherwise, I think particularly tonight, is inappropriate. I do not think that we need to go there.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) said that States are having to make cuts, and you do not see why it is not possible that we in this Congress cannot take a 1 percent across-the-board cut.

I could accept that, but the only problem is where the gentleman did not cite the difference between the States and us is that they are not parading around talking about tax cuts in Tennessee, Connecticut, Michigan, Florida and New Mexico.

Mr. SHAYS. Reclaiming my time, I understand there is an objection to the tax cuts. I understand that debate is going to be one in which we will disagree. We happen to believe that tax cuts generate economic activity. We have an honest disagreement on that issue.

I am just saying in this debate tonight when our men and women are fighting to even suggest for a moment that our troops are not going to get all of the resources they need is simply going over the edge. I would just suggest that we both know that we need to provide our men and women with everything they need, and our job is to make sure it is never a fair fight, that we always have the advantage, and we have done that.

I think the gentleman would acknowledge that this side of the aisle has continually put more money into the defense budget. That is what we continue to do today. I just would make this point. Our men and women are going to get whatever they need, and we are going to have a supplemental that impacts this budget, not next year's budget. They will get whatever they need to do their job and win this war.

We have disagreements. Our disagreements are we are putting more money in defense and homeland security. We believe a meaningful tax cut, one that is noticeable and large, will strengthen the economy and create jobs; and we believe that a 1 percent cut on nondefense, nonhomeland security discretionary spending, 1 percent for 1 year will make sense. What my colleague from South Carolina did not point out is during the late 1990s, we slowed the growth in spending for 2, almost 3, years, and then allowed it to go up again. We believe that is why our budget balanced. We are going to have disagreements on that.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to enthusiastically support the Spratt substitute amendment on the budget because of its commitment to child care, education, Medicare and Medicaid, and because it helps ease the pain of working Americans.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

(Mr. HINOJOSA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican's proposed budget resolution for fiscal year 2004 and in support of the Spratt substitute amendment. If passed, the budget resolution currently before the House would require the Committee on Education and the Workforce to cut

mandatory spending programs under its jurisdiction by $269 million for fiscal year 2004 and $2.675 billion for fiscal years 2004 through 2008. This is completely unacceptable. Education is the key to success.

The Federal cuts come at a time when States are facing a severe budget crisis. According to the National Governors' Association, States face a combined $80 billion budget shortfall for fiscal year 2004 in addition to a $30 billion shortfall for the current fiscal year.

In my State of Texas, they are suffering from at least a $10 billion shortfall in this 2-year period.

As I see it, all of these cuts to essential educational programs are being made only to benefit the wealthiest Americans—the top 1%—through tax cuts. The President and the Republican party insist on cutting taxes far beyond any reasonable amount at a time when we are at war with Iraq and will need to occupy Iraq for years to come to maintain the peace and rebuild the country. They are acting irresponsibly by failing to include the projected cost of the war and its aftermath in this current budget resolution. The cost of the war alone has been estimated at anywhere from $70 billion to $200 billion, according to the Administration's former economic advisor, Lawrence Lindsay.

The Republican budget also cuts $28 billion in health care and disability benefits for military veterans again to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans less than 24 hours after sending our forces into battle. They should be ashamed of themselves. It is unconscionable for the Republicans to be cutting taxes and reducing social services programs at a time when the United States has a large and growing deficit, our states are in crises, and we are at war with Iraq. History will not be kind when it judges the Republicans' actions.

There is a far better alternative budget. Congressman SPRATT's Democratic substitute offers real economic stimulus and job creation. It proposes responsible tax policy by continuing the implementation of middle-income tax cuts, such as the increased child tax credit, and by freezing tax cuts for the top two income tax brackets. The Spratt substitute meets our nation's domestic needs by providing over $200 billion more in domestic investments than the Republican budget. It fully funds priority investments such as No Child Left Behind, IDEA, veteran's benefits, children's services, public health, transportation, environmental programs and agricultural programs. This alternative also invests in health care and a strong prescription drug plan by providing at least $20 billion to cover the uninsured and at least $528 billion for a prescription drug program under Medicare, while allowing senior citizens to stay with their current doctors. Finally, the Spratt alternative budget invests in Homeland Security and defense funding by increasing resources for Homeland Defense and by giving $20 billion more to First Responders than they would receive under the Republican Budget. In short, the Spratt Budget provides for America's needs, the needs of our people and strengthens our economy. It is a sound, reasonable budget blueprint, and we should support it.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican's proposed budget resolution is inherently flawed. It hurts the education system in the United States. It harms children's programs. It damages small businesses, which are the strength of the U.S. economy, and it insults our veterans and our troops fighting in Iraq. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Spratt substitute and oppose the irresponsible, illogical, and ill-advised Republican budget resolution.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) mentioned not tonight, we do not walk the talk about what is happening to our veterans and military tonight. What better time to pull the covers off and show exactly what this Republican Party is doing for our veterans.

□ 2215

How in the name of any degree of decency and respect can we, on a day that will certainly live in infamy in the hearts of veterans, on a day and a time that we are sending our men and women into battle, what reward do we want to give our veterans who had to remember a day in infamy 60 years ago? What do we want to give them? A $17 billion cut for veterans.

I represent the State of Georgia. I say to my friends in the Republican Party, and I want you to know that every weekend I go home that my office is lined with veterans with tears in their eyes, saying, how could they be so mean? Every year in campaigns my Republican friends run around the country, and they talk about conservative compassion. This is not conservative compassion. This is downright conservative meanness. These veterans do not appreciate it. This is why I say, let us support the Democratic budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, as a Democrat who voted for the 2001 Bush tax cut, I am here tonight to say that I would never support a vote for this Republican budget proposal. The Republican budget completely abandons the goal of a balanced budget. It embraces deficits and debt. It slashes critical programs for our working families, and it is fiscally irresponsible. The Republican budget would mean a cut of hundreds of millions of dollars from Nevada's hospitals and health care providers due to cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. Nevada already has a health care crisis. We cannot afford these cuts in medical care for our elderly and our poor.

The Republican budget eliminates after-school programs for over 2,900 children in Nevada. Southern Nevada has one of the highest dropout rates in the country. Abandoning these kids who are struggling to stay in school would be a disaster. The Republican budget cuts almost 8 percent from highway funding. In Nevada, the fastest-growing State in the country, this translates into a $16 million cut and represents a loss of more than 760 construction jobs for Nevada.

At a time that our Nation is going to war, the Republican budget cuts $28 million from the veterans budget. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Spratt proposal and not the Republican budget debacle.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, there are words we should remember. There are quotes worth quoting again. Here is one:

''If we are to prevail in the long run, we must expand the long-run strength of our economy. We must move along the path to a higher rate of growth and full employment.

''For this would mean tens of billions of dollars more for each year in production, profits, wages and public revenues. It would mean an end to the persistent slack which has kept our unemployment at or above 5 percent for 61 of the past 62 months.''

''To achieve these greater gains, one step, above all, is essential, the enactment this year of a substantial reduction and revision in Federal income taxes.

''For it is increasingly clear, to those in government, business and labor who are responsible for our economy's success, that our obsolete tax system exerts too heavy a drag on private purchasing power, profits and employment. Designed to check inflation in early years, it now checks growth instead. It discourages extra effort and risk. It distorts the use of resources. It invites recurrent recessions, depresses our Federal revenues, and causes chronic budget deficits.''

''This net reduction in tax liabilities will increase the purchasing power of American families and business enterprises in every tax bracket, with the greatest increase going to our low-income consumers. It will, in addition, encourage the initiative and risk-taking on which our free system depends, induce more investment, production and capacity use, help provide the 2 million new jobs we need every year, and reinforce the American principle of additional reward for additional effort.''

Mr. Chairman, there are Democrats that we should quote, there are Democratic words that we should remember, and those that I have just quoted came from the Democratic President of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, in his State of the Union message in 1963.

There is a contemporary Democrat who offers to his party also very good advice. It, of course, is Democrat Bill Richardson from the State of New Mexico, who says that ''reducing taxes,'' and this year he is talking about, this is not in 1963, he is talking about 2003, ''reducing taxes puts us on the road to economic growth.'' His plan reduces New Mexico's income tax by 40 percent, from the current 8.2 percent to 4.9 percent. He agrees that his plan sounds

sort of like the Bush tax-cutting agenda.

All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is this. There was a time when the Democratic Party could be counted on to do the right thing for the government, to do the right thing regardless of whether or not you could make a class envy debate out of this thing. They knew it was the right thing to do. It was the right thing to do when the President of the United States said so in 1963, it is the right thing to do today when the Democratic Governor of New Mexico says to do it, and I encourage this body to do it by striking down this substitute and supporting the underlying amendment.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. FORD).

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my good friend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) that Governor Richardson in New Mexico, we applaud him for what he has done.

There are many on this side who believe that tax cuts should be a viable part of any stimulus plan. The only problem is the tax cut that you propose we do not believe will actually stimulate very much, nor will it help us to achieve the balanced budgets that my friend the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) claims he wants, and I believe that he actually wants, even though he was a bit condescending when he told me to shut up a few seconds ago.

I will say this to my friend, Bill Richardson and other Governors across this Nation, Bill Richardson was here a few days ago along with Governor Bush and another Governor, talking about Medicaid dollars and complaining to this Congress that the cuts we are imposing on his hospitals in his State as well as Governor Bush's State and other States are far too onerous.

All we ask on this side is that we be honest about the moment we face. Many of us on this side have rallied behind this President and our Commander in Chief in this effort against Iraq and this war on terrorism. I resent my friend the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), for whom I have great affection, for some of the words. I understand the passion sometimes, it happens to me, it gets to us and perhaps allows our words to get away from us. I am sure he did not mean some of the personal things he said this evening.

Our budget, I believe, we believe, is better for the country than yours. It is about priorities. Next election cycle we will see who is right, but I can tell this to the gentleman from Connecticut, I want to win this war, I want to see this economy grow, and I can assure you that everyone on this side of the aisle wants that as well. We just think our budget is better.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, here is the dilemma we are faced with. If this budget passes and becomes real, which I doubt, it will be devastating to our children and their education, to our seniors and their security, and to some of the most worthy citizens we know, sick and disabled veterans. On the other hand, if it passes and does not become real, if those cuts are not actually made, then it will devastate the bottom line of our budget.

Those of us who have been here a long time can tell you how intractable deep deficits can become. For 15 years we struggled to get ourselves in surplus, and in 2 years we have blown it. That is why we are out here intensely tonight fighting. Important principles are at stake.

I have to say to my colleague and wonderful friend, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), when I first saw this budget on the day of markup, I said, ''It ain't on the level. I can't take it at face value.'' The better I understand it, the less credence I give it. I honestly think it is just a clever device for passing another round of tax cuts as large as the last, $1.35 trillion, despite the fact that this time there is no surplus. It goes straight to the bottom line and increases the deficit.

Here the numbers are displayed on this chart. If you want a choice between us and them, here it is, Mr. Chairman. Here it is, colleagues. Our budget every year has a lower and lower deficit until the year 2010 when it is no longer in deficit, it is in surplus. We put the budget back in surplus. That is our driving purpose. The first parameter we set for ourselves was we are going to get to balance in a reasonable period of time, and that date turned out to be 2010.

If you compare the Republican chart, you will see they do not get to balance until the year 2012, 2 years later, and that depends, Mr. Chairman, on some stupendous cost-cutting around here. I have been here 20 years. I just do not think that they are going to be able to accomplish it.

I heard these colloquies over here on the House floor. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), one of the ablest Members of this House, chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, he had a colloquy that, in effect, said, you don't expect me really to get $40 billion out of government retirement pensions, do you? The answer was basically, no, you've got other mandatory programs. You can reform procurement, for example, and save $40 billion.

Give me a break. That is not going to happen. This is a serious, serious effort and exercise, because if we are wrong here, we will live with the consequences for a long, long time.

We have before us a real choice to this budget which we have brought to the House floor from the House Budget Committee. We have got a choice that is a far better choice, the Democratic substitute. It is a fiscally sound choice because our budget balances in 2010; theirs balances in 2012. Our budget racks up less debt during that 10-year time frame, $913 billion less debt, and, listen to this, $1.647 trillion less debt than the President's budget.

Our budget is fair and sensible. The Democratic budget weighs priorities. The Republican budget wreaks havoc. Indeed, much of our budget is devoted to restoring the damage the Republican budget does.

The Republican budget cuts education and training by $60 billion. It flat-funds Leave No Child Behind, even though the authorizing act calls for $9 billion next year. We restore that cut and add to the education function.

The Republican resolution wipes out Justice Department programs like community policing. We can all attest to its effectiveness. It drops and cuts out Byrne grants. It drops level funding for these Justice Department programs by $35 billion. Do you know who you are cutting when you are doing that? The famous first responders. These people that we talk about, but do so little for, they are the victims. We do not stand for that in our budget. We restore those programs because we think this is the first line of homeland defense, and we put $24 billion more in our budget than they do for homeland security.

We have heard it charged on the floor today that our budget increases spending. Let me just lay that argument to rest once and for all with a chart that is taken straight from the numbers in our budget. As you can see, this year we are spending about 20.4 percent total spending of GDP. Following the path laid down by our budget, that will decline to 19.1 percent of GDP in 2013. In the years 2004 through 2013, the 10-year time frame of this budget, our spending will grow by 4.6 percent over that 10-year period of time. That will be the annual rate of growth. That is less than the GDP nominal growth rate.

Let me finally say that our bill also has in it something that is critically important. We have got a weak, wobbly economy. We have got in our bill the stimulus package, which we think is an excellent package. It was offered by us on January 6 of this year. We say, let us enact it. Let us help those who are unemployed, let us give this economy a kick, let us give those who are likely to spend it a rebate straight to their pockets. It will be spent on the economy. Let us give small businesses extra expensing. Let us help large businesses by saying, if you will do something in 2003, we will give you a 50 percent depreciation.

It is dramatic, it is bold, and when you compare it by any of the established economic models, we get two to three times the results in GDP growth and job creation that the Republicans get for spending six times as much money in their jobs and growth package.

We have a real choice, a stark choice today, and far better the choice is our Democratic substitute. Vote for the

Spratt substitute. Vote for the Democratic substitute. It is the best choice by far.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this Democrat budget. I find it fascinating that we have so much angst about the deficit on this side of the aisle. I have a lot of angst about the deficit. I do not want to leave our children a legacy of debt. I have a 1-year-old. I want to leave them a legacy of freedom and opportunity. But, Mr. Chairman, the tax relief in the Republican package accounts for less than 5 percent of this budget.

□ 2230

If there is so much angst over the deficit, why does the Democrat budget not focus on 95 percent of the problem, which is spending? Our budget increases spending, increases it by 3 percent. How much is enough? Over 5 years we have increased the VA, HUD, and independent agencies by 35.7 percent, Transportation by almost 80 percent, HHS by 96 percent. If every Government program was so great for the American people, why do we not simply double these budgets? Why do we not triple these budgets? Why do we not quadruple the budgets? Why do we not tell the American people to quit sending us State, local, and Federal taxes of 40 percent? Why do they not just send it all to us?

The point we are making is that good things can be done perhaps outside of this Government. I mean, the Democrats talk and accuse us of cutting programs. It is their budget that cuts education programs. It is their budget that cuts housing programs because in our budget we help American families pay for their programs. Our budget is going to allow 46 million married couples to keep over $1,700 more of what they earn. That is enough to pay two mortgage payments. That is a housing program and the Democrat budget cuts it.

Under our budget, 34 million families with children would keep an additional $1,500, enough to purchase a personal computer for their children. That is an education program and the Democrat budget cuts it. Six million single mothers would keep $541. That is enough to purchase a month of daycare. That is a childcare program. And the Democrat budget cuts it.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot tax our way into prosperity, spend our way into prosperity, or sue our way into prosperity; and we need to reject this Democrat budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his distinguished leadership in putting together the Spratt proposal this evening.

I rise in strong support of the Spratt budget resolution and in opposition to the Republican budget on the floor tonight. I want to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his great leadership. I also want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for his leadership on the Congressional Black Caucus budget and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) for his leadership on the Blue Dog budget. All three of these Democratic budgets are far superior to the Republican proposal.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values. We should allocate our resources to those proposals that are important to us.

Let me ask my colleagues, is it a statement of your values to cut funding in the education of our children in order to give a tax cut to the wealthiest in America? I did not think so. America's children deserve better.

Is it a statement of your values to give a meager drug prescription benefit and cut nursing home care to America's seniors while giving the most of the tax breaks to those who need it least? I did not think so either. America's seniors deserve better.

Is it a statement of your values to cut funding for America's disabled veterans and not include one penny for a war budget as we send our young men and women into harm's way? America's veterans and servicemen and women deserve better.

Is it a statement of your values to underfund Homeland Security while we are on high alert? The American people deserve better.

The Republican budget is clearly not a statement of our national values. It explodes the deficit, fails to create jobs, and fails to invest in the education and health care initiatives that this country needs for long-term economic growth.

I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his masterful leadership in developing a Democratic budget that creates jobs, in fact, 1 million new jobs this year. The Spratt proposal balances the budget, sparks economic growth, funds the priorities of working families, education for their children, prescription drugs for their parents and grandparents, health care for our veterans, and resources for the police and firefighters who protect our communities.

This Democratic budget invests in our children. The Republican budget indebts them. This Democratic budget gives the American people the responsible budget they deserve. The Republican budget is reckless and irresponsible. On every measure important to working families, the Democratic budget is better.

We will fight this unconscionable Republican budget at every opportunity. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on Spratt.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is getting late. I know we are going to have a 2-hour dialogue of strong support for our men and women in battle. I would like to conclude by making a number of points, but not using all my time.

First, there is really no one I respect more on either side of the aisle than the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), and I appreciate the graciousness in which he does his business and the conviction with which he expresses it and the work that he and his staff and his members do.

My comments are meant to just explain differences and not to describe character; but when we were debating this bill last week, we looked at amendments to the budget that only increase spending. We did not see any Democratic amendment that cuts spending. Admittedly, they reduce the tax cuts and therefore added more taxes than we would have. That is true. But there was $1 trillion of more spending, and I would submit that during the 20 years that my colleague talks about serving in this Congress, the only time he ever saw Congress balance the budget was under a Republican Congress. He never saw it happen under a Democratic Congress. He never saw a debt paid back under a Democratic Congress. So I understand that we have clearly been very proud of the fact that we on the Republican side of the aisle, working with Democrats, balanced the budget and started to pay down debt and now we have gone in a different direction.

It does not surprise me, though. The economy has slowed down. We had a horrific attack on September 11, 2001, that I think most people know had an impact on the budget. Ten percent of our gross domestic product came to a standstill with the airline industry and tourism. So we all understand that. We just have a difference in how we generate economic activity because both sides recognize that we ultimately balance the budget by growing this economy and getting more revenue. That is what we know happened. And the difference is a 1 percent reduction in mandatory and discretionary nondefense, nonhomeland security, non-Social Security, non-Medicare that we think is something that grown men and women can do. And when my colleagues on that side of the aisle ascribe a cut in a particular part of the budget, what they had to do was they had to assume that we were going to cut more than 1 percent and where we were going to make that cut was in the particular area they wanted.

The disadvantage we have is that we decided to allow the appropriators to make that decision, unlike what we did in the Committee on the Budget I was on a few years ago in 1996 and 1997 where we specified those cuts, we said the appropriators can make those decisions, and I am absolutely certain that in most instances described on the other side of the aisle, those cuts would not be made there. That is what I believe because we are talking about a 1

percent cut in 1 year and then we allow the budget to grow the next year and the next year and the next year and the next year. Nine years we allow it to grow, but our logic is make the reductions this year because then we see benefit in all the years that follow.

Maybe it is hard here, but when I was in the Statehouse and on the Committee on Appropriations for 13 years, we sometimes had to reduce the budget by 5 percent or more; and what we did is we sat down with the department heads and said, This is what we have got to do, where would you like the cuts to be? We met with our version of GAO and said, Where do you think it should be? Our version of the Inspector Generals, and we put it all together, and we came down with where we thought the cuts should be. A 1 percent reduction 1 year is what we are asking for.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would just say we do want to protect America. We do want to increase the defense budget and homeland security, and we do. We do want to strengthen the economy and create jobs. We do it by a tax cut. On the other side of the aisle, you do it by spending increases and a much smaller tax cut, and we ultimately want to balance the budget and now your budget will balance 2 years sooner under a static model. We believe under a dynamic model when we restrain spending and we have tax cuts, we will see it balance sooner.

We saw that happen in 1990. We did not get credit in 1990 when we had our 7-year plan to balance the budget. The CBO would not give us credit, but we balanced it in 3 years, 4 years sooner than we thought.

You may not agree with what I have said, but that is the reality as we see it, and that is the differences we have, and they are honest disagreements; but the one thing we do not have a disagreement on, and that is what I was trying to explain to my colleague. Our men and women are going to get whatever they need to win whatever war they are fighting and to make sure it is never a fair battle. On that Republicans and Democrats are totally and completely united. Totally and completely.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the budget proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT. The Republican majority of the House Budget Committee approved a federal budget reducing funding for veterans' health care and benefit programs by nearly $25 billion. The actual spending impact of these cuts would be even greater.

Over a ten-year period the GOP is proposing a cut of almost $9 billion in veterans' health care—an average of more than $900 million less than the President has proposed per year. For other veterans' benefits, including cash payments to veterans disabled by military service, the Republican budget calls for a $15 billion cut in spending from current levels during the next ten years.

In sharp contrast to the Republican's proposal, the Committee on Veterans Affairs, on a bipartisan basis, recommended adding $3 billion to the President's budget next year for veteran discretionary programs including medical care and research, construction, and programs that fund the administrative costs of other important benefits such as compensation, pension, and education programs. A group of Veterans Service Organizations who support the Independent Budget also recommend an increase over the President's budget of almost that much.

The Republicans also spurned other efforts to increase funding for the nation's veterans. An amendment in the Budget Committee offered by DARLENE HOOLEY to add $1 billion for veterans' health care and restore cuts in mandatory programs was voted down on a largely party-line vote.

Passing the Republican's budget will mean serious problems for veterans' health care. Among them, Congress will have to seriously consider the new copayments and enrollment fees proposed by the Bush Administration in order to keep the system operating in the next fiscal year. Some of these proposals include retaining the ineligibility for new Priority 8 veterans for VA health care services indefinitely, requiring Priority 7 and 8 veterans to have an annual enrollment fee in addition to increased copayments for pharmaceutical drugs and primary care and providing only veterans with highly rated service-connected disabilities (more than 70 percent) VA Nursing Home care.

In addition, passage of the Republican's budget would mean there would be no additional funds available to implement the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Assistance Act to work toward the goal of elimination chronic homelessness in a decade. It would also mean that the current exercise Capital Assets Realignment for Enhanced Services (CARES) that VA is undertaking to assess the best use of its physical infrastructure will become a ''de facto'' closure commission with no ability to respond to veterans' needs for primary care, long-term care, and mental health projected by its own models. There would be little money leftover for any of the system's desperately needed construction projects.

As serious as the problems for health care would be, the implications of the scheduled cuts for veterans' benefits would be even worse. The Administration's Budget for 2004 makes no provision for additional service-connected disability benefits resulting from the present war with Iraq. As we know from the last war in the Persian Gulf, war results in adverse health effects and justifiable claims for service connected disability compensation. It does acknowledge the expected increase in veteran's claims and an expected worsening of the disabilities of some service-connected veterans. Under these circumstances, cuts in mandatory spending can only be made by cutting benefits to veterans with service-connected disabilities.

Ninety percent of the mandatory spending the Budget Committee proposes to cut is from cash payments to service disabled veterans, low-income wartime veterans and their survivors. I do not believe that as our young men and women are fighting in Iraq and defending freedom in other parts of the world, we should pass a budget which will not fully compensate them for any disabilities they acquire during, or as a result of, that service.

Other programs funded with mandatory spending are the Montgomery G.I. Bill education benefits, vocational rehabilitation and independent living programs for service-disabled veterans, subsidies for VA home loans and insurance for service-disabled veterans and funds to provide headstones, markers and flags for decreased veterans.

As our Nation enters a war certain to result in disability and death for young Americans, the Budget Committee's proposed requires the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to make permanent cuts in the benefits paid to those disabled by virtue of their service to our Nation. These cuts must be made, so that our government can afford to provide a tax cut which will benefit only the wealthiest Americans, many of whom have never served in the military.

In contrast, Mr. SPRATT's amendment would restore the cut for benefits and health care and add $200 million to the VA health care budget.

I ask you now, who deserves to receive the benefits of the national treasury—America's disabled veterans or America's millionaires? I urge my colleagues to vote for the Spratt amendment.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, at a time when our federal budget faces huge deficits and we are engaged in a large military campaign halfway around the globe, now is not the time to slash taxes. Never in the history of our country have we fought a major war and cut taxes at the same time. Yet that is exactly what the Republican budget resolution does. These serious times demand that we act prudently, and that means we must pass a budget that meets our financial obligations.

The Republican budget makes permanent the $1.35 trillion tax cut passed in 2001, at a cost of $523 billion. It also implements the $694 billion ''Growth'' bill, the centerpiece of which is the elimination of the dividend tax. This plan will fail to spark an economic turnaround because it applies to only 25% of the population and less than 5% of the benefits take place this year when the economy needs it the most. According to the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office, a similar tax cut proposed by the Administration would add $2.2 trillion in deficits over the next 5 years.

Because the first priority of the Republican budget is to cut taxes, programs dedicated to health care, education, and the environment suffer drastic cuts. To make room for tax cuts, at least $265 billion over ten years is slashed from programs like veterans' benefits, loans for college students, school lunch programs, and Medicaid.

Most concerning is that we really don't know how much the military operations and our occupation of Iraq will cost, but we do know that the U.S. alone will carry the tremendous burden of that responsibility. Estimates vary widely, and the lowest, most optimistic figure is $80 billion. With that enormous figure added to this year's deficit of $304 billion, common sense dictates that we refrain from additional tax cuts and return fiscal sanity to the budget process.

I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic budget alternative, which offers a sound, practical way to stimulate economic activity while paying down the debt and saving critical social programs. The Democratic proposal includes $136 billion in tax cuts and targeted investments this year. At less than one-sixth the cost of the Republican ''Growth'' bill, the plan allows the budget to recover while giving the

economy the immediate boost it so desperately needs.

The Democratic alternative ensures that critical social services will continue to be provided at their current levels by restoring the cuts made in the Republican Resolution. It also provides $528 billion in new money for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, while the Republican proposal only offers $128 billion. The Democratic measure allocates $34 billion more for homeland security and $60 billion more for education over the next ten years, adds $10 billion more to help working families with child care over five years, and protects funding for Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program, Women Infants and Children Nutrition, housing programs and other important initiatives.

If we pass another round of irresponsibly large tax cuts, government deficits will spiral out of control, especially as war increases our overall spending. We cannot saddle our children and grandchildren with this debt—we must decide now to adhere to the principals of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, we take up this budget debate at a moment of great national challenge. The men and women of our armed forces have begun military action in Iraq. We wish them a swift and successful end to hostilities with a minimum loss of life on all sides. At this moment, when they are demonstrating such courage and sacrifice, we here at home must make responsible decisions about the kind of America we want for them and our children. The decisions we make tonight will affect the well being of our troops and all Americans for years to come. We must make important decisions about the future economic health of our nation and what investments we decide to make for the common good.

We need to adopt an economic plan that will put America back to work and a budget that reflects the priorities of the American people. Just as each family must make tough decisions about their own household budgets, so must we make tough decisions for our entire American family. How we decide to invest our collective resources should tell us a lot about what we care about as a people and who we are. The budgets and economic plans we adopt should reflect the values and priorities of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully to the people in my district. I think I understand their priorities. And I believe that what they care about is what every American cares about. They want a country where every child has the opportunity to get a great start in life with a first rate education. They want a country where every American has access to quality health care. They want an America where there is a job for every individual ready to roll up their sleeves and go to work. And they want to know that their government is taking all reasonable steps to protect our homeland and be prepared to respond to national emergencies. These are the simple things we want for our families, our neighbors and our fellow Americans.

We are a great nation. We can do these things. Unfortunately, the Republican budget before us does not begin to meet the needs and priorities of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, just a short time ago I had the privilege of sitting in this chamber when the President gave his State of the Union address. At the outset of his speech, he made the following statement: ''We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other Presidents and other generations.''

Unfortunately, neither the budget submitted by the President nor the Republican Budget Committee proposal before us today passes that test. In fact the budget before us today does exactly what the President says he does not want to do. It does ignore our problems and, if we don't fix those problems we will be simply passing the buck to future Congresses, future Presidents, and future generations.

Look at education. Last year, with great fanfare, the President signed the Leave No Child Behind bill at the White House. Yet the ink was barely dry before the administration submitted a budget that fell well short of the promised funding. Well, when you leave the funding behind, you leave millions of children behind with nothing but broken promises. And the Republican proposal falls $9 billion short—almost 25 percent—of the funds authorized. That is a terrible message to send to our school children and teachers.

Look at health care. The Republican budget contains no meaningful proposal to address the problem of the 41 million Americans who have no health insurance. Apparently the Republican budget proposes to leave this problem to future Congresses and generations.

How about domestic security? The Republican's proposed budget ignores many of the needs outlined by the agency heads at the U.S. Customs Service, the Coast Guard, the Department of Energy and elsewhere. They have said they need far more resources to meet the threat than what is proposed in the Republican budget.

So what have the House Republicans proposed? What is their top domestic priority? Another huge tax cut that overwhelmingly benefits the super wealthy. Like the President, the House Republicans have decided that the most pressing domestic problem—the one issue that cannot wait—is that the super wealthy are paying too much in taxes. That comes on the heels of the $1.4 trillion tax cut from 2001 that disproportionately benefits the very wealthy.

And what will be the result of the Republican tax cut plan directed mostly to the wealthy? Even administration officials have conceded that it will do virtually nothing to stimulate the economy right now. The real result will be rivers of red ink and rising interest rates. The Republican plan would result in a $324 billion deficit this year and lead to one of the sharpest reversals in America's fiscal fortunes in history. And that doesn't even include one penny of the cost of the ongoing war with Iraq and its aftermath. The President's policies would take us from a projected $5.6 trillion surplus over 10 years to a projected $2.1 trillion deficit. The Republican Budget Committee proposal masks these long-term deficits by calling for huge and unrealistic cuts. The actual result of their tax cut proposals will be exploding deficits.

Who's going to pick up the tab for this growing mountain of debt? The American people of course. It's simple. There are only two ways to deal with it in the long run. Either we substantially raise taxes on the next generation or we dramatically cut the areas of largest expenditure—Social Security and Medicare. Already, funds from the Social Security trust fund are going to pay for the President's last round of tax cuts. Remember that ''lock box?'' Well, the lock has been picked and the raid is on. The Republican budget plan makes the problem even worse. It is a guided missile aimed at the heart of Social Security. And its not just money in the trust fund that will be lost; we will also lose the trust of the American people.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned with the reckless economic course proposed in the Republican budget. It does exactly what the President said in his State of the Union that he does not want to do—it ignores our very real current needs, and passes on the burdens of huge tax cuts to Social Security, Medicare and future Congresses and generations. I believe the Republican budget plan is out of touch with the true hopes and aspirations of the American people.

We have an obligation to confront our needs squarely now. We need to talk straight to the American people. The Democratic budget alternatives we are debating tonight all reflect the values and priorities of the American people better than the Republican plan. They correct the serious defects in the proposed Republican budget. All of them provide a great national investment in education, health care, homeland security, and prescription drug coverage for seniors. And they all do so without running up the huge deficits and debt contained in the Republican plan.

One shortcoming in the Democratic plans, however, is that—although they all provide a greater investment in our children's education than the Republican proposal, none of them reach the full level of funding promised in the Leave No Child Behind legislation. Full funding for Leave No Child Behind, IDEA and the other educational commitments we have made must be a top priority. I will continue to press for a budget that keeps all the promises we have made America's children.

While I am disappointed that the Democratic alternatives do not provide for full funding of these educational commitments, they come far closer than the Republican proposal. They also meet many other needs that are neglected in the Republican budget. I hope this Congress will adopt an economic plan and a budget that reflects the true priorities of the American people and does not pass the buck to future generations.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I support the Democratic budget and I reject the Republican budget.

The Democratic Budget invests in education and training. Our budget provides $3.2 billion more for education and training than the GOP budget in FY 2004 alone. Over the next 10 years the Democratic budget provides $44 billion more than the GOP budget. These budget increases mean increased funding for No Child Left Behind programs which reduce class sizes and provide advanced training for teachers.

The Democratic Budget also invests more in discretionary health care programs than the GOP Budget. The Democratic budget provides $2.9 billion more for discretionary health care in FY 2004, and $27.8 billion more over the next 10 years than the Republican Budget. Programs such as health professions training, rural health programs, Ryan White AIDS activities, and Healthy Start will be the direct beneficiaries of the Democratic Budget proposal.

The Democratic Budget is also preferable to the GOP Budget in Veterans' Health Care. The Democratic Budget provides $23

billion more than the GOP budget over the next 10 years for Veterans' programs. It provides $17 billion more for discretionary veterans' programs. It provides $15 billion more for mandatory veterans' programs—where the GOP budget cuts $15 billion from mandatory veterans' programs.

Finally, the Democrats budget call for spending $34 billion more than the GOP budget on Homeland Security over the next 11 years. One the other hand, the GOP budget freezes homeland security funding at the 2003 level. The Democratic budget, for example, would ensure that $3.5 billion in desperately-needed new money would be available for police officer, firefighters and emergency medical personnel. The GOP budget does not.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 192, noes 236, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

AYES—192

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—236

Aderholt
Akin
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Buyer
Gephardt
Hyde
Lipinski
Thornberry
Udall (CO)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2305

Mr. BURGESS and Mr. SOUDER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOPES AND PRAYERS FOR STEVE BUYER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AND HIS FAMILY AS HE DEPARTS FOR MILITARY DUTY

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD a letter that I received today.

''Dear Mr. Speaker: I have been called to active duty in the United States Army. Pending further orders, I request immediate indefinite leave of the United States House of Representatives to accommodate my military duties.

''Respectfully, Steve Buyer, Member of Congress''

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the resolution we are considering affects one of our own today and may affect others in the near future. Our hopes and prayers are with STEVE and his family as he prepares to depart for Iraq.

OUR DUTY TO PROTECT AMERICA

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, we will be considering a very important resolution before us this evening. I rise in strong support of that resolution, and I expect that all of my colleagues would vote for it.

Our men and women in uniform are now engaged in an important conflict

in the country of Iraq. We are engaged with 30-some other nations, and it involves certainly a tyrant who has defined himself over the last 20 years.

Like my colleagues, I remember the day of September 11, 2001. I remember standing in the front of my office waiting to get a call from the Vice President and looking and watching an unfamiliar phenomenon, a roll of black smoke going across the mall that I can look down from my window and see. And I asked one of my staff, I said, find out; that black smoke is not supposed to be there. A minute and a half later they came in and said, well, the third plane had gone into the Pentagon.

Little beknownst to me and the rest of us at that time, there was a fourth plane involved, and 9 or 10 or 11 brave young men and women brought that plane down into an empty field in southern Pennsylvania. We know now that if it had not been for the actions of those people, that plane would have been in the west front of the Capitol.

That being said, many of us visited right after the World Trade Center. We had walked the halls of the Pentagon and visited those folks who helped pull their comrades out, some to safety, some beyond help. We talked to the families who lost their folks in the Pentagon, the World Trade Towers; we passed some extraordinary legislation.

But this country suffered a huge loss that day. I think I speak for all of us when I say that that is something that we do not want to see visited upon this Nation again. We know that in Iraq Saddam Hussein has weapons of mass destruction. We know that he has a nexus to al Qaeda, and we know that that training has been going on over an extended period of time. I believe that it is our duty, this Nation's duty, to protect our Nation and to make sure that that is not visited upon this Nation ever again.

The men and women whom we are about to salute and wish well tonight and send our best thoughts and prayers to are doing a job that nobody wants to do. Nobody wishes this to have to happen. But in the tradition of this Nation, in the tradition of keeping this country free, and in the tradition of trying to stabilize the Middle East, we are doing this job. We are doing it with 30 other nations who have decided this is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, as we go through this very sober debate tonight, I would ask for your positive consideration and positive vote.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE STEVE BUYER, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable STEVE BUYER, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 20, 2003.

Hon. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives, H–232, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been called to active duty in the United States Army. Pending further orders, I request immediate indefinite leave of the House of Representatives to accommodate my military duties.

Respectfully,

STEVE BUYER,
Member of Congress

EXPRESSING SUPPORT AND APPRECIATION FOR THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES PARTICIPATING IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 104) expressing the support and appreciation of the Nation for the President and the members of the Armed Forces who are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration pursuant to the following order:

Debate on the concurrent resolution shall be limited to 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution to final adoption, without intervening motion or demand for a division of the question.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, has rightly reminded us tonight of the events of 9/11. I think all of us remember the time that we stood together singing ''God bless America'' on the steps of this Capitol, unified in recognizing that what is involved here is bigger than us as individuals or as political parties, and how we joined with near unanimity in supporting the President on the war on terrorism.

□ 2315

Thanks to the good efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), we did this once again about 10 days ago, when he offered his resolution, H.J. Res. 27, ''commending the continuing dedication, selfless service, and commitment of members of the Armed Forces and their families during the Global War on Terrorism.'' At that time I rose, along with many colleagues, to support that resolution honoring our service members and to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for an effort that brought us together, rather than splitting us apart.

I doubt that we can offer too many resolutions for our servicemen and servicewomen, so I understand the gentleman's interest in offering a further resolution tonight. I would like nothing more than to see a similar unanimous vote in support of that resolution.

I would ask the gentleman under my reservation, since we have not yet even had this resolution printed for our review, if he is familiar with a resolution commending our troops that was authored by Senators FRIST and WARNER and Senators DASCHLE and LEVIN, and which was passed unanimously today in the United States Senate?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman asking me if I am aware that the other body passed a resolution?

Mr. DOGGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUNTER. Yes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is it correct that the gentleman's resolution is not the same as resolution S. Con. Res. 26?

Mr. HUNTER. That is true.

Mr. DOGGETT. I believe the gentleman's resolution omits clause 5 of Senate resolution S. Con. Res. 26, which says that the Congress ''joins all Americans in remembering those who lost their lives during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm in 1991, and those still missing from that conflict, including Captain Scott Speicher of the United States Navy''.

Would the gentleman be open to amending his resolution to include that language from clause 5 of the Senate Con. Res. 26?

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will yield further, yes, we would be open to including it.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentleman would be open to including that language?

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to add clause 5 of the Senate version, S. Con. Res. 26.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I would retract that and tell the gentleman that I would not be open to that. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOGGETT. Let me just ask, and then I will be very brief, because I know it is late and the gentleman wishes to proceed.

The Senate, I am sure, acted, and not every word did I agree with, but they did act unanimously. It was good enough for the majority leader, Senator FRIST and Senator WARNER, chairman of the Armed Services Committee. Could we not dispense with this debate and simply take up, with the gentleman's approval, the entire Senate resolution and adopt it, and have every one of us saying not only the same thing in this House chamber but saying the same thing throughout the Capitol, that with one voice, we, the House and Senate, approve and applaud and support our troops?

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I just want to advise the gentleman that I read not only the resolution that was offered by the other body in 1991, but

also our resolution. We had a different resolution at that point, also.

I would just say to the gentleman that I think that the Members of this body have made a very fine statement, a very heartfelt statement commending our troops. I think it says the right thing. I applaud the gentleman for other things that he would like to see in a resolution. I think reasonable minds can differ.

I would hope that the gentleman would, in the spirit of bipartisan support for people that wear the uniform of the United States, not ask us to have precisely the same words as the other body, and simply spend a few minutes and go home. I would hope the gentleman would allow us to have our own resolution to express our own heartfelt support for those people, and let this body work its will.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman. Continuing under my reservation very briefly, it just seems to me we have heard so much about the need for us to speak with one voice that we could speak with one voice and do it promptly by taking verbatim what was good enough for Senators FRIST and WARNER.

But let me ask the gentleman one other question, since he talks about acting with unanimity. The gentleman has three enacting clauses in his resolution. Clause two commends the Members of the United States Armed Forces; Clause three commends their families. I think there is unanimous agreement for both of these.

Would the gentleman be open under his unanimous consent agreement to our proceeding now by unanimous consent to approve those two clauses, so that we could concentrate our debate in the only area that we have any difference, which are the words that the gentleman uses to approve the President's action with his first-strike policy in clause one?

Mr. HUNTER. No.

Mr. DOGGETT. Just one final question. The draft of this resolution, and I know there have been changes going on all night, but the draft that we Democrats were asked to approve late this afternoon was a little like the President's recent budget on Afghanistan, which he forgot to fund. The resolution draft we were offered as praising the troops largely forgot the troops.

I was wondering if the gentleman would have any objection to my putting into the RECORD the resolution draft that we were given this afternoon and asked to approve, which did not include in the ''whereas'' clauses much of anything about our servicemembers other than the first and last paragraphs. Most all of it seems to be about the President.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman that we have some excellent commendations in this particular resolution.

Mr. DOGGETT. Added at our request, for the troops.

Mr. HUNTER. Let me finish my statement, if I might.

We commend the President as Commander in Chief. That is something we did in 1991. Under the Constitution, he leads this military force. We commend the Members of the United States Armed Forces. We commend the families. We give them our sincere gratitude and appreciation.

I would think that any Member reading this resolution, and I would ask all Members to read it since the gentleman has called it into question, would agree that this resolution is an excellent resolution, and that it does all the things that we want to do. It would lead us all to wonder why the gentleman somehow wants it to say something else or follow some other example. It does not make a lot of sense.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I will save the rest of my remarks for the debate.

Mr. HUNTER. I will look forward to that.

Mr. DOGGETT. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, this type of unanimous consent request, which seeks only to place in the RECORD the draft of the resolution we Democrats were asked to concur in this afternoon, that it might be made part of the record so all could see it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. THOMAS. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) is recognized under his reservation of objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, as any Member, has the right to place any material under extension of remarks in another area of parliamentary procedure of this body. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman makes clear why the Chair should entertain only one unanimous consent request at a time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has the right to place in the RECORD at another point in the proceedings. Since he has that right, which cannot be removed, I object to doing it at this time.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it being apparent that the decision of 99 Members of the United States Senate is inadequate for some in this House, that they will not accept even placing in the RECORD at this point, at a very appropriate and proper point, the resolution they offered us, which treated the troops almost as an afterthought, since the goal was not to applaud the troops but the President; and recognizing their refusal to let us approve now unanimously what we all agreed to, that the Members of the Armed Forces and their families deserve commendation, even if we disagree with the civilian, political decision to institute a new first-strike policy, which will actually endanger our families, I recognize little ability to reach unanimity; and I will raise the rest of my concerns about the Administration's unfortunate new policy, which places so many in harm's way, in the course of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) may be heard under his reservation.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), we are all patriots and we all want to support the troops, including our colleague. We all want to support their families.

In hopes of trying to come to an agreement here, I am wondering if the gentleman would be willing to modify his unanimous consent request to include a more neutral resolution which supports the troops, as we all do, for their valiant and dedicated work, consistently performing in a professional manner; and which supports the families at this time of difficulty and trial?

Since I think unanimously there is a way that we can all agree on this, would the gentleman be prepared to support House Concurrent Resolution 105, which I left at the desk and which is at the desk there, which is a resolution that supports the troops, but does not require Members to agree with the policy in Iraq?

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman and to the gentleman who just spoke, there are hundreds of thousands of Americans in uniform putting themselves in very difficult positions for our freedom tonight. If they are watching this procedure, they are probably wondering, what in the heck are those guys doing? We have a commending vehicle.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio controls the time.

Mr. HUNTER. I guess what I am saying is the answer is no to the gentleman from Ohio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) controls the time.

Mr. KUCINICH. To the gentleman, and he is a gentleman, I would like to say that we all agree that we want to support the troops. This resolution, however, or at least half of it, is not about the troops. At least half of it is about the war in Iraq, which is a matter of contention. We understand that. There are 133 Members of this House who voted against the Iraq resolution.

The gentleman has made his decision, and I regret the decision, which I

think unfortunately politicizes what is really a very important resolution to support the troops. I think it lets politics get beyond the water's edge, Mr. Speaker. I do not think my good friend really intends to do that.

I have a question to ask my good friend. Mr. Speaker, in looking at this resolution, I would like to call attention to page 3 of the resolution. I just want to understand, would the gentleman be prepared to amend his unanimous consent request to eliminate any references in this resolution to 9–11, since no credible evidence has ever been presented that would link Iraq to 9–11, so that this Congress would not be put in a position when something really has not been decided, we have not had a commission that has made that decision?

The media has not really had an investigation that has decided that Iraq is connected to 9–11, this Congress has not made that association, yet this resolution does make that association. Would the gentleman be prepared to delete that reference in order to make this resolution something that would be more palatable?

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, first, that restates the President's letter.

Second, a second point I would make to the gentleman is that we have been working, Democrats and Republicans, to put this resolution together. My colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, has been working on it. The gentleman's leadership has been working on it. The product that we have before us is a product of both sides.

I would just say to the gentleman if he has a disagreement with it and he thinks that it does not state his position, I would urge the gentleman to take time in this debate in the next several hours and explain his position; but nonetheless, let the rest of us in this House work our will and give our commendation to the troops. Obviously, we would all write it differently.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman is correct. I think this House should be able to give a commendation to the troops.

Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my reservation of objection in the hopes that in the course of the debate we can clarify that while we all support the troops, there are many of us who have reservations about the wording of this resolution and it going beyond support for the troops.

Mr. HUNTER. I look forward to the gentleman's statement.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

□ 2330

Mr. FRANK OF Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to hear the gentleman from California respond to the gentleman from Ohio when the gentleman from Ohio referred to that part of the resolution which quotes the President's letter and said he disagreed with it in effect.

The response from the gentleman from California was that simply factually recounts the President's letter. If, in fact, he is saying this is not necessarily by this body an endorsement of that, but simply a recognition of the fact that the President says it, and this is on the record, I think that would help us advance this.

So I appreciate the gentleman from California having made that point that that particular phrase that the gentleman from Ohio mentioned is not the wording of this House. It is a reference to a fact that the President said that, and it does not reflect one way or the other what individual Members might think.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be so considered.

There was no objection.

The text of H. Con. Res. 104 is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 104

Whereas the United States Armed Forces, a total force comprised of active, National Guard, and Reserve personnel, are now undertaking courageous and determined operations against the forces of Saddam Hussein's regime;

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives and the American people have the greatest pride in the members of the Armed Forces and strongly support them;

Whereas the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–338) stated that it should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime;

Whereas on October 16, 2002, the President signed into law House Joint Resolution 114 of the 107th Congress, the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243), which provides congressional authorization for the use of military force against Iraq;

Whereas the United Nations Security Council, in Security Council Resolution 1441, adopted on November 8, 2002, voted unanimously that Iraq ''...will face serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations'' to disarm in accordance with all relevant United Nations resolutions;

Whereas Iraq remains in material breach of the relevant United Nations resolutions;

Whereas the United States has assembled and deployed an allied military coalition to apply pressure on Saddam Hussein to comply with the relevant United Nations resolutions;

Whereas on March 18, 2003, the President transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate the President's determination, consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107–243), that reliance by the United States on further diplomatic and other peaceful means alone will neither adequately protect the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq nor likely lead to enforcement of all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq, and that the President's use of military force against Iraq is consistent with necessary ongoing efforts by the United States and other countries against international terrorists and terrorist organizations, including those nations, organizations, or persons who planned, authorized, committed, or aided the terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001;

Whereas on the evening of March 17, 2003, the President of the United States issued Saddam Hussein and his sons a final ultimatum to leave Iraq within 48 hours or face United States military intervention;

Whereas, when Saddam Hussein failed to comply, the President ordered United States Armed Forces to commence military operations against the forces of Saddam Hussein during the evening of March 19, 2003, under the code name of Operation Iraqi Freedom, in order to liberate Iraq, remove Saddam Hussein from power, and neutralize Iraq's weapons of mass destruction;

Whereas the United States Armed Forces and allied forces are performing their missions with great courage and distinction in carrying out air, land, and sea attacks against Iraqi military targets; and

Whereas the ability of the Armed Forces to successfully perform their mission requires the support of their nation, community, and families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress expresses the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation—

(1) to the President as Commander-in-Chief for his firm leadership and decisive action in the conduct of military operations in Iraq as part of the on-going Global War on Terrorism;

(2) to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are carrying out their missions with excellence, patriotism, and bravery; and

(3) to the families of the United States military personnel serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are providing support and prayers for their loved ones currently engaged in military operations in Iraq.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 60 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I rise today, this country is embarked on a very noble endeavor. Last evening, military forces of the United States and our coalition allies commenced military operations to liberate the country of Iraq.

This is indeed a historic moment. Operation Iraqi Freedom marks the culmination of nearly 13 years of U.S. action in Iraq. Commencing with Iraq's invasion of Kuwait on August 2, 1990, through Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, through the coalition enforcement of the northern and southern no-fly zones, to Operation Desert Fox and beyond, the United States and our allies have for over a decade been required to deal with the deceit, brutality and duplicity of Saddam Hussein, both diplomatically and militarily.

Today Saddam's moment of truth has arrived. The path to his downfall began

when the Congress passed and President Clinton signed the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998, making it the policy of this Nation to support efforts to remove Saddam's regime from power and to promote a democratic government in Iraq. It continued last fall when Congress passed and President Bush signed House Joint Resolution 114 authorizing the use of military force in Iraq should it become necessary.

Since the passage of that resolution, President Bush has undertaken herculean efforts to avoid a conflict. The President aggressively pursued the unanimous passage of U.N. Security Council Resolution 1441, calling for Iraq to disarm or face grave consequences. Subsequently, the President has exhausted every diplomatic means available to make the United Nations Security Council enforce 1441 to no avail.

Today, the time for diplomacy has passed.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today does three things. First, it expresses the support and appreciation of our Nation to the President for his firm leadership and decisive action in the conduct of the military operations currently underway in Iraq. It is because of his wisdom and judgment that Iraq will soon be a free Nation, a Nation without weapons of mass destruction, a Nation that will become a full and peaceful participant in the international community.

Second, this resolution expresses the support and appreciation of a Nation to our men and women in uniform. A few short weeks ago, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and I brought forward H.J. Res. 27 commending the members of our Armed Forces and their families for the dedication to duty and service to country that they demonstrate each and every day around the world. Today we bring forward this resolution to show our support, admiration and thanks for the nearly 230,000 soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines and coast guardsmen who are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Because of their dedication and devotion to duty, Operation Iraqi Freedom will be a success.

Finally, this resolution expresses support for the families who wait at home for their loved ones who have undertaken this mission. Without the love and support of the families, our military personnel could not focus on the serious task at hand in Iraq, and I want to express a special thanks to the families of those serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom. Their sacrifice will not be in vain.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to show our support for our men and women in uniform by supporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a solemn moment for this body. We are here this evening representing Americans all across our land, and we are here to say on their behalf thank you to the young men and women who wear the uniform today, just as those veterans have done in yesteryear.

I appreciate the Speaker mentioning to this body that our colleague and friend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) has been called to Active Duty. We will remember him in our thoughts and prayers, just like we do every soldier, sailor, airman and marine who represents us in this struggle for freedom and the end of a regime that could cause great harm to the free world.

It is too bad that we have to have a resolution for our young men and women when they are in danger. Maybe we ought to pass one when there is a time for peace, when there is no conflict or a threat of conflict. It was the British poet Rudyard Kipling that put it so well in his poem ''Tommy'' when he said, It's Tommy this and Tommy that and throw them out the brute, but savior of his country when the guns begin to shoot.

I think we should show respect and thanks and appreciation to those who wear the uniform, who are trained daily, working daily, and, when they are called upon as they are now, be ready.

So I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), my good friend and chairman, for his efforts. We have worked so well, as we did on a previous resolution just a few days ago, and sadly, the process by which we find ourselves here tonight has not met with full understanding. Nevertheless, we are here to commend those troops for what they are about to do and what they are doing on the field of battle this evening.

We unite as Americans in support of our troops, who are the truest expression of what this country stands for: courage, strength, compassion. They are the finest sons, daughters we have to offer the world as defenders of freedom, both in the United States of America, for the Iraqi people, as well as for those who love freedom across this globe.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We will have a number of speakers, and as a result thereof, I will cut my remarks short, and I thank the gentleman from California for his efforts in this behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to respond to my friend from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and all the members of our Committee on Armed Services, Republican and Democrat, who work every day to support the people in uniform who are protecting American freedom around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this great instrument of freedom, our Armed Forces, have saved the world and liberated hundreds of millions of people in three major conflicts, World War I, World War II and, of course, the Cold War that involved several smaller wars, smaller battles, that I call Vietnam and Korea, and we have liberated hundreds of millions of people.

The real product of our Army and our Navy and our Marine Corps and our Air Force is freedom, and shortly we are going to be liberating 23 million more people, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, in that great book about Korea, it was called the Bridges of Toko-Ri, by James Michener, if my colleagues have read that book, watched that movie, they may recall that the hero was a carrier pilot, flew out and hit a set of bridges in Toko-Ri that they had gone after day after day and lost a lot of people, and in the end that pilot did not come back. The commander of that carrier air group stood on the deck of the carrier when it was clear he would not return and neither would those people who were sent out to rescue him, and he asked, where does America get these people who will join the U.S. Armed Forces and put themselves in a very dangerous position, in this case go off on a mission, fly into enemy territory, hit a very heavily defended target and come back and try to find that little postage stamp called an American aircraft carrier? Then he answered his own question: They come from the cities and the towns and the villages of this country, and they always have, and as long as they continue to come, we are going to be a free Nation.

Mr. Speaker, one of those people comes from Shelbina, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who was the top gun in Vietnam, nominated for the Congressional Medal of Honor, and a guy whose heart always travels with people that wear the uniform of the United States.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have thought a lot about this resolution. I do not think any of us can speak adequately on our feelings to our men and women that serve us today. They are today not only in Iraq, but in Afghanistan and all over this world, and they go a long way to protect our families and our country.

Over 40 nations have joined the leadership of the United States, and they also send their sons and their daughters and their family members so that terrorism will stay there instead of here.

My friends, like the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), they know the fears of Private Ryan and We Were Soldiers and Glory, and I guarantee my colleagues the families do, too.

My mom cried when I was shot down. An officer told her that I had been shot down, and she passed out, and they took her to the hospital before she even knew that I was okay. In my district and in my colleagues' districts, I

bet them, there are children right now weeping for their parents.

This is an important resolution. I hate to see the partisanship, that things come up. I know different people believe certain ways, but let us not do it here. This is so important.

I know when we were overseas, many of us, it was important. I did not care if it was President Johnson, I did not care if it was President Clinton, all I wanted to know was that the Congress was behind us, that they would support us and that the Congress would support our leaders because they had to make the decisions that kept us alive or not.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding time and for his distinguished service on the committee and to our country, and I also commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

In the previous day, a couple of weeks ago, we had a very fine resolution on the floor that they proposed that was worthy of the troops that we were honoring. I wish we had that resolution before us today.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution which, in part, honors our courageous men and women in uniform. I disagree with the policy that took us to this war. I dispute some of the arguments used in favor of this resolution, and I am disappointed in some of the provisions in it, but even those objections cannot overcome the pride and appreciation that I have in our troops and the message that I want them to hear from us tonight of our support for them.

Tonight the thoughts and prayers of all Americans are with our military forces and their families. I think we should be honoring the military wherever they serve in our country tonight because they are all brave, courageous, patriotic and willing to make the sacrifice for our country.

□ 2345

Mr. Speaker, I certainly think we could have done better in this resolution, but do not let that stand in Members' way for us to give a resounding vote of support of appreciation and pride for our men and women in uniform.

Tonight we learned of the first casualties of this war. Sixteen American and British Marines have died in a tragic helicopter accident in Kuwait. I hope it is a comfort to the families who lost their loved ones that so many people mourn their loss and are praying for them at this sad time. There is no heavier burden for a President and no more solemn choice for this Nation than to send our young men and women into battle.

As Commander in Chief, President Bush has made that difficult decision. Despite our policy decisions, as Americans we stand behind our men and women in uniform. As Congress, charged by the U.S. Constitution with providing for the common defense, we pledge today to our Armed Forces and their families, they will have the support they need in this dangerous and difficult time, both to win the war and to secure the peace.

In recent weeks I have met with some of these courageous men and women. We have all been meeting with them over time; but as the war drew near, it was more poignant. I traveled with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, to Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri to meet with the B–2 crews that may soon be engaged over Iraq. They were again brave and patriotic. Everyone respected the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), as Members can imagine; and everyone recognized what a great patriot he is in our country.

Three weeks ago, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), I traveled to Kuwait, Qatar, and Turkey to meet with the soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines now risking their lives in Iraq. We brought with us Members' good wishes of appreciation and pride, and thanked them for their patriotism, courage and, willingness to make the ultimate sacrifice.

Our men and women in uniform are an inspiration. They have waved goodbye to their husbands, wives, and children; and they endure daily hardships over many months to enhance America's diplomatic leverage. They are focused on their mission, motivated by a profound love of country and prepared, yes, to make the ultimate sacrifice. They are the best-trained, best-equipped and best-led military force the world has ever seen; and every American is eternally indebted to these patriots.

During our visit to the Persian Gulf, we met a young soldier named Captain Jennifer Schulke of Fort Bliss, Texas. She commands a Patriot missile battery in Kuwait. With the precision and ease of an engineer, she described for us the capability of the weapons system she commands. But she spoke with even greater pride of something else, about her daughter back home. Her daughter will be 2 years old on March 27, and on her birthday her mother will be serving in a country halfway around the world. Captain Schulke is one of the countless mothers and fathers, husband and wives and sons and daughters in uniform making sacrifices American families can only begin to imagine. I thought of her today when we heard of the Scud attacks and the Patriot response. It is people like Captain Schulke who inspire us and insist that we must support our men and women in uniform.

Today we pray for their swift and safe return into the loving arms of their families. When they come home, we will honor them for the heroes they are. And if they do not come home, we will support their families and honor their heroic deeds. We also honor our men and women in uniform by proving ourselves worthy of their sacrifice when we uphold the democratic values they defend with their very lives.

As we protect and defend the American people, we must also protect and defend the Constitution and the civil liberties contained therein which we cherish. And we must treat honest debate for what it is, an expression of patriotism, not a violation of it. Open discussion of the great task before us does not give comfort to America's adversaries. No, on the contrary, it gives comfort and confidence to the American people who look to Congress to uphold the immutable values and ideals that define our American democracy.

Today, America's sons and daughters preparing to go into Iraq have answered the call of their country. In the days to come, let us build a future worthy of their sacrifice. May God bless our courageous forces and their brave families. May God bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Even though the hour is late, Members are willing to stay here because it is so important for the House of Representatives to express our support for our men and women in uniform, our troops in harm's way now, and as the minority leader said, those troops anywhere in the world and at home. And also to support their families for the sacrifices that they are making. It is tough on the families, probably tougher on the families than any other people. We are also here to commend the President for his strong leadership in bringing us to where we are today.

Our men and women in uniform need to understand why they are fighting and why they are risking their lives, and understand that this House supports them in that because in order to risk their lives, they have to understand that they are doing it for the right reasons.

Last night began a challenging time for our country as our Armed Forces went on the march against tyranny. It also signaled the time for our country to come together with singleness of purpose and speak with a single voice.

Under our Constitution, America speaks through the United States Congress, and last year we spoke out boldly and strongly from both political parties. We let the world know that the defenders of freedom are not going to allow the world's leading purveyor and practitioner of terror continue to spread his grip of fear.

Today, Congress is set to speak again for the American people. We want to honor the men and women of our Armed Forces who are conducting their mission with the utmost honor and courage as they defend our democracy.

We salute every person taking risks to confront terrorism and tyranny to expand the frontiers of freedom, and we salute the President for showing the world the power of strong, moral leadership.

We know that Saddam Hussein is seeking the means to murder millions in just a single moment, and he is consumed with hatred for America. We know that the war on terrorism will be fought here at home unless we summon the will to confront evil before it attacks. Free democratic nations must be willing to stop his evil aspirations. He is not a man with whom we can confer, consult, or convince. He is not a man we can trust. He has violated 17 United Nations resolutions. He is in material breach of multiple U.N. resolutions, and he has ignored the final ultimatum by the President of the United States.

Saddam Hussein once agreed to end his missile program. He agreed to stop building chemical weapons. He agreed to stop developing biological weapons. He agreed to end his nuclear weapons program. He agreed to stop brutalizing and oppressing his people. He agreed to do many, many other things; but every promise he made was a lie. Every agreement was a devious swindle. Every commitment was an expedient falsehood.

It was all a devilish strategy designed to escape accountability for past crimes and to buy the time to develop weapons for even greater crimes against humanity.

He turned the regime's resources to the awful purpose of developing terror weapons to spread the cruelty and oppression beyond his own borders. He welcomes terrorists to sanctuary and support within his own borders.

During the years that Saddam Hussein slow-walked the United Nations through his series of deceptions, his regime systematically brutalized the Iraqi people. He tortures children to punish their parents. He executes members of his government to enforce obedience. We can never know how many faceless victims have screamed out their last words to the uncaring ears of Saddam Hussein's torturers.

As a member of England's Labour Party recently laid out in chilling detail earlier this week, Saddam Hussein is a diabolical prodigy in the craft of evil. This member spoke of Iraqi citizens who witnessed men being forced into a machine intended to shred plastic. The men who went in head first were, in a tragic sense, the fortunate ones. The men who were sent to their death feet first, their final words were anguished screams for mercy. She told of women raped as Saddam Hussein's torturers made their husbands watch.

This is wickedness that by the grace of God the people of America will never know. We have not cornered the market on morality, but our policy of intervention to force an end to this evil is clearly a just cause, a worthy war and a principled stand.

Fortunately, President Bush is proceeding with courage and boldness. He is leading with moral clarity. He is fighting principled battles, and he is not backing down. We have to give President Bush our full support as he confronts this evil, and our men and women in uniform as they confront this evil.

This vote to support our Commander in Chief and our courageous troops in battle sends the right message that we are denying Saddam Hussein the power to take additional lives. We believe that in the teeth of terrorism, America must continue exporting the values, democratic institutions, and patterns of conduct that have built the strongest and fairest system of government and the most free society the world has ever seen.

We feel very deeply for all of the people trapped within autocratic regimes and born with repressive governments. And as defenders of freedom, we also owe the besieged people of Iraq the same hope we supplied to the people of Germany nearly 6 decades ago.

In the battle between freedom and terrorist tyranny, there is no middle ground. We look to the day, far off though it may be, when every person comes into this world with the full promise of their God-given rights upheld by the government of their birthplace. This is a bold vision and a noble goal, but the potential of the American people is not constrained by the timid boundaries of conventional thinking. We are called to far more than that. And due to the excellence and patriotism and bravery of our soldiers and their families, and the courage of the President with moral purpose, the liberation of Iraq has begun.

May God bless our President, may God bless our troops, may God bless our Nation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST).

(Mr. FROST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the war to remove the grave threat posed by Saddam Hussein and his regime's weapons of mass destruction has begun. Throughout this mission, the men and women of our Armed Forces will have the unwavering support of Congress and the American people. I thank the leadership of both parties for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

Today, this House speaks with one clear voice to America's allies and adversaries alike. We stand united in strong support of our troops.

My wife, Army Major General Kathy Frost, Commander of the Army Air Force Exchange Service, recently visited our troops in four Persian Gulf countries. She has shared with me their absolute commitment to everything asked of them by our country to complete this mission.

I also wish to recognize the thousands of American civilians, such as the AAFES employees, who are providing vital support to our troops in the Persian Gulf. The work of these civilians is essential to the success of this mission, and they, too, deserve our gratitude for taking the enormous risk to work in what is now a combat zone.

□ 0000

Our troops will succeed in carrying out this mission. Like all Americans, I hope and pray they do so as safely and quickly as possible.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), chairman of the appropriations Subcommittee on Defense and a guy who works every day on behalf of folks in uniform.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise really to express my deep appreciation for both the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) for the fabulous job they do on behalf of the men and women who make up our Armed Forces. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and I have talked about the fact that I am very proud at this moment in our history to have the privilege to chair the subcommittee of appropriations that does the funding for the men and women who are now serving us overseas.

This evening we will have before us a budget that is probably the finest budget in terms of national security that I have seen in all the years I have been in Congress, and we will have the opportunity in that budget to express our strong support for those men and women who are doing this work on our behalf and on behalf of freedom in the Middle East this evening.

But particularly relative to this resolution are these two gentlemen, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), who have come together to provide a vehicle for us to express our deep appreciation, our deepest appreciation, for the work that they are about. Indeed, it is America's challenge to preserve freedom and provide leadership for freedom in the world. The men and women who are serving us this evening who we are praising by way of this resolution are right at the point of the strength of America as we go out carrying forward that responsibility we have to be the world's force for peace as well as for freedom. I thank them so much for what they are doing.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our troops.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the concurrent resolution. We are now at a state of war with Iraq. Regardless of how we as individuals

may feel about the President's decision to go to war, it is imperative that we support the men and women who are in Iraq now and who have put their lives in harm's way.

Over the last few months, we as a nation have engaged in a vigorous discussion concerning our policy toward Iraq. During this time, many people have expressed a differing view from the President's concerning Iraq.

No one should ever mistake our open society for weakness of spirit and resolve. I support our American and allied troops, and I pray for a swift and decisive conclusion with as few casualties as possible.

When the fighting concludes, and if Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and his top officials survive the war, I have introduced a resolution with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON, which calls for the establishment of a U.N. war crimes tribunal to investigate and try them for crimes against humanity, genocide and other criminal violations of international law. I have little doubt that such a tribunal is justified. There is an enormous amount of irrefutable evidence that Saddam and his top officials ordered Iraqi soldiers to commit atrocities against their own population and against others, including American soldiers during the 1991 Gulf War.

Our immediate focus after the fighting stops must be to stabilize Iraq and the entire Middle East region. After the war the United States and our international partners must help Iraq transition to a democratic republic that respects the rule of law and human rights. I also look forward to working with the President to ensure that Iraq has the help it needs to transition to a democratic republic that respects the rule of law and human rights.

The weeks ahead will be difficult ones, but I know Americans will join me in supporting our troops who are in harm's way. I also know that all of us want a swift conclusion to this conflict with as little loss of life as possible.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, we all wanted diplomacy to find a peaceful solution, and now we all want our troops home as quickly and safely as possible. The enemy should understand that it can take no comfort in the disagreement we have had with President Bush on the wisdom of a unilateral war in Iraq. Once our President sends our men and women into harm's way, we will do everything possible to support our troops abroad and their families here at home.

I share the sadness and concern for our fighting men and women and the people of Iraq. I join my colleagues and Californians in wanting to ensure our troops are safe, innocent civilians casualties are avoided, Saddam is disarmed, and the world community is engaged in rebuilding a democratic Iraq.

When I was in the Persian Gulf earlier this year, I saw many of the men and women who will win this war for America. They are young, they are smart, and they are ready. To the men and women of the Armed Forces, especially those from Travis Air Force Base and Reserve and National Guard units from throughout California and the Bay area, you have the unwavering support of this Congress and the American people. To the families of these brave men and women, let me tell you that your sacrifice is tremendous, and we are praying for your loved ones' safe return.

Now the only exit strategy that remains is victory. I am confident that day will come soon. God bless our troops and God bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT), who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Projection Forces.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, however much we may disagree in the Congress and the country about how we got to this moment in time, here we are. Americans are engaged in battle to disarm Saddam Hussein of his weapons of mass destruction and to free the Iraqi people from his reign of terror. The world must know all Americans stand behind President George W. Bush in his role as Commander in Chief. The world must also know that all Americans stand united in support of our magnificent military personnel who are now in harm's way. Victory is certain. I believe it is important that we all pray and ask for God's guidance and assistance that victory come swiftly and with as little loss of life as possible, both American and Iraqi.

I believe the surest path to peace is through strength. Americans are a peaceful people, but evil exists. This is a time when the evil of Saddam Hussein and the threat he poses must be defeated with military force. It is right and proper that we appeal to God, for we need His help to move beyond war and achieve the goal of a free and prosperous Iraq that will be a model for the Middle East and the world.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1999, the now majority leader addressed the House of Representatives with these solemn words:

''Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult speech for me to give because I normally, and I still do, support our military and the fine work that they are doing. But I cannot support a failed foreign policy.'' I quote this, Mr. Speaker, not in criticism and not for any political purpose, but because these words express my feelings tonight, just as they expressed the majority leader's when our troops were in Kosovo, a policy I supported, just as he supports the war in Iraq.

Each and every word of praise and support for our troops in this resolution I wholeheartedly endorse. As a mother, every expression of gratitude and prayer for their families I embrace. But as one who believes that this preemptive war that put these brave patriots in harm's way is unwise and unnecessary, I cannot in good conscience support a resolution that unequivocally endorses that action. I deeply love my country, and without reservation the men and women who wear our uniform, but regretfully, will not be able to support this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as a parent of three sons who are in the military, I rise in support of the resolution being offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

In particular, I had the opportunity just last month of going on a delegation to visit our troops in Kuwait. It was an extraordinary opportunity. The delegation was led by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS). We went to encourage the troops, but actually while I was there, they encouraged me. We saw the troops of the 82nd Airborne, the 3rd Infantry Division, neighbors of mine from Fort Stewart, Georgia; I was able to see the troops from the 1st Marine Division.

At each stop we were encouraged by the high morale of the troops. We could see that they had the best equipment in the world. They have the best training in the world. They have the finest military leaders in the world. My greatest concern for the troops was the threat of chemical and biological weapons.

I want to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities. Yesterday we had a presentation which revealed to us the extraordinary technology which is being provided our troops, the lightweight protective gear, the wonderful modern gas masks, the 20,000 chemical detection devices. Each one of our troops is well protected against chemical and biological weapons.

We have 44 allies involved in the coalition that is facing Saddam Hussein at this time. In the Persian Gulf there were 41. Two countries in particular I want to thank. I have had the opportunity to be with Ambassador Elena Poptodorova of Bulgaria. Bulgaria has provided troops. It is providing the first American air base in the history of their country at Burgas. I also thank Ambassador Sorin Ducaru of Romania. I met with him 2 days ago. It is just extraordinary the services they are providing as they support the war against terrorism and the war against Saddam Hussein.

I conclude, God bless our troops.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, the United States is at war. We have one Armed Forces, one Commander in Chief, one Nation. There are questions to be asked about how we came to this moment, about the diplomacy, about the relationships with our allies, about the shifting rationales we have been offered for war. These are serious issues.

They should and will be debated here by historians and scholars in the months and years ahead.

Today is not a time for that debate. There are hundreds and thousands of young men and women in harm's way, my neighbors and yours. Our attention should be focused on those young men and women, the success of their mission, and their safe return.

I had the fortunate experience of serving in the White House. I know firsthand what a solitary and difficult decision it is for a President to send our Armed Forces into harm's way. I well remember some Members of this body, in the midst of conflict, attacking the President, the Commander in Chief, even as he worked day and night to complete a mission to bring our servicemen and women home safely. It was wrong then. It would be wrong now.

I for one will not do that to our President, to our Commander in Chief. I want him to succeed. We should all want him to succeed. So long as our troops are engaged, we should suspend the debate over how and why, focus on the mission, unite as a country in prayer and resolve, hope for a speedy resolution of this war, with a minimum of loss. God bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

(Mr. WAMP asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word to the courageous men and women in uniform and a word to the courageous men and women of the United States Congress. First, I think we should remember September 11 because the greatest generation on whose shoulders we stand today were incredibly encouraged by the bravery and the sacrifice following September 11 when we were struck in our homeland. They were encouraged because they realized that their children and grandchildren had what it takes, that we were actually willing to answer our call to courage in our generation, and that we were willing to sacrifice.

Today's men and women in uniform around the world are standing in the gap between a threat and our civilian population, and we all thank them for that.

When I was growing up, it was almost all Active Duty career men and women in the military. Today it is the Guard and the Reserves, and they are all deployed, and they leave their jobs and they go and they serve, and they did not know this moment was going to come, but they are ready and willing.

I sent off the 181st earlier this week from Chattanooga, Tennessee, and wives and parents were all there. They have got guts, and we appreciate them so very much.

But let me say something quickly to this body. I have been around long enough to know, I do not know what the next election is going to bring except probably a real close election, and I do not know who is going to be President. I was raised in the Cold War, but I am raising my children in a hot war. This is not the only time that we are going to be on the floor addressing problems like this. We are going to be back. I do not know who is going to be President, but I hope that the tradition of us meeting at the water's edge when it comes to our national security is carried on, because this institution and that tradition is bigger than either party or any Member, and we must continue to stand together for freedom in the United States Congress.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of our troops and our families.

Mr. Speaker, at this moment my prayers and thoughts are with the service men and women who are braving the fierceness of battle in the deserts of Iraq. My best wishes are with them and their families for a safe return home. I have no doubt that they will be victorious in their undertaking and perform their duties honorably and bravely.

I have a particularly soft spot in my heart for the service men and women serving in Michigan's National Guard and reserve units that are now activated to duty. They are providing a myriad of services and tasks on behalf of the war effort and in service to our nation.

The politics of war should stop when the first shot is fired and when the men and women who make up our armed forces move into the field of battle. Some Members in this chamber have taken exception to the Administration's handling of the Iraq crisis, and I include myself among those who have had strong reservations about our road to war. If this were a simple resolution expressing our support and best wishes for the safe return of our troops, it would have my complete and unquestioning support. As a Member of the House Appropriations Committee, I will do everything I can to make sure that our troops are provided with the equipment and resources necessary to ensure their safety and support their families.

But I have strong reservations about the course of action that took us into our present state of war. My position on this war has been plainly clear since the beginning, when the Administration first proposed using preemptive action against Iraq. I supported working through the United Nations and our allies and using all diplomatic means possible to disarm Saddam Hussein. I do not feel that the President stayed true to this path and exhausted all diplomatic means available. Therefore, I could not in good, moral conscious, vote "yes" for this resolution because it represents an affirmation of the policy of pre-emption. I strongly disagree with the application of a pre-emptive doctrine. It is counter to our values as a democratic nation and our American tradition.

Now that we are committed, our troops are bound to perform their mission effectively and destroy the Iraqi war machine. As they pursue their objective, they will encounter many perils as the war follows its course. I share with the President the wish that their job will be completed swiftly so that they will soon be returning home to their loved ones.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise with a heavy heart in strong support of our troops. My thoughts and prayers are with them, and I pray for their safe return. As a soldier's daughter, my heart also goes out to their families. I know they anxiously await their return home.

America's Armed Forces put their lives on the line and their sacrifices should never be forgotten. That is why just 2 weeks ago I voted in favor of H.J. Res. 27, which recognized and commended the continuing dedication and selfless service of members of the Armed Forces and their families. In spite of our policy differences, I do support our young men and women in uniform.

□ 0015

But what I cannot support, though, is this resolution that endorses war against Iraq. I believed and still believe that diplomatic alternatives existed, the inspections process was working. Keeping our troops out of harm's way has been and remains first and foremost on my mind and in my heart. May God protect them and return them safely home.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), who was a fighter pilot in the Persian Gulf and in Vietnam.

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice to the many voices who are commending the troops of our Nation and our allies as they undertake the task of liberating the people of Iraq and removing the danger that Iraq's illegal weapons present to the world. It is unfortunate that Saddam Hussein did not take the opportunity given to him for the past 12 years to simply comply with the demands of the world and peacefully disarm. However, the decision to ignore the world will ultimately be a tragedy, mostly for Saddam Hussein.

Over the next few days we are going to find out just how fortunate we are to have our young men and women on the front lines. The bravery of our troops has already been demonstrated in the last 24 hours. A courageous 117 pilots have struck deep into Iraq with minimal support in some of the first air strikes of this war. Marines and soldiers alike in Kuwait have engaged the enemy in Iraq, and freedom for Iraq is closer today than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, in many ways this is the beginning of the end for many different people. For the Iraqi people, it is

the beginning of the end of 20 years of oppression and tyranny; and for terrorists another haven for training and planning attacks is coming to an end. For the men and women of our Armed Forces, 12 years of constant deployment to contain a tyrant is coming to an end.

The men and women of our Armed Forces will demonstrate to the world the courage of our Nation, and they will show that the United States will not tolerate appeasement that keeps tyrants in power and endangers the entire world. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

May God bless our leaders. May God bless our troops, and may God bless this great Nation.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as we gather tonight, hundreds of thousands of Americans and allied troops are risking their safety to protect ours. They are courageously confronting Saddam Hussein and the danger his regime poses to the world, and we have the utmost confidence that their victory will be sure and swift. I pledge my full support to these brave men and women and my firm commitment to providing whatever resources may be necessary to back their critical mission. Just as importantly, I want to thank the loved ones these soldiers have left at home for their sacrifice during these difficult times.

Sadly, the deaths tonight of 16 Marines and British troops in a helicopter crash in Kuwait remind us of the great and constant risk our servicemen and women are facing. I offer my deepest condolences to their families in their time of grief. Above all, I express the gratitude of every American for the brave patriots who have been called upon to defend freedom and security.

May God be with each and every one of our troops as we all pray for their protection in combat and a quick and safe return home.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) for his great service to the Committee on Armed Services.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCHROCK), another gentleman with great military expertise.

Mr. SCHROCK. Mr. Speaker, as the representative of the Navy's Atlantic fleet and nearly 100,000 active duty servicemen and women, I am pleased to rise to honor our brave men and women in uniform. The piers in Norfolk stand empty tonight and thousands of families are risking their loved ones, but we pray along with them that their loved ones have a successful and safe mission and that they can return home as soon as their mission is complete.

Fortunately, our enemies do not often witness the strength of the U.S. military firsthand, but Saddam Hussein's regime is learning of that strength tonight. It is the men and women of our armed services that give us that strength. Their resolute training, their unwaivering bravery, and their steeled resolve will bring a quick and decisive end to this conflict. These men and women have volunteered to fight and put their lives at risk to ensure our freedom and to liberate those held back by the chains of tyranny. These men and women represent the best that America has to offer, and we must stand united behind them and our Nation's leadership.

I thank the gentleman from California, whose son is an active duty Marine Corps officer and the gentleman from Missouri whose son is an active duty naval officer for bringing this resolution to us, and I urge its swift passage.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a Member of this body who was privileged to serve my country as an officer in the United States Navy. In that roll as chief psychiatrist at the Long Beach Naval Station at the height of the Vietnam War, it was my duty to evaluate and treat seaman and Marines returning from combat. I saw their pain.

I wish it to be clearly understood that I have the utmost respect and appreciation for the courage, tenacity, and dedication of those currently serving in Iraq and elsewhere. But, Mr. Speaker, war is not a partisan matter. The leadership should be ashamed of bringing this resolution to the floor. Everyone here wants to support an honest and straightforward resolution to support our troops. Do not give us a disingenuous and deceptive resolution that confuses the issue by asking us to endorse the Bush doctrine that sent our troops to war. I for one will not be forced to praise the President's reckless decisions when what I want to do is praise the troops. I cannot endorse the administration's policy of unilateral military action without international sanctions. This war of choice undermines the international order and endangers our Republic.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member. I appreciate this opportunity, and I rise really for two specific reasons. First, on behalf of those I represent in the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia, I want to rise to express my appreciation and my support for this resolution, the men and women whom it honors, the parents who raised them, and the Commander in Chief who today leads them.

And, secondly, I rise to pay tribute in memory of my best friend, Captain Jackson Elliot Cox, who died in 1967 in Vietnam. He died at a time when America's Congress was divided over another conflict at another time. He died and gave the last full measure of his life on behalf of this country so this body could do its work just as those men and women are doing today in the sands of Iraq and in the Middle East.

So before at this early stage we divide ourselves over words, I hope we will unite ourselves over the praise of these young men, these young women, their families that raised them, and the President that leads them. This resolution is important to all in America, but it is most important to those who tonight serve us while we have the freedom to debate, to vote, and to participate in the greatest democracy in the history of the world, the United States of America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, what a great opportunity we had tonight for all of us to unequivocally endorse and praise those brave young men and women who are prepared at any time to put their lives on the line and put themselves in harm's way for the interests of the United States of America.

My training in the military dictated to me that when that flag goes up, we salute it. When you are in the military, you do not have the options of determining which is a right war, which is a moral war, and which is any other type of war that one likes or dislike. You do what you are told, and you fight for this great country.

As Members of Congress, however, we had an opportunity to forge a resolution that would not have any doubt about our unequivocal support for our men and women not just tonight but as long as we are able to serve in this great body for this great country. But somehow we sought not to do this. Somehow, as the majority leader said on different occasions, we wanted to mix policy with praise. Our fighting men and women do not have an opportunity to deal with policy; and yet this is what we are asked to do, as the majority leader said, that we must congratulate and express the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation for a President who brought us where we are today. I do not like where we are today. I did not vote or support how we got where we are today. I am prepared to salute the Commander in Chief because he is in charge today, but why do you put me in the position that it even looks as though I am not supporting our men and women? Because I reserve the right as a Member of this body to disagree with this President or any other President as long as I am elected to serve my constituents.

I am happy that I will have other occasions to show in a more vocal way

my unequivocal support for our brave fighting men and women.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE), a gentleman with great experience in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. KLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in favor of this resolution to commend our troops and to show our complete support for them. The men and women engaged in the struggle against the war on terrorism face a difficult challenge, and we have seen it tonight with the loss of 16 servicemen. Whether directly involved in combat or serving in support roles, these brave individuals are responsible for providing protection to our allies and freedom to the people of Iraq.

There are those who may have debated the United States's role in this conflict, and fairly so. But now is a time to rise above this debate and send one clear message to the men and women of our Armed Forces. These troops need to know that we support what they are doing. If we express doubt as to the validity and purpose and importance of what they are doing, I am afraid our support will sound hollow to their ears. Our message to these troops is one of gratitude for what they have done and what they will continue to do to advance the cause of peace and protect our national security. Our prayer tonight is one for fortitude that they can persevere throughout the battle and return safely to their families and their loved ones.

We commend our troops for their service, and we pray for their safety.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, Abdul Henderson was called up as a Marine Reserve to go to Iraq. I am hoping and praying that he was not aboard that helicopter. As soon as I leave these Chambers, I will make a call out to Los Angeles.

He is the son of one of my employees. We saw him off. I support and I honor our troops for they are following commands, and I think the most honorable thing we can do is take them out of harm's way.

□ 0030

There is no way I can support this resolution because it speaks to a war that I feel is unnecessary and unjustifiable.

Even after we succeed in Iraq, is America going to be any safer? Because I remember the President talking about the Axis of Evil, Iran and North Korea. So I pray every day for our troops and their families. And let us do the right thing. Never, ever again should America do a preemptive strike. Why do we not do what we need to do, and that is go after Osama bin Laden, who has been proven to be an effective terrorist.

Bring our men and women home, and let us honor them so they can come back to their families.

God bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from California (Chairman HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for bringing this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, in early February, the Speaker asked five of us to travel to the Middle East, first stopping in Kurdistan, on into Uzbekistan. We attempted to get into Afghanistan, but, due to bad weather, we were unable to; and also on into Kuwait city.

The purpose of that trip was to deliver a message from the Congress of the United States about the support that we have for Enduring Freedom and for the operation that is going on that they are carrying out today.

On our visit to each of the stops, we had four ways of expressing our gratitude. One, we had banners, banners that had inscribed the words from the President's State of the Union Address, when he addressed the troops and said, you believe in America, and America believes in you. Those banners were signed by hundreds of people, not just Members of Congress, but people from across the country who visited here in Washington. Each of those banners was signed by the Commander in Chief.

Another way that we had of expressing the gratitude of the Congress was a video, a 10-minute video which began with the Speaker of the House delivering a message personally, the Commanding General of Fort Benning, Georgia, people from the PX, people from the streets, also the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), Vice President DICK CHENEY, and ending by a message from the Commander in Chief, President Bush.

The third way that we expressed our gratitude from the Congress was with a flag. We presented each stop, each unit that we visited, with a flag that had been previously flown over the Capitol of the United States.

Five of us were traveling; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EVERETT), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and myself. Never once did we identify ourselves at any stop as other than Members of Congress. We did not carry a label by party, just Members of Congress, to express our gratitude.

The fourth way was there in person, to personally deliver the message. We never heard one complaint, and we shook the hands of thousands of men and women in uniform. Not one complaint, but a lot of fine compliments to the Congress and to the Commander in Chief. Proud to serve both.

But to our surprise in Uzbekistan, as we were presenting these gifts and expressions of gratitude of the Congress, they had a gift for the Congress. They had a flag that they had flown over the air base, K–2 in Uzbekistan, a forward operation base for Enduring Freedom. But not only did they fly it over the base, they put it aboard a C–130 gunship and flew it over Afghanistan, because they wanted to express to us their gratitude for what we do as Congress and for our Commander in Chief.

Should we not be doing that today in the same fashion that the five of us traveled, as Members of Congress; not by party label, just Members of Congress, proud to be so, and proud of our soldiers and our airmen, our sailors, our marines, our Coast Guard.

God bless each and every one, and God bless our Commander in Chief.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), the ranking member of the new Select Committee on Homeland Security.

Mr. TURNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, tonight American soldiers are crossing the deserts of Iraq to disarm Saddam Hussein. It is a mission that will present unknown dangers to our young men and women in uniform. They go not as conquerors, but as liberators. They seek no sovereignty over the Iraqi people, but seek to grant the opportunity for freedom and democracy to an oppressed people.

Their mission is to disarm Saddam Hussein in accordance with the mandate of the United Nations Resolution 1441. Some would say that the task of disarmament might be accomplished without force, but none would deny that the threat of the use of force is the only credible tool in dealing with a dictator who has for 12 years defied the requirements of the resolutions of the United Nations.

Our Nation vigorously sought to unite the world in this cause. Though some of our allies failed to face the reality of a brutal dictator who seeks to accumulate weapons of mass destruction, we are joined tonight by over 40 nations to confront this dictator who controls a nation that possesses the wealth to achieve his goals of military dominance.

The policy of containment and mutual deterrence that worked successfully in the 20th century is not a strategy for security against the threats of weapons of mass destruction in the 21st century.

We join together tonight in deep gratitude for the brave young men and women who courageously face the dangers of our mission. They join a long line of patriots who have given us the opportunity to live in peace and prosperity. May God bless and protect them, and may His hand guide them in the pursuit of the cause of freedom and justice for all.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, some Members of this United States Congress support President Bush's preemptive strike against Iraq. Some Members have done their elected and patriotic duty and raised questions about the President's diplomatic failure and inability to resolve this conflict peacefully. However, every Member of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, strongly support our men and women in uniform.

Why, then, could our Republican Members not agree to a clean-cut, clearly worded resolution of support for our soldiers? The Republican leadership chose to politicize this moment in history with a politically worded resolution designed to trap the opposition into supporting a war that we do not support. They have cheapened this debate by trying to use this resolution to legitimize this war. This war is neither legitimate nor necessary.

No matter, our troops are in harm's way. We support our soldiers and their families and will do everything in our power to make sure our men and women in uniform are honored and respected as they bravely serve our country. And when they return home, my office and my staff are always available to our men and women in uniform, and we will work very hard for them.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, 50,000 marines and sailors who call San Diego home are officially at war, and I respect their courage and the skills they bring in defending our freedom. I have met with many of these families and with those who advocate on behalf of them, the ombudspeople who volunteer every day to ensure that parents and spouses and children get the support they need in times of peace and in times of war.

I supported the resolution 2 weeks ago, and I will support it again tonight, because my support overrides honest differences that I and many of my constituents have in the course that we have taken.

Jessica, whose fiance is a marine in the Gulf, sent in an article from San Diego today: ''Nobody wants war, but the troops need our support. They have the toughest job. I get to sleep in my bed tonight.''

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, oh, freedom; oh freedom. I pledge my unequivocal support for the Armed Forces of the United States of America. I, too, have visited troops in Germany, Italy, Kosovo, Qatar, Bahrain and Hawaii.

I have attended deployments of two units from the 11th Congressional District of Ohio. Their mothers and fathers asked me, why are we going to war, and why in Iraq? I could not answer their question, but I, too, gave them a flag, and asked them to bring it back to me safely.

Oh, freedom; oh, freedom. Freedom includes the right to have free speech. Thank God I am free to speak in opposition to this resolution.

Oh, freedom; oh, freedom. The young men and women of the Armed Forces, God bless you, God keep you, God surround you with his love. Oh, freedom; oh, freedom.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), who, as he brings his distinguished service to this House, also is the distinguished father of a son who is serving tonight as we have this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of this resolution; not because I like every single word that is in it, but the words that mean the most to me this evening are those that relate to and are connected to the treasures of our Nation, the sons and the daughters that are in harm's way this evening.

They are the sons, they are the daughters; they are fathers, they are mothers; they are grandsons, they are granddaughters; they are nephews, they are nieces; and they are really the beloved of our Nation.

I have raised questions about what would bring us to war. I stand in opposition to preemption, but tonight I do not believe is the night for that debate. We had it before; I think we will have it again.

Our troops who wear the flag on their uniform may very well, some of them, come home with a flag draped around their coffin. So, tonight I think our entire Nation genuflects and prays for every single one of them.

Let God watch over them and bring them home safely to the families who gave birth to them, to the families that love them, and to the families that had to bid farewell to them.

God bless them, and God help us.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a very sad day. I weep for my country tonight. I am sorry, very sorry, that we have arrived at this point.

□ 0045

Tonight I think the world is a much more dangerous place for all humankind.

I want to make it clear that I support all of our young men and women who are in harm's way, and I pray and I pray for their safe return.

But tonight, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for peace. War is bloody and messy. It destroys the hopes, the dreams, and aspirations of a people. In all good conscience, I cannot and will not vote for a resolution that supports and endorses a failed policy that led us to war. War is never the answer. War is obsolete.

The struggle for peace is as old as the dawn of history and as fresh as the morning dew. The struggle for peace is a struggle that lasts for more than 1 day, 1 week, 1 year, or more than a lifetime. But we must struggle.

Is it possible, is it too much to ask? Maybe it is possible for humankind to evolve to a much higher level and lay down the tools of hate, violence, and war. If we want to create a beloved community, a community that is at peace with itself, if that is our end, if that is our goal, then our way must be one of love, one of nonviolence, one of peace.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I ask God's blessing on our soldiers, and may God bless our little planet we call Earth.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

Today Congress stands in support of our Commander in Chief and our men and women in uniform. Tonight I join with all Americans in sending my thoughts and prayers to the men and women of our Armed Forces and their families. These brave soldiers have been entrusted with the ultimate responsibility of defending our freedom, and for this they have our unconditional support.

Citizens of my State know all too well the sacrifices that are made in times like this. In my home State of Connecticut, 35 percent of all National Guard and Army reserve troops have already been deployed to not only Iraq, but throughout the world, the third highest amount of any State in the Union.

We do not know what the days ahead for us will bring, yet it is the sincerest hope of every American that this conflict will be finished quickly and successfully. We hope there will be minimum casualties to our military and to the people of Iraq, and we will continue to pray for the safe return of these men and women to their families and their loved ones.

This is a time for all Americans to join together, to let our troops know that we support them fully and completely, and that they are in our hearts.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member on the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, we gather here for a well-deserved tribute to our troops in the Middle East. Yet just before this, we were debating the President's budget which cruelly cut $25 billion of veterans benefits, including disabled veterans. Is this how Republicans would honor those who have made great sacrifices in defense of our country? Is that how they would boost the morale of our current troops? Every major veterans organization has denounced these cuts as unconscionable, but now the pending business before us is a little bit different.

So I rise to reject these efforts to piggyback support for President Bush's dangerous policies on to a simple, but deserved, resolution supporting our troops. I trust the American people to see through this attempt to coerce endorsement of his ''preventive war'' doctrine.

I fully support our troops and offer my prayers for their safe return. I am an Army veteran myself; I care deeply about their well-being. And precisely for that reason, I cannot in good conscience vote for tonight's resolution, a carefully crafted document to force endorsement of President Bush's doctrine of preventive war, allowing him to attack countries whenever or wherever he chooses. I will not provide support for such a dangerous doctrine.

For years to come, it will unnecessarily put current and future members of our Armed Forces in harm's way, even when our national security is not really threatened.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush is about to unleash the dogs of war. He has set the clock ticking toward an unprecedented barrage of destruction dropped on a city of 6 million human beings. The barrage is oddly named the days of ''shock and awe.'' All Americans who hold human life precious should watch the clock run down, not with ''awe'' but with fear and trembling. The sad truth is that we are lurching towards an unnecessary war that President Bush seems determined to launch.

Apparently, therefore, the brave young men and women of our Armed Forces are about to head into harm's way. We all offer them our support as they try to do their duty, and we send our prayers for their safe return. But we must also be faithful to our duty, a duty entrusted exclusively to the Congress by our Founding Fathers. That is the solemn duty to decide whether the United States should go to war.

The Constitution's framers emphatically entrusted that decision to the Congress alone. They were adamant that the Executive not play a role—although once war began the Executive is the Commander-in-Chief to implement that decision. The Framers were so intent on excluding the President that they rejected an offer to share the power to declare war between the Congress and the Executive.

I know that President Bush, and many of my colleagues believe that the Congress properly authorized war against Iraq last Fall, pursuant to Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution. I respectfully disagree. We have not performed our duty yet. Last fall Congress enacted a resolution that generally authorized the president to fight terrorism and to seek enforcement of previous U.N. Resolutions on Iraq. But in reality, that resolution bucked the duty constitutionally conferred on Congress to the President. It let the President decide to choose when and where and against whom to start a war. In short, it dodged the decision and sought to delegate an authority that may not be delegated.

The administration's supporters argue that legal precedents allow the Congress to provide an authorization of war that is functionally equivalent to the now rarely-used formal Declaration of War. That entirely misses the point. It is not the format which is at issue; it is ''who decides?''

It was clear, at that time, from the congressional debate, from Executive Branch statements, and from the resolution itself that the diplomatic route would be pursued first, by going through the U.N. Subsequently, in response to a broad national consensus, the U.S. spearheaded U.N. Security Council passage of Resolution 1441 that imposed a new inspection regime. In other words, it was clear last fall that the decision of whether to declare war was being put off for a later date.

In the months since then, it has become increasingly clear that the decision on going to war would turn on two crucial assessments. The first would be an assessment of the results of that inspection program.

The second assessment, and the ultimate judgment, would require weighing the implications of the inspection results and other information about what threat Iraq poses to the U.S. against the full costs—fiscal, diplomatic, casualties and increased terrorism—of going to war. Clearly these are not military judgments for a Commander-in-Chief. They are precisely the kind of complex national policy judgments that the Founding Fathers conferred on the Congress in matters of war and peace.

Yet in the present circumstances, the Congress has abdicated any role in that fateful decision. The entire world has been riveted on whether the American President would decide to declare war against Iraq. President Bush has brazenly told journalists and Members of Congress alike that it is his decision, and his decision alone. This is a perversion of the Constitution.

Even if one argues that Congress properly exercised its constitutional duties, and that the President thereby has all necessary authority to start a war the fundamental questions remain. ''Why war?'' ''Why now?'' And most importantly, ''Will waging war in Iraq make us more secure or less secure?''

Bush's war would have disastrous consequences for every American. War is about devastation, destruction and death. The American people are not bloodthirsty. We want war only if our country is in imminent danger. Otherwise, a war's human and economic costs are too great. The human devastation of death, injury and destruction is obvious. In addition, it will rob us of resources urgently needed by America's working families and less fortunate.

Even in terms of national security, an all-out war will rob Americans of hundreds of billions of dollars needed for the first line of defense in homeland security, on which we have made far too little progress since the tragedy of 9/11. As the President repeats his unverified mantra of ''threats to national security,'' cities across this land are laying off police, firemen, and emergency medical services teams—the so-call ''first responders'' to any new terrorist attack. They must do so because this Administration's ''first response'' to empty city treasuries across America has been one word: ''Tough.''

This is not merely a partisan spat, nor a Washington insiders' policy dispute. The citizens' crusade to stop an immoral war in Iraq has been nothing less than a noble struggle for our Nation's soul. Thus far, that struggle has not succeeded. But we will not give up. We must commit ourselves to stopping hostilities and re-weaving the torn fabric of international organizations with the same dedication and urgency with which we strove to stop segregation and the Vietnam war, and finally brought our Government to its senses.

President Bush repeatedly insists that for him ''war is a last resort.'' But his actions reveal that war was really his first choice, all along. His attempts to make it politically palatable by badgering, bullying and bribing countries into a counterfeit coalition have been a mere fig leaf transparent to the entire world.

President Bush has failed to present compelling evidence that Iraq currently is a threat to our national security. One rationale after another has been disproved. The President, Vice President and Secretary of Defense have presented a kaleidoscope of ever-changing rationale as they tried to stay one jump ahead of ''truth squads'' exposing their disinformation—at the U.N., among skeptical Members of Congress and the media, and even in their own intelligence agencies.

Americans have readily borne the burden of war when attacked or actually threatened. But America cannot, in good conscience, start a war so costly in blood and treasure simply on the basis of circumstantial evidence and speculation that, sometime in the unspecified future, Iraq may present an actual threat to the U.S.

Bush's war against Iraq is:

A war that will devastate a country of 26 million and cause damage that will take years to undo;

A war that will see many American casualties, and that could fracture our fragile economy;

A war that will destabilize the Middle East;

A war that will swell the ranks of terrorist recruits;

A war that will weaken our fight against terrorism, at home and abroad, and that will cost billions of dollars desperately needed for programs in Detroit and other cities;

A war that will set a terrible precedent, in a world of growing numbers of nuclear states, for any country to launch a preventive war against opponents deemed a possible future threat; and

A war not really wanted by the American people, our military commanders or our allies.

Worst of all, it is a war that, as the CIA admits, will only make it more likely that Saddam would unleash whatever unconventional weapons he does have against our troops, Israel and our other allies. There is no evidence Saddam seeks to commit suicide. We deterred him from using weapons of mass destruction during Desert Storm. If he faces destruction, however, Saddam may well seek to play Sampson and pull down the Temple for lethal revenge.

Last weekend, several of the Nation's leading newspapers seemed to suddenly discover all of these grave costs of war in Iraq. Article after article reported with an air of sudden discovery that:

The war would drastically increase the likelihood of Saddam's using weapons of mass destruction;

That it would almost certainly escalate dramatically terrorist attacks against Americans;

That many U.S. military commanders feared it would undermine the real war against terrorism;

That their could be extensive casualties among innocent Iraqi civilians; and

That, even following a quick ''military victory'' against Saddam, we could be mired in

an Iraqi quicksand of tribal feuds and guerrilla warfare for years.

I took cold comfort from the irony of the media's belated ''discoveries.'' It would have been far more useful to their readers if the media had discovered this costly side of the war ledger months earlier. Instead, like the Administration, most media coverage focused only on whether, absent other concerns, it was desirable to prevent Saddam's pursuit of armaments and remove his regime—as if there were no competing costs on the other side of the ledger to be carefully weighed in deciding whether war would be a net plus for America.

There is still time for President Bush to avoid starting the wrong war, in the wrong place, at the wrong time. There is still time—but precious little time—for the American people to speak out against a war that few of them support. If the war commences, there is time for it to be brought to a rapid end and areversion to diplomatic efforts and enhanced inspections.

We should remember the warning of General Anthony Zinni. A distinguished Marine Commandant and head of U.S. Central Command, which guards the Middle East, Zinni reminded us that military commanders know the full horrors of war and hesitate to plunge ahead unless the national interest is clearly at stake. On the other hand, Zinni warned, those who have never worn a uniform or seen combat often are the quickest to beat the drums of war.

Those are harsh words. The administration will condemn whoever utters them as partisan and unpatriotic—just as the Johnson White House condemned King's questioning of Vietnam. The Bush team has already spread that slander, in order to stop erosion of support for the war as the public learns the truth. Are the military veterans and retired generals opposed to this war unpatriotic? Are families of those who were killed on 9/11 and who oppose this war partisan? That is outrageous.

I know many of my colleagues have in good faith been convinced that Iraq is a threat to us now. But they have been the target of a Niagara of propaganda, especially the Vice President's early insistence that Saddam was involved in 9/11 and that Saddam had nuclear weapons now—both of which claims have long been disavowed by our intelligence community. Many other assertions and premises used by the administration to ''market their product,'' in the revealing phrase of the White House Chief of staff, have crumbled under close scrutiny.

I would ask my colleagues who support the war to reconsider their view in light of these facts:

Almost the entire world is strongly against this war; this includes the majority of the citizens of even those countries formally part of the ''coalition'';

Every major city in America has gone on record against this war;

The U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, almost every major Protestant denomination, the American Labor movement and the NAACP are against this war;

Leading retired U.S. military commanders such as General Zinni, and General Schwarzkopf—in his original unvarnished views—have voiced opposition to this war;

Numerous active duty generals have told reporters off the record of their concerns about a war against Iraq; and

General Scowcroft, who was also President George Herbert Walker Bush's National Security Advisory is against this war.

And all of this opposition has arisen even before the war has started—an unprecedented phenomenon in human history. In view of these facts, I ask whether it is just possible that there is something amiss with the President's premises with his logic, and with his rejection of further effort to resolve the issues peacefully.

I urge my colleague to reflect on these powerful facts and join me in pressing President Bush to find another way—to follow the path of peace. As the Bible teaches, ''Blessed are the Peacemakers.''

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran I stand behind our troops, and I ask everyone to get together in the form of solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, several months ago, when we voted on the President's Iraq resolution, we all hoped war could be avoided, even though most of us believed deep down that it was a forgone conclusion. It was just a matter of when. Well, the day we all knew would come upon us. As we speak the U.S. Army 7th Calvary has engaged the enemy inside Iraq.

This is a difficult dilemma. We hope and pray that Saddam does not have any weapons of mass destruction to use against our troops. My faith teaches me that only those who are without sin should cast the first stone in conflict. We have cast the stone, and we'll just have to wait and see what the effects will be.

However, Mr. Speaker, none of that is important anymore. The most important issue we face as any war begins is how we are going to support our brave men and women in uniform. No matter how we feel about the prospect of waging war at this time, we must stand solidly behind our troops. Hundreds of soldiers from my district have already deployed. Thousands more from the Inland Empire and across California are heading to the Persian Gulf region. Even more Californians are serving our Nation in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines all over the World. It saddens me to think that some of these men and women will not return home to their mothers and fathers, to their sons and daughters, to their husbands and wives.

We can support our troops by keeping the promises we have made to our veterans, and by providing them with the benefits and healthcare that they have earned through their services to our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as I think about the lives that may be lost in the coming days and weeks, I ask myself one question. Could this situation have been avoided? Although I cannot answer this question with 100 percent certainty, I have always believed that there was a diplomatic solution to the Iraq crisis. I believed that when I voted for a resolution in October authorizing the President to use our armed forces in support of any U.N. resolution mandating the disarmament of Saddam Hussein. Mr. Speaker, I still believe that now. Unfortunately, the diplomatic window is closed. Diplomacy no longer seems to be an option.

But I want my colleagues to hear me when I say this. Now is not the time to debate misguided or unsuccessful policies. Now is the time to come together and support our brave men and women in uniform. We must let them and their families know that we appreciate their sacrifice. Let us rally around our troops and show the world that our Nation stands united. I hope the unity that Members on both sides of the aisle are showing tonight sends a strong signal to our troops. We are thinking of you and praying for you.

Mr. Speaker, I do have one request. I ask my constituents, and every American, to light a candle and pray for our troops and pray for all the innocent victims of this war.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, at times of great stress, great patriots rise to the occasion. Tonight there are young Americans who are rising to the occasion as they traverse across the desert sands of Iraq, as they soar across the unfriendly skies of Iraq, as they serve on naval ships. Tonight their families have risen to the occasion, as they sadly note the empty place at the dinner table, the bedtime story not read to a young son or daughter, or as they stare at the photograph on the mantel piece and wish that he or she were at home with them.

I know that every Member who has spoken tonight is a great patriot. Every Member who has spoken on both sides loves their country. And I know that many feel a sincere sense of doubt about some of the words that are in tonight's resolution. I would implore every Member, though, to try to rise to the occasion and rise above the words and rise to a symbol of unity that says to every one of these young men and women that their interests are our prime interests. I would ask every Member to support this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) for his great work on the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), who was a distinguished Marine rifleman in Vietnam.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), my good friend, the two of them, for bringing this resolution to the floor.

We all remember the words of Thomas Jefferson: ''We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.''

And we remember the words of Abraham Lincoln: ''With malice toward none, with charity for all, let us work together to bind up the Nation's wounds.''

And another century passing by, we remember Martin Luther King, Jr. and his dream that little children will not

be judged by the color of their skin, but by the content of their character.

This great Nation of ours has seen periods of great joy, wretched despair, and great sacrifice. And still, we come, children of democracy, again here tonight to find our place in history. Our young men and women, once again on the front lines of history, once again in anticipation of great joy, although for some there will be wretched despair because some will not come home, we give them our praise and support for the sacrifice that they are now enduring as they bear the greatest burden of preserving and restoring freedom during this present crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a very familiar poem by a Canadian soldier during World War I who did not make it home:

''In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row by row
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly
Scarce heard amid the guns below.

''We are the Dead. Short days ago
We lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Loved and were loved, and now we lie
In Flanders fields.''

Those who lie in Flanders fields said,
''Take up our quarrel with the foe:
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.''

The Americans in the Middle East are bearing the burden of the present crisis, and we come here tonight to mix and to mingle and to speak and to have differences, but the unity of this Congress, the unity of this Nation will linger for decades to come.

I stand here tonight to support the resolution.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is sadly too late for truth to be the first casualty of this war, because we have already had brave people killed. But truth is taking a beating tonight.

We had the floor manager of this bill object to efforts to democratize the process and give Members more choice to make real votes in the name of letting the House work its will. He blocked unanimous consent requests that would have allowed amendments, that would have allowed separated votes, theoretically in the name of democracy. We had another gentleman from California come and say, ''let us not make this partisan,'' in defense of a resolution that is very partisan, that is drafted in a way that will minimize, rather than maximize, the goal Members pretend to want to be in favor of.

We have had Members who savaged Bill Clinton during the war in Kosovo, now announcing their convergence to the doctrine that once the guns start, the President is untouchable. Why? To use the unanimous admiration felt in this House for our troops for political purposes.

The gentleman from California who is managing the bill asked before, he said, people will be watching and they will say to us on the Democratic side, what are you doing? I will tell them what we were trying to do. We were trying to stop the Republicans from taking the troops politically hostage to serve the President's political purposes. We were trying not to allow the support that is unanimously felt for the troops, the admiration for their courage, the sympathy for the plight that their families are in; we did not want that used to puff up support that does not exist for decisions made by the President.

Sadly, we failed, because the majority used its control of this body, and so Members were put in an unfortunate position. But let us be very clear. Had the majority wanted to do it, there would have been a unanimous vote in this House, every Member voting, in support of the troops. The resolution, those parts of it that support the troops would have been unanimous. Unfortunately, partisanship has resulted in what will be a diminution in the vote that is cast for the support for the troops.

□ 0100

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking leader for yielding time to me.

I stand with great pride and respect in support of this resolution. I support our brave and courageous troops. I support their mission and their Commander in Chief. It is very difficult for me to stand here and say I support the troops and not their mission, and not the Commander in Chief that sent them in harm's way.

Mr. Speaker, we did not ask for this war. It was brought to us unexpectedly, without warning, savagely, tragically by terrorist suicide bombers, terrorists who are desperately trying to get their hands on weapons of mass destruction. Biological and chemical weapons, biological and chemical weapons are being manufactured by the tens of thousands of tons by Saddam Hussein of Iraq. What other choice would we have?

The least this Congress can do on a night when we are losing our military men, with their lives on the line, is to stand here together, Democrat and Republican, and support this resolution, and send a proud message to our men and women in uniform that we are here to stand with them, and stand in the evil day, and stand.

God bless America, God bless our troops, and thank God that we have got these courageous men and women who are willing to put their lives on the line. It is with great pride that I stand here to support this very worthwhile and important resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair will remind all Members that there is a rumbling of noise out in the aisles, and ask Members to keep their conversations down or remove them to the cloakroom.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

(Mr. PEARCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this resolution to the body. I salute the comments of the gentleman just prior to me. I appreciate the observations.

The Second Congressional District of New Mexico is home to the Stealth fighters, the ones who launched the attacks last night. I know personally some of the men and women of that unit, and recognize and know personally some of the National Guard and Reserve troops who are called up. I recognize the sacrifices of their family.

In 1967, I won the lottery. As a result of winning the draft lottery, I went for 3½ years into Vietnam, from the period of 1971 to 1974. I watched personally as a political discussion devolved into disrespect and disregard for what our troops were doing there: the insults, the spitting on, the disrespect that was given to our troops that emanated from a political discussion.

I hope that political discussion does not take the same road now; for even today when I see those Vietnam veterans who were disregarded so much on their return, their simple greeting is, welcome home, brother; and it is done with tears in the eyes of people who faced death every day.

I served at that time without regard for who my Commander in Chief was as far as a politician, but instead, of the duty that I was called to perform. I think our young men and women today are doing the same thing. I respect the sacrifices that their families make; I respect the sacrifices that they themselves make. I ask that we keep them in our prayers.

I support the resolution, and I thank the gentleman for bringing it.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

For the sacrifices of our sons and daughters in uniform and that of their families, no mere resolution or series of resolutions suffices to express our gratitude.

Because the support for our troops is so very strong and the justification for the administration's reckless first-strike doctrine is so very weak, this resolution relies on the pride that all of us feel for our troops in order to carry this weak policy, this faulty and unworthy policy that is so faulty it cannot stand on its own merits, it has to be clumped with the sacrifices of the men and women who serve America tonight in the Persian Gulf.

Just as this administration has failed completely to provide the slightest

link between Saddam Hussein and 9–11, this resolution mistakenly links the invasion of Iraq to the war on terrorism. I support that war. I recognize that containment and disarmament may not end all wars, but they are clearly superior to the new first-strike policy that risks wars without end.

This resolution could have been the one the Senate adopted today by 99 votes. It was good enough for Majority Leader FRIST, it was good enough for JOHN WARNER, but it did not go to the extremes that our colleagues want.

We could have all accepted my request that we approve by unanimous consent support for our troops and families, but they did not have that in mind. They want this back-door approval. We will not be intimidated into silence. If we were to do that, we would be abandoning the very democracy we are pledged to serve and that they tonight defend.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, 12 years ago I helped welcome home 235,000 Army soldiers from my district who had fought in Desert Storm. I saw firsthand how much it meant to them, to those brave Americans, that our Nation respected their service to country; and that is why I join my colleagues tonight in strong support of this resolution.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that a majority of my colleagues in less than 1 hour after this vote will support a budget resolution that the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have called ''callous and unconscionable'' in its treatment of veterans.

Today's troops are tomorrow's veterans. They will watch our deeds even more than our words. So in the spirit of supporting our troops, I propose that we reduce this morning the proposed dividend tax cut by less than 10 percent so we do not have to cut veterans services by $8 billion. Let us honor today's troops and tomorrow's veterans with our words and our deeds.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members will hear me say nothing tonight other than that we have the bravest, the most valiant, the most courageous young men and women in the world standing for our freedom.

But what I will say, Mr. Speaker, is that there is a need to speak the truth. The first truth is that we have lost brave young men and women already, and my deepest sympathy and affection and love for those families. I know full well the burying of young men and women who served in the United States military. I sat at the funeral of one in my constituency, and the family still mourns.

So I rise tonight to stand on the side of peace over war and life over death. I remind this Congress that we are best when we understand what freedom is all about. Democracy is more than words; it is practice. So I agree with Hubert Humphrey when he said, what we need are critical lovers of America, patriots who express their faith in their country by working to improve it.

I stand before the Members to say that I commend and express the gratitude of the Nation to all Members of the United States Armed Forces, whether on active duty, in the National Guard, or in the Reserves, and the civilian employees who support their efforts, as well as the men and women of civilian national security agencies who are participating in the military operations of the Persian Gulf region, for their professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

Mr. Speaker, I will stand undivided in commending the brave men and women tonight, but I will also go to my death for the right to stand to save lives. I would clearly remind those who feel we are dividing the caucus, the Nation, the world, to be reminded that my voice is hoarse but my spirit is not broken; for I remind Members of Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, who wished that he had been able to stand more than 30 years ago to be able to save the lives of 58,000 brave young men and women in the Vietnam War. There are Vietnam veterans, and some came home, thank God. But I would rather be able to say that I stand, as I said, for life over death.

I thank Members for democracy that allows variety. You will never hear me say an unkind word of the Commander in Chief. I stand undivided and in support of the troops of the United States of America.

First and foremost, whether our valiant men and women of the United States Military are away from home to fight a war, to protect a peace, or to enforce disarmament, they will have the full support of the U.S. Congress. We will take every possible step to ensure that they are protected from potential attacks and a difficult environment, that they have the support they need to do their jobs effectively and efficiently, and that we bring them home safely as soon as practicable. I cite my support by referring to Sen. Con. Res. 26.

The Congress: Commends and expresses the gratitude of the Nation to all members of the United States Armed Forces (whether on active duty, in the National Guard, or in the Reserves) and the civilian employees who support their efforts, as well as the men and women of civilian national security agencies who are participating in the military operations in the Persian Gulf region for their professional excellence, dedicated patriotism and exemplary bravery;

Commends and expresses the gratitude of the Nation to the family members of soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and civilians serving in operations against Iraq who have borne the burden of sacrifice and separation from their loved ones;

Expresses its deep condolences to the families of brave Americans who have lost their lives in this noble undertaking, over many year, against Iraq;

Joins all Americans in remembering those who lost their lives during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm in 1991, those still missing from that conflict, including Captain Scott Speicher, USN, and the thousands of Americans who have lost their lives in terrorist attacks over the years, and in the Global War on Terrorism

I continue to cite my support by referring to H. Con. Res. 104.

Whereas the United States Armed Forces, a total force comprised of active, National Guard, and Reserve personnel, are now undertaking courageous and determined operations against the forces of Saddam Hussein's regime;

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives and the American people have the greatest pride in the members of the Armed Forces and strongly support them;

Whereas the United States Armed Forces and allied forces are performing their missions with great courage;

Whereas the ability of the Armed Forces to successfully perform their mission requires the support of their nation, community, and families: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Congress expresses the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation:

To the President as Commander-in-Chief for his firm leadership [in the] ongoing Global War on Terrorism; to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are carrying out their missions with excellence, patriot-ism, and bravery; and to the families of the United States military personnel serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are providing support and prayers for their loved ones currently engaged in military operations in Iraq.

When history is recorded as I stand on this floor tonight, my words will note that I stand undivided from the troops. I have nothing but the greatest honor, respect, and admiration for their courage and their unselfishness.

May God have mercy on their families, and bless them in this time of challenge. And may God give all of our troops the fortitude, strength, and resolve to get their jobs done and then to get back home to their loved ones.

And for those whom we will never see again, they will remain heroes . . . throughout time, never forgotten, Partiots until the end.

God bless them, and God Bless the United States of America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE), who has a son in the United States Navy.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, as I sat last night in front of the TV, I could not take my eyes off of the images that I was seeing because, as a mother, I was thinking of my son. The gentlemen know that a mother's love is different than a father's love.

As I sat there, I thought of my grandmother, who sent two young sons off to war. I thought of my uncle, who was missing in action for over 13 months; of how the family felt when they did not know whether he was dead or alive. I

thought of my brother-in-law, who served in Korea. I thought of him because that, as you know, is the forgotten war. I thought of my brother who served in Germany.

I thought of the heroes among us in this Chamber, the veterans that we love and we honor. I thought of when I first shook the hand of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON). When I found out why his hand was crippled, I thought of how I wanted to kiss his hand and honor him.

Tonight, with a mother's heart, I want to say, God bless each one of the young men and women who are serving us. God bless their families that have made the sacrifice. When we are away from our loved ones, we want to hold them; and we are holding them in our hearts.

Today I got an e-mail from John, and it touched me. Let me just share it with you:

''Hey, everyone, I just wanted to drop an e-mail to you to let you know I am doing great and that I am safe and sound. Here on the ship, the spirits are high. Everyone is going about their business like we do every day. Everyone here is united in the spirit of what we are doing. It gives us a sense of how important our job really is. All the late hours, all the things we put up with, are now justified.

''Just wanted to give you a quick update and thank you for your thoughts and your prayers.''

Tonight my thoughts and prayers are with our Commander in Chief. I pray that the Lord would give him wisdom. I pray for the team that he has surrounded himself with. I pray for the families whose young people are serving.

I want to give a clear message to every one of those young men and young women: never again in this Nation should we tell anyone who is serving that we do not appreciate what they have done, because we appreciate every one of them. We love them and we hold them in our hearts tonight. God willing they will come home so we can hold them in our arms again.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, of the over 200,000 men and women who are in and around Iraq this evening, I want to just touch on one person who was highlighted today in the New York Times, Captain Cynthia Brito from Woodside, Queens, my hometown. She is the daughter of Ecuadoran immigrants Angel Brito, a limousine driver, and his wife Ines, a jewelry worker.

□ 0115

Captain Brito is a graduate from Fordham University in the Bronx, and she is serving as a dentist in the Army in the 561st Medical Company of V Corps.

Captain Brito represents the best of the men and women who are fighting on our behalf on the front lines. She is the daughter of immigrants, a female officer in a male-dominated Army, and a dentist with medical training. We know that she will be on the front line.

So much this evening has been said about the war, and I do not think enough has been said about our young men and women troops fighting over there. These mostly young men and women like Captain Brito are the ones truly making the sacrifice for our country.

Men, women, white, African American, Latino, Asian, Christian, Jews and Muslims, they are all the faces of this country. Our prayers go out to each and every one of them this evening and to all their families, especially to Cynthia Brito, who makes all of us proud.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the troops, to our troops overseas and everywhere in the world, thank you. I thank them for their bravery, thank them for their courage, thank them for believing in this Nation, thank them for being willing to give their life for our freedom. We love them, we support them, and I am sure that is all 535 Members of Congress.

As I look at this resolution, to me it is like a contract, and if a person signs a contract, that means they agree with everything in the contract. I do not agree with the doctrine of preemptive strike. Therefore, as to page 4, line 4 through 7, I disagree, and therefore, I cannot sign on to this contract.

I really wanted to sign on to and vote for this resolution, and we had an opportunity to speak as one Congress, House-Senate alike, sending the same message. That is unity. What a great opportunity we had. What a great opportunity we missed.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND).

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I stand tonight in support of this resolution not because I agree with the decisions that have brought us to this moment, but because I love, honor and revere those brave young Americans who are fighting for us even as we sit in this Chamber at this late hour.

I am troubled tonight because I believe one way we honor our current troops fighting in Iraq and around the world is to honor those who have served before them, our veterans, veterans like my brother who turned 79 years old last week and who served our Nation in World War II.

Very soon the vast majority of us will vote for this resolution to honor our troops, as we should. I am troubled that soon thereafter many of my colleagues in this Chamber will cast another vote, a vote that will cut $28 billion from veterans' benefits. I am puzzled that so many would salute the troops with one hand and vote to cut $28 billion from veterans' benefits with the other hand.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes for this resolution and to vote no for the budget resolution.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, last October I thought that it was absolutely necessary to disarm Saddam Hussein. I still think so, but I thought then and I think now that Saddam could have been disarmed without resort to war. So I voted against the resolution giving the President complete authority to use military force at his sole discretion.

Now our country is at war and our young people in harm's way. I unequivocally support our troops in their valiant role, and I, therefore, support this resolution.

This resolution expresses support for our troops and for their families and for the President's leadership ''in the conduct of military operations in Iraq,'' and only for his conduct of those military operations. It does not, as some have said, express support for the President's decision to resort to war or for the administration's diplomacy that has led us to war.

Our troops and their families deserve our support, and I will express my support for them by voting for this resolution.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I disagree with this war, but I will always support our brave men and women in uniform and their families. They must be treated with dignity and respect, both while the battles are being fought and when they come home.

This means that our soldiers have the best military equipment and protective gear and that their families are cared for while they are away. The children and spouses of our military must not be on welfare rolls, and they must not have to survive off of food stamps or live in substandard homes.

The families of reservists and the National Guard should not suffer economically while their loved ones are called up for Active Duty. The families of enlisted soldiers must have salaries adequate to lift them out of poverty, and the United States must fulfill its promises by providing all necessary care and promised benefits to our enlisted and Reserve military personnel as active members and as veterans.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK), who is a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand here tonight to endorse this resolution, but I must say that this resolution has language like

many pieces of legislation that moves through the body of this Congress. There is language in it that I do not agree with, and I am glad that I am able to state that as an American, but I think it is important that we remember that boys and girls, I mean teenagers, I also mean mothers and fathers, I also mean sons and daughters, are getting sand in their teeth right now defending our country, and I think it is important we send a very strong message to not only their families, but to their loved ones that this Congress stands firmly behind them.

I respect the Members that are going to vote for the resolution. I respect the Members that are not going to vote for this resolution, and I commend their patriotism for standing up for what they believe in, but I think it is imperative that we remember that we must have resolutions that every Member of this Congress can vote for because we are all patriots, and we all believe in the American way, and it is important that American families understand that we are together and united always when it comes down to defending this country.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of this resolution.

I do not necessarily agree with every word of the resolution, but how many times have all of us voted for bills and resolutions that we do not agree with 100 percent? We have to make a choice, and I choose to support our troops. That is clearly the thrust of this resolution, to support the brave men and women that do us all proud.

War is never easy. War should always be a last resort, and while we can question the policies of any administration, the men and women that go to preserve freedom for our great country, we owe them our deepest gratitude.

I think it is very fitting that the Congress show our brave men and women that we strongly support them and that we join hands regardless of how some of us may feel about policy.

I voted to give the President the authority, and I think that now is the time to stand behind our President, to stand behind our troops and to move forward with one voice. Support the resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I rise this morning to honor the men and women of our armed services by supporting the support the troops resolution.

I believe the time has come for Americans to put aside our differences concerning Operation Iraqi Freedom and to stand together to show solidarity for the men and women in our Armed Forces. It is time for all Americans to show their support for the mothers and fathers, the sons and daughters and friends and loved ones who are serving our Nation and defending our freedom.

Our Nation, at the guidance of our President, is facing the inevitable action in Iraq. War is something that we would never dream of for our children to see or to hear. There comes a time, however, when we must unite together and show the enemy that we will stand up for our freedoms, freedoms that our forefathers fought for and won, and we will fight to ensure that the United States remains a beacon of hope and freedom that brightens the world.

One woman in my district, Judith Allen of Denton, Texas, has done her part. After saying good-bye to her son, Private Joseph Paul Terrace, who is part of the Army's 101st Airborne Division, Judith formed the Military Support Group of Denton, Texas. The group is open to families and friends with loved ones in the Armed Forces.

Judith's son answered the call to duty and said in a recent interview with the Denton Record Chronicle, ''Nobody actually wants to go to war, but they want to do their job, and they want to keep people safe, and we realize how much a real threat things are these days.''

In my home county of Denton, Texas, county Judge Mary Horn and her husband Jim have a son also named Jim who is now in an undisclosed region in the Gulf. Keith Self, a man who was in the Republican primary with me in our six-way primary last spring, we were opposed during the primary, but we became friends and have remained friends since that time, Lieutenant Colonel Self was recalled to Active Duty and now serves in an undisclosed location in the Gulf.

My own son Mike serves in the Air National Guard in Fort Worth, Texas. While he has not been called into Active Duty, part of his unit has and is now in an undisclosed location in the Gulf.

I do not believe that in our ordinary life we think about the sacrifices that our U.S. military personnel make, from the hardship of time away from families and children to the hundreds of reservists who unselfishly answer the call to duty. These men and women protect our borders, shield our skies, guard our country, believe in America and support our President. These brave souls will march the same steps of previous generations who gave of their lives to defend our homeland and to secure the blessings of liberty for our country and for generations to come.

While our troops and allies exemplify the true spirit of patriotism, we, the citizens at home, must remain united for freedom and show the world we believe in liberty more than the horror of allowing a deadly dictator to threaten the security of liberty.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), an Army veteran and distinguished Member of this body.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to come and stand before my colleagues this evening, and regardless of how we got here, I think the time has come that we ought to stand together for the troops, and so I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for bringing this to the floor.

I have to reflect on some things, as many of us have done, veterans here, as many of us are, and the lack of support for the two times I went to Vietnam. I was reflecting on that this last Monday when I went to three different communities to activate troops, went off from Fort Riley and will go to the Middle East.

I looked at the faces of the men and women and the uniform, and I realized how much I appreciated when that gymnasium in these three different towns, three different locations, that was packed to the walls, the support of the families and the community was so meaningful and so special and so appreciated.

□ 0130

So I support the resolution, and I encourage Members to support it, to support our men and women in uniform. God bless America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

(Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member, for bringing this resolution to the floor to express our support for our citizen soldiers, all of our men and women who proudly wear the uniform of our armed services, as they are now in harm's way fighting the war against terror in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, I am not here to debate the substance of the merits of the war, but only to express our support, especially for the families and loved ones who anxiously wait and wonder if their husbands, wives, brothers and sisters, mothers or fathers, aunts and uncles and friends will return from the war.

As a Vietnam veteran, nothing warms the hearts and minds of our soldiers, sailors, airmen or Marines more than to know that we here in this Chamber support and pray for their welfare, knowing that at any moment our men and women in the military walk a very thin line between life and death.

Mr. Speaker, the words of Martin Luther King, Jr., ring well in my ears tonight. He said, ''In the end, we will not remember the words of our enemies, but the silence of our friends.''

Mr. Speaker, God bless our men and women in the Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee (Mr. HUNTER) and our senior ranking member, Mr. SKELTON, for bringing this resolution to the floor, to express our fullest support for our citizens-soldiers—all our men and women who proudly wear the uniforms of our armed services, as they are now in harm's way fighting the war in Iraq.

I am not here to debate the substance or the merits of the war, but only to express our support especially for the families and loved ones who anxiously wait and wonder if their husbands and wives, fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts and friends will return from the war.

As a Vietnam veteran, Mr. Speaker, nothing warms the hearts and minds of our soldiers, our sailors, our marines and our airmen more than to know that we here in this Chamber support and pray for their welfare—knowing that any moment our men and women in the military walk a very thin line between life and death.

Mr. Speaker, the words of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. rings well in my ears tonight. He said, ''In the end, we will not remember the words of our enemies, but the silence of our friends.''

Mr. Speaker, as the most powerful military power in the world, we need to also be reminded of a statement made centuries ago by Thucydides who said, ''Of all manifestations of power, restraint impresses most men.''

Mr. Speaker, God bless our men and women in the armed forces.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing we all agree upon, we are grateful to our troops and their families. We respect the men and women in our Armed Forces, and we admire their patriotism and bravery. We all recognize that no matter what the policy disagreements about the steps that took us to this day of invasion, our troops are doing their duty and putting their bodies on the line for our country. They are in our prayers, and we all hope for a speedy conclusion and a safe return for each of them.

How fine it would have been if the right-wingers in charge of this House had put aside their partisanship for just this evening and agreed to write a clean resolution that supported our troops; but no. One can always count on them to try to wedge an issue, divide people and make partisan what should be purely American.

There are plenty of things in this resolution that are just not true, but I am going to vote for it because of clause 2 and 3. I do support and appreciate our Armed Forces and their families. I cannot say the same thing about the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) and the rest of the Republican leaders who once again have proven by their actions this evening that they are more interested in partisan advantage for their party than unity and success for our country. They dishonor our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines who are the real patriots we seek to honor by this resolution.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just say to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services, that I would hope that the gentleman would discourage Members like the Member who just spoke from using this time when we are supposed to be commending our troops from demeaning other Members of this House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I had this and I was not going to use it. I am on the same side as the gentleman. I am in the minority of my party on this issue. But I want to tell Members that they cannot have it both ways. On December 13, 1995, our troops were deployed. Our troops were deployed in Bosnia. They were deployed for the purposes of keeping the peace. They were successful. Thousands of people were being killed. The gentleman remembers that, and our troops were deployed for the purpose of keeping the peace pursuant to an agreement by President Clinton and others in the NATO alliance.

There was a resolution on the floor. That resolution was a very brief resolution and it had one resolved clause, just one and it said this: That the House of Representatives unequivocally supports the men and women of the United States Armed Forces who are carrying out their mission in support of peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina with professional excellence, dedicated patriotism, and exemplary bravery.

The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) voted ''no'' on that resolution. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) voted ''no'' on that resolution. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), who spoke earlier, voted ''no'' on that resolution. The gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who talked about the troops, voted ''no'' on that resolution.

I am with my friend on the substance, but when the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) gets up and makes her statement and she is criticized, remember December 13, 1995.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), a distinguished member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for yielding me this time.

To the point on Bosnia, a lot of us had misgivings. I remember going there fully intent on finding kids to tell me it was a bad idea. I met a kid from Ocean Springs, Mississippi. I regret that I cannot remember his first name. His last name is Rhodes. I asked him should we be here. It was a couple of weeks before Thanksgiving. It was snowing and crummy. It is 80 degrees in Ocean Springs, and it is 18 degrees in Bosnia.

And the kid said, Yeah. I was dumbfounded. I said, Why? He said because I am keeping women from getting raped. I am keeping children from getting murdered. I am keeping old folks from getting drug out into the street and getting tortured at night. That is why I joined the United States Army, to be a good guy.

Tonight we vote to commend the 250,000 young Americans, just like Private Rhodes, who are doing the very same thing.

To my colleagues, I would say every other generation of Americans, check the record, every other generation of Americans voted to pay the cost of those wars right then and not stick the young Private Rhodeses with that bill. Let us not be the first generation of Americans that after we welcome the Private Rhodeses home, stick them with the bill from this war.

I am going to vote for the resolution because it is exactly right, but I am going to vote against their budget because they are sticking those 250,000 young Americans and their children with this bill. That is inexcusable. Let us vote for the troops. Let us vote to pay the bill. Those of us fortunate enough not to be on the front lines, not to watch our buddies lose an arm or leg, their vision, not to watch our buddies die, at least ought to be willing to pay the bill for this war right now and not stick our kids with it.

In the past 2 years, we have run up $802 billion worth of debt. That is no prize to hand those kids when they come home. Let us support the troops and pay for this war right now. Let us be honest with the American people and leave them a Nation that is worthy of their sacrifice.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair reminds all Members to turn off their electronic devices.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Robert Kennedy once remarked, ''All of us, from the wealthiest and most powerful men, to the weakest and hungriest children, share one precious possession, the name American.''

So tonight as our brave men and women in uniform fight for freedom and our security half a world away, we come here not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans, Americans united as one in support of our Armed Forces, and for the success of the cause for which they willingly risk their lives.

That cause, liberty and freedom from fear, inspired our Founding Fathers 227 years ago, and guides our action today. It is a measure of our Nation's greatness that when freedom's call came at

this hour, the finest, best-trained, most skilled and best-equipped military in the history of the world answered the call as previous generations have done.

Our thoughts and prayers are with our troops and with the troops of our allies, four of whom also lost their lives this night, and our thoughts as well are with the families who wait. We are with you. We honor you; we honor your sacrifice. We hail your courage, and we pray for your safe return.

We are confident that the Iraqi people who have been terrorized for so long under Saddam Hussein's brutal reign will soon throw off the shackles of tyranny and see that your mission has always been one of liberation and not of aggression. There should be no doubt we shall win this war, and we must win the peace that will follow. We are committed to a liberated and free Iraq where individual Iraqis can decide their own fate, where basic human rights and the rule of law are respected, and where that nation's tremendous resources are the property of a proud Iraqi people, and not plundered by an international criminal who has killed his own people and who continues to threaten the security of the region and the world.

Saddam Hussein believed, like other dictators and despots who pockmark history, that our democratic debate was evidence of disunity and weakness. He was wrong.

In fact, as all of us who are privileged to serve here know, that ability to debate, that ability to disagree, that ability to want options is what makes America so strong, so envied.

Tonight we stand as one behind our brave Armed Forces. No matter the votes, we stand as one and pray for a quick end to this conflict and to the safe return of our brave men and women and the brave men and women of every nation who will fight in those sands.

May God protect our men and women. May God give wisdom to our Commander in Chief, and may God continue to bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BURNS).

Mr. BURNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of the resolution honoring our troops, their families and our President. It is time that we unite in this recognition and recognize the sacrifice that all pay for our freedom.

I am reminded of two boyhood friends who served in Vietnam, but did not return, Emery Manor Smith, a fine young man, a good friend and a great neighbor. Also I am reminded of another friend, Joe Berry, another great friend and neighbor. I am reminded of a nephew who served in the first Gulf War, Scott Baker, and I honor him tonight for his service to America. I have a neighbor, Adam Ivy, who currently serves in the Gulf as a United States Marine. He serves proudly to protect America from a dictator who would inflict enormous pain and suffering, and to free the people of Iraq.

□ 0145

Tonight we need to unite as one in support of our troops, in support of their families and in support of our President. I believe, and I am sure you agree, we live in the greatest Nation in the world. It is time that we honor those who protect our freedom. May God bless America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of our troops, but on principle must vote against the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my heartfelt support for our men and women who are currently engaged in war with Iraq. Although I disagree with this war, and the policies that have brought us to this point—our troops deserve the full support of America. The more than 200,000 courageous men and women in Iraq represent the best of America. They have made the ultimate sacrifice to serve their country and protect and defend freedom.

The troops are ordinary men and women who are doing extraordinary things. Many of our service people have left family behind to fulfill their commitment to serve. The men and women of our armed services epitomise the biblical proverb: "No greater love is there than one who would lay down his/her life for their fellow man."

I want to assure the families of our service men and women that I stand fully behind them. In addition, I will do everything that I can to ensure that they have the best equipment and resources necessary to carry out their mission and provide for their safe return.

While I have no doubt that America will prevail militarily. It is my hope and expectation that we will redouble our efforts to seek collective, nonmilitary solutions to these critical issues. Also, as we engage in war I hope that we take every effort to minimize collateral damage to civilians and innocent people.

Again, I want to commend and honor the outstanding men and women of our armed services who are carrying out their orders with great distinction.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution and stand 1,000 percent behind our brave and selfless men and women in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

At this decisive moment in history, all Americans stand 1000 percent behind our brave and selfless men and women in uniform.

I have no doubt America will achieve a military victory in Iraq. The road after that will be long, and require sustained commitment along with the support of our allies.

No one can predict fully the course of world events as this war begins, so we must draw our strength from one another. This is a time for reflection, and kindness to one another.

I extend deepest respect to all the people of our community country who have open discussed and not shirked from their responsibilities as free citizens in addressing how best to defeat rising terrorism around the world. Your voices will shape a wiser course for the future.

May the God that creates and sustains us all protect the world's children for a general of peace to come.

Mr. SKELTON. May I inquire of the Chair how many minutes we have remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As I mentioned earlier in the evening, this is a solemn moment. I wish I had the eloquence of diction to sway everyone within hearing distance to vote for this resolution. However, in my mind it is one that speaks loudly and clearly about the young men and young women who wear the uniform today, many of whom will be in harm's way very soon. They are all not Active Duty. We have 212,000 National Guard and reservists called up; 26,000 are in the Gulf area. Our hearts and thoughts are with them.

Earlier in the evening the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) quoted that famous poem that came out of the First World War, Flanders Fields. Part of that poem reads:

To you from failing hands we throw
The torch; be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

Every generation, it seems, has thrown the torch of freedom to hold it high. The generation today that stands guard for Americans wherever they may be, fighting terrorists or in the Gulf, are the ones that are holding that torch high today. We salute them and thank them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone in this body to support this resolution. I give a special thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the chairman, a veteran of the Army, the Vietnam conflict, for his courtesy and help in putting this resolution to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ).

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to address the House tonight, especially this night. I suspicion that many of us came here because, as we would put it, we love this Nation. We love America. As I sit here and listened to this debate on this resolution tonight, it also crossed my mind that this is a resolution about that very thing, about loving America.

Let me tell my colleagues a story about what loving America really is. I have some childhood friends back home in Colorado, Karen and Leon Palmer. I

went to grade school and high school with them. They dated. They got married. They had but one son. His name is Matthew. Matthew got an appointment and has graduated from the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs and is now a pilot in the United States Air Force. In fact, he may be one of the brave pilots that engaged Saddam Hussein just last evening.

When I came back here to be sworn in for my very first time in Congress, this 108th Congress, Matthew's mother Karen came by my house and she gave me a picture of Matthew inside the cockpit of his F–16. She could tell that this action that has now been joined might be coming. She looked at me and she said, ''Bob, please take care of Matthew. Keep him safe. Keep him well equipped. I would love to have him come home, but,'' she said, and this is what love is, ''more than that, I love this Nation, and I love the ideals of this Nation, and I love what this Nation is willing to protect. If I have to sacrifice my only son for the sake of this Nation and for the sake of liberty, Leon and I are prepared to do that.''

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater love than that.

There has been enough partisanship in this body tonight. We ought to check our partisanship at the doors of this great Chamber and vote in support of this resolution about love and about freedom and support our troops.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I offer my prayers, heartfelt sentiments and unwavering support to our American soldiers who are facing enemy fire in a faraway land. I also offer my prayers and my support to their families who eagerly await their safe return. However, I do not support the dastardly attempt by my Republican colleagues to demean our love and concern for our soldiers by shamelessly attempting to transfix our focus from them onto the narrow-minded and misguided policies of their Commander in Chief.

Mr. Speaker, Scripture says in the book of Proverbs 29:2, ''When the righteous rule, the people rejoice. But when a wicked man rules, the people groan.'' Thousands of my fellow Americans are on the streets this night, on the streets of this Nation, protesting this unjust war. They groan because they do not understand and I do not understand why we are at war.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully cannot support this resolution as written.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. One of the age-old realities of politics is that old men sit in judgment and send young men off to war, some to die. Today we have young men and women fighting in the Gulf, fighting for our country. As with many of my colleagues, I have reservations, I have disagreements, I have questions. But I think at this moment in time, it is important that we put aside those questions, disagreements and questions, if you will, about how we got to this point, to unify behind these young men and women and let them know that they have our full support, because we indeed are sending them off to fight and perhaps die.

So this evening, despite those reservations I may have, I am going to support this resolution. I hope my colleagues will do so as well and present to the world a united front of America, 100 percent behind our young men and women in harm's way. God bless these young men and women, and God bless America.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed. I had hoped that this time, that this resolution which was brought forward this evening would bring us together as a House, and perhaps after having some partisan work and working on a policy, budget policy, which often divides us, we would come together and find some common ground in commending our troops and commending our President.

I think anybody who must be watching this from overseas must be wondering at this point, what is in this resolution that so many Members have come out from the Democrat side to condemn? I thought it might be good to go through the resolution, because this resolution is extremely similar to the resolution that we passed in 1991 after we took our first action in Iraq.

What did we do here? The whereas clauses talk about the fact that there was an Iraq Liberation Act of 1998 in which we stated it would be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime. That vote passed, Mr. Speaker, overwhelmingly, Democrat and Republican. It also states that on October 16, 2002, the President signed into law House Joint Resolution 114 of the 107th Congress, the authorization, and I would say this clearly for my colleagues, many of whom probably voted against this, but nonetheless it was the authorization for the use of military force against Iraq. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, that vote passed 296–133. It passed overwhelmingly. It passed more overwhelmingly than the vote that we passed in 1991.

So what was so wrong with this resolution? This resolution followed the law, the steps that we took under the law, under United Nations resolution and under our own law that brought us to the culmination of this event in which it was necessary for the United States to interject force into the Iraq theater. We talked about Security Council Resolution 1441, now well known to most Members of this body that voted unanimously that Iraq will face serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations to disarm in accordance with all relevant United Nations resolutions.

It also said that Iraq remained in material breach of the relevant United Nations resolutions. That was clearly stated by the reports that were adopted by the United Nations. It was in material breach, and Saddam Hussein is in material breach of his obligations.

So just like the resolution in 1991, we followed the law. We followed this trail of steps, very patient steps that the United States took, including acts that were signed by a Democrat President, stating that it was our policy to bring about a free Iraq. That is what we state in this resolution that you think is so poorly worded.

What else did we do? When you get down to the meat of the resolution, and we talk about what it actually says, let us go to the resolved clause. First I want to go to the resolved clause that we passed in 1991 regarding the President and the troops and their families. We said in 1991 that we acclaim the President for his decisive leadership, unerring judgment and sound decisions. We say in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that we express our support and appreciation to the President as Commander in Chief for his firm leadership and decisive action in the conduct of military operations in Iraq as part of the ongoing global war on terrorism.

□ 0200

Now, many of the faces that I see here who are condemning this resolution were thanking Mr. Rumsfeld a few hours ago for the clear judgment that is being shown by this administration in prosecuting this war. I had many Members come up to me from the Democrat side who said he was doing the right thing. They said we were lucky to have a person of that capability. We are lucky to have a team like this team that President George Bush has put together. So we commended our President because he is the Commander in Chief. We commended him in 1991. We commend him tonight.

What else did we do? In 1991 we expressed our highest commendation and sincerest appreciation to the members of the United States Armed Forces and other members of the international coalition who participated in Operation Desert Storm and have demonstrated exceptional bravery, dedication and professionalism.

Where is the trick language in this that you object to so much?

And what did we do in this resolution? We said that we express our appreciation ''to the members of the United States Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom,'' the present operation, ''who are carrying out their missions with excellence, patriotism, and bravery.'' Where is the trick language there? Where is the double meaning?

Now we go to the families, and we say in this resolution ''to the families of the United States military personnel

serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom, who are providing support and prayers for their loved ones currently engaged in military operations in Iraq.'' We give the unequivocal support and appreciation of the Nation. That is what we do in this.

What did we do in 1991? We said almost the same thing, and we conveyed our deepest sympathy and condolences to the families and friends of the United States and coalition forces who had been injured or killed during that operation.

So, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is extremely similar to the resolution that we passed in 1991, I might add, with a Democrat Congress, those words that I read to you about the President exercising unerring judgment even though many of the Democratic leadership had voted against this operation in a much closer vote, incidentally, than the vote to allow force that we took this fall. So they talked about his judgment, and many of them have talked privately about his good judgment in the present operation when we are referring to the present President.

The President and his team have done an excellent job. So maybe what we are really talking about is the cause. The many Members who I think did not represent a majority of the Democrat Party who came out here could have worked this resolution if they wanted it to say we do not really believe in the cause, but I do not think a majority of the Democrat Party wanted to say that because I do not think they believe it. I think they do believe in the cause. Do the Members know something else, Mr. Speaker? I think the people we are commending that we have been talking about all night believe in this cause, and maybe that is the difference between those people, those people wearing the uniform of the United States, and the people who wanted to use this forum to continue to debate this policy.

The facts are this body believes in this cause. We have given permission to the President to use our most valuable asset, our most precious resource, our Armed Forces, to ensure that this just cause is carried out. And, Mr. Speaker, since we have all given our foreign policy statements here tonight, maybe we should listen to the foreign policy statement of a Marine leader just before he took his people across that line, and I want to read a statement that was issued to every member of the First Marine Division before they went into operation today. It comes from the commanding general, J.N. Mattis, and this is what he states. Even though I am sure some Members of the other side could take exception to his language, this is his position:

''For decades Saddam Hussein has tortured, imprisoned, raped, and murdered the Iraqi people, invaded neighboring countries without provocation, and threatened the world with weapons of mass destruction. The time has come to end his reign of terror. On your young shoulders rest the hopes of mankind.

''When I give you the word, together we will cross the line of departure close with those forces that choose to fight and destroy them. Our fight is not with the Iraqi people nor is it with members of the Iraqi Army who choose to surrender. While we move swiftly and aggressively against those who resist, we will treat all others with decency, demonstrating chivalry and soldierly compassion for people who have endured a lifetime under Saddam's oppression.

''Chemical attack, treachery, and the use of the innocent as human shields can be expected as can other unethical tactics. Take it all in stride. Be the hunter, not the hunted. Never allow your unit to be caught with its guard down. Use good judgment and act in the best interests of our Nation.

''You are part of the world's most feared and trusted force. Engage your brain before you engage your weapon. Share your courage with each other as we enter the uncertain terrain north of the Line of Departure. Keep faith in your comrades on your left and right and Marine air overhead. Fight with a happy heart and a strong spirit.

''For the mission's sake, our country's sake, and the sake of the men who carried the Division's colors in past battles, who fought for life and never lost their nerve, carry out your mission and keep your honor clean. Demonstrate to the world that there is 'No Better Friend, No Worse Enemy' than a United States Marine.''

Ladies and gentlemen, those people that wear the uniform do not have the disagreement with this resolution that so many Members from the other side had tonight. They know this is a good cause. They believe in this cause. They share this cause. They also believe that they have a great President leading them.

May God bless them. May God bless America.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for his eloquent statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

(Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of this resolution to support our men and women in harm's way serving this country.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Some discussion has been held tonight regarding foreign policy. Let me say my foreign policy. I speak of the valor and the courage and the dedication of young men and young women who are protecting freedom and safety of our country and of the free world, whether they be on the outskirts of Iraq or in Afghanistan or wherever they may be in this world. I hope everyone will see themselves clear to support and vote for this resolution so we can say thanks to those brave souls of America. We have lost some, as was recently said this evening, whose families will grieve, but it is for us to carry on and say thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the great Roman orator once said that gratitude is the greatest of all virtues, and I hope tonight by this vote we can express our gratitude and exhibit that virtue by voting for this resolution.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, this evening I rise in strong support of the work that our U.S. Armed Forces are doing in Iraq and throughout the Middle East. However, I cannot support the resolution offered by my friend, Mr. Hunter. I truly believe that war is not the answer to this question facing the world community.

I truly believe that Saddam Hussein is an evil dictator and should not be allowed to oppress his people or threaten the rest of the world. Having said that, I would note that we should have given diplomacy a chance to work and more importantly, given the inspectors a chance to do their job to avert this military action.

As a New Yorker, no one understands the reality of terrorism more than me and the people of Brooklyn; we all lost family and friends that day and were all thankful for the outpouring of support we received from the nation and the world in wake of the September 11th tragedies. Having said that, after seeing my city attacked with my own eyes that day I believe that the actions of this administration are wrong and short sighted.

Once again, Mr. Speaker I stand with our troops this evening, but cannot commend those who would not work with the world community to find a peaceful solution to the problems that face our ever-shrinking world.

Tonight I say thank you to our troops and know that I am praying for their safe return to America, but cannot vote for this resolution because I do not believe this to be a just war.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I support the brave young men and women who are following orders that have placed them in harm's way. I hope and pray for their safe return. My thoughts and prayers are with them, their families and loved ones in this difficult time.

While I will always support the troops, I cannot support this mission. Last night, the President ordered an unprovoked aggressive attack against Iraq in violation of American traditions of defensive war.

This war is wrong. As a nation we must come together to support the troops, but continue to challenge the policy that has put them at grave risk.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am voting for this resolution because, like every American, I want to see all of our troops come home safely and want to show my support for them and their families. I also want to see this war ended as quickly as possible, with a minimum of Iraqi casualties.

I am disturbed, however, about the partisan nature of this resolution. Instead of simply indicating our support for the troops, this resolution has language in it which some might suggest indicates support for the policies of the President which have led us to where we are today. Let me be very clear. I do not support those policies. I do not support the concept of ''preemptive war.'' I do not support a foreign policy which undermines the United Nations,

and which alienates us from virtually all of our allies. I believe that all of these actions create a horrendous precedent which makes our country and our planet less safe, which could well result in more terrorism, not less terrorism. I voted against giving the President the authority to go to war in Iraq and I believe that history will determine that was the right vote.

Saddam Hussein is an evil dictator but I believe that, with the support of the international community and the United Nations, he could be contained and his weapons of mass destruction could be removed from him—without war and without killing and at a fraction of the cost that this war and occupation will cost. I also believe that with enforced and prolonged inspections, and with a strong commitment to human rights, the international community could bring democracy to Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget the phenomenon of ''blow-back,'' or unintended consequences. The U.S., the most powerful military force on earth, will surely win this war in short order, but I'm not so sure that this victory will seem quite so clean and positive five years from now. I'm not so sure that the American occupation of Iraq will have all of the positive results that some think.

Let me conclude by expressing my outrage about how, at a time when young men and women are in the line of fire in Iraq, the Republican leadership, on this very night, is voting to cut the benefits of our veterans. On one hand we vote to ''support the troops,'' while on the other hand we vote to deny health care and other promised benefits to those veterans who fought in the first Persian Gulf War, or Vietnam, or Korea or World War II. What hypocrisy! Yes. We apparently have billions available for tax breaks for the rich, but not enough to keep the promises we made to our veterans.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the American men and women in uniform and their families who are providing key support and bearing such a heavy burden. Congress stands in solidarity with those given such a somber responsibility. This resolution is testimony to that unity.

My vote on this resolution affirms my support for our troops, but should not be mistaken as an affirmation of the administration's foreign policies and diplomatic efforts, which I find wanting.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, nearly 250,000 men and women serving in the United States Armed Forces are deployed in Operation Iraqi Freedom. We have just had notice of the first casualties with the crash of a Marine helicopter. I would like to convey my condolences to their families; my heart and prayers are with them at this difficult time.

With the consideration of this resolution, I and every other Member of the United States House of Representatives wish to honor the courage and service of all our troops to this nation. Our thoughts and prayers are with them for their prompt and safe return home to their families.

The House of Representatives could have better demonstrated support this evening for members of the Armed Forces past and present during deliberation and votes on the Budget resolution. The resolution that just passed will cut veterans benefits and fails to fulfill the commitment to lifelong care and care of dependents made to our young men and women at the time of enlistment. I voted against the Republican budget Resolution that mandated the cuts in veterans benefits. Instead I voted for an alternative budget resolution that would have fully funded veterans programs and met our nation's obligation to those who have served selflessly in defense of our freedoms.

I will vote for this resolution to further demonstrate my support for our young men and women in the armed forces. I only wish that all those who join me in this vote had demonstrated a similar commitment when it came to full funding for veterans programs. In casting my aye vote for the troops, I want to note that I would have offered a motion to strike the whereas clause beginning at the bottom of page 2 extending to the top of page 3. I also find that the assertion at the end of line 6 ending on line 7 (p. 4) is not supported by any facts released by the CIA or other intelligence agencies and was, in fact, debunked in a publicly released CIA document last fall.

I have previously made known my concerns with the new policies of pre-emptive and preventative war. I have also spoken of the failure of the United States Congress to fulfill its duty under Article I Section 8, the duty to debate and declare war. Now, as we mourn the first casualties and honor our soldiers still on the front lines, is not the time to continue that debate despite the concerns I expressed earlier. However, there will come a day in the not too distant future when the House will no longer be able to avoid its duties.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer my support for our troops and for this resolution.

First and foremost my heart and prayers are with the brave men and women of our Armed Forces who right now are engaged in a dangerous, but necessary war to rid the world of an evil dictator who threatens the world with his weapons of mass destruction. Our troops are courageously risking their lives for, not only the freedom and security of the people of the United States, but for the people of Iraq, and the entire world.

For 12 years, the United States and United Nations have called on Saddam Hussein to destroy his weapons of mass destruction. The U.N. passed 16 resolutions ordering him to do so. He has chosen not to comply. HIs history of using weapons of mass destruction, plus the likelihood that he could give these weapons of mass destruction to his agents in the U.S. or to terrorist organizations to use against Americans at home or abroad make him a clear and present danger to America.

The risks of this war are great, but the risks of not going to war to disarm Saddam Hussein now are far greater. With September 11 very much in my mind, I believe that our government must be proactive in protecting our people and our homeland.

I am mindful of, and have had extensive discussions with, the many people of good faith in my district who oppose taking action against Saddam Hussein at this point in time. I have great respect for them and for their strongly held views. But I hope that all Americans will join me today in supporting our troops as these brave young Americans place themselves in harm's way on behalf of our nation.

I pray for the safety of the brave men and women in our armed forces and for the innocent Iraqi people. I look forward to the elimination of Saddam's weapons of mass destruction and to the liberation of the Iraqi people from this murderous, sadistic dictator.

May God bless our troops and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 104.

The security of our Nation and the freedoms we enjoy will not be held hostage by a brutal dictator or terrorists whose only aim is to destroy our way of life. We will not live in fear.

The very real threat of an attack on America by terrorists who would use weapons of mass destruction cannot be left to chance. This risk is too great.

In the face of such threats, our current military action in Iraq, with our allies, is warranted.

As many of my colleagues have said before me this evening: Saddam Hussein must be stopped. His arsenal of terror must be eliminated. The terrorist networks with whom he allies himself must be destroyed. America must and will lead the free world to disarm Saddam Hussein and stop terrorism.

We have a duty to protect our people, and this we will do with courage and conviction.

This is the call to action our young men and women in uniform have heard, and for their sacrifices, we owe them our gratitude, our prayers and all of America's support.

Our Commander in Chief has given our brave, young soldiers their orders. They are following those orders with precision, professionalism, compassion and courage. At the end of this battle, the world will be a safer place without Hussein, his anthrax, toxins and nerve gas, or the terrorists he aids and abets.

Our troops now go into battle to defend our Nation and protect our children's future.

As those of us who have seen war know, the price of freedom is paid for by the sacrifices of those who serve. Their courage is our inspiration.

We wish them Godspeed, swift victory, and safe return.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as I vote for this resolution tonight, I am mindful that many of my constituents remain opposed to United States action in Iraq, and believe it reflects an abuse of United States power which unnecessarily risks human life and sets us on a dangerous path for the future.

I want to explain to those constituents, whose views are heartfelt and well intended, why I respectfully disagree.

The President's decision to use force to remove Saddam Hussein from power and eliminate his WMD was, indeed, controversial. I had hoped diplomacy would succeed, and that, even if it failed, the threat of imminent force would cause the Iraqi regime to seek exile.

One day, when we look back to write the history of these past months, we will undoubtedly conclude that there were many mistakes—some by the United States, many by our allies in the United Nations, and critical ones by Hussein and the leadership of Iraq. And we will learn from those mistakes.

But this resolution does to debate the issue of whether we should have gone to war. It merely expresses support and appreciation for those commanding the war, including the President as Commander in Chief, and for our young heroes, those in uniform,

who are courageously and skillfully carrying out their assigned missions.

Mr. Speaker, we must not make the mistake we made during and after the Vietnam war. This time, let's support the women and men serving in our Armed Forces—and, as importantly, welcome them home with open arms.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution commending our brave men and women of the armed services. I wish them Godspeed and a quick and decisive victory so they can return home soon and safe.

America is the greatest democracy the world has ever known. The advent of a new century has brought new threats and new terrors never before imagined that threaten our cherished freedoms and liberties. Fortunately, we have some of the finest citizens of our country who choose to serve to defend those cherished liberties, even at times, by giving their last full measure of their lives. They do it for their country, they do it for their families, and they do it for their buddies in the foxhole next to them, and thank God they do it well. Each generation has faced its own unique challenges and has risen to address them. Now it's our turn and I am confident that the current generation of servicemen and servicewomen will perform honorably and successfully. We are so very proud of them.

With military action to disarm Saddam Hussein just underway, my thoughts and prayers are with these men and women, as well as their families. Over 2,200 members of the Wisconsin Air and Army National Guard are serving on active duty as well as many Reservists from across the Badger State. Our appreciation not only goes out to them but also to their families and their employers for their support and sacrifice during these challenging times.

I want to particularly express my appreciation to the members and families of the Wisconsin Army National Guard's 229th Engineer Company out of Prairie du Chien and Platteville under the command of Capt. Robert Pruitt, the 829th Engineer Detachment out of Richland Center under the command of Capt. Kurt Geilfuss, and the 1158th Transportation Company with members from Tomah and Black River Falls under the leadership of 1LT Jason Stebbins, and Army Reserve's 652nd Engineer Company out of Ellsworth under the command of Capt. Dean Kasparek. These units have been activated and deployed. They can take great pride in knowing that they are part of the greatest military force the world has ever known and that they have the support of a grateful nation. We owe them a debt of gratitude that can never be repaid.

I also want to thank Maj. Gen. Al Wilkening, the Wisconsin Adjunct General and LTC Tim Donovan of the Wisconsin Army National Guard, along with Col. Mike Stazak, commander of Ft. McCoy, Army Reserve Total Force Training Center and his staff in western Wisconsin. The people of Wisconsin are proud of their service and the service of all the men and women of our armed services during this important time in our Nation's history.

As our military effort continues, I and other members of Congress will work to ensure that our service men and women have all the resources necessary to fulfill their mission. My thoughts and prayers are with those serving our country, as well as their families. America is firmly behind our troops and we're all hoping to see them home safe, secure, and soon.

May God bless our troops during this difficult time and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I, like many of my colleagues, worked to keep America's sons and daughters out of harm's way and to protect the innocent civilians of Iraq by encouraging the continuation of U.N. inspections and diplomatic efforts to gain the support of the United Nations Security Council.

I am deeply disappointed that the President instead has chosen to begin military action. But the fact is, since the decision was made to go to war, we must do everything in our power to support and protect our troops and to prevent civilian casualties.

I, like all Americans, am deeply grateful for the patriotism of our troops, their courage and the sacrifices they are willing to make. I join all Americans in praying for their prompt and safe return home to America and to their families.

Since September 11, 2001, Congress has worked in a bipartisan fashion to provide the tools necessary for our military forces to accomplish the difficult tasks given to them. I have supported these efforts because our fighting men and women deserve the very best. With our troops now engaged in conflict, Congress and the President must make certain that our armed force continue to promptly receive the necessary resource to end the war and to secure the peace when the conflict ends.

As the wife of a former Marine and as the stepmother of a proud member of the Army, I also want to thank our country's military families who share fully in the sacrifices of our military personnel. I will work with congressional leaders to continue to address the particular needs of these families during these difficult times and work to insure that full veteran benefits are available to them when they return.

The United States must continue diplomacy to bring together the broadest coalition to aid our efforts during and after the military conflict. America will need the support of our allies to help the people of Iraq rebuild their country.

Mr. Speaker, tonight our prayers and thoughts for our troops and innocent Iraqi civilians are perhaps best expressed by the American poet, Longfellow, who wrote so poignantly:

Our hearts, our hopes are all with thee.
Our hearts, our hopes our prayers, our tears,
Our faith triumphant o'er our fears,
Are all with thee—are all with thee.

Mr. MICHAUD. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of this resolution that expresses our appreciation for our Armed Forces and their families. As a proud member of the Veterans Committee, I have worked to champion the causes of our brave men and women in uniform every day. As we enter a time of peril for our troops, and a time of concern in the hearts of their loved ones, it is important that the Congress is steadfast in our support.

I do have reservations, however, about the full content of this resolution. It mixes a statement of support for our troops, a sentiment that unites this Congress and our Nation, with support for the policies and plans of the administration—policies that remain controversial in this body and among many Americans.

It is the right—indeed, it is the duty—of elected representatives in a Democracy to question, to debate, and to voice the concerns of their constitutes. This resolution seeks to suppress all such concerns in a cynical act of politics, by forcing members either to vote in favor of all of the policies, or risk showing disdain for the troops. This kind of politicking has no place in what should be a pure and genuine expression of national unity.

I am voting for this resolution tonight because the sacrifice of our troops and their families deserves to be honored. But I object to the way in which this was brought forward, and I hope that this body will show a greater regard for all of the voices in our Nation in the future.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 104, a measure to honor our men and women in uniform and the families who support them.

Mr. Speaker, the meaning of this resolution strikes close to home because many men and women from my district are currently deployed overseas or they are in the cue to be deployed. There must be a remarkable level of stress associated with deployment. Uncertainty can be the largest contributor to this anxiety. Uncertain where they will be sent, uncertain as to what they will see. But rest assured, Mr. Speaker, there is no uncertainty in what they must do.

I know first hand that those airmen from the Air Force Special Operations Command, based at Hurburt Field, are of the best trained, best equipped members in our United States Armed Forces. They go hand in hand with the Rangers who trained at Camp Rudder in the Northwest Florida swamps, the sailors who trained at Pensacola Naval Air Station and Whiting field, the Air Force Reservists from Duke Field and the airmen from the 33rd Fighter Wing, the Nomads, from Eglin Air Force Base.

These are the faces of our forces in Iraq. These men and women, mothers and fathers, daughters and sons, are the people who have volunteered to defend our freedom wherever a defense is needed. They protect the very fabric that gives protestors the right to protest, the editorialist the right to editorialize and the security where we can move about our day, completing our routine duties, without fear of oppression or persecution based on our simple, God-given rights.

As you, Mr. Speaker, I've seen many object to our efforts to liberate Iraq. I am deeply troubled by their lack of understanding as to what our troops are battling but at the same time I am proud of our Nation and the beacon of light we shine around the world—that those objections are permitted. Nobody here expects everyone to agree with every policy implemented. But I have yet to see a single protest against the Iraqi regime in downtown Baghdad. I would highly doubt the citizens in Iraq are truly comfortable with living a life of terror at the hands of their own government. I doubt they move about their daily routines without fear of persecution. I know they cannot assemble to oppose the government or publicize their written thoughts that run contrary to the views of the ruling regime.

Mr. speaker, we here in the United States, Western Europe and scores of other countries are fortunate to live in a land where life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are abundant, and I would submit, taken for granted. I look forward to the Iraqi people living in the same type of land and I thank the troops for bringing them to our welcoming arms.

May God bless and protect our men and women in Uniform and continue to bless the United States of America.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, as we speak and assemble on the floor of the House tonight, young men and women of our Armed Forces are ready to pay the ultimate sacrifice in the service of our Nation. Indeed, 12 American and four British soldiers died when their U.S. Marine helicopter crashed in Kuwait just hours ago. My condolences and prayers are with their families at this most difficult time.

About 3,600 of the troops honorably serving in the Persian Gulf today are from Fort Bliss in my own district. I have been fortunate and honored to meet many of them and their families. These men and women have already shown their remarkable abilities, manning Patriot missile battalions that successfully defended Kuwait and allied troops against Iraqi Scud missiles earlier today. I am very proud to represent these brave and capable soldiers. My thoughts and prayers are with them as they face the dangers and uncertainties of war. And my thoughts and prayers extend to their families as well, who must anxiously await their loved ones' safe return. The mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, wives and husbands, and brothers and sisters of our service members are making sacrifices of their own, and enduring a challenging time. They deserve our recognition and appreciation.

I commend all the members of our Armed Forces serving in Operation Iraqi Freedom for their patriotism, bravery, and professionalism. I also wish to express my appreciation to the British and Australian troops who are fighting alongside Americans in combat, and to the personnel from other allied countries who are providing support to our forces.

I support our Government's efforts to prosecute this war swiftly and successfully, with a minimum of military and civilian causalities. Our soldiers deserve our fullest support, and they can count on me for that for however long this war may last.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the men and women of our armed services. These courageous Americans are putting their lives on the line in order to serve our country, and I pray that they succeed swiftly in their mission and return home safely.

I also want to express my support for the families of our troops, who are patiently awaiting their return with heavy hearts. My thoughts and prayers go out to you during these difficult times.

While I fully support our troops, I am frustrated and deeply disappointed by the resolution that we are being asked to consider tonight. I vehemently disagree with the President's decision to abandon a diplomatic solution to disarm Saddam Hussein, and cannot support a resolution that endorses that decision.

I was proud to support H.J. Res. 27 two weeks ago, a resolution commending the service of our Armed Forces. However, it is with a heavy heart that I must oppose the resolution we have before us tonight.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I back this resolution because of my complete support and admiration of the brave men and women in our armed services. Each of us owes a debt of gratitude to these selfless individuals who have put themselves in harm's way in service of our Nation. Like many of my fellow Americans, I still disagree with the process that brought us to this juncture and my vote here does not represent any change in that belief. But I pray for a quick end to this conflict and for the safe return of all of our men and women in uniform.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in support of H. Con. Res. 104. It is very fitting that we honor those men and women who tonight are making the world a safer place. Their mission is legal and, more importantly, just. I am certain they will succeed in changing an evil regime, they will succeed in eliminating dangerous chemical and biological weapons, and they will succeed in liberating the people of Iraq.

Our thoughts and prayers must also go out to the families of our troops. Their sacrifice is great and must be acknowledged.

There is no greater love than the love of a family, so as a nation, as family America, we must send our love to families whose members are in harm's way defending our freedom.

And finally recognizing our President for his leadership, his strength, his decency and his commitment to the American people.

I hope and pray for a swift and safe return for all of our troops. May God bless our military and their families. And may God bless America.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to vote to support our brave armed forces. I will vote for this resolution. My thoughts and prayers are with the men and women in uniform who are serving our country in the Persian Gulf and elsewhere. They will, without doubt, perform admirably. While I am disappointed that this resolution contains dubious and politically opportunistic language regarding Iraq and the war on terrorism, that cannot stop me from endorsing the valor and dedication of our troops. Although I remain concerned that this war will make our country less instead of more safe, I deeply respect the personal sacrifice and commitment of our armed forces. Our democracy permits and even encourages disagreement, but it cannot tolerate disrespect towards our men and women in uniform.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as we vote today to commend our troops, I would like to take the opportunity to express my personal support for our brave men and women in uniform who are in harm's way, and to hope for their safe return home after a victory on the battlefield.

The time for debate over the wisdom of going to war has passed. Although I was unsuccessful in arguing that such a war be undertaken only after the passage of a constitutionally-enacted Declaration of War, it is time now for us to line up behind our troops. As a Vietnam era veteran of the U.S. Air Force I understand how important it is to troop morale that each and every fighting person know all Americans stand behind them.

Once this war has ended we should seriously reconsider the direction of our foreign policy. The American people have seen the ineffectiveness of our reliance upon our so-called ''NATO allies'' and the United Nations. Hopefully this will lead us to reconsider our role in these organizations. I hope this will be the last time Americans fight under the color of U.N. resolutions. Once this war is completed I hope we will reassess our foreign entanglements, return to the traditional U.S. foreign policy of non-intervention, and return to the standard of our own national security.

For now all such foreign policy debates are on hold, and I hope all Americans will join in supporting our troops in the successful completion of their mission.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my unequivocal support of our men and women in uniform currently participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom. I would also like to thank my colleague Chairman HUNTER for bringing this important and timely resolution to the floor.

As we speak, our armed forces are beginning the second day of their quest to end the reign of one of the most diabolical tyrants the world has ever known. As they advance on their objective, the professionalism and abilities of our troops are obvious. These brave men and women—so far from home—bear upon their shoulders the task of keeping the world safe so that the rest of us can enjoy the comforts of freedom.

While no one doubts that ultimate success will be theirs, the dangers our troops face are all too real. Not long ago we received the sad news that a helicopter crash has claimed the lives of 12 U.S. Marines and 4 British soldiers. It is unlikely these casualties will be the last, but we are comforted in the knowledge that the sacrifices they have made will help make the world a safer place.

Saddam Hussien had ample opportunity to join the peace-loving nations of the world, but he refused at every turn. Thus, if falls to our troops to finally put an end to his murderous regime. Earlier today they crossed the line of departure, and are now closing with those enemy forces that chose to put up resistance. But more important than the fear they bring to the allies of Saddam is the hope they bring to the Iraqi people, who soon will see their great and ancient civilization flourish once again.

As for Saddam, he will experience for a second time that there is no great friend, no worse enemy than a member of the U.S. military.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support our brave troops in harm's way, as they fight to disarm Saddam Hussein of his weapons of mass destruction.

My gratitude and prayers are with the 270,000 brave American troops at war to protect the American people, including 2,512 Minnesota National Guard and Reserve Troops.

Mr. Speaker, politics stops when war starts. It's time for all members of this body to take off their political hats and put on their American hats in support of our troops. At time of war, there are no Republicans, no Democrats and no Independents, only Americans.

As Americans, we have the will power and the staying power to accomplish this mission and bring our troops home safely.

Thanks to our brave troops, I am confident we will be successful at disarming this brutal and murderous dictator of his weapoons of mass destruciton. And for that, Mr. Speaker, they deserve our deepest gratitude, respect and prayers.

May God bless our troops and our Commander-in-Chief, and may God bless America!

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I stand 100% behind our troops. The brave men and women in uniform who have volunteered to defend our country are in my thoughts, and in my prayers. I pledge to work to ensure that they have all the resources necessary to help them accomplish their mission quickly and safely so that they can return home to their families.

I also pray for the family members who sent their loved ones into harm's way to protect the freedom that every American enjoys. They are to be commended for their sacrifice and unwavering support for our troops.

My home state of Florida has sent over 5,000 Reserve and National Guard personnel to Iraq with the full understanding that not all of them would return to their families and loved ones, and my heart goes out to these brave Floridians.

Every member of our Armed Forces deserves our deep and unending gratitude for their professionalism and commitment to the ideals of this great country.

For the record, I would like to express my support for the second and third Whereas clause of the resolution we are currently debating, and I would like to submit Congressman HASTINGS' Resolution support the troops which I support in its entirety.

May God continue to bless America.

H. CON. RES.—

Whereas the valiant and dedicated members of the United States Armed Forces consistently perform in an exceptionally professional manner befitting an all-volunteer military force;

Whereas the members of Reserve and National Guard components of the Armed Forces consistently demonstrate their readiness and ability to respond and deploy quickly to become an integral part of the active components;

Whereas the families of the active and reserve forces provide exceptional and unwavering support for deployed forces;

Whereas the valiant members of the military forces of the allies of the United States share common goals and objectives with the United States in the war on terrorism and the war with Iraq; and

Whereas all citizens of the United States and the allies of the United States have demonstrated a show of unity in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and against the threat to global security and crimes against humanity posed by Iraqi President Saddam Hussein: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that—

(1) each member of the Armed Forces of the United States be commended for serving with such distinction and professionalism;

(2) the family members of members of the Armed Forces of the United States be commended for their special role in providing support for the members of the Armed Forces;

(3) each allied service member be commended for serving with such distinction and professionalism; and

(4) all citizens of the United States pay homage to the members of the Armed Forces and their families and to allied service members and their families.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to the order of the House earlier this legislative day, the previous question is ordered on the concurrent resolution.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 151 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 95.

□ 0210

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013, with Mr. ISAKSON (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier this legislative day, amendment No. 4 printed in part B of House Report 108–44, as modified, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) had been disposed of.

It is now in order for a period of final debate on the concurrent resolution.

The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE).

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I will close our side of the debate, and I only have one speaker. I believe I have that opportunity to do so; so I allow the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) to go first.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to claim my time and make a closing statement.

Mr. Chairman, this is not just another partisan vote. This is a pivotal vote with long-lasting consequences, and I urge everybody to ponder those consequences and beg everyone's indulgence at this hour to make just a few comments. When I came to this House 20 years ago, the Government was deep in debt. Over the 1980s the national debt tripled. It took us almost 20 years to rid the Government's budget of deficits. It took Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, which passed in 1985, the Budget Summit Agreement in 1990, the Clinton Budget of 1993, and the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997.

These efforts finally bore fruit. After we passed the Clinton act in 1993, each year thereafter for 7 straight years, the bottom line of the budget got better to the point where in 1993 for the first time in 30 years the budget was in balance.

□ 0215

Mr. Bush took office with an advantage few Presidents in recent times have enjoyed. He had a surplus, a big-time surplus. The Office of Management and Budget, OMB, estimated from 2002 through 2011, the surplus would be $5.6 trillion.

Based on that projection and over the admonitions of many of us, Mr. Bush requested and Congress passed $1.35 trillion in tax cuts. Now, just 2 years later, that $5.6 trillion surplus is gone. That is what CBO and OMB told us when we opened the budget season in January of this year.

OMB told us that it had overstated the surplus. Adjusting it for what we now know about the economy, they said the adjusted surplus is not $5.6 trillion from 2002 through 2011, it is more like $2.4 trillion, and, more than that, about $2.5 trillion has already been committed in new tax cuts and newly legislated spending, much of it for national defense. This means that any new tax cuts we pass will go straight to the bottom line. They will add dollar for dollar to the deficit.

In 2001, you could rationalize an enormous tax cut on the grounds that we had an enormous surplus, but you cannot do that anymore. Nevertheless, the President sent us a budget this year requesting another $1.6 trillion in tax cuts, another round of tax reduction, as large as the last, with only a few modest offsets in it. All of it goes to the bottom line. When CBO did its analysis of the President's budget, it saw nothing but deficits, on-budget deficits, totaling over $5 trillion between now and 2013.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget and his colleagues embraced the President's tax cuts. They totaled some $1.6 trillion, but they pared them down a bit, and then they went looking for offsets. They weren't able to identify specific spending offsets, so they settled on just across-the-board percentage cuts to entitlement spending under the jurisdiction of 14 different committees. Initially they asked for $470 billion in entitlement spending. They settled later for less because they needed the votes to get it passed on their side of the aisle.

Today we have some $262 billion in entitlement cuts entailed by this budget resolution. These will come out of programs within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, that is Medicare; and the Committee on Energy and Commerce, that is Medicaid, $107 billion.

So if you vote for this resolution, you should know that you are still voting very possibly to cut Medicare by $62 billion, Medicaid by $107 billion, government pensions and railroad retirement by over $40 billion, veterans' disability benefits by $15 billion, school

lunches and student loans by nearly $10 billion, and all of this is occasioned by the fact that you want to go forward with this tax cut of $1.3 trillion to $1.4 trillion. Because without it, the budget will be in balance between 2008 and 2010, if you just let the spending increase each year at the level of current service.

You should also know that this resolution calls for limits on domestic discretionary spending that will make it lower than inflation or current services by $244 billion over the next 10 years. It has been claimed on this House floor that these were just cuts of 1 percent, but when you provide for a big increase in international affairs, $51 billion is what the President sought over 10 years, and another big increase in homeland security, the rest of the accounts in discretionary spending have to be squeezed, and by our calculations they are squeezed easily by 6 percent.

That may not seem crippling, but look what is happening to education in this budget. Education is brought in $50 billion below inflation. At this level we will never fully fund Leave No Child Behind; we will never get close to sharing our fair share of IDEA. That is true for other programs throughout the discretionary accounts. Veterans' health care, for example, it is cut by $13 billion to $15 billion, although today right now it has more veterans than it can say grace over to care for.

Mr. Chairman, I deeply doubt that these cuts will ever be achieved. Let us not forget what happened last year. We only passed 2 of 13 appropriations bills in 2002, did not finish the last 11 until a few weeks ago, and those were hard to pass because they had spending restraints on them that are a lot less challenging than what this bill will call for.

So what happens if the cuts are not achieved? The deficit goes higher, we stack up a mountain of debt. But, unlike the 1980s, we are right now on the eve of the retirement of the baby-boomers, and that will make the task of turning these deficits around more intractable and difficult than ever, believe me.

So, before you vote for this resolution, you should ask yourself if you want to take this gamble. You should know that even if all the mandatory and discretionary spending cuts are achieved, which is very, very unlikely, this budget will not be in balance until 2012, a long time from now, and between now and then this budget will accumulate more than $1 trillion of additional debt. And in voting for this resolution, keep in mind, you are voting to raise the ceiling on the national debt.

So, what happens if we do not vote for this resolution? What happens if we vote it down tonight? Well, the default option is not really that bad. If you forego the tax cuts and you can also forego the spending cuts, you can put the budget back in balance by 2008. If you believe in balanced budget, if you think deficits are a menace, that is not a bad outcome. I suggest to you it is a lot better outcome than the budget resolution before us.

Vote no on the budget resolution. Let us go back to the drawing board.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we always hear a lot about history whenever the Democrats come to the floor to talk about the budget, and it is in part because they do not want to talk about the future. They really just want to talk about history. They want to redefine it, they want to recapture it, they want to put it in new context constantly.

How did we get here? Because of a war, because of a national emergency, and because of an economy that has been in recession, and we have to address all of those needs today. We have to have a plan for the future.

Just like we commended our troops tonight, it is time to do our job. Yes, it is late. Yes, there are people who are asked to do much harder work than we are asked to do. But it is time to do our part in all of this. This budget is just the first step.

I have heard people tonight on both sides of the aisle talk about all sorts of devastating things that might happen, devastating things that will happen, all sorts of policies that will flow from this budget that has not even passed yet, that has not even been conferenced with the Senate yet. We do not know where this process will end up, but I will guarantee you one thing: At the end of the day, no one will like it. No one will think it is a perfect budget. I can attest to that, because even though when I started this process I kind of liked what I wrote, by the end of it, I am not even sure I will recognize all of the details that are in this budget.

Why is that? Because 435 people in this body and 100 in the other body write the budget. This is not the Nussle budget, it is not the President's budget, it is not the Blue Dogs' or the Republican Study Committee's or the moderates' or the conservatives'. It is nobody's budget unless we get it done.

Why is it important for us to get it done? Because just last year we did not get it done. We passed one in the House, the other body did not pass a budget, and what happened? Gridlock, breakdown, 7 months of wrangling on the floor over 13 appropriations bills that only attributed one-third of all of the spending that Congress does and the Federal Government participates in. Seven months we spent over just one-third of the budget because of total budget breakdown.

So we need to pass a budget. We need a conference report. We need to have a plan. And what should that plan say? Well, we believe it needs three things:

Number one, it is not negotiable. We must protect America. That means strong national defense and homeland security that gives us the kind of security we need to have to ensure that we can protect freedom at home and freedom around the world.

Number two, we must strengthen the economy and create jobs. A person without a job is not paying any taxes, and a person who is not paying any taxes, more than anything else, knows that they are not able to make ends meet. A person with a job, that is the most important thing we can do is to get people back to work.

So, yes, we reduce taxes. Yes, we take on taxes, because they are too complicated, they are too high, they are too onerous, and it has gone on too long. We have got to do something about taxes. The President has put a plan on the table. Yes, we incorporate that plan in our budget, but it is a first step to getting us back to work as a country.

The third area is fiscal responsibility. Now, I have heard the gentleman from South Carolina, whom I greatly respect, say that we will not achieve these cuts. He is right. We are not going to achieve these cuts, because they are not cuts. How can you cut when you are only decreasing anticipated increases on the one hand, and, on the other hand, when it is waste?

Why is it in America, for some reason in Washington, that whenever an agency or department or program wastes money, we rush in and give it more?

GAO, our General Accounting Office, if you want to talk about waste, we hire great people who put together reams and volumes and all sorts of reports; defense acquisitions, financial management, FAA, Medicaid, Medicare, U.S. Postal Service, food stamp program, tax administration. It goes on and on and on in waste.

We are paying dead people benefits under the Veterans Administration. We are sending dead people checks under Social Security. There are folks in the Lorton prison that are getting benefits under welfare still. And this is under a reformed welfare system.

People will come up to me and say, ''Gosh, do you know what is really tough? We cannot find that waste. We are having a real tough time.'' And our friends on the other side are saying, ''You are cutting, throwing children in the street. People will be kicked out of nursing homes.''

We are after this. This is what we are after. We want to find the waste, fraud and abuse within our system. Is it going to be hard? You bet, because for 5 years we have not been doing it.

Five years ago we reached a balanced budget. Why? Because the Republicans took the majority. We put in a 7-year plan to balance the budget. We got there 4 years earlier than we said because the economy was growing, and we controlled spending. But when we got to balance, we stopped working on spending. We have got to get back to working on the spending side of the budget.

So, this is where I end here tonight with a quote. It is kind of an interesting quote, apropos for tonight, I believe. The quote is, ''We shall, therefore, neither postpone our tax cut plans nor cut into essential national security programs. This administration is determined to protect America's security and survival, and we are also determined to step up its economic growth. I think we must do both.''

President Kennedy said that in 1962. Let us do that job again tonight. Let us vote on the budget.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to highlight how the administration's budget leaves children and families behind. As we begin debate on the FY2004 Federal budget, we must remember that the biggest challenge facing American families is how to bridge their responsibilities between work and caring for their families.

Our children and our families need our help now, more than ever, as this country is involved in a pre-emptive war with Iraq; this is especially true today for the families of our troops, national guard and reservists.

Whether already deployed, or waiting for their orders, these brave men and women and their families are wondering how they'll make ends meet as they fulfill their military duty. How will they juggle their work and family responsibilities as well as their Nation's call?

What we need is a budget that invests adequately in the programs and safety net that help all families balance work and family responsibilities.

That's why it's bad policy that the Republican budget cuts many crucial programs that help parents and children.

For instance, under the President's FY2004 plan after-school programs are cut by nearly $400 million and cuts necessary funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Under the President's budget, CHIP will be jeopardized by a plan to merge it with Medicaid programs through a new block grant.

States will have unprecedented latitude to scale back coverage of necessary care for children, impose substantial cost-sharing requirements on low-income families, and put many children in a position to have no coverage for their health care.

Child care services—which provide care so parents can work knowing their kids are safe—are also being cut. Only 1 in 7 children eligible for Federal child care assistance currently receive the funding they need. Under the President's plan a funding freeze will mean approximately 30,000 low-income children lose child care help in 2004.

Programs such as Head Start will also suffer. Head Start, the premiere early childhood program for disadvantaged preschoolers would be dismantled and sent to the States, without the performance standards that are the core of the program's success.

Mr. Chairman, this budget fails to provide the support that many of our working families depend on to give their children the best possible care. Families need this financial and emotional support to keep it all together. In fact, it seems that whatever we do in this fast-paced competitive society requires a balancing act.

All families can use a little help, yet, families are told that this is their own ''personal problem''—although most everyone experiences it—and ''don't look to Washington for help, the Federal Government has other priorities'' such as a $400 billion defense budget to champion or a $675 billion tax break for the wealthiest few.

What I propose is that we need a common vision of how to assist the struggling families of our country. A balancing act would recognize that there is no more important job than parenting.

A balancing act would give parents the opportunity to stay at home for at least the first three months after a birth, or an adoption, without the loss of income or employment.

A balancing act would see that when parents go back to work they would have access to quality child care.

A balancing act would provide voluntary universal pre-school for every three- and four-year old.

A balancing act would ensure that all children are cared for . . . not just during the school day, but after school as well. Instead of kids hanging out in the street with lesson in drugs, alcohol and early pregnancy, let's have safe places and enriching experiences available for our kids . . . places where they want to be . . . where they are safe and where they now they are cared about.

A balancing act would address the sad fact that in too many families, breakfast is a casualty of the new economy and our fast paced life. When kids go to school on an empty stomach, they can't learn.

And finally, a balancing act would extend benefits to part time workers. Whether an employee works 40 hours or less, their contribution to the company is just as great. All parents, and their families deserve to be protected against illness and loss of employment.

Mr. Chairman, our first priority in this budget must be helping working families find a balance between their work and home responsibilities. I encourage my colleagues to remember children and families as we debate the FY2004 Budget.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Chairman, if Republicans are trying to send a message with this budget, the bright neon lights spell ''working families don't count.'' This is a budget of missed opportunities, misguided plans and misplaced priorities. This budget does not even account for the war, and reduces or eliminates benefits to the same brave soldiers that are waging that war as we speak.

This budget is missing any serious recognition of the devastating economic downturn our Nation has suffered during this administration or of the severe budget crisis facing the states.

The budget fails to invest in what matters most to American working families:

It does nothing to rebuild or modernize our schools. It does nothing to improve our nation's aging transportation system.

It does nothing to patch the holes in our homeland security framework.

It does nothing to stem the relentless loss of jobs in our nation's manufacturing and industrial base.

It does nothing to create new jobs.

Small businesses form the entrepreneurial backbone of our Nation's economy. Most new jobs in this country come from businesses started only from a little seed money and a big dream. Yet, this budget cuts the very Small Business Administration programs that help keep the American Dream alive.

This dream is being lived, at this very moment, by the hard working owners of countless Section 8A-small businesses. These businesses provide services to our government that are often less expensive and higher quality than many large corporations.

We must oppose a budget that bundles small business contracts together into larger contracts that only multinational and large corporations will be able to bid on.

This budget also does nothing to solve our Nation's crippling health care crisis, which means high cost and little coverage to working families. It also means a consistent 15 percent yearly cost increase to employers who are becoming less willing to pay for their workers' health care.

This budget leaves behind the $9 billion in funding that President Bush promised for education. This budget leaves behind 40 percent of the funding for after school programs, 26 percent of the funding to migrant education programs, 43 percent of the funding for high school equivalency programs, 13 percent of early education programs, and the list goes on.

I wish my Republican colleagues understood that it is neither apathy nor laziness that makes people poor and creates under-performing schools. Even where the budget seeks new funds for neglected priorities, the approach to solving the problem is deeply flawed and the conditions are unfair and counterproductive.

During a time of corporate scandals, Republicans choose instead to go after labor unions. The Department of Labor is even increasing its funding to audit, investigate, and prosecute labor unions. It increased its funding by closing down the United States Employment Service.

During a time of state budget shortfalls that are forcing deep cuts to education, this budget instead redirects critical education funding to private school vouchers so that he can begin to privatize public education.

During a time of soaring energy prices, the Republican budget freezes funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, so our seniors can bake in the summer and freeze in the winter.

Seniors will be forced to leave Medicare to get a prescription drug care benefit, only to be covered by HMOs that will provide less care for more money.

Our seniors are concerned that this budget puts the long-term solvency of social security in serious jeopardy.

This budget will have a record of $1.8 million deficit over the next 10 years. This reckless deficit must be paid off, but how? Republicans hope to indebt our Nation to the point where we have no choice but to privatize Social Security. We must strengthen Social Security—not privatize it!

The current state of our economy demands investments to help people, but Republicans are instead squandering the funds on tax cuts. The resources that the budget seeks fall well short of basic needs—a direct result of the President's obsession with butchering the tax code and wringing from it trillions in tax breaks for the wealthiest. Tax breaks that are breaking the backs of our State budgets. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the President tucked 11 tax cut proposals in his budget that would have disastrous effects on State budgets. Talk about kicking someone when they are down!

The tax cuts will cost the States $64 billion in revenues over the next 10 years. Those are $64 billion dollars that would have funded our police and funded our schools. Eleven States have cut their spending on K–12 education, delaying much-needed renovation and construction, eliminating preschool and after-school programs and, in some places, cutting days from the school week. Nineteen States have cut higher education spending, forcing cancellation of classes and tuition hikes.

Eighteen States have cut their welfare programs, even though the rolls are rising for the first time since passage of the 1966 welfare reform law. The number of States with waiting lists for child care assistance has grown, and the waits are getting longer. In seven States, eligibility for child care aid has been tightened significantly, and five States have hiked parent fees.

Twelve States are cutting Medicaid. At least 1 million people, largely in working poor families, will lose their health care coverage if these cuts are fully implemented. Another 1 million are experiencing cuts in coverage and benefits.

Many States have implemented or are considering tax increases to raise revenues. Among the 34 governors who have submitted 2004 budgets, 16—Republicans and Democrats—have called for increases in taxes and fees. Three are proposing personal income tax hikes, seven recommend sales tax increases or an end to sales tax exemptions, five propose corporate tax hikes and three are considering various other fees and levies. Ironically, these State tax hikes, many of which will hit low- and moderate-income residents, may offset any Federal cuts.

This budget and the tax cuts are clear examples of how Republicans want to shift the tax burden of our Nation from the rich to the working class.

Around this time last year, I led a successful effort to restore food stamp benefits to legal permanent residents. Although the President signed the law, this budget does not fund our commitment to keeping all lawful residents of our Nation fed. We cannot approve monumental reforms that bring hope to people's hearts and then coldly deny the funding for these very same programs.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this budget. It's a budget that sends its message—in bright neon lights—''real people don't matter.''

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to this budget resolution, which undermines our long-term fiscal health and severely hampers our ability to meet critical domestic needs and foreign responsibilities.

I stand united with the President and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in our commitment to win the war against Iraq and take all necessary steps to defeat terrorism and preserve national security both at home and abroad. However, despite the many new security and economic challenges confronting us, the war and our homeland protection efforts should not, and need not, shortchange our domestic priorities. We can win the war against Iraq and terrorism without raiding Social Security and Medicare and without increasing the national debt. Yet, this Republican budget resolution would accomplish just the opposite.

Two years ago, the administration and Congress were looking covetously at a staggering $5.6 trillion cumulative surplus through 2010. At the time, Congress was continually reassured by the administration that we could afford an enormous tax cut, ensure the solvency of Social Security and Medicare, pay down the national debt, fund our domestic priorities and still have a large reserve fund for unanticipated emergencies. Like many of my colleagues, I cautioned the administration at the time that its budget and enormous tax cut were based on unrealistic surplus projections that would never materialize.

Earlier this year, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) confirmed that in less than 2 years the 10-year projected surplus has been erased. While portions of this decline are a result of our efforts to defeat terrorism and preserve national security both at home and abroad, the depletion of the surplus to date was largely caused by the fiscally irresponsible policies of 2001. The additional $1.3 trillion in tax cuts, much of which are due to excluding dividends from taxation, that the administration and the Republican leadership propose would only worsen our current situation and lead us further down the path of mounting deficits and escalating public debt.

To pay for the additional tax cuts, the Republican's budget resolution would raid the entire $2.2 trillion Social Security trust fund to cover deficits in the rest of the Federal budget over the next 10 years. Moreover, the projections used to frame this budget are overly optimistic. They do not include the cost of the administration's plan to permanently extend several expiring tax cuts, which would add $100 billion to the deficit between 2004 and 2013. In addition, this budget omits the cost of extending relief from the selling individual Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT) beyond 2005. Without AMT relief, the number of taxpayers subject to it will soar from 2 million today to over 43 million by 2013. The projections also leave out an assessment of the enormous cost of the current war and the subsequent costs of occupation, which could last for a number of years.

The disappearance of the 10-year surplus compels us to consider not just a 1-year but also a long-term budget plan. Congress and the American people have the right to know how the Republican Leadership proposes to restore fiscal discipline while enacting additional multi-year tax cuts, boosting spending for the military, and meeting commitments to a growing number of retirees. Furthermore, I find it incredibly irresponsible that the majority continues to pursue large tax cuts while shortchanging important domestic priorities. Congress should devise budgetary rules that make tax cuts contingent on the realization of specified targets for the budget surplus and the Federal debt. Unfortunately, this budget fails on all those accounts.

Moreover, this budget would cut domestic appropriations by $244 billion over 10 years below the amount needed to maintain services at the 2003 level. Remarkably, the funding levels in this budget are $115.3 billion lower than the level in the President's budget, which many Members—on both sides of the aisle—thought was too low. Further, it would require cuts of $265 billion over 10 years in programs such as Medicaid, veterans' benefits, student loans, housing assistance and pensions and benefits for Federal employee. This budget also fails to provide funds for necessary infrastructure improvements or help hard-pressed states and localities. Meanwhile, it provides an inadequate prescription drug benefit, and underfunds other key priorities without reaching balance until 2012.

Instead, I plan to support the Democratic alternative that would eliminate the unfair, costly tax cuts for the rich, and would provide targeted tax rebates to working families, as well as additional funding for expanded unemployment benefits for laid off workers, assistance for states and localities, and necessary infrastructure projects. It would also provide greater funding for Medicare prescription drugs, education, housing, homeland security and other vital domestic programs. This alternative would provide an immediate boost to the economy and crate thousands of jobs, without aggravating our long-term deficits.

The need to respond to new short-term needs is no excuse for ignoring the long-term problems we already have. Ultimately, deficits do matter. It is time that we all take the deteriorating budget outlook seriously. We need to ensure that the burden of today's fiscal policies is not placed on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren. This is a matter of fiscal stewardship and generational responsibility, and we must address it without delay.

I urge my colleagues to reject this misguided budget and to develop one that will ensure security at home and abroad, without dramatically increasing our debt, borrowing against Social Security and Medicare, or abandoning our commitments to children, workers, senior citizens and all Americans.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, today we are brought to the floor of this House as America's young men and women are at war in Iraq. The American people expect their elected representatives to address how much this war will cost and how much securing our hometowns will cost in our continuing war against terrorism as well. Instead, the Bush administration is asking this Congress to treat as its highest budget priority the lifting of that very onerous burden felt by the wealthiest of Americans—the double taxation of dividends. We all know what a huge burden double taxation of dividends imposes on the wealthiest Americans. Apparently Republican Party leaders in Washington feel that failing to lift this burden from the shoulders of the rich would be too great a sacrifice, even in wartime. For them, lifting the burden of double taxation of dividends is:

More important than paying for a war in Iraq and the subsequent rebuilding of Iraq.

More important than paying for security at our ports, airports, and nuclear power plants; and

More important than providing affordable health care and medicine to our grandparents.

Last night, President Bush officially created a whole new group of 250,000 war veterans—yet he does not even have enough money in his budget to take care of this country's obligations to veterans of the first Persian Gulf War, the Vietnam War, the Korean War, or World War II.

Never before has a President cut taxes in the face of war. According to the New York Times, the Civil War gave birth to an estate tax and World War II expanded the income tax. But during the war in Iraq the Bush administration plans to cut taxes by a total of nearly $2 trillion over the next 10 years.

This tax cut for the rich is a fiscal MOAB [Mother of All Bombs], pointed right at the heart of the Federal budget.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, it seems that each year I've been in Congress, the Republican budget proposal is further and further removed from the needs and expressed wishes of the American public. This year follows that disturbing trend. Fundamental priorities and long-term fiscal stability are sacrificed for the sake of continued tax cuts.

This budget puts into place a framework that will fail to meet our needs. It ignores funding requirements for our operations overseas, our actions in Iraq and a commitment to rebuild and stabilize Afghanistan. Worst of all it ignores real problems here at home. There is no meaningful assistance for the 47 states, including mine, that are in serious financial difficulty, to say nothing of the unmet needs for transportation, environmental cleanup and ''hometown'' security.

We must look at this current budget as an opportunity, despite the fact that we are now at war and our economy continues to stumble. We have a choice whether we want deficits as far as the eye can see. We have a choice whether we want to provide tax cuts to the detriment of education, healthcare and the environment. The Democratic budget alternatives we are voting on today are far better in addressing these choices.

The Democratic budget alternatives:

Invest in our communities, which creates jobs, provides needed infrastructure improvements for transportation and water, and cleans up the environment;

Help state and local governments cope with their current budget crises and provides money for ''hometown'' security and the first responders that protect our communities;

Provide increased funding for discretionary healthcare programs and education, reducing classroom sizes and providing advanced teacher training—proposals President Bush promised but the Republicans refuse to fund; and

Offer tax cuts and reforms that are much more affordable and equitable. They repeal the marriage penalty, provide immediate and permanent estate tax relief that increases the family exclusion level to $6 million, and accelerate the child tax credit to $800 per child. Other tax cuts would be deferred if the budget remains in deficit because of the war in Iraq or other factors.

My constituents and the American people understand that these are extraordinary times. They are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to protect our communities, to educate our children, and to clean our environment. We have an opportunity to help families become safer, healthier, and more economically secure. The Democratic budget alternatives seize this opportunity.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to voice my concern about the budget resolution before use today. As a Member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am especially concerned about the amount of funding included in the budget resolution for our Nation's veterans.

This Republican budget is woefully short of what is needed, and I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic budget alternative. Our alternative provides $32 billion more than the Republican budget over the next 10 years for veterans. This means providing $17 billion more for veterans' health care and rejecting the Republican cut of $15 billion for mandatory veterans' programs, programs like service-connected disability compensation, pensions, survivors' benefits, vocational rehabilitation, educational and burial benefits. I cannot imagine even thinking about cuts to compensation for our disabled veterans!

The Democratic budget is supported by the authors of the Independent Budget, a budget created by veterans' service organizations who are on the front lines and in a position to know exactly what is needed. They call the Democratic alternative ''a solid step forward in meeting the very real needs of veterans''.

This morning I attended the joint Senate and House VA Committee hearing, where we heard views on the budget from the Vietnam Veterans of America, the American Ex-Prisoners of War, the Military Officers Association of American, and AMVETS. I must report that for much of the hearing, there were only two Members present to receive the veterans testimony.

On the day following the beginning of the war with Iraq, it is hard to believe that most of the Members of the VA Committee were too busy to attend this hearing about funding for our veterans' programs. Perhaps our Republican colleagues were reworking their original budget resolution, working to respond to the outcries from veterans and the public about their original budget resolution. But the final result before us today is still woefully inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, as we send our young men and women to war in Iraq, certain to result in disability for some young Americans, we unfortunately are simultaneously sending the message that Congress is not concerned about their future as veterans! This is unconscionable.

Why does the Republican budget proposal fail to fund veterans programs at the level recommended by the Independent Budget? I am sad that it is largely because Congress is poised to give a tax break to the wealthiest Americans.

Who deserves to receive the benefits of the national treasury—America's disabled veterans or America's millionaires?

I urge my colleagues to reject this budget resolution.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I find it deeply troubling that as this country prepares for war and unites in support for our troops, the House Republicans would push forward a deeply partisan, environmentally destructive budget, hoping that a nation focused on war abroad will not notice this domestic attack.

This outrageous budget cuts more from crucial environmental programs than even the President's proposals. Without bothering to explain where these cuts will come from, House Republicans slashed more than 10 percent for the 2004 environmental funding, over 3 billion dollars. Incredibly, these cuts continue through the next ten years, providing for less than minimally required to maintain the existing levels of enforcement and environmental protections Americans rely on to protect our health and natural world.

Perhaps most deplorably, this proposed budget dictates our nation's environmental policy for the near future. It is a back-door way to open one of America's most precious wilderness areas to oil drilling. My Republican colleagues claim that this budget is 'silent' about oil drilling in the Arctic. If this budget is silent, it is certainly not neutral. The $1.1 billion cut over 10 years will all but force the federal government to use income from oil drilling in ANWR to reconcile deep funding cuts to balance their budget.

While Secretary Norton may think that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is ''an area of flat, white nothingness,'' my constituents understand that the Refuge is an unique, irreplaceable coastal plain and home to more than 100 specifes of wildlife and birds whose habitat would be undeniably devastated by this reckless drilling. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is a gem of the national wildlife system, created over one hundred years ago by Teddy Roosevelt, and the area of proposed drilling, Area 1002, is the ecological heart of the refuge.

Slipping ANWR 'silently' into this budget is dishonorable procedure and dangerous environmental policy. I urge my colleagues to oppose this handout to big oil companies and to support the Spratt substitute, which will protect an invaluable American treasure.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, You can tell a lot about a family by looking at their checkbook. The same is true of our nation. This budget reflects our priorities by investing in Defense, Homeland Security, the economy, and programs supporting our most vulnerable populations. The number one responsibility of the federal government is to protect American lives.

Under this budget, our military men and women will have the best and most modern equipment, better pay, better housing, and better Veterans Benefits—$62 billion dollars. That's $4 billion more than the previous year.

In my district of Jacksonville, the USS *John F. Kennedy* is undergoing an extensive maintenance rehabilitation period. There are many other aging ships within our fleet that require this type of depot level maintenance. This budget provides $5.3 billion for intermediation and depot level ship maintenance—an additional $500 million over last year's levels. This budget is a responsible investment in Jacksonville as a national security asset.

Included in the 2004 Military Construction request is $115.7 million for the acquisition of Blount Island. The Marines operate their maritime pre-positioning force from this location. Sixteen ships loaded with a brigades worth of equipment from light armored vehicles to the Meals Ready to Eat are maintained on a routine basis at this location. The Maritime Prepositioning Force floats in certain geographical locations around the world to reduce time required to deploy Marine forces. Currently 11 of these 16 ships have off-loaded their Jacksonville maintained equipment in Kuwait for the Marines use in the liberation of Iraq.

Under this budget, the federal government is on a 9-year-track toward balance and we remove tax code obstacles that stand in the way of growing our economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this budget resolution, not just because it protects Americans, not just because it restrains spending, not just because it targets waste, fraud, and

abuse, not just because it removes barriers to economic growth . . .

Vote for it because somewhere in my hometown of Jacksonville, there's a family that will sit around their kitchen table tonight, and they will talk about how much money is in the checking account and they will talk about when their bills are due.

They are making responsible decisions and expect nothing less from us.

This budget blueprint will protect that family, it will let that family keep a little more money to pay a bill, buy new clothes, or save for their children's education.

Vote for this budget because it's what's right for America.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the House Budget Committee and Chairman NUSSLE's leadership in crafting a Budget Resolution that epitomizes fiscal discipline and brings important tax relief and job creation to hard working American families. This Resolution will also protect Americans both here and abroad as we continue to face the challenges of the War on Terrorism.

It is too common in this chamber that Members talk about reducing spending, creating jobs, protecting Americans and providing common sense tax relief without a willingness to make the important changes. Unfortunately, rhetoric does not produce results.

This Budget Resolution symbolizes a strong commitment to make the needed reforms in spending that this body has been promising. This resolution is fiscally responsible and outlines a plan to balance the budget in nine years, while bringing important tax relief to American families.

This Resolution calls for a one percent reduction in growth, except for social security, defense, Medicare and Veterans and homeland security funding. By no means is this approach radical. This Budget Resolution allocates $200 billion over the next 10 years for Medicare with an additional $400 billion for Medicare modernization and prescription drug coverage. Veterans spending will increase by $844 million in Fiscal Year 2004. Education, Defense, Homeland Security and many other agencies will receive significant increases under this plan.

A one percent reduction in growth will allow for the elimination of waste, fraud and inefficiencies that consistently plagues federal spending. Locating this abuse is no great challenge for most agency budgets and eliminating it should be our obligation.

The Budget Resolution also provides for sound growth policy that will stimulate our economy, provide jobs to Americans and reduce the tax burden on American families. For example, the budget resolution assumes the 2001 tax cuts are made permanent and accommodates the entire growth plan proposed by President Bush.

President Bush's growth plan is vital to stimulating our weak economy and creating jobs for Americans. This includes the permanent elimination of the marriage penalty tax, the death tax and the double taxation of dividends.

The elimination of the double taxation of dividends, alone, will provide an average of 500,000 jobs a year and will greatly help the 52 percent of Americans—half of which are seniors—that are invested in the stock market.

The President's Growth Plan will also provide job opportunities to unemployed Americans throughout the nation. In Florida, alone, 248,500 jobs will be created over the next four years as a direct result to the policies of President Bush's Growth Plan.

Small businesses—the foundation of America's economy—would also receive important tax savings under President's Growth Package. In fact, 23 million small businesses will receive tax cuts averaging $2,042 under this plan.

Unfortunately, the only plans the Democrats are offering would spend irresponsibly and raise taxes. This is not only an injustice to the American economy, but a great injustice to American families that rely on tax relief during rough economic times.

I came to Congress promising my constituents that I would support tax relief and the concept of fiscal discipline. There is no piece of legislation that outlines a plan that accurately adheres to these principles better than the Budget Resolution we have before us.

Todays vote will clearly indicate who restrains spending and provides tax relief and who only talks about it. I look forward to sending a clear message to America that the days of rhetoric are over—we are going to control spending, provide tax relief to hard-working families and open the door to employment opportunities for millions of Americans.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Majority's fiscal year 2004 Budget Resolution because this resolution is unrealistic in reflecting the spending realities that our nation will face. Never in the history of our country has a Congress or a President dared to reward the wealthiest at a time of recession and war while asking the rest of America for painful sacrifice. If you believe seniors, veterans, and children are the problem, then the Majority has a budget solution for you. This shameful plan cuts funding for nearly every federal program, while at the same time making way for excessive tax cuts that will explode the deficit further and do nothing to help our economy.

This Budget Resolution contains deep and widespread cuts in every basic domestic program except Social Security and military retirement. The budget would require congressional committees to cut mandatory programs by $470 billion over the next ten years. The cuts are reminiscent of those proposed by former House Speaker Newt Gingrich in 1995 and included in the Contract with America budget legislation that former President Clinton vetoed that year.

While requiring deep cuts in domestic programs, the budget makes room for most for the President's large tax-cut package, including $1.4 trillion in tax cuts through 2013. The tax cuts in the ''growth'' package alone would cost $725 billion over ten years and would, according to the Tax Policy Center, result in tax reductions averaging $90,000 each in 2003 for those Americans who have incomes of more than $1 million. Unfortunately, 35 percent of New Mexico taxpayers would get no tax cut at all under the Bush plan, and 53 percent of New Mexico taxpayers would get a cut of less than $100.

Mr. Chairman, according to official projections by the Congressional Budget Office, budget deficits will turn to surpluses by 2008 if Congress refrains from enacting any further tax cuts or program increases, with the budget running a net surplus of $0.6 trillion over the period from 2003 through 2013. As is widely recognized, however, these projections are too optimistic: they do not include the large and inevitable cost of providing relief from the exploding scope of the Alternative Minimum Tax; they include no allowance for a war with Iraq; and they assume that various ''temporary'' tax credits will expire on schedule even though Congress nearly always extends them. Reflecting the cost of these three omitted items adds approximately $1 trillion in deficits over ten years.

The most reprehensible component of the House budget, as with its Senate counterpart, is that as the United States has begun ''Operation Iraqi Freedom'' neither measure sets aside one penny for this war with Iraq. The Bush administration has resolutely refused to offer cost estimates of war or early reconstruction despite requests from those on both sides of the aisle. Leaders in both parties have expressed increasing frustration that the potential bill for war and rebuilding Iraq still remain a mystery.

Mr. Chairman, with nearly a quarter of a million young Americans crossing the Iraqi border this House is on the verge of approving a nightmare budget that sets aside no money for this effort. Instead of sticking our heads in the budgetary sand and ignoring the war's price tag, we need to be honest with American taxpayers and ourselves. To pass a budget plan including large tax cuts without attempting even to estimate the war and postwar reconstruction costs is breathtakingly irresponsible.

I oppose the Majority's Budget Resolution because: It Fails to Promote Economic Growth—Instead of Creating Both Short-Term & Long-Term Economic Growth.

It Fails to Provide a Meaningful Prescription Drug Plan—Instead of Investing in An Affordable Medicare Prescription Drug Benefit, Available to All Seniors.

It Embraces Fiscally Irresponsible Tax Cuts Totaling $1.35 Trillion—Instead of Embracing Responsible Budgeting.

It Makes Substantial Cuts to National Priorities—like Education and Health Care—Instead of Funding Key National Priorities like the ''Leave No Child Behind Act''.

It Cuts Veterans' Benefits and Freezes Homeland Security Funding—Instead of Providing For Our Veterans and Giving Our First Responders the Tools they Need to Protect Our Homeland.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier we should be honest with the American taxpayers and with ourselves that the responsible thing to do is not pass this budget until we have the war supplemental figures before us and can reach consensus on other key federal programs.

Mr. STARK. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 975. This bankruptcy bill is touted as reform. But, it is actually a wolf in sheep's clothing intended to allow credit card companies and other lenders to gouge consumers when they are most vulnerable.

Republicans are giving this gift to the big credit card companies in the midst of this difficult recession, making it harder for working families to seek shelter from the common financial emergency of a lost job or lack of health coverage. In fact, 90% of all bankruptcies are filed for these very reasons. It's hard to see the abuse in these real instances of need, especially when many Americans live paycheck to paycheck.

Yet, this Republican legislation makes it more difficult for those Americans forced into

bankruptcy—a disproportionate number whom are women and minorities—to seek this protection. In fact, the bill requires the debtor in some cases to have to take on big corporate lenders in court to prove they are worthy of bankruptcy, forcing them to bear legal expenses they can't afford. In addition, this bill also allows creditors to threaten debtors with costly litigation that will in turn force many families to needlessly give up their legal rights.

In their continuing compassion, the Republicans have crafted this so-called reform so that a parent seeking to collect child support from an estranged spouse that's declared bankruptcy will have to fight it out with creditors to receive payment. Meanwhile, this bill makes it easier for those seeking bankruptcy protection to lose their homes or be evicted by their landlords. Yet, those with million dollar mansions will be able to keep their homes even while seeking the same bankruptcy protection. Nothing like a fair shake for America's working families.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, with all of the perks they've awarded to the big credit card companies, Republicans have done nothing to ensure that they are held accountable. There is nothing in this bill that stops the abusive, predatory lending that lands too many Americans in bankruptcy in the first place.

I urge my colleagues to vote down this anti consumer bill. Now is not the time to turn the tables on America's working families. Vote no on H.R. 975.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the lengths to which my Republican colleagues will go to in order to help out their fat-cat buddies will never cease to amaze me. We are considering a budget resolution today that is so bad and so draconian that the Republican leadership is having trouble convincing some of their own rank and file to support it.

I am outraged, Mr. Chairman, absolutely outraged that at a time when this nation is at war, my Republican colleagues are attempting to cut funding for veterans. Have they no shame? Mr. Speaker, these men and women were willing to risk their lives for this nation and many lost limbs in the process. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle would repay these most patriotic of Americans by slashing $15 billion from the Veteran's Administration budget over the next 10 years. Of course, since 96 percent of the VA's discretionary budget goes to pay for the healthcare of those who served this Nation, this means that we are reducing enrollment, reducing hospital days of care and reducing nursing staff. This is how the Republican leadership gives their thanks to our veterans.

At recent hearings, I expressed skepticism about the President's ''budget-neutral'' proposal to convert Medicaid to a block grant. Not only would this proposal leave States at risk if Medicaid costs rose, but I warned that it was a prelude to Congressional cuts in the program. The ink was not even dry on the President's proposal before the House Republicans are now requiring $100 billion cut in the program. As State budgets are being squeezed, the notion of reducing Federal spending on Medicaid is an astonishingly bad idea.

Although our Republican colleagues appear to have backed off their threat to slash Medicare to the bone, no one should be mistaken that this is the last we will hear of it. For years, Republicans have sought to do away with Medicare and Social Security—most recently under the guise of privatization. Medicare and Social Security remain primary targets for Republican ideologues and tax-cutters, and we must remain ever vigilant to protect these vital programs.

Mr. Chairman, this budget also fails to protect the environment. In fact, it cuts FY 04 funding by more than 10 percent. And over the next 10 years, it slashes environmental spending by more than 11 percent. What does this mean? Well, it could mean cuts for clean water, which is a logical choice since the Bush Administration seems hell bent on dismantling the Clean Water Act and selling off our rivers to hydroelectric companies. It likely means cuts for brownfields redevelopment. Of course, my Republican colleagues try to soften this blow by opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to drilling, which they say will increase federal receipts by $2.1 billion over the next 10 years. I am not certain how my friends on the other side of the aisle intend to do this, since some cooler heads in the Senate stripped the ANWR provision out of their budget yesterday.

Just two years ago, President Bush signed into law the No Child Left Behind Act, which was lauded by Democrats and Republicans alike. At the time that the bill was signed, the President and Congressional Republicans made a commitment to American families and their children that the programs in that bill would be funded at proper levels so that our public schools would not be placed in financial straight jackets. For two years that promise has gone unfulfilled, and this budget not only continues that dangerous trend, but actually cuts education funding. Mr. Speaker, Congressional Republicans have gone even further in their cuts than the President did in his budget, slashing spending by 8 percent. Let me give you a specific, Mr. Speaker. If this budget passes, more than 22,000 kids in my home state of Michigan will quite literally be left out in the cold. These kids will be left without any after-school services. Let me ask, is this what compassionate conservatism is all about?

Mr. Chairman, the cuts don't stop there. This sham of a budget drastically cuts our agriculture programs. Our farmers are the lifeblood of this great Nation. How do we show them our support? Well, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle thank our farmers by slashing agriculture programs by $763 million in FY 04. What this means in real terms is that conservation, nutrition, rural development and producer payment programs would be cut by more than 25 percent over their authorized amounts. These draconian cuts are neither justified nor sustainable. Again, that is not the end of the agriculture cuts. The Republican budget requires that the Agriculture Committee cut nearly $20 billion in direct spending over the next 10 years. This means more cuts to our family farmers by slashing funding to farm loan programs, conservation programs, rural development, forestry and research.

All of this leads to a very logical question, Mr. Speaker: why are my Republican colleagues doing this? Why are they gutting programs that help America's working families? Well, Mr. Speaker, they are doing this to accommodate more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. Yes, the goal of this budget is to allow the President to push through more of his irresponsible tax cuts. Make no mistake: these tax cuts will not stimulate the economy and will not help middle class Americans. In fact, in my home state of Michigan, about 50 percent of taxpayers would get less than $100 under the President's plan, and 30 percent would get no tax cut at all. Of course, this all leaves open the possibility that local communities will have to raise taxes because my Republican colleagues expect them to bear the burden of homeland security costs. This rascality is just another ploy for my Republican colleagues to help out their fat-cat corporate friends and leave the American people out in the cold.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I neglected to mention the cost of this current war with Iraq. We don't know how much the war will cost, and we have no idea how much it will cost to rebuild Iraq after the war. The Republican budget does not include one penny to pay for our troops currently overseas or the costs of reconstructing Iraq. Mr. Speaker, is this really the time to be centering the entire budget around tax cuts? I think not. This is a sham and an outrage.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget provides members with a reasonable and responsible alternative and I would strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it. Our budget is centered around a stimulus plan that provides both long term and short term economic growth—creating 1 million new jobs this year alone. The Democratic budget is responsible, balancing the budget by 2010 without unrealistic spending cuts. The Democratic budget gives schools the funding they need to implement No Child Left Behind, and more importantly, the funding they need to properly prepare our kids for the future. The Democratic budget provides $32 billion over the next 10 years for Veterans healthcare. Mr. Speaker, making sure those who were willing to give their lives for this country are taken care of needs to be a priority. It is, quite simply, the right thing to do. At this time of war, the Democratic budget adequately invests in Homeland Security by providing $32 billion

more than Republicans over the next 10 years—ensuring $3.5 billion in desperately needed new money for first responders. The Democratic budget also provides an adequate prescription drug benefit so our senior citizens don't have to choose between groceries and filling a prescription.

I would ask my colleagues, all of my colleagues, to reject the Republican budget and support the Democratic substitute.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, as we are now unfortunately engaged in an assault on Iraq, I pray for the safety of our American servicemen and women engaged in that military campaign and hope for their safe return. As we debate this budget resolution to fund programs for the defense and investment in our country I am very troubled by the harmful consequences for the budget cuts called for in this document.

This budget resolution partially reflects our current priority to protect the men and women of our fighting forces. It is only a partial measure because we need to see the supplemental appropriations request before we really know what the defense budget is. Looking beyond defense, this resolution is a travesty to the Americans who live within these borders.

High priority programs like Medicaid, education, veterans benefits, federal employee pension benefits, prescription drug benefits, law enforcement, food stamps are targeted under this budget resolution.

The majority says the cut backs total represent a 1 percent across-the-board cut. But because the Republican budget mirrors the President's request for defense, they impose a 2.9 percent cut on nondefense spending.

This is a guns and caviar budget.

The budget resolution says these cuts will come from eliminating waste, fraud and abuse. That's hogwash; it cannot be found. The resolution instructs the authorizing Committees to do the dirty work. The Committees will be asked to pony up $470 billion in direct spending program cuts over 10 years. When measured against a 10-year mandatory spending projection of $15.6 trillion that amounts to a 3 percent cut.

The only way to accommodate a cut of this magnitude is to cut benefit levels or restrict eligibility for benefits for human service programs that service our children, elderly, veterans, farmers, federal workers and more.

This budget could push nearly half a million poor children out of child nutrition programs.

In the field of health care, the Republican budget does not provide any significant funding for a Medicare Prescription Drug Program—only $28 billion. With that, you might be able to provide every senior with a bottle or two of aspirin each year.

The Resolution doesn't tell Congress to specifically cut funding for Medicare and Medicaid in order to provide a prescription drug program. It tells the Ways and Means and the Energy and Commerce Committees to do the dirty work. So if the Republicans want to deliver on their promise of a $400 billion prescription drug program, the two committees will have to find a combined total of $372 billion in program cuts.

Under this budget resolution seniors lose out in two ways. They get little or no prescription drug benefit and they will see their coverage under Medicare and Medicaid reduced. They will lose out because here are the options available for getting to the numbers called for in the Republican budget resolution:

Cut physician reimbursement by a third, saving $215 billion. If we go that route, it will only encourage doctors to stop seeing Medicare and Medicaid patients.

Eliminate hospital payments for medical education and cost of uncompensated care, saving $200 billion. That will be devastating to urban hospitals in Detroit and other inner cities, which are on the brink of financial collapse as it is.

Terminate home health benefits under Medicare. That will yield $207 billion. Or do away with skilled nursing home benefits . . . that will save $187 billion.

We can save $51 billion by taking health care services away from 5.3 million low income kids under the State Children Health Insurance Program.

This is a resolution that says to the wealthy, you don't have to pay the cost of this war against Iraq. We'll give the bill to seniors, children, disabled Americans, the sick, the hungry and to generations not yet born. There is no sacrifice being asked of those who can afford it the most. Make no mistake about it. The $382 billion dividend tax cut will do nothing to stimulate the economy. It most benefits those who financially benefit the most in our society.

And that's not just my view. It's a view point shared by the Disabled American Veterans. Ed Heath, National Commander of the DAV, says—and I quote—''Cutting already under funded veterans' programs to offset the costs of tax cuts is undefensible and callous.''

I have been critical of the President's budget and foreign policies. Why, after all, are we conducting a war that we are not willing to pay for. The President is sending a message that we can extend our global military reach without any sacrifice and still afford a tax cut that will largely benefit the top one percent of Americans. This budget document echoes what the Administration has been saying: ''We can have it all.''

Well, we can't have it all if it means breaking a contract with federal workers by cutting their pension health benefits;

if it means breaking the contract that we have with our seniors to cut back on Medicaid and Medicare health coverage;

if it means reneging on a promise to provide seniors with a meaningful prescription drug benefit;

if it turns our back on disability benefits and health care for our veterans;

if it means denying opportunities to our children by cutting back on health programs, Head Start, and Pell Grants.

This budget resolution is nothing but a series of broken promises. All the alternatives being considered today represent a better way, and I am going to support them. With an America at war, we need to act with some fiscally responsibility. The Republican budget does not meet that test. This budget benefits the investment class with a dividend tax cut at the expense of programs that serve everyday Americans. It divides us as a country and worsens our economic position.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very reluctant support of H. Con. Res. 95 because I believe that the cuts contained in the budget resolution, particularly as they relate to healthcare and veterans issues, will have dire consequences for a substantial portion of our nation. However, I will support the budget resolution today to ensure that this process moves forward. I know that last year Congress was unable to pass a budget resolution, and it greatly harmed our ability to move forward and to the work of the American people. It's critical that the House move the budget process forward, with the hope that the Senate will do its share and also pass a budget, which will trigger a conference. It is my hope that after today we will be one step closer to creating a fairer budget that maintains fiscal discipline while still meeting the needs of our constituents.

As a four-year veterans, I have always worked hard to be a vocal advocate for veterans throughout my congressional career. I strongly oppose the provisions in H. Con. Res. 95 that call for approximately $15 billion in mandatory spending programs for veterans. These programs include compensation for service-connected disabilities, survivor benefits and veterans' education benefits. I do not believe that forced budgetary reductions in these important mandatory spending programs are in the best interest of disabled veterans and their families.

While I will vote in favor of H. Con. Res. 95 in order to get the bill into conference with the Senate, I want to make it perfectly clear that I will not support the conference report on the budget resolution or any deeming resolution if it contains these or similar reductions in veterans' mandatory spending and does not provide sufficient funding for veterans' health care programs. Nor will I support the conference report if it contains significant reductions in Medicare funding. Moreover, if the conference report contains these types of reduction, I will do everything in my power to overturn them.

What kind of message are we sending to the men and women currently serving in our Armed Forces, especially those in Iraq, when we cut funding for programs that benefit our nation's current veterans? I want to remind my colleagues of a quote by our first Commander-in-Chief George Washington: ''The willingness with which our young people are likely to serve in any war, no matter how justified, shall be directly proportional to how they perceive the veterans of earlier wars were treated and appreciated by their nation.'' We must support the brave men and women who have sacrificed so much to keep our nation free.

The Medicaid cuts contained in this budget can not be sustained. The cuts will seriously damage a program depended upon by our most vulnerable citizens. Waste, fraud, and abuse, particularly abuse, do exist but we must have time to excise these problems, without being forced into mandatory programmatic reductions. Also, we must realize that each of our States will be particularly hit hard by these cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I do believe that we can strike a balance that will provide tax relief to American families, fund our national priorities, while still achieving a balanced budget. I refuse, however, to do so on the backs of some of our nation's most vulnerable citizens; and I declare that I will consider myself bound by this resolution should the House and Senate fail to pass a joint budget resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as war begins in Iraq, Americans are rallying behind our Armed Forces. It is an extraordinary show of support for some of the finest men and women in America. They deserve our support and our gratitude.

Our soldiers confront the gravest threat of our time: the combination of rogue regimes, weapons of mass destruction and the forces of global terrorism. The cause of peace will prevail when terrorists lose a wealthy patron and protector—Saddam Hussein.

There is little doubt that Hussein will be fully disarmed. And the means of his disarmament will be carried out by the United States Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines. These are four institutions so identified with their commitment to honor, duty and country that words can never adequately convey their importance to the survival of freedom . . . to the survival of the United States of America.

On the eve of the war, Marine Major-General J.N. Mattis explained the mission to his Corps. They are words every American soldier in the Persian Gulf can embrace.

General Mattis said:

On your young shoulders rest the hopes of mankind. . . . Our fight is not with the Iraqi people, nor is it with members of the Iraqi army who chose to surrender. While we will move swiftly and aggressively against those who resist, we will treat all others with decency, demonstrating chivalry and soldierly compassion for people who have endured a lifetime under Saddam's oppression. . . .

For the mission's sake, our country's sake, and the sake of the men who carried the Division's colors in past battle—who fought for life and never lost their nerve—carry out your mission and keep your honor clean. Demonstrate to the world there is ''No Better Friend, No Worse Enemy'' than a U.S. Marine.

General Mattis deserves an enduring ''Semper Fi'' for inspiring our soldiers. We hope and pray for their safe return home.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have four priorities for this budget; creating an environment for job creation, providing for the common defense, making quality health care more affordable, and improving education. I also want all these things must be done in a way that gets us back to a balanced budget within a reasonable period of time. The resolution we will pass tonight is tough medicine and doesn't do all it needs to do.

I believe that this budget will create jobs and stimulate the economy. By leaving room for significant tax relief we can leave extra dollars in the pockets of millions of Americans. I support tax relief, particularly for small businesses that create jobs and I applaud the chairman for his work.

During this time of war, this budget does a great job funding our national defense, both military spending and homeland security. This budget goes a long way toward making all Americans more secure. I am very concerned that even with the manager's changes, it sorely under funds our veterans programs.

Inroads have been made so this budget begins to address issues regarding the affordability of Health Care. When this budget was introduced it had spending levels in Medicare that were unworkable. Because of these cuts, I felt it necessary to introduce my own amendment that was not accepted by the House Rules Committee to provide more than $375 billion additional dollars for Medicare and other Health programs over the next 10 years. Changes made in the Medicare accounts since its introduction have relieved many of my concerns. I hope that the conference report will completely fix the funding of healthcare as it relates to Medicaid.

The most difficult part of this budget for me to accept is the lack of commitment to education. Just last year we passed the landmark legislation, ''No Child Left Behind.'' I feel that this budget does not meet the promises we made in that legislation. The amendment that I proposed would have increased the budget authority on education by more than $70 billion over 10 years. I urge the conferees to renew our commitment to education and fund education at least to the President's level.

I will vote for this budget, but my support comes cautiously. Last year we didn't have a budget and it created great difficulty in getting the appropriations done. We need to move this process forward building on the progress we have made in the last twenty-four hours. While I will support this budget today, I will not support a conference report that does not adequately support our veterans, keep our promises on education, create jobs, and improve our Nation's health system. I ask that the conferees make these important improvements before our final vote on this budget later this year.

Ms. MAJETTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to explain why I voted for those budget alternatives I supported today. The passage of the budget resolution to day represents the culmination of a long and arduous process involving 435 members of Congress and their often divergent views and priorities. As each member of Congress represents a unique constituency, each with its own concerns, it is entirely fitting that alternatives be considered and debated before the final federal budget is passed by this body.

This budget outlines the manner in which our shared national resources will be allocated for the year, and, as such, the resolution must be a statement of both our immediate needs as well as our long-term priorities. Consequently, the budget process requires each of us to make tough choices when deciding how much to burden American families with taxes as well as how to allocate these limited resources to different categories of needs.

The budget process often results in choices between imperfect alternatives that do not necessarily completely reflect any one member's priorities. In deciding which alternative to support, I balanced two primary priorities: my ardent desire to limit our spending's impact on the future, and my sincere belief that spending should be focused on programs that provide real investments in the future.

To realize our long term goals, we ought to minimize our long-term debts. In doing so, we will allow our children to pay for their dreams without being saddled with our realities.

I would like to bequeath to our children a world where we have tackled the problems of our day and provided them unfettered access to the tools they'll need tomorrow. If we are determined to spend our precious resources now (rather than saving them for our children's use) it is reasonable that we devote a large portion of these resources to the betterment of our children's future.

Perhaps the most future-oriented use of a taxpayer's money is to invest in exploration of our world through research. Scientific inquiry, by its very nature, offers no guarantees; the paths of discovery are rife with pitfalls and stumbles. As the explosion of the Columbia tragically reminded us, exploring the unknown is never easy. It is often painful. In the end, however, scientific inquiry offers us our best hope that the world can be a better place.

Through government assistance, some of the greatest minds of our time are working to find cures for the disease that plague us, young and old, rich and poor alike. Failing to fund these initiatives robs our children of their hopes for a better world. One day in the future, these scientists will discover a cure for cancer, a vaccine for AIDS, and a better method for reaching further into the galaxy. We must continue to make their efforts a priority—they are exploring for all of us.

As we consider our nation's priorities, we must be absolutely certain that we fully fund education initiatives. Education is the ultimate mechanism for allowing social mobility by leveling the playing field of opportunity. The United States continues to be a beacon of hope for other nations as a place where anyone, regardless of socioeconomic background, race or parentage, is limited only by his or her dreams; a place where everyone can achieve their goals. Our promise as a nation rests on maintaining this ideal. As Thomas Jefferson once stated, ''If the condition of man is to be progressively ameliorated, as we fondly hope and believe, education is to be the chief instrument in effecting it.''

My preference today was to vote for a budget that is both fiscally responsible and that focuses the Public's resources on those programs for which we can expect the greatest return on our investment. After considering the alternatives, I voted in favor of more than one alternative.

The Blue-Dog budget provides a fiscally responsible alternative. As presented, this plan would have reduced the national debt by $1.35 trillion, compared to the budget which passed. This reduction would have resulted in $250 billion less in taxes that our children would have to pay simply to pay the interest on this debt. While limiting the debt burden on our children, this alternative would also have cut taxes and focused resources to educational investments including student-loan and child nutrition programs.

The budget committee's ranking member, Mr. SPRATT, offered a budget which is a powerful statement of priorities and would have continued to fund our nation's important commitments to job creation, social security and medicare. This budget would have ensured that education and science programs be allocated the necessary funding to ensure that our nation continues to be a leader in the information age. It also would have allowed our children to meet the challenges of the future with the resources necessary to face them.

Through none of the budget alternatives I supported passed, I look forward to working with my colleagues to continue to establish our priorities in the weeks and months ahead. It is crucial that as we do so we remember where we are going. IF we are truly committed to social equality and to leaving no child behind, we must provide our children with the tools necessary to create an even better world

than the entirely too dangerous one in which we now find ourselves. If we endeavor to better understand our world through research, we give hope to our children that they will not be afflicted by the ailments that we suffer today and we give them the legacy of vision to look beyond that which is not imaginable. Finally, we must not bind our children with debt if we hope to allow them to rise above our own accomplishments.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 95 because it fails to meet the challenges confronting our country. We need a balanced approached to fiscal responsibility that treats the national budget just like a household budget.

America is going through very trying times. The economy is struggling unemployment is up, consumer confidence is down and our Armed Forces are at war. H. Con. Res. 95 fails to address these concerns because it embraces an inflated and fiscally irresponsible tax cut plan totaling $1.4 trillion. These tax cuts accommodate all of President Bush's proposals, but they would not provide the stimulus we need to jumpstart our economy. However, including all of them in this budget force us to make deep cuts in heavily relied upon programs.

I cannot go home and tell my constituents that I cut after-school programs, student loans, teacher quality programs, and COPS funding to make room for inflated tax cut plan that has no immediate impact on our economy.

I also cannot go home and tell my constituents that I slashed $265 billion in mandatory spending, placed an increased burden upon cash-strapped States, reduced investments in highway construction, and only partially funded programs under the No Child Left Behind Act so we can make room for a back-loaded tax plan that crowds out important programs.

And don't forget our ongoing war in Iraq. There is not one penny in this proposal that budgets for the war or the cost of rebuilding the economy.

Some argue we can address these costs in a supplemental. However, supplementals are becoming more like 2nd budgets. If we have an idea of what something is going to cost, we should budget accordingly for it now. We should not be playing games with the numbers.

This body should pass a budget that: Puts us back in balance; provides a tax stimulus that actually stimulates; secures our Homeland; offers a sensible prescription drug proposal; and sufficiently funds our military.

Although I understand the need to make sacrifices if we want to jumpstart the economy, they shouldn't be made by passing bad policy.

That is why I supported Democratic substitute. This budget projects a balanced budget in FY 2010, but does so with $500 billion less public debt than the committee-reported resolution. Unlike the resolution, the substitute does not cut domestic discretionary spending below the level needed to keep pace with inflation and does not contain any cuts in mandatory spending. Furthermore, the substitute provides a tax stimulus proposal that stimulates now.

Another important contrast is the prescription drug provisions contained in each budget proposal. The Democratic substitute provides $528 billion in new funds over 10 years for a prescription drug benefit. The resolution, by contrast, establishes a $400 billion ''reserve fund'' for Medicare prescription drugs and Medicare modernization. Why create a reserve fund instead of budgeting for a prescription drug proposal today?

Reserve funds do not solve the problems confronting this country. We need specific budget allocations for specific problems. Generally addressing problems at a later time in a reserve fund simply dances around the issue.

I want to support a budget that actually stimulates while taking into consideration long-term budget implications. There is no room for political gamesmanship when people lose their retirement savings, or their jobs.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H. Con. Res. 95. I do so reluctantly.

I respect the President.

I admire the Speaker more than I can say.

I think JIM NUSSLE has done an extraordinary job under impossible conditions.

But I am going to oppose the Nussle bill because I think it moves us in the wrong direction.

There are strong arguments against my position, such as: This is only a step in a long process; the conference report is where the real vote is cast; and we must be loyal to the President and to the troops overseas.

But, Mr. Chairman, I don't think that being loyal to the President or our troops in the Persian Gulf—or for that matter to all the other citizens—is really an issue here.

This is a democratic process with which we work—and I know there are party pressures, and I know we need a budget—but this particular budget is not particularly helpful in solving our problems.

At the very least I feel that we should wait until the President submits his ''supplemental'' request—based on what he feels the military will need. This will be, I assume, a rather large number.

Also the issue of timing is critical. The expense budget which we will vote on is inherently tied to the tax reduction program. This scares me. Together the numbers are not right—the timing is bad. I ask myself—

How can we vote to adversely impact medical and education expenses in a war atmosphere?

How can we see our revenues collapsing in front of us and then consider a tax reduction bill which, while somewhat stimulating to our economy, will further deplete revenues?

For me this package, I'm sorry to say, doesn't hang together.

I just think we can do better.

I hope we can do better—so that I can soon vote for a program which does right by us as a country long term, stimulates our economy short term—and keeps faith with the families of our troops in the Persian Gulf.

Mrs. BROWN of Florida. This irresponsible Republican budget needs to be sent back to the drawing board. The war in Iraq is no reason to ignore the needs of this country. This budget cuts programs for our neediest citizens, while rewarding the wealthiest with huge tax cuts. It is particularly disturbing that at the very moment we send our young men and women into harms way, we fund the veterans budget at a level that keeps these national heroes waiting 12 months to see a doctor. This Congress can always seem to find plenty of money for tax cuts, but when it comes to veterans healthcare, we have nothing but lip service.

This Republican budget is bad for America, and bad for my home State of Florida which is suffering badly from the one-two punch of the Bush Brothers. The President's budget:

Cuts $20 million for After School Programs in Florida; cuts $3.7 million in Teacher Quality Funding for Florida; cuts $40 million in transportation funding for Florida; cuts $38 million from Election Reform efforts in Florida; cuts $16.5 million in Clean Water Funding for Florida; cuts $4.3 million from Community Service Block Grants in Florida; cuts $1.2 million in Energy Assistance Programs; and cuts $765 million for the COPS program, which put 7,280 new officers on Florida's streets.

All this while his brother Governor Jeb Bush slashes funding for state education and health programs, squeezes Medicaid resources to pay for Capital Gaines Tax Cuts, and uses money meant for Local First Responders to pad his budget shortfalls.

This Republican budget was written for their political contributions, and not for the people of this country with real needs. Reject this sham budget, and support the CBC/Progressive budget. It's the right budget for every American.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, it is with great regret that I voted to support the fiscal year 2004 House Budget Resolution. I did so because I appreciate the value of moving the process along towards a Concurrent Resolution with the Senate. I will not vote for a final Concurrent Budget Resolution that contains the same levels of funding as the House Budget Resolution.

It is my full expectation the cuts to Medicaid and Veterans programs will be restored in the final Concurrent Resolution. It is my intention to support a final Resolution that makes these programs whole again. New York hospitals face a Medicaid cut of $1 billion from New York State. It would be unthinkable for my hospitals to face a deep cut on the federal level at the same time. They have survived the 1997 Balance Budget Agreement cuts, but can stand no more. One of the hospitals in my district is already scheduled to close and I simply can't afford to lose another one.

I support the goal of a balanced budget and have even cosponsored the Balanced Budget Act, but a balance is just that: matching the merits on both sides. Indeed there is some waste in the current programs and it is time for everyone to do some belt tightening, but the current cuts cannot stand.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member rises to express his reluctant and temporary support for H. Con. Res. 95, the House Budget Resolution.

Mr. Chairman, our country is facing a difficult fiscal situation and this budget resolution sets a framework for this Congress to carefully proceed over the next ten years. While the budget resolution reserves revenue to finance the full range of the tax cuts proposed by the President, this Member adamantly believes the proposed tax cut is too large and, in fact, this Member will not vote for such a large tax cut when the House separately votes on that issue.

There are three reasons this Member is opposed to this large tax cut. First, it is fiscally irresponsible. Second, in the economic sense, eliminating the tax on dividends is not the best

way to quickly and effectively stimulate the economy. Tax cuts for middle-income Americans and small businesses is far more effective, and eliminating the tax on dividends may in fact drain money from capital goods to dividends for the corporate leaders' pocketbooks through their large stock holdings in their company. And third, the elimination of the tax on dividends as a major part of this tax cut package is not equitable, because a very high percentage of tax relief would go to a small percentage of taxpayers.

The elimination or substantial reduction of the tax on dividends, which results in an estimated reduction in tax revenue of more than an estimated $100 billion per year, is simply not sound fiscal policy—especially given the estimated size of the deficit, the unknown costs of the war in Iraq, the war on terrorism, and the costs of homeland security measures.

If the budget protects Medicare from huge cuts, as it must, and increases even more the revenues for veterans programs, it would cause impossibly large cuts in the rest of the discretionary budget. This cut in the remainder of the domestic programs required by this budget proposal is too severe even when the savings from the elimination of waste, fraud and abuse is taken into account.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to do what the other body is considering—responsibly cut back the size of the huge tax cut. It is this Member's hope that the conference agreement on the budget will follow the Senate's lead and decrease the funds held in reserve to finance a tax cut. If the conference report comes back to the House with the same fiscally unsound level of tax cuts and substantially the same level of tax cuts related to eliminating the tax on dividends, this Member will vote ''no'' on the conference report. It is fiscally irresponsible and inequitable to middle-income taxpayers, and the proposal to eliminate taxes on dividends will not give us the immediate economic stimulation our country needs.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, this Member votes ''aye'' on this budget proposal in order to move the process along. As we learned from last year's inaction on the budget by the other body, the passage of a budget resolution is critically important as the first step in the annual appropriations process that funds the U.S. Government and provides invaluable services to our constituents. As a result, this Member cannot in good conscience vote to stop or stall the process at this early stage. However, be assured that this Member will follow-up on his commitment to vote ''no'' on the conference report if the level of tax cuts is not decreased and the huge amount dedicated to eliminating the tax on dividends is not dropped or very substantially reduced.

Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to support the budget resolution before us today. While the budget before us makes great strides to control spending and reduce the deficit, I am afraid the Veterans Administration will not have the necessary resources to take care of our nation's veterans. I know that many of my Virginia congressional colleagues share these same concerns as well.

While I fully recognize that no budget is perfect, I hope we can all agree that providing health care to our nation's veterans should be the last place we look to reduce spending. Perhaps it would be more appropriate for us to review our spending on foreign aid before we ask our veterans to sacrifice yet again for their country. At a time when our country has soldiers deployed in Iraq in defense of freedom, it is important that we do not leave behind the men and women who have served our country in the past.

I will vote for this budget, however, because I believe it is vital that we keep the budget process moving. Further delaying the budget could negatively impact defense, homeland security, and other important government functions. As we all know, by failing to pass a budget resolution last year, the Senate caused a train wreck in the appropriations process. The House and the Senate never agreed on a common budget, which left the respective appropriations committees working from two different, irreconcilable sets of numbers. That resulted in Congress working on appropriations bills in January—bills that should have been completed last September. With America now at war, we cannot allow that to happen again.

It is my hope that the final product will be improved, so that I will be able to support the final budget conference report.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget resolution. There are many reasons to oppose this budget, but I am going to concentrate on just one.

This resolution quite simply pays for tax cuts that benefit the wealthy by cutting programs for seniors and disabled people who are most in need of help in meeting their medical expenses.

The original version of this resolution was quite explicit: it required massive cuts in both the Medicare and Medicaid programs. Facing an uproar from beneficiaries and providers alike, what have our Republican colleagues done. They have responded by concentrating all of the cuts on Medicaid, the program that serves the neediest seniors and disabled beneficiaries, as well as millions of poor children.

They think they can fool people by doing this. But millions of America's seniors—widows living on Social Security, people in nursing homes, seniors living on modest budgets—are totally dependent on the additional assistance they get from Medicaid so Medicare can work for them. They know what these cuts mean. They need the help they get with their Medicare premiums and cost-sharing. They need Medicaid coverage of prescription drugs.

And they know that Medicaid is the only source of payment for long-term care services—both nursing home care and home and community based services. It is Medicaid payments that nursing homes rely on—to pay staff, to maintain quality, to provide services.

Medicaid is a critical payer for hospitals, community health centers, clinics and providers that serve the disabled, the low-income, the uninsured, and seniors.

Two-thirds of the dollars we spend in Medicaid go to seniors and disabled people, the very same population served by Medicare. These beneficiaries need both programs. And we all know our States are in desperate need of additional funds to maintain Medicaid coverage and services.

This budget responds to this crisis by slashing Medicaid instead of helping, by turning our backs on millions of disabled people, kids, and low-income seniors instead of assisting them. This budget responds with a proposed cut in Medicaid twice as big as any reduction made by any previous Congress.

The Republicans have responded to the charge that they were financing their tax cuts on the backs of seniors and the disabled by financing them on the backs of the POOR seniors and disabled.

This budget will cripple our States, it will add to the numbers of uninsured, and it will be devastating for millions of Medicare beneficiaries who need extra help.

If the majority passes this budget, it will show the true colors of the Republican party. It will show a lack of caring for the most vulnerable of our seniors, for the disabled, for poor kids and their moms, for the institutions in this country who try to deliver health care to them, and to the States that are struggling to provide for them.

We should defeat this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). All time for debate having expired, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. ISAKSON, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 95) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013, pursuant to House Resolution 151, he reported the concurrent resolution, as amended by the adoption of that resolution, back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution, as amended.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on House Concurrent Resolution 95, the budget resolution, will be followed by a 5-minute vote on House Current Resolution 104 regarding Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 215, nays 212, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—215

Aderholt	Bono	Coble
Akin	Boozman	Cole
Bachus	Bradley (NH)	Collins
Baker	Brady (TX)	Combest
Ballenger	Brown (SC)	Cox
Barrett (SC)	Brown-Waite, Ginny	Crane
Barton (TX)	Burgess	Crenshaw
Bass	Burns	Cubin
Beauprez	Burr	Culberson
Bereuter	Burton (IN)	Cunningham
Biggert	Calvert	Davis, Jo Ann
Bilirakis	Camp	Davis, Tom
Bishop (UT)	Cannon	Deal (GA)
Blackburn	Cantor	DeLay
Blunt	Capito	DeMint
Boehlert	Carter	Diaz-Balart, L.
Boehner	Chabot	Diaz-Balart, M.
Bonilla	Chocola	Doolittle
Bonner		Dreier

Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—212

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Castle
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—8

Buyer
Gordon
Lipinski
McCarthy (MO)
Saxton
Snyder
Thornberry
Udall (CO)

□ 0254

Mr. COMBEST and Mr. HALL of Texas changed their votes from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT AND APPRECIATION FOR THE PRESIDENT AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES PARTICIPATING IN OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The pending business is the question of agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 104, on which further proceedings were postponed.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 11, answered ''present'' 22, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 83]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Janklow
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher

Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—11

Conyers
Honda
Jones (OH)
Lee
McDermott
Rangel
Scott (VA)
Stark
Towns
Waters
Watson

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—22

Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Carson (IN)
Clay
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Doggett
Farr
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
Meeks (NY)
Owens
Paul
Payne
Rush
Sabo
Schakowsky
Watt

NOT VOTING—10

Buyer
Gordon
Lantos
Lipinski
McCarthy (MO)
Rogers (MI)
Saxton
Snyder
Thornberry
Udall (CO)

□ 0302

Mr. PAYNE changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''present.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING H.R. 1104, CHILD ABDUCTION PREVENTION ACT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of March 24 to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 1104, the Child Abduction Prevention Act of 2003.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and 1 copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in Room H–312 of the Capitol by noon on Tuesday, March 25, 2003. Members should draft their amendments to the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary on March 18, 2003, which is expected to be filed on Tuesday, March 25, 2003.

Members are also advised that the text should be available for their review on the Websites of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules by Friday, March 21, 2003.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate form. Members also should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the balance of the week and next week.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader who worked just a little too hard tonight.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I no longer have to whip these folks like the gentleman does, and our whip was really working hard tonight and did a great job.

I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland yielding to me, Mr. Speaker.

If the gentleman would continue to yield, the House will convene on Tuesday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of those bills will be sent to Members' offices early next week. Any votes called on these bills will be rolled until 6:30 p.m. on Tuesday.

On Wednesday, we expect to consider several additional bills under suspension of the rules before moving to legislation to create a compensation fund for first responders who receive the smallpox vaccine. While this legislation has not yet been introduced, I tell my friend from Maryland the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Education and the Workforce have been working diligently to arrive at a compromise that I believe all Members will be able to support.

On Thursday, we will consider two bills addressing child abuse, as we head into April, which is designated as Child Abuse Prevention Month. H.R. 1104, the Child Abduction Prevention Act, would extend the Justice Department's Amber Alert system to a nationwide program. It also eliminates the statute of limitations for child abduction and sex crimes, prohibits pretrial release in cases of rape and child kidnapping, provides for a mandatory minimum sentence for child kidnapping, and establishes a two strikes and you are out requirement for child sex offenders.

H.R. 14, the Keeping Children and Families Safe Act, will reauthorize and modify the Child Abuse Prevention Treatment Act and related programs to prevent child abuse and family violence, and to protect and treat abused and neglected children and victims of family violence.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I will be happy to answer any of his questions.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished leader for that information.

First, Mr. Leader, I presume we have concluded all of our work this week; is that correct?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is correct. I failed to say that we have completed the work of the House for the week and will not return until Tuesday.

Mr. HOYER. I know all the Members thank the gentleman for that information.

I will ask the gentleman, next Friday, does the gentleman expect to be in session next Friday, or could the Members expect not to be in session next Friday?

Mr. DELAY. No, we do not expect to be in session on next Friday.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that information.

Does the gentleman anticipate that the tax bill will be marked up by the Committee on Ways and Means next week, and then can we anticipate it on the floor the following week?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would continue to yield, the Committee on Ways and Means, as the gentleman knows, has held a series of hearings on various components of the President's economic growth package. Now that the House has passed the budget resolution, I expect that the committee will move forward very soon in this important legislation, and I would certainly like to have it considered by the House before the Easter recess.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talked about the committees, but the energy bill, when can we expect the full committee to take action on that bill, and when does the gentleman expect it to come to the floor?

Mr. DELAY. If the gentleman would continue to yield, as the distinguished minority whip knows, the proposal that the House passed in the last Congress had provisions from more than half a dozen committees. We are again working to coordinate the work of various committees to ensure that we can quickly get a bill through the House. At least one committee began the markup process for that bill last week, and I know the others are moving forward as fast as they can, and many of them are marking up next week. I would hope that all the committees involved in this important legislation on energy would complete their work in time so that we can have the bill on the floor prior to the Easter recess.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and, Mr. Speaker, I have no further questions of the leader, and I appreciate his giving us the schedule.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 24, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 24, 2003.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, MARCH 25, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, March 24, that it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday,

March 25, 2003, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CONFISCATING AND VESTING CERTAIN IRAQI PROPERTY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108–51)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b) (IEEPA), and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1631, I hereby report that I have taken additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990, by exercising my statutory authority to confiscate and vest certain property of the Government of Iraq and its agencies, instrumentalities, or controlled entities.

Consistent with section 203(a)(1)(C) of IEEPA, 50 U.S.C. 1702(a)(1)(C), as added by section 106 of the USA PATRIOT ACT, Public Law 107–56, I have ordered that certain blocked funds held in the United States in accounts in the name of the Government of Iraq, the Central Bank of Iraq, Rafidain Bank, Rasheed Bank, or the State Organization for Marketing Oil are hereby confiscated and vested in the Department of the Treasury. I have made exceptions for any such funds that are subject to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations or the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, or that enjoy equivalent privileges and immunities under the laws of the United States, and are or have been used for diplomatic or consular purposes. In addition, such amounts that, as of the date of the order, are subject to post-judgment writs of execution or attachment in aid of execution of judgments pursuant to section 201 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–297) are not being vested, provided that, upon satisfaction of the judgments on which such writs are based, any remainder of such excepted amounts shall, without further action, be confiscated and vested.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury authority to undertake all other action of the President and all functions of the President set forth in section 203(a)(1)(C) of IEEPA with respect to any and all property of the Government of Iraq, including its agencies, instrumentalities, or controlled entities, and to take additional steps, including the promulgation of rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued, which is effective immediately.

I have exercised these authorities in furtherance of Executive Orders 12722 and 12724 with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to our national security and foreign policy posed by the policies and actions of the Government of Iraq. I intend that such vested property should be used to assist the Iraqi people and to assist in the reconstruction of Iraq, and have determined that such use would be in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States.

The power to vest assets of a foreign government with which the United States is engaged in armed hostilities is one that has been recognized for many decades. This power is being used here because it is clearly in the interests of the United States to have these funds available for use in rebuilding Iraq and launching that country on the path to speedy economic recovery. In addition, this authority is being invoked in a limited way, designed to minimize harm to third parties and to respect existing court orders as much as possible.

GEROGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 20, 2003.*

RECONSTRUCTION

(Mr. MCDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as the Bush-Cheney-Rumsfeld war has begun, we must now turn our attention to the reconstruction. As we discuss the budget today, we must keep some facts in mind.

In a country where 60 percent of the people are entirely dependent on the Oil-for-Food Program run by the United Nations, which was ended 2 days ago, we are preparing to spend $12 billion a month bombing and $65 million for food, water, sanitation, shelter and health.

We have accepted full responsibility for the people of Iraq as of this day. We did the same for Afghanistan. We promised back in October of 2001, Bush and Blair said the conflict will not end, we will not walk away as the outside world has done before. The fact is we spent $6.5 billion bombing Afghanistan, and $300 million was all we would commit for the first year. Mr. Karzai was in this country the other day begging for aid. He got $50 million, and we told him $35 million has to go to build a hospital.

I will include in the RECORD an article by George Monbiot.

A SCAR ON THE CONSCIENCE OF THE WORLD

LEFT BEHIND TO STARVE—A HUMANITARIAN DISASTER IS ENGULFING AFRICA AS CASH IS POURED INTO THE WAR WITH IRAQ AND ITS AFTERMATH

(By George Monbiot)

There is surely no more obvious symptom of the corruption of western politics than the disproportion between the money available for sustaining life and the money available for terminating it. We could, I think, expect that, if they were asked to vote on the matter, most of the citizens of the rich world would demand that their governments spend as much on humanitarian aid as they spend on developing new means of killing people. But the military-industrial complex is a beast which becomes both fiercer and greedier the more it is fed.

As the United States prepares to spend some $12 billion a month on bombing the Iraqis, it has so far offered only $65 million to provide them with food, water, sanitation, shelter and treatment for the injuries they are likely to receive. A confidential U.N. contingency plan for Iraq, which was leaked in January, suggests that the war could expose around one million children to ''risk of death from malnutrition.'' It warns that ''the collapse of essential services in Iraq could lead to a humanitarian emergency of proportions well beyond the capacity of U.N. agencies and other aid organizations.'' Around 60 percent of the population is entirely dependent on the oil for food programme, administered by the Iraqi government. This scheme was suspended by the U.N. yesterday, leaving the Iraqis reliant on foreign aid. The money pledged so far is enough to sustain the Iraqies for less than a fortnight.

It is hard to believe, however, that the U.S. Government will leave them to starve once it has captured their country. For the weeks or months during which Iraq dominates the news, the U.S. will be obliged to defend them from the most immediate impacts of the institutional collapse its war will cause. Afterwards, like the people of Afghanistan, the Iraqis will be first forgotten by the media and then deserted by those who promised to support them.

But even before the first troops cross the border, the impending war has caused a global humanitarian crisis. As donor countries set aside their aid budgets to save both themselves and the United States from embarrassment under the camera lights in Baghdad, they have all but ceased to provide money to other nations. The world, as a result, could soon be confronted by a humanitarian funding crisis graver than any since the end of the Second World War.

Every year, in November, the U.N. agencies which deal with disasters launch what they call a ''consolidated appeal'' for each of the countries suffering a ''complex emergency''. They expect to receive the money they request by May of the following year. The payments and promises they have extracted so far chart the collapse of international concern for the people of almost every nation except Iraq.

In Eritrea, for example, the drought is so severe that the water table has fallen by ten metres. Most of the nation's crops have failed and grain prices have doubled. Seventy percent of its 3.3 million people are now classified as vulnerable to famine. The United

Nations has asked the rich countries for $163 million to help them. It has received $4 million, or 2.5 percent of the money it requested.

Burundi, where almost one-sixth of the inhabitants have been forced out of their homes by conflict and natural disasters, and which is now officially listed as the third poorest nation on earth, has received 3 percent of its U.N. request. Liberia, where rebels have rendered much of the western part of the country uninhabitable, forcing some 500,000 people out of their homes, has been given 1.2 percent; Sierra Leone, where lassa fever is now rampaging through the refugee camps, has received 1 percent; and Guinea, which has recently taken 82,000 refugees from Cote d'Ivoire, 0.4 percent. Somalia, Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo have all received less than 6 percent.

Much of the money for these invisible countries has come from donor nations with relatively small economies, such as Sweden, Norway, Canada and Ireland. ''The state of Africa'', Tony Blair told his party conference in October 2001, ''is a scar on the conscience of the world, but if the world focused on it, we could heal it''. Well, let it now be a scar on the conscience of Tony Blair.

As a result of this unprecedented failure by the rich nations to cough up, the people of the forgotten countries will, very soon, begin to starve to death. The U.N. has warned that ''a break in supplies'' to Eritrea ''is now inevitable''. The World Food Programs has started feeding fewer people there, but will run out of food within two months. In Burundi it can, it says, continue feeding people ''for another four weeks''. Beans will run out in Liberia this month; cereals in May. One hundred thousand refugees in Guinea could find themselves without food by August. Yet neither of the two governments which are about to launch a ''humanitarian war'' appear to be concerned by the impending humanitarian catastrophes in the world's poorest nations.

The aid crisis is now so serious that it is restricting disaster relief even in nations which are considered by the major powers to be geopolitically important. The U.N. agencies have so far received just 2.9 percent of their request for Palestine, and 8.4 percent of the money they need in Afghanistan.

The latter figure is, in light of the repeated promises made by the nations prosecuting the war there, extraordinary. ''To the Afghan people we make this commitment,'' Blair pledged during the same speech in October 2001. ''The conflict will not be the end. We will not walk away, as the outside world has done so many times before.'' Three months later, the U.N. estimated that Afghanistan would need at least $10 billion for reconstruction over the following five years. The U.S., which had just spent $4.5 billion on bombing the country, offered $300 million for the first year and refused to make any commitment for subsequent years. This year, George Bush ''forgot'' to produce an aid budget for Afghanistan, until he was forced to provide another $300 million by Congress.

The government, which has an annual budget of just $460 million—or around half of what the U.S., still spends every month on chasing remnants of Al qaeda through the mountains—is effectively bankrupt. At the beginning of this month the Afghan president, Hamid Karzai, flew to Washington to beg George Bush for more money. He was given $50 million, $35 million of which the U.S., insists is spent on the construction of a five-star hotel in Kabul. Karzai, in other words, has discovered what the people of Iraq will soon find out: generosity dries up when you are yesterday's news.

If, somehow, you are still suffering from the delusion that this war is to be fought for the sake of the Iraqi people, I would invite you to consider the record of the prosecuting nations. We may believe that George Bush and Tony Blair have the interests of foreigners at heart only when they spend more on feeding them than they spend on killing them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HYDE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today until 11 p.m. on account of medical reasons.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 153. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish penalties for aggravated identity theft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

□ 0311

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 11 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 24, 2003, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1220. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mexican Fruit Fly; Treatments [Docket No. 02-129-2] received March 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1221. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Mexican Fruit Fly; Addition of Regulated Area [Docket No. 02-129-3] received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1222. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Licensing and Inspection Requirements for Dealers of Dogs Intended for Hunting, Breeding, or Security Purposes [Docket No. 99-087-3] received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1223. A letter from the Aciting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitive Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Experimental and Innovative Training — received February 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1224. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Civil Penalties Under ERISA Section 502(c)(7) and Conforming Technical Changes on Civil Penalties Under ERISA Sections 502(c)(2), 502(c)(5) and 502(c)(6)(RIN: 1210-AA91, RIN: 1210-AA93) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1225. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Rule Relating to Notice of Blackout Periods to Participants and Beneficiaries (RIN: 1210-AA90) received January 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1226. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Dept., Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits — received March 4, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1227. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Energy Information Administration's Annual Energy Review 2001, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(2); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1228. A letter from the Director, National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities, NIH, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2001 Annual Report on Health Disparities Research of the National Institutes of Health, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 299a—1 Public Law 106—525, section 903 (a)(6); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1229. A letter from the Director, National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities, NIH, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Strategic Research Plan and Budget to Reduce and Ultimately Eliminate Health Disparities for FY 2002-2006, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 287c—31 Public Law 106—525, section 105; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1230. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drugs; Phenylbutazone; Extralabel Animal Drug Use; Order of Prohibition [Docket No. 03N-0024] received March 11, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1231. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; Permits for Construction, Modification, Relocation and Operation of Stationary Sources of Air Pollutants, Notification Requirements, Administrative Updates, Temporary Permits [WV055-6025a; FRL-7449-4] received February 25, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1232. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Blanket, TX) [MB Docket No. 02-351; RM-10601] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1233. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations

(Little Rock, AR) [MM Docket No. 00-139; RM-9915] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1234. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Ridgway and Rangely, CO) [MB Docket No. 02-118; RM-10394] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1235. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations, (Rose Hill and La Grange, NC) [MB Docket No. 02-110; RM-10406] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1236. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Greenwood, MS [MB Docket No. 02-209; RM10512]; Hyannis, NE [MB Docket No. 02-210; RM-10510]; Wall,SD [MB Docket No. 02-211; RM-10511] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1237. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Murrieta, Arcadia, Fallbrook, Yucca Valley, and Desert Hot Springs, CA) [MM Docket No. 01-11; RM-10027, RM-10322] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1238. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Monroe and Luna Pier, MI) [MB Docket No. 02-115; RM-10427] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1239. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Crawfordville, GA) [MB Docket No. 02-225; RM-10517] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1240. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Dickens, TX) [MB Docket No. 02-258; RM-10500]; (Floydada, Texas) [MB Docket No. 02-259; RM-10501]; (Rankin, Texas) [MB Docket No. 02-262; RM-10504]; (San Diego, Texas) [MB Docket No. 02-264; RM-10505]; (Westbrook, Texas) [MB Docket No. 02-265; RM-10556] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1241. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisory to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Jasper, FL [MB Docket No. 02-274; RM-10560]; Tigerton, WI [MB Docket No. 02-275; RM-10561]) received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1242. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations, (Madisonville and College Station, Giddings, and Bay City, Columbus, Edna, Garwood, Palacios and Sheridan, TX) [MM Docket No. 99-331; RM-9728, RM-9847, RM-9848] received March 13, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1243. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Source Material Reporting Under International Agreements (RIN: 3150-AH10) received March 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1244. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification pursuant to Section 1203 (d) of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993 and the the FREEDOM Support Act (Public Law 102-511); to the Committee on International Relations.

1245. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's inventory of activities that are not inherently governmental functions as required by Section 2 of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998, Public Law 105-270; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1246. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Semiannual Management Report to Congress for April 1, 2002 through September 30, 2002, and the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1247. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, Department of Labor, transmitting a copy of the Department's Commercial Activities Inventory for Fiscal Year 2002; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1248. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting notification that effective March 1, 2003, the Director resigned; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1249. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Notices (RIN: 1029-AB99) received February 24, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1250. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Global Ocean Data Assimilation Experiment (GODAE) [Docket No. 021202295-2295-01] received February 24, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1251. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 021212306-2306-01; I.D. 021403] received March 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1252. A letter from the Chief Scout Executive and President, Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the Boy Scouts of America 2002 report to the Nation, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 28; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1253. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's legislative proposal to restructure the patent fees and adjust trademark fees for the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1254. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services Division, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Abbreviation or Waiver of Training for State or Local Law Enforcement Officers Authorized to Enforce Immigration Law During a Mass Influx of Aliens [INS No. 2241-02] (RIN: 1115-AG84) received February 21, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1255. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Removal of Visa and Passport Waiver for Certain Permanent Residents of Canda and Bermuda [INS No. 2202-02] (RIN: 1115-AG68) received February 4, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1256. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Admission and Orientation Program: Removal From Rules [BOP-1110-1] (RIN: 1120-AB08) received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1257. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services Division, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Automated Inspection Services--Extension of Enrollment Period [INS No. 2256-03] (RIN: 1115-AG94) received March 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1258. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Release of Information Regarding Immigration and Naturalization Service Detainees in Non-Federal Facilities [INS No. 2203-02] (RIN: 1115-AG67) received January 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1259. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services, INS, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of a $3 Immigration User Fee for Certain Commercial Vessel Passengers Previously Exempt [INS No. 2180-01] (RIN: 1115-AG47) received January 30, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1260. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Aliens and Nationality; Homeland Security; Reorganization of Regulations [EOIR No. 137F; AG Order No. 2662-2003] (RIN:1125-AA42) received March 5, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1261. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Documentation of Immigrants —— Elimination of Extended Visa Validity Benefits under Section 154 Pub. L. 101-649 — received February 20, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1262. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule — Documentation of Immigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended — Issuance of New or Replacement Visas

(RIN: 1400-AB39) received March 11, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1263. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Miss America Pageant, Atlantic City, New Jersey [COTP Philadelphia-02-005] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1264. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Industrial Canal, one-quarter mile north and south of the Almonaster Bridge, New Orleans, Louisiana [COTP New Orleans-02-018] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1265. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Mile Marker 52.0 to 53.0, Cape Girardeau, MO [COTP Paducah, KY 02-006] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1266. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Atchafalaya River, Port of Morgan City, Morgan City, LA [COTP Morgan City-02-005] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1267. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Mississippi Sound, Pascagoula, Mississippi [COTP Mobile-02-017] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1268. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile 90.0 to 91.0, Wheeling, West Virginia [COTP Pittsburgh-02-014] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1269. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Coast Guard Activities New York [CGD01-02-103] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1270. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone: All water within 100 ft of the M/F FUJI MARU while transiting Apra Harbor and while moored at Hotel Wharf, Port Authority of Guam, Territory of Guam [COTP GUAM-02-016] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1271. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones; Port of New York/New Jersey [CGD01-02-120] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1272. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Ashley River, Charleston, SC [CGD07-03-018] received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1273. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Monongahela River, Mile Marker 0.0 to Mile 1.3 and Allegheny River Mile Marker 0.0 to Mile Marker 0.5, Pittsburgh, PA [COTP Pittsburgh-02-020] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1274. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Allegheny River Mile Marker 0.0 to Mile Marker 0.3, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania [COTP Pittsburgh-02-021] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1275. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Monongahela River Mile: 22.5 to 23.5 [COTP Pittsburgh-02-015] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1276. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Chickahominy River, Williamsburg, Virginia [CGD05-02-045] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1277. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone: 4th of July Celebration, Marblehead, Massachusetts [CGD1-02-080] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1278. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety zone; Triathlon Swim, Hudson River, Ulster Landing, NY [CGD01-02-081] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1279. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Strategic Booming Exercise in Absecon Inlet, New Jersey [COTP Philadelphia-02-002] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1280. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administration Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone Regulation: Horn Island Sea Buoy (HI) at the entrance to Horn Island Pass in the Gulf of Mexico to Bayou Casotte, Mississippi [COTP Mobile, AL 02-009] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1281. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fourth of July Fireworks, Lake City, MN [COTP St. Louis, MO-02-011] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1282. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (GICW), Mile Marker 210 to 225 (EHL), Fort Walton Beach, Florida [COTP Mobile-02-013] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1283. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; First Night Summer Best Fireworks, Dorchester Bay, Dorchester, MA [CGD01-02-097] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1284. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: Yankee Homecoming Fireworks, Cashman Park, Newburyport, MA [CGD01-02-095] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1285. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety and Security Zone: Boston's Fourth of July Esplanade Events, Charles River Esplanade, Boston, Massachusetts [CDG01-02-088] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1286. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of the Dimensions of the Grand Canyon National Park Special Flight Rules [Docket No. FAA-2001-8690] (RIN: 2120-AG74) received March 7, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1287. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zone; Pioneer Dock, Kachemak Bay, Homer, Alaska [COTP Western Alaska 02-008] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1288. A letter from the Trial Attorney, FRA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Conforming the Federal Railroad Administration's Accident/Incident Reporting Requirements to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration's Revised Reporting Requirements; Other Amendments [Docket No. FRA-2002-13221, Notice No. 2] (RIN: 2130-AB51) received February 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1289. A letter from the Senior Regulations Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Coast Guard Board for Correction of Military Records; Procedural Regulation [OST Docket No. 2002-13439; Notice 2002-1](RIN: 2105-AD19) received February 28, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1290. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Scientific and Technical Reports (RIN: 2700-AC33) received February 10, 2003, pursuant to

5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1291. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Board of Veterans' Appeals, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Appeals Regulations: Title for Members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals (RIN: 2900-AK62) received February 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1292. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Provision of Drugs and Medicines to Certain Veterans in State Homes (RIN: 2900-AJ34) received March 12, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1293. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Deferral of Duty on Large Yachts Imported for Sale [T.D. 03-14] (RIN: 1515-AC58) received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1294. A letter from the Acting Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in the Insular Possessions Watch, Watch Movement and Jewelry Program [Docket No. 991228350-2301-04] (RIN: 0625-AA57) received February 11, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1295. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Rev. Proc. 2003-24] received March 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1296. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit or abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Rev. Proc. 2003-25] received March 3, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1297. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Areas in which rulings will not be issued (domestic areas) [Rev. Proc. 2003-3, 2003-1] received February 10, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1298. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Amendment of 26 CFR Section 301.6103(n)-1 to Incorporate Taxpayer Browsing Protection Act [TD 9044] (RIN: 1545-BB13) received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1299. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Earned income credit for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1978 [TD 9045] (RIN: 1545-BA34) received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1300. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Interest rates; underpayments and overpayments (Rev. Rul. 2003-30) received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1301. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Disallowance of Deductions and Credits for Failure to File Timely Return [TD 9043] (RIN: 1545-AY26) received March 18, 2003, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1302. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's legislative proposal entitled, ''To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes''; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services, Transportation and Infrastructure, Energy and Commerce, Resources, Ways and Means, Government Reform, the Judiciary, Veterans' Affairs, Financial Services, Science, Education and the Workforce, International Relations, the Budget, and * * *

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. OSE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. UPTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. COX, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 1372. A bill to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to require enhanced disclosures of employee stock options, and to require a study on the economic impact of broad-based employee stock option plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. FEENEY):

H.R. 1373. A bill to provide options to States to innovate and improve the education of children with disabilities by expanding the choices for students and parents under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. REYES, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. LEE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. FROST, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MICHAUD, and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1374. A bill to amend chapter 1606 of title 10, United States Code, to increase the amount of basic educational assistance for members of the Selected Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. ROSS):

H.R. 1375. A bill to provide regulatory relief and improve productivity for insured depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BACHUS, and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 1376. A bill to improve the Enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 1377. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to enhance the access of Medicare beneficiaries who live in medically underserved areas to critical primary and preventive health care benefits, to improve the MedicareChoice program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WELLER:

H.R. 1378. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to increase payments to States for expenditures for short term training of staff of certain child welfare agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FILNER:

H.R. 1379. A bill to freeze the price of gasoline pending analysis by the Secretary of Energy of fluctuations in such price; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HALL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CANNON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. DUNN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DREIER, and Mr. FLETCHER):

H.R. 1380. A bill to suspend the excise tax on aviation fuel used in commercial aviation during the period of hostilities with Iraq; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. REYES, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BACA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. STARK, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 1381. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 and title 5, United States Code, to allow leave for individuals who provide living organ donations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHADEGG:

H.R. 1382. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the regulatory operation of the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act (EMTALA); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 1383. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for the

conversion of cooperative housing corporations into condominiums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1384. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 to eliminate a limitation on benefits; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 1385. A bill to extend the provision of title 39, United States Code, under which the United States Postal Service is authorized to issue a special postage stamp to benefit breast cancer research; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BONILLA:

H.R. 1386. A bill to amend part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants and loan guarantees for health centers to enable the centers to fund capital needs projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 1387. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a vocational and technical entrepreneurship development program; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 1388. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program for surgical first assisting services of certified registered nurse first assistants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. KING of New York, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. WEINER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BELL, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 1389. A bill to enhance the ability of first responders to respond to incidents of terrorism and for certain other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Science, the Judiciary, and Homeland Security (Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 1390. A bill to establish a pilot program to encourage certification of teachers in low-income, low-performing public elementary and secondary schools by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 1391. A bill to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for commencement of construction of the Mt. Hope Waterpower project (FERC Project No. 9401), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. OTTER, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 1392. A bill to require inspection of all cargo on commercial trucks and vessels entering the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JANKLOW (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 1393. A bill to ensure that tax-exempt status and other benefits afforded under Operation Enduring Freedom are also provided to United States Armed Forces personnel in Israel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FROST, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CASE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BAKER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 1394. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to authorize programs and activities to promote intermodal transportation of passengers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 1395. A bill to provide for the establishment of research, development, demonstration, and commercial application programs for fuel cell and hydrogen production, delivery, and storage technologies for transportation and stationary applications; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1396. A bill to allocate spectrum for the enhancement of wireless telecommunications, and to invest wireless spectrum auction proceeds for the military preparedness and educational preparedness of the United States for the digital era, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H.R. 1397. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to ensure that employees are not improperly disqualified from benefits under pension plans and welfare plans based on the misclassification or reclassification of their status; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 1398. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to fully fund 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for programs under part B of that Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 1399. A bill to revise the boundary of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BERRY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. STARK, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CASE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FROST, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SABO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 1400. A bill to provide for substantial reductions in the price of prescription drugs for Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 1401. A bill to support the establishment or expansion and operation of programs using a network of public and private community entities to provide mentoring for children in foster care; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself, Mr. REYES, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 1402. A bill to designate a United States courthouse in Brownsville, Texas, as the ''Garza-Vela United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1403. A bill to remove the exemption with respect to Pakistan from the prohibition on assistance to a country whose elected head of government was deposed by decree or military coup; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1404. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to present a ribbon of appropriate design to all persons who, while a member of the Armed Forces serving on active duty, were exposed to ionizing radiation as a result of participation in a test of atomic weapons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1405. A bill to disqualify certain persons from receiving Federal funds; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. HART, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. MURTHA):

H.R. 1406. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit additional States to enter into long-term care partnerships under the Medicaid Program in order to promote the use of long-term care insurance; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 1407. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to enhance security at executive and judicial branch facilities by requiring locksmiths who provide locksmith services at such a facility to be credentialed, which includes undergoing a criminal history background check; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina):

H.R. 1408. A bill to provide for the consideration of a petition for Federal Recognition of the Lumbee Indians of Robeson and adjoining counties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma):

H.R. 1409. A bill to provide for a Federal land exchange for the environmental, educational, and cultural benefit of the American public and the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 1410. A bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize the use of clinical social workers to conduct evaluations to determine work-related emotional and mental illnesses; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 1411. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to extend from three months to twelve months the period after release of a member of the Armed Forces from active duty during which the member is protected from mortgage foreclosure under that Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.J. Res. 41. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted to Congress by the Department of Veterans Affairs on January 22, 2003, with the title ''VA Acquisition Regulation: Simplified Acquisition Procedures for Health-Care Resources''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. GOODE):

H.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to deny United States citizenship to individuals born in the United States to parents who are neither United States citizens nor persons who owe permanent allegiance to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. NEY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MURTHA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FROST, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. BALLANCE, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. WATSON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. STARK, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. KILDEE):

H. Con. Res. 103. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning support to members of the United States Armed Forces and allied military forces engaged in the war on terrorism and the war with Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution expressing the support and appreciation of the Nation for the President and the members of the Armed forces who are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself and Mr. CONYERS):

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress concerning support to members of the United States Armed Forces and allied military forces engaged in the war on terrorism and the war with Iraq; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

H. Con. Res. 106. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring America's Jewish community on the occasion of its 350th anniversary, supporting the designation of an ''American Jewish History Month'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. FROST, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BACA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H. Con. Res. 107. Concurrent resolution urging increased Federal funding for juvenile (Type 1) diabetes research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution encouraging corporations to contribute to faith-based organizations; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. OTTER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Ms. HART, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. RENZI):

H. Con. Res. 109. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the Blue Star Banner and the Gold Star; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AKIN (for himself, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. SOUDER):

H. Res. 153. A resolution recognizing the public need for fasting and prayer in order to secure the blessings and protection of Providence for the people of the United States and our Armed Forces during the conflict in Iraq and under the threat of terrorism at home; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H. Res. 154. A resolution commending the Prime Minister of Great Britain for his stalwart leadership and unwavering support of the United States in the effort to disarm Saddam Hussein of weapons of mass destruction and free the Iraqi people of the scourge of brutal dictatorship; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MEEKS of New York (for himself, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Res. 155. A resolution concerning the formation of the African Union; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ROGERS of Michigan (for himself and Mrs. TAUSCHER):

H. Res. 156. A resolution recognizing the goals and objectives of the Intelligent Transportation Systems Caucus; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. UDALL of New Mexico (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Res. 157. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding several individuals who are being held as prisoners of conscience by the Chinese Government for their involvement in efforts to end the Chinese occupation of Tibet; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 2: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 20: Mr. STARK, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 21: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 22: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 33: Mr. LATOURETTE and Mr. OXLEY.

H. R. 44: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 73: MS. HART, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 74: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 126: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 135: Mr. ISAKSON and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 141: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 173: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 217: Mrs. KELLY, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 218: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SHAW, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. FEENEY.

H.R. 221: Mr. FILNER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 235: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 253: Mr. PETRI and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 284: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFLEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 286: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 303: Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 313: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 328: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
H.R. 348: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. JENKINS.
H.R. 387: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 401: Mr. CANTOR and Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 412: Mr. CASE, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 423: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 424: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 432: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 434: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 450: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 466: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 489: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 495: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 501: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania and Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 515: Mr. BELL.
H.R. 522: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. TAUZIN.
H.R. 527: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 528: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 548: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.
H.R. 568: Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 569: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 583: Mr. FORBES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. AKIN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NEY, Mr. RENZI, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mrs. BONO.
H.R. 584: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. AKIN.
H.R. 586: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 612: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 613: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 614: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 623: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 648: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 660: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.
H.R. 664: Mr. WU., Ms. SOLIS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ROTHMAN, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H.R. 668: Mr. HOEFFEL.
H.R. 673: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 678: Mr. ROSS.
H.R. 683: Mr. ISRAEL.
H.R. 684: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 706: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 709: Mr. GOODE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. GILLMOR.
H.R. 715: Mr. GORDON and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 721: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 735: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BAKER, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 759: Mr. OTTER, Mr. COBLE, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 765: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 767: Mr. HOUGHTON and Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 768: Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 770: Mr. RUSH and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 771: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 775: Mr. BAKER, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 776: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 780: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 785: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 786: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 792: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 808: Mr. TERRY, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 814: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SABO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 815: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 823: Mr. WALSH, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 839: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 871: Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 872: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. FEENEY.
H.R. 876: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. SHUSTER.
H.R. 879: Mr. SCHROCK and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 882: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 883: Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 898: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 919: Mr. HAYES, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. UPTON, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.
H.R. 920: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 931: Mr. BONNER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 932: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. SAXTON, and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 933: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 935: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 936: Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 953: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 961: Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 967: Mr. CASE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PLATTS, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H.R. 970: Mr. WICKER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FROST, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 976: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 977: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 1007: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. WATSON, Mr. HONDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1032: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 1036: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 1046: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HILL, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1054: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1057: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HOBSON, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 1063: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1066: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1068: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BELL, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 1070: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BEAUPREZ, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 1072: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 1077: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1085: Mr. BURGESS.
H.R. 1098: Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 1105: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1110: Mr. ETHERIDGE and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1115: Mr. FLAKE.
H.R. 1118: Mr. ROSS, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 1136: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 1157: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1170: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1177: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1185: Ms. NORTON and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 1213: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1225: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. BALLENGER.
H.R. 1227: Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 1234: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1236: Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire.
H.R. 1240: Mr. NADLER and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 1241: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1242: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. GRIJALVA. Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1246: Ms. LEE, AND MS. NORTON.
H.R. 1252: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.
H.R. 1260: Mr. OTTER.
H.R. 1264: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. REYES, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1266: Mr. EHLERS.
H.R. 1267: Mr. NADLER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA.
H.R. 1270: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 1282: Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1288: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MICA, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1294: Mr. KILDEE AND MR. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1313: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 1337: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1343: Mr. BAIRD and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1357: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.J. Res. 4: Mr. MURPHY.
H.J. Res. 28: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.J. Res. 29: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. WATT.
H.J. Res. 30: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WATT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. LEE.
H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. AKIN and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. MCNULTY.
H. Con. Res. 86: Mr. HONDA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SABO, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H. Con. Res. 98: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. SOUDER.
H. Res. 21: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of

California, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CASE, Mr. REYES, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 49: Mr. KIRK, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CARTER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H. Res. 59: Mr. BLUNT.

H. Res. 108: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. BAIRD.

H. Res. 113: Mr. TERRY.

H. Res. 118: Mr. SESSIONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Res. 121: Mr. DINGELL.

H. Res. 133: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 149 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 2003 No. 45—Part II

Senate

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE U.S. GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 23.

AMENDMENT NO. 288, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are 2 minutes evenly divided on the Kyl amendment No. 288, as modified. Who yields time?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the Kyl amendment would move up the time of making permanent the elimination of the estate tax by 1 year. That costs $46 billion. The Senator has proposed paying for it by cutting the Finance Committee jurisdiction. That means cutting Medicare, Medicaid, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, the State Health Improvement Program, and the earned-income tax credit.

This is the wrong way to go. We ought to reform the estate tax, not repeal it. I hope my colleagues will resist the Kyl amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, what my distinguished colleague just told you is absolutely false. If it were true, then I would not support the amendment.

Our amendment cuts from the discretionary funding across the board. There is no Medicare. There is no Medicaid. There is no Social Security. We would not do that. That would be foolish. It would not be prudent. We are not doing that.

All this does is advance by 1 year the repeal of the death tax. We repealed it permanently in this body, starting with the year 2010. All this amendment does is start it in the year 2009. That is all it does. Since we have already adopted the permanent repeal, I hope my colleagues will support moving this up by 1 year.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the Senator yesterday said he took it from the Finance Committee jurisdiction for mandatory spending. That is what the record shows. That is where it comes from.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, since the distinguished Senator from North Dakota intruded into the time, let me reiterate, this funding is from function 920, across-the-board discretionary funding. That is the fact. There is no Medicare, Medicaid, or Social Security offset, period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CRAIG. Regular order.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 288, as modified. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) is necessarily absent due to a family medical matter.

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Alexander	Domenici	Murkowski
Allard	Ensign	Nelson (FL)
Allen	Enzi	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Fitzgerald	Nickles
Bond	Frist	Roberts
Brownback	Graham (SC)	Santorum
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burns	Gregg	Shelby
Campbell	Hagel	Smith
Chambliss	Hatch	Specter
Cochran	Hutchison	Stevens
Coleman	Inhofe	Sununu
Cornyn	Kyl	Talent
Craig	Lincoln	Thomas
Crapo	Lott	Voinovich
DeWine	Lugar	Warner
Dole	McConnell	Wyden

NAYS—48

Akaka	Dayton	Landrieu
Baucus	Dodd	Lautenberg
Bayh	Dorgan	Leahy
Biden	Durbin	Levin
Bingaman	Edwards	Lieberman
Boxer	Feingold	McCain
Breaux	Feinstein	Mikulski
Byrd	Graham (FL)	Murray
Cantwell	Harkin	Pryor
Carper	Hollings	Reed
Chafee	Inouye	Reid
Clinton	Jeffords	Rockefeller
Collins	Johnson	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kennedy	Schumer
Corzine	Kerry	Snowe
Daschle	Kohl	Stabenow

NOT VOTING—1

Miller

The amendment (No. 288), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 294

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes evenly divided on the Graham of Florida amendment.

Who yields time?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, we are about to take the Medicare vote of the year 2003. Last year, the Senate cast 52 votes for the plan that this amendment would allow us to consider again. It failed with 52 votes because we were operating under a budget resolution which required us to have 60 votes.

This amendment will allow us to pass the same prescription drug plan that a majority of Senators wanted to do a year ago. The alternative, if we do not pass this amendment, is going to be to adopt the President's prescription drug plan which will require seniors to be in HMOs in order to have access to prescription drugs. I don't believe that is what this Senate wants to do.

The amendment I offer will do two things. It will add $219 billion to the Medicare account; it will put $177 billion over the next 10 years toward deficit reduction. That is a responsible program that will secure a good Medicare prescription drug benefit and make a significant contribution toward deficit reduction.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

I close by thanking my colleagues Senator DORGAN and Senator STABENOW for their great assistance.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in support of an amendment offered by Senators GRAHAM, DORGAN, STABENOW, and others that would increase funding in the budget resolution by $220 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, providing a total of $620 billion for a comprehensive benefit. This amendment would also reduce the tax cut by nearly $400 billion and reduce the deficit by $250 billion.

According to a study by the Kaiser Family Foundation, 38 percent of seniors and disabled Americans have no prescription drug coverage whatsoever. Instead of finding ways to help these individuals and improve access to care for those with coverage, President Bush has proposed pushing Medicare beneficiaries into private health plans as a means of receiving drug coverage. And the level of coverage that could be provided under this scenario is questionable. Given the history of the Medicare+Choice program, many of my colleagues and I are skeptical that such a proposal would be successful. Many private insurers have withdrawn from the Medicare program or severely limited service areas in recent years. Of those who have remained, many plans have decreased prescription drug benefits and other benefits so much so that they offer little or no advantage over the traditional Medicare fee-for-service program. It is unclear how the President's proposal will avoid similar problems.

This amendment would increase funding in the budget resolution for a prescription drug benefit in the Medicare Program that is available to all beneficiaries. In addition, it specifies that prescription drugs should be provided on an equal basis with respect to benefit level regardless of whether beneficiaries remain in the traditional Medicare fee-for-service program or enroll in a private plan like those proposed by the administration. This is consistent with the approach that the supporters of this amendment and I favor. We have been working toward legislation that would create an affordable, comprehensive, and voluntary Medicare drug benefit and lower costs for all Americans by increasing access to lower priced drugs.

It is clear that even this additional funding would not completely meet the needs of Medicare beneficiaries. A recent Congressional Budget Office estimate suggests spending for prescription drugs by and on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries would total $1.84 trillion over the next 10-year period. However, this amendment moves us much closer to meeting the needs of Medicare beneficiaries while simultaneously reducing the deficit.

Our Nation is facing serious challenges at home and abroad. And we know that challenging times often require sacrifice. We must ask ourselves who will bear the brunt of these sacrifices. Are we going to spread them evenly? Or will we force those who have worked hard to make the United States the great Nation that it is to carry an unnecessarily heavy load? I fail to see how it is appropriate, at this time, to pass a tax benefit that benefits the wealthiest Americans without providing adequate resources to provide a prescription drug benefit for Medicare beneficiaries. Our older Americans and the disabled individuals who rely on Medicare deserve more than this budget resolution provides. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Graham-Dorgan-Stabenow amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment, not because Medicare is not a very legitimate subject of discussion; it is. The difference between this year and last year, last year we did not have a budget resolution. The process this year is a very orderly process toward getting us a prescription drug program as part of Medicare. That very orderly process is, first of all, to have a budget resolution. It is a very orderly process. We are going to have a budget resolution this year. We are going to have $100 billion more for Medicare/prescription drugs than the last time we debated this.

Most of the people on the other side of the aisle 2 years ago helped us get a $300 billion figure. We have a $400 billion figure. We have a Senate majority leader who is committed to the committee process working. Out of the Finance Committee in June, we will produce a good prescription drug program for the Senate to debate this summer.

I urge Members to vote against the amendment. I move to table the amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER), is necessarily absent, due to a family medical matter.

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

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Chambliss	Fitzgerald
Allard	Cochran	Frist
Allen	Coleman	Graham (SC)
Baucus	Collins	Grassley
Bennett	Cornyn	Gregg
Bond	Craig	Hagel
Breaux	Crapo	Hatch
Brownback	DeWine	Hutchison
Bunning	Dole	Inhofe
Burns	Domenici	Jeffords
Campbell	Ensign	Kyl
Chafee	Enzi	Lott
Lugar	Santorum	Sununu
McCain	Sessions	Talent
McConnell	Shelby	Thomas
Murkowski	Smith	Voinovich
Nelson (NE)	Snowe	Warner
Nickles	Specter	
Roberts	Stevens	

NAYS—44

Akaka	Durbin	Levin
Bayh	Edwards	Lieberman
Biden	Feingold	Lincoln
Bingaman	Feinstein	Mikulski
Boxer	Graham (FL)	Murray
Byrd	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Cantwell	Hollings	Pryor
Carper	Inouye	Reed
Clinton	Johnson	Reid
Conrad	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Corzine	Kerry	Sarbanes
Daschle	Kohl	Schumer
Dayton	Landrieu	Stabenow
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dorgan	Leahy	

NOT VOTING—1

Miller

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes equally divided on the Rockefeller amendment.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will give everybody an outline of what we can expect over the next 24 hours before we begin what will be the last vote of the evening.

Following this next vote, which will begin shortly, there will be approximately 5 hours remaining for consideration of the budget resolution. Our plans are that we will stay in session tonight. The chairman and ranking member will remain this evening to debate the amendments with others, and to participate in that debate until all time has expired.

The plan will be to reconvene tomorrow at 9:30 in the morning. And it will be a long day. At 9:30 we will begin our rollcall votes, a series of rollcall votes. I know the two managers are committed to try to make this an orderly process as we complete the budget resolution. That, in part, means they need to have all amendments, and they will accomplish an ordering of those amendments so we can start right in at 9:30 and start clicking through the amendments at the appropriate speed tomorrow.

I do ask Members to notify the managers if they intend to offer an amendment during the voting sequence tomorrow. Once the voting begins tomorrow, we will remain until the budget resolution is completed.

I thank all Members for their real cooperation today. Again, it was a challenging day for all of us. And it has worked out almost perfectly, seamlessly in many ways, as we were able to recognize the service of our military personnel and the President of the United States and at the same time continue the budgeting process.

Mr. DASCHLE. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

I know that before the agreement was reached regarding the resolution on our troops, we had made a promise that those who could not speak prior to

the vote could have the opportunity to speak as soon as these votes have been completed.

The majority leader did not mention that, but I assume that has not changed. I asked earlier whether we could ensure that those comments would be printed in the RECORD prior to the vote, as well. If that could be accommodated, that would be helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, indeed, those statements, written and oral statements, will appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

Also, we would encourage people tonight to take advantage of the fact that we are going to be here in session. We have agreed that that time will be on the budget, the 5 hours that are remaining. I think it is 5 hours. And people are welcome to speak tonight.

Again, I remind people they will have other opportunities to express themselves on support for the troops, as well.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. FRIST. Yes.

Mr. NICKLES. I just request of the majority leader if we might start the votes at 9:45 instead of 9:30 to accommodate one of our Members. I also request of our colleagues, I know some people—Senator CONRAD and I do not want vote-aramas. And I hate for anybody to come back and say: I have not had a chance to debate my amendment. We will be here tonight to discuss amendments, and we will work together to schedule amendments according to Senators' wishes. But we need to see copies of the amendments in advance, and then we will try to schedule the amendments. We will work energetically—as soon as we get copies of amendments—to work out some of these amendments, maybe accept some amendments if we have some advance notification. We are going to try to be as cooperative as possible.

So my first request would be, hopefully, to move the first rollcall vote to 9:45. And then I just urge our colleagues, if they wish to debate their amendments tonight, please do so. And if not, I request that they submit us copies of the amendments as early as possible so we can do some work on those amendments tonight.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, with regard to the 9:45 start, the surgeon in me says we ought to start at 8 o'clock, but we will start at 9:45.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank the leader.

Mr. FRIST. Was there a second request?

Mr. NICKLES. No.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. FRIST. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. Do I understand correctly, from the exchange that just took place, immediately after this vote there will be an order to make statements with respect to the resolution that was passed just a short while ago?

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, it is in order to do so. But I will turn to the two managers of the bill to respond to that. If statements are made, part of the 5 hours will be used up for the statements.

Mr. CONRAD. If the majority leader will yield, let me attempt to make a clarification because I do not think we want a misunderstanding on this question.

The majority side has yielded back all of their time. I have something like 4½ hours remaining on this side. But the way the rules work, there are three pending amendments, and the Republican side gets half on each of those amendments.

My understanding is—and I think it is the appropriate inclusion here—that time on the war resolution from your side would come off your amendment time, not off my time.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, that is correct.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator.

I say to my colleagues on our side, if I may, please understand that when they say there is 4½ hours left, there is 4½ hours left in total. Even though they have given back all of their time, because there are three amendments pending, they get half of the time on each of those amendments. So we do not have 4½ hours. We have much less than that left potentially.

We have significant amendments to debate. I know there are colleagues who would like to speak, still, on the war resolution. We will attempt to accommodate them. But my intention is to give them 2 minutes each because otherwise we are not going to have time to debate very consequential amendments with respect to reducing the size of the tax cut, with respect to the transportation infrastructure amendment that is very significant, with respect to other amendments that are pending, Senator HARKIN's IDEA amendment, and others.

So we are going to have to use a lot of discipline and forbearance for people to have an opportunity to debate very consequential items and discuss the war.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. I ask a question of the majority leader.

In light of the statement Senator CONRAD just made, would it not be possible to have, say, an hour, after this vote, for the making of statements on the resolution unrelated to taking time away from consideration of the budget?

This is an important resolution. There are many Members who did not get a chance before the vote to make a statement. It seems to me a reasonable accommodation in light of what the ranking member of the committee has just stated.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the leader yield?

Mr. FRIST. I will yield in 1 second.

A discussion with the Democratic leader and myself today was under the understanding—again, no unanimous consent agreement—under the understanding that if people were going to be talking about the Iraq resolution, time would be coming off the time on the budget.

Let me also clarify the earlier statement. If our side is speaking on the Iraq resolution, it will come out of the 2 ½ hours of our time. If your side is speaking on the Iraq resolution, it will come out of your time.

I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. I wanted to make that clarification. For the information of our colleagues, I guess theoretically we could spend a lot of time talking about amendments pending and not allow time to be discussed on Iraq. That is not our intention. I will be happy to share time with my colleague from North Dakota and others who wish to speak on Iraq. We will be here until midnight. If people want to speak longer on amendments, I am happy to do that, too. I want to be as accommodating as possible but still try to complete this resolution by tomorrow night. I will be happy to yield some time if it would help some of our colleagues.

Mr. SARBANES. If the Senator will yield on that point, we are, obviously, on a track to complete this budget resolution. As I understood it, the 3 hours of debate from 2 to 5 before the vote on the resolution did not come out of the time on the budget; is that correct?

Mr. NICKLES. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SARBANES. All I am suggesting is given there are some additional Members who wish to speak, that we have another hour after this vote unrelated to time on the budget resolution to discuss the support for our troops resolution.

Mr. NICKLES. I would be happy to, out of the time we have in the bank, you might say, for the amendments, to allow Members to speak up to an hour on the Iraq resolution, if they so desire. I don't want to yield all of it, but I will be happy to do that. I don't think that is going to be necessary. I will be happy to work with our colleagues.

Mr. SARBANES. It seems to me that this is a matter of such consequence.

Mr. STEVENS. You should have been here this afternoon.

Mr. SARBANES. I was here this afternoon, in response to my colleague who raised that point. There was a very long list of people wishing to speak. There wasn't time to speak within the time that was allotted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader controls the time.

Mr. FRIST. Let's have regular order.

AMENDMENT NO. 275

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 275. Who yields time? The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senators LANDRIEU, SPECTER, JOHNSON, and DAYTON as cosponsors of the amendment.

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

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. This amendment is a simple sense-of-the-Senate amendment. That is all it is. It asks that there be no less than $30 billion over the next 18 months of which half must be for Medicaid to be given to the States for fiscal relief within the stimulus package.

Our States are broke. Quite frankly, the $98 billion that States spend on Medicaid today actually turns into $280 billion of fiscal stimulus. So it is fiscal stimulus. If we don't do this, 1,700,000 more people will lose their Medicaid, lose their health care. They are our most vulnerable citizens. I ask that our colleagues support this amendment offered by Senator COLLINS, Senator NELSON, and myself.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I want to say just a few words in support of the amendment, No. 275, offered by my friend Senator ROCKEFELLER on behalf of Senators COLLINS, Senator BEN NELSON, Senator CLINTON, Senator SCHUMER, myself and others. This amendment is extraordinarily important for our homeland security, our families, and our entire economy.

This amendment says that any economic growth package has got to include at least $30 billion for State fiscal relief. I think that is exactly right. I have offered a bill that would provide $50 billion in relief. At this time, in the context of the budget resolution, this amendment—at least $30 billion—is the most important thing we can do.

With our troops at war today, their security is first on everybody's minds today. Our thoughts and prayers are with these men and women who are risking their lives for our freedom and safety even as we speak.

At the same time, we are also thinking about security here at home. We know there is a real risk of an attack now that we are at war. Just as we must always make sure our troops on the frontlines abroad have what they need, we also need to make sure our troops on the frontlines at home have what they need. And the troops on the frontlines at home are our police and our firefighters. They need the best protective gear, the best bomb detection equipment, the best emergency training, and the best communications systems in the world.

They aren't getting that right now. And one reason they aren't getting it is that States can't afford to provide aid because of their deficits. We are seeing the largest State fiscal crisis since World War II—deficits of over $100 billion. And with those shortfalls, States just cannot afford to hire more first responders or give them the training and equipment they need. And that is a huge mistake.

So we need fiscal relief so States and local governments can provide for first responders. My bill would set aside $10 billion for that.

But fiscal relief is about more than homeland security. It is about our entire economy.

Virtually every American has felt this economic downturn. They have felt it from North Carolina to Nevada, from the biggest cities to the smallest towns. They have felt it in convenience stores, in factories, in hospitals—they have felt it everywhere. Two million jobs lost, wages down, stock market down—and the list goes on. All Americans deserve a better economy than we have got right now.

Now, the state fiscal crisis is seriously hurting our economy. Here is what is happening. Let's say you are a governor, and you are facing a massive deficit. In North Carolina, we have a deficit of close to $1.7 billion. What do you do? You can't print money like a President can. You can't borrow like a President can. You have only two choices. You can raise taxes—property taxes or income taxes or sales taxes. Or else you can cut spending on priorities like homeland security, education, and health care. Or you can do a little of both.

States are already calling for $14 billion in tax increases. Portland, OR, will likely cut 5 weeks from its school year. Hundreds of California nursing homes may go bankrupt. In Florida, 26,000 low-income people may lose medical coverage.

So this economic downturn hurts our families. They pay more in taxes, or they get less from their schools, their hospitals, their police forces. Or both—they pay more and get less.

At the same time, our whole economy gets hurt. At a time when we should be investing more, tax hikes and education cuts mean we end up investing less. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the state spending cuts and tax increases now likely will make our economy 1 percent smaller. That is 1 percent of our economy, gone because of the fiscal crisis. And according to the Center on Budget, ''The only way this blow to the economy can be mitigated is through federal fiscal relief for the states.''

Now, it is unthinkable to offer nothing for the States right now. This fiscal crisis was caused by the current economic downturn, and now this fiscal crisis is making the current economic downturn even worse. The only way out is to stop the crisis with fiscal relief.

As I have said before, I believe we can and must pay for this fiscal relief over the long term. It would be irresponsible not to do that. And the way to pay for it over the long run is to cut wasteful spending, close needless loopholes, and roll back some of the tax cuts for the very wealthiest Americans.

This relief is hugely important, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I have actually offered a State fiscal relief package that provides $50 billion in aid to States, and I am hopeful that we can get some action on that package. Passing this amendment is the first and most important step we can take to ending a fiscal crisis that benefits nobody.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this bipartisan sense-of-the-Senate resolution would help ensure that any economic growth package includes $30 billion in desperately needed fiscal aid to the States. Half of the money would have to be used for the Medicaid Program which has been severely cut. Forty-nine States are facing budget shortfalls.

This approach would have no impact on the deficit. It would not change the caps in this resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Rockefeller, Collins, Nelson, and Smith amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 275. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER)) is necessarily absent due to a family medical matter.

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

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—80

Akaka	Dayton	Leahy
Alexander	DeWine	Levin
Baucus	Dodd	Lieberman
Bayh	Dole	Lincoln
Bennett	Domenici	Lugar
Biden	Dorgan	Mikulski
Bingaman	Durbin	Murkowski
Bond	Edwards	Murray
Boxer	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Breaux	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Brownback	Fitzgerald	Pryor
Bunning	Frist	Reed
Burns	Graham (FL)	Reid
Byrd	Grassley	Roberts
Campbell	Hagel	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Harkin	Sarbanes
Carper	Hatch	Schumer
Chafee	Hollings	Smith
Chambliss	Hutchison	Snowe
Clinton	Inouye	Specter
Cochran	Jeffords	Stabenow
Coleman	Johnson	Stevens
Collins	Kennedy	Talent
Conrad	Kerry	Voinovich
Cornyn	Kohl	Warner
Corzine	Landrieu	Wyden
Daschle	Lautenberg	

NAYS—19

Allard	Gregg	Santorum
Allen	Inhofe	Sessions
Craig	Kyl	Shelby
Crapo	Lott	Sununu
Ensign	McCain	Thomas
Enzi	McConnell	
Graham (SC)	Nickles	

NOT VOTING—1

Miller

The amendment (No. 275) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 4 hours 52 minutes remaining on the resolution, with time controlled by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield me a few minutes?

Mr. CONRAD. I am more than pleased to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I appreciate that very much. In light of the discussion that was earlier held, my own view is that we should have allowed more time to talk about the resolution with respect to Iraq straight out, without mixing it into the budget resolution problem. It is obviously the issue facing the country. I think Members wanted to address it, and I do not believe it ought to be truncated. But I understand the difficult position in which the able Senator from North Dakota, who has done such an excellent job in terms of his efforts on the budget resolution, now finds himself. So I will try to limit my time in that regard. I thank the ranking member for his courtesy.

(The remarks of Mr. SARBANES are printed in today's RECORD in the debate on S. Res. 95.)

Mr. CONRAD. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

How much time is the Senator seeking?

Mr. DODD. Four minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut, who has been very patiently waiting.

Mr. DODD. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. If I could have 2 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank my colleague.

(The remarks of Mr. HARKIN are printed in today's RECORD in the debate on S. Res. 95.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I join first of all with my colleague from Maryland in expressing some regret we have to ask unanimous consent to have remarks added to the RECORD here at a moment like this when 300,000 Americans in uniform are presently engaged in conflict in the Middle East. I would have thought, like he, there would be a little more time for everyone to express our strong sense of support to these men and women rather than to find ourselves limited because of the budget debate; that more time would have been allocated. Given the seriousness of this situation, I would be hard pressed to think of another situation in recent times that is as serious as this. It would certainly command the attention and time of this institution.

Having said that, I add my words of commendation for my friend and colleague from North Dakota. He has done a magnificent job and we are all extremely proud of the work he and his staff have done in trying to fashion together a budget debate that allows for a meaningful discussion of the important issues that are included in this budget discussion.

I, like many, regret we have not had a chance to talk about and include in the budget debate, obviously, the issue of the cost of the conflict in the Middle East, the cost of reconstruction—not because we necessarily disagree with it at all; in fact, I supported the resolution last fall—but it ought to be part of the debate and discussion of the budget. Those matters have to be left for another day as we go through this budget resolution.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD are printed in today's RECORD in the debate on S. Res. 95.)

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I agree completely with the Senator from Connecticut. I deeply regret the decision was not made to spend this day discussing the war. I said this morning, I find it very difficult to understand, as much as I value the budget and the budget process, after spending my entire time in the Senate on the Budget Committee. That is not, frankly, the focus of the attention of the American people today. The war is the focus of the attention of the American people today and we should have spent this entire day on the war. We should have put off the budget discussion and the budget debate until later.

The majority refused to do that. The majority insisted the budget was the priority and we would have limited time to discuss the war. That is a mistake. It is not right. That is where we are.

The Senator from Wisconsin is seeking time, and I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

(The remarks of Mr. KOHL are printed in today's RECORD in the debate on S. Res. 95.)

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin. I thank him very much for his patience. Again, I want to express my regret that we are forced into this circumstance of limiting time on such a consequential subject. But the rules unfortunately dictate the circumstance we are in, and the unwillingness of the other side to give us an extended time for discussion; instead to be locked into the budget discussion, which is regrettable.

The Senator from Louisiana has also been extraordinarily patient, not just today but for several days. He has an amendment that is one of the most consequential to come before the body on this subject. So I apologize to the Senator from Louisiana. He has been, as always, a gentleman. How much time would the Senator seek?

Mr. BREAUX. Can I have 10 minutes?

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana. If he would like additional time, we will do that as well.

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I thank the ranking member. I thank him not only for yielding and his nice comments about what we are attempting to do, but I also congratulate him on the very difficult job of serving as ranking member on the Senate Budget Committee. This is a very difficult job. He has handled it with a great deal of finesse and maturity and understanding about the intricacies of the budget process.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 339

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk and ask it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

Mr. BREAUX. I ask the amendment be set aside and ask the amendment at the desk be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. BREAUX], for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. VOINOVICH, proposes an amendment numbered 339.

Mr. BREAUX. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce tax cuts by $375 billion and to reduce projected deficits by $464 billion)

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by $10,433,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $33,015,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $27,962,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $22,167,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $16,893,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $16,183,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $15,879,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $15,992,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $52,874,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $79,512,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $84,090,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $10,433,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $33,015,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $27,962,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $22,167,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $16,893,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $16,183,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $15,879,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $15,992,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $52,874,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $79,512,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $84,090,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $899,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $2,687,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $4,364,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $5,762,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $7,003,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $8,294,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $9,640,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $12,035,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $16,276,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $21,605,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $899,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by $2,687,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $4,364,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $5,762,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $7,003,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $8,294,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $9,640,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $12,035,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $16,276,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $21,605,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $10,511,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $33,914,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $30,648,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $26,532,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $22,654,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $23,186,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $24,173,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $23,632,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $64,909,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $95,788,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $105,696,000,000.
On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $10,511,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $44,425,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $75,073,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $101,605,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $124,259,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $147,445,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $171,619,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $197,250,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $262,159,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $357,947,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $463,643,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $10,511,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $44,425,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $75,073,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $101,605,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $124,259,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $147,445,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $171,619,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $197,250,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $262,159,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $357,947,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $463,643,000,000.
On page 40, line 2, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.
On page 40, line 3, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $899,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $899,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $2,687,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,687,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $4,364,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $4,364,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $5,762,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $5,762,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $7,003,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $7,003,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $8,294,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $8,294,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $9,640,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $9,640,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $12,035,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $12,035,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $16,276,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $16,276,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $21,605,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $21,605,000,000.
On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $375,000,000,000.

Mr. BREAUX. This amendment I have sent to the desk is on behalf of our colleague on the Republican side, Senator SNOWE; on behalf of the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator BAUCUS; and also on behalf of our Republican colleague, Senator VOINOVICH from Ohio.

I remember that a great Chinese philosopher once said: May you live in interesting times.

I would also add today that we are actually living in very confusing times.

The bombs began to drop on the country of Iraq last night. We have over 200,000 men and women engaged in a war in a far off country. We have a country that is presently on orange alert, the second highest in our country's history. We have a war, and we do not know how long it is going to last, whether it be 4 days or 4 weeks or 4 months. We have a war and we have no concept of how much it is going to cost. We have estimates from $50 billion, $60 billion, $100 billion, depending on how long the conflict lasts.

We have a financial situation in this country where we have a $300 billion deficit that is now facing us in the short term. Yet we have a budget recommending that we now take the action of cutting revenues to pay for the cost of the war by about $1.36 trillion, of which the budget request adds $726 billion be protected by the process of budget reconciliation which would prevent any effort to filibuster that, on behalf of our Republican colleagues.

In addition, we all know in this Congress we are faced with additional costs in health care, particularly in the Medicare Program where we are attempting to add a prescription drug benefit plan to a Medicare Program which is desperately in need of additional funds. We have all of our Governors and all of 50 States saying how they do not have enough revenues to adequately run their State Medicaid Program.

Indeed, it is not only interesting times, it is very confusing times in the sense of trying to rationalize how we as a nation, with the pending demands we have on our society, financial demands that are legitimate and pressing, especially the conduct of a war in the country of Iraq, and at the same time we are asking to cut revenues by a total of $1.36 trillion.

I remember back when we looked at the last major tax reduction and tax cut in this country, back in the year 2001. We passed and ultimately enacted a $1.35 trillion tax cut. Times were different. Times were not as confusing. In those days we had a $5.6 trillion surplus. We had $5.6 trillion more in the Federal Treasury than we needed to operate and serve the people of this country. When you have a surplus of that magnitude, it is appropriate that you give some of the money back to the taxpayers of this country. We had a surplus. We were not at war. Conditions were different. Times were different. They were not confusing. We knew what we were facing.

Today that has changed, completely, totally, 180 degrees. We are at war, Medicare is on the verge of collapse, Medicaid is in fact collapsing, and we have a deficit, not a surplus. Yet we are faced today with a proposal that says in those conditions, one of the most important things we can do is cut revenues, and cut revenues not by an insignificant amount but, rather, by a total of $1.36 trillion over the next 10 years.

I know of only a small number of people who say that makes common sense. What business that is in debt and losing money would declare a dividend? What government that is facing war, and in fact is in war, with a net

deficit of over $300 billion in 1 year, would say we need less revenues to meet our demands when in fact just the opposite is true: That is the issue that is facing us.

Some Members on the Republican side of the aisle think the number of the tax cut at $726 billion in this budget under reconciliation protection is just the right number. There are some on our side who think, no, we should have no tax cut until we know what the costs and demands are in our society. They would suggest we should have a zero tax cut until we know the cost of the war, and how much we are going to need for Medicare and prescription drugs and Medicaid, and how much we are going to have to pay for homeland security. They take the position that until we know those answers, we should not be reducing and cutting and slashing the revenues that we need to run Government.

Tax cuts are popular, but they also have to be realistic. Tax cuts are not free. We do not just eliminate $726 billion in revenue and think it is going to come out of the sky. In fact, we have to pay for it. And to pay for provisions in this legislation is simply adding to the deficit of this country at a time of great demands and at a time when we do not know what the future holds.

I think that is not good policy. I would prefer no tax cut at this time, but that is not politically possible. So what my colleagues and friends, in a bipartisan fashion, have tried to do is to say there must be some meeting of the minds, somewhere in the middle, between $726 billion in tax cuts and zero in tax cuts. That is why two Democrats and two Republicans—who have worked weeks and weeks together to come up with this—are now presenting this amendment to our colleagues in the Senate.

We have met with economists. We have met with tax experts. We have met with the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, to get his ideas and to get his suggestions about what we need to do.

What we have before the Senate now is a reflection of that. It is the only bipartisan amendment being offered that I think has a realistic chance of passing. It is clear in my mind, for those on my side of the aisle who would prefer zero in tax cuts, that if they do not vote for this amendment, with a $350 billion tax cut, they in effect are voting for a $726 billion tax cut. Because it is clear in my mind, and I think in the minds of others, that if our amendment does not pass, the tax cut that remains is $726 billion.

I know for those who say, I don't want any, it is difficult for them to vote for $350 billion. But let me say to them, what they are doing, in doing that, is reducing the tax cut by a substantial amount and a significant amount. In fact, they would be reducing the tax cut by $375 billion by voting for our amendment. They would be reducing the Federal deficit by $464 billion. That is not insignificant. It should be more, but this is what we have the potential, and the political reality, of accomplishing.

So for those on my side, it is very important to understand, if this amendment does not pass, the likelihood of what passes is much larger and increases the deficit substantially. By voting for our amendment, you have a chance to reduce the Federal deficit by $464 billion over the next 10 years. That is real progress for people who believe in economic balanced budgets.

It is, in fact, the conservative thing to do, I say to my Republican colleagues, because you don't spend money you don't have. Whether it is for a tax cut or whether it is for some spending program, they both have the same results. We have to pay for them.

So I think what we offer today is an amendment that should, hopefully, find comfort and support from both sides of the aisle. That is what we have attempted to do. And that is what this amendment, in fact, does.

I know some would like a much larger tax cut, but in looking at what we have offered, I think it does represent a tax cut, so that we in the Finance Committee, and later in the full body, will be able to craft something that has meaning, that really adds stimulus to the economy. And we would support that. That type of program can pass with a significant number of Democratic votes joining with our Republican colleagues in a bipartisan fashion.

It should not be all or nothing. That is too risky. It is too irresponsible. So what my colleagues and I have offered together is a compromise, a bipartisan compromise, which I think makes a great deal of sense for everyone who is concerned about the future of this country.

It is difficult in challenging times. These are confusing times. These are uncertain times. And in these times, I would suggest the right course of action is to be a little more conservative with how we spend our Nation's money, as we prepare to face obligations which no one can be certain how large or for how long they are going to continue.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BREAUX. Mr. President, I yield time, on behalf of the ranking member, to the distinguished Senator from Maine, Ms. SNOWE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, these obviously are very difficult times and, obviously, the point at which we find ourselves in trying to reconcile some of the more significant issues that are incorporated in this budget resolution.

As the Senator from Louisiana indicated, several of us have been working across the political aisle—with the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Ohio—to reconcile some of the issues with respect to the central question in this budget resolution in terms of the extent to which we should have a growth package—what type, what size, and what should be included in that growth package.

Obviously, the policy will not be determined in the budget resolution. But certainly we can determine the size that could dictate ultimately the policy in the days and weeks ahead.

I appreciate our ability to work across the political aisle to help craft this amendment. As the Senator from Louisiana indicated, it is an amendment that will reduce the size of the tax cut from $726 billion to $350 billion. And the remaining $376 billion would be applied towards deficit reduction. Through this alone, we would achieve $86 billion savings in interest costs.

I happen to believe this is a responsible, well balanced approach that will both stimulate our economy in the short term and protect our economy from the effects of unnecessary deficits in the long term. That is particularly important because when we compound future deficits, we raise the likelihood we will drive up long-term interest rates.

I understand the challenges of bringing forth a budget resolution. First, I commend the chairman of the Budget Committee, in his new position as chairman, for having the persistence and the determination, as well as the dedication, to bring this budget resolution before the Senate.

I commend him for his tireless work in forging and producing the budget we have debated on the floor this week. As a former member of the Budget Committee, I know what goes into this process. I also know that Senator NICKLES wants what we did not have last year, which was a budget resolution. It is critical because it imposes structure and discipline and defines the priorities in Federal expenditures.

That is a fundamental responsibility of Congress. That is why it is so critical and instrumental to get it done, to pass a budget resolution, so we can advance the budget process that ultimately will determine the policy as well as the appropriations, so we do not have what we had this year. This year, the first month and a half was devoted to the unfinished business of the last Congress—half of the domestic budget—because we had failed to pass a budget resolution. So that is important.

That is why I and the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Montana, and the Senator from Ohio worked together, because we understood, in order to pass a bipartisan budget resolution, it was also important to focus on some of the issues that would divide us. One of those questions was, of course, on the size of the growth plan as proposed by the President.

I commend the President for his leadership in initiating the debate on the

necessity of stimulating our economy. I happen to share his belief that we should take steps to rejuvenate this sluggish economy, to try to do what we can in the short term to strengthen the economy.

I also happen to believe that our budget resolution has to bear the stamp of the totality of the extraordinary historic events and times in which we live. In the last 2 years, it has been an extraordinary transformation for America, in the aftermath of the most horrific event, the devastating attack on American soil, the ongoing war on terrorism, the initiation of military action in Iraq and more than 250,000 troops poised for potential war. We also have grave concerns about the nuclear proliferation on the Korean peninsula. All of these global uncertainties have cast a dark shadow over a domestic economy that was already on shaky ground even before September 11. The events of September 11 catapulted an already shaky economy into a recession.

Indeed, over the past year our Nation's economy has only grown worse. The economy grew at an anemic .7 percent in the fourth quarter, the weakest quarterly gain since the end of the recession, and just last month 308,000 people joined the unemployment rolls, bringing our unemployment to an 8-year high. Since the recession began, we now have lost more than 2.3 million jobs in the private sector. Without question, we need to have a stimulus package to address the short-term, immediate economy.

As Allen Sinai said, chief economist for Decision Economics, the fiscal stimulus is ''absolutely essential'' because the U.S. and world economies are struggling.

In short, failing to act now by passing an immediate growth package in this budget is to risk contributing to a jobless recovery or incurring a double dip recession. We cannot afford to wait until our military action in Iraq is concluded.

This is the right time. This is the right vehicle for action. We can always debate further issues later. But we will never be able to turn the clock back to jump-start the economy.

When we were involved in deliberations about a stimulus package in 2002, we had numerous discussions with Chairman Greenspan and other experts. The one thing we did hear was this: If you want to effect the short-term behavior of the economy, you have to do it as soon as possible to have the maximum impact on short-term behavior. So we cannot afford to lose time. I believe we should have a growth package in this budget. At the same time, given these unprecedented times and the confluence of circumstances on which they are defined, whether it is the economic uncertainties, the war in Iraq, the projection of higher and higher budget deficits, the domestic fiscal challenges that lurk on the horizon because of Social Security and Medicare, our responsibility to carefully evaluate the impact of any tax reduction and spending increases in this budget is that much greater.

That is the context in which we must shape this budget. These are realities that we cannot afford to ignore. Indeed, our projected Federal deficit for this fiscal year is now estimated to be $246 billion. That is an increase of 54 percent. That is without any new spending or tax cuts. There were only 3 other years in the last 32 years in which we saw higher deficit levels in terms of real dollars. What is required in this budget resolution is careful calibration, if we are to produce short-term benefits for our economy without jeopardizing long-term fiscal responsibility and economic growth.

Let there be no mistake, just as the need for short-term economic stimulus is compelling, so, too, is the need to return to balanced budgets and, indeed, surpluses as soon as possible.

I have been in Congress, both the House and Senate, for 25 years. I have seen how difficult it is to achieve a balanced budget. After all, it took 18 years of my career before we saw the realization, the accomplishment of a balanced budget amendment. We all cheered on the success, that for the first time we were able to escape the chronic budget deficits that had characterized the budgetary process for decades. Then a year later we were able to have the first on-budget surplus. We have been able to have 4 years of surpluses from 1998 to 2001. I don't want that to be an anomaly. I want deficits to be an anomaly.

As I said, over the last two decades, I saw the progression of the deficits. I saw the progression of various procedures and how we were going to attack deficits, from Gramm-Rudman-Hollings to every other mechanism. There were those who said we should not have a balanced budget because they said it was a gimmick. I said, if it was a gimmick, we would have passed it a long time ago. It wasn't a gimmick. It worked.

We cannot risk the impact of undue deficits in the long term because those chronic deficits drive up interest rates. That is going to stymie our ability to do what we need to do for future generations. It will diminish our ability to address the problems associated with Social Security and Medicare.

That is how I am approaching this economic growth question in the budget resolution. What will stimulate the economy today versus what will not? And for those measures in this package, and the funding measure that we are including in this budget resolution are not strong, immediate, and of limited duration, if they truly have merit in their own right, then they should be paid for as we go.

We need to ask ourselves in this current circumstance, can we really afford to deficit finance nonstimulative proposals? Maybe we could do it in a different time or place, but not now.

It all comes back to setting priorities. That is what we said time and again in all those years that we were fighting for a balanced budget that was accomplished right here in the Senate back in 1996. That is what we talked about, establishing priorities, getting our fiscal house in order. Now that is what we need to do in this budget resolution. We have to draw lines, and we have to draw distinctions.

What I am saying tonight is, if those proposals that are nonstimulative to change our tax structure are part of a long-term economic growth plan or are part of tax reform, those proposals should be fully paid for so as to not exacerbate our future economic situation and lead to greater problems down the road. That is not my view. It is the prevalent view among economists—Chairman Greenspan and so many others across the board—because we are dealing with so many challenges and crises simultaneously.

How much can we afford to do now? How much? How much is too much? Should it be $726 billion? Should it be a trillion? Should it be $2 trillion? We have to draw lines. That is why I am here tonight. That is why I reached across party lines, to work together so we can pass a bipartisan budget resolution that reaches a consensus on this key issue of whether or not we should have a growth plan, and, if so, how much can we afford to do now?

I drew the line on what was stimulus versus nonstimulus. We need to have a carefully calibrated growth plan that is limited, of short duration, to have an immediate impact on the economy and that will not have a negative impact on long-term interest rates.

I looked at the outyears because I wanted to get exactly a snapshot of where we are today and where we are going in 2013. All I can see down the road are deficits as far as the eye can see. We have deficits every year. We have deficits through 2013, the year in which we will also have the onset of 77 million baby boomers retiring. So we will have a convergence of not only that massive wave of retirement that will impact Social Security and Medicare, but we will also continue to have deficits.

I looked at the projections by CBO. What I found were interesting facts. CBO projects a return to surpluses in 2008. But let it be clear, the assumptions do not account for real budget costs—the war in Iraq, tax cuts, prescription drugs, more spending on defense and homeland security, all national imperatives.

In fact, CBO's baseline assumes real discretionary spending will remain constant. That certainly contravenes the recent trends of around 8 percent growth in spending. According to the Brookings Institute, it said:

> Such assumption implies real outlays will fall by 9 percent relative to population, and by 20 percent relative to gross domestic product over the next decade.

I do not think anybody seriously believes that is realistic. Putting these

costs into the budget, we could have a deficit this year of over $300 billion and next year it could approach $400 billion. If we anticipate a supplemental of $100 billion or more in the short term, that will push our deficit near 4 percent of GDP, and that will be a historical high. I have heard time and again these deficits represent a minimal amount as a percentage of the GDP. I heard those arguments through the eighties. I heard them in the nineties. How much is too high? Today it is 2 percent. Tomorrow it will be 3 percent. With the supplemental next week, it could be 4 percent.

Why are we not focusing on how we can return to a balanced budget as soon as possible? Are balanced budgets no longer part of the political and economic lexicon? We should be devoting our time to figuring out, given all these exigencies, extenuating circumstances which, without question, need to be funded, how much can we do now in terms of a tax cut? We had a tax cut in 2001. We had a tax cut in 2002, and in my entire career, I have supported tax cuts, but now we are looking at multiple challenges on the horizon that demand significant Federal expenditures.

Therefore, I say, let's be prudent, let's be proportional, let's be practical, and target the growth plan to $350 billion that would be sufficient to have an effect on the short-term economy to turn this economy around.

Some people say wait until after the conflict with Iraq is over. If you have a weak economy, we have no way of prognosticating the future in terms of what the economy will look like in the aftermath of Iraq. We may have fundamentals strong enough that we can rebound. Certainly Chairman Greenspan has indicated he thinks that will be the case. If not, we do not want to take the risk, particularly because it affects the well-being of the American people and particularly those who have lost their jobs. So let's put something in place now. Mr. President, $350 billion seems to me to be a right size approach to do that for the short term.

Some people say that is just splitting the difference, 726, 350, it is half a loaf. It is splitting the difference. It is the moderate's approach to splitting it in half. It is not about splitting the difference, it is about making a distinction. It is making a distinction between what is a stimulus and what is not, what we can pay for now and what we can pay for in the future. That is the difference, and that happens to be a major difference.

Finally, when I look to the future, I think we all share the concern about the fact that we now have reverted back to using the surplus of the Social Security trust fund to mask the size of the true deficit. As I said earlier, we broke that chronic pattern of bad fiscal behavior. We were able to finally realize that moment where we could say that we no longer use the surpluses from the Social Security trust fund.

We know why we are in this situation today. No one questions that. The question is, how do we get back to where we were? That is my concern. When I look at the long-term projections, when I look at the fact that in the year 2013, we will be using $2.5 trillion in the Social Security trust fund surpluses to mask the true condition of the bottom line, that is of concern. That should be a concern to all of us, particularly at a time in which we will see as well the first wave of baby boomers retiring.

These are serious times. We cannot afford to diminish our ability to strengthen Social Security and Medicare. We have looked to this next decade, the decade we are in, as a window of opportunity to return to surpluses to prepare us for the future challenges. But as we have seen over the last 18 months, we can see how projections dramatically change and opportunities have evaporated. We know we had a $5.6 trillion surplus just 2 years ago, but we also understand what happened on September 11 that transformed this country. We obviously had to address emergencies, homeland security, the war on terrorism, and 68 percent of the surpluses were evaporated as a result of the declining economy.

So I do believe we need to have a growth plan, but we must exercise caution so that we do not aggravate the long-term picture and threaten our ability to address long-term priorities.

We have to be cautious because when you have fluctuations, and as the ones that have been as dramatic as they have been over the last few years, it can increase or it can decrease the amount of revenues that are available for other programs and certainly can decrease the amount of revenues coming in to the Federal Treasury.

Just a 1-percent fluctuation in the GDP can decrease tax receipts by $120 billion over 5 years and increase outlays by $52 billion over 5 years—just a 1-percent change. Think of where we have been in terms of economic growth and the fluctuations that have occurred.

That is why I think we have to be prudent. The President was right to offer a growth plan, but I think we cannot ignore the impact of all the challenges we face. If we step back and take the long view, I do believe we have to make a decision in terms of how much we can afford to do now, and what we need to do is to stimulate the short-term economy. What we cannot afford to do, without paying for it, without adding to the deficit, is advancing long-term economic growth plans, tax reform, nonstimulative proposals.

I hope my colleagues will give this very serious consideration in support of this amendment. I do not offer this lightly. I have taken this responsibility very seriously. I happen to believe it is important to get a strong bipartisan budget resolution with the right size number for a stimulus plan, a figure that will help us get a budget on a timely basis, a number that will help us to stimulate the economy.

I happen to believe the amendment we are offering today strikes the right balance. It represents the most effective way, I believe, that we can advance a growth plan that can achieve the strongest possible support but, more importantly, have the maximum effect on our economy without affecting the long-term future. We know these are extraordinary times, but I hope we will not abandon our goals for fiscal discipline. I hope we will not compound the outlook, the chronic future budget deficits, and diminish our ability to address and finance our security in Medicare. We need to lift the economy but without adding to future deterioration.

I hope we are not retreating in the notion that we can never return to balanced budgets. I hope we will concentrate on the goal of returning to balanced budgets as soon as it is possible. I hope we can begin now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). Who yields time on the amendment?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, how much time is the Senator seeking?

Mr. VOINOVICH. I seek 15 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, before I address the merits of this amendment, I commend the chairman of the Budget Committee for his successful efforts to bring a budget resolution to the floor. I would like to particularly commend the chairman for including several important budget reform initiatives that will control spending and impact the soaring deficit: Extension of supermajority enforcement, reestablishment of discretionary spending limits in the Senate, reestablishment of restrictions on advance appropriations in the Senate, providing a clear definition of emergency legislation, reestablishment of the pay-as-you-go point of order in the Senate. Those are good things, but I must say I take issue with the reconciliation instructions contained in the budget resolution. As much as I oppose deficit spending, I also oppose deficit tax reduction, and these reconciliation instructions have the opposite effect of the budget reforms in the resolution.

I say to my colleagues this evening that we are on the edge of a serious crisis in terms of our Federal budget. In the past decade, conservatives worked hard to return the Federal Government to a balanced budget. For a short time after hand-to-hand combat, we met our goal for 2 years in 1999 and 2000. We balanced the budget without raiding the Social Security surplus. We had an on-budget surplus. That means we did not use Social Security in 1999. In 2000, again we did not use Social Security and we had a true on-budget surplus of

$87 billion. Ever since 2000, we have been increasing our budget deficit to the extent that if the budget deficit for 2003 is projected, it will be $408 billion, the largest budget deficit we have experienced in the Senate.

Unfortunately, as I said, our balancing the budget was short lived. Today, instead of reducing our $6.2 trillion national debt, we are expanding it. In 2001, we suffered an on-budget deficit of $33 billion. In 2002, we suffered an on-budget deficit of $314 billion. CBO now projects that if Congress were to go home and not legislate any further—and that does not include costs associated with the economic stimulus, a drug benefit for Medicare, or the war—we would suffer an on-budget deficit, as I mentioned, of $408 billion. It is clear that increased discretionary spending has led to these exploding Federal deficits.

This discretionary spending reached a post-cold-war low in 1995 of $502 billion. At the current rate of growth, discretionary spending will exceed $1 trillion in fiscal year 2008. In terms of deficits, the future does not look very good. CBO recently prepared an analysis of OMB's budget proposals and, according to this report, if these proposals are enacted, we can expect a whopping on-budget deficit of $452 billion in fiscal year 2003, which does not include costs associated with war, and $512 billion in fiscal year 2004. Again, that does not include the costs associated with the war.

The fact of the matter is that in 2003 and 2004, if we include Social Security, we are going to be borrowing over half a trillion dollars to run our Government.

Currently, as I said, we have a $6.2 trillion debt. The administration has recently asked Congress to again raise the debt ceiling. I am sure they are reluctant to come over here and ask us to raise the debt ceiling at the same time we are talking about a $726 million reduction in taxes.

The current Federal debt represents an obligation of more than $21,000 for each man, woman, and child in the United States, including the Budget chairman's new grandson Nicholas and my new granddaughter Emily. Under CBO's baseline, again, assuming Congress goes home and does not legislate anymore for the next 10 years and spending grows at inflation, we will reach a total debt of $8.7 trillion by 2008 and $9.7 trillion by 2012. However, under current policy assumptions, which include costs associated with economic stimulus and a drug benefit for Medicare, but not the war, OMB's budget projects Federal debt will exceed $9.3 trillion by 2008. The President's budget did not even include a projection for debt of 10 years.

I say to my colleagues that debt does matter. Every dollar we add to the Federal debt today must be repaid in the future with interest, and there is no way around it.

I am also concerned about the seemingly new message which minimizes the importance and effect of the debt. In contrast, Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan has consistently stated that all things being equal, a declining level of Federal debt is desirable because it holds down long-term interest rates, thereby lowering the cost of capital and elevating private investments.

Even the proponents of using the debt-to-GDP ratio as a measure of fiscal responsibility must acknowledge our current situation is not good. As recently as 2000, we had a surplus-to-GDP ratio of 2.4 percent. In 2001, when we passed the last stimulus package, the ratio of deficit to GDP was only 1.5 percent. Currently, CBO estimates the GDP ratio for 2003 will be 3 percent and could go higher. We have doubled that percentage in 1 year without including the cost of the war.

In January, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan described the effort to bring deficits under control and decisions needed to maintain fiscal discipline. He said: Achieving a satisfactory budget posture will depend on ensuring that the new initiatives are consistent with our longer run budgetary deficits. As you craft the budget strategy for the coming years, you may want to consider provisions that in some way would limit decreasing tax and spending initiatives if specified targets for the budget surplus and Federal debt were to be satisfied.

In other words, in putting our budgets together, we have to look down the road to the day of reckoning when the baby boomers retire and we are in a position where we can take care of their retirements.

Many foreign investors believe budget deficits demonstrate the relative strength of an economy. In addition, they believe this ratio gives a fair idea of Government policies and political aspects of the individual nation's monetary systems. Consequently, the Maastrich Treaty requires the EU countries not to exceed a debt-to-GDP ratio of 3 percent. When the costs of the anticipated supplemental spending related to the war are added, the current budget deficit will exceed 3 percent of GDP in 2004.

The U.S. Federal budget would demonstrate less fiscal discipline than European nations are imposing on themselves. This change in perception would tend to increase interest costs for Federal borrowing since the United States finances a large portion of its debt held by the public through the sale of T-bills. And it will become progressively more difficult to finance continued deficits or pay future Social Security benefits.

That being said, and despite my concerns regarding the expanding national debt, I think most agree that some economic stimulus is needed to provide a shot in the arm to our economy, although many economists, including Alan Greenspan, have said the problem is geopolitical, that after the cloud of a war is over our economy will move forward.

Stimulus, I believe, is still needed. But not $700 billion worth of stimulus. Our amendment calls for $350 billion in stimulus. And realistically, tax cuts larger than $350 billion appear to have very little support on either side of the Hill. It might not be possible to pass any stimulus proposal if the pricetag is too large. The all or nothing approach could rob us of the opportunity to give business the stimulus it needs. That is unacceptable. We need to cooperate and enact a $350 billion stimulus package and get the economy moving as rapidly as possible.

I say to the Presiding Officer, when I was Governor of Ohio, if I suggested a $700 billion package of tax reductions to the legislature and they came back to me and said on a bipartisan basis, we will give you $350 billion, I would have taken it and ran. We believe that $350 billion will cover what is needed to help rev up the economy, especially given the fact we will be borrowing each and every dollar used for the tax cut.

Reconciliation instructions at the $350 billion level provide the financing committee the ability to enact one large tax reform proposal, several small reforms, or a combination of medium and small reforms. It is reasonable to expect future economic growth within 10 years would begin to pay for the cost of tax reforms limited to $350 billion.

It is also important to note our amendment does not preclude Congress from passing a larger economic stimulus package this year. It just says we need to pay for it.

We should honor the principle embodied in pay-go. If people want more than $350 billion in tax reductions, pay for them with offsets. Even proponents of dynamic scoring can see it would take much longer than 10 years for economic growth to begin to pay for tax reductions of more than $350 billion. Although many have agreed to vote for final passage of the budget resolution, I can guarantee we will not support a package larger than $350 billion.

The Senate should also clearly recognize bipartisanship is the best stimulus we can provide the American people at this time. The Senate did not even consider a budget resolution on the floor last year. It led to partisan gridlock and failure to enact appropriations bills before the end of the 107th Congress. Major programs, including many related to homeland security, were left in limbo. We must not repeat this mistake. The Senate, the administration, and the American people are best served through bipartisan support for budgetary initiatives.

The people are watching us. They want to see us work together. We are at a time of war. Given the current economic and geopolitical climate, we should avoid excessive partisanship which breeds uncertainty and discourages business investment. Enacting a budget resolution with only a one or two vote margin tells financial markets that Congress is likely to drag out

the whole process, including reducing taxes and passing appropriations bills when they are needed. In contrast, enacting a budget resolution with strong bipartisan support will signal stability, tell financial markets that Congress is likely to manage Federal finances efficiently and effectively, and encourage business investment.

Additionally, I think it is very important that we act in a unified manner, supporting the President due to the war. I disagree strongly with my Republican colleagues who maintain that not passing the President's larger package will look bad for him. I don't agree with that. Instead, I believe passing a $350 billion package with strong bipartisan support will be looked upon very favorably by the American public, that the Congress and the President can work together to move things ahead on a bipartisan basis.

Let's send a signal to Wall Street, Main Street, and the rest of the world that during this time of crisis we are able to overcome our differences and unify behind fiscal policies with a broad base of support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time yielded to Senators BREAUX, SNOWE, and VOINOVICH be taken from the amendment time rather than the resolution time.

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

Mr. CONRAD. Just to comment, first, I respect very much my colleagues, Senator BREAUX, Senator SNOWE, Senator VOINOVICH, and Senator BAUCUS for offering this amendment. They come from a centrist tradition of the Senate of which I was long a member before I got into this position, and it is really no longer appropriate for me to be part of that group. I have enormous respect for them. I thank them.

The Senator from Montana is seeking 15 minutes off the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes remain.

Mr. BENNETT. How much time would be available on the amendment for those who are opposed to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One hour.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak following the Senator from Montana in opposition.

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

Mr. CONRAD. Might I revise my request. There are only 7 minutes; we take 7 minutes off the amendment and give an additional 8 minutes off the resolution so the Senator from Montana would have 15 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to join my fellow colleagues, Senators BREAUX, SNOWE and VOINOVICH, in support of this important amendment that works to reach a middle ground.

This is a bipartisan amendment and will allow Congress to pass a responsible economic stimulus package, a package that will provide a real boost to the economy while not burdening our future generations with skyrocketing deficits.

The budget resolution we are debating today includes a ''reconciliation'' instruction for the Finance Committee to reduce revenues by up to $725 billion over 10 years.

This is the same amount of the President's economic stimulus package. And while I support tax cuts and have worked closely with the President in the past to enact tax cuts, I am very concerned by the size of his current package.

First, we are at war and the immediate and long term costs of the conflict and reconstruction are unknown. Our economy is sluggish and we face rising unemployment. This is not the time to enact a package of tax cuts as large as the President has suggested.

I recognize that the economy needs a shot in the arm. So I have joined my fellow Senators in offering this amendment to keep a stimulus package at $350 billion. And ensure that the $375 billion which is saved goes toward deficit reducing measures.

Our amendment does not dictate what tax cuts should be passed out of the Finance Committee. It simply reduces the size of the tax cut. And I believe if this amendment is not passed, the Federal budget and the U.S. economy will be hurt significantly.

As my colleagues know well, ''reconciliation'' instructions ensure that any legislation that is reported out by a Committee pursuant to those instructions enjoys special privileges when it is brought to the Senate floor.

That means that the legislation only needs a simple majority of 51 votes to pass. In contrast, without reconciliation protection, legislation takes a supermajority of 60 votes to pass.

Legislation under reconciliation instructions is also protected from nongermane amendments. Such amendments can create serious obstacles to the passage of legislation. But passage of a non-germane amendment to reconciliation legislation requires a supermajority of 60 votes. And this is usually difficult to achieve.

What these special privileges really mean is that reconciliation legislation is more likely to pass the Senate.

Unfortunately, passing legislation to reduce revenues by $725 billion would hurt our budget and our economy. I believe the budget resolution should not instruct the Finance Committee to make $725 billion of tax cuts.

Why do I believe $725 billion of tax cuts is inappropriate? The most serious problem is that this enormous tax cut is not paid for. The Federal budget is facing huge annual deficits.

This is happening at the worst possible time. In a few short years, the huge baby boom generation will begin to retire. The added costs for Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid will put a huge amount of additional stress on our budget. And on our economy too.

With these budgetary and economic pressures looming, we should be running surpluses—not deficits—as soon as the economy returns to full employment in the near-term. We should be retiring debt, not creating it when the economy is at full employment.

If this amendment does not pass, we are going to add an additional $375 billion in debt and deficits during the next ten years. This is during a period when the economy should be at full employment.

What difference does it make if we run large deficits when the economy is at full employment?

The answer is that large deficits eat up savings that would otherwise be used by businesses to invest in new plant and equipment. Without these investments, the economy will grow more slowly. And our future standard of living will be reduced. As well as the standard of living of our children and grandchildren.

Once the economy is at full employment, large deficits will also cause long-term interest rates to go up. This will increase the cost of mortgages. And car loans. This will hurt the consumer. But it also will hurt the economy. Because people will buy fewer homes and cars.

The simple truth is this. We cannot afford to increase Federal budget deficits by an additional $375 billion. If anything, we should reduce deficits, not add to them.

With the concerns about the costs of a war and growing deficits, many of you may be asking why aren't we trying to eliminate the entire $725 billion package?

The answer is that right now, the economy is not at full employment. That means that we need to encourage more spending. More spending will stimulate more production. And that will increase employment and return economic growth to its full potential.

The $350 billion of tax cuts that we are leaving intact, therefore, should be used for tax cuts and program initiatives that would increase spending right now.

And, the incentives to encourage more spending must also be temporary. Once the economy returns to full employment, the decrease in savings that would result from the increase in consumption will reduce investment. And that will lower our standard of living in the long-run.

Again, I want to emphasize that we do not dictate what the tax cuts should be—we simply say the amount should be lower. But I believe there are three specific areas we should consider to effectively stimulate the economy in the short-run.

First, probably the best short-run stimulus is increasing aid to state governments on a one-time basis. The recession and subsequent weak economy has severely reduced state revenues. States are facing budget deficits in the upcoming fiscal year of $70 to $85 billion.

Unlike the Federal Government, almost all states have annual balanced budget requirements. So even though the economy is weak, States must lay off workers, cut spending programs, and increase taxes in order to balance their budgets.

These actions make the economy even weaker. They also reduce important services that state governments provide.

There is a remedy, however. By increasing Federal aid to states, states can avoid layoffs. Avoid cutting programs. And avoid increasing taxes. In contrast, any attempts by Congress that lack a state relief component will ultimately fail to stimulate the economy. Because efforts to spur the economy will fail if, at the same time, states are forced to raise taxes, cut spending, and eliminate jobs.

Increased aid to state governments should only be made on a temporary basis, however. Once the economy improves, the increased aid must stop.

Second, cutting taxes on households who are likely to spend those tax cuts quickly effectively stimulates the economy. The President's plan includes an acceleration of many of the tax cuts that were enacted in 2001.

I fully support acceleration of some of the tax cuts that are primarily directed to those taxpayers who will spend most of the tax cuts they receive. Such as accelerating the reductions in the marriage penalty or the increases in the child tax credit.

But, a portion of America's households will not receive any benefit at all under the President's plan. Therefore, I believe we also need to accelerate the reduction of marriage penalties for households receiving the earned income tax credit. And we also need to accelerate the refundable portion of the child tax credit from the 2001 tax cut.

Acceleration of these tax cuts will give the economy a boost in the short run. But without increasing deficits in the long-run. Because the revenue losses are in the years when the acceleration takes place. There is no revenue loss in the years after that.

Third, we can stimulate the economy by completely eliminating the income tax on the first $3,000 of wages. This proposal also puts money into the hands of taxpayers who will spend it. Especially if we make it refundable. Which will provide a tax cut to the 30 million Americans who are left out of the President's program.

These are just three ways to stimulate the economy—aid to the states, acceleration of some tax cuts, and elimination of income tax on the first $3,000 of wages. Needless to say, there are other proposals that we should consider. Some of these other proposals include increased funding for highway construction, health insurance tax credits for businesses, and allowing small businesses to deduct more of their investments in plant and equipment.

A reconciliation instruction of $350 billion of tax cuts to the Finance Committee can be used for several types of economic stimulus without increasing long-run deficits. But we cannot add to that a larger tax cut that will increase long-run deficits. That would weaken our economy. We cannot let that happen.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. President, while I have the floor, I also want to say that I will be proposing another amendment this evening, or tomorrow.

My amendment is a very simple amendment. It would clarify the Medicare reserve fund language to say that beneficiaries who choose to remain in the current fee-for-service program which, I might add, is 89 percent of all seniors right now should get the same drug benefit as those who choose to enroll in a private plan.

Let's put aside the question of whether $400 billion is enough for an adequate drug benefit. Having spent a lot of time reviewing the cost of different benefit levels, I know that $400 billion buys a rather paltry benefit.

But whatever benefit level we can afford with that amount, we should make sure that the same benefit is available to seniors who choose to stay in the fee-for-service program as those who enroll in an HMO, a PPO or any other sort of private plan in Medicare.

I believe that is the commitment many of us have made to our seniors, and that is the commitment we ought to fulfill.

Earlier this month, President Bush unveiled his vision for Medicare reform. I am pleased that he doubled the amount of money he is willing to spend on a prescription drug benefit over what he proposed last year.

But I am concerned that the President's vision for reform is to privatize the program. He would give a comprehensive drug benefit to seniors who enroll in private plans. But those who choose to stay where they are now, in the fee-for-service program, would get only a discount card and catastrophic coverage.

That is not something I am willing to support. Let me explain why.

First, we already know that private plans have had difficulties serving the Medicare population. Many of my colleagues may recall that the reason Medicare was created in the first place was because so many seniors were ill-served by the private market. About half of the elderly were uninsured in 1965. Because of Medicare, now nearly all elderly are covered.

More recently, since Medicare+Choice was created in 1997 to expand private plan options in Medicare, we have seen a dramatic drop in the number of HMOs participating in the program. And as a result, an estimated 2.4 million beneficiaries have lost their health plan.

As you can see by this chart, only 875 counties across the country currently have a Medicare managed care plan. That is out of a total of 3,200 counties. So more than 2,300 counties don't have access to managed care plans or PPOs.

Looking at this map, I might add that the counties without these plans are predominantly rural.

And it is not that plans are underpaid, as some might try to argue. The average payment to Medicare+Choice plans is currently 104 percent of local fee-for-service costs. That figure doesn't tell the whole story, but it does suggest that simply increasing payments will not draw private plans into rural areas.

My own state of Montana is a good example. The floor payment for Medicare+Choice plans in Montana is 128 percent of local fee-for-service costs. Yet, we don't have any HMOs or PPOs in my state.

Let me repeat that: despite a payment rate that is 28 percent higher than traditional Medicare, private health plans are still not serving Montana seniors.

All this leads me to the second reason I do not support the President's proposal it doesn't save any money. Moving beneficiaries into private plans will not save the program for the next generation and will do nothing to address Medicare solvency.

We can all talk about coordination of care, disease management, and the potential efficiencies private plans might be able to achieve. But at the end of the day, private health plans are subject to the same cost pressures affecting the entire health care system. Just look at the Federal Employees Health Benefits Plan, FEHB. This plan serves federal employees, retirees, and their dependents and has been held up as a model for Medicare reform. Yet we find that FEHB premiums have increased, on average, by more than 10 percent each year in the last 5 years. Far faster than Medicare's per capita costs.

Third, and finally, I don't support a differential drug benefit, because it is just not fair to make beneficiaries move into a private plan to get a drug benefit. In Montana, virtually all beneficiaries are in traditional Medicare. That means, in order for them to get a drug benefit, they would need to drop their supplemental coverage and enroll in a private plan accepting all the restrictions, preferred networks, and coverage limitations that come along with the plan.

For a senior who may be older, used to what she currently has, and to anyone with a chronic health condition, this is a frightening proposition.

As the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. TAUZIN so aptly said recently, ''You couldn't

move my own mother out of Medicare without a bulldozer. She trusts it, believes in it. It's served her well.''

That is the case with millions of seniors around the country. They like what they have now, and they want to stay there. They need a drug benefit, they have been pressing Congress to act for months, years now, and they don't believe they should have to swallow such far-reaching reforms to get the help they need. And the more we delay, the more expensive it gets to provide this benefit.

In the 4 years that Congress has been seriously debating Medicare prescription drugs, we have considered a range of options. And we've seen the CBO scores for these proposals go up and up as we've taken longer and longer to act.

While there are differences in the bills we have debated, they all have one thing in common. They would offer all seniors the same level of drug benefit if they chose to enroll in the new benefit. Not just private plan or HMO enrollees, but all beneficiaries.

In closing, I would like to point out that 90 Members of the Senate who are here today voted in favor of legislation last summer that would uphold this principle.

I think we should keep the commitment we made last summer. I am happy to work with the administration and my colleagues across the aisle on ways to improve and increase private plan participation in Medicare. But we need to make sure that the benefit is provided in full to fee-for-service beneficiaries as well as private plan enrollees.

For the sake of America's seniors, particularly the oldest, the sickest, and the most frail, and for the sake of America's rural seniors, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Utah is to be recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Thank you, Mr. President. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have been very interested in the discussions we have had up until now. I think there are several things that need to be said. Even though they have been said before, they need to be stressed again.

With respect to the projections that are made about the future, and the numbers we are looking at, the one thing we can be sure about, with respect to the projections, is they are wrong. What we cannot be sure of is whether they are wrong on the high side or the low side. But we can be sure they are wrong.

We also can be sure they will be adjusted, revised, and issued with the same pronouncement of certainty a year from now. They will be different a year from now, but we will be told: These are the numbers.

The second thing I think we need to understand as we enter this debate is the nature of the recession we have just gone through. I have referred it to as the first recession of the information age.

The recession in 1990–1991, I believe, was the last recession of the industrial age. That is why this recession is so different from any others we have had.

I want to make it very clear, we are not currently in a recession. The press talks as if we are. I have heard speeches on the floor saying: This is the worst economy in 50 years. This is not the worst economy in 50 years. This is not close to the worst economy that we have had in this last half century, in any way.

It is different. It feels different. For some people, it feels terrible. For other people, these are booming times. If you are in the housing business right now, you say: What recession? Because housing has been booming all through the recession period.

If you look at the unemployment rate—when I went to school, I was taught in economics that 6 percent unemployment was full employment, that you could not get below 6 percent unemployment without causing strains in the economy. We proved that wrong in the 1990s. We got down to the point where we thought 3 percent unemployment was normal.

Well, we hit 6 percent unemployment as a result of the recent recession. We are now backing off from that number. The last number was 5.7 percent.

If we were to take the economic numbers that currently apply to the United States and transport them to Germany, the Germans would feel they were in the strongest recovery they could imagine, because unemployment there is double digits.

Last year—a sluggish year, a year that Alan Greenspan referred to as a ''soft patch''—we grew at 2.7 percent of GDP. The Germans are not growing. The Japanese are not growing. The French are not growing. They would be delighted to have our numbers. And they are clearly not nearly as bad as people are talking about them. But they are a soft patch. And the soft patch is too soft, and it is going on too long. And we need to address the question of what we do about it.

I have said, this is the first recession of the information age. It is not a recession driven by inventory imbalances which usually has signaled a recession in the industrial age. This recession was created by overinvestment, something that in the industrial age we never saw. And, indeed, as an investment recession, it has to be dealt with with an investment solution.

We saw the excitement, almost to the point of ''tulip time,'' that occurred in the late 1990s. I say ''tulip time'' to refer to the great tulip mania of the Dutch in the Middle Ages, where the price of a tulip bulb rose so high, as people thought tulips would always continue to increase in value, that families would mortgage their farms, sell everything they had, to buy a single bulb, in the hope they could sell that bulb to somebody else for more money later on. When the tulip mania burst, the economy of Holland was damaged for close to a century, as they had to deal with it.

Well, that is an overstatement of what we went through in the late 1990s, but we went through a fascination with dot-coms and with high-tech companies and IPOs, where we had an investment bubble. And the bubble burst. When it burst, we had a tremendous decrease in what economists refer to as ''the wealth effect,'' as Wall Street saw a correction to that overenthusiasm of the time. It was not brought about by a traditional business cycle. It was brought about by a new kind of overexuberance in the business cycle.

The Wall Street numbers were inflated improperly. They had to come down. But when they came down, the confidence was lost, the wealth effect was gone, and people who had overinvested then decided they were going to stop investing.

So we had an investment-led recession for the first time. As that recession was coming, but before it hit, we had the projection of a $5.6 trillion surplus over the next 10 years. That was given to us by the same models that now talk about deficits as far as the eye can see. They were not bad people who made those decisions. The models worked themselves out. The problem was, the assumptions that went into the models, seemingly logical at the time they were made, produced that kind of a situation.

What happened to the surplus? We have heard a lot of rhetoric about who is responsible for destroying the surplus. Some of the rhetoric has been quite political. Let's just look at the same numbers for the $5.6 trillion surplus and say, all right, as we feed in current numbers, what happened to the surplus?

This in dark blue is the Bush tax cut. Yes, that was done deliberately on the grounds that the surplus could afford it. The surplus said we should bring taxes down. I will talk about that in a moment.

The gray over here, light blue, depending on what you see it as, 45 percent of the loss of the $5.6 trillion surplus is the weak economy and changes in the estimates. In other words, these estimates were made before we realized where we were in the excesses of the 1990s. And as the economy contracted and people changed the estimates, obviously, while the tax cut represented 25 percent of the surplus, and that was done deliberately, this hit us because we didn't make the right calculations. To be sure and to be fair to the people who made the calculations, they did not anticipate September 11. They did not anticipate all of the shock waves that came out of that situation. They did not anticipate what would happen when the economy hit the investment recession to which I referred.

The red represents increased spending, increased spending at 28 percent. We have spent more than the tax cut. Some of that, again, we did not anticipate. We did not anticipate we would have to spend $40 billion to rebuild New York. We did not anticipate we were going to have to spend the amount of money that we have spent in homeland security. We did not anticipate all of the other. But a lot of that spending came out of the mentality that, gee, we have a $5.6 trillion surplus; we can spend a little more here and we can spend a little more there. And a little more here and a little more there turned out to be a lot more when added to the problems. And this is what we get.

Now let's put it in 2004 because we have had a lot of rhetoric about this particular fiscal year and the budget we are facing. Here are the same numbers with respect to the projections that were made for the surplus for fiscal year 2004. The Bush tax cut for that original projection of the surplus: 19 percent. It is a smaller percentage of the deficit for 2004 than it is for the 10-year. The weak economy: 51 percent. It is a bigger number affecting 2004 than it does the 10-year picture. Increased spending, 24 percent; and then other tax relief becomes a bigger issue.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to.

Mr. CONRAD. On the previous chart, if you could go back to that for a moment, might I just ask, is the President's additional proposed tax increase included in that chart?

Mr. BENNETT. No. This is the tax increase that was enacted.

Mr. CONRAD. That is the tax increase already passed and implemented?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. CONRAD. If I could inquire of the Senator, if the additional proposed tax increase by the President were added to that chart, can the Senator tell us then what one would see in terms of the calculation of the disappearance of the surplus and what is the primary culprit?

Mr. BENNETT. I happen to have another chart. I will get to that if the Senator will be patient. I appreciate his willingness to listen.

Back to 2004, we see once again the impact of the soft patch. We see that if we are going to look at this and say, what can we do to get this money back, the first thing we can do, the best thing we can do, is get rid of this. Fifty-one percent of the whole comes from the weak economy. Another good thing we can do is hold down this: 24 percent comes from increased spending.

For those who said, we will solve our deficit problem if we just repeal the tax cut—and we have heard that rhetoric on the floor—no, that is the least effective way to get this back where it belongs. I am glad people who have said let's repeal the tax cut are backing away from that position.

Here is another way of demonstrating how the projections went wrong and the impact of the spending. These were the revenues in that boom time. And then we began to see the revenues start to slack off just as outlays that were increasing at one level began to increase very sharply. Here again is the responsibility of where we are.

Here is the chart answering the question about the impact of the President's growth plan. This shows the total taxes that will be paid in the next 11 years, $29.3 trillion. And the President's growth plan says we will have $725 billion, or 2.4 percent of that amount, that will come out of the overall pie. If you add the $725 billion to the $29.3 trillion that will still be paid, you come up with $30 trillion. It is obvious that the $30 trillion is a nice round figure, which will be wrong. It will once again be wrong on the high side or wrong on the low side, but no one with any certainty can look out 11 years and add up the exact amount of tax revenue that will come in. It is simply not humanly possible.

The best estimate that can be made says: Well, it will be, and it is rounded off, at $30 trillion. So you take $30 trillion, and we are talking about 2.4 percent of that.

The net effect of this over the next 11 years is, if I might use a phrase we are all familiar with, within the margin of error. It is clear that the estimate of what this will be cannot be that close, to a 2.4 percent accuracy. It is within the margin of error. We are not talking about a major impact. Seven hundred twenty-four billion sounds like a huge amount of money, and of course it is. But when it is stretched out over 11 years and when it is compared to $30 trillion, then you put it in perspective.

Many people say: Why should we be cutting taxes at all? Let's err on the prudent side and get that money in.

The fact is, of course, that we cannot assume that if we set the tax burden at a certain level, the economy will yield that kind of tax revenue.

I was in Ireland with a group of my colleagues last summer, and the Irish economy was booming, growing more rapidly than any other economy in Europe. We said to the Prime Minister of Ireland: To what do you attribute your growth? He said: We attribute it to the fact we cut our corporate tax rate to 10 percent, and we immediately started booming.

I will concede immediately that is a simplistic answer and there must have been other reasons involved, but I will not concede that the decision to cut the corporate tax rate to 10 percent was a trivial one or that it did not have a major impact on seeing that the Irish economy became the strongest economy in Europe.

I think it is not an accident that they have the lowest tax rates and the highest rate of growth. I think there is some correlation between those two, while conceding that there are other aspects.

Let's look at the historic tax burden we have had in the United States measured in the only way that really makes any sense; that is, as a percentage of the economy. For those who say: Oh, no, that does not matter, let me repeat again a personal experience that I think demonstrates it does matter.

As I have said before, before I came to the Senate, I ran a business. When I was hired as the CEO of that business, the total debt of the business was $75,000. When I stepped down as the CEO of that business prior to running for the Senate, the total debt of that business was $7.5 million. If you are going to measure my stewardship by the size of the debt, you can say Bennett was a lousy steward and we are good to get rid of him because he took a little tiny debt of $75,000 and ran it up to $7.5 million, and now we have to pay off that debt and he left us in this terrible hole.

Let me add a few more facts. When I took over as the CEO of the company, they were doing about $300,000 a year in total business; $75,000 in debt represented 25 percent of the sales and, indeed, threatened the survival of the business because the business could not service a $75,000 debt on $300,000 in sales. Indeed, the business was losing money at $300,000 a year in sales and could not survive unless we did something.

When I stepped down as the CEO of the business, we were doing over $75 million in sales, and the $7.5 million in debt represented 10 percent of the sales instead of 25 percent of the sales. Furthermore, we were earning enough money, our margins were strong enough that we had over $7 million in the bank.

You say: Why didn't you pay off the debt? Because the debt represented primarily mortgages on real estate that had prepayment penalties on them. We had borrowed the money to build the facility. We needed to run the business, and it was cheaper for us to earn interest on the money in the bank than it was to pay the prepayment penalty on the mortgage.

I frankly think I did a pretty good job at that company. I think my stewardship was proper, if you measure it solely on the basis of the debt, though I took a $75,000 debt and ran it up to $7.5 million. If you take the total value of the company, it was failing, and at the point of extinction with a $75,000 debt, it had a market cap of $200 million or $300 million with the $7.5 million debt.

Applying that same principle, and I think it is legitimate to do so, we should look at our debt now not in terms of how big is it in numbers, but how big is it with respect to the size of the economy, and it is now at a level with respect to the size of the economy less than it was at the time of the Eisenhower administration.

The highest point of our debt as a percentage of gross national product was in 1945 at the end of the Second

World War. We were running a total debt of close to 1½ times the size of the economy. Adding in the Social Security trust funds and all of the rest of it, it is about 60 percent. We are way below a level that at one time in our history we demonstrated we could survive with.

Putting that same calculation to the issue of taxation, here is a demonstration of taxes as a percentage of GDP. We have drawn a line at 20 percent of GDP. When did taxes get higher than 20 percent in our history? Once back in 1945, again responding to the Second World War when we had a debt that was three times GDP, and we immediately brought the taxes down to 15 percent and started to see the economy growing in such a fashion that the debt started coming down in dramatic fashion as a percentage of GDP.

With the tremendous surge of tax revenue that came primarily as a function of the high-tech run up in the late nineties and the realization from capital gains when, in this Chamber, we cut the capital gains tax rate so people started cashing in their dot-com stocks and paying enormous capital gains revenues to the Treasury, even though the rate went down, the rate went down but the realizations went up. We saw, once again, for the first time since the Second World War the total tax take as a percentage of GDP go above 20 percent.

To me that was the more compelling argument than the one that even the President made when he said: We are taking too much of your money; we need to give it back to you. I said how does it fit overall in the economic pattern?

Historically, when the tax take begins to get up to this 20-percent line, it is a signal that you have too much burden on the economy and you need to bring the tax take down below 20 percent. That is why I supported the President's decision and supported the President's position in the Tax Code that said: OK, let's bring it down.

You always see tax revenues drop in a time of recession. We had the tax cut, and then it was followed by the recession. This is the estimate of what will happen under current law if we do not do something about making the tax cut permanent. We will be in a historic area until the tax cut expires and goes back up, at which point we will bounce back over 20 percent of GDP.

I want GDP to grow more rapidly than Government expenditures. If GDP grows more rapidly than Government expenditures, we have no need to worry about the future. But if it does not, we cannot tax our way to prosperity. We cannot tax our way to a balanced budget.

There have been a lot of quotations of Alan Greenspan around here. I happen to be a great Greenspan supporter. Sometimes I am a little surprised to think I can understand him. I have been in the Senate now 10 years and on the Banking Committee, and he has appeared before us every year. I am on the Joint Economic Committee, and he appears there every year. For the first few years, I did not break the code, but I think I am now beginning to understand Greenspan speak.

This is a point he made to a group of us that I think is essential to this debate: You can set expenditures at almost any level you want. You cannot set revenues at any level you want. Revenues are a function of the economy, and if you do something wrong in fiscal policy that causes the economy to fail, you are not going to get the revenues you may project.

One can, on the spending side, commit themselves to long-term, built-in obligations that they cannot then cover if the revenues are not there. This is the ominous number on this chart. If we can get the revenues back up by getting the economy back up, back to the first chart—get this part of it solved, the weakness in the economy—then we will be just fine.

Now we come to the amendment. After all of the presentation, we come to the question of how big should the growth package be? Should it cost $724 billion over 11 years or can we get rid of this part of the softness for only $350 billion over the next 11 years? I think that is the wrong question to ask because it is a mathematical question to which there is no correct answer.

As I said at the beginning, all of these projections are wrong. All of them will be revised. No one can, with certainty, make a prediction of what is going to happen in 11 years in this economy and be anywhere near close. So the question to ask is, Will the proposals the President has made actually produce a structural change within the economy that has a chance of dealing with the softness in the economy?

I go back to the other thing I said, which is this particular recession was an investment recession. So the fundamental question to ask is, Will the proposals the President has made address the investment side of the soft patch we are in?

Well, we had a tax cut. Part of it addressed the consumer side and we thought: that is going to stimulate the economy. We sent out checks, 300 bucks for everybody who had filed a tax return. We discovered that it was not stimulative. Why not? Because it was aimed at the consumer side. It was not aimed at the investment side. And it did not produce any major structural change to give us the kind of growth we needed. It did not even hit the consumer side to the point that we projected because many consumers we now know did not spend it. They used it to pay down personal debt, which is a very logical thing for many people to do. But it upset all of the projections we made of what would happen.

So as I see it, the President's proposal has two big groups. The first group is a collection of tax cuts: the marriage tax penalty, the elimination of the death tax, the child credit. That is about half of the $720 billion that we are talking about. I think those are all salutary. I think those will all help, and I am prepared to vote for them.

Then we come to the other half, which is the elimination of the double taxation on dividends. If we pass this amendment, the conventional wisdom is that the elimination of double taxation on dividends is dead, that it will never come out of the Finance Committee.

Let me focus on why the passage of the President's proposal with respect to the elimination of double taxation on dividends will go directly to the heart of the softness on this chart and why it is the investment solution to deal with an investment recession.

If we go back to the excesses of the late 1990s and look at them now historically, we find that one of the things that drove the excesses on the stock market, and indeed got us into trouble as far as corporate management is concerned, was the tremendous desire to drive up stock prices. Stock prices were driven up by driving up earnings estimates. Enron, WorldCom, and the rest of these companies did everything they could to create the notion that they had tremendous earnings. They drove it up partly by leverage. Leverage, by definition, means borrowing, and they were borrowing because they could deduct the interest. They could get the money, they could deduct the interest, they could produce the leverage, and in the case of Enron they could lie about it. Make no mistake, there was tremendous greed and chicanery going on, but the whole system was geared towards debt as the primary source of capital.

If you go to the equity market and try to entice people to give you sound equity investments, you have to say to them, we cannot pay you a return on your investment because dividends are taxed at an effective 60-percent rate, so your only return on investment will be if you can sell your shares to somebody else at a higher price than you bought them. Sound like tulips? Yes, there is some similarity. The greater fool theory—the bigger fool theory: I buy this stock hoping that there is a bigger fool than me out there who I can sell it to at a higher price.

That is not really the way the stock market works, but that is the way it seemed to work in the late 1990s. Remember when Alan Greenspan warned us against irrational exuberance in the stock market? The Dow was at 6,000. Today, it is over 8,000, and we are saying it is the worst economy in 50 years. It got to 12,000 before tulip time finally hit and it backed down.

If we change the situation so a company can go to the equity market and say, if you give us equity capital instead of going to the debt market to get debt capital, we can give you a return on your equity capital that will only be taxed once, we can give you a return that will make it logical for you to hang in with us over the long term,

even if the stock does not go up immediately in the short term, you can hold the investment because you are going to get your dividends and your dividends are only going to be taxed once. This is a structural change that the economy badly needs. This is a structural change, once again to quote the guru that has been talked about, that Alan Greenspan has endorsed as good for the economy. This is a structural change that can begin to address the question of the weaknesses in the economy that can have long-term consequences. And this is a structural change that will make us more competitive with the rest of the world because the rest of the world does not tax dividends at the same rate we do.

That is what this debate really should be about. It should not be about numbers: Is 350 too little or is 350 too much? Is 724 too big or is 724 too little? It should be about whether these proposals work. I believe they will.

If we have identified that they will work, then the question is, How much money do we need to put in the budget to allow them to go forward?

So the number comes after the decision of whether the program makes sense rather than the number driving the program. In my opinion, this is a gamble well worth taking.

Back to the total tax take that we are talking about, where the 2.4 percent of the estimate is within the margin of error, this is not a serious gamble. In my opinion, if one were to say, OK, we are going to cut this in half at 350 so the 2.4 percent goes down to 1.2 percent, that is really what we are talking about, 1.2 percent of a $30 trillion pie when the evidence is overwhelming, in my view, that the dividend thing will work.

How does it have to work in order to pay for itself? It has to make the economy 1.2-percent more efficient. The studies out of the business roundtable from the econometric model down at the University of Maryland say this will add 2 points to GDP growth. What will happen to this $30 trillion pie if it grows at 2 points higher than the present estimate? It is a gamble worth taking. That is why I oppose this amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. President, the reason I inquired of the Senator what his chart depicted was that he has only shown the tax cut advocated by the President that has already been implemented. He did not show the additional effect of the tax cut the President has proposed, which is even larger than the one that has already been implemented.

He showed on his chart that 25 percent of the $5.6 trillion surplus went to the President's first tax cut. He does not talk about the additional tax cut that costs $1.9 trillion when you add the associated interest costs.

Second point: On the Senator's chart he attributes the additional interest cost of the tax cut to spending. Any fair allocation of the additional interest costs from the tax cut has to be attributed to the tax cut, not to spending.

Those two things change the picture quite dramatically. What we see is, over the decade, if you take the President's tax cuts already implemented and the tax cuts proposed, and attribute the interest costs of the tax cuts to the tax cuts, the biggest culprit in the disappearance of the surplus, and in fact, moving to deficit, is the tax cuts.

The Senator makes a very important point on what will work. The Senator believes the additional tax cuts the President has proposed will help grow the economy. I don't believe it. Not only don't I believe it, but a whole group of economists do not believe it.

This chart is the work of Macroeconomic Advisors. These folks are under contract to the White House, they are under contract to the Congressional Budget Office to do macroeconomic analysis. What they have concluded is the President's plan will give a short boost—this is the green line—if you do nothing; the black line is if you do the President's policy. After 2004, they say the President's plan will actually reduce growth from what we would have if we did nothing. Why? Because they say, as Chairman Greenspan has said, you will get a crowding out effect because the President's tax cuts are not financed by cutting spending, they are financed by borrowing the money.

You cannot borrow your way to prosperity. What happens when you borrow the money is you reduce the pool of societal savings; you reduce the amount of money available for investment; you reduce economic growth.

Let's talk about real world tests of that theory. In the 1980s, we had a real world test of the notion of running deficits and having tax cuts and that would spur the economy.

Let me finish, and I will be more than happy to yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I just want to talk about your chart.

Mr. CONRAD. Let me complete this thought, and I will be happy to talk about this chart or your chart or other charts.

In the 1980s, we tried the big tax cut, the big deficits. In the 1990s, we tried the alternative, which was to eliminate deficits and to have restraint, to reduce spending, actually increase revenues.

I have a chart that shows the long-term spending revenue. This is a very important debate to have. The red line shows spending from 1981 projected out to 2018. The red line is spending as a percentage of GDP, which the Senator from Utah indicated is an appropriate way to judge these things. I agree entirely. The blue line is the revenue line.

In the 1980s, we had an enormous gap with big budget deficits. Spending went up to over 23 percent of gross domestic product. In 1993, we passed a plan to bring down spending and to raise revenue. We did them both. The economy was weak. When we did that plan, we were told by the other side it would crater the economy. We were told: You are going to increase deficits; you are going to decrease economic growth. I can remember the debate in the Senate so well, being told it would crater the economy.

They were wrong. We raised revenue, we cut spending, and we helped a surge of economic growth unprecedented in our history, the longest period of sustained economic growth in U.S. history, the lowest unemployment in 30 years, the lowest inflation in 30 years. We turned deficits into surpluses, and we did it the old-fashioned way; we got revenue above expenditures.

Now look at what happened. Our friends are showing the chart. It is true, revenue collapsed. Part of that is the tax cuts. It is true that spending has gone up. Why has spending gone up? Where did the spending go? In 2001, 73 percent of the increase in spending went to national defense. We all supported it. Fifteen percent of the increased spending went to homeland security. We all supported it. And 7 percent went to New York City relief. We had to rebuild New York. We all supported it.

In 2002, 55 percent of the increase went to national defense, 21 percent to homeland security, 19 percent to rebuilding New York; 95 percent of the spending increase in those 2 years was national defense, homeland security, rebuilding New York.

In 2003, 73 percent is defense, 15 percent is homeland security, and 88 percent of the spending increase went for the purposes of homeland defense and national defense.

That is where the money has gone. We all supported it. The question is, How are we going to pay for it? What my colleagues are proposing is to keep the revenue line down below the spending line for the entire rest of this decade.

The reason that is so dangerous, in this Senator's opinion, is this decade is like no other in our economic history. What is coming is not a projection. What is coming is the retirement of the baby boom generation that is going to double the number of people eligible for Social Security and Medicare. It will explode the cost to the Federal Government of those two programs.

Those programs right now are throwing off big cash surpluses in their trust funds, but in the next decade they start to go cash negative. When they do, that is the very time the President's tax cut, which is the red bar—the trust fund is green, and blue is Medicare-Social Security surplus, the red is the President's tax cut—the very time the costs explode, the costs of tax cuts explode, leading to deficits totally unsustainable.

We just got released today the results of the Federal Open Market Committee meeting of January 28 and 29.

There is a lag before the releasing of the results of the meeting. Here is what the report says: A number of members expressed the hope that the legislation would not encompass provisions that would lead to permanently large Federal deficits with negative consequences for the economy over the longer term.

That is precisely what is wrong with the President's plan and wrong with the budget plan from the committee. It is going to lead to large budget deficits over time. That is going to hurt economic growth. Don't take my word for it. The deficits in the budget resolution are right here. They are large and continuing. The President's own documents go out to 2050 and they show these are the good times. Even though they are record budget deficits now, his own documents, page 43 of ''analytical perspectives,'' show the deficits now are the good times because, as you go forward and adopt the President's policy, the cost of the tax cuts explodes at the very time the cost of the retirement of the baby boomers explodes and you have deficits of such enormous size: 10 percent, 11 percent of GDP, 2 ½ times what they are today. That is totally unsustainable.

The conclusion of many economists is those tax cuts will actually hurt economic growth. It is the dead weight of those deficits and debt that will hurt economic growth. The fundamental reason is the President's tax cuts are not offset by spending reductions. He is not proposing offsetting them by spending reductions. He is proposing increases in spending. I do not fault him for that. He is talking about increasing defense—we have to do it; increasing homeland security—we have to do it. But we have to pay for it. If we do not, on the eve of the retirement of the baby boom generation we will saddle this country with so much deficit and so much debt that it will serve as a dead weight on this economy and it will inhibit, it will limit, it will reduce the pool of societal savings, and it will reduce the amount of money available for investment.

I am not going to take longer. I could go on, on this subject, for a long time. But I am happy to respond to an inquiry from my colleague.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, if the Senator will put back the one chart, I would like to address that chart. The one which the Senator quotes as coming from the President.

Mr. CONRAD. Yes—no, this is not from the President. This is from Macroeconomic Advisers, which is under contract to the White House and under contract to CBO.

Mr. BENNETT. Under contract to the White House.

Mr. CONRAD. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. First, let me say, in another time and place, and I know others wish to speak, I think the Senator and I could explore this at some greater depth. I agree with him absolutely that the problem is ahead in the retirement years of the baby boomers. The place where we differ is whether this proposal the President has put before us will prepare us for a more efficient economy in that period and thereby give us the strength we need or whether it will do damage. The Senator obviously believes this proposal will damage the economy. I, obviously, believe it will better the economy.

As long as we are quoting economists back and forth, I once again say that Alan Greenspan has endorsed the dividend thing as a logical long-term structural change.

Mr. CONRAD. Could I just say on that point, you have to read very carefully what Chairman Greenspan said. He said the dividend proposal, as long as it is revenue neutral—not financed by borrowing—is good for the economy. If it is financed by borrowing, it is not good for the economy.

Mr. BENNETT. When Mr. GREENspan comes before the Joint Economic Committee, I will explore that with him in depth, so we can get it nailed down.

The point I want to make off the Senator's chart, where he has the black line demonstrating the impact of the President's policy and the green line representing the base, he shows the President's policy would indeed produce a significant beneficial change in 2004.

The question, of course, is whether or not the projections beyond that are reliable. Once again, my experience in this body is that everything gets changed year to year, as you go forward. To get us out of this soft patch we are in, it would be very nice to have that kind of a spike in 2004.

But even if we accept the chart exactly as it is presented, is it not true that the black line ends up, long-term, above the green line? That in the years out there, it shows the long-term impact of the President's proposed policy is a better economic result than the baseline, and that, if it is true, is the argument I am making that the long-term structural change of the President's proposal will give us, long term, a healthier economy, and long term is where the Senator and I both agree the problem lies.

With that, I do not want to prolong this. I have taken up too much of the Senate's time on it and I appreciate the indulgence of my colleagues as I have gone on. I appreciate the openness and candor and expertise of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I have enjoyed this debate. Let me just say to my colleague, I wish I had—I am asking my staff to get it, but I do not want to interrupt the discussion any further.

Let me just say the text of the analysis from Macroeconomic Advisers makes clear they believe the long-term impact is negative. Because of the crowding-out effect, because it is borrowed money, it is because that reduces the pool of societal savings. I have loads of other economic analysis that concludes the same thing. It is what I believe. I think it is a mistake. That is where we differ.

I am not going to interfere any further in this other discussion we promised people they could have. How much time is the Senator seeking?

Mr. BOND. I ask for 20 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, let me express my sincere thanks to my good friend from the Dakotas, and thank him for the work he has done on the Budget Committee as the ranking member. I thank my friend from Oklahoma, the chairman of the Budget Committee, as we are seeing that being on the Budget Committee is one of the most thankless jobs around. You have to read economic analysis, tons and tons of pages, and 50-year economic analyses. Then you come out with a bill that is a series of numbers. It is all supposed to work out. Then people like me come along and try to change it. It is with some experience on the Budget Committee that I express my appreciation for the work that has been done.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Senator.

AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. BOND. Today, along with a number of my colleagues, I want to address an amendment which is at the desk, amendment No. 358 to the Senate budget resolution. I am very pleased to be joined in this by Senator REID of Nevada, Senator INHOFE, Senator JEFFORDS—all three from the EPW committee—as well as Senators SHELBY, SARBANES, WARNER, MURRAY, MURKOWSKI, BYRD, CHAFEE, FEINSTEIN, COLLINS, SPECTER, LEVIN, LOTT, REED of Rhode Island, and BROWNBACK.

This amendment would increase the budget allocations to $255 billion for highway infrastructure, and $56.5 billion for mass transit needs over the 6-year period fiscal year 2004 to fiscal year 2009.

Before these numbers startle some of my colleagues and good friends, like my friends on the Budget Committee, let me remind my colleagues we are not abandoning the ''user pays'' concept of the Highway Trust Fund. In fact, over the past several years, a great deal of money has been stolen or diverted out of the Highway Trust Fund, paid in by highway users, that rightfully should have gone for road improvements.

For example, highway users started paying a 2.5 cent tax in 1990 with the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 that never went to road improvements. It went to the general fund instead. The tax even grew to as high as 6.8 cents in 1994 and 1995, and over the years, highway users have paid well over $40 billion—that is a conservative estimate—$40 billion which never went into the highway trust fund.

In addition, the highway trust fund lost revenues as a result of alternative fuel vehicles. I support alternative fuel vehicles, whether they run on hydrogen or electricity or some other form of energy. But we also must remember that

these alternatively fueled vehicles travel on the roads. They use the roads. They crowd the roads. They are, in fact, burdens on the roads. And they must somehow pay some share, just as those vehicles fueled by gas or diesel pay for a share.

Some very significant constituents have spoken out about the needs for the highway trust fund. I have letters of support, that I will offer later, from affiliated labor unions engaged in transportation, construction, and the broader Transportation Construction Coalition, the Highway Users Alliance, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Governors Association, and others.

I daresay we have all heard from our respective State transportation officials, our metropolitan planning organizations, from our labor unions, our friends in the transportation industries, and others about the needs. But perhaps more importantly, we have all seen the congestion, the potholes covered with steel plates, the bridges down to one lane.

If any of you who have done what I have done, and had an open meeting in a townhall forum in the last several months as we came up on the reauthorization of TEA–21, you have heard that our citizens are concerned about inadequate transportation. They are really chafing at the bit because in too many areas our country is strangling.

Now, we have all waited in traffic, hoped our car's alignment would not be permanently damaged, and looked down through a bridge to see the water below.

We have also comforted far too many friends and families who have lost loved ones because of unsafe roads or bridges. I still correspond with families who have made getting decent highways their cause to remember a loved one who was killed because of an inadequate highway system with too much traffic on it.

Our Nation has some needs. This little chart shows in red what the President proposed in his budget. What the Budget Committee has come out with is shown in green. And what this Bond-Reid amendment would do is shown in blue. As you can see, these start going up a little bit.

You may ask, what is this big yellow line way up here above all of them, even well above the blue line? Well, it is simply this administration's own estimate of the cost simply to maintain the current system; that is, not to get it any better. Just to keep it as it is, we should be spending this much, as shown in yellow. Right now, this budget has us spending what is shown in the green. We really need to get up at least to this high, as shown in the blue, so we can begin to try to keep up with the needs.

We know our Nation's transportation needs are staggering and our constrained transportation system is costing our country a whole lot of time and money. We know it is time to do something about it.

The transportation system is a lifeline of our country and our economy. I was a student of American history. The economic history of America really began when railroads tied together this Nation and brought it as a whole economic unit. Railroads were the tie that bound us together in the 19th century. In the 20th century, it became the highway system. The highway system provides mobility. It provides transportation for economic activities. It, in essence, brings jobs.

I can tell you, in the years I spent as Governor of Missouri, I spent an awful lot of time working on economic development. It was one of my top priorities. And I could see, economic development was going by where the roads went. If you build a good four-lane road, jobs will go there.

Jobs and economic opportunity require good transportation. Not all jobs. We have e-mail and telecommunications. But distribution requires a good transportation system.

I can tell you, for the 21st century, it is not only good railroads, it is not only good roads and highways, it is good transportation systems, it is good air transportation, it is good water transportation, and it is good mass transportation that is going to be essential for our growth.

Looking at the road side of it, in my home State of Missouri the problems are diverse and complex. To highlight just a few of the glaring examples: Commercial truck traffic is expected to increase 89 percent by the year 2020. The cities of St. Louis and Kansas City spend over $1 billion each year on costs associated with traffic congestion. Fatalities on Missouri highways are considerably higher than the national average—nearly 7,000 people were killed between 1995 and 2000 on our highways.

How will this broad range of problems be adequately and appropriately addressed? The answer simply is investment—investment in the future of our Nation's surface transportation to promote safety, to increase employment, to decrease congestion, and to enhance security.

In order to meet these needs, Federal, State, and local government investment will have to be significantly increased. Our amendment we offer today will allow it to do so at a very modest rate compared to the true needs, but without raising gas taxes and diesel taxes at this time.

I want to emphasize to my colleagues, this transportation responsibility is a duty of the Federal Government. Road building is one activity that the Government should administer but in coordination with the private sector and other levels of government. If we do not want the responsibility at the national level, or if we are unwilling to fund it, then let's quit calling our I–70s, our I–80s, our I–5s, our I–95s, and our other interstates by those names.

When President Dwight Eisenhower first proposed the interstate highways, if I remember correctly—I was a youngster at the time—our Nation's defense was the primary focus, the national defense highway system.

Now terrorism threatening our homeland requires an adequate defense network to get the people, the law enforcement, the military, to prevent actions, to bring in responders where there is an action, to give people a means away from an area of danger. These all require good roads and highways.

To demonstrate the enormity of this crucial task of relieving congestion and building highway infrastructure, we have to examine the costs involved. A report by the Nation's State transportation officials found that $92 billion will be needed on an annual basis just to maintain the current conditions of highways and to keep traffic from getting worse.

However, if our goal were to be as I think it should be—to improve significantly the overall condition of U.S. highways, enhancing safety standards, reducing traffic congestion; a goal that I think is critical to the protection of American lives as well as our economy, the study showed that more would be needed, a total of $125 billion annually.

Now, those figures do not even include the additional $19 billion in capital investments required each year to maintain existing road conditions and service levels. Clearly, this will be a massive and expensive effort.

Increased funding for transportation will also have other beneficial effects. It creates jobs at a time when many businesses around the country are heading in the reverse and are contracting. The added investment for transportation will serve to directly stimulate the economy. Every billion dollars of investment is 47,000 jobs.

Naturally, this will contribute to the prosperity of American communities by bringing a wide variety of benefits to people in every State and every location across the country. The increased investments in roads will help satisfy many of our needs currently and for the future.

Unfortunately, the administration's 2004 budget provides allocations that remain wholly inadequate for conquering the ever-growing needs of the people who use our Nation's transportation infrastructure. It is the status quo funding.

Again, our amendment will increase spending authority on highways to $255 billion and on mass transit to $56.5 billion over the 6-year life of the TEA–21 reauthorization bill. As my colleagues know, a budget resolution amendment is all about numbers and not about specific requirements. However, I will offer some ideas and thoughts because there is a menu of sources and options, so you can understand where that money comes from.

Let me go over a few of the aspects. The $255 billion increase over the budget, where does that come from: 5.2 cents on the ethanol tax incentive fix,

something the Finance Committee is going to work on; spending down the trust fund balances. This was proposed by the President in his budget, and it is proposed in the Budget Committee's markup that we extend that. We provide interest credit on the balances, and we restore a lost $8 billion in TEA–21; $8 billion just disappeared from the trust fund. We put that back. We maintain the historic relationship between contract authority and obligation limitations. I will forgo a description of the contract authority and obligation limits. I don't think it is necessary to add further confusion at this point. But let me say we straighten out the problem that the underlying budget amendment has.

Then we ought to have fair share funding for alternative fuel vehicles—electric hybrids, natural gas, recognizing the loss to the fund for these vehicles which pay little or nothing into the trust fund but cause the same damage to roadways. This is vitally important, as is cracking down on tax evasion and compliance initiatives, dealing with those who avoid the taxes or otherwise have been excluded from paying for their use of our roads and highways.

This increased investment authorized by our amendment will decrease congestion, enhance security, help to create jobs, stimulate the economy, and, most importantly, will save American lives by improving safety on the highways.

These are the highway-related fatalities in thousands, beginning with 39.3 thousand in 1992, reaching as high as 42.1 thousand in 1996, and again in 2001, over 40,000 people killed in each of these years, too many of them because of inadequate highways. It is not an option to stand idle in the wake of these conditions.

I urge my colleagues to support our amendment. I ask unanimous consent to print letters of endorsement for this proposal.

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

MARCH 18, 2003.

DEAR SENATOR: As the Senate begins debate on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2004 Budget Resolution, the 28 national associations and labor unions working together in the Transportation Construction Coalition urge inclusion of the highest level possible for investment in highway and public transportation infrastructure programs. This is particularly critical, as later this year the Congress must work to reauthorize the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA–21).

Unlike many federal initiatives, investment in improved transportation infrastructure provides tangible benefits that impact the safety and quality of life for every American on a daily basis. An efficient transportation infrastructure system is also a key component of national security and emergency response activities.

The U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) surface transportation Conditions and Performance Report just sent to Congress provides data clearly showing that a $375 billion federal investment in the federal-aid highway and public transportation network is necessary over FY 2004–2009. This federal share is the amount necessary to begin the process reducing highway deaths and injuries, and the traffic congestion that is costing the nation $67 billion per year in lost productivity and wasted motor fuel.

The USDOT report shows that a $50 billion per year federal highway investment is necessary to simply maintain the current physical conditions and system performance of the nation's highways and bridges. A $12 to $14 billion annual investment in public transportation, the report suggests, is necessary to meet our pubic transportation needs. To actually improve these vital facilities, greater levels of investments are necessary.

The bipartisan leadership of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee (EPW)—and perhaps other senators—will offer amendments to increase transportation funding in the FY 2004 Budget Resolution. We urge you to support the Senate EPW amendment, which would provide a very significant step forward toward meeting the needs identified by the USDOT through the TEA–21 reauthorization process.

Sincerely,

THE TRANSPORTATION CONSTRUCTION COALITION.

NATIONAL HEAVY & HIGHWAY ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, March 18, 2003.

DEAR SENATOR: During the debate on the Fiscal Year 2004 budget resolution, there is likely to be an amendment offered by the bipartisan leadership of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. The purpose of the amendment will be to increase spending for the federal-aid highway program from FY 2004 to 2009 to a $255 billion investment level. In addition, the amendment will also increase federal transit spending to the $55 billion level over the same time period.

Given the recent US Department of Transportation's Conditions and Performance Report, the proposed amendment seriously begins to address our country's surface transportation needs. The funding level contained in the Senate Budget Committee's resolution is completely inadequate to either maintain or improve our highway and transit infrastructure systems as reflected in the DOT Report. We commend the leadership of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee for realistically addressing the critical surface transportation needs in our country.

We strongly urge you to support the higher investment levels in the proposed amendment to help stimulate our economy and to create jobs.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND J. POUPORE,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, March 19, 2003.

Hon. BILL FRIST,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

Hon. THOMAS A. DASCHLE,
Democratic Leader, U.S. Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FRIST AND SENATOR DASCHLE: As you debate the fiscal year (FY) 2004 budget resolution, the nation's Governors would like to reiterate the importance of adequate transportation funding levels. The nation's Governors support growth in Highway Trust Fund revenues and an increased federal funding commitment to transportation to enable states to maintain safe, secure, and reliable highway and transit systems. Decisions made during consideration of the pending FY 2004 budget resolution will have irreversible impacts on our nation's transportation infrastructure as Congress moves to consideration of the transportation reauthorization legislation later this year.

Transportation infrastructure is the engine that powers our economy. Investments in surface transportation and highway projects provide greater returns than any other area of government spending. In fact, for every $1 billion of federal highway investment, 42,000 jobs are generated. The transportation industry accounts for 11 percent of the nation's economic activity, and accounts for one out of every five dollars of total household spending.

TEA–21 significantly increased investment in our nation's transportation system by increasing funding levels to help meet our transportation needs. Historically, however, investment levels in surface transportation have been insufficient to meet the growing transportation needs of our country. In order to maintain the transportation system now in place and address myriad pressing needs, revenues invested in surface transportation must be increased.

On behalf of the nation's Governors, we thank you for your leadership and attention to the transportation needs of our country.

Sincerely,

PAUL E. PATTON,
DIRK KEMPTHORNE,
Governors.

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Alexandria, VA, March 19, 2003.

Hon. HARRY REID,
U.S. Senate, Senate Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID: As the Senate debates the Fiscal Year 2004 budget resolution, the Associated General Contractors of America (AGC) urges you to support the Bond-Reid-Inhofe-Jeffords amendment to increase highway and transit funding in the legislation. The amendment would allow highway funding to be increased to $255 billion and transit funding to $56 billion over the six years in the upcoming reauthorization of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA–21).

The importance of substantially increasing funding for our surface transportation programs is well documented. A report by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) found that the current $65 billioin annual level of highway investment by all levels of government will have to increase by 42 percent, to $92 billion annually, to keep highways in their current condition, including keeping traffic congestion from getting worse.

The AASHTO report found that it would take nearly doubling current highway investments, to $125 billion annually, to imporove significantly overall conditions of the nation's highways, including improvements in safety and reduction in traffic congestion.

To begin addressing these documented needs we must boost investment in the highway and transit programs. The Bond-Reid-Inhofe-Jeffords amendment will help address the investment shortfall. AGC urges you to suppoort this amendment, which will enable us to address the needs and improve our highway and transit systems.

Sincerely,

PETER J. LOUGHLIN,
Executive Director,
Governmental Affairs & Federal Markets.

AMERICAN ROAD & TRANSPORTATION BUILDERS ASSOCIATION,
March 19, 2003.

DEAR SENATOR: Thursday, March 20, the U.S. Senate will start debate and then cast votes that will determine the level of surface transportation program funding that will be included in the FY 2004 Budget Resolution. This will be the first important vote in Congress this year on future highway and transit investment. The funding levels adopted in the Budget Resolution will likely frame the parameters for the Senate TEA–21 reauthorization bill that will authorize annual federal highway and transit investment levels through 2009.

The bipartisan leadership of the Senate Environment & Public Works Committee and other transportation supporters will offer an amendment during the Thursday morning debate that would boost the Budget Committee's recommended highway funding contract authority level by at least $49 billion over six years. The Bond-Reid-Inhofe-Jeffords Amendment would set total highway investment over FY 2004–FY 2009 at $255 billion—an average $42.5 billion annually. The amendment would set transit investment over the period at $56.3 billion—or an average of 9.4 billion annually. This amendment would go a long way toward closing the $13 billion per year ''maintain existing conditions and performance'' federal highway investment gap and transit needs detailed in the U.S. Department of Transportation's 2002 report to Congress.

The federal highway and transit program should be considered one of the nation's most important weapons in the fight to improve public health and safety. Forty-two thousand Americans die each year on America's roads. Over 3 million Americans are injured annually in motor vehicle crashes. Traffic accidents are the leading cause of death of Americans 6 to 28 years of age and result in more permanently disabling injuries to young Americans than to any other type of accident.

These grim statistics should be an outrage to every American. Particularly when poor roadway conditions or outdated alignments are a factor in nearly one-third, or 14,000, of those deaths annually, according to the U.S. Department of Transportation. This unacceptable safety performance can be addressed by upgrading the overall conditions of our highway system, by increasing overall surface transportation capacity, building more forgiving roads, and targeting road and bridge improvements that have documented positive cost-benefit ratios.

Motor vehicle crashes cost American society more than $230 billion each year, according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. That's more than six times what the federal government is investing in highway and public transportation improvements this year.

Without surface transportation capability additions, traffic congestions will also continue to increase in all major U.S. urban communities, according to the Texas Transportation Institute's 2002 Urban Mobility Report. The economic cost to the nation in lost productivity and wasted motor fuel caused by traffic gridlock will grow from $67.5 billion in 2000, to almost $100 billion by 2009.

Please vote for American jobs, safety and mobility by increasing transportation investment in the FY 2004 Budget Resolution. We urge you to co-sponsor and vote for the bipartisan Bond-Reid-Inhofe-Jeffords Amendment to the FY 2004 Budget Resolution. Thank you.

Sincerely,

———.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to ask my colleagues to support the Bond-Reid amendment to S. Con. Res. 23 which increases funding for highways to $255 billion and increases funding for transit to $56.5 billion. The amendment does not assume a tax increase. Nor do I take lightly that I am asking my colleagues to increase spending. Let me be very clear on this next point. This amendment does not have to mean deficit spending. There are choices we as a body can make to offset the increased spending. I share the same reservations that many of my colleagues do about deficit spending.

Normally, I would be down here urging you to vote against any such amendment. I would like you to consider the following before you make up your mind on this amendment.

The primary purposes of federal spending are to support a strong national defense and to invest in and maintain a strong national infrastructure.

Unfortunately, we are coming out of an extended period in which we neglected defense spending and we are now having to play catch up. During the Clinton Administration, 1993–2001, defense spending was $407 billion under the rate of inflation. Yet during that same period, government spending increased. This increased spending went to domestic programs. I personally believe that, given this wartime environment, those domestic programs should now shoulder an across the board cut. I am not here to make that argument today, but rather to discuss the importance of increased transportation spending.

Projected highway trust fund receipts do not support the level of spending in the amendment. However, we need to be honest in our analysis and recognize that the lag in trust fund receipts is temporary because of a slow economy and a sharp increase in the cost of fuel. Once the economy recovers and gas prices stabilize, receipt will increase above the current projections. Additionally, we need to get the revenue currently lost to the trust fund from users of the system who do not pay their fair share.

As much as it pains me to say this, this budget resolution fails to provide sufficient funding to maintain our nation's infrastructure, much less improve it. The Federal Highway Administration's, FHWA, recent 2002 Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions and Performance report states the following:

> . . . maintaining the overall conditions and performance of highways and bridges at current levels would require significantly more investment by all levels of government. . . . the average annual investment [needs] to be . . . 17.5 percent larger.

The resolution before us sets spending at $30.5 billion in FY04, increases it to $35.1 billion in FY05 and then flat lines it at that level through FY09, for an average investment of $34.3 billion per year. This represents a significant shortfall of over $80 billion from 2004 to 2009 to simply maintain the existing system.

Again, quoting from the Conditions and Performance report:

> Despite the historic investments in highway infrastructure and improving conditions on many roads and bridges, operational performance—the use of that infrastructure—has steadily deteriorated over the past decade. In 1987, for example, a trip that would take 20 minutes during non-congested periods required, on average, 25.8 minutes under congested conditions. By 2000, the same trip under congested conditions required 30.2 minutes, or an additional 4.4 minutes.

Colleagues, this resolution simply does not adequately address the needs. The Bond-Reid amendment sets a reasonable spending level of $39.2 billion in FY04 and moves us in a direction that at least maintains existing infrastructure.

My colleagues on the Budget Committee will argue that this amendment breaks the link between user fees and highway spending because it does not assume an increase in gas taxes. That is not correct. We can pay for this increased spending as I will outline. In the final analysis, the relevant Committees and this body will determine the best ways to pay for this amendment if we choose to do so.

I will now talk about how we can increase spending on transportation and pay for it without increasing the deficit.

First, the trust fund needs to be reimbursed the $8 billion in highway user fees that were transferred to the general fund during the drafting of TEA21. Those were dollars paid by highway users and should be used on highway infrastructure. This is a moral issue. When the motorist pays the gas tax at the pump, they rightly expect that the dollars they pay in taxes will be used for transportation infrastructure. We broke faith with them when we allowed the $8 billion transfer to the general fund.

Furthermore, we as a nation have made some policy choices to encourage the use of certain fuels that cost the highway trust money. Most of us understand that the 5.2 cent tax incentive for ethanol use comes directly from the highway trust fund because ethanol users do not pay the full 18.4 cents per gallon. I believe most would agree that the highway trust fund should be compensated for this amount which is estimated to be over $9 billion. A vehicle that uses an alternative fuel creates the same wear and tear on the system as a gasoline powered vehicle.

Additionally, there is a national policy to encourage the purchase of hybrid and electric vehicles. While these vehicles address an important policy goal of promoting clean burning transportation, they also cost the highway trust fund money. They either pay a limited amount of fuel taxes because their vehicles are hybrids, or in the case of electric vehicles they do not sue gasoline at all and thus do not pay anything into the highway trust fund. Yet the highway trust fund is expected to

pay for the infrastructure for their use. Currently there are 640,000 hybrid vehicles on the road. It is estimated that by 2009 there will be 5 million. This is going to be a real problem in the future in terms of how we fund transportation infrastructure. It is irresponsible to not address this before it becomes a crisis. We need to work now on coming up with a fair mechanism whereby the highway trust fund is compensated for these vehicles using the highway system. I believe that could result in up to $10 billion of new revenue into the trust fund.

Indexing the current gas tax to inflation would result in about a one-half cent increase per year and yield $17 billion from 2004–2009.

Additional options include:

Interest on the trust fund cash balance—$3 billion plus;

Fuel Tax Evasion Measures—$6 billion;

Lost interest on the $8.1 billion transfer—$2 billion;

Retroactive Interest on TEA–21 cash balance, 1991–2003, $4.5 billion;

Bonding—$30 billion, American Association of State Highway Officials;

Clinton Gas Tax Increase Paid into General Fund—over $40 billion.

On this last option, I realize it is not feasible, but that doe not take away the fact that this money belongs to the highway trust fund.

Added together, these ideas generate more than enough to offset the increased spending proposed by this amendment.

Again, I oppose deficit spending and will not ask my colleagues to do so. If I did not believe that there was a way to get this spending without increasing the deficit, I would not be down here today asking you to vote for it. Personally, I support across the board cuts to pay for the amendment, but again, I recognize others do not share my feelings on this and so I have given several very viable options from which to choose.

Finally, I realize that in times of economic downturn and the war, Senators are hesitant to further increase spending. I don't think my reputation around here is that of someone who goes out of his way to increase government spending. I would hope that most recognize that I am a strong advocate of slowing down the rate of government spending and in most cases I favor cutting spending. In this instance, I believe it is the right thing to increase spending because we cannot strengthen our economy unless we have an efficient transportation system. In order to improve our transportation system we need to invest significantly more than is assumed by this budget resolution.

Today's vote is the first step in drafting a bill that will govern how and where our transportation dollars are spent. If we short change ourselves today we won't get a bill that improves transportation or adds to the national economy. I ask you give the Environment and Public Works Committee the head room we need to write a bill.

Support the Bond-Reid amendment and know that it can be done without increasing the deficit by using some of the above mentioned options.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Senator BOND which I am pleased to cosponsor along with a number of my colleagues. This bipartisan amendment would increase highway spending to $255 billion and transit spending to $56.5 billion over the next 6 years.

This amendment is essential to provide for continued growth in the Federal investment in mass transit and highway infrastructure across the country. Together, these increases will ensure that much needed resources are in place to help meet our Nation's staggering surface transportation needs.

The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, TEA–21, expires on September 30, 2003, and as we move forward, it is important that we maintain our commitment to improving the nation's transportation systems. I believe it is critical that we invest significantly in transportation funding in order to address the growing demand for new and safer roads and new and better transit systems for all communities. Our transportation systems connect America.

Continued investment in these areas helps to relieve congestion, stimulate the economy, improve productivity and generally enhance the quality and safety of our highways and transit systems.

Federal, State and local investment in our nations' transportation infrastructure is vitally important to a growing economy. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has estimated that each $1 billion invested in transportation creates 47,500 jobs.

Additionally, the Federal investment that we are proposing today will leverage State and local dollars, as well as generate significant private investment in local communities all over this country.

This amendment provides additional resources necessary to maintain the gains that have been made in mass transportation and highway infrastructure development. Recognizing these benefits, since 1982, transit has been allocated 20 percent of all new surface transportation funding. This amendment will assure that this balance in funding between highways and mass transit is continued.

Under this amendment, in fiscal year 2009, transit would be allocated 20 percent of total amount of highway and transit funding. This is particularly important because we have seen evidence that improvements in mass transit have stimulated economic growth and enhanced the quality of life for millions of Americans.

This amendment provides funding to assure that the highway and transit infrastructure is in place to allow our economy to continue to grow. I urge my colleagues to support adoption of this amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with several of my colleagues to offer an amendment to boost transportation funding for the 6-year period to be covered by the next highway bill.

The enactment of a new surface transportation bill will be a mammoth task for the 108th Congress. No group of Senators is more familiar with the depth of this challenge than the principal cosponsors of this amendment.

In my more than 56 years in elected office, I have always served in a legislative body. I served in the West Virginia House of Delegates and the West Virginia Senate. I served three terms in the U.S. House of Representatives before joining the Senate roughly 45 years ago. Over all those years, I have been called on to vote on thousands of amendments. As such, I learned a long time ago to take careful note, not just of the substance of each amendment, but also who is offering it.

As such, I ask all Senators to take careful note of the principal cosponsors of this amendment. They include the chairman and ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee; the chairman and ranking member of that committee's Subcommittee on Surface Transportation; the chairman and ranking member of the Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee; the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee; and, the chairman and ranking member of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee.

What unites all these Senators is an acute knowledge of the challenges that stand in front of us as we seek to reauthorize the TEA–21 law. What also unites us is an acute knowledge of the true needs of our transportation system, whether it is the need to renew our aging highway infrastructure or expand the capacity of our mass transit systems. While we are required to reauthorize every 6 years, many of us face these issues every year. Indeed, both Senators BOND and REID, in addition to their authorizing responsibilities, serve with me on Senator SHELBY's and Senator MURRAY's Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee. Just last month, we all worked together to reject the Bush administration's attempt to cut highway spending by some $8.6 billion. We were successful in restoring almost every penny of that cut.

But when we assess the current conditions of our highway system and the growing demands our society places on that system, each one of us knows that holding steady at the current level of funding is simply not adequate. And that is what brings this bipartisan group of Senators to the floor today. Together, we are offering an amendment to substantially boost our level of investment in both highways and mass transit. And we ask all Senators to join with us in this effort.

In a just a few weeks time, the Environment and Public Works Committee and the Banking Committee will begin in earnest to draft their portions of the surface transportation bill. During that time, I expect that each of my fellow Senators will be approaching the chairman and ranking member of these committees to articulate the most critical transportation needs for their states. For some Senators, their focus will be deteriorating highway bridges; for others it will be alternative fuel buses, or the widening of existing highways or the construction of new highways. Some Senators will be focused on the need to provide seismic retrofits of bridges near earthquake faults while other Senators will be looking for new commuter rail lines or even ferry terminals.

No matter what the transportation needs are in their State, I implore each and every Senator to reflect seriously on these needs before they come to the floor and vote against this amendment.

Much has been said over the last week about the need for this budget resolution to be based on the true budgetary realities that we face as a nation. We need to focus on the real world cost of the war. We need to focus on the real costs of a meaningful prescription drug benefit for our Medicare recipients.

Here are some other real world facts that we must attend to:

Approximately 30 percent of the bridges along our Nation's highway system are either structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

It would require $42 billion more in annual investment to actually make progress to improve the conditions of our Nation's highways. Put another way, if we continue as a nation to provide only inflationary increases in the current rate of highway spending, the condition of our Nation's highways will just continue to deteriorate.

These are not the observations of ROBERT C. BYRD—they are the observations of the Bush administration's own report on the Condition and Performance of our National Transportation System.

We must face these realities head on as we draft the next surface transportation bill. And to do so, we are going to need more resources—far more resources than are called for under the budget resolution we are currently debating.

So I urge all Senators to join with me and the leadership of both the transportation authorizing committees and the transportation appropriations subcommittee in setting us on a path where we can make meaningful improvements to our highway and transit systems. I commend the bipartisan leadership of the transportation authorizing committees and I intend to stand with them as we seek to advance the cause of our Nation's mobility and prosperity.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want to voice my strong support for the Bond-Reid amendment to ensure that we invest in our transportation infrastructure.

Time and again, in our daily lives and in the news we hear and see that our Nation's roads and transit systems are crowded. On our way to work or on our way to visit family, we spend countless hours stuck in traffic or waiting for a bus.

But this congestion is more than just a personal inconvenience. Indeed, we know from studies by the Texas Transportation Institute and others that traffic congestion costs our economy $67.5 billion every year. That's billions in lost productivity.

Sadly, the budget resolution before us fails to provide the resources needed to meet these demands. It even fails to meet the level of funding that the administration's own Department of Transportation believes are necessary if one reads the DoT's report on the conditions and performance of our Nation's highways and transit systems.

Fortunately, the bipartisan amendment offered by the Senate's leaders on transportation policy would ensure that we have the resources to maintain and modernize our roads, bridges, and transit systems.

By providing a total of $255 billion for highways and $56.5 billion for transit, this amendment makes sure we have the resources to repair aging bridges and improve transit service.

Last year, as the chairman of the subcommittee with jurisdiction over our Nation's transit programs, we heard repeatedly from witnesses who represented transit systems of all sizes from all over the country about the success of TEA–21. When I asked why TEA–21 was successful, every witness had the same answer: resources. It was the resources that brought fast, environmentally sound transit to growing cities like Denver and helped transit attain the highest growth rate of any mode of transportation. This amendment will ensure that we continue this success.

In addition, during a time of economic uncertainty, this amendment means jobs and a great stimulus to our economy. Indeed, an estimated 47,000 well-paying jobs are created for each $1 billion we invest in transportation.

I want to thank my colleagues, Senators BOND, REID, SHELBY, and SARBANES, for their leadership on this amendment. I look forward to its passage and preservation in conference with the House.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few days ago I spoke about the serious concerns I had with the budget resolution that was proposed by the new majority. One of the areas where the resolution before us falls woefully short is transportation funding. We have an opportunity before us to increase funding for Federal highway and transit programs by adopting the Bond/Reid amendment.

As all Senators know, this year the Congress is scheduled to reauthorize the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century also known as the TEA–21. This bill includes resources not just for highways, but for highway safety and mass transit. This will be an enormous task for four separate Senate authorizing committees and will require a great deal of resources if we are to be able to develop a consensus package that will get on and off the Senate floor.

What we do in this budget resolution will set the stage for TEA–21 reauthorization and demonstrate to the American people just how committed we are to investing in our nation's transportation infrastructure; to reducing congestion and improving the environment in our cities; to making our transportation system safer; and to putting people back to work. Simply put, the budget resolution as currently written simply doesn't do enough.

The amendment before us would increase the highway program to $255 billion and the transit program to $56.5 billion over the next 6 years. The Federal Highway Administration's own ''Conditions and Performance Report'' states that in order to improve our aging transportation infrastructure we should be investing an additional $42 billion in highways and bridges and $20 billion in mass transit each year.

The benefits of increasing transportation funding are multifaceted. First and most importantly, increased transportation investment will help stimulate our struggling economy since every billion dollars of highway funding generates 47,500 jobs and every dollar in transit investment generates $6 more in economic returns. I don't know about your State, but in my home State of Washington, we can use every bit of economic stimulus that we can get because Washington State was ranked either first or second in the Nation's unemployment rate for much of the last two years and we have lost a staggering 74,000 jobs in the last 18 months.

Second, improving our nation's highways and transit systems will also mean that Americans will spend less time in traffic and more time with their families and loved ones. And the people of Washington State—particularly in the Everett to Seattle corridor—know something about congestion and the toll it takes on family life and the pocketbook since this area is ranked third in the nation in congestion. Nationwide, the value of travel delay and wasted fuel that occurs in congested traffic is estimated at over $67 billion annually.

And finally, every year over 40,000 Americans die on our Nation's roads and highways—we need to continue to invest in transportation to make sure our infrastructure is safe; that trucks and vehicles meet safety standards; and that Americans drive responsibly by wearing their seatbelts and without the influence of drugs or alcohol.

We have much work ahead of us as we move forward with TEA–21 reauthorization. We have an opportunity to

help our economy by creating good transportation jobs and to improve the quality of life for millions of Americans by ensuring that we have a transportation system that is safe and efficient. I urge my colleagues to support the Bond-Reid amendment.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that Senator BEN NELSON be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont is seeking time. I propose that he take 15 minutes off the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont off of which amendment?

Mr. CONRAD. The Bond amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Bond amendment is not pending.

Mr. CONRAD. I don't think it makes much difference. Does it make a difference to you, Mr. Chairman? I took Senator BOND's time off the resolution. I am not sure it makes much difference, whichever one is top on your list there.

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

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Bond-Reid transportation amendment. This is probably the most important amendment we will vote on in the next few days, as far as really doing something meaningful to our economy.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bipartisan Bond-Reid amendment on transportation offered by the chairman of the Transportation Subcommittee—Senator BOND—and the ranking member, Senator HARRY REID and myself.

I appreciate the strong leadership in this effort provided on the Republican side by Senators INHOFE, BOND, SHELBY and many others.

On the Democrat side, Senator, HARRY REID has done a tremendous job. I want to note that Senator SARBANES has taken the lead on transit with Senator SHELBY.

The Bond-Reid amendment will allow the Congress to write a strong transportation bill which, in part, can address many of the administration's ideas for enhancing the mobility and security of our transportation modes.

The chairman of the full EPW Committee, Chairman INHOFE, supports this effort, as do I as ranking member of the EPW Committee.

The chairman and ranking member of the Banking Committee, Senators SHELBY and SARBANES, with jurisdiction over transit issues, also support this amendment.

This amendment allows us to enhance the security of our vital transportation networks, to better protect against the unexpected, and to enhance the mobility of our citizens and commerce.

This amendment will also create hundreds of thousands of jobs and allow Congress to fund important transportation components—such as intelligent transportation systems—to better monitor and move people during rush hours, and during emergencies. This is real economic stimulus. More than anything else we are doing.

These funds can also be used to facilitate secure and efficient international border crossings and fund administration security proposals.

This will be important for States sharing borders with Canada or Mexico, such as my home State of Vermont.

President Eisenhower saw our highways as important to the national defense—and the economy—and it appears that this Administration will recommend provisions to the Congress which they see as critical.

A report by the Nation's State transportation official found that Federal, State, and local governments must significantly increase investment in highways and bridges to improve safety enhance security relieve congestion, and protect bridges and harbors.

According to that national study, we must invest $92 billion annually to just to maintain current conditions, and improving the system's conditions and performance would cost $125 billion annually.

This bipartisan amendment will increase the highway program to $255 billion over the next 6 years and will proportionately increase transit investments to $56.5 billion.

This amendment will thus significantly increase the number of well-paying construction jobs and improve the safety and security of our citizens.

This amendment is the first step toward a strong bipartisan effort to revitalize our Nation's economy through investments in transportation.

The spending that we authorize today will help Vermont and all our States, keep pace with road and bridge repair, transit demand and improved safety and security needs. We will supplement this spending by attracting private capital to expand freight capacity and relieve congestion.

I hope we can pass this amendment with the support of all of my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, which was jurisdiction over the Federal transit program, I am pleased to join in this effort with Chairman SHELBY and Senator JACK REED, ranking member of the Housing and Transportation Subcommittee, as well as my colleagues on the Enviroment and Public Works Committee, Senators BOND, REID, INHOFE, and JEFFORDS, and my other colleagues who support this important amendment.

As has already been noted, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, known as TEA–21, will expire on September 30 of this year. This Congress will have the opportunity to craft legislation that will shape America's surface transportation system for the next decide and beyond. The decisions we make will be critically important to our Nation's future economic strength, the quality of our environment, and our national security. Therefore, as we consider this budget resolution, and engage in the debate about how best to use our limited Federal resources, I believe it is appropriate to take a few moments to consider what is contained in this budget resolution, what this amendment seeks to accomplish, and the importance of our surface transportation system for America's future.

Unfortunately, the budget resolution before us does not come close to making the necessary investment in surface transportation. Instead, the budget as written would actually cut the highway program next year, grow funding somewhat the following year, and then flat-line the program for the remainder of the authorization period. The budget's numbers for transit call for annual increases below the President's projected rate of inflation, not to mention the projected ridership growth. This budget calls for only $206 billion for highways and $46 billion for transit over the next 6 years, far less than what is needed. I am deeply concerned that this budget would move us backward, not forward, in our efforts to meet the mobility needs of the Nation.

This amendment would grow these programs by $49 billion and $10.5 billion respectively over what is included in the budget resolution, increasing investment in our highway program to $255 billion over the next 6 years, and our transit program to $56.5 billion. By growing our investment, we will not only help to preserve and maintain the systems that we have in place, we will begin to make progress toward improvement. Further, by the end of the next reauthorization cycle, surface transportation investment will reach its goal of a 4 to 1 balance between highways and transit. This goal was established in TEA–21, and this amendment reaffirms that decision.

The transportation needs of this Nation are significant, as more and more communities find themselves confronting the problems of traffic congestion and delay. According to the Texas Transportation Institute, in the year 2000, Americans in 75 urban areas spent 3.6 billion hours stuck in traffic, with an estimated cost to the nation of $67.5 billion in lost time and wasted fuel. As these figures show, congestion has a real economic cost to the nation, in addition to the psychological and social costs of spending hours each day sitting in traffic. It is clear that we must increase the capacity of our transportation infrastructure to handle the growing demands for mobility of both people and goods to keep our economy moving.

Investment in our transportation infrastructure has other economic benefits as well. According to the U.S.

Chamber of Commerce, each $1 billion invested in transportation infrastructure creates 47,500 jobs. At a time when our economy is struggling, investing in transportation is one of the smartest actions that government can take. Increased investment creates jobs today and leads to economic growth tomorrow.

Let me take a few moments to focus on the transit program, which I have a particular interest in as the ranking member of the Banking Committee. During the last Congress, that Committee, along with the Housing and Transportation Subcommittee, chaired by my colleague Senator REED, held a series of eight hearings to begin laying the groundwork for the reauthorization. What those hearings clearly demonstrated is that investing in transportation, particularly public transportation, pays off in terms of economic, environmental, and mobility benefits for our nation.

TEA–21's increased investment in transit stimulated a surge in transit ridership. As Federal Transit Administrator Jennifer Dorn testified last April: ''Transit has experienced the highest percentage of ridership growth among all modes of surface transportation, growing over 28 percent between 1993 and 2001.''

Of course, the benefits of TEA–21's investment are broader than increased ridership. The economic development impact of transit is becoming more and more apparent as new systems have come into service under TEA–21. For example, the Banking Committee heard testimony that over $1 billion has been invested in private development along Dallas's existing and future light rail lines, raising nearby property values and supporting thousands of jobs. We learned that BellSouth relocated almost ten thousand employees from scattered sites in suburban Atlanta to three downtown buildings near MARTA rail stations, in part because, in the words of BellSouth Vice President Herschel Abbott, commuting by transit ''saves employees time. It saves employees money. It saves wear and tear on the employees' spirit.'' And that has real returns for their employer.

Transit is about more than our economic life; it is also about our quality of life. During the Committee's hearings, we heard a great deal about the importance of transit to our senior citizens, young people, the disabled, and others who rely on transit for their daily mobility needs. Several of our witnesses observed that the increased investment in transit and paratransit services under TEA–21 has provided the crucial link between home and a job, a school, or a doctor's office, for millions of people who might otherwise have been unable to participate fully in the life of their communities.

And transit can be a lifetime in other ways as well, as we discovered on September 11, 2001. We heard testimony during our hearings about the efforts made by transit operators on that day to move thousands of people quickly and safely out of city centers. As more and more Americans are using public transportation, it is clear that transit must be a vital component of any city's evacuation plan.

While September 11 showed the importance of transit in responding to an emergency, it also raised our awareness of the unique challenges transit faces in the safety and security area, as several witnesses discussed. Transit agencies are taking great pains to improve the security of their systems, but these efforts are not without cost.

It is clear to me that we will have to greatly increase Federal support for transportation to help local communities make the investments in infrastructure and system preservation that will be required to move America into the 21st century. The Department of Transportation has identified $14 billion per year in capital needs simply to maintain the conditions and performance of our transit systems—$20 billion is needed to improve conditions and performance. Other estimates show an even greater need. A report by the Nation's State transportation officials estimated that an annual investment of $19 billion is needed just to maintain our transit systems at their current levels, and $44 billion would be needed to improve conditions and performance. According to the same study, almost $100 billion is needed annually just to maintain the current condition of our nation's roads and bridges. Failure to make the needed investment will result in the continued deterioration of our existing infrastructure.

As we debate the priorities of this Nation in the context of this Budget Resolution, I urge my colleagues to be mindful of a comment that Dr. Beverly Scott, then General Manager of the Rhode Island Public Transportation Authority, made before the Banking Committee on April 25, 2002, regarding the reauthorization of TEA–21. Dr. Scott said: ''As Americans, mobility is one of the greatest and most precious freedoms that we enjoy. This basic cornerstone of American life—who can or cannot get from place to place, how we plan and conduct our daily lives, the choices we make about what we do, and even more importantly, what we can do—are hanging in the balance.'' That is what is at stake here. This Congress will shape the future of transportation in American, which will have a very real impact on every one of our citizens. Passage of this amendment is essential if we are to keep America moving. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to support the amendment to increase highway and transit spending levels in the budget resolution.

Increasing transportation spending is an important objective. Highway investments create jobs, increase the productivity of our economy, and improve the quality of life for all Americans. In Montana, its our lifeblood. We count on highway money for our economic development and we count on transit money to give our rural areas access to goods and services and people.

In 1998 Congress passed one of the most successful and bipartisan bills in recent memory—the ''Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century'', better known as ''TEA–21.'' I am honored to have been an author of that piece of legislation and I look forward to working on the next reauthorization act.

TEA–21 passed overwhelmingly in 1997 because there was a 40 percent increase, on average, in funding. So, even if some states got a lower percentage of funds than their neighbor, everyone brought home more dollars than under ISTEA. That 40 percent increase was primarily derived by the transfer of the 4.3 cent gas tax from the general fund to the Highway Trust Fund, the new budgetary treatment for highways and the ''protected'' status of the Highway Trust Fund.

We are hoping to build on the success of TEA–21 by ensuring that our Budget Resolution can accommodate higher levels of spending for highways and transit. These higher levels of spending will enable the successor to TEA–21 to become law.

In order to pass a TEA–21 reauthorization bill, we will need more money. Increasing funds into the Highway Trust Fund is the sole responsibility of the Senate Finance Committee. Senator GRASSLEY and I have been working very hard to find ways to increase funding for both highways and transit. We are absolutely committed to growing the programs without raising taxes.

I can't emphasize enough that the single principal feature of any new highway reauthorization bill has to be its increased funding for the program, something that will help all States and all citizens. Our first step is this blueprint for our budget.

The Finance Committee believes that the levels included in this amendment to the Budget Resolution can be reached. $255 billion for Highways and $56.5 billion for transit over 6 years can be achieved without raising taxes. I know this because over the past 3 months finding this money has been a priority for myself and my chairman, Senator GRASSLEY.

Let me sum up by saying that the Senate Finance Committee has the responsibility to figure out how to grow the highway and transit programs. We believe that we can come up with increased funding for both highways and transit. We can do it without raising taxes. This amendment gives us the room to achieve that.

I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote yes for increased investment in infrastructure. I say both sides of the aisle because, as I've said in the past, there are no Democratic roads or Republican bridges. We will all benefit from this investment. We should all support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, being authorized by the ranking member of the committee, I will speak on the amendment that is almost pending, we thought it was pending, whatever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. REID. The Bond amendment.

This is a really fantastic proposal of the Senator from Missouri. It is sponsored by the chairman of the committee, Senator INHOFE; the ranking member, Senator JEFFORDS; the chairman of the subcommittee on transportation, Senator BOND; the ranking member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nevada; the chairman of the full Banking Committee which handles transit matters, Senator SHELBY; the ranking member of the Banking Committee, Senator SARBANES; and many others.

I thank my friend from Missouri, Senator BOND, for his work on this amendment. He has shown great leadership. I am pleased to join him in sponsoring this bipartisan highway and transit amendment.

This amendment represents an important step in the reauthorization of the country's surface transportation system. We made significant gains over the life of TEA–21, and we must keep this momentum as we move forward. Despite these gains in TEA–21, there is much that remains to be done.

This budget debate is about choices, and I understand that. I also understand that we need to prioritize given these perilous times. I firmly believe that a well-maintained transportation infrastructure is a foundation for a healthy, vibrant national economy.

Our Nation's surface transportation system is critical to the free flow of citizens and the free flow of commerce.

This amendment adds an additional $50 billion for highways and $10 billion for transit over the next 6 years. The Federal Highway Administration's 2002 Conditions and Performance Report estimates that the annual Federal investment in roads must increase by 17 percent per year simply to maintain the Nation's existing highway and bridge system.

I will not take a lot of time, but the Senator from Louisiana, who is on the floor, has brought to my office on two separate occasions people from Louisiana who have desperate needs for transportation improvement. It is critical that we get more money for programs that can meet the demands of the folks from Louisiana and the folks from Nevada. It can only be done if this amendment is adopted. I hope it does.

Improving the system will cost more than the report of the estimates of Federal investment of roads needing to be increased by 17 percent. This administration calculates current Federal investment must increase by as much as 65 percent to basically improve our Federal infrastructure as it relates to highway.

As the Senator from Missouri has indicated with his charts, safety is still a serious problem. When 45,000 people a year are being killed on the roads, I think that says it all. In addition to the people who are killed, we have people who are paraplegic, quadriplegic, people who are hurt in many different ways in automobile accidents that are caused because of unsafe highways.

According to the Department of Transportation, our Nation's fatality rate per million vehicle miles traveled has decreased, but the number of fatalities has increased, with the disproportionate share of these occurring on rural roads. We really do not give any attention to speak of to rural roads.

In addition to the personal tragedy associated with traffic accidents, accidents cost an estimated $137 billion per year in property losses, losses in productivity, and medical costs.

System maintenance costs do not include the cost to improve the system's access and mobility to allow for the efficient and timely flow of citizens and commerce throughout the country.

America's congestion problems continue to get worse. The Texas Transportation Institute estimates this year residents in the top 75 metropolitan areas will lose more than 3.6 billion hours due to traffic congestion and $67 billion in wasted time and fuel.

The problems in Washington, DC, are legendary, but as a result of the man with the tractor in the reflecting pool, it took one of my friends traveling from over the bridge in Virginia 2½ hours to get to work because of the added congestion because of the tractor in the reflecting pool. Traffic in Washington, DC, and the rest of the country is in deep trouble.

The Governor of the State of Nevada, a friend of mine by the name of Kenny Guinn, has written a letter dated yesterday. He is a Republican Governor. He supports this amendment. It is important because the population of the State of Nevada has increased during the past 10 years by 64 percent, and this problem is going to continue to grow.

We in Nevada are not depending on the Federal Government alone to satisfy the needs of highways. In fact, the State of Nevada spends more by some $40 million than the Federal Government. This is very rare. The Governor of the State of Nevada fully endorses this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter dated March 19 from Gov. Kenny Guinn, be printed in the RECORD.

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

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Las Vegas, NV, March 19, 2003.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Assistant Minority Leader, S–321, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID: I am writing to express my support for your efforts to increase funding for the federal highway and transit program to $255 billion and $55 billion over the next five years. The amendment you along with a bipartisan group of eight senators have proposed to the Senate Budget Resolution is critical to Nevada's continued economic vitality.

As you know, our state has experienced the largest growth rate in the nation. The population of Nevada is currently estimated to grow to 2.44 million residents by 2005, a 64% increase from 1994. These new residents have put unprecedented demands on Nevada's transportation infrastructure.

The federal highway and transit programs have been critical in our ability to meet these demands. While we could not have kept pace with our transportation needs without the federal program, Nevada has not shirked its responsibilities either. Nevada's revenue derived from our own citizens has risen from $279.5 million to $365.7 million in 2002. This 31% increase in revenue from state sources is in addition to the $234.7 million Nevada received in federal funds in 2002. Nevada's local jurisdictions have stepped up to the plate with self-imposed taxes to supplement the state and federal contribution, as well. Just this past year Washoe and Clark County voters approved increased local taxes to pay for transportation needs.

Under TEA–21 Nevada has experienced a steady increase in federal funds that has kept pace with our own contributions. Without similar expansion under the coming reauthorization bill we will fall behind, endangering our economic future with clogged highways, compromised traffic safety, and decreased air quality.

Thank you again for your support of Nevada's transportation needs.

Sincerely,

KENNY C. GUINN,
Governor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I indicated that the chairman of the Banking Committee, Senator SHELBY, and the ranking member, Senator SARBANES, have also approved this legislation. The reason they do so is because they are responsible for the transit aspect of the highway bill.

In years past, we divided the money we get on highways; 20 percent of it basically goes to transit. Why? For every person who is riding on a train, that is that much less traffic congestion and burden on our highways. It has worked well for decades. We need to continue that.

This amendment recognizes additional highway capacity alone will not solve the problems of congestion; therefore, we should provide Americans with other transportation options such as transit. It is part of important congestion relief. It is also a lifeline for millions of Americans to health care, to jobs, and to schools.

Nevada is an example. Ten years ago, for us to talk about needing transit money would have been unheard of. But now we are badly in need of it. We are building the only commercial monorail that will go from the airport up and down the strip which will save millions of hours in travel time and make it a much easier trip from the airport to the many vacation spots along the Las Vegas strip and downtown.

We have duty to every American to invest in a balanced transportation system. That is what this amendment is about. I ask for the support of the Senate. This is a bipartisan measure,

and I hope it has a strong bipartisan vote tomorrow. I appreciate very much the Senator from North Dakota yielding me the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I am going to speak on both the economic package and the highway bill, but I see my friend and colleague from Louisiana. Does she wish to speak?

Ms. LANDRIEU. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. NICKLES. We will be happy to have you discuss it, but prefer you not send it to the desk immediately.

I yield to my friend and colleague before speaking.

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator yield for a moment so I can thank the Senator for his courtesy in doing that? That is a gracious act, especially at this time of night. I appreciate it very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CONRAD. I yield time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I rise to discuss an amendment I plan to offer. First, I thank the leadership, particularly the Senator from Oklahoma for his gracious yielding because the time is getting very late tonight and there are other colleagues on the floor who wish to speak briefly on some amendments about which they feel strongly. As we try to offer these amendments and state our case, we realize these votes will take place tomorrow. I thank my colleague from Oklahoma for his leadership and my colleague from North Dakota.

First, I have somewhat mixed feelings about offering this amendment or any amendment tonight. I was in the minority of Senators who believed we should have taken a break from this discussion at least for the next couple of days as this war is raging in Iraq. Literally, as we speak, all, I would venture to say, of the television sets in this Nation and many around the world and radios and Internet communication are focused on this extraordinary undertaking that is underway as we speak and 250,000 of our finest citizens are mobilized and en route—land forces, air forces—in the battle. I was hoping we could take some time and come back to this early next week when we had a better sense. But as the Senate, in its will, decided to move forward, I wanted to come forward and at least offer one amendment, not that all the others are not significant and relevant and most certainly part of this debate, but this particular amendment actually affects the lives, safety, equipment, and strategy of the war we are fighting.

The amendment I hope to have voted on tomorrow and will discuss just briefly is very simple. It will add $1 billion to the underlying budget resolution providing an extra billion dollars of the $400 billion that is in the budget for defense. So it is a minor increase in the scheme of things but very important to the beneficiaries of this amendment.

Those beneficiaries, of course, are all the citizens of the United States, the citizens of Iraq, and the citizens of our coalition, as well as the people it directly affects, which are the Guard and Reserve, Guard and Reserve members who have been called up to stand alongside the Active Duty.

I ask unanimous consent to have several letters printed in the RECORD.

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

Hon. IKE SKELTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SKELTON: In response to your letter of 29 January 2003, we are providing a combined Navy and Marine Corps list of our unfunded ''Naval'' programs to which additional funding could be applied. While we are grateful for and have benefited from the increased resources recently provided by the President and the Congress, there still remain additional shortfalls that are detailed herein.

The Department's FY 2004 Budget continues to focus on our new defense strategy and emergent challenges of the 21st Century. The resources contained in this budget go far in helping both services to maintain heightened readiness in uncertain times, to provide further investment in transformational programs, and to take care of our Sailors, Marines and their families. However, the road to attaining our shipbuilding and aircraft procurement program goals remains exceptionally challenging. Additionally, the Global War on Terrorism and current operations incident to the Iraqi question continue to stretch our resources in many areas.

For FY 2004, Naval unfunded programs total $6.5 billion. These unfunded items are listed under Enclosure (1) for Navy programs and Enclosure (2) for Marine Corps programs. As you know, the items identified on these lists are important to the long-term efficacy of our Navy/Marine corps Team.

If we may be of any further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

VERN CLARK,
Admiral, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations.

MICHAEL W. HAGEE,
General, U.S. Marine Corps, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Army National Guard (ARNG) plays a key role in the defense of our Nation. Whether responding to Combatant Commander's requirements worldwide, answering our Nation's Homeland Security requirements, or helping communities respond to natural disasters, the Army National Guard remains an integral part of our Nation's defense strategy. Citizen-soldiers of the ARNG are trained, experienced, and motivated. Within our ranks are some of the finest Americans the country has to offer. In order to keep them trained and ready they require Full Time Support (FTS), modernized equipment that is compatible with the active Army, up-to-date facilities to maintain equipment and train at, and additional training time and resources to remain relevant as a viable force in the full Spectrum of Operations. Readiness is our focus as we stretch every dollar to maximize efficiency and effectiveness.

The Fiscal Year 2004 Budget Request supports peacetime operational levels and provides $5.514B to train, educate, and prepare military personnel (MPA Budget Activity 8); $4.211B in operations and training support; and $168M for construction acquisition, and rehabilitation of facilities. This request represents a program (above cost and price increases) of $102.2M or 1.9% in the MPA BA 8 appropriation; a program decrease of $125M or −3.0% in the Operations and Maintenance Army National Guard (OMNG) appropriation; and a program decrease of $73M or −30% in the Military Construction Army National Guard (MCNG) appropriation.

The Department has focused resources on Operations & Maintenance, Collective Training and Sustainment Restoration Maintenance (SRM) and has taken risk in Base Operations. Within Pay and Allowances the budget provides for the statutory requirements for Inactive Duty Training and Annual Training, continued progress towards the goal of 85% Duty MOSQ, and Special Training to bring ARNG capabilities in support of the Combatant Commanders.

The Army National Guard has received recent increases in our Total Obligation Authority. We are grateful to the Congress and to the Army for these increases, proving that we are all part of the same team. However, much remains to be done. There are several specific requirements that must be met in order to continue to keep our soldiers ready as the Global War on Terrorism continues. Attached are lists of our top personnel, readiness and transformation shortfalls and our top twenty-five equipment needs.

The nation asks a grant deal of its citizen-soldiers. Before we put them in harm's way, it is our responsibility to ensure that our soldiers receive the best possible training, are maneuvering in the most current aircraft and armored combat vehicles, and are armed with the most lethal weapons systems. Our ability to be ready when called upon by the American people is, and will always be, our top priority and our bottom line.

ROGER C. SCHULTZ,
Lieutenant General,
Director, Army National Guard.

SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, February 21, 2003.

Hon. JOHN W. WARNER,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Department's FY04 budget reflects an efficient and effective investment of resources designed to sustain our forces and enhance our capabilities for the future. The budget will help fight and win the war against terrorism, continue transforming the service to meet the challenges of this century, and provide for recruiting and retaining of a quality fighting force to meet the commitments of this nation. We need your support for these objectives and for the budget we have proposed to achieve these goals. The Unfunded Priority List (UPL) that I forward today complements these objectives, but in no sense is an alternative to the fundamental priorities of our President's Budget request. We ask that, as you consider the list, you remain mindful of the context in which it is presented.

Our list emphasizes programs already planned that can be brought forward plus a number of areas where additional investment can be helpful. In any budget there is a need to balance investment and thus to balance risk, so there will always be areas where additional funding can be effectively applied. With this in mind, we have been careful to

assure that the list consists of proposals that can be executed in a timely manner and that will not disrupt the program we have laid out in the President's Budget or the Future Years Defense Plan. For the military construction entry, we have included an additional list which provides the project detail. However, we do not address unbudgeted costs related to Operation Noble Eagle, Operation Enduring Freedom, or other emerging costs of the Global War on Terrorism, recognizing that a supplemental request which brings together a Department-wide estimate is the more appropriate vehicle for presenting these requirements. Finally, we have included two items that address the need we have to recapitalize our aging tanker force. We are in the process of working issues associated with a potential lease of tankers and will inform the Congress of that outcome as soon as it is decided. The list reflects the costs required to implement that lease and an alternative, if the lease is not approved, that brings forward dollars to accelerate a buy of new tanker aircraft.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide you our UPL. Our Armed Forces are winning the war on terrorism and through your diligence and assistance we eagerly look forward to launching into the 2nd century of powered air and space flight.

A similar letter has been sent to the Ranking Minority Member of your Committee.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. ROCHE.

Ms. LANDRIEU. It is shocking what has come to my attention as a former member of the Armed Services Committee and now as a member of the Appropriations Committee: The lack of equipment, the lack of money in this budget to fund their current operations.

This amendment asks to take a billion dollars away from a tax cut that I think could give an extra billion dollars and transfer that room in this budget to add a billion dollars for the Guard and the Reserves.

I have a couple of facts that might help people understand why this is so critical and why I really believe we should—and hope we can do this in a bipartisan way—take this positive step. In 1990, there were 2.5 million men and women in the Active Forces of the United States. Today, there are only 1.4 million. The Reserve and Guard make up a larger portion of our fighting force than ever before in the history of the world. There are 860,000 men and women in the Guard and Reserve. They are from the States of my colleagues, as well as my own State. We all know and have people on our staffs, in our families, our neighbors, who signed up basically to be weekend soldiers and weekend warriors, but they have ended up being regular warriors because of the transformation that is occurring. The transformation is that the Active and Reserve units of this Nation are playing a vital role in our protection, not just on the weekends, not just in training but in the real-life battles. They are as much a part of this war that is underway tonight as our actives.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am mindful that we are going through a great transformation in our military. It is something that is supported in a bipartisan way and that this country supports. It is like trying to turn a large aircraft carrier around. It cannot be done right away. It cannot be done quickly, but if directions need to be changed, that directional change needs to be ratcheted so you can go in a different direction. We are trying to move our forces in a different direction because we are no longer fighting World War II. We have done that. We have been there. We did it and we won. We are now fighting an international war on terrorism and it takes quick mobility, lethal action, smart bombs, strategic guidance missile systems, stealth, unmanned vehicles. It takes a different makeup of our Armed Forces.

When we fought World War II, we had months to get ready to fight. We had months to build up. Today, we do not know where the attack is going to come. It came to New York City on September 11. It might come to Washington, DC, tomorrow morning. It might come to San Francisco next week. We have to move immediately. So we do not have the luxury of building up for 12 months or 18 months as we did in New Orleans when for 2 years we built the best boats that were built that won World War II, the Higgins boats. We do not have that luxury.

So we are restructuring our force in a wise and smart way, which is to say that we will count on our Reserve units. They are not in the Active, so it is a cost-effective way to keep our strength up. We have to give them helmets and rifles. We have to give them helicopters that fly. We have to give them training dollars.

We are underfunding our Guard and Reserve. In fact, there are two units that are actually in transit tonight, a Virginia unit and a Georgia unit, and I ask unanimous consent to have this printed in the RECORD.

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

STRATEGIC EQUIPMENT, WEAPONS, AND TECHNOLOGY NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE SERVING IN AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ

Service—System	Cost
Air Force Reserve.	
WC–130J Radar—Upgrades Reserve Radar to specifications needed by Active forces	$50,000,000
F–16 LITENING II AT Upgrade Modification—Provides Reserve Tactical Fighters with same radar upgrades as active forces; reserve fighters flying same missions	16,200,000
F–16 LITENING II AT Pod Procurement—Provides Reserve Tactical Fighters with same radar upgrades as active forces; reserve fighters flying same missions	14,400,000
A–10 TARGETING PODS—Provides Reserve Tactical Fighters with same radar upgrades as active forces; reserve fighters flying same missions	48,000,000
B–52 TARGETING PODS—Provides Reserve B–52s with same radar upgrades as active B–52s; performing same missions	4,800,000
TACTICAL RADIOS—Provides radio upgrades for interoperability with active forces	14,900,000
Land Mobile Radio Infrastructure	12,000,000
Total	160,300,000
Navy Reserve:	
VAW–78—EC–2 Squadron—Funding Prohibits decommissioning in FY05 of this currently deployed unit	10,160,000
VFA–203—F/A–18 Squadron—Funding prohibits decommissioning in FY04 of this currently deployed unit	20,110,000
Littoral Surveillance System—Procures one additional system to upgrade port surveillance by Navy Reserve	14,500,000
F/A–18 Advanced Targeting FLIR—Procures radars for 5 squadrons to make compatible with Active Navy	14,700,000
P–3 Aircraft Improvement Program (AIP)—Would upgrade 28 of 42 Reserve P–3s to have same capabilities as Actives; AIP allows P–3s to better operate against surface combatants and improve surveillance and targeting	29,700,000
P–3 Block Modification Upgrade Program (BMUP)—Brings all Reserve P–3s into compliance with each other, not Actives—gives all Reserve P–3s similar computers and acoustics sensors	33,000,000
F/A–18 ECP 560 Precision Guided Munitions Upgrade—Provides 1 Reserve F/A Squadron with precision guided munitions similar to Active F–18.	33,240,000
CBR–D Equipment Storage and Logistics—Funds shortfall of 10,000 bio-chem suits for Navy Reservists	8,000,000
Total	163,410,000
Army Reserve:	
High Frequency Radios (Interoperability for Special Ops Reservists)	57,138,816
M–4 Rifles	1,200,000
M–16 Rifles	1,200,000
Tactical Electrical Power (5–60KW)TQG	5,404,000
Tactical Electrical Power (3KW)TQG	3,000,000
Truck Tractor Line Haul	12,420,000
Improved Ribbon Bridge	22,400,000
Truck Cargo PLS 10X10 M1075 (T40999)	6,936,000
Trailer PLS 8X20 M1075 (T93761)	1,320,000
Spreader Bituminous Module PLS 2500 Gal. (S13546)	2,080,000
Mixer Concrete	1,375,000
Dump Body Module	3,496,000
Engineer Mission Module Water Distributor	9,630,000
Airborne/Air Assault Scraper (S30039)	7,575,000
Distributor Water Self-Propelled 2500 Gal.	2,970,000
Truck Transporter Common Bridge (CBT) (T91308)	8,360,000
Truck Dump 20 Ton	7,215,000
Generator Smoke Mechanical	11,667,600
Tent Expandable Modular (Surgical)	729,000

STRATEGIC EQUIPMENT, WEAPONS, AND TECHNOLOGY NEEDS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE SERVING IN AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ—Continued

Service—System	Cost
Total	166,116,416
Army National Guard:	
Black Hawk Helicopters	223,200,000
SINCGARS (Radio Systems)	34,900,000
Air National Guard:	
F–16 Targeting Pods	35,100,000
A–10 Targeting Pods	70,200,000
C–130H2 AN/APN–241 Radar	24,500,000
F–15 AIFF/IFF (Data Link Systems)	31,300,000
F–15 220E Engine Kits	98,000,000
Total	517,200,000
Marine Corps Reserve:	
Reserve Training Center Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Mobile, AL	8,000,000
Reserve Tank Maintenance Facility, Columbia, South Carolina	3,800,000
Reserve Training Center Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Camp Lejeune, NC	8,100,000
Uniform and Equipment needs	13,200,000
Weapons System Repairs	7,300,000
Total	40,400,000
Grand total	1,047,426,416

Ms. LANDRIEU. There is an EC–2 squadron out of Virginia that is in transit, and an F–18 squadron out of Georgia in transit. In the current budget, they have been decommissioned because there is no money in the current budget for these troops that are en route to fight the battle that is being waged.

There is something wrong, and what is wrong is we are underfunding our Guard and Reserve. Perhaps we are putting too much of an emphasis on tax cuts and not enough of an emphasis on the strength that this country needs at this time, and sharing those resources with the Guard and Reserve and plussing them up.

In addition, when the Guard and Reserve members go, they leave their jobs behind, they take a cut in pay, and unfortunately they do not get the same benefits that many of our Active do. This has to change if we are going to ask them to serve not just on the weekends, not just once every couple of years, these units have been out there—some of them are on their fourth rotation.

I just want to discuss my amendment, to vote on it at the appropriate time, whenever the leadership thinks we can take a few minutes. I hope we can take quite a long time to discuss this, but I know there are other important amendments. I do not know what could be more important than trying to make a few tweaks to this major budget resolution that might send not only a positive signal, but it would actually back up in real meaningful terms the resolution that we voted on 99 to 0 a few hours ago that said we love our troops, we support our troops, our prayers are with our troops. Then let us send some money to our troops, particularly to our Guard and Reserve. This billion dollars would go a long way.

We went through the unfunded list. This is a list that the Guard and Reserve say, look, we desperately need this money. We have listed it in a priority. This is not luxury. These are things we actually need. To upgrade the Air Force Reserve, let me give an example. This is a $48 million item to provide the Reserve tactical fight territories, the fighters that we see in the battle as we are watching the televisions, they need the same radar upgrades as the Active Forces. The fighter planes for Active have one kind of radar, and then the Reserve fighters do not have the same radar. So when we say let's keep our troops out of harm's way, one thing that would help is to have the same sophisticated radar that our Reserve and our National Guardsmen are using as are the Actives. That would be one smart way to keep them out of harm's way.

If we were talking about $100 billion, if we were talking about $50 billion, if we were talking about a lot of money, I would say maybe we do not have it. But, most certainly, if we are talking about trillions of dollars of tax cuts, we could find $1 billion to make a slight adjustment to pay and put some money up for our Guard and Reserve.

I know the leadership is probably going to come back and say we have plans, we are going to put this money in the supplemental. I realize there are other times that we could potentially do this, but I would make two arguments: One, in the past, the rule has been that we do not put new items in the supplemental. This is sort of ongoing items that are funded. You run out of them so you are sort of supplementing it because you are not going to make it through the end of the year. While we anticipate a very large supplemental, I think it would be very meaningful if we would think about making an adjustment right now for the thousands of Guard and Reserve that need this help and support.

I finish by asking my colleagues to look at this chart. These are two of our young men. In this list I am holding up of things that are unfunded, some of our units need helmets. Some of our units need biological and chemical covering. Because of the way we have designed a lot of these suits, if they are used once they have to be thrown away. Then they need a new one.

If they get attacked and one is contaminated, they are going to have to come home because we cannot leave them out there without suits. So this is not only about doing what is right and fair, this is about keeping our strength in the battlefield, funding the items that help protect them and keep our forces safe and being true to the amendments that we speak about on the floor.

For too long, the Guard and Reserve have received hand-me-downs from the Active component. Maybe there was a time that was appropriate because they served as supplemental, but now they are carrying a big weight, and they are doing it magnificently and at great personal sacrifice to their businesses, to their communities, and to their families, because in many instances their pay goes down.

Let us invest in our Guard and Reserves and make sure we are giving them what they need and to honor our commitment to them and to win future battles. We need the Guard and Reserve. Let's give them their rifles, their helmets, and their tactical equipment so we can, as we know we will, win this war.

Let's remember that when the fighting is over in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Guard and Reserve will be there for us, protecting us. Let's give them the tools they need to succeed.

Before I yield the floor, let me spend 1 minute supporting my colleague who will be coming up next, the Senator from Delaware, who is about to offer what I think might be the best amendment of all in terms of balancing the needs to boost our economy, to restrain spending, as well as to give the people of this Nation the tax relief that will help get this economy moving again. The Senator from Delaware will offer an amendment. I am proud to add my name as a cosponsor. The Concord Coalition has looked at all the proposals—the President's proposal, this proposal, that proposal, the leadership proposal—and today they came out and supported Senator CARPER's amendment. I think he should be very proud of that. They said this would put us on the path back to economic development, restraint on spending, fiscal discipline, and hopefully prosper, giving us the strength we need to win the wars ahead.

This may not be the only one we have to fight and win in the next few months and years ahead. We should reserve our financial strength to be able to make sure we win the war first and then do that which is necessary to protect our freedoms and give us strength.

I yield the floor and I add my name as a cosponsor to the next amendment.

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

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield myself such time on the Breaux amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Most agree we need to do something to grow the economy. There are different ideas, and I compliment my colleagues for some of the ideas. We have some very good ideas on both sides. Maybe we can come up with some of the best. I wish to talk about our plan a little bit and also make a couple of comments on the highway bill, as well.

We are dealing with a budget. We have a deficit, and a lot of people ask, why do we have a deficit? Revenues have declined, and declined substantially. In the year 2000 revenues were over $2 trillion, and last year they were $1.85 trillion. That is a reduction of $175 billion. If you look at the history of the United States, almost every year there has been some increase. Hardly ever have we seen a decrease 2 years in a row. That is a decrease together of 9 percent. That is a reason we have a deficit, coupled with the fact expenditures are up. Revenues went down 9 percent and expenditures went up by 12 percent. I am not casting blame. That is the situation and where we are today.

Right now we spend more than we take in. That is a $160 billion difference and the projection is worse for this year.

How do we get this number to grow? This is a real reduction. What caused that? We look at gross domestic production and the economy really declined. It started declining in the year 2000. We had robust economic growth through the mid-1990s. In 1997, when we reduced the capital gains tax from 28 percent to 20 percent, that created an economic explosion that helped the stock market and helped the economy grow. More companies were paying more bonuses and the economy had a robust growth.

Chairman Greenspan said it is irrational exuberance because the market climbed precipitously. It started falling in the year 2000 and we had negative three quarters which is called a recession, the last part of 2000; it fell down in the first three quarters of 2001. It was negative so we had recession. It bounced up in 2002, but still very soft.

If you look at what happened in the stock market, there was a lot of reduction of wealth in NASDAQ which was up to 5,000 in March of 2000, and by December of 2000 it was half that amount, less than 3,000; 2,800 I believe. NASDAQ fell about half in the last 9 months of 2000.

Again I am not faulting anyone, but there was a precipitous decline in wealth, precipitous decline in market value and, to some extent, that continued in the year 2001, particularly after September 11.

Add those things together and the market falls, revenues fall, we have a big deficit. 2001 caused a lot of increase in expenditures, helping those people who needed help and rebuilding our cities and the Pentagon, and so on, the war on terrorism. A lot happened to cause enormous deficits.

Most of us ask, what can we do to improve this? How can we turn the economy around? I mentioned in 1997 we reduced the capital gains rate, we had a very positive increase of revenues to the Government even when we reduced taxes. So we are trying to think, what can we do now to help the economy? That certainly worked in 1997. I don't think anyone disputes that. What can we do in the year 2003 that might help the economy?

I think we should eliminate the double taxation of dividends. People sometimes who maybe do not follow the economic markets, tax policy, and so on, are shocked when I say, did you know we tax dividends twice? We tax dividends higher in the United States than any other country in the world but Japan, and Japan and the United States are taxed about the same. Higher than anyone. The effective rate is about 70 percent. The corporate rate is 35 percent. Individual rates could be 38.6 or 35 percent or 27 percent, but the combined rate, if it is 35 percent and the individual rate is 30 percent, is 65 percent. That is two-thirds of the money going to Government. So if a corporation makes money and they want to distribute to their owners, the Government gets two-thirds and the owners get one-third. That is not a big deal. That discourages investment. Who wants to invest in a company if that is what they get back? I owned and operated a company. It does not make sense to distribute earnings in the form of dividends. The Government would be the primary beneficiary, the owner would be the secondary beneficiary. That did not make good sense.

The President is proposing eliminating double taxation of dividends. That is exactly right. We would be closer to other countries. It is embarrassing to me to see we tax dividends at a rate greater than the French, greater than Hungary, greater than the Czech Republic, greater than Greece. It is time for a change.

People whom I respect, what do they say? Charles Schwab says:

> I can't think of any other tax policy that would, at one stroke, be more beneficial to ordinary investors. The impact [of dividend relief] would be enormous.

I think he is right. I don't think he was doing that for personal interest.

Here is the analysis by several analysts in their projection of what they think, by eliminating double taxation of dividends, how much the market might rise. A lot of well-respected individuals—Lehman Brothers—say anywhere from 5 percent to about 15 percent. Most said it would be a positive benefit to the market.

Alan Greenspan testified:

> In my judgment, the elimination of the double taxation of dividends will be helpful to everybody. There is no question that this particular program will be, net, a benefit to virtually everybody over the long run, and that is one of the reasons I strongly support it.

That was in his testimony before the House on February 12 of this year.

So I just make those comments. I hate to see a proposal that is before us—I should not say that. I welcome the alternatives that are offered by my friends and colleagues, that are supporting the so-called $350 billion proposal. The tax reduction in the 350 proposal is really $323.3 billion. The balance of that is additional refundable tax credits; in other words, the Government is writing a check.

I am afraid, if that amendment is agreed to, and we will be voting on it tomorrow—I have great respect for my colleagues, Senators BREAUX, VOINOVICH, SNOWE, who offered this amendment, Senator BAUCUS. I have great respect for them and served with them for many years in my Senate career and have the pleasure of serving with them on the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee will take whatever number we give them out of the budget, and they will fashion together a growth package.

I am afraid if we went with a growth package that is limited to tax reduction of $323 billion, we will not be able to do this dividend proposal, we will not be able to follow the advice of Mr. Greenspan and Mr. Schwab and many others who really think this would help grow the economy. I don't want to take the growth out of the growth package. I do want us to be innovative enough to say, wait a minute, if we can change tax policy and grow the economy, let's do it. If you find effective tax rates anywhere above 60 percent, that is very suffocating to economic growth. It dampens it to such an extent, a lot of people say, why make the investment? Why would people invest, if they are primarily interested in dividends, if they realize the complicated and very heavy burden of taxation that is in the present law? Especially when you can invest in other countries and the taxation rate is not nearly as high.

Now we have such an international investment system, with the home PC, you can invest anywhere in the world any time of the day you want. It is wonderful, the opportunities we have in the United States. You don't have to invest in the United States.

What has really happened as a result, people realize the economic consequences of investing in companies that pay large portions of their proceeds in dividends, so they shy away from those companies, in many cases, and go towards what we would call

growth stocks, stocks that do not pay dividends but they have greater growing potential. They may be more volatile, may be a little more risky, but the taxation rate on those companies—not on distribution of dividends, it is on capital gains—taxed at 20 percent. It is not double taxed. Capital gains would be capped at 20 percent, about half the rate of dividends. So you have a real encouragement. Frankly, you have had an explosion in growth of those companies vis-a-vis the companies that pay dividends.

Why should we disadvantage companies that distribute the benefits of their earnings to their owners through the form of cash?

I think the administration is right on target. I think they have come up with a good proposal that would benefit, not just investors, not just the people who own a lot of stock, they would benefit the fireman, benefit the policeman, the teacher, the civil servant, they would benefit anybody who happened to have money in a retirement fund that happens to invest in stocks. And most all retirement funds do.

So, let's do something to help the teachers and the firemen and let's do something that would help government employees and other people, individuals, to help grow the economy. When we do that, we will see the stock market grow and we will see capital gains being paid again; we will see more revenues coming into the Government; we will see more investment, more jobs created.

It is estimated that this proposal on dividends alone would create well over a million jobs—I think 1.4 million jobs just in the first year.

Also, on family relief, there are a couple of packages we have. We have the investment proposal, and I want to talk about that primarily. Also, the package we have that the administration proposed and that we are hopeful will be reported out of the Finance Committee—again, we don't write the bill on the floor. I think some people think we do that in the budget. We do not, unless Senator CONRAD and I can come up with an amendment and change the way we do business. We just give the Finance Committee an instruction. But the instruction we are hoping to give would allow them to eliminate double taxation of dividends and also provide what I would call small business and family relief. We would do, I think, some wonderful, long overdue things that would help grow the economy. We would tax individuals no more than we tax corporations.

Why in the world would we tax individuals at a rate about 10 percent higher than we tax corporations? We do that today. We will not if we are able to pass this package.

Why in the world would we have heavy taxes on families? The proposal we have before us would provide tax relief to 92 million taxpayers. It is very profamily.

We would have marriage penalty relief that would benefit 42 million couples. Marriage penalty relief—somebody says, what are you doing? We are taking the individual tax rate of 15 percent—and individuals who have taxable income of $28,000 pay 15 percent. Above that, they pay 27 percent. We are saying, why don't we double that for a couple. The present law doesn't do that. So we expand the 15 percent bracket for couples from about $46,000 to $56,800. What is the impact of that? That means that for a couple, a married couple, if they have a combined income up to $56,800, their tax rate is 15 percent. That will save them about $1,222.

Think about that. I heard somebody say about the tax proposal, I know the bulk of this goes for the wealthy. That is not correct. That is very significant tax relief for a lot of married couples today, $1,200, if they have combined income up to $56,000. If they have two kids, they get an additional tax credit per child. The present law is $600; we would accelerate that to $1,000 per child.

My daughter just gave birth to a new son, my grandson Nicholas. They will be able to get a $1,000 tax credit for Nicholas and that's true for every child in America—$1,000. That is significant. If you have four kids, that is $4,000 somebody wouldn't be paying taxes on. They will be able to use that money for their education, for their health care, for taking care of them. This is very family friendly. I think it is also very friendly for growing the economy.

We also provide expensing for small business. I used to own and operate a small business. I had a janitorial service with my wife, and that was a small business. We would be able to expense things, not amortize them. That is a positive thing. That means you get to recoup your investment over a very short period of time—actually, immediately. Up to $75,000 you get to expense it, not write it off over years. It makes sense to write it off in the year you write the check, rather than spread it over several years. It makes you more likely to make the investment, which means you would make more investments and create more jobs. It is a very positive, progrowth, probusiness change.

If you look at several of these provisions in the President's package, I think they would help the economy, help the stock market, help small businesses, help American families. They would help taxpayers.

If we cut it in half, I am afraid we will not be able to do the things either for the family or do the things for investment. We will not be able to grow the economy. We won't be able to create jobs. I am afraid if we cut the package in half, we would basically be taking the growth out of the growth package. It might be some tax relief, but the net result would be, I am afraid, you wouldn't get much growth.

You say: Why is that, $350 billion sounds like a lot of money. Over this 10-year period—and that is what we are talking about—the Federal Government is estimated to take in $28 trillion. So if you talk about $350 billion over $28 trillion, that is a very small percentage. We are proposing you need to have a little more if you are really going to have an impact on the economy.

Is it too much? Is 725? Well, $725 billion is really not the tax cut. The real tax cut portion is $698 billion—again, spread out over 10.

Somebody will say, Wait a minute, your budget proposal is more. The President had $1.5 trillion; you have $1.3 trillion. What we are reconciling is this $698 billion. By reconciling, for those who are not familiar with Senate language, that means we are telling the Finance Committee: Report out a bill that would do such-and-such. We didn't say put the entire package over the next 10 years, this $1.3 trillion in the package. We are telling the Finance Committee, take about half of it and make it law this year because we want to grow the economy this year; we want to do it now. Part of the tax cut could be done anytime up to the year 2010. Because we are basically just extending present law.

We have several years to do that. This needs to be done now. This needs to be done now because we need to create jobs now.

So I just mention that. I have the greatest respect for my colleagues, some of whom are sincere deficit hawks, and they believe maybe if we did this, we might not be good for the deficit. I think we need to do something more aggressive to help grow the economy.

We have a legitimate difference of opinion. I have great respect for their opinion. I have great respect for colleagues who have different ideas. We have had proposals that will be considered tomorrow, or we have already had them on the floor, from $100 billion, to more than that, $350 billion, $700 billion—you name it. There may be someone who has it for more.

I think the President has a pretty good balance. I encourage my colleagues to not vote for the amendment which would cut the growth package in half.

AMENDMENT NO. 358

Mr. President, I wish to make a couple of other comments.

My friend and colleague, Senator BOND, discussed an amendment dealing with transportation. He talked about highways. Frankly, every Member of Congress—probably every elected official in any elected capacity—happens to be a friend of highways.

If you are in a city council, someone is talking to you about roads; if you are the mayor of Minneapolis or St. Paul, people are talking to you about roads. If you are in State government, you spend half your time talking about highways.

I used to be in the State senate. They ran me off. But everybody is concerned about highways. Everybody is concerned about infrastructure. And they

are right. And particularly after a harsh winter, roads are particularly bad.

We are all concerned about bad roads. Somebody was talking about the commutes take too long. Part of it is because of the bad roads. There is a lot of truth in everything that is said. We have a lot of compelling infrastructure needs.

But I have some reservations about the amendment offered by my colleague from Missouri, and, frankly, my colleague from Oklahoma, for whom I have the greatest respect, and other people who are supporting this. I think they are as well intended as anybody you will find. But I am concerned about what I am afraid the amendment would do.

It would move us away from the idea of user taxes to pay for roads. That is a tradition that we have had certainly since Eisenhower, since we started building the Interstate System. Since we have had a Federal highway program, we have had gasoline taxes pay for highways. And then we take off a percentage of gasoline taxes to pay for mass transit. But basically it is the user fees that pay for the expansion of the program.

And looking back, I remember debating, in 1982 or 1983—I think there was a nickel-a-gallon gasoline tax, and we had a filibuster that lasted right before Christmas. It was over whether or not there would be a nickel-a-gallon gasoline tax increase. I was opposing it at that time, thinking the States should have to have the right if they wanted to do it, the State should have the option, not a Federal mandate. I lost that debate, but it was a long and interesting debate. But I can see the demand by people who want to have more highways built, and maybe a Federal gasoline tax, and so on.

I am a lot more sympathetic now to listening to the demands. People say: We want more for highways. I certainly want to listen to them, but I think they should be paid by gasoline taxes.

Some people are proposing that we now have a significant infusion of general revenue funds to pay for highways. You might say: Why are you opposed to that? Because there is no limit as to how much that would cost the Federal Government. There is no limit to the demand for more money for highways, absolutely no limit, no limit whatsoever.

You could take any program before us, and you could multiply it by five, and somebody could legitimately say that is not enough—legitimately because there are a lot of demands. You can take these figures and multiply them. There are a lot of demands for more highways.

But, to me, it is a serious mistake and maybe a budget breach. If you say we are going to use general revenues to pay for highways, then a lot of people think, if it comes from the Federal Government, it doesn't cost anything. It doesn't cost you anything because it is from the Federal Government—especially if you have a highway formula that says 80 percent of it comes from the Federal Government and only 20 percent comes from the State.

So the States may decide: let's raise gasoline prices because we want to get four times as much from the Federal Government. You think about that. We have not done that in the past.

Now, we made some changes. I look back. In 1990—guess what—the Federal program for highways was $10 billion. Today, it is over $30 billion. This is 12 years later, and we are spending three times what we spent in 1990.

In 1997, we were spending less than $20 billion, $18.7 billion. Today, we are spending over $30 billion. That was just about 5, 6 years ago that we were spending $18.7 billion. Now we are spending over $30 billion.

Congress even changed the formula when we had gasoline revenues going up. We did, and the economy was really going well. Frankly, when the economy is going well, you have more highway usage, and you have more money coming into the trust funds. So the fund formulas were altered to allow the highways to get more of that money more immediately. I supported that. It seemed good. More money was coming in, so let them have it. It is a user fee. Let the user fee apply.

But the formula also said, if the highway funds decline, they will be reduced. That was agreed to. That is part of law. That was part of the agreement. Well, guess what? Revenues declined, and then everybody said: No. Whoa. We can't take a decline. And so, in the last year's appropriations bill—actually this year; we just passed it in January—it said, instead of going down, according to law, what, to $24 billion, it came in at $31.6 billion. It was supposed to go down to $24 billion. Congress said: No, no, no. We don't want to have a reduction of that percentage even though we agreed to it. We decided to put more money in more quickly, but we were supposed to reduce it if it started falling.

Highway revenues started falling because of different reasons, maybe because of terrorism or gasoline prices, but the total money coming into the fund went down. But Congress said: No. Let's spend more money. So we went from $31.3 billion.

The administration requested $29.3 billion in 2004. And I will tell you, as the chairman of the Budget Committee, we squeezed every way we could. We came up with: Can we squeeze the trust fund down quicker? Can we move some money into the trust fund that should have been in there? Yes, we found some gasohol money going into general revenue funds. We put that in. That was about $700 million per year. We did some other things.

If it is a legitimate user fee concept, I am willing to consider it. I think there are vehicles driving around today that are tax exempt, that do not pay taxes, and, by golly, they ought to pay a tax. They are tearing up the road like everybody else. Some of them Senator BOND alluded to that I agree with. Some have new technology and maybe Congress tried to encourage that by saying they will be tax exempt. But I don't think they should be, if they are tearing up the road.

We have some cases where maybe even some groups do not pay highway taxes and they are on the highway. Let's stop that. They are using the highways. They should pay for them. Some people in my State will not like me saying that because we have a lot of individuals who are doing that today. So let's close whatever loopholes we can and get whatever money could come into the highway fund as a result.

But the proposal that is before us now, that we will be voting on—and it may well pass; I can count votes around here probably as good as some—would increase that $31 billion program. The President's request was $29 billion. We were able to scrape it around and come out with, what, $32.1 billion. That is about the best we can do out of the money that is coming into the fund.

I am open to ideas. If we can do better, I am happy to consider that. We put in language that says, if we in the Finance Committee raise more money one way or another through a user fee, whatever they would do, great, they get the money. Power to them. If they raise gasoline prices, they index gasoline prices, they put on an excise tax on tires, whatever the committee might do, if they close the loophole because they find out certain groups are on tax-exempt vehicles that ought to be paying taxes, power to them. Whatever they can get, they should come in. And maybe we have underestimated it. The Finance Committee does a great job or the Ways and Means Committee. If they can find more ways of closing loopholes, power to them; they get 100 percent of the money.

But the proposal we have before us now just basically let's you increase that by about $8 billion. Let's take that $32 billion and make it a $40 billion program. It increases costs over what we have proposed in the first 6 years of our budget, about almost $60 billion for 6 years. Our budget is a 10-year budget. But for the first 6 years, it is about $10 billion a year.

Now, that is a big increase: $10 billion a year being highways and mass transit. That is a big increase. And it is not paid for by gasoline taxes. It is basically paid for by an increase in the deficit. And maybe even worse than that, it breaks this tradition of paying for roads and highways through user fees.

I will say again, the reason why I am speaking very strongly about this is that I think that is a terrible precedent to set. If we are going to be general funding highways, we are opening ourselves up to unlimited demands on Federal money, especially if you stay with

the 80-to-20 ratio. The 80-to-20 ratio is 80 percent the Federal Government and 20 percent States. And there is no limit to the demands at that kind of ratio.

If we are going to be paying 80 percent of the cost, you are going to do general revenue funds, I will tell you right now, Congress will be besieged with more requests and put in more general revenue funds.

I understand the highway lobby is powerful. I understand they are out in the Halls. I understand they have lots of cosponsors. I understand they are making phone calls: We need this to get our road; we need this to get a better ratio for our State, our State has been a donor State for years.

I want to see that corrected. Some people see this as a solution for correcting it. If you go general revenue funds, we will regret it. At least if you have a user fee concept, it is limiting the growth of the program because there is a negative on raising gasoline taxes. People can see it, and they are having a hard time paying their gasoline prices right now, with gas line prices at $1.75 and $2, in some cases.

Maybe the war in Iraq will go well and can be over soon. I hope and pray that it does. God bless our troops and our leaders. They are doing a fantastic job. If that happens, my guess is oil prices will come tumbling down as will gasoline prices, and maybe then it will be more palatable to be raising gasoline taxes.

If my colleagues vote for a gasoline tax increase, power to them. I hope every dime of it goes into highways. But to get something started where you end up having about 25 percent of highways being built with general revenue funds, I think would be a mistake. I also don't think the President will sign the bill. So I mention these things. It is important for us to pass a highway bill and to get it passed.

I make a commitment to work with my friends and colleagues, Senator INHOFE and Senator BOND, others who have a very strong interest in this. I want to work with them. I want a good highway bill to be signed by the President, and I would like to think that we would put one on his desk that would be responsible as well.

I am afraid that the bill we have before us, going from basically $10 billion in 1990 to $18 billion in 1997 and now we are at $31, $32 billion, to try to jump that up immediately at 40 with general revenue funds is wrong. If we do it through some other type of a user fee, that might be more palatable.

I encourage my colleagues. I don't think this is really sustainable, if we don't do something different. I know there is some flexibility among some of the proponents. I commit that I will work with them to try to come up with something that will be agreeable, sustainable, and something that can be signed.

I mention those reservations with the greatest respect to the proponents. I will urge my colleagues to vote no on the amendment tomorrow.

I apologize to my colleague from Delaware because he has been waiting for a few minutes. I didn't mean to speak at that length, but I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I will take a couple of minutes. I apologize for this, but it is important for the RECORD that we address the famous chart my colleague has shown over and over on the comparison of corporate tax rates. We have seen several references to this chart that is entitled ''United States, Second Highest in the World Combined Corporate and Dividend Taxes.''

The chart says that the U.S. has a tax rate of 70 percent, second only to Japan. My colleague and my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, has referred to this chart so often that I decided to go off and do a little independent research on that chart.

Let me tell you what I found. First, let's look at corporate taxes alone. When we look at corporate taxes alone this is for 2000 as a percentage of GDP, which Senator BENNETT said is the appropriate way of looking at it—a much different picture emerges about where we fit in.

This is from OECD, the international scorekeeper. What they have found is the United States ranks 22nd out of 29 in effective corporate tax rates. The Senator from Oklahoma shows nominal tax rates, the tax rate that appears in the Tax Code. We all know that is not what people actually pay. When you look at what they actually pay, you see a much different picture: 22nd out of 29 in effective corporate tax rates as a percentage of gross domestic product. We are down here, 22nd out of 29.

Mr. NICKLES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONRAD. I will.

Mr. NICKLES. That is percentage of GDP. We have a much bigger percent of GDP, but a tax rate is a tax rate.

I ran a corporation. When I made profits, I paid that rate. Maybe somebody was able to figure out some Enron-type schemes and things. This corporation didn't. Most corporations, a lot of corporations do not. I wanted to make sure, the percentage GDP, because we have the largest GDP in the world, I don't think is the relevant type of analysis to use.

Mr. CONRAD. Well, I respect my colleague's view. Let me just say, this is how OECD does the scorekeeping on effective tax rate comparisons, what people are actually paying. This is their conclusion about where the United States fits in.

Let me continue because the Senator raises an important point. There is an implication that we have a competitive problem because our tax rate is so high.

The fact is, as this chart shows, over 40 years, corporate taxes have fallen as a share of our economy but risen for other industrial economies. This line shows the United States. We have gone from an effective rate as a percentage of GDP of 4 percent, which is a way of giving an accurate comparison between countries with different levels of GDP. Ours has gone down dramatically. Other OECD countries have gone up over the 40 years.

The Senator from Oklahoma's chart and the arguments he made suggest that all corporate income is taxed at the maximum corporate and individual tax rates. This goes to the Senator's question. I hope the chairman will listen to this. At least a quarter of corporate profits are not taxed at all because of various tax preferences. That translates into a zero-percent effective tax rate. Another half of corporate income is taxed once at the corporate level, but not taxed again because it goes to pension funds and other stockholders who do not pay individual income taxes. That again lowers it. The Senator is showing nominal tax rates, not effective tax rates.

Finally, the chart being used assumes that all corporate income goes to individuals in the top individual tax bracket at the Federal, State, and local level. In recent years, corporations have used stock buybacks to convert their profits into individual capital gains which have an effective tax rate of less than 10 percent.

How can it be at 10 percent when the capital gains rate we all know is double that? The reason for that is the deferral that is inherent in capital gains which gives you a much lower effective tax rate than the nominal tax rate.

I say this because it is important to have in the RECORD that this notion that we have a 70-percent rate on corporate profits is not accurate. That is not the effective tax rate. It is nowhere near that. And if one compares corporate taxes in this country to other countries on a fair comparison basis, we are not a high tax jurisdiction. We just are not. I offer that for the RECORD.

The Senator from Delaware has been extraordinarily patient. How much time would he like?

Mr. CARPER. Two hours? Ten minutes would be just fine.

Mr. CONRAD. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, a couple of weeks ago Senator BLANCHE LINCOLN of Arkansas invited several of us Democratic Senators to a briefing in her office on Capitol Hill. She also invited several Members of the House of Representatives who are Democrats. There were several of them in the room. They call themselves Blue Dog Democrats.

The Blue Dog Democrats, for those who have not heard that term before, tend to be budget hawks. They believe balanced budgets do matter, and the idea of running chronic budget deficits year after year is not good for this country. In fact, it is very troublesome for this country. Blue Dogs are willing to take tough votes on defense spending, nondefense spending, entitlement

spending, and taxes as well to get us closer to a balanced budget.

I served for 10 years in the House of Representatives and as Governor of Delaware. I guess I was a Blue Dog before we had Blue Dogs. I believe I am today.

Tomorrow a number of us, including a Republican, Senator LINCOLN CHAFEE, Senator MARY LANDRIEU, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, and I will offer a budget alternative that is modeled after the approach offered by the Blue Dog Democrats in the House of Representatives which was voted on earlier this evening and I understand received about 170, 175 votes. It fell short, but it was a respectable showing. I want to talk about the provisions of that approach and why I think it makes sense.

A number of my colleagues talked tonight about the need to stimulate the economy and the need to do so in part with tax policy. In the alternative we will propose tomorrow, we do just that. Those who want to effect the 10-percent rate cut to accelerate it, we do that, in fact, this year. Those who want to accelerate the 27-percent tax bracket cut, we accelerate that this year. Those who want to expand and increase the child credit, we do that this year.

To those people who would like to allow small businesses to expense not just $25,000 in investments they make but $75,000, we let them do that this year to encourage that kind of investment.

To those who want to eliminate the marriage tax penalty—we did that in Delaware when I was Governor—we would do that immediately under the proposal that will be before us.

We raise the exclusion for the estate tax to $6 million for a couple, and we do that this year, effective immediately, and leave it at that rate.

Those are some of the provisions we do right now. It would have an immediate impact, and I think a very positive impact on the economy at this time.

For those people who happen to be in the 10-percent bracket, they would realize some tax savings, but so would those people whose income is not just $15,000 or $20,000 but $150,000. They would realize a savings, too, by accelerating the tax cut for those in the 27-percent bracket. We are not just helping people in the middle-income portion of the spectrum, but it also helps people at the top of the income spectrum.

What we do not do in our approach is reduce further the 35-percent rates and the rate to the 38.6 rate, the top two rates. We defer those cuts until two things happen: One, we pay for the war in Iraq; and, two, until we have actually balanced the budget. That is what we do on the taxing side. That is what was offered in the House of Representatives this evening as well.

On the spending side, what we have done is to essentially embrace the discretionary spending numbers proposed by the President. In the House of Representatives, the Blue Dogs took the President's defense discretionary numbers and put that in their proposal. In the Senate, we elected in our version of our budget alternative to take the defense numbers proposed by the Budget Committee. They are a bit less than the President's proposal, I think, by about $85 billion over a 10-year period of time. But we embrace the numbers from the committee itself.

We then take that roughly $85 billion and use those moneys to add to the domestic discretionary spending side to help pay for No Child Left Behind, to help meet some of the health care needs in this country, and to help meet some of the agricultural needs in this country. It is roughly $80 billion to $85 billion. It would shift from the defense side to the nondefense discretionary side.

Even at the end of that, we would still be spending above the baseline of more than the rate of inflation over the next 10 years for defense and a little less than the baseline in our domestic discretionary spending. But I like the balance a little bit better than what was debated and voted on in the House earlier tonight.

The third piece we address is budget controls. I will focus on one, but there are actually several others that are included in the measure we will offer tomorrow.

Pay-go: The concept is if a Senator or a House Member wants to cut taxes, or a Senator or House Member wants to raise spending in a way that makes the deficit larger, they have to figure out a way to pay for that so it is budget neutral starting now, not starting next week or not starting next month but starting now.

In our alternative, in our substitute, pay-go provisions become effective now. They are reinstated now. If anyone wants to increase spending, they are free to have at it. If they do, they have to offset it by cutting spending somewhere else, or if they cut taxes in one area, they have to raise taxes in another area or do something on the spending side to offset that.

We have budget controls that address issues of emergency spending and other provisions as well. I will not go into all those tonight because it is late. That is an important component of what we are trying to do.

Let me sum up. We reduce taxes, we do a number of things that have an effect immediately this year, but we pay for them. The overall effect of the tax reduction over 10 years is roughly $100 billion, $115 billion. Most of that is loaded in the first year or two.

We provide real spending restraint both on the defense side and on the nondefense discretionary side, and we put in place budget controls, some of which have been allowed to lapse. We put them back into effect to strengthen in the way they ought to be effective.

Today it is March 20. The day is almost over. During the course of this day, we will pay as a nation in interest on the national debt roughly $1 billion. That is not principal; that is interest on our debt, $1 billion. We will pay that tomorrow, the next day, and the next day after that.

We are a nation marching off to war. Tonight we have tens of thousands of young men and women on the march in a war I hope is mercifully brief for both sides. There is a great irony here as we are sending tens of thousands of our young people marching off to war. We are actually talking about reducing the revenues available to finance that war, to mobilize the troops, the cost of the war, the postwar occupation, and instead of raising the revenue and the means of financing the war, we are taking away those resources, which sits logic on its head, at least for me.

As we send those tens of thousands of young men and women marching off to war, their parents and grandparents are on a different kind of march, but a march nonetheless, with a different destination. It is called retirement, and the baby boomers, which I am one, are on the march and starting at roughly the end of this decade and throughout the course of the next decade.

The impact that is going to have on Social Security, Medicare, and other spending is the boomers, as they march off into their golden years, will create a financial burden that we are not even a little bit prepared to address.

My fear is if we take the course that has been proposed by the administration and is incorporated in this budget resolution, we will have not really been consistent with what the President said in his State of the Union Message.

I think one of the finest statements he said in his State of the Union Message is when he said the American people, our Government, should not pass on the problems of today to the next President, to the next Congress, or to the next generation.

I am afraid this is exactly what we are prepared to do with respect to the way we spend our money and the way we meet our financial obligations. We do not have to do that. We can do the right thing.

I have been looking for months for an approach that I could believe in and say let's do this because it is the right thing to do. This is the right thing to do.

I thank those who join me in offering this substitute tomorrow. I especially thank the Concord Coalition for embracing it today and the Blue Dog Democrats for giving us the inspiration in the first place. I yield back my time.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of a bipartisan, fiscally responsible budget amendment, which I have sponsored with Senators TOM CARPER and LINCOLN CHAFEE.

Our amendment would provide immediate tax relief to every taxpayer in this country, while balancing the budget 4 years earlier than the resolution currently being considered.

Instead of driving the Nation further into debt, our budget would cost $50

billion over 10 years—a fraction of the $1.7 trillion the underlying resolution would add to the deficit over the next decade.

Our budget corrects for the Budget Committee's low discretionary spending limits after 2008 by recognizing the need, at a minimum, to increase domestic discretionary spending with inflation. In contrast, the Budget Committee's mark would increase those limits by an average of only 1.5 percent after 2008, a rate of increase which is simply unrealistic.

Were it not for that needed adjustment to discretionary spending, our budget would actually increase revenue due to a 10-year net surplus on the tax side.

Many members of this Chamber have expressed concerns about pursuing a $726 billion tax cut at a time of massive projected budget deficits and rising uncertainty about the cost of the war with Iraq.

In fact, neither the administration's budget, nor the one currently being considered, nor our budget for that matter, includes funding to cover the cost of a war with Iraq, despite estimates that range from $60 billion to $100 billion or more.

The added cost of this conflict could push our budget deficit this year to over $500 billion, if the surplus in the Social Security Trust Fund is not included. Although no proposed budget accounts for the cost of the war in Iraq, our budget proposal faces the reality of significant new costs head-on by bringing us back to balance quickly.

I share the concerns of many of my colleagues, and I believe our primary responsibility is to pass a budget that meets our nation's long-term needs. And this is what our amendment seeks to do.

Why do I support this amendment? Our budget accepts the discretionary spending limits laid out in President Bush's budget proposal. Despite concerns about the impact of those limits on many critical priorities, I have agreed to those spending limits in an effort to support a realistic compromise which addresses our fiscal needs conservatively.

I believe that without real bipartisan compromise, it will prove impossible to return to a balanced budget.

Therefore, I join with Senators CARPER and CHAFEE today, because we all value fiscal responsibility and recognize the need for balanced budgets.

I must state clearly, however, that this budget does include a $10 billion reserve fund for homeland security in fiscal year 2004, and does not commit to the specific programmatic cuts detailed in the President's Budget.

The Carper/Chafee/Feinstein budget keeps those elements of the President's proposed tax cut that would benefit all Americans and stimulate the economy. It would:

Immediately expand the 10 percent income tax bracket from $6,000 to $7,000; Accelerate cuts to the 27 percent tax bracket from 2004 to 2003; Increase the child tax credit from $600 to $700; and Accelerate marriage penalty relief from 2005 to 2003.

Our budget also includes:

Immediately increase the individual estate tax exemption to $3 million per individual and $6 million per couple—something not included in the budget which was reported out of Committee. This would exempt all but one percent of estates from any tax liability whatsoever.

Increase small business expensing limits from $25,000 to $75,000, allowing them to make needed capital improvements and expand their operations.

All of those cuts are retroactive to January 1, 2003, and would immediately put money in every taxpayer's pocket.

This budget amendment would pay for these tax cuts in part by freezing planned reductions to the top two tax rates—the rates that apply to adjusted gross incomes above $143,500 for individuals.

Yet even those who pay taxes at this rate would receive tax relief—from the expansion of the 10 percent bracket, marriage penalty reduction, a larger child tax credit, and a cut to the 27 percent bracket.

This budget does not increase taxes for any American, but instead is a balanced blueprint designed to promote fiscal responsibility.

When I came to the Senate in 1992, we faced a record budget deficit of $290 billion, a record which we will almost certainly surpass this year.

After securing commitments from Senate moderates in the Centrist Coalition, we were able to hold the line on new spending and further tax cuts. Those efforts paid off in 1998, when the Federal Government returned to surplus for the first time since the Johnson Administration.

It was no coincidence that the path back to surplus, and the following three years of consecutive surpluses, coincided with the greatest period of economic expansion in American history.

The single biggest impediment to returning to similar rates of economic growth, however, is the tremendous uncertainty facing the United States.

While we now face a war in Iraq and ongoing stand-off in North Korea, we can do a better job in managing our domestic economy.

Pushing through a $726 billion tax cut now would only increase deficits and uncertainty, and would lead to a spike in long-term interest rates as we take on trillions in new debt.

I urge my colleagues to support this budget. It is a compromise which makes sense.

By adopting this budget amendment, we can bring the budget back into balance in six years, stop raiding the Social Security Trust Fund in ten, and forego nearly $2 trillion in new debt by 2013.

The alternative, which does not recognize our current fiscal crisis, will only make future compromises all the more difficult.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CORZINE. I yield myself up to 10 minutes.

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

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I had a statement earlier today, but I would like to briefly say that I am pleased my colleagues passed the supporting resolution today for our troops. We need a strong and unequivocal expression of support for the courageous men and women who are fighting for our values and defending America tonight in the Persian Gulf. It is important to say that this is an expression that is far more than just a personal expression. It is an expression of feelings that the people of New Jersey—I see my colleague from New Jersey, Senator LAUTENBERG, is in the Chamber as well, and I know both of us feel powerfully for the mothers, the fathers, the brothers, the sisters, the spouses all of those who have loved ones in harm's way, that we strongly stand with them, and the people across this country do as well.

The gist of my statement is that no matter how we may have felt and debated and deliberated these issues, our united view is unshakable as we go forward.

Mr. President, I rise to speak about an amendment I would like to bring up tomorrow. It would increase funding for environmental protection and natural resource conservation, reduce pollution, and improve America's quality of life.

If I had my druthers, we would all be dealing with a ''patriotic pause,'' as far as I am concerned, until we were able to get a better handle on some of the costs. It seems incongruous to me that as our men and women are sacrificing on the ground in the Middle East, we are unwilling to think about and factor in those costs in this budget process as we go forward. I think it is particularly unusual to understand that maybe as soon as next week we will get a supplemental that covers this, and it may be literally hundreds of billions of dollars of expenditures that are not considered in the context of a budget that is already estimated at $300 billion on a unified basis, on an on-budget basis, and on an off-budget basis $400 billion.

It is hard for me to understand, but I am a realist. It is a quarter of 11 at night, and we will be debating amendments that make a real expression about what our budget is about, our priorities. I think it is absolutely essential that the budget process be about difficult choices and an expression of those choices.

For millions of Americans, and certainly for myself, I strongly believe we cannot neglect the environment and our natural resources, and our budget should reflect that importance. I ask my colleagues to consider in that vein

that the President's fiscal year 2004 budget request increases discretionary spending at an average rate of 4 percent for all discretionary spending. But with respect to his requests with regard to the environment and conservation issues, the President's budget actually cuts spending on the environment.

By the way, in the House budget resolution—that is where we will be negotiating when we go to conference—that is a cut of $1.3 billion relative to the enacted levels in fiscal year 2003.

Fortunately, the Senate resolution does restore some of that, but in my view we could do a lot better, and we should do a lot better. My amendment is a simple 1-year amendment to improve that, to meet that 4 percent discretionary standard that might be how we are looking at other spending.

In dollar terms, my amendment would increase our investment in environmental protection and resource conservation by up to $30.4 billion. That is $2.4 billion above what the President has asked for and $1.1 billion over the Senate resolution. The spending is offset by a corresponding reduction in the size of the tax cut.

By adopting this amendment, the Senate would make a strong statement that even in these difficult times we have not lost the desire, the faith, the will, to provide for environmental protection and natural resource conservation. They are really continuing important priorities of the American people.

By adopting this amendment, the Senate would make it possible to fund a number of very vital environmental programs. I will itemize a couple. The amendment funds clean water and drinking water State revolving funds—something that is important for economic expansion—at a combined level of $3 billion. It is only about $800 million over the level that is asked for in the budget resolution. This money flows directly to the State loan funds and will be used to build sewage treatment plants and water purification facilities, an important part of our infrastructure.

Forty percent of our Nation's lakes and rivers still do not meet the goal of the Clean Water Act of being fishable and swimmable. It is about 80 percent in New Jersey.

While my amendment will not get us all the way there, it goes a long way to close the gap between where people estimate we should be over the next 25 years and the $535 billion expenditure it will take to get us there.

Second, my amendment will also fully fund efforts to enforce environmental laws, clean up toxic waste dumps, and redevelop abandoned brownfield sites. Superfund is critical to my home State. My colleague from New Jersey has been one of the most articulate advocates in making sure we fully fund Superfund. He was one of the original authors of building this law in our Nation. We have 111 Superfund sites in New Jersey, most of any in the Nation. Forty-nine States have Superfund sites. One in four Americans lives within a mile of a Superfund site. That is a real health issue, a quality of life issue, and it is one that needs to be addressed.

There are lots of ways to go. We are cutting down the number of cleanup sites. Two years ago, we had 87 Superfund cleanups in a year. It has dropped below 40 now. We need to do better. We need to work at this now.

Of course, there are brownfield sites in every State in the Nation. We were all very proud that we passed the Brownfields Revitalization and Environmental Restoration Act of 2001, but getting around to funding that at authorized levels has not happened. My amendment would make this possible in fiscal year 2004. The amendment would fund important natural resource conservation programs, conservation programs that fight sprawl, protect open space, and improve quality of life for all Americans.

We have a long tradition of valuing and fighting to protect parks, wildlands, wildlife, open spaces, recreation resources, and cultural treasures. This is important to the heart and soul of this country, special places that need to be addressed.

Several years ago, as we entered the 21st century, we started the Conservation Trust Fund that would fund land and water conservation programs in a way that the toolbox would be available across the country to work on these issues—the sprawl, taking in parklands, and protecting our shorelines. It is unfortunate that we are not adequately dealing with this issue that will impact every American's life.

So I hope we can consider this amendment. It is funded, as I suggested, out of the tax cuts, and we can do a lot to really improve our society with relatively minimal expenditures in such an overwhelmingly large budget.

By adopting my amendment, the Senate will boost vital environmental protection and natural resource conservation programs. It will mean cleaner water, more Superfund sites and brownfields cleaned up, and more acres of open space and wildlife habitat protected. I hope the Senate will affirm this commitment to the environment as an important funding priority in our budget. I look forward to bringing up this amendment for debate tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume, probably less than 20 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I be given that time.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I rise to talk now about an amendment I intend to offer with Senators BOXER, CORZINE, REED of Rhode Island, SARBANES, and MURRAY as cosponsors. This amendment would add funding that is critical to the Superfund program. My colleague and friend, Senator CORZINE, just talked about his intention to offer an amendment that is going to help us maintain a quality of environment that he and I feel is necessary for America.

I appreciate one part of that because this budget falls short of protecting Americans from deadly toxins in their communities. Too many communities in this country live near toxins left behind by polluting industries. Each day we delay cleanups is another day we expose families to poisonous chemicals. The numbers are alarming: 70 million people in this country live within 4 miles of a Superfund site and 10 million of the people exposed to the chemicals at those sites are children, the most defenseless among us. Ten million children who must eat their meals, brush their teeth and sleep within a few miles of harmful poisons that will persist in their soil and ground water for decades and longer. Children are the most vulnerable among us to arsenic and DDT and brain-damaging heavy metals such as lead and mercury found at the contaminated sites.

On March 3, just 2 weeks ago, the EPA announced the latest scientific data that show small children have a tenfold higher risk of developing cancer when exposed to chemicals than do adults. Across the Nation, each site cleanup—and we have successfully cleaned up over 800 so far—reduces those threats to our children: threats of cancer, learning disabilities, and other chronic and painful health problems.

This amendment enables the equivalent of 28 additional sites a year to be cleaned up, allowing thousands more families to get out from underneath the shadow of living next to a toxic dump. An extra 25 sites may not sound like a lot unless you and your family live next door to an empty lot laced with arsenic and dioxin.

This amendment would eventually close the gap between the program's need and what has been budgeted. This amendment assumes reinstatement of the original structure and guiding principle of Superfund and assumes the restoration of minimal taxes to get that job done. For example, in the case of the oil industry, the tax would be less than 10 cents a barrel for every 42 gallons of oil. This is a small investment for the large dividends it would pay. The end result would be measured in thousands of happier and healthier children and families.

The amendment will permit the addition of $300 million to the Superfund reserve each year for 10 years. That is less than the approximately $350 million the Congressional Research Service estimates the budget will fall short of when it tries to meet next year's projected needs for Superfund cleanup, but it is close.

At the same time, by making the polluter pay, this amendment increases

total Federal revenues by well over $1 billion a year for the next 10 years, contributing to the deficit reduction and helping to lower the public debt.

The Superfund needs new life injected into it because this administration has significantly slowed the pace of cleanups, cutting the rates in half. It is time Congress and the administration stopped refusing to force polluters to pay. They are the ones who ought to pay for it. They did it. They spoiled the Earth and the area, and they ought to pay for this.

No other American President, Democrat or Republican, has ever said that taxpayers, not polluters, should pay to clean up their toxic mess, and neither should this one. President Ronald Reagan understood the importance of the Superfund trust fund in making the polluter pay. In 1986, not only did he reauthorize the original Superfund tax, he approved two in Superfund taxes, a tax on imported chemical derivatives, and corporate income tax of .12 percent on taxable income above $2 million.

Reinstating the polluter-pays principle is fair, it has a proven record of working, and I would urge my colleagues to support this good governance amendment.

I have one more short amendment to discuss, an amendment I will offer on behalf of myself and Senator ROBERT BYRD to adequately fund our national passenger rail system, Amtrak, at $1.8 billion.

As it stands now, the budget before the Senate assumes that funding level of only $900 million for Amtrak. That is about half of what the railroad needs. That would be a devastating cut. The funding in this fiscal year 2004 budget is nearly 22 percent lower than this year's level. Without question, it would result in the bankruptcy of our national passenger railroad system halfway through the fiscal year 2004.

This Senate cannot stand idly by and allow this budget to bankrupt Amtrak. Amtrak is critical to our Nation's transportation system. We have a new president, an impressive fellow, CEO at Amtrak, David Gunn. David Gunn has demonstrated his ability to find commonsense solutions to tough problems, particularly around rail and transit. We should give Mr. Gunn the tools he needs to put Amtrak back on the track. Everyone feels confident he has the capability of doing that if we give him the tools.

In many areas across the Nation, rail is as important to the transportation system as aviation. Amtrak is critical to business and the economy in many communities and improves the quality of life for many Americans who use rail as an alternative to traffic jams on highways and the headaches we find now at the airport.

In the days following the September 11 attacks, our entire aviation system was shut down. The unbelievable took place. It was never conceived something could happen in our aviation system that would shut the whole thing down across the country. But it did. Rail served as a critical alternative for those who otherwise would have been stranded.

Now, many passengers have shifted to rail on a more permanent basis. In fact, more people take the train to New York from Washington than catch a flight each day. September 11, 2001, showed us we need to maintain an intermodal transportation system. We cannot put all our resources into aviation, and we cannot put all of our resources into highways. If we want a 21st century transportation system, we must invest in Amtrak and passenger rail. My amendment would provide Amtrak with the $1.8 billion that has been requested by the Amtrak board of directors. This is the funding level that will ensure the trains run in 2004 and beyond. This is also the funding sorely needed for capital investments to improve infrastructure and improve the system's reliability. These capital investments are also needed to help Amtrak lower its operating costs. We cannot continue to let them run a railroad held together by duct tape. Without Amtrak, congestion on the roads and in the skies would be substantially worse. Amtrak helps to remove 18,000 cars a day from the congested Northeast corridor between Philadelphia and New York, and 27,000 cars a day between New York and Boston. Everyone knows if there were that many more cars on the road, it would be impossible to travel on these highways.

But Amtrak does more than alleviate congestion in densely populated highway and air corridors. In many cases, Amtrak also provides residents of small rural towns with their only form of intercity transportation. Each year, some 22 million passengers depend on Amtrak for transportation between urban centers and rural locations. Amtrak provides service in 45 of the 50 States. This country of ours, this most advanced Nation in the world, needs a world-class passenger rail service. We can already board a high-speed train from New York's Penn Station and arrive in Washington in less than 3 hours. That is city to city. It is without the hassle and the problems one takes going to the airports these days.

But we should also be able to take a high-speed train from Atlanta to Charlotte or Miami. We should be able to travel from Los Angeles to San Francisco or St. Louis to Chicago by high-speed rail.

September 11 and the lingering terrorist threat shows us that we need a viable alternative to aviation for intercity travel. But the budget before us would cripple our Nation's passenger rail system.

Once again, I look to my colleagues to think the problem through thoroughly, to recognize even if Amtrak is not a primary mode of transportation in their State, that it is part of the national network that we have to have in a society as advanced and as crowded as ours has gotten to be.

I hope we will have the support for passenger rail and support for Amtrak.

I thank the President, the occupant of the chair, for his indulgence of this wee hour of the night. I thank my colleague from Washington, also, for permitting me to talk about my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise at this late hour to address an amendment that will be offered tomorrow dealing with the issue of workforce training. I applaud both of my colleagues from New Jersey for being here at this late hour to articulate a variety of needs in Superfund cleanup and infrastructure.

I would like to address an issue about our human infrastructure and our investment in job training and education at a time when we have in the Northwest are experiencing some of the highest unemployment in the country, over 7 percent in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Alaska, and a very high average national unemployment rate.

The question we are debating on the floor this week is how do we move forward with a budget resolution and what should our priorities be? I am here tonight to advocate that our priorities should be about a program that will help put people back to work by making sure they have the skills that are necessary in today's economy.

While we hear a lot about the high unemployment, we also know from employers that they can't find the skill level that they are looking for in the workplace among the employees out there today. Why do they say that? We know for a fact that there are thousands of jobs in our State in the health care field that cannot be filled. There are thousands of jobs in the Information Technology field, but people can't be hired because the skill level just isn't there. Yet we have 110,000 dislocated workers in my State of Washington who would love to have those jobs.

It is about matching those unemployed workers with job opportunities that employers would like to give them. The missing ingredient is funding, as we have in the past, adequate levels of job training dollars to train workers to meet the skills gap.

People consider this issue and think: Isn't this about whether we help an individual worker? And it is. It is about retooling the American workforce. It is about retooling our workforce in an information age economy. But it is also about helping our national economy. Think of it for a second. What happens when you help re-train somebody and they upgrade their skills, as we have done in Washington State?

I know a woman who was working, employed in the timber industry. She went back to a community college, was re-trained, got an Information Technology job, and made twice as much money. That was good for her but what was also good was that firm that hired

her found a needed employee to help improve the productivity and bottom line of that company. That bottom line productivity and improvement in that company also helped our local economy. It produced a better output and a better general economy for the State. So by investing in workforce training we are actually helping our entire national economy.

Why at a time with high unemployment, why at a time when our economy is transitioning and we are trying to come up with a budget that will stimulate growth for the future, would we cut such an economic development tool as job training? I know there will be some people tomorrow who will say we are not really cutting programs, instead we are actually just moving the dollars around.

Earlier in this year we also heard that there were carryover funds to fund these job training program. However, my State has spent those dollars. They have actually committed those dollars to retrain people and upgrade their skills. We will hear tomorrow that, no, the money is there. But, what is really happening is that we are actually decreasing the money to fund important programs like the dislocated worker program or adult training program by as much as $678 million dollars. The President FY 04 budget proposal simply transfers dollars from other existing job training accounts and consolidates them into one adult training account under the Workforce Investment Act and calls that an increase. We are really robbing Peter to pay Paul. What I would like to be advocating is that those job training dollars need to be increased beyond prior years. What we should be talking about is, not the 2002 level, but a much higher level in 2004, if we want to reap the benefits of having a fully employed workforce. That should be our goal.

I would even advocate we ought to be looking at the GI bill for job training and education this year as we reauthorize WIA and the Higher Education Act. That is the best way for us to keep our competitive edge in a global economy.

Think about it. What is going to happen? I have been in the private sector. I hired lots of people for a high-tech firm. What is going to happen when you as an employer can't find the workforce because they are not skilled? You don't stop looking. You can't. You have to ship products. You have to develop your services. You go find the workforce wherever they exist. In this case they might be foreign workers.

What we are really saying tomorrow is this: By cutting the workforce dollars by this budget proposal, we are really saying we would rather have foreign skilled workers in nursing, in Information Technology and other professions. Let foreign workers take these jobs rather than helping American workers to fill these jobs.

I don't think that is what we want. We want to put the best foot forward in an economy that is changing, where companies have to compete in a global environment. Any company will tell you that their workforce has to be robust. By robust they mean well educated and ready to shift to new products and services as they meet the competition from other companies in a world that is changing much more rapidly.

Even in the best of economic times, I would say we should be greatly increasing our investment in the workforce. In bad economic times, we ought to be filling that gap in an even much more aggressive fashion, to make sure we do not fall behind and that more of these jobs do not go, either overseas internationally because the skill level isn't here, or to foreign workers who are coming into our country on green cards and filling these jobs because they are the skilled workers.

Tomorrow we have an important opportunity, with this workforce development amendment I will be offering, to say to people in this country that it is not just a tax cut to the wealthiest Americans that will get our economy growing. I disagree with that. But even if you do make some of those tax cuts to those brackets, you have to be saying to Americans who are unemployed and unable to find work at a time when employers are saying I can't find the workers either, when the health care industry is saying there are thousands of nursing jobs to be filled or there are thousands of Information Technology jobs, just give me the skills and we will hire them. We need to be making that investment.

So I hope that my colleagues will join me tomorrow in supporting this very important amendment, to make the right priorities and the right decisions about where our workforce, our economy needs to go in the future.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a sense-of-the Senate amendment regarding the uninsured. Last week was Cover the Uninsured Week, a week dedicated to focusing attention on the plight of the millions of uninsured Americans. This week, I want to continue the momentum from this historic event by talking about the uninsured in the context of the Federal budget.

We have all heard the statistics: more than 41 million Americans do not have health insurance. Forty-one million people. We have heard the number so many times that it seems to have lost its impact. But let's look at that number more closely. Forty-one million people—that is about one in six nonelderly Americans from every conceivable walk of life: children, pregnant women, parents, single adults, full time workers, self-employed individuals, and students.

These 41 million people include those who have lost their jobs as the economy has worsened. It includes people who work hard for small companies that can't afford to offer health benefits to employees. It includes people who work for companies that offer health benefits, but who can't afford their share of the premium. I think most Americans would be surprised to know that more than 80 percent of all uninsured children and adults live in families where there is at least one working adult. Most of the uninsured—two thirds of them—go without health insurance for more than 6 months.

I learned another sobering statistic last week: almost 75 million Americans were insured for at least some time over the past 2 years. That is almost one of every three Americans under age 65.

I don't know about what all this means to you, but to me, this spells crisis. Our health care system is in crisis, and it is up to us to fix it.

Last month, Senator CLINTON and I called on our colleagues on the Budget Committee to provide real dollars to cover the uninsured. While in the end the Senate Budget Committee did set aside a reserve fund of $50 billion to cover the uninsured over the next 10 years, I just don't think this is enough to make a sizeable dent in a problem of this magnitude.

The sense of the Senate before you today asks the Senate to make it a priority to expand access to health care coverage in the United States. It asks that, to the extent that additional funds are made available, a significant portion of these funds should be dedicated to expanding access to health care coverage so that fewer Americans have to live without health care coverage, and the safety net is protected and strengthened.

Americans are losing their jobs as the economic downturn continues, without the benefit of any economic stimulus legislation from us in Congress. There can be no doubt what will happen this year—it has already begun. Through no fault of their own, many employers will have to raise copayments and premiums, while reducing benefits . . . if they are able to continue to offer insurance to their employees at all. The bottom line is that this year, more people will lose their health insurance.

These facts and figures should disturb all who see them. But behind every single one of those 41 million people is a face and a story. And as I travel around Oregon for townhalls with my friend and colleague Ron Wyden, we look into the faces of the uninsured, and we hear their stories, and we see their pain.

While the stories are always different—and many of them are tragic—the circumstances that have brought them to these places are often similar. The loss of a job. An increase in insurance premiums. A serious illness. Unavoidable circumstances that could happen to any one of us.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and ask you to join the growing coalition as we struggle to cover the uninsured.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered

by the Senator from South Carolina to increase funding to our Nation's ports.

This amendment will provide more funding to help all ports prevent a future terrorist attack. It will provide $1 billion annually for the next 2 years—an increase of $2 billion total.

We all know U.S. seaports are a gaping hole in our Nation's system of defense against terrorism. We have beefed up security at our airports, but as our Nation fights a war in Iraq, we are not doing enough to increase the security of our seaports.

Last year, Congress approved legislation, the Maritime Transportation Security Act, sponsored by Senators FRITZ HOLLINGS, BOB GRAHAM, and others designed to increase security at our ports.

In my view, this legislation was a good first step, but our ports remain extremely vulnerable to attack. One reason our ports are still vulnerable is that the Federal Government has not provided them with enough money to enable them to increase security.

For example, the Coast Guard has estimated that the present value cost of complying with existing and upcoming international and national security requirements will be about $6 billion over 10 years. The 10-year present value cost for facility security will be $4.4 billion and the cost to comply with section 102 of the Maritime Transportation Security Act alone will be $477 million.

These figures do not account for the funds that will be needed to pay for additional security measures that can and should be taken to protect against a terrorist attack at or through our ports.

Thus, I am very concerned that, apart from some specific projects and earmarks, Congress has appropriated less than $400 million for seaport security grants since September 11, 2001. I was disappointed to see that President Bush has not requested a single dime for seaport security grants in his fiscal year 2004 budget.

We also need to provide greater support to the Federal agencies enforcing our border security laws. Coast Guard, Customs, and TSA need additional funds for port security vessels, new screening and detection equipments, and cargo security programs, and to implement an identification card program.

Port security is a crucial national security issue—like immigration and other border security functions. We need to ensure that more of the money to protect our borders is used to safeguard our ports. We simply cannot leave the Nation's ports in the lurch, forced to pay the bill to protect our citizens from terrorism.

I am particularly concerned that California's ports are not getting enough funds to help prevent a terrorist attack.

For example, California ports have received about $16.405 million from the seaport security grant program established by Congress after the September 11 terrorist attack—about 18 percent of the money available. However, according to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, California ports handle almost 50 percent of maritime container imports.

In other words, if international terrorists overseas put a ''dirty bomb'' in a container, the odds are 50–50 that this container would pass through a California port. Mr. President, $16 million is simply not enough to stop such an attack—especially now when we are on the brink of war.

I hope the Department of Homeland Security will ensure that California ports receive their fair share of port security grants in future allocations. However, this Congress can and must do more.

I will soon be introducing legislation that takes a comprehensive approach to port security and focuses our limited resources where they are needed most. Among other things, the bill would do the following:

Update our criminal code to ensure that terrorists who strike at us at or through our seaports can be appropriately prosecuted and punished;

Create a container profiling plan that would concentrate on identifying high-risk cargo early in the shipping process; and

Secure the international supply chain by requiring the government to come up with a plan to inspect containers overseas, before they arrive in the United States—once a weapon of mass destruction in a container reaches the United States, it is too late.

Mr. President, I visited two ports last year, Hong Kong and Los Angeles/Long Beach, and I learned firsthand how difficult it is to protect our Nation from an attack through a seaport.

According to the U.S. Bureau of Transportation Statistics, about 13 million containers, 20-foot equivalent units, came into U.S. ports in 2002. However, only about 2 or 3 percent of these containers are inspected. This translates into millions of tons of cargo moving through our ports with no real scrutiny, any one of which could contain an explosive or weapon of mass destruction.

If attacked, casualties at our ports and surrounding cities could run in the thousands and our Nation's economy could be brought to a standstill. Just imagine if a container holding up to 60,000 pounds of explosives slips undetected into a harbor and is detonated—blowing up a ship, a bridge, or even an entire seaport.

Or worse, picture a nuclear device or radiological ''dirty bomb''—no bigger than a suitcase—installed in a container, shipped to the United States, and exploded at a port or somewhere within the interior of our country.

Beyond the human toll, such an attack would mean that every container in the system would have to be inspected to ensure that there wasn't another bomb out there—grinding our economy to a halt. One estimate suggests that it would take 6 months to screen all of the containers in the system on any given day. So we must do everything in our power to prevent an attack from happening in the first place.

Simply put, more funding is of critical importance when you consider the October 2002 report by former Senators Gary Hart and Warren Rudman. The followup Hart-Rudman report points out, ''Only the tiniest percentage of containers, ships, trucks, and trains that enter the United States each day are subject to examination—and a weapon of mass destruction could well be hidden among this cargo.''

The report recommends revising transportation security because ''the vulnerabilities are greater and the stakes are higher in the sea and land modes than in commercial aviation. Systems such as those used in the aviation sector, which start from the assumption that every passenger and every bag of luggage poses an equal risk, must give way to more intelligence-driven and layered security approaches that emphasize prescreening and monitoring based on risk-criteria.''

The bottom line: We must do a better job of profiling and inspecting cargo that could put our Nation and our citizens at risk. This will take time, money, and cooperation from industry—but it is a necessary and critical part of our homeland security effort.

A year and a half has passed since our Nation was struck by terrorists from the sky. We can't afford to wait for a similar—or potentially greater—tragedy to provide adequate funds for port security.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I start by congratulating the chairman of the Budget Committee, Senator NICKLES, on his fine work.

One of the reasons for the problems of last session was the absence, for the first time in a generation, of a budget resolution. Chairman NICKLES has carried the President's budget to the floor and been a loyal lieutenant for our Commander in Chief. It looks as if much of the President's budget may remain intact, but it is also true that the budget will change somewhat.

Let me make it clear. I support the President's budget, including the tax cut number and the growth package.

I believe we need a bold response to the flagging economy. It is our obligation to the folks that sent us here. We need to respond. Both sides agree on that need, as do the centrists, led by Senators BREAUX and SNOWE. Where the Democratic caucus, the Republican caucus, and the centrists differ is on the number we allocate for growth proposals.

The debate we have this afternoon is about that number. Really, though, the debate is about whether we should be bold, cautious, or timid. The President and most of the Republican caucus want to be bold. We want American

businesses, small and large, to grow. We want every American who wants a job to be able to get a job. We don't want to take any chances.

The Democratic leadership's proposed growth package yields a net tax increase of $11.7 billion. That package also contains new spending of $118.7 billion. I call that a timid response to the flagging economy.

Now, let's turn to the Breaux-Snowe-Baucus-Voinovich amendment. I understand the concerns of my friends from the Centrist Coalition. They are worried about long-term deficits. I am too.

I am more worried about the spending side of the ledger. The Centrists are focusing on the tax cut side only. It is important that the Centrists' amendment does place the tax cut reduction into deficit reduction. There is, however, no guarantee that the $375 billion will not be spent in subsequent amendments on this resolution.

Senators BREAUX and SNOWE have a long history of trying to secure bipartisan consensus. In 2001, they, along with Senator BAUCUS, were critical supporters of the bipartisan tax relief package. They are widely known for their efforts to find bipartisan consensus on Medicare. I will be looking to this group when we take up Medicare legislation later this year.

Senators BREAUX and SNOWE suggest that the middle ground is splitting the difference between the President's number of $726 billion and the Democratic leadership's position.

I am opposed to this amendment because we need more than $350 billion to do the job the right way. Don't get me wrong. If $350 billion is the number, that is the number the Finance Committee will work with. The Finance Committee will develop the best package we can.

My point is that the Finance Committee can do more growth incentives with a number above $350 billion.

Now, some view the net $350 billion as a vote against the President's proposal to eliminate the double taxation of dividends.

I support the President's proposal to eliminate the double taxation of dividends. It is good tax policy and it is good economic policy.

This vote is not about the dividends proposal. The Finance Committee, in its bipartisan way, will decide the composition of the growth package.

To my moderate friends, let me say something in conclusion. No matter where the number ends up, I expect Senator BAUCUS and I will produce a bipartisan growth package.

The Breaux-Snowe amendment, while well intentioned, does not provide the Finance Committee with the tools necessary to do the job of delivering a bold growth package to the American people.

AMENDMENT NO. 363

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I want to bring to the attention of the Senate the critical shortfall in funding for the Indian Health Service, IHS—a shortfall addressed by an amendment I intend to offer tomorrow.

Through treaties and Federal statute, the Federal Government has promised to provide health care to American Indians and Alaska Natives. In the Indian health amendments of 1992, Congress specifically pledged to ''assure the highest possible health status for Indians and urban Indians and to provide all resources necessary to effect that policy.''

Sadly, we haven't even come close to honoring this commitment. The IHS is the only source of health care for many Indians, and is required to provide it, yet funding has never been adequate. The chronic underfunding has only grown worse in recent years, as appropriations have failed to keep up with the steep rise in private health care spending.

The results are startling and disturbing. While per capita health care spending for the general U.S. population is about $4,400, the Indian Health Service spends only about $1,800 per person on individual health care services. The Government also spends considerably less on health care for Indians than it spends for Medicare beneficiaries, Medicaid recipients, and veterans.

This level of funding is woefully inadequate to meet the health care needs of Native Americans—who have a lower life expectancy than other Americans, and disproportionately suffer from a number of serious medical problems. Indians have higher rates of diabetes, heart disease, sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS), and tuberculosis. There is also a great need for substance abuse and mental health services.

More funds are needed if the IHS is to provide necessary health care services to Indians. The current shortage of funds is having serious consequences. Native Americans are often denied care that most of us take for granted and, in many cases, would consider essential. They can be required to endure long waits before seeing a doctor and may be unable to obtain a referral to see a specialist. Sometimes lack of funds means care is postponed until Indians are literally at risk of losing their lives or their limbs. Other Indians receive no care at all.

This rationing of care means that all too often Indians are forced to wait until their medical conditions become more serious—and more difficult to treat—before they may access health care. This is a situation none of us would find acceptable, yet this is the reality in Indian country.

Last year, Gregg Bourland and Harold Frazier, then the chairman and vice chairman of the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe in South Dakota, sent a letter to the IHS. This is how they described the situation in Eagle Butte:

> In January and February 2002, the Eagle Butte Service Unit on the Cheyenne River Sioux reservation has been swamped with children with Influenza A, RSV [Respiratory Syntactical Virus], and one fatal case of meningitis. There are only three doctors on duty, one Physician Assistant, and one Nurse Practitioner. The only pediatrician is the Clinical Director who will not see any patients, even though there is a serious need for the services of a pediatrician. Several of these children have presented with breathing problems, high fever, and severe vomiting. The average waiting time at the clinic has been four and six hours. The average time at the emergency room is similar. Most babies have been sent home without any testing to determine what they have and with nothing but cough syrup and Tylenol. In at least three cases, the baby was sent home after these long waits two or more times with cough syrup, only to be life-flighted soon thereafter because the child could not breathe. The children were all diagnosed by the non-IHS hospital with RSV [Respiratory Syntactical Virus]. No babies have died yet, but the Tribe sees no justification for waiting until this happens when these viruses are completely diagnosable and treatable.

I couldn't agree more. It is absolutely unacceptable to put the lives of these children at risk. And we can do something to help. On more than one occasion, I have heard horror stories of pregnant mothers delivering children in circumstances that no expectant mother or child should have to endure.

For example, right now the Service Unit at Eagle Butte in South Dakota does not have an obstetrician. The Eagle Butte Service Unit is funded at 44 percent of the need calculated by the Indian Health Service. The facility has a birthing room and 22 beds, but there are only two to three doctors to staff the clinic, hospital and emergency room. Naturally, as a result, many children and expecting mothers do not receive the care they need and deserve. Due to budget constraints, the IHS policy is to allow only one ultrasound per pregnancy. The visiting obstetrician is available only every couple of weeks.

The story of Brayden Robert Thompson points out how dangerous this situation is. On March 3, 2002, Brayden's mother was in labor with a full-term, perfectly healthy baby. Brayden's umbilical cord was wrapped around his neck, but, without ultrasound, that went undetected. The available medical staff didn't know what to do about his lowered heartbeat, abnormal urinalysis or the fact that his mother was not feeling well. Despite the symptoms, IHS refused to provide an ultrasound or to send her to Pierre to see an obstetrician. Brayden was stillborn. This tragic death was completely preventable, but tough choices are being made every day at IHS facilities throughout the country because there simply isn't enough money to provide the care that every American deserves.

The Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in my State of South Dakota built a beautiful new hospital and health care center. In many ways, they are equipped to provide state-of-the-art, coordinated care. But they cannot retain health care professionals because of low payment schedules and inadequate training opportunities for local people. Their shiny new labor and delivery rooms, surgery rooms and even

dental chairs stand empty, and individuals on the reservation are forced to travel long distances to receive these vital services. This also is the case on the neighboring Rosebud Indian Reservation.

This is not solely an Indian issue. This is a community issue. It affects surrounding rural community hospitals, ambulance services, and other health care providers who work with IHS. For example, the Lake Andes-Wagner ambulance district in northeastern South Dakota is facing financial disaster, in part because they have not been reimbursed properly by the Indian Health Service. This ambulance service offers emergency transport for citizens of Charles Mix County and Yankton Sioux tribal members, since the Wagner IHS hospital cannot afford to operate its own service. If this ambulance service shuts down, what will these residents—Indian and non-Indian—do when they face an emergency?

Bennett County hospital in the southwestern part of the South Dakota is located between the Pine Ridge and Rosebud Indian Reservations, and suffers similar IHS reimbursement problems, as do other non-IHS providers in South Dakota and throughout rural America. From 1998 to 2001, the most recent year for which IHS has data, IHS contract denials have increased 75 percent.

In his budget request for the next fiscal year, the President requested only $1.99 billion for clinical services for Indians. This represents only a small increase over what the President requested for fiscal year 2003, and virtually no increase over what was finally included in the omnibus appropriations bill. We can and must do better.

The amendment I am proposing would increase funding for clinical services by $2.9 billion over the President's request for fiscal year 2004. It is the minimal amount that is necessary to provide basic health care to the current IHS user population. The full cost over the next 10 years would be $38.7 billion. The amendment also devotes an equal amount to deficit reduction, all offset by a corresponding decrease in the top tax rate reduction.

The amendment is cosponsored by Senators INOUYE, BINGAMAN, DORGAN, MURRAY, WYDEN, JOHNSON, LEAHY, CANTWELL, REID, and KENNEDY. It is also supported by a wide range of health organizations, native and non-native.

This budget resolution is a test of this Nation's priorities. Some will say that it doesn't matter, that it is purely symbolic. But the whole point of the budget resolution is to establish an enforceable fiscal framework and make room in our budget for needs that we believe are worthy of our national attention.

I know there are some in this body who honestly believe that it is more important to eliminate the taxation of stock dividends—or accelerate huge tax cuts for our Nation's wealthiest citizens than to provide Native Americans the health care they have been promised but denied. Some defend that position by saying that someday, somehow, these Native Americans will benefit from the tax cuts extended to others, that the benefit will ''trickle down'' to them. It is their right to take that position, but they could not be more wrong.

A woman going into labor cannot wait for economic benefits to trickle down to her. A child in respiratory distress cannot wait, either. How is it possible that we can afford to delve deeper into debt to fund additional tax cuts for those doing relatively well in this country, but we cannot afford to dedicate a small fraction of that amount to fund the most basic health care services for some of the poorest people in America who have been guaranteed that care?

We must not tolerate this situation any longer.

The problem is real; the solution is simple. Give the Indian Health Service the funds it needs to provide Native Americans the health benefits they were promised. Yes, it will require a slight decrease in the reduction of the top tax rate. But those top-bracket taxpayers will still get the benefit of every other rate reduction and every other tax break available to them, and almost 2 million Native Americans will have health care coverage.

I ask unanimous consent that letters from the National Indian Health Board and Friends of Indian Health be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

NATIONAL INDIAN HEALTH BOARD,
Washington, DC, March 18, 2003.

DEAR SENATE MEMBER: On behalf of the National Indian Health Board, we are writing to urge your support of a floor amendment providing a $2.9 billion increase over the President's FY 2004 funding request to enhance the Indian Health Service (IHS) clinical services budget. Further, we urge you to participate in the floor discussion and join other American Indian and Alaska Native health advocates on both sides of the aisle as we work together to educate other Senate members about the health needs in Indian Country and how the $2.9 billion increase to IHS clinical services would save many lives.

While we understand the difficult decisions the United States government is facing regarding the FY 2004 budget due to military action in Iraq, a sluggish economy and the war on terrorism, it is equally important that the federal government honor its trust responsibility to American Indians and Alaska Natives by ensuring that IHS has adequate funding to meet basic health care needs. Adoption of an increase in the clinical services budget of the Indian Health Service of $2.9 billion for FY 2004 will move us one critical step closer to that goal.

Medical care for American Indians and Alaska Natives is currently rationed, which has created a health care crisis. Patients are faced with a ''life or limb'' test that dictates whether they may or may not receive IHS health services. In most situations, unless their lives are immediately threatened or they risk the loss of a limb, their treatment is deferred for higher priority cases.

Additionally, local health care providers outside of the IHS system feel the consequences of this lack of funding. Because IHS is so under-funded and is often unable to offer the full range of necessary care, the agency contracts with local hospitals and other health care facilities and often is unable to reimburse these non-IHS facilities for the services they provide, resulting in serious budget shortfalls for the contract facilities.

Once again, we urge you to join members on both sides of the aisle in supporting this $2.9 billion increase as we work towards eliminating the health disparities plaguing Indian Country. I hope I can count on your support, and should you require further information, please contact J.T. Petherick, National Indian Health Board Deputy Director of Legislative Affairs at (202) 742–4262 or by e-mail at *jpetherick@nihb.org*. We look forward to working with you to address the health challenges facing American Indian and Alaska Native communities.

Sincerely,

JULIA DAVIS-WHEELER,
Chairperson, National Indian Health Board.

FRIENDS OF INDIAN HEALTH,
March 20, 2003.

DEAR SENATOR: Our organizations are writing to urge you to support the Daschle budget amendment to S. Con. Res. 23 that calls for increasing funding for FY 04 for Indian Health Services clinical services.

The state of Indian health is at a crisis level and appears to be worsening compared to all other races in the nation. According to mortality data collected by the IHS, between FY 1997–1999, death rates for American Indians/Alaska Natives (AI/AN) from diabetes, cancer, suicide and injuries rose significantly. These increases have resulted in an overall increase in the death rate for AI/ANs while rates for all other Americans have been dropping. This health disparity gap will likely continue unless access to treatment and preventive services are significantly improved.

An increase of $2.9 billion would allow the IHS to restore lost services. Since 1992, due to budget shortfalls, the IHS has experienced an almost 20% loss of spending power. Repeated failures to fund mandatory costs for population growth and inflation, have resulted in the tribes, urban Indian programs and the IHS absorbing close to three-quarters of $1 billion in program costs. As a result our organizations have seen decreases in important primary care services including:

A 37% decline in well child services between FY 1992–97

A 35% decline in physical exams between FY 1994–97 and,

A 26% reduction in people receiving dental services between FY 1992–99.

We believe that in order to meet the health care needs of the AI/AN population, the FY 2004 budget resolution must include realistic funding levels to restore clinical and preventive services and attract a viable workforce of health care providers.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter of vital importance to America's Indians. We hope we can count on your support, and please let us know if we may assist your efforts. If you have any questions or need more information on this issue please contact Judy Sherman at *shermanj@ada.org* or (202) 789–5164.

Sincerely,

American Academy of Ophthalmology; American Academy of Pediatrics; American Association of Colleges of Nursing; American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy; American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; American Dental Association;

American Dental Education Association; American Diabetes Association; American Optometric Association; American Podiatric Medical Association; American Psychiatric Association; American Psychological Association; American Public Health Association; Association on American Indian Affairs, National Kidney Foundation.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by my leader, the Senator from South Dakota.

I think it is important to review briefly the history that brought us to this point today.

A few hundred years ago, before the first Europeans landed on the shores of what is now the United States, the Indian nations exercised dominion and control over 550 million acres of the land which became America.

By the time of the Revolutionary War, relations with the Indian tribes were well established, and it was the Native people of this land who provided food to General George Washington and his troops that sustained them throughout the harsh winter at Valley Forge.

Native warriors fought beside the revolutionary soldiers, and their valuable contributions to the success of the war for independence was widely chronicled.

Later, as our Founding Fathers undertook the task of developing a constitution for a new Nation, it was the governmental structure of the Iroquois Confederacy that they chose as the model for our democracy and the foundation of our government.

In contemporary times, more Indian men and women, on a per capita basis, have put on the uniform of our country and placed themselves in harm's way in defense of our country than any other ethnic group.

This dedication to a nation that has many sad and sorry chapters in its history of relations with the Native people of this land is remarkable.

Nonetheless, Indian people have served in the Armed Forces of the United States in greater numbers than any other segment of the population, on a per capita basis, in World War II, the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Gulf War and Desert Storm, and in every military action in which our country has been engaged in modern times.

These are the people whose ancestors ceded 500 million acres of land to America, in exchange for certain fundamental commitments on the part of the United States, including the provision of health care.

So, as has been observed more than once in this Chamber, the Native people of the United States has paid their dues.

They have sacrificed their sons and daughters, mothers and fathers, uncles and aunts in the defense of our Nation.

And through their treaties with the United States, and their cession of millions of acres of land to the United States, the Native people of this land purchased the first prepaid health plan in America.

The question that we are confronted with today is: What promises did the United States make to the Native people of America in treaties and what responsibilities did the United States undertake in subsequently enacted Federal laws, and how do those commitments measure up to what is provided to other Americans today in the arena of health care services?

I believe that the reason my colleague from South Dakota has come forward today with his amendment is that he sees in his home State of South Dakota the same dynamic that we see across Indian country—a health care system that is woefully underfunded and alarmingly understaffed, with facilities that are in such a state of disrepair that many of them have been condemned.

As a veteran and as ranking member of the Defense Appropriations subcommittee, I have had the opportunity to compare the investments our Nation makes in the health care provided to our veterans, to our men and women in active duty service and their dependent, and to our Federal employees.

I think these comparative expenditures should interest our colleagues—for they tell the story and paint a dramatic picture of disparities that are so large and frankly, so shocking, that we would be negligent and irresponsible were we to fail to address them.

Let's look at veterans. The Veterans' Administration expended $5,214 for medical care for each eligible veteran in 2001. In 1999, Medicare expended $5,915 per eligible Medicare enrollee.

The average medical expenditure in the United States on a per capita basis in 1999 was $5,065 per patient.

For Medicaid enrollees, $3,879 was expended for each eligible Medicaid patient in 1998.

For inmates in Federal prisons, $3,803 were expended for health care services provided to each inmate in 1999.

Just a little less—$3,725—was provided to Federal employees in 1999 for health care services under an eligible Federal health care plan.

Compare all of these figures with that provided to patients of the Indian Health Service in 2002—a shocking $1,914 per patient for medical care and $619 for nonmedical care such as preventive health care services.

So if you are an Indian person and you are in need of health care services, you would have twice as much provided for your health care as a Federal prison inmate than you would as a law-abiding Native citizen of the United States.

If you were a veteran, 60 percent more would be dedicated to providing health care to you, and if you were eligible for Medicare, the percentage would be even higher.

This is the relative nature of the manner in which we carry out our commitments to the Native people of this land.

Now let's look at some health statistics of the Native American population. If you are an Indian or an Alaska Native, the likelihood that you will die from diabetes is 390 percent higher than for other Americans.

As a Native person, your chances of dying from tuberculosis are 500 percent higher than other Americans.

And if you are a newborn or an infant Native child, your mortality rate is 25 percent higher than other infants.

Rates of cardiovascular disease are twice those for the general public and they continue to increase while the incidence of cardiovascular disease is going down amongst the general population.

To complete this picture, we also need to look at the health care system that is designed to serve the needs of Native people.

Health care in Native America is provided through the Indian Health Service system of hospitals and clinics, through tribally operated hospitals and clinics, through urban Indian health care programs, and through government contracts with private hospitals and health care providers.

In some of the most heavily populated areas of Indian country, particularly California, Oregon, and Washington State, there are no Indian Health Service hospitals and clinics, so Native people in those states must rely on either a tribal health care system or on contract health care services.

But because of the severe constraints that have been imposed on funds available for the purchase of contract health care services, those who must seek care outside the Indian Health Service system have to prove that their condition is either life-threatening or that they may lose a limb in the absence of treatment.

So if you have severe diabetes and resultant kidney damage, for example, as a Native person you wouldn't be eligible for kidney dialysis until you were at death's door. Physicians would instruct us that by that time, it is often too late to save the life of a patient.

In this category alone, there is a shortfall of $20.6 million of what is needed for contract health care services.

To bring the 55 most poorly funded tribal health care systems up to 40 percent of the identified health care needs, it would require $34 million.

And to bring tribal communities across the Nation up to just 60 percent of the identified health care needs, it would require $388 million.

The Indian Health Service is also charged with providing safe water and sanitation facilities for Indian communities, but there is a $1.753 billion backlog in sanitation facilities.

For basic primary health care services—services which most Americans take for granted because their access is unlimited—for Native people the need that is unmet is $6.336 billion.

For Indian people suffering from cancer, the health care service need that is currently unmet is $294 million.

For those Native patients with heart disease, the unmet need for health care services is $369 million.

Native Americans with diabetes have an unmet need for health care treatment of $452 million.

I could go on and on with such tragic statistics—and if they were just numbers it might be a different matter—but each of these statistics represents thousands of Native people who are going without the most fundamental health care.

These are the people who have given this country their land so that we could build a new nation.

These are the people who have sacrificed their lives in the defense of our country.

These are the people who have given the most and who are in turn, provided the least.

Most of the Indian Health Service hospitals are over 30 years old. They are so badly in need of repair and replacement that the minimum unmet need is $610 million.

Year after year, the costs associated with providing care—salaries of doctors and nurses and other health care professionals serving Indian country—fail to keep pace with those employed in the Department of Defense and Veterans' Administration health care systems, or with medical inflation rates.

Not surprisingly, these valued professionals leave Indian country for more pay, better working conditions, and as caring people—for the promise that the patients they see on a daily basis won't have to wait until their lives are hanging in the balance before they can receive care.

If treaties mean anything—and the U.S. Supreme Court has repeatedly held that treaties are the highest laws of the land—then this Nation has not only a moral duty but a legal obligation to fulfill its treaty commitments to the Native people of this land.

And I think that these numbers make it abundantly clear why the amendment proposed by my friend from South Dakota is conservative.

It won't meet all of the health care needs in Indian country, but it would be a good beginning in addressing conditions that are devastating and tragic by any measure—conditions which portray a shameful picture that a benevolent and prosperous nation appears to care so little about its First Americans.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I strongly support Senator DASCHLE's amendment to increase funds for the Indian Health Service's clinical services by $2.9 billion. I believe access to good health care services is a basic human right. This is especially true for Native Americans, for whom the Federal Government has the trust responsibility to deliver health care services. But statistics tell us that when it comes to ensuring good health for Native Americans, we are failing.

The Indian Health Care Improvement Act, S. 212, which I cosponsored last year, includes some sobering statistics. The bill reads, ''In death rates for example, Indian people suffer a death rate for diabetes mellitus that is 249 percent higher than the death rate for all races in the United States, a pneumonia and influenza death rate that is 71 percent higher, a tuberculosis death rate that is 533 percent higher, and a death rate from alcoholism that is 627 percent higher.'' This is unacceptable.

When I meet with tribes from Washington State and around the country, improving access to health care for underserved populations—from neo-natal care for pregnant women to care for elders—almost always comes up. I understand that narrowing the health gap that exists between Native Americans and non-natives is a complex challenge. Good health care for Native Americans depends in part on decreasing poverty and unemployment, improving education, strengthening economic development, and overcoming physical and cultural barriers to accessing good health care.

But it also depends on adequate resources, and I believe we must do more in this area. In 2003, medical inflation exceeded 12 percent in the Pacific Northwest. With medical inflation in the double digits and growing Native American populations, we cannot accept cuts to the Indian Health Service. Nor can we accept only minimal increases in funding for IHS programs year after year.

But that is what this Budget Committee has proposed, in keeping with President Bush's 2004 budget request. This Budget Resolution assumes no discretionary increases in funding for IHS. The Bush Administration has asked for an increase of only 2 percent for IHS clinical services. This is woefully inadequate.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to increase funding to ensure good health care for Native Americans. This amendment to the budget resolution will provide an increase of $2.9 billion for IHS clinical services in fiscal year 2004 and a $40 billion increase over the next ten years. The cost of these increases for the Indian Health Service is paid for by a decrease in the proposed tax cut.

The Daschle amendment provides a crucial first step towards securing increased appropriations for Indian health care. Over 90,000 Indian people in the Northwest, and more than 1.5 million Native Americans nationwide, depend on IHS funds and services. We can no longer let down American Indians by continuing to under-fund vital health care services. I hope my colleagues will support this amendment.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for the budget resolution.

First I would like to say that it is nice to actually have a budget on the floor in the Senate. We didn't ever get to vote on one last year, and I would like to compliment Chairman NICKLES on moving this resolution swiftly through the budget committee and to the Senate floor.

We have to remember that part of our responsibility to our constituents is not to just listen to and be their voice in Washington.

We also have to respect and follow the traditions, rules and processes of our duties that have been entrusted to us.

Whether it is following the committee process to get a bill to the floor, or allowing an up or down vote on a president's judicial nominee, we have to remember that the Senate is only as great as those who serve in it.

I think the Senate suffered last year when for the first time in nearly three decades we did not even consider a budget resolution.

It then took us almost a full year to get all of our work done. We didn't pass last year's appropriations bills until just 2 months ago.

Last year we failed and we have to improve. The result was a broken process that limped along for months and months. This year we have to do better and I believe we will.

We face a tough budget for 2004. While I am happy the budget resolution before us balances the budget within 10 years, we do face some large deficits in the near term.

These large deficits primarily occur because we have had a steep decline in revenue.

Contrary to what some of my colleagues try to argue, our revenue problems are caused by a weak economy and not tax cuts.

The evidence is overwhelming that tax cuts stimulate the economy. They create jobs, and increase economic activity, that leads to more revenue.

And that is why we need tax cuts now—to get the economy out of a rut and to help improve the budget forecast.

If American businesses are not generating profits, if American workers are not working, the result is a lot less money coming into the Federal Government through various taxes.

Decreased tax receipts do not mean taxes are too low; they mean the economy is too slow. We cannot make these budget numbers look better in the long term without a strong economy.

Many of my friends argue against tax cuts and at the same time complain about falling revenues.

If they really want to increase federal receipts and provide more funding for their favorite programs, tax cuts are the answer.

Our budget committee, under the leadership of chairman NICKLES, has crafted a strong budget.

Besides this budget outlining our federal spending priorities, it also addresses one of the most important challenges facing our country today—strengthening the economy.

At its core, this budget recognizes that we must grow our economy. That is why the budget committee chose to include a jobs and growth package at the very core of this budget and to include that package in reconciliation.

We have a fundamental responsibility to the American people to make

this economy stronger and to return it to a growth pattern we have enjoyed in the past.

Many here have expressed concerns for our men and women who are fighting for our freedoms and to liberate the people of Iraq.

We all pray for their safety and their quick return home to their loved ones. But in addition to our responsibility to do what we can to insure their safety overseas, we must also focus upon our responsibilities to them when they return.

While we continue to pray for a quick and decisive end to this war, we have to think about what our soldiers and sailors will have to come home to.

An economy with an unemployment rate of 5.8 percent is not good enough. An economy that's barely growing is not good enough.

We have to do better. We have to make sure they have choices and opportunities in the American job market that will allow them to support themselves and their families.

It is not going to do us any good to win the war and lose the economy. We have to do both at the same time.

We have to get this economy moving and Americans working. And the jobs and growth package included in this budget resolution is the answer to our economic troubles.

The council of economic advisors estimates that this economic growth plan will create 510,000 new jobs in 2003 and another 891,000 new jobs by the end of 2004.

The business roundtable estimates that around 3.5 million jobs will be created over that same time frame.

Between these two estimates, that is 1.5 million to 3.5 million Americans that will not be working over the next two years if we eliminate the President's growth package from this budget.

The majority of the Budget Committee believe strongly in the wisdom of this jobs and growth package. And that is why we provided for the package under the special procedures of reconciliation.

Through the accelerated procedures provided by reconciliation, we will be able to enact changes to help our economy sooner rather than later. The faster we can implement these policies, the better it will be for all of us.

While the details of any growth package will be determined by the Senate Finance Committee, I hope that any bill that comes out of that committee, on which I serve, will include many, if not all, of the proposals that have been put forward by President Bush.

High on the list are the acceleration of a number of proposals we passed in 2001 which are scheduled to totally phase-in and become effective in later years.

The President's plan will immediately increase the child tax credit to $1000. This will benefit over 25 million American families—342,000 of them in Kentucky.

The President's plan will accelerate the expansion of the 10 percent tax bracket—which benefits all American taxpayers. Over 69 million taxpayers will benefit from this provision, including 879,000 Kentuckians.

Over 35 million married couples—almost 500,000 of them in Kentucky—will benefit from the President's acceleration of marriage penalty relief.

We also accelerate the reduction of the marginal tax rates. It is estimated this will provide 28 million taxpayers with a tax cut—including the 85 percent of America's small businesses which pay personal income taxes rather than corporate taxes.

Approximately 79 percent of the tax relief provided by accelerating the reduction in the top bracket to 35 percent would go to small business owners. As my colleagues are aware, it is the entrepreneurs and small business owners which create two-thirds of the new jobs in the United States.

Another component of the President's jobs and growth package is the elimination of the double taxation of dividends.

This could be the most effective provision of all of the President's proposals contained in the President's budget. But because of the usual class warfare mantra from its opponents, it may be the toughest to sell.

Half of all households in America own stock and 50 percent of all dividend income goes to our country's seniors. So a reduction in the tax rate that dividends face—currently in the range of a 60 to 70 percent marginal rate—could have a real impact on our economy by allowing more dollars to be spent by consumers.

This reduction in the double taxation of dividends not only assists current dividend recipients, but it assists all who own stock.

Some private-sector estimates indicate that market increases from this proposal could be up to 20 percent. This would be welcome news to Americans who have been hard hit by the loss of about $7 trillion in the value of U.S. stocks since March 2000.

An added bonus to eliminating the double taxation is the change it will have on the debt-to-equity ratios of American businesses.

Treasury Secretary Snow estimates we could see changes in the debt-to-equity ratios in the range of 5 to 8 percent. This movement of corporations toward the use of more equity and less debt would leave them less vulnerable to economic downturns.

And before we hear the usual cries from the opponent's of the President's tax relief package—who say we are raiding the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for tax cuts for the rich—let me set the record straight.

As the law requires, we invest social security funds in government bonds which are the safest and most reliable investment out there.

These bonds are kept in a secure facility in Clarksburg, WV. And no one has shown up there to grab these bonds and hand them out to the rich. That is just a bogus claim.

The President's growth package is just that—an economic growth package. We recently passed an extension of unemployment benefits and President Bush signed that into law. While this may provide a quick—yet short—stimulus to the economy, what we really need is a long-term jobs and economic growth plan.

We cannot spend our way into prosperity. We have seen governments try this and fail. It may make some of us feel good to write check after check from the government, that is simply the wrong approach.

Governments don't create jobs and wealth. Free individuals with an idea and a source of capital create jobs and wealth.

We can grow ourselves into prosperity. We have done it before. The fundamental question is: Who knows better what is good for Americans—the Federal Government or the American people?

The strength of the American economy is not from the government and more Federal programs. It is the American people—the workers, entrepreneurs, investors, and risk takers—who keep the American dream alive.

It is better to allow Americans to keep more of their money to make spending, savings and investment decisions. We cannot decide here what job skills different people need, or what new equipment companies should purchase, or how to organize a small business' growth plan.

The Federal Government cannot make these investments for them. Big brother does not know best. We in Congress do not know what investments will best suit the particular interests of American families, entrepreneurs and business owners.

But what we can do is allow Americans to have access to more of the money they work for and earn. And then we have to trust them to make the necessary decisions within the economy to invest and create more jobs.

But to do this, we need to pass this budget resolution with its jobs and economic growth package in tact. And therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution as it was passed by the Budget Committee.

Finally, I want to say a few words about the Medicare prescription drug benefit provision in the resolution.

We all agree that Medicare is an important program. It provides health coverage to 41 million Americans, including almost 630,000 Kentuckians.

When Medicare was created back in 1966, it ensured that seniors would be able to receive health care coverage. However, medicine has advanced so rapidly and prescription drugs play a major role in the health care of many. For years, Congress has debated various proposals for adding a drug benefit to Medicare. So far, we haven't gotten

the job done. I am hopeful this year will be different for several reasons.

First, our seniors need our help now more than ever. They shouldn't have to make tough decisions about which prescriptions they can afford to fill each month, or whether or not they should divide pills or skip meals.

This is one of the biggest issues we hear about from our constituents. There are a lot of Kentuckians who would benefit. Almost 144,000 seniors in Kentucky are below 200 percent of poverty, and almost 58,000 are below the poverty level.

Second, this budget resolution sets aside $400 billion over the next 10 years to create a medicare drug program. This is a great increase over what the President proposed before and shows his dedication to this issue.

In fact, the President proposed $153 billion for Medicare prescription drugs in his fiscal year 2002 budget.

For fiscal year 2003, this number increased to $190 billion.

And for fiscal year 2004, President Bush has more than doubled last year's amount to $400 billion.

For Congress's part, this $400 billion figure is also a substantial increase.

In the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution, we set aside $40 billion over five years for a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

In the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution, Congress allocated $300 billion over 10 years.

Of course, last year, we didn't pass a budget. And, this year, we have set aside $400 billion over 10 years.

Third, the finance committee will be allowed to consider and report a bill to the floor this year. And I am hopeful we can avoid many of the problems we encountered last year.

Last year we voted on four prescription drug proposals. But because the bill didn't come from the finance committee as it should have, all these proposals required 60 votes to pass. Needless to say, none came close.

Also, these four proposals ranged widely in price from as low as $295 billion to over $600 billion. The tri-partisan plan, which I and many of my colleagues voted for, was estimated to cost $370 billion over 10 years.

We have a real chance for a bipartisan effort this year. An overwhelming majority in this body have indicated their support for a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution. It will create jobs if we can pass it with the President's job and tax package in tact. And the Medicare prescription drug benefit package it includes is what seniors not only need, but what they deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALENT). Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

Mr. NICKLES. I thank my colleague from North Dakota.

We have now completed the debate and discussion time for consideration of the budget resolution. The statute calls for 50 hours. We have yielded back a few hours, but for the most part we have probably spent some 40-odd hours on the floor of the Senate debating and discussing various amendments. It has been a very high level debate. We considered several amendments. We have adopted amendments. We have agreed to adopt additional amendments.

Unfortunately, as sometimes happens in budget resolutions, when we conclude the scheduled time for debate, the 50 hours, we have not dealt with all the pending amendments. We still have many amendments. Sometimes that leads to a lot of votes. So tomorrow we will begin that. We will begin it at 9:45.

I urge all my colleagues to be here and, for the most part, to stay on the floor. We will work with all of our colleagues who have amendments filed or pending or feel that they are compelled to offer amendments. We encourage them not to. But knowing a little history, I would expect a lot of rollcall votes tomorrow. I will say on behalf of colleagues on my side and others, we will be happy to work with colleagues. I would hope that maybe we could get some amendments accepted by voice vote, or maybe the sponsors of the amendment might decide it might be a better time to offer their amendment at another date for which we would give them great credit and applause. Regardless, I expect that we would have a lot of votes beginning at 9:45 tomorrow morning.

I expect the time for the votes will be limited to 10 minutes for the information of our colleagues. We will provide periodic breaks for individuals so they can have maybe some chance for us to regroup and reconsider the order and priority of amendments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 9:45 the Senate proceed to votes in relation to the following amendments in the order mentioned: Schumer amendment No. 299; Cochran on homeland security; Feingold on war reserve; Lautenberg on defense; Hollings on no tax cut; Sarbanes on a water related amendment; Crapo on a water related amendment; Conrad on IDEA, Gregg on IDEA; and Senator MIKULSKI on long-term care.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CONRAD. No objection.

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

Mr. NICKLES. I thank my colleague, Senator CONRAD. He has been a pleasure to work with through the first several days of this resolution. I expect that we might have a long day tomorrow. I hope not. But we will be in as long as necessary to complete this resolution, and I encourage all of our colleagues, tomorrow is a good day to attend if you want to improve your voting record. It is not a good day to miss if you want to have a good voting record for the year.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague, the chairman of the committee. He has been gracious throughout this process and a gentleman. I have very much enjoyed working with him.

The fact is, now we have over 90 amendments pending at the desk—I think 93. At 10 minutes apiece, that is over 15 hours of voting, and that is if we voted every 10 minutes. We all know that won't occur. So we would be talking about a very long day tomorrow.

I will just send a message out to any of our colleagues or any of their staffs who are listening, to those who have amendments pending: If this is something that you think is a good idea but you really don't need to do now, that you could offer on an appropriations bill or some other vehicle, we encourage you to do that.

This is a very difficult process. I think the record is 34 votes in a day. I remember that day. I think the chairman remembers that day. It was not pretty. I don't look forward to a replication. But that is what the rules are. That is where we are. The only way it is going to be better is if we use restraint. I just hope colleagues and staffs are listening and that tomorrow restraint is demonstrated. We don't need to vote on every one of these 93 amendments.

The chairman and I will work diligently to try to clear amendments, to get agreement on amendments, to work through amendments that could be accepted. We ask our colleagues, we implore them to work with us tomorrow, to avoid this being an unpleasant and unproductive experience.

Again, I thank the chairman and our colleagues who have worked cooperatively today to make progress.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I thank my friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Budget Committee. He is exactly right. There are 90-some amendments. I would hope most of them would not be called up, and I hope the balance will be voice voted, and maybe we will have a couple rollcall votes and finish at decent hour.

I would like the Senate to conduct itself in a way that we would be proud. In years past that has not always been the case, when we are doing these rapid fire amendments.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period for morning business.

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

BIOLOGICAL, CHEMICAL, AND RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS COUNTERMEASURES RESEARCH ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to speak about my cosponsorship, with

Senator LIEBERMAN, of the bipartisan Biological, Chemical, and Radiological Weapons Countermeasures Research Act of 2003. Senator LIEBERMAN and I also offered similar legislation, S. 3148, in the 107th Congress.

I think that when our colleagues, the administration, academic biomedical researchers, patient advocacy organizations, and the general public study the ambitious set of incentives contained in the Lieberman-Hatch bill, they will conclude that this measure can materially improve our national security. If adopted, this legislation will allow the families of Utah and in our sister states across America to live with a greater measure of safety.

Although this is a complex piece of legislation, its goal is simple. The Lieberman-Hatch bill will establish a unique public-private sector relationship that will result in stimulating the private sector to increase its scope and pace of research and development activities for a wide range of medical products intended to deter and respond to acts of biological, chemical, or radiological terrorism.

Senator LIEBERMAN and I believe that the best way to discourage and prevent acts of bioterrorism is to be able to demonstrate our capacity to develop, produce, and distribute biological, chemical, and radiological weapons countermeasures.

In short, if our medicine chest is full and we show the world that we have the ability to rapidly discover new countermeasures, we will decrease the likelihood of ever having to deploy these countermeasures in the first place. For example, in the last 18 months we have made great strides in ramping up production of, and our capacity to distribute, smallpox vaccine. In fact, few, in any, countries could respond more effectively than the United States to the introduction of smallpox. Our enemies in Baghdad and those hiding in mountains of Afghanistan might do more harm to themselves and their neighbors if a worldwide smallpox outbreak occurs.

Unfortunately, there are dozens, and perhaps many more, biological and chemical threats for which we have no adequate response. As well, this latest outbreak of antibiotic- and antiviral-resistant pneumonia points out the need to develop responses to new public health threats whether they are spread intentionally or naturally. This bill tries to create a new paradigm for the development of vital bioterrorism countermeasures that could also serve as a model for stimulating private sector drug discovery activities in other important areas such as cancer, heart disease, and infectious and rare diseases.

Senator LIEBERMAN and I praise the work that has already been done to help our nation meet this new type of threat. Senators BYRD, STEVENS, SPECTER, and HARKIN made available a substantial amount of new resources immediately in the aftermath of the September 11th and the October, 2001 anthrax attacks.

Last year, Senators GREGG, KENNEDY, and FRIST led the effort to pass important bioterrorism legislation to improve the public health infrastructure so that our country can better respond to public health emergencies.

The Bush administration is currently working closely with Congress on the Project BioShield program. We salute these efforts. We are pleased that the Administration is now embracing the concept of a guaranteed market that was part of last year's Lieberman-Hatch bill, S. 3148. We urge the Administration and Congress to adopt other critical features of Lieberman-Hatch.

The Lieberman-Hatch bill is a bold attempt to move the ball closer to the goal line. Our bill attempts to complement all the previous efforts to build up the capacity for public sector responses with a set of incentives designed to unleash the creative genius and substantial resources of the private sector actors within our Nation's biomedical research enterprise.

Let me quickly summarize the major features of the bill.

The Department of Homeland Security sets the countermeasures research agenda so that firms know beforehand the research targets. Interested companies register with DHS and become obligated to report their activities and subject their plants to inspection.

The legislation allows a participating company seeking to fund eligible research to elect from among four types of tax incentives. First, we provide for the establishment of R&D limited partnerships. Second, we create the authority for qualified firms to issue a new class of stock that would be subject to no capital gains tax. Third, we create a new tax credit to help fund the research. Fourth, we allow for a special tax credit for research conducted at non-profit and academic research institutions.

Anyone familiar with the current dismal financial state of affairs within the biotechnology industry will understand the attraction of these tax provisions. Many struggling firms might find it prudent to explore the benefits of adjusting their research portfolios to include countermeasure research and development.

The legislation authorizes funding for a program whereby companies successfully developing countermeasures that secure FDA approval can be guaranteed a market at a pre-negotiated price and pre-negotiated quantities.

Our legislation also contains some fundamental revisions in pharmaceutical intellectual property laws. As author of the Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984, I hold these provisions near and dear.

Essentially, the bill adopts a policy of day-for-day patent term restoration for each day lost during FDA review. Under the current provisions of the 1984 Hatch-Waxman law, no patent may be restored by more than five years and then only if the effective patent term does not exceed 14 years regardless of whether the FDA review takes longer than five years.

The legislation also grants a ten year period of marketing exclusivity for any approved countermeasure, regardless of a product's patent status. This means that FDA could not approve a competitor product until that period expires. This provision operates in parallel with patent protections and serves as a floor time period during which generic versions of the pioneer countermeasure product could enter the market. Current U.S. law only provides for a five year marketing exclusivity period while most European Union countries and Japan already provide a ten year marketing exclusivity period.

The Lieberman-Hatch bill also allows certain types of biotechnology companies, specifically those with less than $750 million in paid-in capital, to extend any patent by two years if the firms successfully develop a countermeasure.

I can tell you that these substantial changes in the area of intellectual property will get a positive reaction in corporate boardrooms; resources will flow in the direction of products eligible for these new intellectual property protections and products will be developed to help our country respond to bioterrorist threats.

In addition to the guaranteed market provisions, targeted tax breaks, and intellectual property incentives, the Lieberman-Hatch legislation also contains liability provisions; accelerated FDA approval procedures, and a limited antitrust exemption.

In summary, the Lieberman-Hatch bill contains an array of incentives designed to spur a robust response from the private pharmaceutical sector. If we are going to increase our ability to defend the American homeland, we need to be certain that both the public and private sectors' are fully engaged. That is exactly what our bill will help accomplish by unleashing the energy and resources of those private sector firms engaged in biomedical research and development.

I urge all of my colleagues and others with an interest in homeland security to study the bipartisan Lieberman-Hatch Biological, Chemical, and Radiological Weapons Countermeasures Research Act of 2003. I believe that when our legislation is examined, it will attract broad and strong bipartisan support.

Let me close by commending my friend from Connecticut, Senator JOE LIEBERMAN, for his vision, energy, and leadership in this critically important area. I would also like to commend the efforts of our bipartisan group of partners in the House, Congressmen TOM DAVIS, CAL DOOLEY, CURT WELDON, and NORM DICKS.

HONORING FRAN AGNES

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, at this hour, the men and women of our Armed Forces face great dangers in the Middle East. We are thinking of them and praying for them in the challenges they encounter. As a nation, we have faced many conflicts before, and we have relied upon the bravery, skill, and honor of our military personnel.

Today I am honored to share with my colleagues and with the American people the example of a remarkable man named Fran Agnes, who served his country and his fellow veterans and their families for many decades.

I know his name is familiar to many of my colleagues and to anyone who has worked on veterans issues. I am sad to report that Fran Agnes passed away on February 9 of this year. He was surrounded by his loving family.

I suspect that if Fran were here today at the start of this new war, he would say, ''Make sure we are prepared to take care of the soldiers, sailors, and airmen we send over there. They need to know, and their families need to know, that we will be there for them.''

Today, I want to pay tribute to Fran Agnes and discuss a bill that bears his name. I am especially honored that Fran's family members and friends are here in Washington, DC, today.

I don't recall exactly when or where I met Fran, but it is a sure bet that he walked up to me, shook my hand, smiled, and said: ''You don't know me, but I'm Fran Agnes and I want to help you help veterans.''

Boy, he wasn't kidding. As I look at the things Fran worked on over the years, that is exactly what he did.

For example, 7 or 8 years ago Fran started talking to me about the importance of making honor guards available at the funerals of veterans. We talked about the nearly 30,000 World War II veterans who pass away every month—who take with them an important part of our history. Fran was upset that we as a nation were allowing veterans to be laid to rest without the appropriate honors.

We discovered that the military was relying more and more on volunteers to perform funeral honors. And more often than not, the volunteers themselves were older veterans who struggled to meet the demand. We found case after case of families all across the country who couldn't find an honor guard to present a flag with the words ''On behalf of a grateful nation'' at the funeral service of a veteran. We even had a case at Arlington National Cemetery where a local family could not secure an honor guard for a veteran.

Fran asked me to get involved in the issue. We worked together to come up with legislation to require the Department of Defense to provide honor guards for veterans' funerals. We worked with the American Ex-Prisoners of War. Fran was an enthusiastic member of the organization and served as its national commander. We built a coalition of veterans service organizations in support of the legislation. Senator PAUL SARBANES, Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI, and Congressman LANE EVANS joined the effort and provided important leadership.

The Department of Defense opposed our legislation. With Fran's encouragement, we set out to address the DoD's concerns. Ultimately, we offered an amendment to the Defense authorization bill, and it was agreed to unanimously. Similar legislation passed the House of Representatives. Together, we succeeded in changing the law and ensuring the Department of Defense would provide honor guards when requested by a veteran's family. Fran Agnes raised this issue and touched a nerve all across our country. And he helped change the law for veterans. That is just one example of Fran's service.

Fran was also the visionary leader behind the campaign to create the Takoma National Cemetery for Washington's veterans. He was its greatest champion, and I worked closely with him to authorize and build it. Fran loved Takoma. Washington State veterans are proud that when Fran was taken from us last month, the Takoma National Cemetery was there to welcome him home with full military honors.

Fran Agnes lived a life of service to his family, to his fellow veterans and to his community. He coached Little League baseball for 20 years. He was responsible for building ballfields for young Washingtonians in both the Spokane and Everett areas. He was involved in both the Elks and the Eagles.

I was fortunate to know and work with Fran Agnes. I was blessed by his support and friendship. Washington State is a stronger community because of Fran Agnes, and veterans in my State had no greater friend or advocate than Fran.

As I mentioned, Fran passed away on February 9, 2003, with his loved ones at his side. At his service a few days later, his family was joined by the veterans community, the State of Washington, and a truly grateful nation to pay tribute to Fran as he was laid to rest in his beloved Takoma National Cemetery.

Secretary of Veterans Affairs Tony Principi sent a moving letter to Fran's wife Marlene Agnes. The letter from Secretary Principi states, ''Fran's service to America is legend in the veterans' community. He and all the men and women of his generation will long be remembered for their monumental struggle and decisive victory. However, Fran's service and sacrifice at Bataan, and later as a prisoner of war, were as great as any American has ever been asked to endure.''

I ask unanimous consent that the full letter appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Several years ago, my father passed away. He, too, was a World War II veteran. It wasn't until after my father's death that we discovered his letters and writings from the war. My father was like most veterans of his generation who did not talk about their experiences. Fran was like that, too. I saw Fran many times over the years. He came to Washington with the American Ex-Prisoners of War. I saw him at veterans events all over my State. If I attended a veterans event, you can bet Fran would be there—proudly wearing the maroon coat of the American Ex-Prisoners of War.

In all the time Fran and I spent together, he never asked me to do anything for himself. It was always things for other veterans and their families. He asked me to help the widows of our veterans. He asked me to support the POWs' lawsuit against the Japanese companies that profited from slave labor during World War II. He would ask about helping another veteran who might be having a problem with the VA.

Fran Agnes did not boast of his service. He didn't complain to me about injuries or problems from his time as a prisoner of war. Fran would call my office just to check in. He usually didn't have a request. He would just call and say, ''I know you're working for us. Keep it up.''

Because Fran, like so many veterans, did not boast of his own accomplishments, I want to share them with the Senate today. I cannot let this moment pass without sharing some of the things about Fran that he didn't talk about.

Fran Agnes was born in 1922 in North Dakota. His father was an Irish immigrant who moved the family to Wenatchee, WA, for a WPA job during the Great Depression.

Fran graduated from high school and enlisted to join the war effort. In 1941, he was stationed with the 20th Pursuit Squadron in the Philippines. He was captured early in 1942.

Fran Agnes endured the Bataan Death March—a 100-mile forced march conducted without food or water. During the march, men would drop out of column due to fatigue, dehydration, illness, and injury. This ''disobedience'' would cause the Japanese guards to rush up, shouting commands in Japanese to get back in the group. When that approach failed, shots would ring out, killing those who would not or could not rise.

Many of those failing to obey the order to march were killed instantly by sword-wielding Japanese soldiers who were guarding the men on the march. Seventy thousand Americans were forced on the Bataan Death March. Only 54,000 made it to the Japanese prisoner-of-war camps that awaited the survivors. Fran turned 20 years old on the Bataan Death March. He survived and was detained at Camp O'Donnell, which was used as a holding station.

Most prisoners stayed there for about 50 days. Eventually, it would house 50,000 men. Conditions there were grossly underequipped for the volume of men passing through its gates. For

example, there were only two water spigots available for all the prisoners. The men were fed tiny portions once a day.

Fran spent 6 months at Camp O'Donnell before being moved to Camp Cabanatuan. Fran spent an additional year at that camp. He worked mostly in the hospital—helping other POWs survive their imprisonment.

Finally, Fran was transferred to Japan where he was kept at the Hiro Hata POW camp and forced to work slave labor. He was held 30 miles from Hiroshima. He would later describe the atomic bomb that signaled the end of World War II and the end of his 3½ years of captivity.

On September 2, 1945, the men at the Hiro Hata prison camp conducted a liberation ceremony. The men gathered together and sang ''The Star Spangled Banner.'' Fran Agnes returned home to the United States weighing approximately 100 pounds.

Most of us can only imagine the horror that men like Fran Agnes endured as prisoners of war at the hands of the Japanese. After a short stint back at home in Wenatchee, Fran re-enlisted with the Army Air Corps before it became the Air Force. He served in the Air Force for two decades and retired at the rank of Captain. Fran worked for Washington State for 25 years.

Fran had a big family as well. In addition to his wife Marlene, he had three daughters: Rose, Sonya, and Kathleen. I spent a few minutes with Fran's daughters yesterday, and in each of them, I was reminded of their father. Fran also had two sons, David and Gregory, as well as 13 grandchildren and 5 great-grandchildren.

Fran was involved in numerous veterans service organizations, particularly the American Ex-Prisoners of War, which is holding its winter meeting here in Washington, DC, this week. Fran served as national commander of the American Ex-POWs in 1990 and 1991. He was also chairman of the Governor's Advisory Action Committee in Washington State. Fran was chairman of the Tahoma National Cemetery Group in Washington.

I think it is appropriate that we memorialize Fran's many sacrifices and his great service to our Nation. Today, I have asked my staff to work with the Tahoma National Cemetery, with the Agnes family, and with the Washington veterans community to discuss naming an appropriate place at Tahoma after Fran Agnes.

In addition, I call upon my Senate colleagues to join me in support of the Francis W. Agnes Prisoner of War Benefits Act of 2003. This legislation clarifies who is eligible for POW benefits through the VA and ensures our POWs can receive care for a number of ailments related to their captivity. The legislation is important to all POWs, and a similar measure has been introduced in the House of Representatives.

Fran wouldn't ask us to single out his fellow Pacific theatre POWs for health care, but I know he would take special pride in the passage of this legislation because it is so important to our prisoners of war who survived such harsh treatment at the hands of the Japanese in World War II. I encourage all of my colleagues in the Senate to support the Francis W. Agnes Prisoner of War Benefits Act of 2003.

Fran Agnes was a great American. I was blessed to know him and work with him. Veterans everywhere were blessed to have him as a fellow soldier and airman. With his passing, it is time we acknowledge his service and commit his memory to our history as an example to us all.

Even though I can't call upon him for his guidance and support, Fran will always be there for me. After all the time we spent together—and all the efforts we worked on together—I feel that I know what he would want me to do. And I pledge to continue to work very closely with veterans from my State and with his family to build on his legacy.

I hope this tribute captures for the Senate the many contributions of a true patriot. Mr. President, Fran Agnes called himself a survivor. We—those who knew him and his life of service to others—call him an inspiration.

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

THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2003.

Mrs. MARLENE AGNES,
Everett, Washington.

DEAR MRS. AGNES: On behalf of America's 25 million veterans, please accept my sincerest condolences on the death of your husband, Fran. Although I am aware that mere words cannot ease your sorrow, or that of your children and grandchildren, be certain that my thoughts and prayers are with you.

Fran's service to America is legend in the veterans' community. He and all the men and women of his generation who answered America's call during World War II, will be long remembered for their monumental struggle and decisive victory. However, Fran's service and sacrifice at Bataan, and later as a prisoner of war, were as great as any American has ever been asked to endure.

Fran was an American patriot who served his country twice-over. Once in a uniform of its military services, and once-again as a pillar of the Nation's veterans constituency. As National Commander of America's Ex Prisoners of War, Fran's leadership bore the same indelible hallmarks that distinguished his wartime service . . . exemplary ability, great honor, unfailing courage, and true compassion. His contributions at once strengthened our Republic and enriched the lives of its citizen-soldiers who, like him, had borne the burden of captivity.

Quite simply, Fran was an ordinary American who served in extraordinary ways. He represented the best of what it means to be an American, and our Nation is lessened by his passing.

Mrs. Agnes, we who were privileged to know Fran, mourn with you and your family.

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. In the last Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Local Law Enforcement Act, a bill that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred August 24, 2000 in Allentown, PA. A 24-year-old man, Michael Gambler, shot a 15-year-old at a party after the teen touched him on the arm. According to witnesses, partygoers suggested the teen was gay and teased the victim and Gambler prior to the shooting. After the teen touched his arm, Gambler retrieved a shotgun and shot the victim in the forehead.

I believe that Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

ASSASSINATION OF SERBIAN PRIME MINISTER ZORAN DJINDJIC

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to honor a man of courage, conviction and integrity who was recently taken from his people and this world in the most brutal and shocking of circumstances.

On Wednesday, March 12, Serbian Prime Minister Zoran Djindjic was slain in Belgrade, assassinated, gunned down, leaving his Belgrade office. He was, tragically, only 50 years old, and was taken from us long before his time. To his wife Rizica and his two young children, Jovana and Luka, I extend my deepest condolences.

I had the pleasure of meeting Prime Minister Djindjic in 2001, during a visit to Belgrade. He was best known to Americans and the international community for his central role in the downfall of former Yugoslav dictator, Slobodan Milosevic, in October 2000. It was Djindjic who, in 2001, took the principled decision to render Milosevic to the War Crimes Tribunal in The Hague, where he is at this moment facing trial for genocide and crimes against humanity.

It was this courage, this stand for integrity, that won Prime Minister Djindjic not only the respect of the internation community, but the love and admiration of the people of Serbia, whom he helped to free from the grips of dictatorship, oppression, and cruelty.

Prime Minister Djindjic was someone who fought for the needs of his people. He devoted his life to the fight for progress, reform, and democracy, and a better life for the people of Serbia. Ultimately, he gave his life for that fight.

He was imprisoned for his activities as a student dissident against the repressive Communist Yugoslav regime in the 1970s, but this did not diminish his zeal. In 1989, Djindjic, along with a group of dissident writers and intellectuals, founded the Serbian Democratic Party. One year later, he was elected its chairman, and in 1994, its president. In the 1990s, as a member and a leader of Serbia's Parliament, he remained at the forefront of the dissident movement, resisting the oppression of a new generation of post-Communist dictators, this time bent on ethnic cleansing and genocide.

As his courage grew, so did the people's respect for him. In 1996, the people of Belgrade freely elected him the first non-Communist mayor sine World War II. It was in that position that he built the popular base and credibility that served him so well in the historical role he was about to play, in the downfall of Slobodan Milosevic. Djindjic was one of the chief strategists behind the September 24, 2002, Yugoslav Presidential elections and the October 5, 2000, uprising that resulted in Milosevic's overthrow. In December 2000, he led the Democratic Opposition of Serbia—a coalition of 18 parties spanning a broad range of the political spectrum—into Serbia's parliamentary elections, and won an impressive 65 percent of the popular vote. The DOS elected Djindjic to be Prime Minister of Serbia on January 25, 2001.

That popularity speaks well of Zoran Djindjic, but it speaks volumes about the people of Serbia. After years—decades—of Communist and fascist dictatorship, the spirit of the Serbian people arose valiant, triumphant because the desire for freedom cannot be crushed. Prime Minister Djindjic was, in a large sense, the embodiment of their determination, their yearning to be free. Each time this man spoke of freedom and liberty, of reform and democracy, the people of Serbia supported him, sustained him, elevated him to lead them, and followed them into the brighter future that he hoped fervently to help them build.

It appears that it was, ultimately, his pledge and his actions to stamp out corruption and widespread organized crime that brought him into the assassin's sights.

In February, a truck swerved from its lane, headed directly for the motorcade carrying the Prime Minister, and narrowly missed. Prime Minister Djindjic very well could have been killed. Djindjic himself suggested that the incident might be the handiwork of members of organized crime rings, which flourished under Miloservic and remain linked to him to this day.

Just as he did not permit prison to diminish his energy, Prime Minister Djindjic did not let this danger impede him or dim his spirit. He pressed on, valiantly, in his campaign against the crime and corruption that corrodes his society.

The news of the Prime Minister's death has been a tremendous shock, not only to the people of Serbia, but to the entire region. President Stjepan Mesic of Croatia has rightly described the assassination as ''an act of madness,'' and raised concerns that this assassination will ''slow down [Serbia's] progress towards democracy.''

I certainly understand the Croatian President's concern. It would be a dishonor to the memory of Prime Minister Djindjic were his fears to be realized. After centuries of conflict and decades of oppression and crippling violence, Serbia and the entire Balkan region have made remarkable strides toward peace, democracy, economic development, and a better life for the people of all nations in the region. The United States has played a crucial role in furthering that progress. For the past 10 years, in Bosnia Hercegovina, in Kosovo, the United States has fought—diplomatically and militarily—to stop the forces of oppression and genocide, and to support the forces of liberty and democracy.

There can be no greater way to remember this man than to ensure that his death will not be in vain, that his life's work will continue. And so, I urge all of us who are friends and supporters of democracy, and those who fight for it, to redouble our commitment to and solidarity with those who stand, as Prime Minister Djindjic did, for a better, freer, more democratic future for the people of Serbia.

THE CHILD SUPPORT DISTRIBUTION ACT

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to state my strong support for the Child Support Distribution Act of 2003, which Senator SNOWE and I introduced yesterday. I want to thank Senator SNOWE for continuing to work with me over the years on this important issue.

This bill takes significant steps toward ensuring that children receive the child support money they are owed and deserve. In fiscal year 2001, the public child support system collected child support payments for only 44 percent of its total caseload, up from 19 percent in 1995. Obviously, we still need to improve, but States are making real progress. It is time for Congress to take the next step and help States overcome a major obstacle to collecting child support for families.

There are many reasons why noncustodial parents may not be paying support for their children. Some are not able to pay because they don't have jobs or have fallen on hard times. Others may not pay because they are unfairly prevented from spending time with their children.

But other fathers don't pay because the public system actually discourages them from paying. Under current law, $2.2 billion in child support is retained every year by the State and Federal Governments as repayment for welfare benefits—rather than delivered to the children to whom it is owed. Fifty-six percent of that amount is for families who have left welfare. Since the money doesn't benefit their kids, fathers are discouraged from paying support. And mothers have no incentive to push for payment since the support doesn't go to them.

The current rules withhold a key source of income for low-income families that could help them maintain self-sufficiency. For low-income working families receiving child support, that support is the second-largest source of income for those families, after wages, according to the Urban Institute, a nonpartisan organization that studies social and governance issues. Families who receive child support can often avoid going on welfare. When low-income working families get child support, but not welfare, child support makes up 35 percent of their income.

It is time for Congress to change this system and encourage States to distribute more child support to families. My home State of Wisconsin has already been doing this for several years and is seeing great results. In 1997, I worked with my State to institute an innovative program of passing through child support payments directly to families. An evaluation of the Wisconsin program clearly shows that when child support payments are delivered to families, noncustodial parents are more apt to pay, and to pay more. In addition, Wisconsin has found that, overall, this policy does not increase government costs. That makes sense because ''passing through'' support payments to families means they have more of their own resources, and are less apt to depend on public help to meet other needs such as food, transportation or child care.

We now have a key opportunity to encourage all States to follow Wisconsin's example. This legislation gives States options and strong incentives to send more child support directly to families who are working their way off—or are already off—public assistance. Not only will this create the right incentives for noncustodial parents to pay, but it will also simplify the job for States, who currently face an administrative nightmare in following the complicated rules of the current system.

We know that creating the right incentives for noncustodial parents to pay support and increasing collections has long-term benefits. People who can count on child support are more likely to stay in jobs and stay off public assistance.

This legislation finally brings the Child Support Enforcement program into the post-welfare reform era, shifting its focus from recovering welfare costs to increasing child support to families so they can sustain work and maintain self-sufficiency. After all, it is only fair that if we are asking parents to move off welfare, stay off welfare, and take financial responsibility for their families, then we in Congress

must make sure that child support payments actually go to the families to whom they are owed and who are working so hard to succeed.

I am pleased that there has been widespread bipartisan support for this legislation. In 2000, a House version of this bill passed by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 405 to 18. Our legislation was also included in last year's TANF reauthorization bill that passed out of the Senate Finance Committee with bipartisan support.

In addition, I am pleased that the administration and the House of Representatives both included child support provisions in their TANF reauthorization legislation. However, while those provisions are an important first step in the process, I am concerned that both the House bill and the administration's proposal fall short in reforming child support. Their approach would not benefit all States equally, has more limited benefits for families who are currently on TANF, and imposes fees on some low-income families. I hope as the TANF reauthorization process continues, we can all work together to address these concerns and ensure that all children receive the support they are owed and deserve.

We must keep this bipartisan momentum going in this Congress. It is time that we finally make child support meaningful for families, and make sure that children get they support they need and deserve.

PIONEER NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAILS STUDIES ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Pioneer National Historic Trails Studies Act. This bill would require the National Park Service to study the Pony Express, the Oregon, the California, and the Mormon National Historic Trails and make recommendations to Congress on possible additions to these trails that were used by the early pioneers of the West.

For various reasons, early settlers often used routes to arrive in the West which were variations of the main routes now recognized as National Historic Trails. These routes were used by large numbers of westward pioneers. Since the enactment of the National Trails System Act in 1968, support has been building to broaden the law to include alternate routes that branch off the main trails. The Pioneer National Historic Trails Studies Act allows for the feasibility study and designation of side trails and variant routes taken by pioneers otherwise associated with the main trails.

These trails are the highways of our history. They are central to the great story of the West. But unfortunately, because of the confining ''point to point'' wording now found in the Trails Act, many crucial parts of the story are not being told. Not every pioneer embarked on his journey from Omaha or Independence, and not every great or tragic event took place along the main routes. To the contrary, tens of thousands of settlers set out from other places, and many of the memorable, if not most important, events occurred along historical side roads and alternate routes that were chosen because of inclement weather, lack of water, and conflicts with Native American tribes, among other reasons.

Since the original passage of the National Trails System Act, the Park Service has conducted endless hours of research, and now has a more accurate picture of the story of our Western pioneers. There has been a great deal of support shown by State and local communities which want to broaden the act to include this new knowledge. However, the Park Service has determined that legislation is required to do this. The Pioneer National Historic Trails Studies Act will enable the Park Service to identify those routes most worthy of being included in our trails system. This legislation will highlight our Western history, and it will do so without any infringement of the rights of private property owners.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for the opportunity to address this important issue today, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

TEACHING OF AMERICAN HISTORY AND CIVICS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a speech I gave before the Heritage Foundation on March 14 be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR LAMAR ALEXANDER

PUTTING THE TEACHING OF AMERICAN HISTORY AND CIVICS BACK INTO OUR CLASSROOMS

OUT OF MANY, ONE: E PLURIBUS UNUM

I am glad to have this privilege to come to Heritage today to talk about the two subjects I care about the most: the education of our children and the principles that unite us as Americans. I salute Heritage for providing public forums on issues that are important to our nation.

At a time when we are asking young Americans to give their lives to defend our values, we are doing a poor job of teaching just what those values are.

That is why, last week, in my maiden address—we still call it that in the United States Senate—I proposed ways to put the teaching of American history and civics back in our schools so our children can grow up learning what it means to be an American.

The Senate will hold hearings on April 10 on my proposal. The proposal is to create Presidential Academies for Teachers of American History and Civics and Congressional Academies for students of American history and Civics—residential summer academies at which teachers can learn better how to teach, and outstanding students can learn more about the key events, persons and ideas that shaped the institutions and democratic heritage of the United States of America.

Today I want to discuss, first, why America is exceptional—not always better than other countries, but in important ways different; second, how the teaching and learning of American history and civics has declined and why; and, finally, why the three Latin words that were the first motto of our nation, E Pluribus Unum, are still in the right order—Out of Many, One—even though some are trying mightily to turn them around to say that we are ''Many, out of One.'' In other words, in the United States of America, I believe unity still trumps diversity.

YOU CAN'T BECOME JAPANESE

Now to do this, I want to ask for your help.

So, will you please imagine that we are in a federal courtroom in Nashville, where I was on October 2001. It is naturalization day. The room is filled with anxious persons, talking among themselves in halting English. They are obviously with their families and closest friends. They are neatly dressed, but for the most part, not so well dressed.

Most faces are radiant. Only a few faces are white. There are 77 persons from 22 countries who have passed their exams, learned English, passed a test about American government, survived a character investigation, paid their taxes and waited in line for five years to be a citizen of the United States.

The bailiff shouts, ''God Save this Honorable court,'' and the judge, Aleta Trauger walks in. She asks each of the applicants to stand.

Now—here is where I need your help.

I will be Judge Trauger.

I want you to be the 77 new citizens.

Will you please stand, actually stand, raise your right hand, and repeat after me. I want you to listen carefully to this oath.

''I, and state your name.

''Hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state or sovereignty, of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen;

''That I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic;

''That I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same;

''That I will bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by the law;

''That I will perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States when required by the law;

''That I will perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by the law; and that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion:

''So help me God.''

You may be seated. Thank you for doing that.

Now, that is quite an oath.

Sounds like it might have been written by some rowdy patriots in Philadelphia or Williamsburg, and I wonder if anything like that could be written into law today?

Judge Trauger then addressed the new citizens in Nashville with these words:

''You are now an American citizen. On behalf of your fellow countrymen, I congratulate you. You have studied hard and achieved much. You know more about the matters of citizenship than many of us born into it. Even so, I would like to speak to you for a few minutes about what I think it means to be an American citizen,'' she said.

Continuing to quote, ''Americans, unlike many other people, are not Americans simply because of accidents of geography or centuries of tradition. Instead, we Americans based our citizenship on our foundation of shared ideals and ideas brought from many countries, races, religions and cultures.''

The judge said, ''We are Americans because we also share certain fundamental beliefs.

We are bound together by the unique set of principles set forth in documents that created and continue to define this nation. We find our heritage and inspiration in the profound words of the Declaration of Independence: 'All people are created equal and endowed with unalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.' We pledge allegiance to the Republic as one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. But the greatest expression of our national identity is the constitution of the United States which established the responsibilities and rights that go with citizenship.'' And the judge continued.

These were the words that fall day in 2001 of Judge Aleta Trauger to 77 incredibly happy new citizens, their families and friends in the Nashville courthouse.

This happens almost every month, in almost every federal courthouse. That same year, about 900,000 new citizens took this oath and heard words like this.

Judge Trauger, may I say, is not some right wing, super patriotic extremist nominated for the federal bench by the Bush White House. She was appointed by a Democratic president.

But Democrats as well as Republicans—almost all of us as Americans—agree with what Judge Trauger's exposition of what it means to be an American.

For example, after 9/11 President Bush spoke of the American character.

Former vice-president Al Gore said the next day we ''must defend the values that bind us together.''

Judge Trauger, the President and the former vice-president were invoking a creed of ideas and values in which most of us believe. ''It has been our fate as a nation,'' the historian Richard Hofstader wrote, ''not to HAVE ideologies but to BE one.''

Those who love and hate the United States love and hate us not so much for what we do but for who we are.

And it IS different being an American. One major difference is how you get to be an American, just as those citizens did.

You can't become Japanese by moving to Japan and taking some oath.

A Turk with great difficulty might immigrate to Germany and become a citizen, but he will find himself described as a Turk living in Germany, not as a German.

Because of their Pakistani roots, the family of the recently arrested Al Qaeda leader, Khalid Shaikh Mohammed, could not become Kuwaiti when they moved to Kuwait.

But if a Japanese, or a Turk or a Pakistani came to America and wanted to be a citizen, they would have to take that oath to become an American. And they do that based not on race, creed or color but by taking an oath and pledging allegiance to a common set of principles.

WHAT HAPPENED TO OUR COMMON CULTURE?

What principles?

Judge Trauger mentioned most of them.

Until recently in our country, most people learned these principles in school, in their churches, at home, from the media, in patriotic celebrations that were a part of everyday life.

Thomas Jefferson spent his retirement evenings at Monticello teaching overnight guests what he had in mind when he helped create America.

Other founders took extensive notes and wrote long letters explaining what it means to be an American.

At the Alamo, Col. William Barrett Travis appealed for help simply ''in the name of the American Character.''

Former American Federation of Teachers President Albert Shanker, said that the public school ''was invented to teach immigrant children the three Rs and what it means to be an American with the hope they would then go home and teach their parents.''

Diane Ravitch reminds us that McGuffey's reader sold 120 million copies and helped to create a common culture of literature, patriotic speeches and historical references.

President Roosevelt made sure those who charged the beaches of Normandy knew they were fighting for Four Freedoms.

But then things changed, for a variety of reasons.

One reason was that McCarthyism gave ''Americanism'' a sour taste.

The Vietnam War and other challenges to authority questioned prevailing attitudes including our founding principles.

The end of the Cold War removed a preoccupation with who we were not, making it less important to consider who we are.

And our history textbooks, which had done a good job of teaching some traditional history, left out a lot. The contribution of Spanish explorers was undervalued. The diseases those explorers brought with them that devastated Native Americans was rarely mentioned.

No Tennessee history book taught me about men like Kunta Kinte, the seventh generation ancestor of Alex Haley, a Tennessean who won a Pulitzer Prize for his family story, Roots, the struggle for freedom and equality.

There was very little mention of men like my ancestor John Rankin, a conductor in the underground railway, and about the slave-catchers from Kentucky who tried to assassinate him.

And finally, the largest number of new Americans in our country's history came to our shores—and in the last few years, the prevailing notion became let's just celebrate all those cultures, and we forgot to remind new Americans of the principles that have always united our many, new cultures.

OSAMA BIN LADEN AND GEORGE WASHINGTON

So, just at a time when there should have been an acceleration in the teaching and learning of American history and civics—it declined.

In Dr. Ravitch's words, instead of incomplete history and simplistic patriotism, we went to the other extreme—''Public schools with an adversary culture that emphasized the nation's warts and diminished its genuine accomplishments.''

So imagine the plight of teachers. Assaulted by simplistic patriotism on one side and multiculturalism on the other, teachers dove for cover, textbooks became sanitized and boring, and we've seen the embarrassing results.

Christopher Hitchens, in a 1998 article in Harper's, summarizes the evidence:

59 percent of 4th graders do not know why Pilgrims and Puritans first voyaged to America.

68 percent of 4th graders can't name the first 13 colonies.

90 percent of 8th graders can't recount anything about the debates of the constitutional convention.

Today, three quarters of 4th, 8th and 12th graders—this is according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress—are not proficient in civics knowledge and one third of them do not have basic knowledge, making one third of our students ''civic illiterates.''

Children are not learning American history and civics because they are not being taught it, or at least they are not being taught it well. American history has been watered down and civics is too often dropped entirely from the curriculum.

Today, more than half the states don't have a requirement for students to take a course—even for one semester—in American government.

The results of this are evident everywhere in American life.

For example, some federal judges—who seem not to know that the first Congress enacted both the first amendment and paid the first senate chaplain—these judges are unable to reconcile our religious traditions with the separation of church and state—producing absurd decisions like the one removing ''under God'' from the pledge of allegiance.

A United States Congresswoman actually says that ''Osama Bin Laden and these nonnation state fighters with religious purposes are very similar to those kinds of atypical revolutionaries that helped to cast off the British crown.''

Schools remove the names of George Washington and Thomas Jefferson because it is discovered they owned slaves, without remembering they also created a country whose principles led to the inevitable end of that horrible practice.

And, according to the Princeton Review, our presidential debates (and I participated in these) are now conducted at a sixth or seventh grade vocabulary level as compared with the Lincoln—Douglas debates in the 1850's which were conducted at a level of vocabulary expected of high school seniors.

TRUST CLASSROOM TEACHERS

So, to help put the teaching of American history and civics back in its rightful place in our schools, I have proposed that we 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 in the summer for two weeks for teachers and four weeks for students. Their purpose would be to inspire better teaching and more learning of these subjects.

The idea for these academies is based primarily upon my trust and respect for classroom teachers.

I believe that if, for example, 200 Tennessee teachers come together for two weeks in the summer to discuss how to do a more complete, inspiring and effective job of teaching American history and civics, they will light up their classrooms with their enthusiasm during the next year.

In the same way, good students who spend a month with such teachers will go back to their classrooms not only inspired themselves but serving as good examples for other students.

I know this works because I have seen it happen before. Tennessee's Governors' summer schools for teachers and students were the best education spending, dollar for dollar, our state has ever done. Teacher after teacher, student after student told me these schools literally changed their lives. There are more than 100 such Governor's schools in 28 states, almost all with great experiences.

Our pilot program would start with 12 Presidential Academies for Teachers and 12 Congressional Academies for students. We'd spend $25 million a year for four years and see if it worked. The schools would be sponsored by educational institutions. The grants would be awarded for two years at a time by the National Endowment for the Humanities after a peer review process. Each grant would be subject to rigorous review after three years to see if the program is worth continuing.

This is not only something that will work; it is something parents want. A Public Agenda survey showed that 84 percent of parents with school age children said they believe that the United States is a special country, and they want schools to convey the belief to

their children by teaching about its heroes and traditions.

President Bush has taken leadership in this. He created a ''We the People Program'' to develop curriculum and sponsor lectures on American history and civics. He is also sponsoring a White House forum on the subject soon.

Last year the Senate authorized $100 million to schools for the teaching of traditional American history and civics. A dozen senators, including the Democratic Whip, Harry Reid of Nevada, have joined in sponsoring our legislation. Congressman Roger Wicker and colleagues in the House of Representatives have introduced it there.

I have one more thing I need to say.

I want to read you one sentence from my so-called ''maiden speech'' to the Senate last week, because it elicited what one newspaper described as ''harsh criticism from the civil rights community.''

This is the sentence: ''Some of our national leaders have 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.''

There are some real differences of opinion reflected in the criticism I got for saying that.

Some believe that America is just another country, and that it is embarrassing for us to claim it is truly exceptional.

Some believe it is old fashioned and wrong to try to define the principles that unite us as Americans because in the past it led us to excesses such as McCarthyism, because it can seem exclusionary and that we would be better off just being comfortable as descendants of wherever we came from.

Most important, we have not been able to put behind us the memory that the ancestors of some of us who didn't come for the same reasons most did. Native Americans were already here, and the ancestors of most African-Americans, like Kunta Kinte, were captured in their villages, transported in the stinking bellies of slave ships to this country and sold into bondage. It is hard to put that out of one's memory.

WHY UNITY TRUMPS DIVERSITY

Here is what I believe.

I believe that America's variety and diversity is a magnificent strength. I have always sought that in my own life and for my children.

But diversity is not our greatest strength.

Jerusalem is diverse.

The Balkans are diverse.

The greatest challenge we face in Iraq is not winning a war but turning diversity into unity after the war.

The greatest accomplishment of the United States of America, after establishing freedom and democracy, is that we've found a way to take all our magnificent variety and diversity and unite as one country.

I preside a great deal as a freshman senator. Engraved above the Senate president's chair, for every C-SPAN viewer to see, are the three Latin words that form the original motto of our country, E Pluribus Unum—Out of many, one.

It is NOT many, out of one.

As Samuel Huntington has observed, if it were many out of one, we would be the United Nations, not the United States of America.

''PLEDGE PLUS THREE''

Now, since 9/11, there has been a different tone in our country. The terrorists focused their cross hairs on the ideas that unite us—forcing us to remind ourselves of those principles, to examine and define them, and to celebrate them.

President Bush has been the lead teacher, literally taking us back to school on television about what it means to be an American.

We should join our President in this National discussion.

One way would be for each school to start each day the way the Senate does—with the Pledge of Allegiance, followed by a teacher or student saying in his or her own words for three minutes ''what it means to be an American.'' It would be a daily lesson in American history and civics for the whole school.

When I decided to run for the Senate a year ago, I was a member of the faculty at Harvard's school of government, teaching a course in ''The American Character and America's Government.''

The students and I were trying to figure out if there is ''an American way'' to solve tough public policy problems.

It was easy for us to define the principles that unite us, such as: liberty, equal opportunity, rule of law, laissez faire, individualism, e pluribus unum, the separation of church and state.

But applying those principles to real problems turned out to be hard work. The Senate was reminded of this yesterday when we debated partial birth abortion: it was the liberty of a woman versus the life of a baby.

We see these conflicts of principle when we discuss President Bush's faith-based charity proposal because on the one hand, ''In God We Trust,'' but on the other hand, we don't trust government with God.

I want the federal government to pay for scholarships that would follow children to any accredited school—public, private or religious. To me that is equal opportunity. To the National Education Association it is the violation of separation of church and state and of the principle of e pluribus unum.

As Samuel Huntington has written, most of our politics is about conflicts among principles that unite us—and about disappointments that occur when we try to live up to our greatest dreams.'' ''All men are created equal,'' we say, but there is still racism in America. ''We will pay any price, bear any burden to defend freedom,'' President Kennedy said, but we didn't go to Rwanda, and there is a great debate about going to Iraq.

If the conflicts among these principles and our disappointment in not reaching them is what most of our politics and government are about—then we had better get busy teaching them again.

My best student in my last class at Harvard was Natalia Kubay. She had grown up in Ukraine, married a Peace Corps worker and moved to Boston. She was waiting for her citizenship. Her enthusiasm for her new country was so great that it infected all of us who were privileged to be in the classroom with her. She hopes one day, after she is a citizen, to run for office and serve in government.

Natalia is proud of her family and her native country. When she takes the oath of a naturalized citizen in the federal courthouse in Boston, as you did today, she will be living in this nation of immigrants, proud of where she came from, but prouder to be able to say, ''We are all Americans.''

Thank you.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to commemorate the 47th anniversary of Tunisia's independence.

Since the establishment of the Republic of Tunisia, it has made significant progress in the areas of social and economic development, transparency of the electoral process, respect for human rights, and the promotion of women's rights.

As the Bush administration recently stated, Tunisia has become a force for tolerance and moderation in the region.

It has been a vital partner with the United States in our efforts to facilitate dialogue in the Arab world. This role has become increasingly important in this turbulent time.

I would also like to express my appreciation for Tunisia's continued support and cooperation in the fight against terrorism.

By working together against this common enemy, we will eliminate the threat of terrorism and ensure international peace and security.

Our shared commitments towards this end will only serve to strengthen our relations in the future.

I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the government and people of Tunisia on the occasion of their 47th anniversary of independence.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

IN CELEBRATION OF THURGOOD MARSHALL AWARD RECIPIENT DALE MINAMI

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to recognize Dale Minami, the 2003 recipient of the American Bar Association's Thurgood Marshall Award.

Mr. Minami has had a successful law practice in San Francisco for many years. Additionally, for over 30 years, Mr. Minami has worked tirelessly to promote civil liberties and social justice. He has selflessly provided pro bono legal representation to minorities and disadvantaged communities. Because of his dedication, Mr. Minami has become an accomplished leader in the national civil rights community.

Among his many accomplishments in the courtroom, Mr. Minami is known for successfully reopening the landmark Supreme Court cases of Fred Korematsu, Gordon Hirabayashi, and Minoru Yasui. The Supreme Court subsequently overturned their convictions for refusal to be interned during WWII.

Mr. Minami cofounded the Asian Law Caucus, the first Asian Pacific legal service organization in the Nation, established in 1972. Mr. Minami also helped establish the Asian American Bar Association of the Greater Bay Area in 1976, the first Asian American Bar Association in the country. Additionally, he helped found the Asian Pacific Bar of California. He has also taught and lectured at various colleges and universities and has spoken widely across our country.

Mr. Minami has also been involved in developing public policy and legislation. He has volunteered his time on numerous boards and commissions, including California's Fair Employment and Housing Commission, the California Attorney General's Asian Pacific Advisory Committee, and the Civil Liberties Public Education Fund

Commission. I am pleased and honored to say that Mr. Minami also served as a member of my Judicial Screening Committee, from 1993 to 1996. Mr. Minami did an outstanding job on the committee, and his contributions were invaluable. He has been a successful advocate for increasing the selection of African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, and Asian Americans for executive and judicial appointments at both State and Federal levels.

Dale Minami embodies the legacy of Thurgood Marshall. I commend him for his dedication, hard work, and many achievements in the areas of civil liberties and social justice and wish him well in all future endeavors. He is the kind of person who makes my State and our country a better place. ●

COMMEMORATING THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF TUNISIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, today, Tunisia commemorates the 47th anniversary of its independence from France. Our two countries share a long friendship that began in 1797, when Tunisia was one of the first countries to sign a Treaty of Peace and Friendship with the United States. In 1956, when Tunisia gained independence from France, the United States was one of the first countries to recognize Tunisia's independence. This long relationship has served as the backdrop for our increased cooperation in the efforts to combat international terrorism. Our shared commitments to peace, security, and stability in the world will remain the most important principles guiding our relationship throughout the 21st century.

I am pleased by Tunisia's commitment to further strengthen the democratic values that our two countries share as the foundation for free and open societies, and I am confident its leaders will continue to work toward promoting greater political freedom and respect for human rights throughout the region.

I wish the Tunisian people the best as they celebrate their country's successful transition from colony to republic. I look forward to many more years of cooperation and friendship between the United States and Tunisia.

HONORING DR. GEORGE V. IRONS, SR.'S INDUCTION INTO THE ALABAMA MEN'S HALL OF FAME

● Mr. SESSIONS. I rise today to honor Dr. George V. Irons, Sr.'s induction into the Alabama Men's Hall of Fame. Dr. Irons was Distinguished Professor of History and Political Science at Samford University for 43 years and a prominent civic leader. As a professor, he taught 17 students who became university presidents—a record in American education.

Dr. Irons was also one of Alabama's true athletic greats—the only University of Alabama track field athlete ever inducted into the prestigious Alabama Sports Hall of Fame. He is also the only person inducted by both Alabama Sports Hall of Fame and the Alabama Men's Hall of Fame.

While a student at the University of Alabama, he was spotted by Coach Hank Crisp running across the campus because he was late to class. Coach Crisp promptly put him on the track team where he set a collegiate record the first time he pulled on a Crimson Tide uniform. Remarkably, his records still stand today.

Before the days of the million-dollar band at major football games, halftime entertainment consisted of a sport called road racing. After laps in the stadium runners would speed over a hill-and-dale course, about 4 miles, finishing as the halftime show. In this realm, his feats have been heralded by as the greatest of his era.

The Men's Hall of Fame was created by the Alabama Legislature in 1987 to honor posthumously those men who in their chosen professions have made national and international impact for the betterment of humanity. Past inductees include some of America's most distinguished leaders: Warner Von Braun, famed scientist who developed rockets which propelled American astronauts to the Moon; George Washington Carver, botanist who mutated plants to create vital food sources throughout the South; and James A. ''Brother'' Bryan, who gave sacrificially to fellow Alabamians during some of the severest economic times.

Its most recent inductee, Dr. Irons, joined the Howard College (now Samford University) staff in 1933, the depth of the Great Depression. On his first day the College President asked him to report to the bank to try to stop mortgage foreclosure on the school. At this time, the school owed over a half million dollars. Dr. Irons' personality and persuasion on behalf of the college won the day, saving the school from foreclosure. During difficult economic times, he often taught for the salary of an IOU and in his spare time he coached the college track team and fired the dorm furnace.

In 1962 he received Freedom Foundation's George Washington Medal of Honor for his speech: ''Freedom, America's Weapon of Might.'' It was broadcast worldwide on the U.S. Armed Forces Network. He was the first Alabamians to win this award. He also distinguished himself through military service in World War II and was a respected leader in civic, social, and professional organizations.

Dr. Irons was elected to the Alabama Men's Hall of Fame as the representative of the entire 20th Century. J.L.M. Curry, former Congresswoman and ambassador whose statue as one of Alabama's two representatives in the Capitol's Statuary Hall collection, was elected for the nineteenth century.

It is good this revered Hall of Fame honors those heroes who celebrate the best of our past. I am hopeful that Dr. Irons' life as an athlete, university educator, military serviceman, and community leader will continue to serve as an inspiration for future generations.●

JAMIL DADA, RECIPIENT OF THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA FIVE NATIONS DISTRICT 2003 DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN GOOD SCOUT OF THE YEAR AWARD

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I would like to take this moment to reflect on the exceptional work of Jamil Dada, who will be honored by the Boy Scouts of America's Five Nations District with its 2003 Distinguished Citizen Good Scout of the Year Award on March 21, 2003.

Jamil Dada is exceptionally qualified for this award, with a strong record of serving others in his community in Riverside County and the broader region. His contributions to both local and regional community organizations have made a significant difference to countless Californians.

Mr. Dada's most prominent role is that of chairperson for the Riverside County Workforce Development Board, working to ensure a healthy, well-trained workforce for the county. In addition, Mr. Dada devotes his time as a board member for the Boy Scouts of America Inland Empire Council, the Family Service Association of Western Riverside County, the Magnolia Center Division of the Greater Riverside Chamber of Commerce, the Police Activities League in Moreno Valley, the Planned Giving Advisory Board of UC Riverside, the Riverside Community College Foundation, and the United Way of the Inland Valleys.

In the city of Moreno Valley, he demonstrates his broad capacity for leadership as the vice chairman of the Moreno Valley Chamber of Commerce, the treasurer of the Moreno Valley Substance Abuse Task Force, and vice president of the Community Assistance Program, which provides food to those in need.

Mr. Dada is also an Honorary Commander at March Air Reserve Base, where he serves as vice president of the March Field Air Museum, chairman of the Friends of March Field, and treasurer of the March Air Reserve Base Forum.

It is clear that Jamil Dada is an outstandingly active, concerned citizen, and I am extremely proud to extend my sincere congratulations to him on this much deserved recognition from the Boy Scouts of America Five Nations District.

I send my best wishes for a memorable celebration of Jamil Dada's accomplishments and for his continued success.●

CELEBRATING NATIONAL SAFE PLACE WEEK

● Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, as our country faces imminent war with Iraq, and current events of the day may turn

our attention overseas, it is essential to remember the ongoing battle that many of our young citizens face each day here at home. Our youth are the future of this Nation and must be protected. We not only value the young people of this country, but recognize that they are capable individuals and can take an active role in creating a healthier living situation.

I come to the Senate floor today to talk about a tremendous initiative between the public and private sector that has been reaching out to youth for 20 years: Project Safe Place. I am pleased that the Senate unanimously adopted S. Res. 70, a resolution introduced by Senator DIANE FEINSTEIN and myself to designate the week of March 16, 2003, as National Safe Place Week, in recognition of this partnership.

Over the past 20 years, Project Safe Place has acted as an outreach effort of the YMCA Center for Youth Alternatives—a short-term shelter for youth at risk. Nearly 64,000 young people have received help at over 12,200 designated Safe Place locations. Young people can easily recognize a safe place under a well-known symbol of safety for in-crisis youth. The success of the program, beginning in Louisville, KY, has prompted the implementation of this youth shelter outreach program in over 100 cities throughout the United States. Even though the program has already been established in 41 States across the country, there are still too many communities that don't know about this valuable youth resource.

Safe Place is a nationally acclaimed program that is easily implemented in communities across the country. This program unites the business sector, volunteers, and youth service agencies in a community to provide temporary safe havens for youth in crisis. I urge all my colleagues: if your State does not already have a Safe Place organization, please consider facilitating this worthwhile resource so that young people who are abused, neglected, or whose futures are jeopardized by physical or emotional trauma will have access to immediate help and safety in their community.

National Safe Place Week celebrates that outstanding program and honors the efforts of thousands of dedicated Safe Place volunteers who selflessly devote time and resources to protect our Nation's young people. I hope this commemoration helps to raise awareness of the number of troubled young people in our Nation and provides more youth and their families with the knowledge that help is often right in their own neighborhood.●

IN MEMORY OF DOROTHY SHANNON

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, a precious friend of mine and of progressive causes passed away earlier this week. Dorothy Shannon died early on the morning of Wednesday, March 19, 2003. She was 85.

Dorothy was one of the dearest friends anyone could have. She was a fiercely loyal Democrat who was a long-time, prominent fixture in the Wisconsin political scene when I first ran for public office over 20 years ago. As it was to so many candidates, Dorothy's support, and that of her husband Ted, was crucial to me in that first campaign, and they have been staunch supporters and advisors ever since.

Growing up in a union household in Toledo, OH, during the Great Depression, Dorothy's activism came naturally to her. She came out of the Roosevelt Democratic tradition, and it stayed with her. She would remind me to ''be a Democrat, like Franklin Delano Roosevelt.''

After her serving in the Navy during World War II, she earned her masters in early childhood education at Yale, where she met and married Ted. They moved to Madison in 1950 and had lived there ever since.

As Dorothy told national columnist John Nichols, it did not take her and Ted long to get involved in Democratic politics. She recalled how one day, when they were living in university housing, a young fellow named Bill Proxmire knocked on their door, and asked them to sign up to join the Wisconsin Democratic Party. Ted and Dorothy joined Bill Proxmire and a few other hardy souls, that included such future notables as Carl Thompson, Jim and Ruth Doyle, and Gaylord Nelson. They formed the core of what was to become the modern Wisconsin Democratic Party. Ted and Dorothy helped put Bill Proxmire and Gaylord Nelson in the U.S. Senate, as they helped me over three decades later.

Long before I ran for the U.S. Senate, though, Ted and Dorothy helped me win in my first race, for the Wisconsin State Senate, and they were at every event I ever had for the next 20 years. No matter what the weather, no matter what their health was, they were always there, always encouraging me.

Dorothy's commitment to progressive causes inspired many, and in the early 1980s, Democrats in Dane County made her their cochair, along with a friend of hers, Jim and Ruth Doyle's son. This past January, 20 years later, Dorothy attended the inauguration of the Doyles' son, Jim Doyle, as Governor of Wisconsin.

As was noted in her obituary, Dorothy chaired the Mondale-Ferraro Presidential campaign in Dane County, and she was credited with helping to organize the largest public rally in support of the Democratic ticket that year.

I was at that rally. I remember it well. Everyone who was there will remember it for the rest of their lives. It was a remarkable outpouring of energy, idealism, and hope for the future, and as such it was the perfect embodiment of Dorothy's qualities.

John Nichols reported that last August, at an antiwar rally and march in Madison, Dorothy was seated in the middle of the crowd. He noted that ''when the crowd prepared to parade off to Vilas Park, several folks said goodbye to the white-haired activist. 'Goodbye?' asked Shannon. 'Oh, no, I'm ready to march.'" As Nichols wrote, ''Dorothy Shannon was always ready to march. And rally. And campaign.''

No matter what the progressive cause or issue, Dorothy was there. She was steadfast in her commitment, and it extended well beyond party politics. She served on the Middleton Plan Commission, and was active in the League of Women Voters, the University League, and Friends of Pheasant Branch.

It is still hard for me to fully grasp Dorothy's passing. I have known Ted and Dorothy Shannon for half of my life. And that is how we all thought of them. Ted and Dorothy. We always said their two names as one word. If you wanted to mention just one of them, it took a little effort. It slowed up the conversation.

Now, Dorothy is gone, and conversations will be slowed all around Wisconsin.

I offer my deepest condolences to Ted and his family. I will always remember Dorothy, my dear friend, and cherished supporter.●

UVM CENTER MATT SHEFTIC CENTERS HIS PRIORITIES ON HIS FAMILY

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to a young Vermonter whose priorities are in the right place. Matt Sheftic is the center for the University of Vermont basketball team, the first Catamounts team to reach the NCAA tournament.

Before choosing to play basketball for Coach Tom Brennan, Matt was a standout for the Essex Junction Hornets, leading them to the 1998 Vermont State Championship. He was a first team all-state selection twice, and in 1999 was named Vermont's Mr. Basketball by the Burlington Free Press, and was Vermont's Gatorade Player of the Year. At UVM, he also serves his country as a member of the U.S. Army ROTC program.

Aside from his successes on the basketball court, in the classroom, and in the ROTC program, Matt is first and foremost dedicated to his family. When his sister Lauren battled an unexpected serious illness, Matt left the basketball team to help care for her. His priorities speak volumes about him as an outstanding young man, about the closeness of the Sheftic family, and about the wonderful job his parents have done raising him.

Matt Sheftic's story is told in an article by Joe Burris in the March 20 edition of the Boston Globe. Today, in honor of Matt Sheftic and his family, and in memory of Lauren Sheftic, I ask that the article ''For Vermont's Sheftic, family came first'' be printed into the RECORD.

The article follows:

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

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 20, 2003]

COMEBACK PLAYER; FOR VERMONT'S SHEFTIC, FAMILY CAME FIRST

(By Joe Burris)

BURLINGTON, VT.—Big men get nervous, too. Vermont center Matt Sheftic—a 22-year-old junior with Jack Sikma's shooting touch and Paul Bunyan's body—stood on the sideline moments before the Catamounts' America East final against Boston University, pondering how he would play in the biggest game of his career. Worry set in; Sheftic's melon-sized calves trembled.

But he knew it wasn't too late to dial heaven. As he often does during the national anthem, Sheftic called upon his sister Lauren—who died in 2001 at age 18 from a brain aneurysm after a courageous struggle that lasted nearly a year—and asked if she would loan him ''the strength she showed'' for the next two hours.

Sheftic missed his first shot, with 18:04 left. With 17:25 left, he turned the ball over. In fact, he didn't score until the 11:01 mark of the first half, on his second shot of the game. By then Vermont had raced out to a double-digit lead and Sheftic began to settle; legs that once trembled became sturdy enough to help carry his team.

With 8:33 left, he scored on an up-and-under post move. BU left him open at the top of the key with 5:43 left and he capitalized with a basket. He scored two more soft-stroke baskets to finish the first half with 10 points on 5-for-10 shooting.

Over the last 9:41, when BU rallied and subsequently forged ahead, Sheftic was the Catamounts' go-to guy, scoring 8 points. His poise helped keep Vermont close in a contest at a time when the partisan BU crowd was loudest.

''After I hit a couple shots, I really settled down and I started to get my confidence, and all of my nervousness in my legs just left,'' said Sheftic.

Vermont's David Hehn won it for the Catamounts with a fadeaway baseline basket with 5.6 seconds left, but Sheftic was named most outstanding player, scoring 23 points on 10-for-17 shooting and adding 6 boards to lead UVM to its first NCAA Tournament bid. The Catamounts are the 16th seed in the West and will meet top-seeded Arizona in Salt Lake City today.

''I was just thinking that she was with me at the [high school] state championship game, and just how awesome it would have been for her to be there for [last Saturday's] game,'' said Sheftic about Lauren, who was three years younger. ''But I knew she was watching anyway, and I really felt like she was there with me.''

For Sheftic, his involvement with Vermont basketball this season is a far cry from last season. He enters today's Arizona game as the team's second-leading scorer (10.8 points per game) and rebounder (6.4 rebounds) and is third with 54 assists. The Essex Junction, Vt., resident who chose to stay home rather than accept lures from big-name programs such as Providence and Southern California has led UVM in scoring in five games and in rebounding in six. Moreover, the 6-foot-8-inch, 260-pound widebody has been a team leader. He has helped to alleviate pressure from other players—including sophomore Taylor Coppenrath, the America East Player of the Year.

''We had a situation where when somebody said something about Taylor, that he wasn't that good, Sheftic became his big brother and his protector,'' said coach Tom Brennan. ''It was really a neat thing to watch.''

''I don't know if I've consciously taken it upon myself to be a leader,'' said Sheftic. ''I try to help out the team wherever I can.''

Last season, Sheftic didn't play at all.

Lauren took ill during winter 2000. Sheftic, the oldest of five children and the only male, endured the 2000–01 season, but during the fall of last year, weeks before the start of the season, he decided to take a redshirt to spend more time with his ailing sister.

''It was really an unbelievable time for me,'' said Sheftic. ''Thinking back on it now, it was like a dream, a nightmare. My sister ended up with a brain aneurysm and was really sick, and we had a really tough season the previous year, when we finished 12–17. I'm a business major, and my classes are really tough.

''Making a decision to leave the team, it just became too much for me. I just felt totally overloaded. I felt like I was drowning, like I couldn't get up to the surface to breathe with my school work, going back and forth to the hospital, trying to help my family out, trying to be there for my parents.

''You just didn't know what was going to happen. Phone calls from my mother would range from, 'Lauren's making great progress today,' to 'We took 10 steps back today, she's sick again.' It was an emotional roller coaster I was on, as well as the season, just trying to get up for games, when I felt like all my emotions were with my sister.''

Sheftic went to Brennan's office and relayed his desire to sit out the season. ''He was looking across at me and saying, 'T.B., I just can't do it,'" said Brennan. ''They were very, very close, and it really ripped his heart out. He told me, 'I really need to spend time with her. Basketball doesn't mean as much to me.'"

During his sister's battle, he battled his own sense of grief while helping his three youngest sisters cope. Then, he said, his sister suffered her biggest setback.

''She went in to get a routine shunt in her head, which is a procedure where they drain pressure in her head,'' Sheftic said. ''And when they went to drill into her head, they hit her brain with the drill, and it caused another brain aneurysm. So almost a year later, we were in the exact same spot.

''We had to make a decision. My mom had spent every single day of her recovery with Lauren. And one day [before the surgery], Lauren told her that if anything like this happened again she didn't want to do it again, because it was so painful for her and such a long road.'' Sheftic was at his sister's bedside when she died shortly after the surgery.

''I think my family has become so much more important to me,'' said Sheftic. ''Family is always important, but I don't know: You sometimes start to take your family for granted. They'd be at my basketball games and I loved the support, but I guess you don't realize how good it is to go home until you've gone through some kind of adversity with your family.''

Sheftic returned this season and picked up where he left off as a sophomore, when he averaged 10 points per game. In his first game back, he recorded a double-double: 20 points and 10 boards against Eastern Michigan. That was followed by a 22-point, six-assist contest against Albany, where he went 10 for 10 from the floor.

''Sheftic as a recruit was a star. When we got Sheftic, it was like, 'Wow, this is a tremendous recruit,'" said Brennan. ''And yet he has never said, 'I need the ball more. You're not running plays for me.' He has fit in really well since he's been back.''

Said Sheftic: ''Feeling as much pain as I did that year, I'm so much more thankful and appreciative of having good times and friends and family, and these games mean everything to me.''●

TAYLOR COPPENRATH, PRIDE OF WEST BARNET, VERMONT

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I salute a key member of the first University of Vermont men's basketball team ever to participate in the NCAA Tournament. Taylor Coppenrath is the Vermont version of Larry Bird, a smalltown boy who found huge success on the basketball court.

Taylor's basketball excellence has transformed his hometown, tiny West Barnet, VT, into perhaps, on a per capita basis, our State's most basketball-crazy town, and with good reason. During his career at St. Johnsbury Academy, Taylor did not make the varsity squad until his junior year, but when he finally arrived, his presence was felt. Taylor was named Vermont's 2000 Player of the Year by USA Today and Gatorade, and Mr. Basketball by the Burlington Free Press.

When Taylor joined Coach Tom Brennan's University of Vermont Catamounts, he had an immediate impact, and was named the 2002 America East Rookie of the Year, and earned All-America East, second team honors. During this season, he was named the Kevin Roberson America East Player of the Year, an honor appropriately named for one of UVM's all time greatest players. Taylor has attracted national attention, including a mention on ESPN.com's The Radar Screen. An opposing coach, Tim Welsh of Providence College said of Taylor, ''I'm glad we only have to play him once this year.''

Taylor Coppenrath's story is perhaps best told by award-winning writer Sam Hemingway of the Burlington Free Press in his column of Wednesday, March 19. I ask that the column ''Basketball Star Makes West Barnet Proud'' be printed into the RECORD.

The article follows:

BASKETBALL STAR COPPENRATH MAKES W. BARNET PROUD

[From the Burlington Free Press]

(By Sam Hemingway)

Shortly after 3 p.m. Thursday, the quiet hamlet of West Barnet will grow even quieter.

Sharon Roy will put her small, seldom-used black-and-white television on the counter at the West Barnet General Store and see whether she can capture WCAX-TV Channel 3 on the screen.

Meg Clayton has a better plan. Her good friends, the Coppenraths, have a satellite dish, and because they''ll be away in Utah, she intends to stop by and ''check on their cat'' for a couple of hours.

Over at the Barnet School, the afternoon in-service session for teachers should end in time for the staff to check out the cable television hook-up installed at the school this week.

The focus of all this television attention: hometown hero Taylor Coppenrath. The 6-foot, 8-inch forward will be on network television, leading the University of Vermont men's basketball team in its first-ever NCAA appearance, against the University of Arizona.

The funny thing is, no one in these parts really saw this day coming five years ago. The funnier thing is that, now that it's happening, no one's that surprised about it.

''He's such a sweetie,'' said Karen Stewart, the principal of Barnet School. ''He was always very mellow, very easy going.''

He still is. Neighbor Liddy Roberts recalled how, last year, Coppenrath and her son, Jimmy, were home on spring break and spent a whole day making an igloo for a youngster in town albeit one big enough for Coppenrath to stand up inside.

''And, of course, he and Jimmy had to go out and cook up some hot dogs inside the igloo afterward,'' she said.

Under that unassuming exterior lurks the heart of a lion, however.

As a kid, Coppenrath played so hard at recess, some teachers said, the school created the Taylor Coppenrath Rule: If you come in from recess soaked in sweat like he did, make sure you have a set of dry clothes to put on afterward.

Name a game, and Coppenrath was ready to play it. Games filled the idle hours for kids in the village, none more so than basketball. The sound of a bouncing basketball often echoed through town from dawn to dusk.

Sometimes the games involved Coppenrath and his two best friends, Clayton's son Chris and Roberts' son Jimmy. Other times, it drew in entire families, passers-by, anyone who wanted to play.

''We even had family tournaments,'' said George Coppenrath, Taylor's father. ''You had mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, all bumping and shoving each other out there. It was fun.''

Basketball became such a fixture in West Barnet that six years ago a paved, full-sized basketball court with two backboards and hoops was built smack dab in the middle of the village.

Still, the chances of a small-town kid from Vermont making a big splash in Division 1 college basketball are as remote as West Barnet itself, tucked into the hills 15 miles southwest of St. Johnsbury.

Coppenrath, who kept growing taller throughout high school, was a late-blooming star. He didn't make the varsity at St. Johnsbury Academy until his junior year, a year after his two West Barnet buddies had made the team.

Only as a senior did he finally receive the recognition he deserved: Vermont's Gatorade Player of the Year, The Burlington Free Press' Mr. Basketball and a full scholarship from UVM. This winter he led the Catamounts in scoring and was named the player of the year in the America East basketball conference.

How crazy is this town for basketball now? George Coppenrath has taken to making video tapes of UVM games and leaving them at the two stores in town for people to borrow and watch.

Tuesday, all of the West Barnet General Store's copies were out on loan.

RECOGNITION OF COACH JOHN McDONNELL AND THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS TRACK AND FIELD PROGRAM

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, on behalf of all Arkansans, I want to congratulate the University of Arkansas Razorback Track and Field program on their 17th NCAA Indoor Track and Field championship this past weekend at the Randal Tyson Track Center in Fayetteville, AR. This is the program's 37th overall NCAA crown under the direction of Head Coach John McDonnell. At the University of Arkansas, Coach McDonnell has led his teams to more national championships, triple crowns and conference titles than any other coach in history. His most extraordinary accomplishment is winning 29 consecutive conference cross country championships. He has coached 20 Olympians and over 140 athletes to All-American status. We celebrate Coach John McDonnell's success at the University of Arkansas and his continued dedication to the Razorback Track and Field and Cross Country programs.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE ADDITIONAL STEPS TAKEN WITH RESPECT TO THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WHICH WAS DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 12722 OF AUGUST 2, 1990 BY EXERCISING THE STATUTORY AUTHORITY TO CONFISCATE AND VEST CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAQ—PM 28

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(b) (IEEPA), and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1631, I hereby report that I have taken additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990, by exercising my statutory authority to confiscate and vest certain property of the Government of Iraq and its agencies, instrumentalities, or controlled entities.

Consistent with section 203(a)(1)(C) of IEEPA, 50 U.S.C. 1702(a)(1)(C), as added by section 106 of the USA PATRIOT ACT, Public Law 107–56, I have ordered that certain blocked funds held in the United States in accounts in the name of the Government of Iraq, the Central Bank of Iraq, Rafidain Bank, Rasheed Bank, or the State Organization for Marketing Oil are hereby confiscated and vested in the Department of the Treasury. I have made exceptions for any such funds that are subject to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations or the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, or that enjoy equivalent privileges and immunities under the laws of the United States, and are or have been used for diplomatic or consular purposes. In addition, such amounts that, as of the date of the order, are subject to post-judgment writs of execution or attachment in aid of execution of judgments pursuant to section 201 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (Public Law 107–297) are not being vested, provided that, upon satisfaction of the judgments on which such writs are based, any reminder of such expected amounts shall, without further action, be confiscated and vested.

I have delegated to the Secretary of the Treasury authority to undertake all other action of the President and all functions of the President set forth in section 203(a)(1)(C) of IEEPA with respect to any and all property of the Government of Iraq, including its agencies, instrumentalities, or controlled entities, and to take additional steps, including the promulgation of rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order.

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued, which is effective immediately.

I have exercised these authorities in furtherance of Executive Orders 12722 and 12724 with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to our national security and foreign policy posed by the policies and actions of the Government of Iraq. I intend that such vested property should be used to assist the Iraqi people and to assist in the reconstruction of Iraq, and have determined that such use would be in the interest of and for the benefit of the United States.

The power to vest assets of a foreign government with which the United States is engaged in armed hostilities is one that has been recognized for many decades. This power is being used here because it is clearly in the interests of the United States to have these funds available for use in rebuilding Iraq and launching that country on the path to speedy economic recovery. In addition, this authority is being invoked in a limited way, designed to minimize harm to third parties and to respect existing court orders as much as possible.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 20, 2003.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:54 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, was delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

H.R. 314. An act to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to exempt mortgage servicers from certain requirements of the Act with respect to federally related mortgage loans secured by a first lien, and for other purposes.

H.R. 417. An act to revoke a Public Land Order with respect to certain lands erroneously included in the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, California.

H.R. 519. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the San Gabriel River Watershed, and for other purposes.

H.R. 699. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a comprehensive study of the Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer, located in Idaho and Washington.

H.R. 975. An act to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1307. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for members of the uniformed services in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of a principal residence and to restore the tax exempt status of death gratuity payments to members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1308. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end certain abusive tax practices, to provide tax relief and simplification, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 314. An act to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to exempt mortgage servicers from certain requirements of the Act with respect to federally related mortgage loans secured by a first lien, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 417. An act to revoke a Public Land Order with respect to certain lands erroneously included in the Cibola National Wildlife Refuge, California; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 519. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the San Gabriel River Watershed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 699. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a comprehensive study of the Rathdrum Prairie/Spokane Valley Aquifer, located in Idaho and Washington; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 5. An act to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system.

H.R. 975. An act to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1047. An act to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1308. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end certain abusive tax practices, to provide tax relief and simplification, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–1670. A communication from the Director, Financial Management, General Accounting Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Fiscal Year 2002 Annual Report of the Comptrollers' General Retirement System; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1671. A communication from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Fiscal Year 2002 Annual Report for the National Archives and Records Administration; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1672. A communication from the Chairman, United States Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report entitled ''The Federal Selection Interview: Unrealized Potential'' received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs .

EC–1673. A communication from the Chairman, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the fourth edition of the Commission's Strategic Plan and the Performance Plan for fiscal year (FY) 2002, received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs .

EC–1674. A communication from the Chairman, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commercial Activity Report for the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG), received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1675. A communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department of State Performance and Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 2002, received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1676. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Fiscal Year 2002 Performance Report, received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs .

EC–1677. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to surplus real property transferred for public health purposes, received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1678. A communication from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Equal Opportunity Commission's Government Performance and Results Act Fiscal Year 2002 Annual Program Performance Report, received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1679. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report regarding the implementation of the Government in the Sunshine Act for Calendar Year 2002, received on March 12, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1680. A communication from the Secretary of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to a plan ensuring the elimination, to the maximum extent practicable, of unwarranted disparities in the pay and benefits of employees being transferred to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), received on March 12, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1681. A communication from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of General Accounting Office reports for the month of January 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1682. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Federal Maritime Commission's Annual Program Performance Report covering Fiscal Year 2002, received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1683. A communication from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting, the 2003 annual report for the Export-Import Bank's Sub-Saharan African Initiative, received on March 12, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1684. A communication from the Director, Regulations and Management, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification; Mica-Based (Pearlescent Pigments; Confirmation of Effective Date) (Doc . No. 00C–1321)'' received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1685. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''31 CFR Parts 560–575—Authorization of Certain Humanitarian Activities by Nongovernmental Organizations in Iraq and Iran'' received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1686. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Cuban Assets Control Regulations: Family and Educational Travel-Related Transactions, Remittance of Inherited Funds, Activities of Cuban Nationals in the United States, Support for the Cuban People, Humanitarian Projects, and Technical Amendments'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1687. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of the Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act (1515–AD19)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Finance .

EC–1688. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trade Benefits Under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (RIN 1515–AD20)'' received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1689. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Compliance with Inflation Adjustment Act (RIN 1515–AD25)'' received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1690. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Trade Benefits Under Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (RIN 1515–AD22)'' received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1691. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Entry of Certain Steel Products (RIN 1515–AD15)'' received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1692. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Deferral of Duty on Large Yachts Imported For Sale (RIN 1515–AC58)'' received on March 17, 2003; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1693. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to options for sustaining the space launch industrial base and developing an integrated, long-range, and adequately funded plan for assuring access to space by the United States, received on March 19, 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1694. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report relative to certification that Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan,

Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan are committed to the courses of action described in section 1203(d) of the cooperative Threat Reduction Act of 1993, received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1695. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri (FRL 7467–8)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1696. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri (FRL 7468–1)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1697. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri (FRL 7468–4)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1698. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Interim Final Determination to Stay and/or Defer Sanctions, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (FRL 7460–6)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1699. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the Arizona State Implementation Plans, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (FRL 7460–9)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1700. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, and San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District (FRL 7460–5)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1701. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District, Mendocino County Air Quality Management District, and Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (FRL 7456–6)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1702. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, Imperial County Air Pollution Control District (FRL 7460–8)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1703. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''State Implementation Plan Revisions to Particulate Matter, California—San Joaquin Valley (FRL 7470–6)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1704. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Withdrawal of Revisions to the Water Quality Planning and Management Regulation and Revisions to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Program in Support of Revisions to the Water Quality Planning and Management Regulations (FRL 7470–2)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1705. A communication from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the Sonoma County District Population Segment of the California Tiger Salamander (1018–AI61)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–1706. A communication from the Acting Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Imazethapyr; Pesticide Tolerance (FRL7294–1)'' received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1707. A communication from the Board of Director, National Railroad Retirement Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Management report on operations and financial condition; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–1708. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the calendar year 2002 annual report, received on March 18, 2003; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 671. An original bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 108–28).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 48. A resolution designating April 2003 as ''Financial Literacy for Youth Month''.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 52. A resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of the problem.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 58. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning June 1, 2003, as ''National Citizen Soldier Week''.

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 330. A bill to further the protection and recognition of veterans' memorials, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on the Judiciary.

James V. Selna, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Theresa Lazar Springmann, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Cormac J. Carney, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Philip P. Simon, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Gregory A. White, of Ohio, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Ohio for the term of four years.

Thomas Dyson Hurlburt, Jr., of Florida, to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Florida for the term of four years.

Christina Pharo, of Florida, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Florida for the term of four years.

Dennis Arthur Williamson, of Florida, to be United States Marshal for the Northern District of Florida for the term of four years.

Richard Zenos Winget, of Nevada, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada for the term of four years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. REID, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 670. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 95 Seventh Street in San Francisco, California, as the ''James R. Browning United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 671. An original bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. ENSIGN:

S. 672. A bill to require a 50 hour workweek for Federal prison inmates and to establish a grant program for mandatory drug testing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOND:

S. 673. A bill to amend part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants and loan guarantees for health centers to enable the centers to fund capital needs projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DODD, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 674. A bill to amend the National Maritime Heritage Act of 1994 to reaffirm and revise the designation of America's National Maritime Museum, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KYL):

S. 675. A bill to require the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to use dynamic economic modeling in addition to static economic modeling in the preparation of budgetary estimates of proposed changes in Federal revenue law; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Budget, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one Committee reports, the other Committee have thirty days to report or be discharged.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 676. A bill to establish a WTO Dispute Settlement Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. ALLARD):

S. 677. A bill to revise the boundary of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. INOUYE, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 678. A bill to amend chapter 10 of title 39, United States Code, to include postmasters and postmasters organizations in the process for the development and planning of certain policies, schedules, and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. CLINTON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BAYH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SMITH, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. REED, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DODD, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. PRYOR, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. REID):

S. 679. A bill to provide reliable officers, technology, education , community prosecutors, and training in our neighborhoods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance book donations and literacy; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TALENT, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 95. A resolution commending the President and the Armed Forces of the United States of America; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S. Res. 96. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate that the Federal investment in programs that provide health care services to uninsured and low-income individuals in medically underserved areas be increased in order to double access to health care over the next 5 years; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself and Mr. DEWINE):

S. Con. Res. 25. A concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring America's Jewish community on the occasion of its 350th anniversary, supporting the designation of an ''American Jewish History Month'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. BREAUX):

S. Con. Res. 26. A concurrent resolution condemning the punishment of execution by stoning as a gross violation of human rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

S. Con. Res. 27. A concurrent resolution urging the President to request the United States International Trade Commission to take certain actions with respect to the temporary safeguards on imports of certain steel products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 32

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 32, a bill to establish Institutes to conduct research on the prevention of, and restoration from, wildfires in forest and woodland ecosystems of the interior West.

S. 56

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services.

S. 138

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 138, a bill to temporarily increase the Federal medical assistance percentage for the medicaid program.

S. 140

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 140, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to extend loan forgiveness for certain loans to Head Start teachers.

S. 153

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish penalties for aggravated identity theft, and for other purposes.

S. 157

At the request of Mr. CORZINE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 157, a bill to help protect the public against the threat of chemical attacks.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and further purposes.

S. 251

At the request of Mr. LOTT, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 251, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent motor fuel excise taxes on railroads and inland waterway transportation which remain in the general fund of the Treasury.

S. 271

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 271, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an additional advance refunding of bonds originally issued to finance governmental facilities used for essential governmental functions.

S. 289

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 289, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve tax equity for military personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 303

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 303, a bill to prohibit human cloning and protect stem cell research.

S. 328

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 328, a bill to designate Catoctin Mountain Park in the State of Maryland as the ''Catoctin Mountain National Recreation Area'', and for other purposes.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 338, a bill to protect the flying public's safety and security by requiring that the air traffic control system remain a Government function.

S. 385

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 385, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate methyl tertiary butyl ether from the United States fuel supply, to increase production and use of renewable fuel, and to increase the Nation's energy independence, and for other purposes.

S. 451

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. 451, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase the minimum Survivor Benefit Plan basic annuity for surviving spouses age 62 and older, to provide for a one-year open season under that plan, and for other purposes.

S. 457

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 457, a bill to remove the limitation on the use of funds to require a farm to feed livestock with organically produced feed to be certified as an organic farm.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to extend the authority for the construction of a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr.

S. 480

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 480, a bill to provide competitive grants for training court reporters and closed captioners to meet requirements for realtime writers under the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

S. 501

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 501, a bill to provide a grant program for gifted and talented students, and for other purposes.

S. 504

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 504, a bill to establish academics for teachers and students of American history and civics and a national alliance of teachers of American history and civics, and for other purposes.

S. 518

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 518, a bill to increase the supply of pancreatic islet cells for research, to provide better coordination of Federal efforts and information on islet cell transplantation, and to collect the data necessary to move islet cell transplantation from an experimental procedure to a standard therapy.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to authorize appropriations for border and transportation security personnel and technology, and for other purposes.

S. 580

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 580, a bill to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the products of Russia.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) were added as cosponsors of S. 595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the required use of certain principal repayments on mortgage subsidy bond financings to redeem bonds, to modify the purchase price limitation under mortgage subsidy bond rules based on median family income, and for other purposes.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the investment of foreign earnings within the United States for productive business investments and job creation.

S. 604

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 604, a bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide grants to promote responsible fatherhood, and for other purposes.

S. 605

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 605, a bill to extend waivers under the temporary assistance to needy families program through the end of fiscal year 2008.

S. 647

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 647, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for Department of Defense funding of continuation of health benefits plan coverage for certain Reserves called or ordered to active duty and their dependents, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 4, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S.J. RES. 8

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 8, a joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to raising awareness and encouraging prevention of sexual assault in the United States and supporting the goals and ideals of National Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the sharp escalation of anti-Semitic violence within many participating States of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) is of profound concern and efforts should be undertaken to prevent future occurrences.

S. CON. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 14, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the education curriculum in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

S. CON. RES. 15

At the request of Mr. ALLEN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER), the Senator

from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 15, a concurrent resolution commemorating the 140th anniversary of the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation.

S. RES. 44

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 44, a resolution designating the week beginning February 2, 2003, as ''National School Counseling Week''.

S. RES. 48

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 48, a resolution designating April 2003 as ''Financial Literacy for Youth Month''.

AMENDMENT NO. 270

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 270 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

AMENDMENT NO. 275

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 275 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

AMENDMENT NO. 276

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 276 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

AMENDMENT NO. 278

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 278 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

AMENDMENT NO. 282

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 282 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

AMENDMENT NO. 283

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 283 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

AMENDMENT NO. 285

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 285 intended to be proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

AMENDMENT NO. 294

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, his name and the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 294 proposed to S. Con. Res. 23, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS—March 18, 2003

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 649. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in projects within the San Diego Creek Watershed, California, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to fund projects within the Irvine Basin.

This bill will authorize up to $19 million in funds in order to cover up to 25 percent of the costs of constructing three water projects in Southern California. Water is an issue of paramount importance in California, and these projects provide innovative examples of ways that we can improve our water quality and increase our water supply.

The first project, called the Natural Treatment System, will build a network of wetlands to filter surface water and urban runoff in the San Diego Creek Watershed and Upper Newport Bay. Based on the performance of a single constructed wetland in the area, we expect the Natural Treatment System to filter out 126,000 pounds of nitrogen and 21,000 pounds of phosphorus from the watershed each year and reduce levels of harmful bacteria such as fecal coliform by as much as 26 percent.

The second project, the Irvine Desalter, will clean brackish groundwater and provide drinking water for between 40,000 and 50,000 people. By allowing the Irvine Basin to access another water source, the desalter will reduce our dependence on imported water and take considerable pressure off of our other water resources.

The final project will construct a regional brine line to dispose of brine directly into the ocean. Like much of California, the Irvine Ranch Water District is a leader in water reclamation and recycling efforts. Buildup of too much salt in the system can hamper these reclamation efforts. The brine line will allow the District to continue its innovative efforts to ensure that water is used more than once while increasing use of brackish water resources.

These projects shows us how California and the West can improve our water situation. Projects like these show us the way forward. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS—March 19, 2003

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BOND, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FRIST, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HATCH, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr.

LOTT, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MILLER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. REID, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. THOMAS):

S. 659. A bill to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages resulting from the misuse of their products by others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act that I and my good friend from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, have introduced yesterday. This bill already enjoys strong bi-partisan support—Senator CRAIG and I are joined by over 50 other co-sponsors, both Democrat and Republican.

This bill will correct a significant injustice that threatens the viability of a lawful United States industry, the firearms industry. An increasing number of lawsuits are being filed against the firearms industry seeking damages for wrongs committed by third persons who misuse the industry's products. These lawsuits seek to impose liability on lawful businesses for the actions of people over whom the firearms industry has no control.

This is just outrageous. Businesses that comply with all applicable Federal and State laws, that produce a product fit for its intended lawful purpose—be it elk hunting, duck hunting, target shooting or for personal protection—should not be subject to frivolous lawsuits that have only one goal—to put them out of business. This an unacceptable burden on lawful interstate commerce.

That's why Senator CRAIG and I have introduced the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act. The bill is carefully tailored to bar actions against firearms manufacturers or dealers that are based solely on the criminal or unlawful misuse of firearms by third parties. The bill would not block legitimate actions against the firearms industry for cases involving defective firearms, breaches of contract, criminal behavior by a firearm manufacturer or seller, or the negligent entrustment of a firearm to an irresponsible person.

This is only fair and right. The U.S. firearms industry serves America's gun owners and sportsmen well, and provides good-paying jobs for many Americans. They shouldn't be penalized just for legally producing or selling a product that functions as designed and intended.

I would ask all of my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation. It is very important that we take up and pass this bill as soon as possible.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. REID, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 670. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 95 Seventh Street in San Francisco, California, as the ''James R. Browning United States Courthouse''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am reintroducing legislation today to name the courthouse at 95 Seventh Street in San Francisco, California, as the ''James R. Browning United States Courthouse.''

Judge Browning was appointed to the court by President Kennedy and has spent 40 years as a circuit judge on the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. For twelve of those years, he served as Chief Judge. As chief judge, Judge Browning reorganized and modernized the administration of the Ninth Circuit. Now, he is on Senior Status.

He is originally from Montana and graduated from Montana State University in 1938 and from Montana University Law School in 1941, achieving the highest scholastic record in his class and serving as editor-in-chief of the law review. Before being appointed to the Court, Judge Browning served in the U.S. Army and worked for Department of Justice and in private practice.

I can think of no more appropriate honor for Judge Browning than to place his name on the courthouse building where he has worked for 40 years.

By Mr. ENSIGN:

S. 672. A bill to require a 50 hour workweek for Federal prison inmates and to establish a grant program for mandatory drug testing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Mandatory Prisoner Work and Drug Testing Act of 2003. This legislation is the continuation of work I did while in the House of Representatives to rein in the undeserved privileges that are currently given to Federal prisoners.

Today's criminal justice system is failing, partly because of what happens, or more specifically, doesn't happen, once convicted criminals arrive in prison. What prisoners are doing is watching cable television, getting high on drugs, lifting weights, and learning to be better criminals. What they are not doing is working and paying back their victims. That's not justice.

The purpose of the Mandatory Prisoner Work and Drug Testing Act is to help establish a Federal prison system that provides discipline and rehabilitation for our Nation's prisoners and requires that they make restitution to their victims.

First, this legislation requires that all Federal prison inmates have a 50-hour work week. Job training, educational and life skills preparation study will also be mandated under this provision. Current federal law does not mandate a minimum work week for the 100,000 inmates in the Federal prison system. Sadly, the average workday for a prisoner in the United States is 6.8 hours. This is absolutely unacceptable. American taxpayers should not have to work full-time to provide rest and relaxation for our nation's prisoners.

Federal prisoners would be paid for the work they do, but their pay would be divided and dispersed in the following manner: 25 percent would offset the cost of prisoner incarceration, 25 percent would go to victim restitution, 25 percent would be made available to the inmate for necessary costs of incarceration, 10 percent would be placed in a non-interest bearing account to be paid to the inmate upon release, and the remaining 15 percent would go to states and local jurisdictions that operate correctional facilities which have similar programs.

Second, this legislation requires the Bureau of Prisons to establish a zero-tolerance policy for the use or possession of illegal contraband. A drug-free environment is essential to any hopes of rehabilitation for our federal prison inmates. Under these provisions, inmates would be subject to random searches and inspections for drugs not less than 12 times each year. Federal prisons would be required to offer residential drug treatment for all inmates. And finally, any employee hired to work in a federal prison would undergo a mandatory drug test, and all employees would be subject to random testing at least twice each year.

I understand that many State and local prisons would also be interested in starting programs to get a drug-free prison, and for that reason have included a new grant program. Any State or unit of local government may apply for grants if they meet the same drug-testing requirements that are mandated for federal prisons under this legislation.

Third, the Mandatory Prisoner Work and Drug Treatment Act includes a requirement that all inmates in the Federal prison system participate in a boot camp for not less than four weeks. This boot camp program would include strict discipline, physical training, and hard labor to deter crime and promote successful integration or reintegration of the offender into the prison community. Those prisoners that choose not to participate or are physically unable to participate are required to be confined to their cells for not less than 23 hours per day during the duration that they would otherwise be spending in this program and be allowed only those privileges that are granted under Federal law.

These boot camps work. In fact, the Federal Bureau of Prisons already supports two such programs, one for men and one for women. These programs place inmates in highly structured, spartan environments where they undergo physical training and labor-intensive work assignments, coupled

with education and vocational training, substance abuse treatment, and life skills programs. They focus on promoting positive changes in inmates' behavior, including responsible decision-making, self-direction and positive self-image. In fact, boot camps have worked so well that over 30 states now have them in place.

Finally, this legislation will further restrict inmates' activities and possessions. Under this legislation inmates would not be allowed to possess or smoke tobacco, view or read pornographic or sexually explicit material, or view cable television that is not educational in nature. Inmates would not be allowed to possess microwave ovens, hot plates, toaster ovens, televisions, or VCRs. They would not be allowed to listen to music that contains lyrics that are violent, vulgar, sexually explicit, glamorize gang membership or activities, demean women, or disrespect law enforcement. We have to remember that these individuals are in Federal prison to be punished for a crime they committed. There is no reason for inmates to be given the same, or better, privileges than law-abiding citizens have. No one can tell me that an inmate has to have cable television when many law-abiding, taxpaying families cannot afford such a perk.

We need to work to ensure that our nation's criminals understand the gravity of the crimes they committed. I understand that many of our nation's jails and prisons use activities like weight lifting as rewards for their inmates. My legislation does not restrict that kind of activity. This legislation simply states that it is no longer acceptable for our nation's inmates to leisurely go about their day instead of working to pay for the crimes they committed. It is time that our government send a clear message to the victims of these crimes that these criminals will pay, and that restitution, to the maximum extent possible, will be made.

Quite simply, we need to stop the revolving doors of our prison system. A study released in June, 2002, by the U.S. Department of Justice found that among nearly 300,000 prisoners released in 15 states in 1994, 67.5 percent were rearrested within three years. It is my hope that if Federal prisoners were required to work and given drug treatment, instead of perks like cable television and weight training time, these individuals would be deterred from committing another crime and returning to prison.

I hope that my colleagues will support this legislation and help me in getting it passed this year.

By Mr. BOND:

S. 673. A bill to amend part D of title III of the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants and loan guarantees for health centers to enable the centers to fund capital needs projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce an important piece of new legislation to help an essential part of our health care safety net—our Nation's health centers—serve the uninsured and medically-underserved.

The Building Better Health Centers Act will promote health centers' mission of providing care to anyone who needs it by getting rid of an artificial distinction existing in current law. Right now, federal grant dollars to health centers can be used for most things a health center needs to do—including salaries, supplies, and basic upkeep. But federal grants to health centers cannot be used for one of the most critical and expensive needs a health center, or any business or nonprofit organizations, will ever face—capital improvements.

Unless we correct this silly distinction, many of our health centers are destined to be shackled to slowly deteriorating facilities. Over time, this will sap their ability to provide care. If we are serious about maximizing health centers' ability to deal with our health care access needs, we must allow Federal grant dollars to be used to meet our health centers' capital needs.

I've been down here on the Senate floor many times to talk about health centers, but let me cover the basics once again. Health centers—which include community health centers, migrant health centers, homeless health centers, and public housing health centers—address the health care access problem by providing primary care service in thousands of rural and urban medically-underserved communities throughout the United States.

And as we all know, the health care access problem remains a serious issue in our country. Many health care experts believe that Americans' lack of access to basic health services is our single most pressing health care problem. Nearly 50 million Americans do not have access to a primary care provider, whether they are insured or not. In addition, over 41 million Americans lack health insurance and have difficulty accessing care due to the inability to pay.

Health centers help fill part of this void. More than 3,400 health center clinics nationwide provide basic health care services to more than 12 million Americans, almost 8 million minorities, nearly 850,000 farmworkers, and almost 750,000 homeless individuals each year. The care they provide has been repeatedly shown by studies to be high-quality and cost-effective. In fact, health centers are one of the best health care bargains around—the average yearly cost for a health center patient is just over one dollar per day.

I believe that one of the most effective ways to address our health care access problem is by dramatically expanding access to health centers. And I am pleased to report a strong consensus is developing to do exactly that. The Senate has voted in support of a proposal I have made with Sen. HOLLINGS to double access to health centers by doubling funding over a five-year period. In addition, President Bush has proposed that we double the number of people that health centers care in the years ahead.

But over the next few years, as we hopefully see additional resources flow to health centers, we will increasingly encounter problems that stem from an artificial distinction we see in current law. As I mentioned, Federal health center grants are currently allowed to be used for most purposes—including salaries for health professionals and administrators, medical supplies, basic upkeep of clinic facilities, even lease payments if the health center rents. But they simply cannot be used for capital improvements.

This means that unless health centers can find some other way to finance their capital needs—and I will talk in a moment about the significant barriers they face in doing this—major projects that could provide substantial benefit to patients will never happen.

It means that an urban community health center that has been slowly expanding staff and services over many years until it's bursting at the seams of its modest two-story building will have to continue to find ways to cope, even if that prevents additionally-needed expansion or even if upkeep costs on the old building begin to spiral out-of-control.

It means that a rural community health center in an area desperately in need of dental services may not be able to expand the facility and purchase dental chairs, X-ray machines and other major dental equipment needed for the desired expansion into dental services.

It means that even if Federal Government is willing to commit grant funds to open a new health center in one of the hundreds of underserved communities nationwide which lacks any health care professionals for miles around, the new center may never come to be due to lack of funding for a facility in which to house it.

This is more than theory—the evidence shows that many existing health centers operate in facilities that desperately need renovation or modernization. Approximately one of every three health centers reside in a building more than 30 years old, and one of every eight operate out of a facility more than half a century old.

Moreover, a recent survey of health centers in 12 states showed that more than two-thirds of health centers had a specifically-identified need to renovate, expand, or replace their current facility. The average cost of a needed capital project was $1.8 million, and the needs ranged from ''small'' projects of $400,000 to major $5 million efforts. The survey demonstrates that there may be as much as $1.2 billion in unmet capital needs in our nation's health centers.

And that is just for existing health centers. As I mentioned, hundreds of

medically-underserved areas lack—and could desperately use—the services of a health center. This further shows the need for new facilities—and more capital—as we expand access to new communities.

So what about possible sources of capital? There are plenty of ways—in theory—that health centers might be able to get money for capital improvements. Businesses—large and small—do it all the time. So do other nonprofit organizations like universities and hospitals. They use built-up equity. They take out loans. They float bonds. They raise money through private donations as part of a capital campaign.

But unfortunately, health centers just aren't quite like most other businesses or nonprofits, and many times these options are unrealistic as a way to provide the entire cost of a major project.

Health centers simply don't have loads of cash in the bank. The revenue these clinics are able to cobble together from federal grants, low-income patients, Medicaid, private donations, and other health insurers is typically all put back into to patient care.

Health centers already work hard to maximize the money they can raise through private donations and non-Federal grant sources. In fact, an average of 9 percent of health center revenue comes from these sources. Most of this private and public funding is used to meet operating expenses, and it is difficult to go back to the same sources to request further donations for capital needs. In fundraising, health centers also face a huge disadvantage compared to nonprofit organizations like universities and hospitals because health centers lack a natural middle- and upper-class donor base. And raising private funds is particularly hard in isolated rural areas that are often quite poor and which can have the most dire health care access problems.

Finally, health centers have difficulties obtaining private loans for capital needs for a variety of reasons. The high number of uninsured patients health centers treat and the poor reimbursement rates received from most Medicaid programs mean health centers rarely have significant operating margins. Without these margins, banks are leery about loans because they don't feel assured that a health center will have sufficient cash flow to successfully manage loan payments. Banks are made even more nervous by the high proportion of health center revenue that comes from sometimes-unreliable government sources—such as the health centers' grant funding and Medicine and Medicaid reimbursements.

So what should we do? This isn't exactly rocket science. We have a need—many health centers require significant help to build or maintain adequate facilities because they can't raise the money or obtain the loans themselves. And we have an existing law that prevents the federal government from using health center funding to do exactly that.

We simply need to get rid of the artificial distinction we have right now and allow our health center grant dollars to go to further the health center mission in the best way possible—and that is going to mean at times that we should support some new construction or major renovation projects. If a crumbling building is constantly in need of repair, is soaking up money, and is reducing the number of patients a health center can reach out to, the Federal Government should help with the major renovation or the new construction needed.

The Building Better Health Centers Act authorizes the Federal Government to make grants to health centers for facility construction, modernization, replacement, and major equipment purchases. If our goal is to help health centers provide high-quality care to as many uninsured and medically-underserved people as possible, we need to get rid of barriers to doing that, including capital barriers.

Behond just the possibility of grant funding, the bill goes further and permits the Federal Government to guarantee loans made by a bank or another private lender to a health center to construct, replace, modernize, or expand a health center facility. This loan guarantee is an additional tool that will help allay the fears of banks and other private lenders by limiting their exposure if a health center defaults on a loan. An additional advantage of loan guarantees is that you can stretch funds farther. When guaranteeing a $1 million loan, the Federal Government need only set aside a much smaller amount of appropriated money—perhaps only a twelfth to a tenth of the loan total—to insure against that loan's possible default. This multiplier factor means that for every dollar appropriated for this purpose, many dollars worth of loans can be guaranteed.

There is actually tremendous potential for these two new options—the facility grants and the facility loan guarantees—to work together. Sharing in up-front costs through grant funding, and helping further by guaranteeing a loan that covers the remainder of a project's cost may well be the best approach. This will balance the need to make sure specific projects get enough grant funding to make them realistic and the need to spread capital assistance among as many projects as possible.

Let my try to respond in advance to a few potential criticism of this legislation. First, to those who simply think on principle that the government should stay out of private-sector bricks and mortar projects, I would say we're already at least halfway pregnant. In just about every appropriations bill, we have dozens if not hundreds of specific projects earmarked for major building or renovation projects.

Some might worry that the potential large costs of construction projects could get out of hand and squeeze out funding actually used for patient care. But let me point out that we limit capital assistance to five percent of all health center funding. Based on this year's funding level, this would mean up to $75 million for facility grants and loan guarantees. Because the loan guarantee program would allow some of this money to be stretched, this level of support could easily mean help for more than $200 million in health center capital projects. But the main point is that capital projects are absolutely limited to five-percent of health center funding, which prevents any possible runaway spending.

Finally, we should ask ourselves whether or not Federal assistance is going to give a free pass to communities, which really should be expected to help out with public-minded projects like the construction or renovation of a health center. In my bill, local communities are expected to help. No more than 90 percent of the total costs of a major project can come from Federal sources—and this is the absolute upper limit. Much more likely are evenly-shared costs or situations in which federal support represents a minority of the capital investment. This bill does not give local areas a free ride.

The quick rationale for this bill is simple. Many health centers are hampered in their efforts to provide health care to the medically-underserved by inadequate facilities. It doesn't make sense to help these vital community clinics only with day-to-day expenses if their building is literally crumbling around them.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate and on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee to aggressively help our nation's health centers meet their dire capital needs by making this bill law.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. DODD, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 674. A bill to amend the National Maritime Heritage Act of 1994 to reaffirm and revise the designation of America's National Maritime Museum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be introducing America's National Maritime Museum Designation Act of 2003. This legislation would designate an additional 19 maritime museums as ''America's National Maritime Museums'' nationwide. Maritime Museums are dedicated to advancing maritime and nautical science by fostering the exchange of maritime information and experience and by promoting advances in nautical education.

The America's National Maritime Museum designation would include a

commitment on the part of each institution toward accomplishing a coordinated education initiative, resources management program, awareness campaign, and heritage grants program. Maritime museums in America are dedicated to illuminating humankind's experience with the sea and the events that shaped the course and progress of civilization.

Museum collections are composed of hundreds of thousands of maritime items, including ship models, scrimshaw, maritime paintings, decorative arts, intricately carved figureheads, working steam engines, and much more. Maritime museums offer a variety of learning experiences for children and adults through hands-on workshops and programs that focus on maritime history.

Maritime lecture series offer an opportunity to learn about the history and lore of the sea from some of the Nation's leading maritime experts. Visitors learn the broad concept of sea power—the historic and modern importance of the sea in matters commercial, military, economic, political, artistic, and social.

The legislation that I am proposing would help museums better interpret maritime and social history to the public using their extensive collections of artifacts, exhibits and expertise. These programs and facilities are used by schools, civic organizations, genealogists, maritime scholars, and the visiting public, thus, serving students of all ages.

I urge all members of the Senate to join me in support of The America's National Maritime Museum Designation Act of 2003.

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. KYL):

S. 675. A bill to require the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation to use dynamic economic modeling in addition to static economic modeling in the preparation of budgetary estimates of proposed changes in Federal revenue law; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs and the Committee on the Budget, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one Committee reports, the other Committee have thirty days to report or be discharged.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to instruct the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office to employ dynamic scoring models, alongside static scoring when estimating the fiscal effect of tax policy changes.

For too long, Congress has debated tax changes without considering how those changes might affect the economy.

The current method, static scoring, assumes tax cuts or tax hikes have no effect on how taxpayers work, save and invest their money. Not surprisingly, experience shows this assumption is completely off-base. The idea that tax relief and investment incentives strengthen our economy is not new to the 21st Century.

On April 15, 1986, President Reagan talked about the positive effect of tax relief on economic growth. He stated:

> Whatever you want to call it, supply side economics or incentive economics . . . it's launching the American economy into a new era of growth and opportunity . . . Our basic ingredients for a tax package have not changed: tax rate reductions, thresholds high enough so hard-working Americans aren't pushed relentlessly into higher brackets, some long-overdue tax relief for America's families, and investment incentives for business. . .

What President Reagan stated so eloquently in 1986 holds true today. Economic growth is more easily achieved in an atmosphere where more Americans are able to save and invest their money. Tax relief provides economic growth, and when we draft legislation, we should understand not just the cost of tax relief to the Federal budget, but also the benefits that tax relief provides to the economy and the long-term increase in revenues to the federal government that tax relief can provide.

The current static estimates that we use imply that tax policy changes have no effect on our economy, never produce higher or lower revenues and never cause resources to shift within our federal budget. This is simply incorrect. Tax policy changes can have a huge impact on our economy.

The belief that tax policy changes directly impact our economy is not just a Republican ideal.

In 1962, President John F. Kennedy remarked:

> It is increasingly clear that no matter what party is in power, so long as our national security needs keep rising, an economy hampered by restrictive tax rates will never produce enough jobs or enough profits.

Tax relief provides jobs and profits, no matter who is in the White House and no matter who holds the majority in Congress. It is time that Congress looks at the real world implications of our tax policy before we decide the overall cost and how much relief we can afford to give to American families.

The debate on dynamic versus static scoring may sound like an inside-the-Beltway squabble, but as I have said today, the decision on how to estimate revenues does have important real world implications.

For example, better revenue estimating methods would make it easier to implement tax rate reductions. This would put more money into the pockets of taxpayers, which would have a very real positive affect on our economy.

Another example, shifting to a more simple, fair tax code would be less difficult if revenue estimators were allowed to consider the positive impact of tax reform on economic performance. Clearly a simplified tax code would affect each and every tax paying American.

American families face the challenge of paying their tax burden; providing food, clothing and shelter for their children; and must work even harder to have money leftover so they can afford to pay their medical bills, enjoy a family vacation, save for education costs, or put money away for retirement.

We know that when government takes money away from working families, it stifles growth. We also know that when the government gives money back to the working families that earned it, we encourage growth.

I should clarify that this legislation does not negate the Congress' use of the currently used static scoring model. This bill simply directs OMB and the Joint Tax Committee to use both static and dynamic scoring.

This will create a system that will allow Congress a slide-by-slide analysis of both scoring methods. In a Washington Post editorial on January 31, it was suggested that dynamic scoring could be useful as a way to present tax or spending policies as an additional alternative scenario. The editorial states that it would do no harm to the traditional way that CBO goes about its job to set up a dual scoring method. This is not, as some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have suggested, ''fantasyland scoring.''

By using both static and dynamic scoring methods, Mr. President, through time we will all understand which approach is more realistic, and only then, I believe, can we then confidently do away with the antiquated, unrealistic static model we use today.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

S. 675

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that it is necessary to ensure that Congress is presented with reliable information from the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation as to the dynamic macroeconomic feedback effects to changes in Federal law and the probable behavioral responses of taxpayers, businesses, and other parties to such changes. Specifically, the Congress intends that, while not excluding any other estimating method, dynamic estimating techniques shall also be used in estimating the fiscal impact of proposals to change Federal laws, to the extent that data are available to permit estimates to be made in such a manner.

SEC. 2. ESTIMATES OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION.

In addition to any other estimates it may prepare of any proposed change in Federal revenue law, a fiscal estimate shall be prepared by the Joint Committee on Taxation of each such proposed change on the basis of assumptions that estimate the probable behavioral responses of personal and business taxpayers and other relevant entities to that proposed change and the dynamic macroeconomic feedback effects of that proposed change. The preceding sentence shall apply only to a proposed change that the Joint

Committee on Taxation determines, pursuant to a static fiscal estimate, has a fiscal impact in excess of $250,000,000 in any fiscal year.

SEC. 3. ESTIMATES OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.

In addition to any other estimates it may prepare of any proposed change in Federal revenue law, a fiscal estimate shall be prepared by the Congressional Budget Office of each such proposed change on the basis of assumptions that estimate the probable behavioral responses of personal and business taxpayers and other relevant entities to that proposed change and the dynamic macroeconomic feedback effects of that proposed change. The preceding sentence shall apply only to a proposed change that the Congressional Budget Office determines, pursuant to a static fiscal estimate, has a fiscal impact in excess of $250,000,000 in any fiscal year.

SEC. 4. DISCLOSURE OF ASSUMPTIONS.

Any report to Congress or the public made by the Joint Committee on Taxation or the Congressional Budget Office that contains an estimate made under this Act of the effect that any legislation will have on revenues shall be accompanied by—

(1) a written statement fully disclosing the economic, technical, and behavioral assumptions that were made in producing that estimate, and

(2) the static fiscal estimate made with respect to the same legislation and a written statement of the economic, technical, and behavioral assumptions that were made in producing that estimate.

SEC. 5. CONTRACTING AUTHORITY.

In performing the tasks specified in this Act, the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office may, subject to the availability of appropriations, enter into contracts with universities or other private or public organizations to perform such estimations or to develop protocols and models for making such estimates.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER):

S. 676. A bill to establish a WTO Dispute Settlement Review Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to offer, along with Senator CRAIG, much needed trade legislation. I also want to thank Senators BAYH and ROCKEFELLER for their support for this legislation.

The bill that we are introducing would create a Commission to review decisions of the World Trade Organization.

Why is this legislation necessary? Simply put—we must ensure that the United States is getting the benefit of the agreements we negotiated.

WTO panels have handed down several decisions recently that go well beyond the scope of their authority. These decisions have had a wide-ranging impact, undermining our ability to use antidumping and safeguard laws and calling major portions of the U.S. tax code into question.

Most recently, the WTO ruled that the so-called ''Byrd Amendment'' violates WTO rules. In fact, the Byrd Amendment simply takes duties collected on unfairly traded products out of the U.S. Treasury and redistributes them to companies and workers hurt by that unfair trade.

The Byrd Amendment adds no burden whatsoever on imports. But despite this, a WTO panel has inexplicably ruled that this law imposes an impermissible penalty for dumping.

I would note here that the Administration has proposed repealing the Byrd Amendment. I strongly oppose that. And so does an overwhelming majority of the Senate.

In fact, last month 70 Senators sent a letter to the President in support of this important law.

Another area that I have great concerns about involves the softwood lumber dispute. The WTO currently found that Canada subsidizes its lumber industry, and I applaud that decision.

But then the WTO undercut the benefits of that decision. They ruled that when determining a market price, Commerce must use the subsidy-distorted Canadian timber prices rather than the market-based U.S. prices. This practice is wholly inconsistent with previous WTO practice.

We need to start seriously examining why it is that we are losing these and other cases.

In my view, it is because WTO panels have ceased intepreting our trade agreements and have begun legislating. Instead of following the rules, they are flouting the rules. And they are substituting their own judgment in place of carefully negotiated principles.

In the process, they are eroding U.S. trade laws, taking away rights the U.S. bargained for, and imposing new obligations we never agreed to accept.

Just as troubling, they are doing so mostly under the radar of Congress and the American public.

The purpose of the legislation Senator CRAIG and I are proposing is to open the performance of WTO panels to public debate.

Under the legislation, the President, in consultation with Congress, would create a Commission by appointing 5 retired federal appellate judges to serve 5-year terms.

The Commission would review WTO decisions adverse to the United States to examine whether the panelists have exceeded their authority. The Commissioners would then report their findings to Congress.

Increasing the transparency of the WTO in this manner is entirely consistent with the Administration's stated objectives. It would also allow us to discuss openly and fairly whether the WTO is working as it should.

The legislation offers something for everyone. If the Commission finds that the WTO is applying the rules properly it will silence critics—and perhaps earn converts.

But if the WTO is in fact straying beyond the carefully negotiated boundaries of our trade agreements, Congress needs to have the oversight in place so that we can remedy the situation.

I understand and support the need for a global trading system. But we need to ensure that the WTO is respecting the limits of its authority and honestly applying the rules under which it operates.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in helping to pass this important legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 676

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''World Trade Organization Dispute Settlement Review Commission Act''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States joined the World Trade Organization (in this Act referred to as the ''WTO'') as an original member with the goal of creating an improved global trading system and providing expanded economic opportunities for United States firms and workers, while preserving United States sovereignty.

(2) The American people must receive assurances that United States sovereignty will be protected, and United States interests will be advanced, within the global trading system which the WTO will oversee.

(3) The WTO's dispute settlement rules are meant to enhance the likelihood that governments will observe their WTO obligations. These dispute settlement rules will help ensure that the United States will reap the full benefits of its participation in the WTO.

(4) United States support for the WTO depends on obtaining mutual trade benefits through the openness of foreign markets and the maintenance of effective United States and WTO remedies against unfair and otherwise harmful trade practices.

(5) Congress passed the Uruguay Round Agreements Act based on its understanding that effective trade remedies would not be eroded. These remedies are essential to continue the process of opening foreign markets to imports of goods and services and to prevent harm to American industry and agriculture.

(6) In particular, WTO dispute panels and the Appellate Body should—

(A) operate with fairness and in an impartial manner;

(B) not add to the obligations, or diminish the rights, of WTO members under the Uruguay Round Agreements; and

(C) observe the terms of reference and any applicable WTO standard of review.

(c) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to provide for the establishment of the WTO Dispute Settlement Review Commission to achieve the objectives described in subsection (b)(6).

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADVERSE FINDING.—The term ''adverse finding'' means—

(A) in a panel or Appellate Body proceeding initiated against the United States, a finding by the panel or the Appellate Body that, any law or regulation of, or application thereof by, the United States, or any State, is inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under a Uruguay Round Agreement (or nullifies or impairs benefits accruing to a WTO member under such an Agreement); or

(B) in a panel or Appellate Body proceeding in which the United States is a complaining party, any finding by the panel or the Appellate Body that a measure of the party complained against is not inconsistent with that

party's obligations under a Uruguay Round Agreement (or does not nullify or impair benefits accruing to the United States under such an Agreement).

(2) AFFIRMATIVE REPORT.—The term ''affirmative report'' means a report described in section 234(b)(2) which contains affirmative determinations made by the Commission under paragraph (3) of section 4(a).

(3) APPELLATE BODY.—The term ''Appellate Body'' means the Appellate Body established by the Dispute Settlement Body pursuant to Article 17.1 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(4) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT BODY.—The term ''Dispute Settlement Body'' means the Dispute Settlement Body established pursuant to the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(5) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT PANEL; PANEL.—The terms ''dispute settlement panel'' and ''panel'' mean a panel established pursuant to Article 6 of the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(6) DISPUTE SETTLEMENT UNDERSTANDING.—The term ''Dispute Settlement Understanding'' means the Understanding on Rules and Procedures governing the Settlement of Disputes referred to in section 101(d)(16) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

(7) TERMS OF REFERENCE.—The term ''terms of reference'' has the meaning given such term in the Dispute Settlement Understanding.

(8) TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—The term ''Trade Representative'' means the United States Trade Representative.

(9) URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENT.—The term ''Uruguay Round Agreement'' means any of the Agreements described in section 101(d) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

(10) WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION; WTO.—The terms ''World Trade Organization'' and ''WTO'' mean the organization established pursuant to the WTO Agreement.

(11) WTO AGREEMENT.—The term ''WTO Agreement'' means the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization entered into on April 15, 1994.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a commission to be known as the World Trade Organization Dispute Settlement Review Commission (in this Act referred to as the ''Commission'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 5 members, all of whom shall be retired judges of the Federal judicial circuits, and who shall be appointed by the President, after consultation with the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, the Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the Senate, the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

(2) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The appointments of the members of the Commission shall be made not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Members of the Commission first appointed shall each be appointed for a term of 5 years.

(2) SUBSEQUENT TERMS.—After the initial 5-year term, 3 members of the Commission shall be appointed for terms of 3 years and the remaining 2 members shall be appointed for terms of 2 years.

(3) VACANCIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Any vacancy on the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment and shall be subject to the same conditions as the original appointment.

(B) UNEXPIRED TERM.—An individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed for the unexpired term of the member replaced.

(d) MEETINGS.—

(1) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its first meeting.

(2) SUBSEQUENT MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet subsequently at the call of the chairperson.

(e) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(f) CHAIRPERSON AND VICE CHAIRPERSON.—The Commission shall select a chairperson and vice chairperson from among its members.

(g) AFFIRMATIVE DETERMINATIONS.—An affirmative vote by a majority of the members of the Commission shall be required for any affirmative determination by the Commission under section 4.

SEC. 4. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) REVIEW OF WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION DISPUTE SETTLEMENT REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall review—

(A) all reports of dispute settlement panels or the Apellate Body of the WTO in proceedings initiated by other parties to the WTO that are adverse to the United States and that are adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body; and

(B) upon request of the Trade Representative, the chairman or ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or the chairman or ranking member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, any other report of a dispute settlement panel, or the Appellate Body that is adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body.

(2) SCOPE OF REVIEW.—In the case of a report described in paragraph (1), the Commission shall conduct a complete review and determine whether the panel or Appellate Body, as the case may be—

(A) exceeded its authority or its terms of reference;

(B) added to the obligations, or diminished the rights of the United States under the Uruguay Round Agreement that is the subject of the report;

(C) acted arbitrarily or capriciously, engaged in misconduct, or demonstrably departed from the procedures specified for panels and Appellate Bodies in the applicable Uruguay Round Agreement; and

(D) deviated from the applicable standard of review, including in antidumping, countervailing duty, and other unfair trade remedy cases, the standard of review set forth in Article 17.6 of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, 1994.

(3) AFFIRMATIVE DETERMINATION.—If the Commission makes an affirmative determination with respect to the action of a panel or an Appellate Body under subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (2), the Commission shall determine whether the action of the panel or Appellate Body materially affected the outcome of the report of the panel or Appellate Body.

(b) DETERMINATION; REPORT.—

(1) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 120 days after the date that a report of a panel or Appellate Body described in subsection (a) is adopted by the Dispute Settlement Body, the Commission shall make a written determination with respect to matters described in subsection (a) (2) and (3).

(2) REPORTS.—The Commission shall report the determination described in paragraph (1) to the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

SEC. 5. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS.—The Commission may hold any hearings, sit and act at any time and place, take any testimony, and receive any evidence as the Commission considers advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act. The Commission shall provide reasonable notice of a hearing held pursuant to this subsection.

(b) INFORMATION FROM INTERESTED PARTIES AND FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) NOTICE OF PANEL OR APPELLATE BODY REPORT.—The Trade Representative shall advise the Commission not later than 5 days after the date the Dispute Settlement Body adopts the report of a panel or Appellate Body that is adverse to the United States and shall immediately publish notice of that advice in the Federal Register, along with notice of an opportunity for interested parties to submit comments to the Commission.

(2) SUBMISSIONS AND REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—Any interested party may submit comments to the Commission regarding the panel or Appellate Body report. The Commission may also secure directly from any Federal department or agency any information the Commission considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Upon request of the chairperson of the Commission, the head of that department or agency shall furnish the requested information to the Commission.

(3) ACCESS TO PANEL AND APPELLATE BODY DOCUMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Trade Representative shall make available to the Commission all submissions and relevant documents relating to the panel or Appellate Body report, including any information contained in submissions identified by the provider of the information as proprietary information or information treated as confidential by a foreign government.

(B) PUBLIC ACCESS.—Any document which the Trade Representative submits to the Commission shall be available to the public, except information which is identified as proprietary or confidential.

(4) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES; CONFIDENTIALITY.—

(A) ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE.—Any agency or department of the United States that is designated by the President shall provide administrative services, funds, facilities, staff, or other support services to the Commission to assist the Commission with the performance of the Commission's functions.

(B) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The Commission shall protect from disclosure any document or information submitted to it by a department or agency of the United States which the agency or department requests be kept confidential. The Commission shall not be considered to be an agency for purposes of section 552 of title 5, United States Code.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself and Mr. ALLARD):

S. 677. A bill to revise the boundary of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, today I introduce the ''Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Boundary Revision Act of 2003.'' I introduced a similar bill in the 107th Congress. I am confident that the 108th Congress will quickly pass this bill on to the President for his signature so

that we can continue to celebrate this special place.

My bill improves upon my earlier efforts designating the park.

The Black Canyon of the Gunnison Gorge is a national treasure to be enjoyed by all. The park's combination of geological wonders and diverse wildlife make it one of the most unique natural areas in North America.

The first person to survey the canyon, Abraham Lincoln Fellows, noted in 1901, ''our surroundings were of the wildest possible description. The roar of the water . . . was constantly in our ears, and the walls of the canyon, towering half mile in height above us, were seemingly vertical.'' Similarly, today, visitors can enjoy hiking the deep gorge to the Gunnison River raging below, or look overhead to marvel at eagles and peregrine falcons soaring in the sky.

This bill modifies the legislative boundary of the Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area allowing even greater access to the park's many recreational opportunities including boating, fishing, and hiking.

This important legislation would expand the National Park by 2,725 acres, for a total of 33,025 acres. The Conservation area will be increased by 5,700 acres, for a total of 63,425 acres. In total this bill adds approximately 8,400 acres to provide habitat for several listed, threatened, endangered and BLM sensitive species including, the Bald Eagle, the River Otter, Delta Lomation, and Clay-Loving Buckwheat.

Furthermore, I have added specific language to ensure that the Bureau of Reclamation retains its traditional jurisdiction over water and water delivery systems.

This legislation helps preserve a unique national resource and a source of national pride.

I urge quick passage of this important bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 677

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Boundary Revision Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. BLACK CANYON OF THE GUNNISON NATIONAL PARK BOUNDARY REVISION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 4(a) of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Act of 1999 (16 U.S.C. 410fff–2(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''There is hereby established'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) BOUNDARY REVISION.—The boundary of the Park is revised to include the addition of not more than 2,725 acres, as depicted on the map entitled 'Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge NCA Boundary Modifications' and dated January 21, 2003.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 4(b) of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Act of 1999 (16 U.S.C. 410fff–2(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Upon'' and inserting the following:

''(1) LAND TRANSFER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—On''; and

(2) by striking ''The Secretary shall'' and inserting the following:

''(B) ADDITIONAL LAND.—On the date of enactment of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Boundary Revision Act of 2003, the Secretary shall transfer the land under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management identified as 'Tract C' on the map described in subsection (a)(2) to the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service for inclusion in the Park.

''(2) AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall''.

SEC. 3. GRAZING PRIVILEGES AT BLACK CANYON OF THE GUNNISON NATIONAL PARK.

Section 4(e) of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Act of 1999 (16 U.S.C. 410fff–2(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) TRANSFER.—If land authorized for grazing under subparagraph (A) is exchanged for private land under this Act, the Secretary shall transfer any grazing privileges to the private land acquired in the exchange in accordance with this section.''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D);

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) with respect to the permit or lease issued to LeValley Ranch Ltd., a partnership, for the lifetime of the 2 limited partners as of October 21, 1999;

''(C) with respect to the permit or lease issued to Sanburg Herefords, L.L.P., a partnership, for the lifetime of the 2 general partners as of October 21, 1999; and''; and

(D) in subparagraph (D) (as redesignated by subparagraph (B))—

(i) by striking ''partnership, corporation, or'' in each place it appears and inserting ''corporation or''; and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C)''.

SEC. 4. ACQUISITION OF LAND.

(a) AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE LAND.—Section 5(a)(1) of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Act of 1999 (16 U.S.C. 410fff–3(a)(1)) is amended by inserting ''or the map described in section 4(a)(2)'' after ''the Map''.

(b) METHOD OF ACQUISITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Land or interest in land acquired under the amendments made by this Act shall be made in accordance with section 5(a)(2)(A) of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Act of 1999 (16 U.S.C. 410fff–3(a)(2)(A)).

(2) CONSENT.—No land or interest in land may be acquired without the consent of the landowner.

SEC. 5. GUNNISON GORGE NATIONAL CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARY REVISION.

Section 7(a) of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Act of 1999 (16 U.S.C. 410fff–5(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established'' and inserting the following:

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) BOUNDARY REVISION.—The boundary of the Conservation Area is revised to include the addition of not more than 7,100 acres, as depicted on the map entitled 'Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge NCA Boundary Modifications' and dated January 21, 2003.''.

SEC. 6. ACCESS TO WATER DELIVERY FACILITIES.

The Commissioner of Reclamation shall retain administrative jurisdiction over, and access to, land, facilities, and roads of the Bureau of Reclamation in the East Portal area and the Crystal Dam area, as depicted on the map identified in section 4(a)(2) of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park and Gunnison Gorge National Conservation Area Act of 1999 (as added by section 2(a)(2)) for the maintenance, repair, construction, replacement, and operation of any facilities relating to the delivery of water under the jurisdiction of the Bureau to users of the water (as of the date of enactment of this Act).

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. INOUYE, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 678. A bill to amend chapter 10 of title 39, United States Code, to include postmasters and postmasters organizations in the process for the development and planning of certain policies, schedules, and programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Postmasters Equity Act of 2003, and I am pleased to have Senators COLLINS, DASCHLE, JEFFORDS, INOUYE, MIKULSKI, and SARBANES join me as original cosponsors. Our bill modifies legislation I offered in the 107th Congress. That bill, S. 177, the Postmasters Fairness Act, enjoyed the bipartisan support of 49 members of the U.S. Senate. Its House companion bill, H.R. 250, had 291 cosponsors.

The measure I introduce today differs from its predecessor in that it provides postmasters the option of fact finding rather than binding arbitration if the postmasters management associations and the Postal Service are unable to reach agreement on specific issues. Fact finding would allow for an unbiased review of the issues in dispute and the issuance of non-binding recommendations. The measure would also define the term postmaster for the first time.

Extending the option of fact finding to postmasters will enable them to take a more active and constructive role in managing their individual post offices and discussing compensation issues with the Postal Service. The Postal Reorganization Act of 1970 created a consultative process for postmasters and other non-union postal

employees to negotiate pay and benefits. However, under the current system, postmasters have seen an erosion of their role in improving the quality of mail services to postal patrons and managing their local post offices. This has been particularly true for postmasters responsible for small and medium sized post offices where they serve as front line managers. These circumstances are among factors contributing to the decline in the number of postmasters since the reorganization of the Postal Service over three decades ago.

At the present time, postmasters lack recourse when consultation fails, and my bill extends to our Nation's postmasters what is currently enjoyed by postal supervisors. While postal supervisors have the same consultation process as postmasters, the supervisors also have fact finding, which provides them with greater ability to negotiate with USPS management.

The Postal Service estimates that each day seven million customers transact business at post offices. We expect timely delivery of the mail, six days a week, and the Postal Service does not disappoint us. Given the regularity of mail delivery and the number of Americans visiting post offices daily, it is no wonder that we have come to view our neighborhood post offices as cornerstones of our communities. In fact, many of our towns and cities have developed around a post office where the postmaster served as the town's only link to the federal government.

Our Nation's postmasters are on the front line to ensure that the mail gets delivered in a timely manner, and they help fuel the infrastructure that continues to boost the performance ratings of the Postal Service. Postmasters have enabled us to communicate with one another since the dawn of this great republic. I urge my colleagues to join me in showing their support for our Nation's postmasters by cosponsoring this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 678

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Postmaster Equity Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. POSTMASTERS AND POSTMASTERS ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1004 of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting '', postmaster,'' after ''supervisory'' both places it appears;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the first sentence, by inserting '', postmaster,'' after ''supervisory''; and

(B) in the second sentence—

(i) by striking ''or that a managerial organization (other than an organization representing supervisors)'' and insert ''that a postmaster organization represents a substantial percentage of postmasters (as defined under subsection (j)(3)), or that a managerial organization (other than an organization representing supervisors or postmasters)''; and

(ii) by striking ''relating to supervisory'' and inserting ''relating to supervisory, postmasters,'';

(3) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting '', and the Postal Service and the postmasters organization (or organizations),'' after ''supervisors' organization'';

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and the postmasters organization (or organizations)'' after ''the supervisors' organization'' both places it appears;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''organization'' and inserting ''organizations''; and

(iii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''organization'' and inserting ''organizations'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and the postmasters organization (or organizations)'' after ''supervisors' organization''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''organization'' and inserting ''organizations'';

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting ''and the postmasters organization (or organizations)'' after ''supervisors' organization''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''organization'' and inserting ''organizations''; and

(D) in paragraph (4), by inserting '', and the Postal Service and the postmasters organization (or organizations),'';

(5) in subsections (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and the postmasters organization (or organizations)'' after ''supervisors' organization'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', the postmasters organization (or organizations),'' after ''The Postal Service''; and

(C) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''and the postmasters organization (or organizations)'' after ''supervisors' organizations'';

(6) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) 'postmasters organization' means, with respect to a calendar year, any organization whose membership on June 30th of the preceding year included not less than 20 percent of all individuals employed as postmasters on that date; and

''(4) 'postmaster' means an individual who is the manager-in-charge, with or without the assistance of subordinate managers or supervisors, the operations of a post office.''; and

(7) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (j), and inserting after subsection (g) the following:

''(h)(1) If, notwithstanding the mutual efforts required by subsection (e) of this section, the postmasters organization (or organizations), believes that the decision of the Postal Service is not in accordance with the provisions of this title, the organization may, within 10 days following its receipt of such decision, request the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to convene a fact-finding panel (in this subsection referred to as the 'panel') concerning such matter.

''(2) Within 15 days after receiving a request under paragraph (1) of this subsection, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall provide a list of 7 individuals recognized as experts in supervisory and managerial pay policies. The postmasters organization (or organizations) and the Postal Service shall each designate 1 individual from the list to serve on the panel. If, within 10 days after the list is provided, either of the parties has not designated an individual from the list, the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service shall make the designation. The first 2 individuals designated from the list shall meet within 5 days and shall designate a third individual from the list. The third individual shall chair the panel. If the 2 individuals designated from the list are unable to designate a third individual within 5 days after their first meeting, the Director shall designate the third individual.

''(3)(A) The panel shall recommend standards for pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs affecting the members of the postmasters organization (or organizations) for the period covered by the collective bargaining agreement specified in subsection (e)(1) of this section. The standards shall be consistent with the policies of this title, including sections 1003(a) and 1004(a) of this title.

''(B) The panel shall, consistent with such standards, make appropriate recommendations concerning the differences between the parties on such policies, schedules, and programs.

''(4) The panel shall make its recommendation no more than 30 days after its appointment, unless the Postal Service and the postmasters organization (or organizations) agree to a longer period. The panel shall hear from the Postal Service and the postmasters organization (or organizations) in such a manner as it shall direct. The cost of the panel shall be borne equally by the Postal Service and the postmasters organization (or organizations), with the Service to be responsible for one-half the costs and the postmasters organization (or organizations) to be responsible for the remainder.

''(5) Not more than 15 days after the panel has made its recommendation, the Postal Service shall provide the postmasters organization (or organizations) its final decision on the matters covered by factfinding under this subsection. The Postal Service shall give full and fair consideration to the panel's recommendation and shall explain in writing any differences between its final decision and the panel's recommendation.

''(i) Not earlier than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection, and from time to time thereafter, the Postal Service or the postmasters organization (or organizations) may request, by written notice to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and to the other party, the creation of a panel to review the effectiveness of the procedures and the other provisions of this section and the provisions of section 1003 of this title. The panel shall be designated in accordance with the procedure established in subsection (h)(2) of this section. The panel shall make recommendations to Congress for changes in this title as it finds appropriate.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—

(1) SECTION HEADING.—The section heading for section 1004 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1004. Supervisory, postmaster, and other managerial organizations''.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 10 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1004 and inserting the following:

''1004. Supervisory, postmaster, and other managerial organizations.''.

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall take effect 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. CLINTON, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SARBANES, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BAYH, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. CONRAD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SMITH, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. REED, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DODD, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. PRYOR, Mrs. LINCOLN, and Mr. REID):

S 679. A bill to provide reliable officers, technology, education, community prosecutors, and training in our neighborhoods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to reauthorize the COPS program through 2009.

Since September 11, our local police have been asked to do more for their communities than ever before. Walk the beat. Be on guard against terrorists. Secure critical infrastructures. And gather intelligence on future terrorist acts when possible. Washington has a role in securing the homeland, but the burdens fall heaviest on our local communities.

There are more than 700,000 police officers and sheriffs in the country, compared with nearly 11,000 FBI agents. It is our local police chiefs and sheriffs who are called upon more and more to protect us against the new threats from abroad. We had a sobering reminder this week. As President Bush braced the Nation for war in Iraq, Homeland Security Director Tom Ridge ratcheted our alert level back up to orange and called all 50 governors to request that they provide an increased police presence at airports.

Our mayors and police chiefs are hurting. Local budgets are incredibly tight—some communities have been forced to lay officers off, or to consider freeing criminals before their sentences are up, to cut costs. Even before 9/11, it was clear that the crime drop of the nineties was coming to a close. Last winter, the FBI reported that crime jumped for the second straight year. The FBI has had to necessarily refocus its resources. Recently, the Washington Post reported that the FBI has plans to ''mobilize as many as 5,000 agents to guard against terrorist attacks'' during hostilities with Iraq. The FBI's criminal surveillance operations ''would be temporarily suspended.'' Local police will be called upon to pick up the slack once the FBI is forced to pull almost half of its agents out of traditional crime-fighting work.

The fight to secure our streets does not end with preventing terrorism. Crime is up again. The newest figures tell us the historic crime drop the nation experienced during the 1990s is over. Property crimes—offenses that tend to jump in a week economy—are rising particularly fast. The FBI recently reported a 4 percent hike in burglaries and motor vehicle thefts last year alone. Where fighting violent crime and bank robberies used to be among the FBI's highest priorities, the FBI is now focused on counterterrorism efforts. Increasingly, local police departments, statewide crimefighting task forces and drug-fighting projects are being told by the Bush administration that they are on their own when it comes to fighting crime.

What's worse, all of this is happening during a time of unprecedented economic hardship in our cities and States. States are facing dramatic budgetary shortfalls. A new report finds that budget gaps for State governments soared by nearly 50 percent in the past three months and state legislatures face a minimum $68.5 billion budget shortfall for the coming fiscal year. Mayors nationwide report that cities spent $2.6 billion through the end of last year on new security costs.

The response of the administration to these concerns has been disappointing. This year, for the second budget cycle in a row, the President proposes to eliminate the COPS hiring program. COPS is the only initiative in the entire Federal Government that targets its resources directly towards police. There is no middleman. There is very little red tape. Police chiefs report they have never worked with such a responsive, effective Federal program. And yet the administration wants to shut it down.

Since we created COPS as part of the 1994 Crime Bill, the program has awarded grants to hire and redeploy 117,000 police officers to the streets. 87,300 are on the beat. In the most recent year of hiring grants, 2002, 4,400 officers were hired or redeployed.

The President's budget gives several justifications for shutting down COPS. First, the administration claims the program doesn't work, that it hasn't cut crime. That is a curious assertion. Crime dropped for seven straight years after COPS resources began to be put to use in cities and towns. There was a 28 percent drop in crime from 1994 to 2000.

Two studies support the assertion that COPS grants help cut crime. One, released just this past November by the American Society of Criminology, found that COPS hiring grants have ''resulted in significant reductions in local crime rates.'' In 2000, the urban Institute concluded that COPS has had a ''broad national impact'' on the levels and styles of policing, and that it provided ''significant support for the adoption of community policing around the country.''

It's not just criminologists and think tanks who agree with me that COPS works. Leading law enforcement officials share the view. Last year, our friend and former colleague Attorney General Ashcroft called COPS a ''miraculous sort of success.'' He said, ''it's one of those things that Congress hopes will happen when it sets up a program.'' At a conference last July, the Attorney General endorsed the theory that COPS cuts crime. ''Since law enforcement agencies began partnering with citizens through community policing, we've seen significant drops in crime rates,'' he noted.

The administration offers a second reason for wanting to eliminate COPS: The disparity between ''officers hired'' and ''officers funded''. Because COPS has funded 117,000 cops, but only 87,000 are on the street, the President argues, the program is not accountable. That assertion overlooks the operations of the Office of community Policing Services. Few Federal programs operate with as much oversight and internal review as does COPS. The disparity that seems to so concern the Administration is simple to explain: It takes time to hire a new cop. Once COPS awards a hiring grant, it can take anywhere from six to eighteen months to find, hire, train and deploy the new officer. There is no accounting problem. It is good public policy for police departments to take the appropriate amount of time to find suitable candidates for new community policing positions, and this discrepancy between officers funded and officers hired is the result.

Post 9/11, COPS is about much more than fighting crime. It's about homeland security. The Attorney General again said it best last July when he noted that ''COPS provides resources that reflect our national priority of terrorism prevention.'' The new assistant director at the FBI in charge of coordinating with local law enforcement agreed: ''The FBI fully understands that our success in the fight against terrorism is directly related to the strength of our relationship with our State and local partners.'' These aren't my words. They're the words of the top cops.

COPS does not just hire new officers. It requires these officers to practice community policing. Community policing is a philosophy that gives more power to line officers. They get assigned to fixed geographic areas. This decision-making power and neighborhood familiarity can be invaluable in a crisis, when relationships with community residents and the ability to make quick decisions is critical. Community relationships that come from COPS can also help unearth intelligence about potential terrorist actions.

By taking cops out of their cars and having them walk the streets, police

officers get to know the residents of the neighborhood where they're assigned. This has proven extremely effective at building trust and partnership between local police and the residents they protect. Community residents consistently sing the praises of community policing. It pays dividends by creating a climate in which neighborhood residents partner with police, not only providing police with valuable information about criminal activity in their neighborhood, but restoring overall confidence in the criminal justice system.

We need to continue the COPS program. The Justice Department reports that for the past several grant-making cycles, demand for new police hiring grants has outstripped available funds by a factor of almost three to one. To meet this need, the legislation I introduce today authorizes $600 million per year over the next 6 years, enough to hire up to 50,000 more officers. We have made this portion of the program more flexible: up to half of these hiring dollars can be used to help police departments retain those community police officers currently on payroll. In another change from current law, a portion of these funds can be used for officer training and education.

We make a key change to the current COPS program in the bill I introduce today. In response to the needs of first responders across the country, the bill authorizes a new, permanent COPS Overtime Program. This initiative, funded at up to $150 million per year for 6 years, will help ease the homeland security burdens faced by police departments across the country by reimbursing local police departments for the homeland security overtime expenses they incur. I was pleased that the Appropriations Committee included a 1-year, $60 million version of this program in the recently-passed omnibus appropriations bill. The permanent COPS Overtime Program in this bill builds on that appropriations provision.

The legislation also provides funding for new technologies, so law enforcement can have access to the latest high-tech crime fighting equipment to keep pace with today's sophisticated criminals. Also included are funds to help local district attorneys hire more community prosecutors. These prosecutors will expand the community justice concept and engage the entire community in preventing and fighting crime. The statistics we have on community prosecutions are quite promising, and we should increase the funds available to local prosecutors, a piece of our criminal justice puzzle that has too often gone overlooked.

I would like to thank the men and women of law enforcement for their service and heroism during these difficult times. They are up to the challenge, but we should support them any way we can. The bill I introduced today gives local police the support they deserve. I look forward to working with my colleagues to continue the COPS program.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 680. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance book donations and literacy; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation designed to clarify and enhance the charitable contribution tax deduction for donations of excess book inventory for educational purposes. This proposal would simplify a complex area of the current law and eliminate significant roadblocks that now stand in the way of businesses with excess book inventory to donating those books to schools, libraries, and literacy programs, where they are much needed.

Unfortunately, our current tax law contains a major flaw when it comes to the donation of books that are excess inventory for publishers or booksellers. The tax benefits for donating such books to schools or libraries are often no greater than those of sending the books to the landfill. And, since it is generally cheaper and faster for a company to simply send the books to the dump, rather than go through the trouble and cost of finding donees, and of packing, storing, and shipping the books, it often ends up being more cost effective and easier for companies to truck the books to a landfill or recycling center.

While there are provisions in the current law where a larger deduction is available for the donation of excess books, many companies have found that the complexity and uncertainty of dealing with the requirements, regulations, and possible Internal Revenue Service challenges of the higher deduction serve as a real disincentive to making a contribution.

This is a sad situation, when one considers that many, if not most, of these books would be warmly welcomed by schools, libraries, and literacy programs.

The heart of the problem is that under the current law, the higher deduction requires that the donated books be used only for the care of the needy, the sick, or infants. This requirement makes it difficult for schools to qualify as donees and also frequently prohibits libraries and adult literacy programs from receiving such deductions. This is because these schools, libraries, and literacy programs often serve those who are not needy or are over the age of 18. Further complicating the issue, the valuation of donated book inventory has been the subject of ongoing disputes between taxpayers and the IRS. The tax code should not contain obstacles that provide disincentives to charitable donations of books that can enhance learning.

The bill I am introducing today addresses the obstacles of donating excess book inventory by providing a simple and clear rule whereby any donation of book inventory to a qualified school, library, or literacy program is eligible for the enhanced deduction. This means that booksellers and publishers would receive a higher tax benefit for donating the books rather than throwing them away and would thus be encouraged to go to the extra trouble and expense of seeking out qualified donees and making the contributions.

My home State of Utah, like the rest of the Nation, has a problem with illiteracy. According to the National Institute for Literacy, between 21 and 23 percent of the adult population of the United States, about 44 million people, are only at Level 1 literacy, meaning they can read a little but not well enough to fill out an application, read a food label, or read a simple story to a child. Another 25 to 28 percent of the adult population, or between 45 and 50 million people, are estimated to be at Level 2 literacy, meaning they can usually can perform more complex tasks such as comparing, contrasting, or integrating pieces of information but usually not higher level reading and problem-solving skills. Literacy experts tell us that adults with skills at Levels 1 and 2 lack a sufficient foundation of basic skills to function successfully in our society.

While this bill is not a cure-all for the tragedy of illiteracy, it will increase access to books, both for adults and for children. Our tax code should not encourage the destruction of perfectly good books while schools, libraries, and literacy programs go begging for them.

The Senate is already on record in unanimous support of this bill. During the floor debate on the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001, I offered this proposal as an amendment, which was accepted without opposition. Unfortunately, the provision was dropped in the conference with the House. Moreover, the Finance Committee has also approved this provision, having included it in S. 476, the CARE Act, which is currently pending on the Senate calendar.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates this provision would decrease revenues to the Treasury by $283 million over a ten-year period. This estimate helps demonstrate the extent of the value of the books that are currently being discarded that could be utilized to help America's adults and children.

I hope our colleagues will join us in supporting this bill. It is wrong for our tax code to encourage book publishers to send books to the landfill instead of to the library. Let's correct this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 680

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CHARITABLE DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF BOOK INVENTORIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 170(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to certain contributions of ordinary income and capital gain property) is amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D) and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

''(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF BOOK INVENTORY FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES.—

''(i) CONTRIBUTIONS OF BOOK INVENTORY.—In determining whether a qualified book contribution is a qualified contribution, subparagraph (A) shall be applied without regard to whether—

''(I) the donee is an organization described in the matter preceding clause (i) of subparagraph (A), and

''(II) the property is to be used by the donee solely for the care of the ill, the needy, or infants.

''(ii) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (B), the amount of the reduction determined under paragraph (1)(A) shall not exceed the amount by which the fair market value of the contributed property (as determined by the taxpayer using a bona fide published market price for such book) exceeds twice the basis of such property.

''(iii) QUALIFIED BOOK CONTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'qualified book contribution' means a charitable contribution of books, but only if the requirements of clauses (iv) and (v) are met.

''(iv) IDENTITY OF DONEE.—The requirement of this clause is met if the contribution is to an organization—

''(I) described in subclause (I) or (III) of paragraph (6)(B)(i), or

''(II) described in section 501(c)(3) and exempt from tax under section 501(a) (other than a private foundation, as defined in section 509(a), which is not an operating foundation, as defined in section 4942(j)(3)), which is organized primarily to make books available to the general public at no cost or to operate a literacy program.

''(v) CERTIFICATION BY DONEE.—The requirement of this clause is met if, in addition to the certifications required by subparagraph (A) (as modified by this subparagraph), the donee certifies in writing that—

''(I) the books are suitable, in terms of currency, content, and quantity, for use in the donee's educational programs, and

''(II) the donee will use the books in its educational programs.

''(vi) BONA FIDE PUBLISHED MARKET PRICE.—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term 'bona fide published market price' means, with respect to any book, a price—

''(I) determined using the same printing and edition,

''(II) determined in the usual market in which such a book has been customarily sold by the taxpayer, and

''(III) for which the taxpayer can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the taxpayer customarily sold such books in arm's length transactions within 7 years preceding the contribution of such a book.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 95—COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT AND THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. FRIST (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. BURNS, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mrs. DOLE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mr. GRAHAM of South Carolina, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KYL, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. LOTT, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. NELSON of Nebraska, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SMITH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TALENT, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. VOINOVICH, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 95

Whereas Saddam Hussein has failed to comply with United Nations Security Council Resolutions 678, 686, 687, 688, 707, 715, 949, 1051, 1060, 1115, 1134, 1137, 1154, 1194, 1205, 1284, and 1441;

Whereas the military action now underway against Iraq is lawful and fully authorized by the Congress in Sec. 3(a) of Public Law 107–243, which passed the Senate on October 10, 2002, by a vote of 77–23, and which passed the House of Representatives on that same date by a vote of 296–133;

Whereas more than 225,000 men and women of the United States Armed Forces are now involved in conflict against Iraq;

Whereas over 200,000 members of the Reserves and National Guard have been called to active duty for the conflict against Iraq and other purposes; and

Whereas the Senate and the American people have the greatest pride in the men and women of the United States Armed Forces, and the civilian personnel supporting them, and strongly support them in their efforts; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That the Senate—

(1) commends and supports the efforts and leadership of the President, as Commander in Chief, in the conflict against Iraq;

(2) commends, and expresses the gratitude of the Nation to all members of the United States Armed Forces (whether on active duty, in the National Guard, or in the Reserves) and the civilian employees who support their efforts, as well as the men and women of civilian national security agencies who are participating in the military operations in the Persian Gulf region, for their professional excellence, dedicated patriotism and exemplary bravery;

(3) commends and expresses the gratitude of the Nation to the family members of soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and civilians serving in operations against Iraq who have borne the burden of sacrifice and separation from their loves ones;

(4) expresses its deep condolences to the families of brave Americans who have lost their lives in this noble undertaking, over many years, against Iraq;

(5) joins all Americans in remembering those who lost their lives during Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm in 1991, those still missing from that conflict, including Captain Scott Speicher, USN, and the thousands of Americans who have lost their lives in terrorist attacks over the years, and in the Global War on Terrorism; and

(6) expresses sincere gratitude to British Prime Minister Tony Blair and his government for their courageous and steadfast support, as well as gratitude to other allied nations for their military support, logistical support, and other assistance in the campaign against Saddam Hussein's regime.

SENATE RESOLUTION 96—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL INVESTMENT IN PROGRAMS THAT PROVIDE HEALTH CARE SERVICES TO UNINSURED AND LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS IN MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED AREAS BE INCREASED IN ORDER TO DOUBLE ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE OVER THE NEXT 5 YEARS

Mr. BOND (for himself and Mr. HOLLINGS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. RES. 96

Whereas the uninsured population in the United States is approximately 43,000,000 and is estimated to reach over 53,000,000 people by 2007;

Whereas nearly 80 percent of the uninsured population are members of working families who cannot afford health insurance or cannot access employer-provided health insurance plans;

Whereas minority populations, rural residents, and single-parent families represent a disproportionate number of the uninsured population;

Whereas the problem of health care access for the uninsured population is compounded in many urban and rural communities by a lack of providers who are available to serve both insured and uninsured populations;

Whereas community, migrant, homeless, and public housing health centers have proven uniquely qualified to address the lack of adequate health care services for uninsured populations, serving more than 5,000,000 uninsured patients in 2002;

Whereas health centers care for nearly 14,000,000 patients, including nearly 9,000,000 minorities, nearly 850,000 farmworkers, and almost 750,000 homeless individuals each year;

Whereas health centers provide cost-effective comprehensive primary and preventive care to uninsured individuals for nearly $1.00 per day, or $425 annually, and help to reduce the inappropriate use of costly emergency rooms and inpatient hospital care;

Whereas current resources only allow health centers to serve 12 percent of the Nation's 43,000,000 uninsured individuals;

Whereas past investments to increase health center access have resulted in better health, an improved quality of life for all Americans, and a reduction in national health care expenditures;

Whereas Congress has already begun to increase access to health care services for uninsured and low-income people in advance of health care coverage proposals by expanding the availability of services at community, migrant, homeless, and public housing health centers; and

Whereas the President has proposed to double the number of people served by health centers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the ''Resolution to Expand Access to Community Health Centers (REACH) Initiative''.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that appropriations for consolidated health centers under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b) should be increased by 100 percent over 5 fiscal years, ending in 2006, in order to double the number of individuals who receive health care services at community, migrant, homeless, and public housing health centers.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce important legislation, the Resolution to Expand Access to Community Health Centers, or the REACH Initiative. This resolution will continue to expand access to health care for the medically underserved by doubling funding for our nation's community health centers. I am joined in this effort by my good friend from South Carolina, Sen. HOLLINGS.

The goal of the REACH Initiative is simple—to make sure more people have access to health care. During the last session of Congress we set out an ambitious plan to double the federal funding for community health centers by 2006. Congress responded by increasing the funding for the program and now we are calling on Congress to continue this effort and complete the doubling plan.

Health centers are already helping millions of Americans get health care. But they can still help millions more—pregnant women, children, and anyone else who desperately needs care. The REACH Initiative will allow another 10 million women, children, and others in need to receive care at health centers by 2006. And since we began this effort, we've already increased the number of health center patients by nearly 3 million, and increased federal funding by nearly 30 percent. We're on track, we just need to stay there; and that's just what this resolution will do—keep us on track to double this important program.

Simply put, we must achieve the goal of the REACH initiative—and we can and should make it happen.

Let me close with what this initiative means in human terms.

The REACH initiative will help make sure that a young woman who has just found out she is pregnant but does not have health insurance has a place to get prenatal care so she does not risk her health and the baby's health by waiting until late in the pregnancy.

The REACH initiative will help make sure that a 6-year-old boy who is living in a deep rural Missouri community, a community that otherwise would not have any health care providers at all, has a place to get regular checkups so he can stay healthy at home and in school.

The REACH initiative will help make sure a young couple without any place to go will be able to get their infant daughter immunized to protect her from a variety of dreaded disease.

These Americans, and millions like them, are the reasons why we must make the REACH Initiative a reality. I invite my colleagues to join me as a cosponsor of this resolution. If we work together, we can make a difference and deliver care to those who are in the greatest need.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 25—RECOGNIZING AND HONORING AMERICA'S JEWISH COMMUNITY ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 350TH ANNIVERSARY, SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF AN ''AMERICAN JEWISH HISTORY MONTH'', AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself and Mr. DEWINE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 25

Whereas in 1654, Jewish refugees from Brazil arrived on North American shores and formally established North America's first Jewish community in New Amsterdam, now New York City;

Whereas America welcomed Jews among the millions of immigrants that streamed through our Nation's history;

Whereas the waves of Jewish immigrants arriving in America helped shape our Nation;

Whereas the American Jewish community has been intimately involved in our Nation's civic, social, economic, and cultural life;

Whereas the American Jewish community has sought to actualize the broad principles of liberty and justice that are enshrined in the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the American Jewish community is an equal participant in the religious life of our Nation;

Whereas American Jews have fought valiantly for the United States in every one of our Nation's military struggles, from the American Revolution to Operation Enduring Freedom;

Whereas not less than 16 American Jews have received the Medal of Honor;

Whereas 2004 marks the 350th anniversary of the American Jewish community;

Whereas the Library of Congress, the National Archives and Records Administration, the American Jewish Historical Society, and the Jacob Rader Marcus Center of the American Jewish Archives have formed ''The Commission for Commemorating 350 Years of American Jewish History'' (referred to in this resolution as the ''Commission'') to mark this historic milestone;

Whereas the Commission will use the combined resources of its participants to promote the celebration of the Jewish experience in the United States throughout 2004; and

Whereas the Commission is designating September 2004 as ''American Jewish History Month'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes—

(A) the 350th anniversary of the American Jewish community; and

(B) ''The Commission for Commemorating 350 Years of American Jewish History'' and its efforts to plan, coordinate, and execute commemorative events celebrating 350 years of American Jewish history;

(2) supports the designation of an ''American Jewish History Month''; and

(3) urges all Americans to share in this commemoration so as to have a greater appreciation of the role the American Jewish community has had in helping to defend and further the liberties and freedom of all Americans.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 26—CONDEMNING THE PUNISHMENT OF EXECUTION BY STONING AS A GROSS VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. INOUYE, and Mr. BREAUX) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 26

Whereas execution by stoning is an exceptionally cruel form of punishment that violates internationally accepted standards of human rights, including those set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment;

Whereas women around the world continue to be targeted disproportionately for cruel, discriminatory, and inhuman punishments by governments that refuse to protect equally the rights of all their citizens;

Whereas the brutal sentence of execution by stoning is pronounced in many countries on women who have been accused of adultery, a charge that is brought even against victims of coerced prostitution or rape;

Whereas in some places execution by stoning has been invoked as punishment for ''blasphemy,'' thereby suppressing religious freedom and diversity and stifling political dissent;

Whereas, in July 2002, Amnesty International referred to execution by stoning as ''a method specifically designed to increase the victim's suffering'';

Whereas, in 2002, the European Union, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, the Government of Australia, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade of New Zealand, the President of Mexico, the Congress of Deputies of Spain, and other world leaders all condemned execution by stoning and called for clemency for individuals sentenced to stoning; and

Whereas, according to the Country Reports on Human Rights Practices of the Department of State, the sentence of execution by stoning continues to be imposed in several countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the practice of execution by stoning as a gross violation of human rights and appeals to the international community to end the practice;

(2) requests the President formally to communicate this resolution to governments that permit this cruel punishment and to urge the termination of execution by stoning; and

(3) requests the President to direct the Secretary of State to work with the international community to promote adherence to international standards of human rights and repeal laws that permit execution by stoning.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a Concurrent Resolution to condemn executions by stoning.

Death by stoning is an exceptionally cruel form of execution. It violates internationally accepted standards of human rights, including the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Convention Against Torture. Amnesty International has noted that stoning is ''a method specifically designed to increase the victim's suffering.'' Unfortunately, the laws of Iran, Pakistan, Malaysia, Nigeria, and several other countries permit this cruel and unusual punishment. It must be eliminated from every corner of the globe.

As those who work on women's issues have learned all too well, women around the world are subjected disproportionately to cruel, discriminatory, and inhuman punishments. Frequently their governments cannot or will not provide equal protection of the law to all their citizens—especially women and girls. In several countries, women can be sentenced to execution by stoning for ''adultery,'' even in cases of coerced prostitution or rape. In some places, stoning has been invoked as punishment for ''blasphemy,'' suppressing religious freedom and stifling political dissent.

The Concurrent Resolution which I have introduced would condemn execution by stoning, appeal for an end to the practice, and request the President to urge other nations' governments to terminate that cruel form of execution. If adopted by the Senate, this measure, together with Concurrent Resolution 26 just passed unanimously by the House, would put both houses of Congress on the record as firmly opposing stonings.

I urge my colleagues to join the eight original co-sponsors and me in supporting this humanitarian measure.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27—URGING THE PRESIDENT TO REQUEST THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION TO TAKE CERTAIN ACTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE TEMPORARY SAFEGUARDS ON IMPORTS OF CERTAIN STEEL PRODUCTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. BOND (for himself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. FITZGERALD) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. CON. RES. 27

Whereas, on March 5, 2002, the President, upon investigation and recommendation by the United States International Trade Commission, proclaimed temporary tariff increases and tariff-rate quotas on certain steel imports;

Whereas neither the President nor the United States International Trade Commission could have fully anticipated the positive or negative effects of the temporary safeguards proclaimed on March 5, 2002;

Whereas steel-consuming manufacturers and fabricators across the United States have reported that the safeguard tariffs and tariff-rate quotas have contributed to substantial price increases, disrupted the availability of input steel, and negatively impacted the ability of the manufacturers and fabricators to compete in the global marketplace;

Whereas ports of entry across the United States have experienced losses of revenue as a result of the tariff increases and the tariff-rate quotas;

Whereas both a strong domestic steel industry and a strong domestic manufacturing base are vital to our national defense and economic security; and

Whereas section 204 of the Trade Act of 1974 requires that the United States International Trade Commission ''shall monitor developments with respect to the domestic industry, including the progress and specific efforts made by workers and firms in the domestic industry to make a positive adjustment to import competition''; and

Whereas the United States International Trade Commission is required to submit a report on this monitoring to the President and Congress not later than September 20, 2003: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes that a strong domestic steel industry and a strong domestic manufacturing base are vital to national defense and economic security; and

(2) urges the President to request the United States International Trade Commission, in addition to fulfilling the monitoring and reporting requirements under section 204 of the Trade Act of 1974, to monitor and report on the impact that temporary tariff increases and tariff-rate quotas on certain steel imports have had on steel-consuming industries and ports of entry in the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 298. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 299. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. BOXER, and Ms. STABENOW) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra.

SA 300. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 301. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 302. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 303. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 304. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 305. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 306. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 307. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 308. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. CORZINE, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 309. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 310. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. REID, Mr. DODD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DORGAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 311. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. DODD, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 312. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 313. Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 314. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 315. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. CLINTON, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 316. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 317. Mr. CRAPO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 318. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REID, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. DAYTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 319. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 320. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 321. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 322. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 323. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 324. Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 325. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. DODD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 326. Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 327. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 328. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 329. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 330. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 331. Mr. CORZINE (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 332. Mr. CORZINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 333. Mr. HOLLINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 334. Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 335. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. CORZINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 336. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 337. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 338. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 339. Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. VOINOVICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra.

SA 340. Mr. KOHL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 341. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 342. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 343. Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 344. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 345. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 346. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 347. Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. SMITH, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 348. Mr. BAUCUS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 349. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 350. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 351. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 352. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 353. Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 354. Mr. DEWINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 355. Mr. DEWINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 356. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 357. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 358. Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. INHOFE , Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BYRD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LOTT, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. NELSON, of Nebraska) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 359. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 360. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 361. Mr. DASCHLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 362. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. BOND, and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 363. Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. CANTWELL , Mr. REID, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 364. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BYRD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 365. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 366. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 367. Mr. CORZINE (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 298. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $174,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $782,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $258,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $68,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $40,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $174,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $782,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $258,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $68,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $40,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $676,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $39,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $42,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $48,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $53,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $85,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $377,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $100,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $48,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $53,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $89,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $455,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $158,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $56,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $62,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $48,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $53,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $89,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $494,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $652,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $721,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $777,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $840,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $885,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $932,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $983,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,036,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $89,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $494,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $652,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $721,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $777,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $840,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $885,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $932,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $983,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,036,000,000.
On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $678,000,000.
On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by $87,000,000.
On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by $391,000,000.
On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $129,000,000.
On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by $17,000,000.
On page 26, line 12, increase the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $39,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $39,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $42,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $42,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $48,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $48,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $53,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $53,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $675,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $87,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $391,000,000.

SA 299. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BIDEN, Mrs. BOXER, and Ms. STABENOW) proposed an amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; as follows:

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by $3,643,000,000.
On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $8,681,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $13,500,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $14,996,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $15,892,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $16,602,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $16,769,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $16,853,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $16,993,000,000.
On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $17,268,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $17,314,000,000.
On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $3,643,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $8,681,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $13,500,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $14,996,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $15,892,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $16,602,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $16,769,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $16,853,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $16,993,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $17,268,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $17,314,000,000.
On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by $4,987,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $6,395,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $8,189,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $7,316,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $7,092,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $6,425,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $5,927,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $5,498,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $5,090,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $4,344,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $3,480,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $1,809,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $4,210,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $6,298,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $6,610,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $6,577,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $6,410,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $5,932,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $5,382,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $4,827,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $4,302,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $3,618,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $1,834,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $4,471,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $7,202,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $8,386,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $9,315,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $10,192,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $10,837,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $11,471,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $12,166,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $12,966,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $13,696,000,000.
On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $1,834,,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $6,306,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $13,508,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $21,894,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $31,209,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $41,401,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $52.238,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $63,708,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $75,874,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $88,840,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $102,536,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,834,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $6,306,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $13,508,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $21,894,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $31,209,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $41,401,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $52,238,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $63,708,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $75,874,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $88,840,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $102,536,000,000.
On page 21, line 19, increase the amount by $550,000,000.
On page 21, line 20, increase the amount by $139,000,000.
On page 21, line 23, increase the amount by $1,125,000,000.
On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $631,000,000.
On page 22, line 2, increase the amount by $1,550,000,000.
On page 22, line 3, increase the amount by $1,182,000,000.
On page 22, line 6, increase the amount by $1,550,000,000.
On page 22, line 7, increase the amount by $1,426,000,000.
On page 22, line 10, increase the amount by $1,550,000,000.
On page 22, line 11, increase the amount by $1,529,000,000.
On page 22, line 14, increase the amount by $1,550,000,000.
On page 22, line 15, increase the amount by $1,550,000,000.
On page 22, line 18, increase the amount by $1,550,000,000.
On page 22, line 9, increase the amount by $1,550,000,000.
On page 22, line 22, increase the amount by $1,550,000,000.
On page 22, line 23, increase the amount by $1,550,000,000.
On page 23, line 2, increase the amount by $1,600,000,000.
On page 23, line 3, increase the amount by $1,579,000,000.
On page 23, line 6, increase the amount by $1,650,000,000.
On page 23, line 7, increase the amount by $1,662,000,000.
On page 23, line 10, increase the amount by $1,575,000,000.
On page 23, line 11, increase the amount by $1,624,000,000.
On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by $3,500,000,000.
On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by $1,225,000,000.
On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by $3,262,000,000.
On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by $2,841,000,000.
On page 23, line 23, increase the amount by $4,712,000,000.
On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $3,790,000,000.
On page 24, line 2, increase the amount by $4,251,000,000.
On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $3,922,000,000.
On page 24, line 6, increase the amount by $4,490,000,000.
On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $4,017,000,000.
On page 24, line 10, increase the amount by $4,330,000,000.
On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by $4,347,000,000.
On page 24, line 14, increase the amount by $4,372,000,000.
On page 24, line 15, increase the amount by $4,411,000,000.
On page 24, line 18, increase the amount by $4,515,000,000.
On page 24, line 19, increase the amount by $4,435,000,000.
On page 24, line 22, increase the amount by $4,659,000,000.
On page 24, line 23, increase the amount by $4,457,000,000.
On page 25, line 2, increase the amount by $4,503,000,000.
On page 25, line 3, increase the amount by $4,530,000,000.
On page 25, line 6, increase the amount by $4,548,000,000.
On page 25, line 7, increase the amount by $4,578,000,000.
On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 27, line 8, increase the amount by $110,000,000.
On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by $800,000,000.
On page 27, line 12, increase the amount by $366,000,000.
On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 27, line 16, increase the amount by $589,000,000.
On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 27, line 20, increase the amount by $605,000,000.
On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 27, line 24, increase the amount by $515,000,000.
On page 28, line 2, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 28, line 6, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 28, line 7, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 28, line 10, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 28, line 11, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 28, line 14, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 28, line 15, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 28, line 18, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 28, line 19, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 28, line 22, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 28, line 23, increase the amount by $478,000,000.
On page 36, line 11, increase the amount by $450,000,000.
On page 36, line 12, increase the amount by $348,000,000.
On page 36, line 15, increase the amount by $1,339,000,000.
On page 36, line 16, increase the amount by $503,000,000.
On page 36, line 19, increase the amount by $1,880,000,000.
On page 36, line 20, increase the amount by $1,190,000,000.
On page 36, line 23, increase the amount by $1,902,000,000.
On page 36, line 24, increase the amount by $1,544,000,000.
On page 37, line 2, increase the amount by $1,921,000,000.
On page 37, line 3, increase the amount by $1,885,000,000.
On page 37, line 6, increase the amount by $1,936,000,000.
On page 37, line 7, increase the amount by $1,904,000,000.
On page 37, line 10, increase the amount by $1,957,000,000.
On page 37, line 11, increase the amount by $1,923,000,000.
On page 37, line 14, increase the amount by $1,978,000,000.
On page 37, line 15, increase the amount by $1,942,000,000.
On page 37, line 18, increase the amount by $2,001,000,000.
On page 37, line 19, increase the amount by $1,961,000,000.
On page 37, line 22, increase the amount by $2,024,000,000.
On page 37, line 23, increase the amount by $1,983,000,000.
On page 38, line 2, increase the amount by $1,996,000,000.
On page 38, line 3, increase the amount by $1,977,000,000.
On page 40, line 2, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 40, line 3, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $131,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $131,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $453,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $453,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $887,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $887,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,369,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,369,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,891,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,891,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $2,452,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $2,452,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $3,045,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $3,045,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $3,670,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $3,670,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $4,333,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $4,333,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $5,039,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $5,039,000,000.
On page 46, line 20, increase the amount by $5,000,000,000.
On page 46, line 21, increase the amount by $1,822,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $6,526,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $4,341,000,000.
On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by $8,642,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $6,750,000,000.

SA 300. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of Subtitle B of Title II, insert the following: ''Sec. . Reserve Fund for National Security.—In the Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase aggregates, functional totals, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution by up to $103.500 billion in Budget Authority and $88.036 billion in Outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2013 for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report providing additional resources for defense or homeland security.''
On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $88,036,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $4,303,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $11,094,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $17,704,000,000.
On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $24,209,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $30,726,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $4,303,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $11,094,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $17,704,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $24,209,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $30,726,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $6,500,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $14,500,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $21,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $27,500,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $34,000,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $4,303,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $11,094,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $17,704,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $24,209,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $30,726,000,000.
On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by $6,500,000,000.
On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by $4,303,000,000.
On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by $14,500,000,000.
On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by $11,094,000,000.
On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by $21,000,000,000.
On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by $17,704,000,000.
On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by $27,500,000,000.
On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by $24,209,000,000.
On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by $34,000,000,000.
On page 43, line 15, increase the amount by $30,726,000,000.

SA 301. Ms. LANDRIEU submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,040,000,000.
On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $375,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $175, 000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $,15,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $375,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $175,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $1,047,426,416.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $375,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $175,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 9, line 2, increase the amount by $1,047,426,416.
On page 9, line 3, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 9, line 7, increase the amount by $375,000,000.
On page 9, line 11, increase the amount by $175,000,000.
On page 9, line 15, increase the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 9, line 19, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 9, line 23, increase the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $1,047,426,416.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $400,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $375,000,000.

SA 302. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $96,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $224,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $280,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $96,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $224,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $200,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $280,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $399,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $19,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $107,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $89,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $121,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $25,000,000

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $49,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $117,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $111,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $159,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $49,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $166,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $277,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $436,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $459,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $484,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $510,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $537,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $566,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $597,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $49,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $166,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $277,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $436,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $459,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $484,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $510,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $537,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $566,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $597,000,000.

On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by $48,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $112,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $140,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $19,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $19,000,000.

On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $400,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $48,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $112,000,000.

SA 303. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $280,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $250,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $350,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $120,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $280,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $250,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $350,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $499,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $59,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $134,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $111,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $61,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $146,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $139,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $198,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $33,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $36,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $207,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $346,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $545,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $574,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $605,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $637,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $672,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $708,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $746,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $207,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $346,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $545,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $574,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $605,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $637,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $672,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $708,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $746,000,000.

On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by $500,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $140,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $125,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $175,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $60,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $140,000,000.

SA 304. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $240,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $560,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $240,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $998,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $46,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $58,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $62,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $62,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $118,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $267,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $222,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $304,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $58,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $62,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $69,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $122,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $293,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $278,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $396,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $58,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $62,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $69,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $122,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $415,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $693,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $1,089,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,148,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,210,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,275,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,344,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,416,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,493,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $122,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $415,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $693,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,089,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,148,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,210,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $1,275,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,344,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,416,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,493,000,000.
On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by $120,000,000.
On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $280,000,000.
On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $250,000,000.
On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $350,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $46,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $46,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $58,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $58,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $62,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $62,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $69,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $69,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $120,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $280,000,000.

SA 305. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by $4,900,000,000.
On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $4,900,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $2,800,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.
On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $4,900,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $4,900,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $2,800,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.
On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by $6,982,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $115,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $256,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $349,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $395,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $422,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $477,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $503,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $530,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $562,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $2,432,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $2,335,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $1,144,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $351,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $395,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $422,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $477,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $503,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $530,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $562,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $2,468,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $2,565,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $1,656,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $1,049,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $395,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $422,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $450,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $477,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $503,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $530,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $562,000,000.
On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $2,468,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $5,033,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $6,690,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $7,739,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $8,134,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $8,556,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $9,006,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $9,483,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $9,986,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $10,516,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $11,078,000,000.
On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $2,468,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $5,033,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $6,690,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $7,739,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $8,134,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $8,556,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $9,006,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $9,483,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $9,986,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $10,516,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $11,078,000,000.
On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by $7,000,000,000.
On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by $2,450,000,000.
On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by $2,450,000,000.
On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.
On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $700,000,000.
On page 40, line 2, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 40, line 3, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $115,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $115,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $256,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $256,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $349,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $349,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $395,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $395,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $422,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $422,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $477,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $477,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $503,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $503,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $530,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $530,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $562,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $562,000,000.
On page 46, line 20, increase the amount by $7,000,000,000.
On page 46, line 21, increase the amount by $2,450,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $2,450,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $1,400,000,000.

SA 306. Mrs. CLINTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $120,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $280,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $250,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $350,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $120,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $280,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $250,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $350,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $499,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $59,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $134,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $111,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $152,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $61,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $146,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $139,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $198,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $31,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $207,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $346,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $545,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $574,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $605,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $637,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $672,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $708,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $746,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $207,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $346,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $545,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $574,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $605,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $637,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $672,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $708,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $746,000,000.
On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by $60,000,000.
On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $140,000,000.
On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $125,000,000.
On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $175,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $60,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $140,000,000.

SA 307. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 63, strike line 7 and all that follows through page 64, line 2.

SA 308. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. LUGAR, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. CORZINE, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 62, line 5, insert before the close parentheses the following: ''and including a measure providing for coverage of pregnant women under the State Children's Health Insurance Program''.

SA 309. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 63, beginning on line 12, strike ''through'' and all that follows through ''rates'' on line 14.

SA 310. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KERRY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. REID, Mr. DODD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. DAYTON, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DORGAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $299,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $299,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $1,300,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $299,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 31, line 2, increase the amount by $1,300,000,000.
On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 31, line 7, increase the amount by $299,000,000.
On page 31, line 11, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,300,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $1,300,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $975,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $299,000,000.

SA 311. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. DODD, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $590,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $2,302,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $59,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $590,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $2,302,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $59,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $1,796,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $74,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $78,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $87,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $92,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $356,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $1,370,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $74,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $78,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $87,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $92,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $234,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $932,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $84,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $74,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $78,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $83,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $87,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $92,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $234,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,166,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $1,316,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,386,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,460,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,538,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,621,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,708,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $234,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,166,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,316,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,386,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,460,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $1,538,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,621,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,708,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 25, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by $360,000,000.
On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by $1,404,000,000.
On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.
On page 40, line 13, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $74,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $74,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $78,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $78,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $89,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $87,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $92,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $92,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $360,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $1,404,000,000.

SA 312. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $1,349,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $1,443,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $1,505,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $1,568,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $1,620,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $1,667,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $1,721,000,000.
On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $1,777,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $1,833,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $1,349,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $1,443,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $1,505,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $1,568,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $1,620,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $1,667,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $1,721,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $1,777,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $1,833,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $282,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $224,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $152,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $75,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $94,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $191,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $294,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $405,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $526,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $57,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $104,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $92,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $21,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $109,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $206,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $309,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $420,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $541,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $1,024,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $1,245,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $1,351,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $1,460,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $1,589,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $1,729,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $1,873,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $2,030,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $2,197,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $2,374,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,024,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,269,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $3,620,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $5,080,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $6,669,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $8,399,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $10,271,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $12,301,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $14,498,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $16,872,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,024,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $2,269,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $3,620,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $5,080,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $6,669,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $8,399,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $10,271,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $12,301,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $14,498,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $16,872,000,000.
On page 16, line 11, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 16, line 12, increase the amount by $75,000,000.
On page 16, line 15, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 16, line 16, increase the amount by $180,000,000.
On page 16, line 19, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 16, line 20, increase the amount by $240,000,000.
On page 16, line 23, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 16, line 24, increase the amount by $270,000,000.
On page 17, line 2, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 17, line 3, increase the amount by $285,000,000.
On page 17, line 6, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 17, line 7, increase the amount by $285,000,000.
On page 17, line 10, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 17, line 11, increase the amount by $285,000,000.
On page 17, line 14, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 17, line 15, increase the amount by $285,000,000.
On page 17, line 18, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 17, line 19, increase the amount by $285,000,000.
On page 17, line 22, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 17, line 23, increase the amount by $285,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $148,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $148,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $225,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $225,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $306,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $306,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $394,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $394,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $491,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $491,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $594,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $594,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $705,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $705,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $826,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $826,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $75,000,000.
On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by $300,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $180,000,000.

SA 313. Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 45, strike beginning with line 20 through page 46, line 2.

SA 314. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $1,694,400,000.
On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by $1,524,960,000.
On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by $67,776,000.
On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $50,832,000.
On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $33,888,000.
On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by $16,944,000.
On page 42, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,694,400,000.
On page 42, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,524,960,000.
On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $67,776,000.
On page 42, line 11, decrease the amount by $50,832,000.
On page 42, line 15, decrease the amount by $33,888,000.
On page 42, line 19, decrease the amount by $16,944,000.

SA 315. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. CLINTON, and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by $6,525,000,000.
On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $9,895,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $6,525,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $9,895,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $90,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $45,000,000.
On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by $6,525,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $9,773,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $12,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $16,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $21,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by $6,525,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $9,773,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $12,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $16,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $21,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $122,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $98,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $57,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $33,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $24,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $122,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $220,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $277,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $302,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $328,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $361,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $427,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $474,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $499,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $122,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $220,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $277,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $302,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $328,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $361,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $427,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $474,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $499,000,000.
On page 30, line 23, increase the amount by $6,525,000,000.
On page 30, line 24, increase the amount by $6,525,000,000.
On page 31, line 2, increase the amount by $9,775,000,000.
On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by $9,775,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $12,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $12,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $16,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $16,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $21,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $21,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.

SA 316. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,018,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $10,794,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $2,410,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $442,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,018,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $10,794,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $2,410,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $442,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $8,893,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $128,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $276,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $324,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $348,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $367,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $388,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $410,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $432,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $456,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $611,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $6,423,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $1,187,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $56,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $348,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $367,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $388,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $410,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $432,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $456,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $407,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $4,371,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $1,223,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $497,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $348,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $367,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $388,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $410,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $432,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $456,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $407,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $4,779,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $6,002,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $6,499,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $6,847,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $7,215,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $7,603,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $8,013,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $8,446,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $8,901,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $407,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $4,779,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $6,002,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $6,499,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $6,847,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $7,215,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $7,603,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $8,013,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $8,446,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $8,901,000,000.
On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $8,900,000,000.
On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by $618,000,000.
On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by $6,551,000,000.
On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $1,403,000,000.
On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $268,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $128,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $128,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $276,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $276,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $324,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $324,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $348,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $348,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $367,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $367,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $388,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $388,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $410,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $410,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $432,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $432,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $456,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $456,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $8,900,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $618,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $6,551,000,000.

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FULL FUNDING FOR THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT.

It the sense of the Senate that the budgetary totals in this resolution assume full

funding for the No Child Left Behind Act in 2004, including providing the $18,500,000,000 for title I that is authorized in the No Child Left Behind Act.

SA 317. Mr. CRAPO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 16, line 11, increase the amount by $3,009,000,000.

On page 16, line 12, increase the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 16, line 16, increase the amount by $451,000,000.

On page 16, line 20, increase the amount by $903,000,000.

On page 16, line 24, increase the amount by $903,000,000.

On page 17, line 3, increase the amount by $451,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, decrease the amount by $3,009,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, decrease the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $451,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, decrease the amount by $903,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, decrease the amount by $903,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, decrease the amount by $451,000,000.

SA 318. Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. REID, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. DAYTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $2,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $2,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $2,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $2,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $1,200,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $2,981,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $127,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $162,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $179,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $190,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $201,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $212,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $224,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $236,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $1,031,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $975,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $473,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $138,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $179,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $190,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $201,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $212,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $224,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $236,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $1,069,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $1,125,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $727,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $462,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $179,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $190,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $201,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $212,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $224,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $238,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,069,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,194,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $2,921,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $3,383,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $3,562,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $3,752,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,953,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $4,165,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $4,389,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $4,625,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,069,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $2,194,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $2,921,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $3,383,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $3,562,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $3,752,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $3,953,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $4,165,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $4,389,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $4,625,000,000.

On page 36, line 15, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.

On page 36, line 16, increase the amount by $1,050,000,000.

On page 36, line 20, increase the amount by $1,050,000,000.

On page 36, line 24, increase the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 37, line 3, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $19,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $19,000,000.

On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $127,000,000.

On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $127,000,000.

On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $162,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $162,000,000.

On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $179,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $179,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $190,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $190,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $201,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $201,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $212,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $212,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $224,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $224,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $236,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $236,000,000.

On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $6,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $1,050,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $1,050,000,000.

On page 79, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 308. PROVIDING GRANTS TO SUPPORT FIRST RESPONDERS IN THEIR EFFORTS TO PROTECT HOMELAND SECURITY AND PREVENT AND RESPOND TO ACTS OF TERRORISM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, our Nation has asked State and local first responders (firefighters, law enforcement officers, and emergency personnel) to defend Americans as never before on the front lines in the war against terrorism:

(2) on March 17, 2003, the Department of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Homeland Security Council, raised the national threat level from an ''Elevated'' to ''High'' risk of terrorist attack (Level Orange) because the intelligence community believes that terrorists will attempt multiple attacks against United States and Coalition targets worldwide in the event of a military campaign against Saddam Hussein led by the United States;

(3) Level Orange indicates a high probability of a terrorist attack and requires additional precautions by first responders at public events;

(4) this is the third time since the Federal Homeland Security Advisory System was created on March 12, 2002, that State and local first responders have been kept on Orange Alert, including—

(A) September 10 to September 24, 2002;

(B) February 7 to February 27, 2003;

(5) notwithstanding the periods listed under paragraph (4), the Nation has continuously been at Yellow Alert (an ''elevated'' threat level declared when there is a significant risk of terrorist attacks), which has required increased surveillance of critical locations for State and local first responders;

(6) the National Governors' Association estimates that States incurred about $7,000,000,000 in homeland security costs in the past year for State and local first responders; and

(7) as a result of the elevated and high national threat alerts and other Federal homeland security requirements, State and local governments have been subject to unfunded Federal mandates.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the funding levels in this resolution assume a total of at least $6,500,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 for the Office of Domestic Preparedness through the Department of Homeland Security to provide direct funds to support first responders nationwide in their efforts to protect homeland security and to prevent and respond to acts of terrorism.

SA 319. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $153,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $268,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $321,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $385,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $460,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $551,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $658,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $785,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $936,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $153,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $268,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $321,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $385,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $460,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $551,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $658,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $785,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $936,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $272,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $269,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $269,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $267,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $262,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $253,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $240,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $220,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $193,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $156,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $187,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $255,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $267,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $262,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $253,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $240,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $220,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $193,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $156,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $119,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, decrease the amount by $54,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $123,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $207,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $311,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $438,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $592,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $780,000,000.

On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $157,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $124,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $137,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $191,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $520,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $832,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,270,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,862,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,642,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $157,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $124,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $137,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $191,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $520,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $832,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,270,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,862,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $2,642,000,000.

On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 25, line 20, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by $193,000,000.

On page 25, line 24, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $261,000,000.

On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 11, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 12, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 16, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 19, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 20, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $55,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $55,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $82,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $82,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $119,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $119,000,000.

On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $193,000,000.

SA 320. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 end for fiscal year 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $1,349,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $1,443,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $1,505,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $1,568,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $1,620,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $1,667,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $1,721,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $1,777,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $1,833,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $1,349,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $1,443,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $1,505,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $1,568,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $1,620,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $1,667,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $1,721,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $1,777,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $1,833,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $282,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $224,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $152,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $94,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $191,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $294,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $405,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $526,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $57,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $104,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $92,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $45,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by 21,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $109,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $206,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $309,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $420,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $541,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $1,024,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $1,245,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $1,351,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $1,460,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $1,589,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $1,729,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $1,873,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $2,030,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $2,197,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $2,374,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,024,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,269,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $3,620,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $5,080,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $6,669,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $8,399,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $10,271,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $12,301,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $14,498,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $16,872,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,024,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $2,269,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $3,620,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $5,080,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $6,669,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $8,399,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $10,271,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $12,301,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $14,498,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $16,872,000,000.

On page 16, line 11, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 16, line 12, increase the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 16, line 15, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 16, line 16, increase the amount by $180,000,000.

On page 16, line 19, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 16, line 20, increase the amount by $240,000,000.

On page 16, line 23, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 16, line 24, increase the amount by $270,000,000.

On page 17, line 2, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 17, line 3, increase the amount by $285,000,000.

On page 17, line 6, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 17, line 7, increase the amount by $285,000,000.

On page 17, line 10, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 17, line 11, increase the amount by $285,000,000.

On page 17, line 14, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 17, line 15, increase the amount by $285,000,000.

On page 17, line 18, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 17, line 19, increase the amount by $285,000,000.

On page 17, line 22, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 17, line 23, increase the amount by $285,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $18,000,000.

On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $148,000,000.

On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $148,000,000.

On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $225,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $225,000,000.

On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $306,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $306,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $394,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $394,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $491,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $491,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $594,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $594,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $705,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $705,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $826,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $826,000,000.

On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $180,000,000.

On page 79, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SUPERFUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the most contaminated, toxic sites in the country are cleaned up through the Superfund Program;

(2) the President's budget assumes sharp reductions in the number of Superfund sites to be cleaned up during fiscal year 2004; and

(3) this resolution provides a significant increase in funding for the Superfund Program for each of the fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that funding under this resolution assumes that the Federal Government will keep its commitment to the American people to clean up contaminated sites by sufficiently funding the Superfund program to enable a significant increase in the number of toxic waste sites cleaned up during each of the fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

SA 321. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 21, line 23, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 79, line 22, insert the following:

SEC. . INCREASED FUNDING FOR ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE.

The budgetary levels in this resolution assume that an additional $50,000,000 will be provided for the Essential Air Service of the Department of Transportation to be derived by reducing any revenue reductions assumed in this resolution.

SA 322. Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself and Mr. HARKIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 57, lines 3 through 5, strike ''as adjusted for any changes in revenues or direct spending assumed by such resolution'' and insert ''based on laws enacted on the date of adoption of that resolution as adjusted for up to $350 billion in revenues or direct spending assumed by section 104 of this resolution''.

SA 323. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $17,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $17,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $17,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $17,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $33,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

On page 20, line 2, increase the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 20, line 3, increase the amount by $17,000,000.

On page 20, line 7, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

SA 324. Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. PRYOR) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $20,279,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $343,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $919,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $1,604,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $1,968,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $2,151,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $2,311,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $2,475,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $2,648,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $2,832,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $3,028,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $343,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $919,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $1,604,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $1,968,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $2,151,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $2,311,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $2,475,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $2,648,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $2,832,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $3,028,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $426,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $1,055,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $1,768,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $2,059,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $2,205,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $2,360,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $2,525,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $2,701,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $2,888,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $3,088,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $343,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $919,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $1,604,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $1,968,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $2,151,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $2,311,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $2,475,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $2,648,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $2,832,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $3,028,000,000.
On page 9, line 2, increase the amount by $426,000,000.
On page 9, line 3, increase the amount by $343,000,000.
On page 9, line 6, increase the amount by $1,055,000,000.
On page 9, line 7, increase the amount by $919,000,000.
On page 9, line 10, increase the amount by $1,768,000,000.
On page 9, line 11, increase the amount by $1,604,000,000.
On page 9, line 14, increase the amount by $2,059,000,000.
On page 9, line 15, increase the amount by $1,968,000,000.
On page 9, line 18, increase the amount by $2,205,000,000.
On page 9, line 19, increase the amount by $2,151,000,000.
On page 9, line 22, increase the amount by $2,360,000,000.
On page 9, line 23, increase the amount by $2,311,000,000.
On page 10, line 2, increase the amount by $2,525,000,000.
On page 10, line 3, increase the amount by $2,475,000,000.
On page 10, line 6, increase the amount by $2,701,000,000.
On page 10, line 7, increase the amount by $.2,648,000,000
On page 10, line 10, increase the amount by $2,888,000,000.
On page 10, line 11, increase the amount by $2,832,000,000.
On page 10, line 14, increase the amount by $3,088,000,000.
On page 10, line 15, increase the amount by $3,028,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $426,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $343,000,000.
On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by $1,055,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $919,000,000.

SA 325. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. DODD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, line 19, decrease the amount by $5,668,000.
On page 12, line 20, decrease the amount by $2,551,000.
On page 12, line 24, decrease the amount by $2,267,000.
On page 13, line 3, decrease the amount by $680,000.
On page 13, line 7, decrease the amount by $113,000.
On page 13, line 11, decrease the amount by $57,000.
On page 18, line 5, increase the amount by $5,668,000.
On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by $2,551,000.
On page 18, line 11, increase the amount by $2,267,000.
On page 18, line 15, increase the amount by $680,000.
On page 18, line 19, increase the amount by $113,000.
On page 18, line 23, increase the amount by $57,000.

SA 326. Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this resolution assume that $20,000,000 from funds designated for drug interdiction should be used for service-oriented targeted grants for the utilization of substances that block the craving for heroin and that are newly approved for such use by the Food and Drug Administration.

SA 327. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $380,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $1,140,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $2,280,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $2,280,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $1,140,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $801,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $1,140,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $2,280,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $2,280,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $1,140,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $3,797,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $72,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $138,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $195,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $224,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $237,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $250,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $283,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $278,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $187,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $547,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $1,068,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $1,002,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $261,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $224,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $237,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $250,000,000.
On page 54, line 13, decrease the amount by $263,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $278,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $193,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $593,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $1,212,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $1,278,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $879,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $224,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $237,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $250,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $263,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $278,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $193,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $787,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,998,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $3,276,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $4,156,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $4,380,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $4,617,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $4,867,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $5,130,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $5,407,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $193,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $787,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,998,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $3,276,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $4,156,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $4,380,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $4,617,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $4,867,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $5,130,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $5,407,000,000.
On page 16, line 11, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 16, line 12, increase the amount by $190,000,000.
On page 16, line 16, increase the amount by $570,000,000.
On page 16, line 20, increase the amount by $1,140,000,000.
On page 16, line 24, increase the amount by $1,140,000,000.
On page 17, line 3, increase the amount by $570,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $72,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $72,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $138,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $138,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $195,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $195,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $224,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $224,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $237,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $237,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $250,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $250,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $263,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $263,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $278,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $278,000,000.
On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $7,220,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $3,800,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $190,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $570,000,000.

SA 328. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. KYL, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KERRY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 16, line 11, increase the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 16, line 12, increase the amount by $325,000,000.
On page 16, line 16, increase the amount by $85,000,000.
On page 16, line 20, increase the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 16, line 24, increase the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 17, line 3, increase the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 42, line 2, decrease the amount by $500,000,000.
On page 42, line 3, decrease the amount by $325,000,000.
On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $85,000,000.
On page 42, line 11, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.
On page 42, line 15, decrease the amount by $25,000,000.
On page 42, line 19, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.

SA 329. Mr. DORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,798,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $1,798,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,798,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $192,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $1,003,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $43,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $52,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $58,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $69,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $81,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $883,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $53,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $37,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $54,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $69,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $81,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $915,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $139,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $62,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $65,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $69,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $77,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $81,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $915,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,054,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,121,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $1,183,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,245,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,311,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,380,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,453,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,531,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,612,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $915,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,054,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,121,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,183,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,245,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,311,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $1,380,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,453,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,531,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,612,000,000.

On page 34, line 19, increase the amount by $1,019,000,000.

On page 34, line 20, increase the amount by $899,000,000.

On page 34, line 24, increase the amount by $96,000,000.

On page 35, line 3, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 35, line 7, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $43,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $43,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $52,000,000.

On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $52,000,000.

On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $58,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $58,000,000.

On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $61,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $69,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $69,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $81,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $81,000,000.

On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $2,029,000,000.

On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $1,019,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $899,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $96,000,000.

SA 330. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. CHAFEE, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2004 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013 as authorized by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 2003 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,343,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,441,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,604,926,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $1,746,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $1,863,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $1,981,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,099,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,226,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,460,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,637,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,778,210,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $16,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $30,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $12,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $6,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$10,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$18,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$21,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: −$33,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: −$33,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $0.
Fiscal year 2013: $0.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,784,216,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,843,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,951,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,071,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,171,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,276,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,373,830,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,472,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,585,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,662,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,768,930,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $1,774,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,851,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,942,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $2,045,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $2,140,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $2,249,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,355,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,461,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,586,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,653,413,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,776,371,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: −$431,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$409,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$337,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −$298,326,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −$276,472,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −$267,599,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −$256,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: −$234,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: −$125,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: −$15,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: −$1,839,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $6,668,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $7,179,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $7,621,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $8,048,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $8,457,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $8,861,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $9,258,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $9,637,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $9,911,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $10,082,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $10,239,283,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of the debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $3,839,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $4,072,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $4,221,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $4,321,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $4,378,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $4,406,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $4,404,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $4,361,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $4,191,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $3,895,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,568,283,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $531,607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $557,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $587,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $619,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $651,128,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $684,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $719,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $755,724,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $792,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $829,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $869,650,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $366,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $380,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $390,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: $402,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: $415,605,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: $429,595,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $446,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $464,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $483,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $506,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $533,097,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $392,494,000,000
(B) Outlays, $386,229,000,000
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $400,476,000,000
(B) Outlays, $400,882,000,000
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $420,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $440,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $460,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $438,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $480,886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $462,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $487,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $476,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $493,340,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $486,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $501,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $498,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $509,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $499,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $517,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $512,815,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $22,506,000,000
(B) Outlays, $19,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $29,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $32,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $33,603,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $34,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $35,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $36,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $37,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $38,005,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $38,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,298,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $23,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $23,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $24,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $25,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $25,949,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $26,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $27,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $28,006,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,372,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,032,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,198,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $2,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $2,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $959,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $2,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $2,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $2,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,100,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,446,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $3,547,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,539,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $30,816,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,940,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $30,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,357,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $31,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $31,824,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $32,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $33,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $34,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,857,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $36,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,870,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $37,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $38,549,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,769,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $24,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,365,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $24,629,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $27,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $26,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,587,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $26,296,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $25,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $26,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $25,531,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $24,971,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $24,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,472,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $7,513,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,132,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $8,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $8,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $8,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $9,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $9,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $9,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,731,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $64,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $59,741,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $64,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,422,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $64,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $64,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $65,521,00,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $66,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $67,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $67,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,629,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $68,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $69,726,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,306,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,435,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,085,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $14,628,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $14,929,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $15,259,000,0003
(B) Outlays, $15,174,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $15,652,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $16,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $16,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $17,205,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,610,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,579,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $84,259,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $88,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $87,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $89,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $91,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,896,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $93,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $95,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,322,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $97,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $99,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $101,142,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $103,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,776,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $226,343,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $222,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $240,084,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $252,037,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $251,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $269,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $268,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $290,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $312,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $310,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $335,314,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $333,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $361,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $359,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $389,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $387,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $419,498,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $418,027,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $452,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $451,354,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $248,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $265,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,376,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $282,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $322,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $318,921,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $344,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $344,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $370,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $396,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $396,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $423,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $424,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $455,875,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $459,232,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $490,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $486,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $526,303,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $526,559,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $322,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $318,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $323,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $326,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $334,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,028,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $340,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $352,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $353,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $363,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $364,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $375,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $376,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $392,310,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $392,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $383,486,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $384,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $398,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $398,881,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $14,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $15,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $16,689,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $18,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,182,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,999,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $24,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $28,416,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $31,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,670,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $57,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $61,978,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $67,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $65,644,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $64,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $67,928,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $69,550,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $71,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $75,962,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $72,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $77,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,329,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $38,543,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $37,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,902,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $37,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $37,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $38,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $39,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $40,306,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $41,406,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $42,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $44,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $45,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,938,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $18,178,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $20,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $20,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $22,361,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $23,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $23,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $24,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,121,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $239,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $239,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $253,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $254,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $293,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,538,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $325,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $329,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $344,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $351,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $360,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $369,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $375,129,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $386,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $387,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $401,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $397,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $401,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $422,797,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $397,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,508,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $0.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $5,384,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,868,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $12,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $17,288,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,418,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $27,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,686,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$44,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$44,583,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$45,580,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$45,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$55,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$55,509,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:
(A) New budget authority, −$57,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$57,437,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007:
(A) New budget authority, −$52,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$52,206,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$54,753,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$54,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$56,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$56,560,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$58,985,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$58,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$61,522,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$61,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$66,358,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$66,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013 :
(A) New budget authority, −$68,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$68,977,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING ECONOMIC GROWTH.—The Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill not later than April 11, 2003, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the total level of revenues by not more than: $46,700,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2003 and 2004 and increase the total level of revenues by not more than $49,900,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that in complying with the instructions set forth in paragraph (1) the Committee on Finance should provide immediate tax relief and economic stimulus by accelerating tax relief for middle-class families through increases in the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and reductions in individual income tax rates, provide incentives for business investment, provide immediate and permanent estate tax relief and defer tax relief for individual taxpayers with incomes above $140,000 until the budget is in balance and national security threats have been addressed.

SEC. 202. INCREASE IN DEBT LIMIT CONTINGENT UPON PLAN TO RESTORE BALANCED BUDGET.

(a) TEMPORARY INCREASE IN STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT.—The Committee on Finance shall report a bill as soon as practicable, but not later than April 11, 2003, that consists solely of changes in laws within its jurisdiction to increase the statutory debt limit by $150,000,000,000.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—(1) Except as provided by subsection (a) or paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that increases the limit on the public debt by more than $100,000,000,000.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply in the Senate if—

(A) the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has made the certification described in section 203 that the unified budget will be in balance by fiscal year 2009; or

(B) the President has submitted to Congress a declaration that such increase is necessary to finance costs of a military conflict or address an imminent threat to national security, but which shall not exceed the amount of the adjustment under section 302 for the costs of military operations in Iraq.

SEC. 203. REVIEW OF BUDGET OUTLOOK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If, in the report released pursuant to section 202 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, entitled the Budget and Economic Outlook Update (for fiscal years 2004 through 2013), the Director of the Congressional Budget Office projects that the unified budget of the United States for fiscal year 2009 will be in balance, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate is authorized to certify that the budget is projected to meet the goals of a balanced budget.

(b) CALCULATING DISCRETIONARY SPENDING BASELINE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall use the discretionary spending levels set forth in this resolution, including any adjustments to such levels as a result of the implementation of any reserve funds set forth in this resolution to calculate the discretionary spending baseline.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS AND ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Reserve Funds

SEC. 301. RESERVE FUND FOR HOMELAND SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for the Department of Homeland Security and if the Secretary of Homeland Security so requests, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Homeland Security should—

(1) conduct a homeland security needs assessment in consultation with all Federal agencies with responsibilities for homeland security and State and local governments; and

(2) submit a report to Congress with additional funding requests, if any, identified in the needs assessment, and that such report should also include a compilation of the needs assessments submitted by State and local governments.

SEC. 302. RESERVE FUND FOR THE COSTS OF MILITARY OPERATIONS IN IRAQ.

In the Senate, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for the costs of military operations in Iraq, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose.

SEC. 303. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL MANDATORY FUNDING FOR EXISTING HEALTH AND EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS WHICH PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND INDIVIDUALS.

In the Senate, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for additional mandatory funding for existing health and employment programs which provide assistance to States and individuals, then the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the appropriate revisions to the allocations and other levels in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but such revision shall not exceed $12,500,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 304. RESERVE FUND FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, if the Committee on Environment and Public Works reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides new budget authority for the budget accounts or portions thereof in the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in excess of the following amounts:

(1) for fiscal year 2004: $30,340,000,000,

(2) for fiscal year 2005: $30,998,000,000,

(3) for fiscal year 2006: $31,707,000,000,

(4) for fiscal year 2007: $32,436,000,000, or

(5) for fiscal year 2008: $33,190,000,000,

and the amount of such excess in each such year is offset by reductions in the deficit caused by such legislation or any previously enacted legislation that changes direct spending from, or receipts subsequently appropriated to, the Highway Trust Fund, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority for such committee by the amount of such excess for fiscal year 2004 and by the total amount of such excesses for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and make the necessary offsetting adjustments in the appropriate budget aggregates and allocations.

(b) COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS.—In the Senate, if the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes obligation limitations that, in total, are in excess of $38,496,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, but not to exceed the amount of such excess that was offset pursuant to subsection (a), for programs, projects, and activities within the highway and transit categories as defined in sections 250(c)(4)(B) and (C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and if legislation has been enacted that satisfies the conditions set forth in subsection (a) for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of outlays for such fiscal year for the Committee on Appropriations by the amount of outlays that corresponds to such excess obligation limitations.

SEC. 305. RESERVE FUND FOR BIOSHIELD.

In the Senate, if the appropriate committee of jurisdiction reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that establishes a program to accelerate the research, development, and purchase of biomedical threat countermeasures and—

(1) such measure provides new budget authority to carry out such program; or

(2) such measure authorizes discretionary new budget authority to carry out such program and the Committee on Appropriations reports a bill or joint resolution that provides new budget authority to carry out such program,

the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations for the committee providing such new budget authority, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, by the amount provided for that purpose, but, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (1), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom and $3,418,000,000 in new budget authority for the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2008 and outlays flowing therefrom or, in the case of a measure described in paragraph (2), not to exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority for fiscal year 2004 and outlays flowing therefrom. Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, the total such revision for fiscal year 2004 may not exceed $890,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom.

SEC. 306. RESERVE FUND FOR PERMANENT EXTENSION OF TAX CUTS; MEDICARE.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 311 of this resolution, if the Committee on Finance reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that makes the provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 permanent or provides additional resources for a medicare prescription drug benefit in excess of $400,000,000,000 over the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, and if the chairman on the Committee on the Budget certifies that the enactment of such legislation would not cause or increase an on-budget deficit in 2013, then the chairman on the Committee on the Budget shall revise allocations to accommodate such legislation and make other necessary adjustments.

Subtitle B—Enforcement

SEC. 311. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN LEGISLATION REDUCING THE SURPLUS OR INCREASING THE DEFICIT AFTER FISCAL YEAR 2008.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that includes any provision that first provides new budget authority or a decrease in revenues for any fiscal year after fiscal year 2008 through fiscal year 2013 that would decrease the surplus or increase the deficit for any fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate certifies, based on estimates prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, that Congress has enacted legislation restoring 75-year solvency of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance Trust Fund and legislation extending the solvency of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for 20 years.

SEC. 312. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to carry out this resolution.

SEC. 313. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS IN THE SENATE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto, that provides new budget authority that would cause the discretionary spending limits to be exceeded for any fiscal year.

(b) DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—In the Senate and as used in this section, the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(8) with respect to fiscal year 2004—

(A) for the defense category: $399,683,000,000 in new budget authority and $389,746,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $392,517,000,000 in new budget authority and $429,054,000,000 in outlays;

(9) with respect to fiscal year 2005—

(A) for the defense category: $420,019,000,000 in new budget authority and $409,737,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $393,481,000,000 in new budget authority and $440,264,000,000 in outlays;

(10) with respect to fiscal year 2006—

(A) for the defense category: $440,044,000,000 in new budget authority and $422,808,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $402,256,000,000 in new budget authority and $446,992,000,000;

(11) with respect to fiscal year 2007—

(A) for the defense category: $460,309,000,000 in new budget authority and $436,164,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $412,091,000,000 in new budget authority and $455,236,000,000;

(12) with respect to fiscal year 2008—

(A) for the defense category: $480,747,000,000 in new budget authority and $460,190,000,000 in outlays;

(B) for the nondefense category: $494,853,000,000 in new budget authority and $465,710,000,000;

as adjusted in conformance with subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) CHAIRMAN.—After the reporting of a bill or joint resolution, the offering of an amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report thereon, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the adjustments set forth in subparagraph (B) for the amount of new budget authority in that measure (if that measure meets the requirements set forth in paragraph (2)) and the outlays flowing from that budget authority. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget may also make appropriate adjustments for the reserve funds set forth in sections 301, 302, and 303.

(B) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in subparagraph (A) are to be made to—

(i) the discretionary spending limits, if any, set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget;

(ii) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(iii) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget.

(2) AMOUNTS OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) an amount provided and designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 314;

(B) an amount appropriated for homeland security as provided in section 301;

(C) an amount appropriated for military operations in Iraq as provided in section 302; and

(D) an amount provided for transportation under section 304.

(3) APPLICATION OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments made for legislation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall—

(A) apply while that legislation is under consideration;

(B) take effect upon the enactment of that legislation; and

(C) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(4) APPLICATION OF THIS SECTION.—The provisions of this section shall apply to legislation providing new budget authority for fiscal years 2003 through 2008.

(5) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 314. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—If a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation is enacted or if appropriations for discretionary accounts are enacted that the President designates as an emergency requirement and that the Congress so designates in statute, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be designated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this resolution.

(b) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under subsection (a), the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are that the expenditure or tax change is—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR USE OF DESIGNATION.—When an emergency designation is proposed in any bill, joint resolution, or conference report thereon, the committee report and the statement of managers accompanying a conference report, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the provision meets the criteria set forth in paragraph (2).

(c) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''direct spending'', ''receipts'', and ''appropriations for discretionary accounts'' means any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that provides direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(d) SEPARATE SENATE VOTE ON EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—In the Senate, in the consideration of any measure or amendment it shall always be in order to move to strike such emergency spending designation from the portion of the bill then open to amendment.

(e) COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.—Whenever the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of either House (including a committee of conference) reports any bill or joint resolution that provides budget authority for any emergency, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution (or the joint explanatory statement of managers in the case of a conference report on any such bill or joint resolution) shall identify all provisions that provide budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom for such emergency and include a statement of the reasons why such budget authority meets the definition of an emergency pursuant to the guidelines described in subsection (b).

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(g) EXCEPTION FOR DEFENSE AND HOMELAND SECURITY SPENDING.—Subsection (d) shall not apply against an emergency designation for a provision making discretionary appropriations in the defense category and for homeland security programs.

(h) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 315. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any one of the three applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ''applicable time period'' means any 1 of the 3 following periods:

(A) The first year covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(B) The period of the first 5 fiscal years covered by the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(C) The period of the 5 fiscal years following the first 5 fiscal years covered in the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) DIRECT-SPENDING LEGISLATION.—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term ''direct-spending legislation'' means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(4) EXCLUSION.—For purposes of this subsection, the terms ''direct-spending legislation'' and ''revenue legislation'' do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget;

(B) any reconciliation bill reported pursuant to section 201 of this resolution;

(C) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on the date of enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990; or

(D) any legislation for which an adjustment is made under section 302.

(5) BASELINE.—Estimates prepared pursuant to this section shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget as adjusted for any changes in revenues or direct spending assumed by such resolution; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) PRIOR SURPLUS.—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted pursuant to reconciliation instructions since the beginning of that same calendar year shall not be available.

(b) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) LIMITS ON APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the minority and the manager of the bill or joint resolution.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall expire on September 30, 2008.

SEC. 316. DISCLOSURE OF EFFECT OF LEGISLATION ON THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Each report of a committee of the Senate on a public bill or public joint resolution shall contain an estimate by the committee of the amount the public debt would be increased (including related debt service costs) in carrying out the bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and in the 5-fiscal year period beginning with such fiscal year (or for the authorized duration of any program authorized by the bill or joint resolution if less than five years).

SEC. 317. DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST COSTS.

Whenever a committee of either House of Congress reports to its House legislation providing new budget authority or providing an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution shall contain a projection by the Congressional Budget Office of the cost of the debt servicing that would be caused by such measure for such fiscal year (or fiscal years) and each of the 4 ensuing fiscal years.

TITLE IV—SENSE OF CONGRESS PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of Congress that legislation should be enacted enforcing this resolution by—

(1) setting discretionary spending limits for budget authority and outlays at the levels set forth in this resolution for each of the next 5 fiscal years;

(2) reinstating the pay-as-you-go rules set forth in section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 for the next 10 fiscal years;

(3) establishing a definition for emergency spending and requiring a justification for emergency spending requests and legislation; and

(4) establishing expedited rescission authority regarding congressional votes on rescission submitted by the President and reducing discretionary spending limits to reflect savings from any rescissions enacted into law.

SEC. 402. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON TAX REFORM.

It is the sense of Congress that the Committee on Finance should—

(1) work with the Secretary of the Treasury to draft legislation reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in a revenue-neutral manner to improve savings and investment; and

(2) consider changes that address the treatment of dividends and retirement savings, corporate tax avoidance, and simplification of the tax laws.

SA 331. Mr. CORZINE (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $378,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $271,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $378,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $271,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 16, line 11, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.

On page 16, line 12, increase the amount by $378,000,000.

On page 16, line 16, increase the amount by $271,000,000.

On page 16, line 20, increase the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 16, line 24, increase the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 45, line 24, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.

On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $378,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $271,000,000.

SA 332. Mr. CORZINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title II, insert the following:

"SEC. ___. PROTECTING RESOURCES REQUIRED FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

(a) POINT ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, or conference report that would increase the deficit in any fiscal year, other than spending measures related to national or homeland security, until the President submits to the Congress a detailed report on:

(1) the costs of the initial phase of the conflict, maintaining troops in the region, and reconstruction and rebuilding of Iraq; and

(2) how all of these costs fit within the budget plan as a whole.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.''

SA 333. Mr. HOLLINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. RESERVE FUND FOR MILITARY ACTION AND RECONSTRUCTION IN IRAQ.

In addition to any action taken by the Senate Committee on Finance pursuant to section 104(b) of this resolution, the Senate committee on Finance shall include in the reconciliation bill required by that section $100,000,000,000 in additional revenues for fiscal year 2004.

SA 334. Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and includig the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal year 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,040,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $860,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,040,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $860,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $991,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $51,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $57,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $64,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $72,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $511,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $395,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $11,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $47,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $64,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $72,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $529,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $465,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $91,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $67,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $64,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $68,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $72,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $76,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $529,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $994,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,085,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $1,152,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,213,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,277,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,345,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,417,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,493,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,573,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $529,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $994,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $1,085,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $1,152,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $1,213,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $1,277,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $1,345,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,417,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,493,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,573,000,000.
On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by $520,000,000.
On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by $430,000,000.
On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $40,000,000.
On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $51,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $51,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $57,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $57,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $60,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $60,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $64,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $64,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $68,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $72,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $72,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $76,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $80,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $80,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $520,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $430,000,000.

SA 335. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. DODD, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. CORZINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $3,210,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $3,745,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $3,970,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $4,043,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $4,082,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $4,080,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $4,080,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $4,080,000,000.
On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $4,080,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $4,080,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $3,210,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $3,745,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $3,970,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $4,043,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $4,082,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $4,080,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $4,080,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $4,080,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $4,080,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $4,080,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $2,111,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $1,919,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $1,802,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $1,676,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $1,545,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $1,406,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $1,106,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $945,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $775,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $1,576,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $1,751,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $1,747,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $1,658,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $1,546,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $1,406,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $1,259,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $1,106,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $945,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $775,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $1,634,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $1,994,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $2,223,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $2,385,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $2,536,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $2,674,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $2,821,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $2,974,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $3,135,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $3,305,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,634,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $3,628,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $5,852,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $8,237,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $10,773,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $13,447,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $16,268,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $19,242,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $22,377,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $25,682,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,634,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $3,628,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $5,852,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $8,237,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $10,773,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $13,447,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $16,268,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $19,242,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $22,377,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $25,682,000,000.
On page 31, line 2, increase the amount by $2,140,000,000.
On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by $1,605,000,000.
On page 31, line 6, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 31, line 7, increase the amount by $1,872,000,000.
On page 31, line 10, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 31, line 11, increase the amount by $1,985,000,000.
On page 31, line 14, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 31, line 15, increase the amount by $2,022,000,000.
On page 31, line 18, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 31, line 19, increase the amount by $2,041,000,000.
On page 31, line 22, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 31, line 23, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 32, line 2, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 32, line 3, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 32, line 6, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 32, line 7, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 32, line 10, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.

On page 32, line 11, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 32, line 14, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 32, line 15, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $121,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $121,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $238,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $238,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $364,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $364,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $495,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $495,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $634,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $634,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $781,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $781,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $934,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $934,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,095,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $1,095,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,265,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,265,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $2,140,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $1,605,000,000.
On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by $2,040,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $1,872,000,000.

SA 336. Mr. BINGAMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting for the congressional budget for the United States Governments for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $1,500,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $1,670,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $1,758,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $1,786,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $1,802,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,500,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $1,670,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $1,758,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $1,786,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $1,802,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 4, line 7 increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $1,800,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $986,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $844,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $792,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $736,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $678,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $617,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $552,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $484,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $413,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $337,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $736,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $779,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $771,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $729,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $679,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $617,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $552,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $484,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $413,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $337,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $764,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $891,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $987,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $1,057,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $1,123,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $1,183,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $1,248,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $1,316,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $1,387,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $1,463,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $764,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,654,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $2,641,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $33,698,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $4,821,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $6,004,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $7,252,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $8,568,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $9,956,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $11,418,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $764,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,654,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $2,641,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $3,698,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $4,821,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $6,004,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $7,252,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $8,568,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $9,956,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $11,418,000,000.
On page 31, line 2, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by $750,000,000.
On page 31, line 6, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 31, line 7, increase the amount by $835,000,000.
On page 31, line 10, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 31, line 11, increase the amount by $879,000,000.
On page 31, line 14, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 31, line 15, increase the amount by $893,000,000.
On page 31, line 18, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 31, line 19, increase the amount by $901,000,000.
On page 31, line 22, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 31, line 23, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 32, line 2, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 32, line 3, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 32, line 6, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 32, line 7, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 32, line 10, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 32, line 11, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 32, line 14, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 32, line 15, increase the amount by $900,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $14,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $56,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $56,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $108,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $108,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $164,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $164,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $222,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $222,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $283,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $283,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $348,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $348,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $416,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $416,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $487,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $487,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $563,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $563,000,000.

SA 377. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 46, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REDUCTION IN FUNCTIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, all non-defense discretionary spending functional totals in this resolution are reduced pro rata by $10,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 and the overall budgetary totals shall be adjusted accordingly.

SA 338. Mr. ALLARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 46, after line 2, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REDUCTION IN FUNCTIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, all non-defense discretionary spending functional totals in this resolution are reduced pro rata by $10,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 and the overall budgetary totals shall be adjusted accordingly.

SA 339. Mr. BREAUX (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. VOINOVICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; as follows:

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by $10,433,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $33,015,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $27,962,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $22,167,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $16,893,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $16,183,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $15,879,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $15,992,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $52,874,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $79,512,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $84,090,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $10,433,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $33,015,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $27,962,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $22,167,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $16,893,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $16,183,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $15,879,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $15,992,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $52,874,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $79,512,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $84,090,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $899,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $2,687,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $4,364,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $5,762,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $7,003,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $8,294,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $9,640,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $12,035,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $16,276,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $21,605,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, decrease the amount by $899,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, decrease the amount by $2,687,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $4,364,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $5,762,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $7,003,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $8,294,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $9,640,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $12,035,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $16,276,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $21,605,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $10,511,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $33,914,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $30,648,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $26,532,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $22,654,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $23,186,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $24,173,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $25,632,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $64,909,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $95,788,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $105,696,000,000.

On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $10,511,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $44,425,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $75,073,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $101,605,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $124,259,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $147,445,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $171,619,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $197,250,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $262,159,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $357,947,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $463,643,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $10,511,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $44,425,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $75,073,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $101,605,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $124,259,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $147,445,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $171,619,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $197,250,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $262,159,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $357,947,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $463,643,000,000.

On page 40, line 2, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 40, line 3, decrease the amount by $77,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $899,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $899,000,000.

On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $2,687,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $2,687,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $4,364,000,000.

On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $4,364,000,000.

On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $5,762,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $5,762,000,000.

On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $7,003,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $7,003,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $8,294,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $8,294,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $9,640,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $9,640,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $12,035,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $12,035,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $16,276,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $16,276,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $21,605,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $21,605,000,000.
On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $375,000,000,000.

SA 340. Mr. KOHL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $160,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $276,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $254,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $160,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $276,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $254,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $36,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $362,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $79,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $131,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $112,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $81,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $145,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $142,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $24,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $81,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $227,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $369,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $407,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $428,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $451,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $476,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $501,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $528,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $557,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $81,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $227,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $369,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $407,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $428,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $451,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $476,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $501,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $528,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $557,000,000.
On page 36, line 15, increase the amount by $363,000,000.
On page 36, line 16, increase the amount by $80,000,000.
On page 36, line 20, increase the amount by $138,000,000.
On page 36, line 24, increase the amount by $127,000,000.
On page 37, line 3, increase the amount by $18,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $27,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.
On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $726,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $363,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $80,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $138,000,000.

SA 341. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, line 2, increase the amount by $182,000,000.
On page 9, line 3, increase the amount by $182,000,000.
On page 9, line 6, increase the amount by $331,000,000.
On page 9, line 7, increase the amount by $331,000,000.
On page 9, line 10, increase the amount by $584,000,000.
On page 9, line 11, increase the amount by $584,000,000.
On page 9, line 14, increase the amount by $965,000,000.
On page 9, line 15, increase the amount by $965,000,000.
On page 9, line 18, increase the amount by $1,454,000,000.
On page 9, line 19, increase the amount by $1,454,000,000.
On page 9, line 22, increase the amount by $1,642,000,000.
On page 9, line 23, increase the amount by $1,642,000,000.
On page 10, line 2, increase the amount by $1,739,000,000.
On page 10, line 3, increase the amount by $1,739,000,000.
On page 10, line 6, increase the amount by $1,844,000,000.
On page 10, line 7, increase the amount by $1,844,000,000.
On page 10, line 10, increase the amount by $1,953,000,000.
On page 10, line 11, increase the amount by $1,953,000,000.
On page 10, line 14, increase the amount by $2,070,000,000.
On page 10, line 15, increase the amount by $2,070,000,000.
On page 79, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE ON PHASED-IN CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS WITH SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES RATED AT 60 PERCENT OR HIGHER.

It is the sense of the Senate that the new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years

2004 through 2013 for National Defense (050) specified in section 103(1) are adequate to provide, and should provide, for the phased-in of concurrent receipt of retired pay and veterans' disability compensation by veterans with service-connected disabilities rated 60 percent or higher as if Section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, were amended to read as follows:

"§ 1414. Members eligible for retired pay who have service-connected disabilities: payment of retired pay and veterans' disability compensation for disabilities rated at 60 percent or higher

''(a) PAYMENT OF BOTH RETIRED PAY AND COMPENSATION.—A member or former member of the uniformed services described in subsection (b) is entitled to be paid retired pay, up to the amount determined for such member or former member under subsection (d), in addition to any entitlement to veterans' disability compensation, without regard to sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38.

''(b) COVERED MEMBERS.—A member or former member described in this subsection is any member or former member who is entitled to retired pay (other than as specified in subsection (c)) and who is also entitled to veterans' disability compensation for a service-connected disability rated at 60 percent or higher, as determined under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

''(c) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) does not apply to a member retired under chapter 61 of this title with less than 20 years of service otherwise creditable under section 1405 of this title at the time of the member's retirement.

''(d) MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF RETIRED PAY.—The maximum amount of retired pay to which a member or former member is entitled under subsection (a) is as follows:

''(1) For months beginning with January 2004 and ending with December 2004, the amount equal to 40 percent of the amount of retired pay to which the member or former member would be entitled if the member or former member were paid retired pay without regard to sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38 for such months.

''(2) For months beginning with January 2005 and ending with December 2005, the amount equal to 60 percent of the amount of retired pay to which the member or former member would be entitled if the member or former member were paid retired pay without regard to sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38 for such months.

''(3) For months beginning with January 2006 and ending with December 2006, the amount equal to 80 percent of the amount of retired pay to which the member or former member would be entitled if the member or former member were paid retired pay without regard to sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38 for such months.

''(4) For months beginning with December 2006, the amount equal to the full amount of retired pay to which the member or former member would be entitled if the member or former member were paid retired pay without regard to sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38 for such months.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'retired pay' includes retainer pay, emergency officers' retirement pay, and naval pension.

''(2) The term 'service-connected' has the meaning given that term in section 101(16) of title 38.

''(3) The term 'veterans' disability compensation' has the meaning given the term 'compensation' in section 101(12) of title 38.''.

(2) COORDINATION WITH SPECIAL COMPENSATION AUTHORITY.—Section 1413 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting '', for months in 2002 and 2003,'' after ''Secretary concerned shall''; and

(B) by striking the last sentence; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking ''September 2004'' and inserting ''December 2003''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (3).

(3) ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(A) Effective on December 31, 2003, section 1413a of such title is repealed.

(B) Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, subsection (d) of section 641 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 (Public Law 107–107; 115 Stat, 1150; 10 U.S.C. 1414 note) is repealed.

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the table of sections at the beginning of chapter 71 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section: 1414and inserting the following new item:

''1414. Members eligible for retired pay who have service-connected disabilities: payment of retired pay and veterans' disability compensation for disabilities rated at 60 percent or higher.''.

(B) Effective December 31, 2003, the table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by striking the item relating to section 1413a.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $182,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $331,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $584,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $965,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $1,454,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $1,642,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $1,739,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $1,844,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $1,953,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $2,070,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $182,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $331,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $584,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $965,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $1,454,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $1,642,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $1,739,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $1,844,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $1,953,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $2,070,000,000.

On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $12,764,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $182,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $331,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $584,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $965,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $1,454,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $1,642,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $1,739,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $1,844,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $1,953,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $2,070,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $182,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $331,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $584,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $965,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $1,454,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $1,642,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $1,739,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $1,844,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $1,953,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $2,070,000,000.

SA 342. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 9, line 2, increase the amount by $3,330,000,000.

On page 9, line 3, increase the amount by $3,330,000,000.

On page 9, line 6, increase the amount by $3,428,000,000.

On page 9, line 7, increase the amount by $3,428,000,000.

On page 9, line 10, increase the amount by $3,630,000,000.

On page 9, line 11, increase the amount by $3,630,000,000.

On page 9, line 14, increase the amount by $3,889,000,000.

On page 9, line 15, increase the amount by $3,889,000,000.

On page 9, line 18, increase the amount by $4,096,000,000.

On page 9, line 19, increase the amount by $4,096,000,000.

On page 9, line 22, increase the amount by $4,316,000,000.

On page 9, line 23, increase the amount by $4,316,000,000.

On page 10, line 2, increase the amount by $4,516,000,000.

On page 10, line 3, increase the amount by $4,516,000,000.

On page 10, line 6, increase the amount by $4,728,000,000.

On page 10, line 7, increase the amount by $4,728,000,000.

On page 10, line 10, increase the amount by $4,952,000,000.

On page 10, line 11, increase the amount by $4,952,000,000.

On page 10, line 14, increase the amount by $5,227,000,000.

On page 10, line 15, increase the amount by $5,227,000,000.

On page 79, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF SENATE ON FULL CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' DISABILITY COMPENSATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that the new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2004 through 2013 for National Defense (050) specified in section 103(1) are adequate to

provide, and should provide, for full concurrent receipt of retired pay and veterans' disability compensation by members and former members of the uniformed services who are entitled to such pay and compensation, without regard to sections 5304 and 5305 of title 38, United States Code.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $3,330,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $3,428,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $3,630,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $3,889,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $4,096,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $4,316,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $4,516,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $4,728,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $4,952,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $5,227,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $3,330,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $3,428,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $3,630,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $3,889,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $4,096,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $4,316,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $4,516,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $4,728,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $4,952,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $5,227,000,000.

On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $42,110,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $3,330,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $3,428,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $3,630,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $3,889,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $4,096,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $4,316,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $4,516,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $4,728,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $4,952,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $5,227,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $3,330,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $3,428,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $3,630,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $3,889,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $4,096,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $4,316,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $4,516,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $4,728,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $4,952,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $5,227,000,000.

SA 343. Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $634,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $535,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $336,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $153,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $634,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $535,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $336,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $153,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $634,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $535,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $336,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $153,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 21, line 23, increase the amount by $850,000,000.

On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $201,000,000.

On page 22, line 2, increase the amount by $850,000,000.

On page 22, line 3, increase the amount by $484,000,000.

On page 22, line 7, increase the amount by $497,000,000.

On page 22, line 11, increase the amount by $336,000,000.

On page 22, line 15, increase the amount by $153,000,000.

On page 22, line 19, increase the amount by $31,000,000.

On page 36, line 15, increase the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 36, line 16, increase the amount by $113,000,000.

On page 36, line 19, increase the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 36, line 20, increase the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 36, line 24, increase the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by $1,000,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $634,000,000.

SA 344. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD FULLY FUND AMTRAK TO PRESERVE A NATIONAL PASSENGER RAIL SYSTEM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Amtrak, the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, served 23,400,000 passengers in fiscal year 2002;

(2) rail passenger service is a vital component to our national transportation system and provides travelers an alternative mode of transportation for intercity travel;

(3) the lack of investment and attention to the needs of passenger rail infrastructure has resulted in a weak passenger rail network, and has caused a strain on the capacity of other modes of transportation in many areas of the country;

(4) passenger rail is an integral part of the Unites States transportation system, relieves the pressures of congestion on highways and at airports, and creates a more balanced system of transportation alternatives; and

(5) the need for a balanced interstate and international transportation system that provides a viable alternative to travel by private automobile or commercial aircraft is particularly evident after the events of September 11, 2001.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should fully fund Amtrak to preserve a national passenger rail system.

SA 345. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING 0.08 BLOOD ALCOHOL CONTENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that, according to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration—

(1) each year, 42,000 people die in motor vehicle crashes, and more than 16,000 of these fatalities are related to impaired driving;

(2) 68 percent of children killed in alcohol-related crashes were riding in a car with a drinking driver; and

(3) the 0.08 blood alcohol content legal limit is 1 of the laws that has had the greatest impact in preventing and deterring impaired driving.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Federal standard of 0.08 blood alcohol content for driving under the influence of alcohol saves lives and must remain the national policy.

SA 346. Mr. LAUTENBERG submitted an amendment intended to be

proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING GAS TAX DONOR STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Federal Highway Trust Fund, established under section 9503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, consists of funds contributed by States through the collection of Federal gasoline taxes;

(2) each State contributes a certain amount of funds collected and receives a certain amount of funds apportioned from the Federal Highway Trust Fund; and

(3) each of the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Washington contributes more to the Highway Account of the Federal Highway Trust Fund Highway Account than it receives.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that apportionments out of the Highway Account of the Federal Highway Trust Fund should reflect the amount that each State contributes into the fund.

SA 347. Mr. LUGAR (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. SMITH, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 10, line 23, increase the amount by $1,115,000,000.

On page 10, line 24, increase the amount by $675,000,000.

On page 11, line 2, increase the amount by $834,000,000.

On page 11, line 3, increase the amount by $830,000,000.

On page 11, line 6, increase the amount by $560,000,000.

On page 11, line 7, increase the amount by $641,000,000.

On page 11, line 10, increase the amount by $294,000,000.

On page 11, line 11, increase the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 11, line 14, increase the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 11, line 15, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 11, line 18, decrease the amount by $242,000,000.

On page 11, line 19, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 11, line 22, decrease the amount by $505,000,000.

On page 11, line 23, decrease the amount by $397,000,000.

On page 12, line 2, decrease the amount by $767,000,000.

On page 12, line 3, decrease the amount by $656,000,000.

On page 12, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,034,000,000.

On page 12, line 7, decrease the amount by $924,000,000.

On page 12, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,298,000,000.

On page 12, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,188,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,115,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, decrease the amount by $675,000,000.

On page 42, line 6, decrease the amount by $834,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $830,000,000.

On page 42, line 10, decrease the amount by $560,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, decrease the amount by $641,000,000.

On page 42, line 14, decrease the amount by $294,000,000.

On page 42, line 15, decrease the amount by $392,000,000.

On page 42, line 18, decrease the amount by $28,000,000.

On page 42, line 19, decrease the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 42, line 22, increase the amount by $242,000,000.

On page 42, line 23, increase the amount by $130,000,000.

On page 43, line 2, increase the amount by $505,000,000.

On page 43, line 3, increase the amount by $397,000,000.

On page 43, line 6, increase the amount by $767,000,000.

On page 43, line 7, increase the amount by $656,000,000.

On page 43, line 10, increase the amount by $1,034,000,000.

On page 43, line 11, increase the amount by $924,000,000.

On page 43, line 14, increase the amount by $1,298,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, increase the amount by $1,188,000,000.

SA. 348. Mr. BAUCUS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 61, line 12, insert ''on an equal basis with respect to benefit level regardless of whether such beneficiaries remain in the traditional medicare fee-for-service program under parts A and B of such title or enroll in a private plan under the medicare program'' after ''prescription drugs''.

SA 349. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $246,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $256,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $267,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $552,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $578,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $908,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $941,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $1,313,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $1,375,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $1,799,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $246,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $256,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $267,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $552,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $578,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $908,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $941,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $1,313,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $1,375,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $1,799,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $246,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $256,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $267,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $552,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $578,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $908,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $941,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $1,313,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $1,375,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $1,799,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $246,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $256,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $267,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $552,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $578,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $908,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $941,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $1,313,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $1,375,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $1,799,000,000.

On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by $246,000,000.

On page 27, line 12, increase the amount by $246,000,000.

On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by $256,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, increase the amount by $256,000,000.

On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by $267,000,000.

On page 27, line 20, increase the amount by $267,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by $552,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, increase the amount by $552,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, increase the amount by $578,000,000.

On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by $578,000,000.

On page 28, line 6, increase the amount by $908,000,000.

On page 28, line 7, increase the amount by $908,000,000.

On page 28, line 10, increase the amount by $941,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, increase the amount by $941,000,000.

On page 28, line 14, increase the amount by $1,313,000,000.

On page 28, line 15, increase the amount by $1,313,000,000.

On page 28, line 18, increase the amount by $1,375,000,000.

On page 28, line 19, increase the amount by $1,375,000,000.

On page 28, line 22, increase the amount by $1,799,000,000.

On page 28, line 23, increase the amount by $1,799,000,000.

SA 331. Mrs. CLINTON (for herself, Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $228,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $228,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $326,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $228,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $326,000,000.

On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by $228,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $326,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $16,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $228,000,000.

SA 351. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASING THE CAP ON THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Victims of Crime Act established the Crime Victims Fund which is one of the main Federal sources of money and support for crime victims.

(2) The Crime Victims Fund provides funding for—

(A) formula grants to States for victims compensation and victims assistance; and

(B) discretionary grants.

(3) State compensation programs pay directly for medical care and counseling, lost wages, and funerals for victims of domestic violence, child abuse, rape, and homicide.

(4) State assistance programs provide services including crisis intervention, counseling, emergency shelter and child care, and emergency transportation.

(5) Discretionary grants awarded to organizations fund demonstration projects, training, and other assistance to expand and improve the delivery of services to victims of Federal crimes.

(6) The Crime Victims Fund consists of monies collected from criminal fines, forfeited bail bonds, penalty fees, and special assessments collected by the Offices of the United States Attorneys, the United States courts, and the Bureau of Prisons, and does not rely on any tax-generated revenues.

(7) The formula to receive funding to compensate victims under the Victims of Crime Act changed in 2002. In that year, the Victims of Crime Act matched 40 percent of the amount that a State spent for victim compensation. In 2003, the percentage increased to 60 percent. However, because of the existence of the cap on the Crime Victims Fund (currently $600,000,000), the increase in victim compensation money has reduced the amount that can be spent on victim assistance. The existence of the cap has resulted in 8 percent less money for victim assistance.

(8) The cap on the Crime Victims Fund must be raised to ensure that the same amount is available for victim assistance that was available in fiscal year 2002, an amount equal to $383,000,000. To ensure this, the national victim advocacy groups estimate that the cap should be raised from the current $600,000,000 to $675,000,000 (not including any amounts for the antiterrorism emergency reserve).

(9) Raising the cap on the Crime Victims Fund will not cost any additional expenditures since Congress has capped the Fund for 4 successive years, thereby holding back more than $638,500,000 allocated to the Fund.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the cap on the Crime Victims Fund be raised to $675,000,000.

SA 352. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 20, line 2, increase the amount by $250,000,000.

On page 20, line 3, increase the amount by $250,000,000.

On page 79, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. ___. INCREASED FUNDING TO RESTORE THE OPERATING SUBSIDY FUND.

The budgetary levels in this resolution assume that an additional $250,000,000 will be provided for the Operating Subsidy Fund of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the purpose of restoring funding cuts in fiscal year 2003 to be derived by reducing any revenue reductions assumed in this resolution.

SA 353. Mr. SMITH (for himself and Mrs. CLINTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING AN EXPANSION IN HEALTH CARE COVERAGE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) there were 74,700,000 Americans who were uninsured for all or part of the two-year period of 2001 and 2002;

(2) this large group of uninsured Americans constitutes almost one out of every three Americans under the age of 65;

(3) most of these uninsured individuals were without health coverage for lengthy periods of time, with two-thirds of them uninsured for over six months;

(4) four out of five uninsured individuals are in working families;

(5) high health care costs, the large number of unemployed workers, and State cutbacks of public health programs occasioned by State fiscal crises are causing more and more individuals to become uninsured; and

(6) uninsured individuals are less likely to have a usual source of care outside of an emergency room, often go without screenings and preventive care, often delay or forgo needed medical care, are often subject to avoidable hospital days, and are sicker and die earlier than those individuals who have health insurance.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this resolution assume that—

(1) expanded access to health care coverage throughout the United States is a top priority for national policymaking; and

(2) to the extent that additional funds are made available, a significant portion of such funds should be dedicated to expanding access to health care coverage so that fewer individuals are uninsured and fewer individuals are likely to become uninsured.

SA 354. Mr. DEWINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING CHILDREN'S GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) children's hospitals provide excellent care for children;

(2) the importance of children's hospitals extends to the health care of all children throughout the United States;

(3) making up only 1 percent of all hospitals, independent children's hospitals train almost 30 percent of all pediatricians and 50 percent of all pediatric specialists;

(4) children's hospitals provide over 50 percent of the hospital care in the United States for children with serious illness, including needing cardiatric surgery, children with cancer, and children with cerebral palsy; and

(5) children's hospitals are important centers for pediatric research and the major pipeline for future pediatric researchers.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that, for fiscal year 2004, children's graduate medical education should be funded at $305,000,000.

SA 355. Mr. DEWINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) bipartisan efforts have led to success in the fight against crime and improvements in the administration of justice;

(2) Congress steadily increased funding for crime identification technologies between 1994 and 2003; and

(3) a strong commitment to improve crime identification technologies is still needed.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the funding levels in this resolution assume that the programs authorized under the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 to improve the justice system will be fully funded at the levels authorized for each of the fiscal years 2004 through 2007.

SA 356. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 31, line 2, increase the amount by $283,000,000.

On page 31, line 3, increase the amount by $212,000,000.

On page 31, line 7, increase the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 31, line 11, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 42, line 2, decrease the amount by $283,000,000.

On page 42, line 7, decrease the amount by $65,000,000.

On page 42, line 11, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 42, line 3, decrease the amount by $212,000,000.

SA 357. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 27, line 12, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 27, line 20, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 28, line 2, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 28, line 6, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 28, line 7, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 28, line 10, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 28, line 11, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 28, line 14, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 28, line 15, increase the amount by $4,750,000,000.

On page 62, line 12, increase the amount by $38,000,000,000.

SA 358. Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. BYRD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LOTT, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. NELSON of Nebraska) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $9,547,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $6,619,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $8,251,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $10,473,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $13,127,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $15,478,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $2,211,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $2,662,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $2,970,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $3,222,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $1,052,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $3,139,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $4,968,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $6,865,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $9,141,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $11,564,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $10,452,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $6,604,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $5,056,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $4,500,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $1,052,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $3,139,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, decrease the amount by $4,968,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, decrease the amount by $6,865,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $9,141,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $11,564,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $10,452,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $6,604,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $5,056,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $4,500,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by $1,052,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by $4,191,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by $9,158,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by $16,023,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by $25,164,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by $36,728,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by $47,181,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by $53,785,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by $58,840,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by $63,340,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $1,052,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $4,191,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $9,158,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $16,023,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by $25,164,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by $36,728,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by $47,181,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by $53,785,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $58,840,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by $63,340,000,000.
On page 21, line 23, increase the amount by $9,528,000,000.
On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $1,033,000,000.
On page 22, line 2, increase the amount by $6,494,000,000.
On page 22, line 3, increase the amount by $3,014,000,000.
On page 22, line 6, increase the amount by $7,909,000,000.
On page 22, line 7, increase the amount by $4,626,000,000.
On page 22, line 10, increase the amount by $9,815,000,000.
On page 22, line 11, increase the amount by $6,207,000,000.
On page 22, line 14, increase the amount by $12,045,000,000.
On page 22, line 15, increase the amount by $8,059,000,000.
On page 22, line 18, increase the amount by $13,849,000,000.
On page 22, line 19, increase the amount by $9,935,000,000.
On page 22, line 23, increase the amount by $8,241,000,000.
On page 23, line 3, increase the amount by $3,942,000,000.
On page 23, line 7, increase the amount by $2,086,000,000.
On page 23, line 11, increase the amount by $1,278,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, increase the amount by $19,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, increase the amount by $19,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, increase the amount by $125,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, increase the amount by $125,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, increase the amount by $342,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, increase the amount by $342,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, increase the amount by $658,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, increase the amount by $658,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, increase the amount by $1,082,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, increase the amount by $1,082,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, increase the amount by $1,629,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, increase the amount by $1,629,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by $2,211,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, increase the amount by $2,211,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, increase the amount by $2,662,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, increase the amount by $2,662,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, increase the amount by $2,970,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, increase the amount by $2,970,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, increase the amount by $3,222,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, increase the amount by $3,222,000,000.
On page 47, line 9, increase the amount by $921,000,000.
On page 47, line 18, increase the amount by $2,631,000,000.
On page 47, line 11, increase the amount by $748,000,000.
On page 47, line 12, increase the amount by $112,000,000.
On page 47, line 20, increase the amount by $1,056,000,000.
On page 47, line 21, increase the amount by $383,000,000.

SA 359. Mr. LEVIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $130,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $153,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $268,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $321,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $385,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $460,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $551,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $658,000,000.
On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $785,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $936,000,000.
On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $130,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $153,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $268,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $321,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $385,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $460,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $551,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $658,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $785,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $936,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $272,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $269,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $269,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $267,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $262,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $253,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $240,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $220,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $193,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $156,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $11,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $187,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $255,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $267,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $262,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $253,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $240,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $220,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $193,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $156,000,000.
On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $119,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $34,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, decrease the amount by $54,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $123,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $207,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $311,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $438,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $592,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $780,000,000.
On page 6, line 5, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $157,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $124,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $137,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $191,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $314,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $520,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $832,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,270,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $1,862,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,642,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $38,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $157,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $124,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $137,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $191,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $520,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $832,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $1,270,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,862,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $2,642,000,000.

On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 25, line 20, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by $193,000,000.

On page 25, line 24, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $261,000,000.

On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 11, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 12, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 16, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 19, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 20, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 27, line 2, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $35,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $55,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $55,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $82,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $82,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $119,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $119,000,000.

On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by $14,000,000.

On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by $275,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $193,000,000.

At the appropriate place insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CORPORATE TAX HAVEN LOOPHOLES

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that companies are taking advantage of loopholes in the United States tax code to direct taxable income to tax haven jurisdictions, some of which have excessive bank secrecy laws and a poor record of cooperation with United States civil and criminal tax enforcement.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate should act to stop companies from avoiding paying their fair share of the United States taxes by—

(1) addressing the problem of corporations that have renounced their United States citizenship (''inverted'') by relocating their headquarters to tax haven jurisdictions while maintaining their primary offices and production or service facilities in the United States; and

(2) addressing the problem of Bermuda-based insurance companies that are using reinsurance agreements with their subsidiaries to direct property and casualty insurance premiums out of the United States into Bermuda to reduce their United States taxes in a way that places United States property and casualty insurance companies at a competitive disadvantage.

SA 360. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EDUCATION FIRST.

(a) STATEMENT OF PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to ensure that a portion of unexpected, additional Federal resources are available to—

(1) assist disadvantaged children, teachers, and schools in meeting the additional academic challenges posed in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107–110);

(2) provide for full funding of Federal financial commitment to children with disabilities and local communities as identified in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.);

(3) ensure that every student with the talent, desire, and drive to pursue postsecondary training at a school of their choice is not inhibited by family financial need; and

(4) grow to 10 percent over time, the share of the Federal discretionary budget dedicated toward education.

(b) ADJUSTMENT.—If the report provided pursuant to section 202(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 602(e)) (the budget and economic outlook: update), estimates on-budget Federal revenues for fiscal year 2003 or 2004, respectively, that exceed estimated on-budget Federal revenues set forth in the Congressional Budget Office's Spring 2003 or 2004, respectively, budget and economic outlook for fiscal year 2003 or 2004, respectively, (adjusted for the enactment of any fiscal year 2003 or 2004, respectively, supplemental appropriations act), then the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall—

(1) in an amount equal to 20 percent of the increase in estimated on-budget Federal revenues for fiscal year 2004 or 2005, respectively, increase the amount of discretionary budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom allocated under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to carry out Function 500 education programs and for other purposes; and

(2) in an amount equal to 80 percent of the increase in estimated on-budget Federal revenue for fiscal year 2004 or 2005, respectively, reduce the deficit and level of publicly held debt in order to better secure the integrity of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401), unless there is a national emergency related to the war on terrorism.

(c) LIMITATION.—Amounts made available under subsection (a) shall—

(1) not exceed ½ of 1 percent of on-budget Federal revenues for fiscal year 2003; and

(2) supplement, and not supplant, amounts allocated under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(b)) and any other amounts used to carry out the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.), and the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) for the previous fiscal year for which amounts are provided under this section.

(d) CONFORMING CHANGES.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall make all necessary conforming changes to the functions and aggregates included in any applicable resolution as a result of adjustments under this section.

SA 361. Mr. DASCHLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $5,104,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $348,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $174,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $116,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $5,104,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $348,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $174,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $116,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $2,854,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $162,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by $173,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by $184,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by $196,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by $207,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $218,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $230,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $2,506,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $54,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by $57,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $104,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $173,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $184,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $196,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $207,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by $218,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by $230,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $2,598,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $294,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $231,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $220,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $173,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $184,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $196,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $207,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $218,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $230,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $2,598,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,892,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $3,123,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by $3,343,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $3,516,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $3,700,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,896,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $4,103,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $4,321,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $4,551,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $2,598,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $2,892,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $3,123,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $3,343,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $3,516,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $3,700,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $3,896,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $4,103,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $4,321,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $4,551,000,000.
On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by $2,900,000,000.
On page 27, line 12, increase the amount by $2,552,000,000.
On page 27, line 16, increase the amount by $174,000,000.
On page 27, line 20, increase the amount by $87,000,000.
On page 27, line 24, increase the amount by $58,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $46,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $46,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $120,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $144,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $162,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $162,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $173,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $173,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $184,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $184,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $196,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $196,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $207,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $207,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $218,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $218,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $230,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $230,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $2,900,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $2,552,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $174,000,000.

SA 362. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. BOND, and Ms. MIKULSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MEDICARE HOME HEALTH PAYMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Home health has become an increasingly important part of our health care system. The kinds of highly skilled, and often technically complex, services that our Nation's home health agencies provide have enabled millions of our most frail and vulnerable older and disabled persons to avoid hospitals and nursing homes and remain in the comfort and security of their homes.

(2) The changes initiated as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 produced cuts in home health spending under the medicare program far beyond what Congress intended. According to estimates from the Office of the Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, expenditures for home health services under the medicare program decreased by 39 percent between fiscal year 1997 and fiscal year 2003.

(3) Projected medicare home health savings under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 have totaled more than $72,000,000,000 between fiscal year 1998 and fiscal year 2002, over 4 times the $16,000,000,000 that the Congressional Budget Office originally estimated for that time period.

(4) Over 3,400 home health agencies have either closed or stopped serving medicare beneficiaries since the enactment of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

(5) Since January 1997, the number of medicare beneficiaries receiving home health services nationwide has dropped by 1,300,000, more than ⅓, and the average number of visits provided over a 60-day period has dropped from 36 to 20.

(6) On October 1, 2002, home health agencies received an additional across-the-board cut in medicare home health payments and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services has dramatically reduced projections for home health spending under the medicare program over the next 10 years.

(7) Further cuts in payments for home health services under the medicare program simply cannot be sustained without affecting patient care, particularly for those medicare beneficiaries with complex care requirements.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the medicare home health benefit should be stabilized by—

(1) avoiding further cuts in payments for home health services under the medicare program;

(2) preserving the full market basket update for payments under the medicare prospective payment system for home health services for 2004; and

(3) providing for an add-on payment under the medicare program for home health services furnished in rural areas after March 31, 2003.

SA 363. Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. REID, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $5,104,000,000.
On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $5,809,000,000.
On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $6,390,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $6,953,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by $7,440,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by $7,961,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by $8,518,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by $9,114,000,000.
On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by $9,752,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by $10,435,000,000.
On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $5,104,000,000.
On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $5,809,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by $6,390,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $6,953,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $7,440,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $7,961,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $8,518,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $9,114,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $9,752,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by $10,435,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $2,854,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $2,912,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $2,944,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $2,968,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $2,988,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $2,999,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $3,000,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $2,993,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $2,973,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $2,939,000,000.
On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $2,506,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $2,714,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $2,819,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $2,892,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $2,907,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $2,912,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $2,907,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $2,893,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $2,866,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $2,824,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $2,598,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $3,095,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $3,571,0000,000
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $4,061,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $4,533,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $5,049,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $5,611,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $6,221,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $6,886,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $7,611,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by $2,598,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by $5,693,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by $9,264,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, deerease the amount by $13,324,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $17,857,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $22,906,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $28,516,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $34,738,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $41,624,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $49,235,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $2,598,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $5,693,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $9,264,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $13,324,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $17,857,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $22,906,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $28,516,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $34,738,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $41,624,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $49,235,000,000.
On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by $2,900,000,000.
On page 27, line 12, increase the amount by $2,552,000,000.
On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by $3,103,000,000.
On page 27, line 16, increase the amount by $2,905,000,000.
On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by $3,320,000,000.
On page 27, line 20, increase the amount by $3,195,000,000.
On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by $3,553,000,000.
On page 27, line 24, increase the amount by $3,477,000,000.
On page 28, line 2, increase the amount by $3,801,000,000.
On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by $3,720,000,000.
On page 28, line 6, increase the amount by $4,067,000,000.
On page 28, line 7, increase the amount by $3,980,000,000.
On page 28, line 10, increase the amount by $4,352,000,000.
On page 28, line 11, increase the amount by $4,259,000,000.
On page 28, line 14, increase the amount by $4,657,000,000.
On page 28, line 15, increase the amount by $4,557,000,000.
On page 28, line 18, increase the amount by $4,983,000,000.
On page 28, line 19, increase the amount by $4,876,000,000.
On page 28, line 22, increase the amount by $5,332,000,000.
On page 28, line 23, increase the amount by $5,217,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $46,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $46,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $191,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $191,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $376,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $376,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $585,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $585,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $813,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $813,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $1,068,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $1,068,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $1,352,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $1,352,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $1,664,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,664,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $2,010,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $2,010,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $2,393,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $2,393,000,000.
On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $77,476,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $2,900,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $2,552,000,000.
On page 47, line 14, increase the amount by $3,103,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $2,905,000,000.

SA 364. Mr. LAUTENBERG (for himself and Mr. BYRD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal eyar 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $929,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $41,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $52,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $55,000,000.
On page 4 line 20, increase the amount by $59,000,000.
On page 4 line 21, increase the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by $929,000,000.
On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by $41,000,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $52,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $55,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $59,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $929,000,000.
On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $41,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, decrease the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, decrease the amount by $52,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, decrease the amount by $55,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by $59,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by $929,000,000.
On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by $970,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by $1,017,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by $1,069,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by $1,124,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by $1,183,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by $1,245,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by $1,311,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by $1,381,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by $1,454,000,000.
On page 6, line 19, increase the amount by $929,000,000.
On page 6, line 20, increase the amount by $970,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $1,017,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $1,069,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by $1,124,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by $1,183,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by $1,245,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by $1,311,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $1,381,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by $1,454,000,000.
On page 21, line 23, increase the amount by $912,000,000.
On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $912,000,000.
On page 40, line 6, increase the amount by $17,000,000.
On page 40, line 7, increase the amount by $17,000,000.
On page 40, line 10, increase the amount by $41,000,000.
On page 40, line 11, increase the amount by $41,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, increase the amount by $47,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, increase the amount by $52,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, increase the amount by $52,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, increase the amount by $55,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, increase the amount by $55,000,000.
On page 41, line 2, increase the amount by $59,000,000.
On page 41, line 3, increase the amount by $59,000,000.
On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 41, line 7, increase the amount by $63,000,000.
On page 41, line 10, increase the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 41, line 11, increase the amount by $66,000,000.
On page 41, line 14, increase the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 41, line 15, increase the amount by $70,000,000.
On page 41, line 18, increase the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 41, line 19, increase the amount by $73,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $912,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $912,000,000.

SA 365. Mr. MCCONNELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, decrease the amount by $264,000,000.
On page 3, line 13, decrease the amount by $428,000,000.
On page 3, line 14, decrease the amount by $452,000,000.
On page 3, line 15, decrease the amount by $478,000,000.
On page 3, line 16, decrease the amount by $507,000,000.
On page 3, line 17, decrease the amount by $539,000,000.
On page 3, line 18, decrease the amount by $572,000,000.
On page 3, line 19, decrease the amount by $607,000,000.
On page 4, line 3, decrease the amount by $264,000,000.
On page 4, line 4, decrease the amount by $428,000,000.
On page 4, line 5, decrease the amount by $452,000,000.
On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by $478,000,000.
On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by $507,000,000.
On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by $539,000,000.
On page 4, line 9, decrease the amount by $572,000,000.
On page 4, line 10, decrease the amount by $607,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by $52,000,000.
On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by $80,000,000.
On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by $111,000,000.
On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $145,000,000.
On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $183,000,000.
On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $225,000.
On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $52,000,000.
On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $80,000,000.
On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $111,000,000.
On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $145,000,000.
On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by $183,000,000.
On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by $225,000,000.
On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $271,000,000.
On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by $454,000,000.
On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by $504,000,000.
On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by $558,000,000.
On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by $618,000,000.
On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by $684,000,000.
On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by $755,000,000.
On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by $832,000,000.
On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by $271,000,000.
On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by $725,000,000.
On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by $1,229,000,000.
On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by $1,787,000,000.
On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by $2,404,000,000.
On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by $3,088,000,000.
On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by $3,843,000,000.
On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by $4,675,000,000.
On page 6, line 21, increase the amount by $271,000,000.
On page 6, line 22, increase the amount by $725,000,000.
On page 6, line 23, increase the amount by $1,229,000,000.
On page 6, line 24, increase the amount by $1,787,000,000.
On page 6, line 25, increase the amount by $2,404,000,000.
On page 7, line 1, increase the amount by $3,088,000,000.
On page 7, line 2, increase the amount by $3,843,000,000.
On page 7, line 3, increase the amount by $4,675,000,000.
On page 40, line 14, increase the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 40, line 15, increase the amount by $7,000,000.
On page 40, line 18, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 40, line 19, increase the amount by $26,000,000.
On page 40, line 22, increase the amount by $52,000,000.
On page 40, line 23, increase the amount by $52,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, increase the amount by $111,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, increase the amount by $111,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, increase the amount by $145,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, increase the amount by $145,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, increase the amount by $183,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, increase the amount by $183,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, increase the amount by $225,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, increase the amount by $225,000,000.

Sense of the Senate.—It is the Sense of the Senate that legislation should be enacted no later than December 31, 2004 providing Presidential authority for the United States to negotiate the entry of the United Kingdom into the North American Free Trade Agreement.

SA 366. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 9, increase the amount by $1,540,000,000.

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $3,080,000,000.

On page 3 line 11, increase the amount by $2,420,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $1,320,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $440,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, increase the amount by $1,540,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $3,080,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by $2,420,000,000.

On page 4 line 3, increase the amount by $1,320,000,000.

On page 4 line 4, increase the amount by $440,000,000.

On page 4 line 14, increase the amount by $2,194,000,000.

On page 4 line 15, increase the amount by $2,150,000,000.

On page 4 line 16, decrease the amount by $135,000,000.

On page 4 line 17, decrease the amount by $203,000,000.

On page 4 line 18, decrease the amount by $243,000,000.

On page 4 line 19, decrease the amount by $264,000,000.

On page 4 line 20, decrease the amount by $281,000,000.

On page 4 line 21, decrease the amount by $297,000,000.

On page 4 line 22, decrease the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 4 line 23, decrease the amount by $331,000,000.

On page 4 line 24, decrease the amount by $350,000,000.

On page 5 line 4, increase the amount by $764,000,000.

On page 5 line 5, increase the amount by $1,490,000,000.

On page 5 line 6, increase the amount by $1,075,000,000.

On page 5 line 7, increase the amount by $457,000,000.

On page 5 line 8, decrease the amount by $23,000,000.

On page 5 line 9, decrease the amount by $264,000,000.

On page 5 line 10, decrease the amount by $281,000,000.

On page 5 line 11, decrease the amount by $297,000,000.

On page 5 line 12, decrease the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 5 line 13, decrease the amount by $331,000,000.

On page 5 line 14, decrease the amount by $350,000,000.

On page 5 line 17, increase the amount by $776,000,000.

On page 5 line 18, increase the amount by $1,590,000,000.

On page 5 line 19, increase the amount by $1,345,000,000.

On page 5 line 20, increase the amount by $863,000,000.

On page 5 line 21, increase the amount by $463,000,000.

On page 5 line 22, increase the amount by $264,000,000.

On page 5 line 23, increase the amount by $281,000,000.

On page 5 line 24, increase the amount by $297,000,000.

On page 5 line 25, increase the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 6 line 1, increase the amount by $331,000,000.

On page 6 line 2, increase the amount by $350,000,000.

On page 6 line 5, decrease the amount by $776,000,000.

On page 6 line 6, decrease the amount by $2,366,000,000.

On page 6 line 7, decrease the amount by $3,711,000,000.

On page 6 line 8, decrease the amount by $4,574,000,000.

On page 6 line 9, decrease the amount by $5,037,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by $5,301,000,000.

On page 6, line 11, decrease the amount by $5,582,000,000.

On page 6, line 12, decrease the amount by $5,879,000,000.

On page 6, line 13, decrease the amount by $6,193,000,000.

On page 6, line 14, decrease the amount by $6,524,000,000.

On page 6, line 15, decrease the amount by $6,873,000,000.

On page 6, line 18, decrease the amount by $776,000,000.

On page 6, line 19, decrease the amount by $2,366,000,000.

On page 6, line 20, decrease the amount by $3,711,000,000.

On page 6, line 21, decrease the amount by $4,574,000,000.

On page 6, line 22, decrease the amount by $5,037,000,000.

On page 6, line 23, decrease the amount by $5,301,000,000.

On page 6, line 24, decrease the amount by $5,582,000,000.

On page 6, line 25, decrease the amount by $5,879,000,000.

On page 7, line 1, decrease the amount by $6,193,000,000.

On page 7, line 2, decrease the amount by $6,524,000,000.

On page 7, line 3, decrease the amount by $6,873,000,000.

On page 23, line 15, increase the amount by $2,200,000,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by $770,000,000.

On page 23, line 19, increase the amount by $2,200,000,000.

On page 23, line 20, increase the amount by $1,540,000,000.

On page 23, line 24, increase the amount by $1,210,000,000.

On page 24, line 3, increase the amount by $660,000,000.

On page 24, line 7, increase the amount by $220,000,000.

On page 40, line 2, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 40, line 3, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 40, line 6, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 40, line 7, decrease the amount by $50,000,000.

On page 40, line 10, decrease the amount by $135,000,000.

On page 40, line 11, decrease the amount by $135,000,000.

On page 40, line 14, decrease the amount by $203,000,000.

On page 40, line 15, decrease the amount by $203,000,000.

On page 40, line 18, decrease the amount by $203,000,000.

On page 40, line 19, decrease the amount by $243,000,000.

On page 40, line 22, decrease the amount by $264,000,000.

On page 40, line 23, decrease the amount by $264,000,000.

On page 41, line 2, decrease the amount by $281,000,000.

On page 41, line 3, decrease the amount by $281,000,000.

On page 41, line 6, decrease the amount by $297,000,000.

On page 41, line 7, decrease the amount by $297,000,000.

On page 41, line 10, decrease the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 41, line 11, decrease the amount by $314,000,000.

On page 41, line 14, decrease the amount by $331,000,000.

On page 41, line 15, decrease the amount by $331,000,000.

On page 41, line 18, decrease the amount by $350,000,000.

On page 41, line 19, decrease the amount by $350,000,000.

On page 45, line 24, decrease the amount by $8,800,000,000.

On page 46, line 20, increase the amount by $2,200,000,000.

On page 46, line 21, increase the amount by $770,000,000.

On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $2,200,000,000.

On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $1,540,000,000.

On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $1,210,000,000.

SA 367. Mr. CORZINE (for himself, Mr. KERRY, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. JEFFORDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 10, increase the amount by $378,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $271,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $216,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.
On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $378,000,000.
On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $271,000,000.
On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.
On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $216,000,000.
On page 16, line 11, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.
On page 16, line 12, increase the amount by $378,000,000.
On page 16, line 16, increase the amount by $271,000,000.
On page 16, line 20, increase the amount by $216,000,000.
On page 16, line 24, increase the amount by $216,000,000.
On page 47, line 5, increase the amount by $1,081,000,000.
On page 47, line 6, increase the amount by $378,000,000.
On page 47, line 15, increase the amount by $271,000,000.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be allowed to conduct a hearing during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 20, 2003. The purpose of this hearing will be to consider the nomination of Vernon Bernard Parker to be Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 20, 2003, at 9:30 a.m., in open session to receive testimony on the Atomic Energy Defense Activities of the Department of Energy, in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2004.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 20, 2003, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on ''Issues Relating to HUD's Proposed Rule on the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 20, 2003 at 2:30 p.m. to hold a hearing on Safer Embassies in Unsafe Places.

Witnesses

Mr. Jess Ford, Director, International Affairs & Trade, U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.

Major General Charles E. Williams (Ret.), Director, Overseas Buildings Operations, Department of State, Washington, DC.

The Honorable Francis X. Taylor, Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security, Department of State, Washington, DC.

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

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Thursday, March 20, 2003 at 9:30 a.m. for a hearing entitled ''Cargo Containers: The Next Terrorist Target?''

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a markup on Thursday, March 20, 2003, at 4:00 p.m. in Dirksen Room 226.

I. Nominations

Priscilla Richmond Owen to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit; Cormac J. Carney to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California; James V. Selna to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California; Philip P. Simon to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana; Theresa Lazar Springmann to be U.S. District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana; Mary Ellen Coster Williams to be Judge for the Court of Federal Claims; Victor J. Wolski to be Judge for the Court of Federal Claims; Ricardo H. Hinojosa to be U.S. Sentencing Commissioner; Michael E. Horowitz to be U.S. Sentencing Commissioner; Gregory A. White to be U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Ohio; Thomas Dyson Hurlburt, Jr. to be U.S. Marshal for the Middle District of Florida; Christina Pharo to be U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of Florida; Dennise Arthur Williamson to be U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of Florida; Richard Zenos Winget to be U.S. Marshal for the District of Nevada.

II. Committee Business

COMMITTEE RULES SUBCOMMITTEE ORGANIZATION

III. Bills

S. 330: A bill to further the protection and recognition of veterans' memorials and for other purposes [Campbell].

S. Res. 48: A resolution designating April 2003 as ''Financial Literacy for Youth Month'' [Akaka].

S. Res. 52: A resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of the problem [Campbell].

S. Res. 58: A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning June 1, 2003, as ''National Citizen Soldier Week'' [Allen].

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

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 20, 2003, for a joint hearing with the House of Representatives' Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to hear the legislative presentations of AMVETS, American Ex-Prisoners of War, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Military Officers Association of America, and the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs.

The hearing will take place in room 345 of the Cannon House Office Building at 10:00 a.m.

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet Thursday, March 20, 2003 from 10:30 a.m. to 1;00 p.m. in Dirksen 562 for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR, CLIMATE CHANGE, AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety be authorized to meet on Thursday, March 20 at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing on legislative proposals amending the Clean Air Act regarding fuel additives and renewable fuels.

The meeting will be held in SD 406.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to Ed Rimback during consideration of this resolution.

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I ask unanimous consent the privilege of the floor be granted to Clyde Taylor of my staff for today.

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

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a congressional fellow in my office, David Napoliello, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the consideration of S. Con. 23.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that David Matsuda, a member of my staff, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of S. Con. Res. 23.

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

IRAQI SCIENTISTS IMMIGRATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 9, S. 205.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 205) to authorize the issuance of immigrant visas to, and the admission to the United States for permanent residence of, certain scientists, engineers, and technicians who have worked in Iraqi weapons of mass destruction programs.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. I applaud the Senate for passing S. 205, the Iraqi Scientists Immigration Act. I am a cosponsor of this legislation, along with Senators BIDEN, HATCH, LUGAR, and SPECTER. When Senator BIDEN introduced this last year, I worked closely with him, discharging the bill from the Judiciary Committee and encouraging the Senate to pass it. I was pleased when the Senate did so, and disappointed that the House failed to act.

This bill could not be more timely. As the United States and United Nations seek to obtain information about Iraq's development of weapons of mass destruction, the scientists who have worked on biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons for Iraq hold critical information. Thus far, however, those scientists have refused to speak privately with U.N. inspectors, instead insisting that Iraqi government representatives be included in interviews. Many have suggested that these scientists fear they will be executed if they provide material assistance to the inspectors.

The Iraqi Scientists Immigration Act offers a potential way around this quandary by offering a benefit to those scientists who would like to share what they know about Iraq's weapons development. It provides for the admission to the United States of scientists who want to provide useful information about Iraq's efforts to develop weapons of mass destruction, along with those scientists' families. Eventually, these scientists could become legal permanent residents of the United States.

This bill has taken on increased importance since the Homeland Security Act—which has caused severe disruption in the processing of asylum and refugee applications—has taken effect. Many Iraqi scientists would surely be eligible for asylum and/or refugee status. Section 457 of the Homeland Security Act, however, eliminated the surcharges on applicants for immigration benefits, which had been used to fund the processing of asylum and refugee applications, which are generally made by destitute people. This was apparently an oversight in the hasty and secret process by which the Homeland Security Act was written by Congressional Republicans and the administration. This provision has left the asylum and refugee programs in limbo. The Senate-passed omnibus appropriations bill includes language to strike section 457 and restore the status quo, but the prospects for that change will remain unclear until the conference committee has completed its work. This gives us an added incentive to pass the Iraqi Scientists Immigration Act as quickly as possible. I urge the House to take the bill up and pass it without further delay.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements related thereto be printed in the RECORD, without further intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 205) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 205

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Iraqi Scientists Immigration Act of 2003''.

SEC. 2. ADMISSION OF CRITICAL ALIENS.

(a) NONIMMIGRANT CATEGORY.—Section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (U);

(2) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (V) and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(W) Subject to section 214(s), an alien—

''(i) who the Attorney General determines, in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Director of Central Intelligence, and such other officials as he may deem appropriate, and in the Attorney General's unreviewable discretion, is an individual—

''(I) who has worked at any time in an Iraqi program to produce weapons of mass destruction or the means to deliver them;

''(II) who is in possession of critical and reliable information concerning any such Iraqi program;

''(III) who is willing to provide, or has provided, such information to the United States Government;

''(IV) who may be willing to provide, or has provided, such information to inspectors of the United Nations or of the International Atomic Energy Agency;

''(V) who will be or has been placed in danger as a result of providing such information; and

''(VI) whose admission would be in the public interest or in the interest of national security; or

''(ii) who is the spouse, married or unmarried son or daughter, parent, or other relative, as determined by the Attorney General in his unreviewable discretion, of an alien described in clause (i), if accompanying or following to join such alien, and whose admission the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Director of Central Intelligence, determines in his unreviewable discretion is in the public interest or in the interest of national security.''.

(b) LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS APPLICABLE TO ''W'' NONIMMIGRANTS.—Section 214 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (m) (as added by section 105 of Public Law 106–313), (n) (as added by section 107(e) of Public Law 106–386), (o) (as added by section 1513(c) of Public Law 106–386), (o) (as added by section 1102(b) of the Legal Immigration Family Equity Act), and (p) (as added by section 1503(b) of the Legal Immigration Family Equity Act) as subsections (n), (o), (p), (q), and (r), respectively; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(s) NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS OF ADMISSION AND STAY FOR NONIMMIGRANTS ADMITTED UNDER SECTION 101(a)(15)(W).—

''(1) LIMITATION.—The number of aliens who may be admitted to the United States or otherwise granted status under section 101(a)(15)(W)(i) may not exceed a total of 500.

''(2) CONDITIONS.—As a condition for the admission, and continued stay in lawful status, of any alien admitted to the United States or otherwise granted status as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(W), the nonimmigrant—

''(A) shall report to the Attorney General such information concerning the alien's whereabouts and activities as the Attorney General may require;

''(B) may not be convicted of any criminal offense punishable by a term of imprisonment of 1 year or more after the date of such admission or grant of status;

''(C) must have executed a form that waives the nonimmigrant's right to contest, other than on the basis of an application for withholding of removal or for protection under the Convention Against Torture, any action for removal of the alien instituted before the alien obtains lawful permanent resident status;

''(D) shall cooperate fully with all requests for information from the United States Government including, but not limited to, fully and truthfully disclosing to the United States Government all information in the alien's possession concerning any Iraqi program to produce weapons of mass destruction or the means to deliver them; and

''(E) shall abide by any other condition, limitation, or restriction imposed by the Attorney General.''.

(c) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—Section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking ''or'' before ''(8)''; and

(B) by inserting before the period ''or (9) an alien who was admitted as a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(W)'';

(2) by redesignating subsection (l), relating to ''U'' visa nonimmigrants, as subsection (m); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(n) ADJUSTMENT TO PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS OF 'W' NONIMMIGRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If, in the opinion of the Attorney General, a nonimmigrant admitted into the United States (or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status) under section 101(a)(15)(W)(i) has complied with section 214(s) since such admission or grant of status, the Attorney General may, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Director of Central Intelligence, and in his unreviewable discretion, adjust the status of the alien (and any alien who has accompanied or followed to join such alien pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(W)(ii) and who has complied with section 214(s) since admission or grant of nonimmigrant status) to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien is not described in section 212(a)(3)(E).

''(2) RECORD OF ADMISSION; REDUCTION IN VISA NUMBERS.—Upon the approval of adjustment of status of any alien under paragraph (1), the Attorney General shall record the

alien's lawful admission for permanent residence as of the date of such approval and the Secretary of State shall reduce by one the number of visas authorized to be issued under sections 201(d) and 203(b)(4) for the fiscal year then current.''.

(d) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—Section 212(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) The Attorney General shall determine whether a ground of inadmissibility exists with respect to a nonimmigrant described in section 101(a)(15)(W). The Attorney General, in the Attorney General's discretion, may waive the application of subsection (a) in the case of such a nonimmigrant if the Attorney General considers it to be in the public interest or in the interest of national security.''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 248(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1258(1)) is amended by striking ''or (S)'' and inserting ''(S), or (W)''.

SEC. 3. WEAPON OF MASS DESTRUCTION DEFINED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In this Act, the term ''weapon of mass destruction'' has the meaning given the term in section 1403(1) of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (title XIV of Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2717; 50 U.S.C. 2302(1)), as amended by subsection (b).

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 1403(1)(B) of the Defense Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Act of 1996 (title XIV of Public Law 104–201; 110 Stat. 2717; 50 U.S.C. 2302(1)(B)) is amended by striking ''a disease organism'' and inserting ''a biological agent, toxin, or vector (as those terms are defined in section 178 of title 18, United States Code)''.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 5, H.R. 975, H.R. 1047, AND H.R. 1308

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I understand the following bills are at the desk, and I ask they be read for the first time en bloc: H.R. 5, H.R. 975, H.R. 1047, and H.R. 1308.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5) to improve patient access to health care services and provide improved medical care by reducing the excessive burden the liability system places on the health care delivery system.

A bill (H.R. 975) to amend title 11 of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 1047) to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 1308) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end certain abusive tax practices, to provide tax relief and simplification, and for other purposes.

Mr. NICKLES. I now ask for their second reading and object to further proceeding on these matters en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to S. Res. 95, Commending President and Armed Forces.

The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 104, expressing the support and appreciation of the Nation for the President and the members of the Armed forces who are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S4043–S4223

Measures Introduced: Eleven bills and five resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 670–680, and S. Res. 95–96, and S. Con. Res. 25–27.

Pages S4165–66

Measures Reported:

S. 671, to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty, to make other technical amendments to the trade laws. (S. Rept. No. 108–28)

S. Res. 48, designating April 2003 as ''Financial Literacy for Youth Month''.

S. Res. 52, recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of the problem, with an amendment.

S. Res. 58, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning June 1, 2003, as ''National Citizen Soldier Week''.

S. 330, to further the protection and recognition of veterans' memorials. **Page S4165**

Measures Passed:

Commending President and Armed Forces: By a unanimous vote of 99 yeas (Vote No. 61), Senate agreed to S. Res. 95, commending the President and the Armed Forces of the United States of America.

Pages S4075–S4107

Iraqi Scientists Immigration Act: Senate passed S. 205, to authorize the issuance of immigrant visas to, and the admission to the United States for permanent residence of, certain scientists, engineers, and technicians who have worked in Iraqi weapons of mass destruction programs. **Pages S4222–23**

Congressional Budget Resolution: Senate continued consideration of S. Con. Res. 23, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2003 and for fiscal years 2005 through 2013, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto:

Pages S4044–75, S4109–4152

Adopted:

By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 62), Kyl/Sessions Modified Amendment No. 288, to provide financial security to family farm and small business owners by ending the unfair practice of taxing someone at death. **Page S4109**

By 80 yeas to 19 nays (Vote No. 64), Rockefeller Amendment No. 275, to express the sense of the Senate concerning State fiscal relief. **Pages S4111–12**

Rejected:

Graham (FL)/Dorgan/Stabenow Amendment No. 294, to provide a meaningful prescription drug benefit in Medicare that is available to all beneficiaries. (By 55 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 63), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S4109–10**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that with respect to amendment No. 294 (listed above), that the names be reversed, and that Senator Graham's name appear first as the one proposing the amendment.

Pending:

Schumer Amendment No. 299, to provide immediate assistance to meet pressing homeland security needs by providing funding in 2003 for first responders, port security, bioterrorism preparedness

and prevention, border security and transit security, the FBI; to restore the elimination of funding of the COPS program, firefighter equipment grants, Byrne Grants and Local Law enforcement grants; to provide a sustained commitment of resources for homeland security needs without reducing funding to other key domestic law enforcement and public safety priorities; and to reduce the deficit. **Pages S4046–63**

Brownback Amendment No. 282, to express the sense of the Senate that a commission be established to review the efficiency of Federal agencies. **Pages S4063–71**

Conrad (for Feingold/Corzine) Amendment No. 270, to set aside a reserve fund for possible military action and reconstruction in Iraq. **Pages S4071–75**

Breaux Amendment No. 339, to reduce tax cuts by $375 billion and to reduce projected deficits by $464 billion. **Pages S4113–25**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for a series of votes on certain amendments to begin at 9:45 a.m., on Friday, March 21, 2003. **Page S4107**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the resolution at 9:30 a.m., on Friday, March 21, 2003. **Page S4107**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following messages from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the additional steps taken with respect to the national emergency which was declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990 by exercising the statutory authority to confiscate and vest certain property of the Government of Iraq and its agencies, instrumentalities, or controlled entities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–28) **Page S4163**

Messages From the House: **Pages S4163–64**

Measures Referred: **Page S4164**

Measures Read First Time: **Page S4164**

Executive Communications: **Pages S4164–4165**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S4165**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S4166–4168**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S4168–4181**

Additional Statements: **Pages S4159–63**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S4181–S4221**

Authority for Committees to Meet: **Page S4221**

Privilege of the Floor: **Page S4221**

Record Vote: Four record votes were taken today. (Total—64) **Pages S4106, S4109, S4110, 4112**

Adjournment: Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 11:30 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Friday, March 21, 2003. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S4107.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

NOMINATION

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Committee concluded hearings to examine the nomination of Vernon Bernard Parker, of Arizona, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Civil Rights, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators McCain and Kyl, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary concluded hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2004 for the Department of Commerce, after receiving testimony from Donald L. Evans, Secretary of Commerce.

APPROPRIATIONS: FOREST SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior concluded hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2004 for the Department of Agriculture Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Dale N. Bosworth, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

APPROPRIATIONS: EPA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies concluded hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2004 for the Environmental Protection Agency, after receiving testimony from Christine Todd Whitman, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION: ENERGY

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded hearings to examine proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2004 for the Department of Defense, focusing on atomic energy defense activities of the Department of Energy, after receiving testimony from Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy.

REAL ESTATE SETTLEMENT PROCEDURES ACT

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded hearings to examine issues relating to the Department of Housing and Urban Development's proposed rule on the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, focusing on the effort to better protect consumers and increase homeownership by making the home financing process more transparent, simpler, and less costly, after receiving testimony from Mel Martinez, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety concluded hearings to examine S. 385, to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate methyl tertiary butyl ether from the United States fuel supply, to increase production and use of renewable fuel, and to increase the Nation's energy independence, and other proposed legislation amending the Clean Air Act regarding fuel additives and renewable fuels, gasoline, water contamination, and the oil and natural gas industry, after receiving testimony from Jeffrey R. Holmstead, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, Environmental Protection Agency; David K. Garman, Assistant Secretary for Renewable Energy, and Mary Hutzler, Director, Office of Integrated Analysis and Forecasting, Energy Information Administration, both of the Department of Energy; Paul J. Granger, Plainview Water District, Plainview, New York; Craig Perkins, Environmental and Public Works Management, Santa Monica, California; Fred Yoder, Plain City, Ohio, on behalf of the National Corn Growers Association; Edward Murphy, American Petroleum Institute, Bob Slaughter, National Petrochemical and Refiners Association, Scott H. Segal, Bracewell and Patterson, on behalf of the Oxygenated Fuels Association, all of Washington, D.C.; Richard Wagman, G.A. & F.C. Wagman, York, Pennsylvania, on behalf of the American Road and Transportation Builders Association; and A. Blakeman Early, Washington, D.C., on behalf of the American Lung Association.

EMBASSY SECURITY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings to examine how to make embassies safer in areas of conflict, focusing on federal efforts to provide secure diplomatic and consular facilities for U.S. Government personnel overseas, the Anti-Terrorism Assistance Program, and related provisions of the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2004 for the Department of State, after receiving testimony from Charles E. Williams, Director and Chief Operating Officer, Overseas Buildings Operations Bureau, and Francis X. Taylor, Assistant Secretary for Diplomatic Security and the Office of Foreign Missions, both of the Department of State; and Jess T. Ford, Director, International Affairs and Trade, General Accounting Office.

CARGO CONTAINERS SECURITY

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded hearings to examine securing seaport cargo containers from terrorist attack by implementing and using the Container Security Initiative, Operations Safe Commerce, and the Customs Trade Partnership Against Terrorism, focusing on the coordination between agencies regulating seaport commerce, the standardization of procedures between and within agencies, intelligence information available to port managers, departmental funding, and providing qualified and well trained personnel for port security programs, after receiving testimony from Asa Hutchinson, Under Secretary of Homeland Security for Border and Transportation Security; Peter W. Hall, United States Attorney for the District of Vermont, Department of Justice; Stephen E. Flynn, Independent Task Force on Homeland Security Imperatives, Council on Foreign Relations, New York, New York; Jeffrey W. Monroe, Department of Ports and Transportation, Portland, Maine; and Michael O'Hanlon, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 330, to further the protection and recognition of veterans' memorials;

S. Res. 48, designating April 2003 as ''Financial Literacy for Youth Month'';

S. Res. 52, recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of the problem, with an amendment;

S. Res. 58, expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning June 1, 2003, as ''National Citizen Soldier Week''; and

The nominations of Cormac J. Carney and James V. Selna, each to be a United States District Judge for the Central District of California, Philip P. Simon and Theresa Lazar Springmann, each to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana, and Gregory A. White, to be United States Attorney for the Northern District of Ohio, Thomas Dyson Hurlburt, Jr., to be United States Marshal for the Middle District of Florida, Christina Pharo, to be United States Marshal for the Southern District of Florida, Dennis Arthur Williamson, to be United States Marshal for the

Northern District of Florida, and Richard Zenos Winget, to be United States Marshal for the District of Nevada, all of the Department of Justice.

Also, Committee adopted its rules of procedure for the 108th Congress and announced the following subcommittee assignments:

Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts: Senators Sessions (Chairman), Grassley, Specter, Craig, Cornyn, Schumer, Leahy, Feingold, and Durbin.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security: Senators Kyl (Chairman), Hatch, Specter, DeWine, Sessions, Chambliss, Feinstein, Kennedy, Biden, Kohl, and Edwards.

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights: Senators DeWine (Chairman), Hatch, Specter, Graham (SC), Chambliss, Kohl, Leahy, Feingold, and Edwards.

Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights and Property Rights: Senators Cornyn (Chairman), Kyl, Graham (SC), Craig, Chambliss, Feingold, Kennedy, Schumer, and Durbin.

Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship: Senators Chambliss (Chairman), Grassley, Kyl, DeWine, Sessions, Craig, Cornyn, Kennedy, Leahy, Feinstein, Schumer, Durbin, and Edwards.

Subcommittee on Crime, Corrections and Victims' Rights: Senators Graham (SC) (Chairman), Hatch, Grassley, Sessions, Craig, Cornyn, Biden, Kohl, Feinstein, Durbin, and Edwards.

MEDICARE REFORM: PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded hearings to examine proposals to improve and modernize the current Medicare system, focusing on prescription drugs benefits, regulatory and contractor reforms, and demographic and health care trends, after receiving testimony from Thomas A. Scully, Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services; and Douglas Holtz-Eakin, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Measures Introduced: 40 public bills, H.R. 1372–1411; and 14 resolutions, H.J. Res. 41–42; H. Con. Res. 103–109, and H. Res. 153–157 were introduced. **Pages H2268–70**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H2270–72**

Reports Filed: No reports were filed today.

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. David K. Stewart, Pastor, First United Methodist Church of Wayne, Michigan. **Page H2133**

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of Wednesday, March 19 by yea-and-nay vote of 373 yeas to 49 nays with 2 voting "present", Roll No. 75. **Pages H2133, H2135–36**

Expressing the Support and Appreciation of the Nation for the President and the Members of the Armed Forces: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 104, expressing the support and appreciation of the Nation for the President and the members of the Armed Forces who are participating in Operation Iraqi Freedom by yea-and-nay vote of 392 yeas to 11 nays with 22 voting "present", Roll No. 83. **Pages H2229–51, H2262–63**

Earlier agreed by unanimous consent to consider the concurrent resolution. **Pages H2227–29**

Leave of Absence Granted to Representative Buyer of Indiana: On motion of Speaker Hastert, Representative Buyer was granted a leave of absence for an indefinite period of time on account of military service. Earlier, the Speaker read a letter from Representative Buyer wherein he stated that he had been called to active duty in the United States Army and that pending further orders, he requested immediate indefinite leave of the House of Representatives to accommodate his military duties. **Pages H2226–27**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Armed Forces Tax Fairness Act: Debated on March 19, H.R. 1307, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a special rule for members of the uniformed services in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of a principal residence and to restore the tax exempt status of death gratuity payments to members of the uniformed services (agreed to by ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 422 yeas with none voting "nay," Roll No. 76); and **Pages H2136–37**

Urging that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals Ruling on the Pledge of Allegiance be Overturned:

H. Res. 132, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling in Newdow v. United States Congress is inconsistent with the Supreme Court's interpretation of the first amendment and should be overturned (agreed to by ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 400 yeas to 7 nays with 15 voting "present," Roll No. 77). **Page H2137**

Concurrent Resolution on the Budget: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 95, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2004 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 and 2005 through 2013 by yea-and-nay vote of 215 yeas to 212 nays, Roll No. 82. **Pages H2145–70, H2171–H2227, H2251–2262**

Pursuant to the rule, the Nussle amendment in the nature of a substitute specified in part A of H. Rept. 108–44 was considered as adopted.

Rejected:

Hill ("Blue Dog Coalition") amendment in the nature of a substitute no. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 108–44 that sought to provide for spending at the levels contained in the President's budget as estimated by CBO; include reconciliation for a tax package with tax relief offset by deferring a portion of tax cuts for upper income taxpayers if the budget remains in deficit; directs a Medicare prescription drug benefit of $400 billion; provides an increase in the debt limit of 150 billion but prohibits any further increase in the debt limit of more that $100 billion until CBO certifies that the budget is on path to balance by 2009 (rejected by a recorded vote of 174 ayes to 254 noes, Roll No. 78); **Pages H2176–89**

Toomey ("Republican Study Committee") amendment in the nature of a substitute no. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 108–44 that sought to balance the budget in four years; provide $512 billion in tax relief over the next five years and $1.6 trillion over the next 10 years, all under reconciliation; freezes total discretionary spending for one year and then permits growth at half of the rate of inflation for two years; and within the total level of discretionary spending, defense and homeland security are funded at the requested levels (rejected by a recorded vote of 80 ayes to 342 noes, Roll No. 79); **Pages H2189–H2204**

Cummings ("Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus") amendment in the nature of a substitute no. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 108–44 that sought to freeze the tax cut; support defense funding commensurate with the President's request; provide $300 billion for economic stimulus; provide for universal single payer healthcare program and $528 billion for Medicare prescription drug benefit; and increase education funding by $20 billion (rejected by recorded vote of 85 ayes to 340 noes, Roll No. 80); **Pages H2203–13**

Spratt ("Democratic Alternative") amendment in the nature of a substitute no. 4 printed in part B of H. Rept. 108–44, as modified, that sought to restore $98 billion of direct spending cuts and increase funding for homeland security, education, and other priorities; provide $528 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit and allows increases to the extent offsets are identified; achieves budget balance in 2010 and adds $573 billion less to the public debt (rejected by recorded vote of 192 ayes to 236 noes, Roll No. 81). **Pages H2213–26**

Earlier agreed to the unanimous consent request made by Representative Spratt that the amendment no. 4 in H. Rept. 108–44 be considered as modified by the form that he placed at the desk. **Page H2145**

The House agreed to H. Res. 151, the rule that provided for consideration of the concurrent resolution by voice vote. **Pages H2138–45**

Presidential Message—National Emergency re Iraq: Message wherein he reported that he has taken additional steps with respect to the national emergency declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990, by exercising his statutory authority to confiscate and vest certain property of the Government of Iraq and its agencies, instrumentalities, or controlled entities—referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 108–51). **Page H2264**

Legislative Program: The Majority Leader announced the Legislative Program for the week of March 24. **Page H2263**

Meeting Hour—Monday, March 24 and Tuesday, March 25: Agreed that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 2 p.m. on Monday, March 24 and agreed that when the House adjourns on Monday, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 25, for morning hour today. **Pages H2263–64**

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with the Calendar Wednesday business of Wednesday, March 26. **Page H2264**

Recess: The House recessed at 11 a.m. and reconvened at 12:30 p.m. **Page H2138**

Senate Message: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H2133.

Referrals: S. 153 was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and S. 342 was held at the desk. **Page H2265**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes and four recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H2135–36,

H2136–37, H2137, H2189, H2203, H2212, H2226, H2261–62, H2262–63. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 3:11 a.m. on Friday, March 21.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies held a hearing on Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services. Testimony was heard from Eric Bost, Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, USDA.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE AND THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, and State and The Judiciary, and Related Agencies held a hearing on DEA and Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Justice: John B. Brown III, Acting Administrator, DEA; and Bradley A. Buckles, Acting Director, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Fiscal Year 2004 Navy/Marine Corps Budget Overview. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Navy: H.T. Johnson, Acting Secretary; Adm. Vernon E. Clark, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; and Gen. Michael W. Hagee, USMC, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held a hearing on Department of Energy: Nuclear Waste Management and Disposal. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Energy: Jessie Roberson, Assistant Secretary, Energy, Environmental Management; and Margaret Chu, Director, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Secretary of Homeland Security. Testimony was heard from Tom Ridge, Secretary of Homeland Secretary.

LABOR, HHS, EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on Secretary of Health and Human Services. Testimony was heard from Tommy G. Thompson, Secretary of Health and Human Services.

VA, HUD AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies held a hearing on Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. Testimony was heard from Ellen Lazar, Executive Director, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.

The Subcommittee also held a hearing on Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. Testimony was heard from Henry Falk, Assistant Administrator, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, Department of Health and Human Services.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST—BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on the 2004 fiscal year defense authorization budget request for Ballistic Missile Defense programs. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: E.C. ''Pete'' Aldridge, Jr., Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics; J.D. Crouch, Assistant Secretary, International Security Policy; Lt. Gen. Ronald T. Kadish, USAF, Director, Missile Defense Agency; and Thomas P. Christie, Director, Operational Test and Evaluation.

MILITARY READINESS AND REVIEW—DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness continued hearings on the state of military readiness and review of the fiscal year 2004 Defense Authorization budget request. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: H.T. Johnson, Acting Secretary, Navy; Brig. Gen. Ronald S. Coleman, USMC, Assistant Deputy Commandant, Installations and Logistics (Facilities); Rear Adm. Christopher Cole, USN, Office of Chief of Naval Operations, Ashore Readiness Division; Rear Adm. Craig McDonald, USN, Deputy Director, Naval Reserve; Nelson F. Gibbs, Assistant Secretary, Air Force, Installations, Environment and Logistics; Maj. Gen. Earnest O. Robbins II, USAF, The Air Force Civil Engineer; Brig. Gen. David A. Brubaker, USAF, Deputy Director, Air National Guard; and Brig. Gen. William A. Rajczak, USAF, Deputy to the Chief, Air Force Reserve.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces held a hearing on the fiscal year 2004 national defense authorization budget request. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Glen Lamartin, Director, Tactical and Strategic Systems; Claude M. Bolton, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Army, Acquisition, Logistics and Technology, Department of the Army; Gen. Paul J. Kern, USA, Commanding General, Army Materiel Command; and Lt. Gen. Robert Magnus, USMC, Deputy Commander, Programs and Resources, U.S. Marine Corps.

WORKFORCE REINVESTMENT AND ADULT EDUCATION ACT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on 21st Century Competitiveness approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 1261, Workforce Reinvestment and Adult Education Act of 2003.

HIV/AIDS, TB, AND MALARIA—COMBATING GLOBAL PANDEMIC

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on ''HIV/AIDS, TB, and Malaria: Combating a Global Pandemic.'' Testimony was heard from Claude Allen, Deputy Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

ACCOUNTANT, COMPLIANCE, AND ENFORCEMENT STAFFING ACT

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance and Government Sponsored Enterprises approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 658, Accountant, Compliance, and Enforcement Staffing Act of 2003.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, Trade, and Technology approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 1280, Defense Production Act Reauthorization of 2003.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ENERGY MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENT

Committee on Government Reform: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 1346, to amend the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act to provide an additional function of the Administrator for Federal Procurement Policy relating to encouraging Federal procurement policies that enhance energy efficiency.

ENERGY DEPARTMENT ACQUISITIONS—DECADE OF FAILURE

Committee on Government Reform: Held a hearing on ''Breaking Fumes; A Decade of Failure in Energy Department Acquisitions.'' Testimony was heard from Robin M. Nazzaro, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, GAO; and the following officials of the Department of Energy: Gregory H. Friedman, Inspector General; and James A. Rispoli, Director, Engineering and Construction Management.

U.S. AND SOUTH ASIA CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN POLICY

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific held a hearing on the U.S. and South Asia: Challenges and Opportunities for American policy. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: Christina Rocca, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of South Asian Affairs; and Wendy J. Chamberlin, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Asia and the Near East, AID.

FEDERAL COURTS IMPROVEMENT ACT; E-GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 1302, Federal Courts Improvement Act of 2003; and H.R. 1303, amended, to amend the E-Government Act of 2002 with respect to rulemaking authority of the Judicial Conference.

SBA FINANCING PROGRAMS—CHANGES NEEDED

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing entitled ''Changes to SBA Financing Programs Needed for Revitalization of Small Manufacturers.'' Testimony was heard from Ronald Bew, Associate Administrator, Capital Access, SBA; and public witnesses.

PROTECTING COMMERCIAL AIRCRAFT

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation met in executive session to hold a hearing on Protecting Commercial Aircraft from the Threat of Missile Attacks. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

MEDICARE REGULATORY AND CONTRACTING REFORM ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 810, Medicare Regulatory and Contracting Reform Act of 2003.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS—REVIEW STATE USE

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Human Resources held a hearing to Review State Use of Federal Unemployment Funds. Testimony was heard from Emily S. DeRocco, Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor; Sigurd R. Nilsen, Director, Education, Workforce, and Income Security Issues, GAO; Jon Brock, Executive Director, Employment Security Commission, State of Oklahoma; Melissa DeLisio, Assistant Director, Department of Job and Family Services, State of Ohio; Dawn Watson, Secretary, Department of Labor, State of Louisiana; and a public witness.

NATIONAL IMAGERY AND MAPPING AGENCY PROGRAM

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a hearing on National Imagery and Mapping Agency Program. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

Joint Meetings

VETERANS' LEGISLATIVE PRESENTATIONS

Joint Hearing: Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs concluded joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to examine legislative presentations of certain veterans' organizations, after receiving testimony from W.G. Kilgore, AMVETS, Lanham, Maryland; Maurice S. Sharp, American Ex-Prisoners of War, Arlington, Texas; Thomas H. Corey, Vietnam Veterans of America, Silver Spring, Maryland; Colonel Robert F. Norton, USA (Ret.), Military Officers Association of America, Alexandria, Virginia; and Raymond G. Boland, National Association of State Directors of Veterans' Affairs.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 2003

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Friday, March 21, 2003

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: Senate will continue consideration of S. Con. Res. 23, Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2004.

At 9:45 a.m., Senate will begin a series of votes on certain amendments.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 p.m., Monday, March 24

House Chamber

Program for Monday: Pro forma session.

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through GPO Access at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at (202) 512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or GPO Access can be directed to the GPO Access User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $217.00 for six months, $434.00 per year, or purchased for $6.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (866) 512–1800 (toll free), (202) 512–1800 (D.C. Area), or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.