

what resources he will devote to protect our domestic security. Up until now the administration's voice has been all too quiet and all too silent. We hope tonight's speech indicates a large change.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. What is the status of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time until 4:45 is under the control of the Senator from New Hampshire, 5 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Five minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Correct.

Mr. GREGG. I was of the impression that the unanimous consent gave us 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is now 5 minutes.

FUNDING

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, there have been a lot of representations made on the floor today by Members of the other side of the aisle relative to funding and lack of funding. It is interesting because, as we went through the last budget exercise in the Senate last week, when the appropriations bills were passed, we heard from the other side that they needed more and more money. And although the President tried to hold the line on fiscal discipline by setting a number of \$750 billion of discretionary spending, which was the agreed-to amount signed off on by the Senator from West Virginia and members of the Democratic Party back when they controlled the Senate in the last Congress, suddenly we found that money was not enough.

There was over a half a trillion dollars of new spending proposed from the other side of the aisle that was not offset, not paid for, that would have been put on top of the spending which the President had committed to. That irresponsible explosion in proposals in spending is an example of the lack of discipline which we are seeing in the area of fiscal policy from the other side of the aisle.

It has to be put in the context not only of the fact that it is an explosive attempt to expand the Federal deficit through new spending, but also in the context of the fact that this President has made stronger commitments in the area of education and national defense than any President in recent times and certainly than the President who preceded him.

I yield the floor.

It is very hard for me to understand how with a straight face, Members from the other side of the aisle can come down here and attack this President for failing to fund education. When we look at what this President has done in the area of funding education, we need to look at some pretty simple and obvious charts. In his first year, President Bush increased funding for education over President Clinton's budget by \$20 billion. That is \$20 billion

of new money this President put directly into education in his first year as President.

An example of that commitment was in the area of special education, where President Clinton basically zero funded, relative to increases, the issue of special education, while President Bush dramatically increased it, by \$1 billion a year, year in and year out, since he has been President the first 3 years—\$1 billion each year, so that he has radically increased funding for special education.

It is pretty hard for the other side to come down here and make the representation that this President has not significantly increased funding. In fact, if you look at the spending this President has committed to funding and done in the context of fiscal responsibility, not exploding the budget with spending as was proposed from the other side of the aisle when they proposed over half a trillion dollars of new spending last week without offsets, this President, in the area of education, has increased funding by \$2.5 billion in the area of title I, for example, in his first 2 years in office. That is a greater increase, by 25 percent, than President Clinton gave in his 7 years in office. So the commitment for funding for education has been dramatic.

We heard earlier that the President hasn't funded up to the authorization levels. That is not unusual in this Congress or in this Government not to fund to the authorization levels. I will point out that if you are going to compare funding up to the authorization levels of this Presidency versus President Clinton, under President Clinton's Presidency, the gap between funding, the difference between funding to appropriation levels and authorization levels was about twice what this President's gap is in that area. President Bush has done even a better job in coming close to funding at authorization levels than President Clinton did.

It is really inconsistent and a touch hypocritical to come down here and attack President Bush for failing to fund education when, in fact, he has done more to fund education than any President in recent times and certainly dramatically more than his predecessor during a time when the Democratic Party controlled both the Senate and the Presidency.

There have been other representations that he has not funded adequately homeland security. That is an incredible representation. When I hear the Senator from New York come down here and say that homeland security has not been adequately funded, when you think of the billions, tens of billions of dollars the Congress has voted to assist the City of New York, very appropriately, under the leadership of this President, I find it difficult to understand how that argument can be made.

If you look at the funding in the area of the FBI, we have heard this rep-

resentation: This number of agencies is going to have to be cut.

That is a total fabrication. FBI funding under this President has gone up every year. It is going up significantly this year. It went up significantly last year. And more agents are being added. The same is true of the INS, the same is true of the Marshals Service, of DEA. All of these accounts come under the jurisdiction of a committee which I had the good fortune to be ranking member of and now am chairman of, the Commerce, State, Justice Committee. The representation that we are actually reducing manpower or reducing the accounts in these areas is simply wrong. It is inaccurate, and it is a gross misstatement. It should not be made on the floor of the Senate because people should know the facts before they come down here and make these representations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GREGG. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is a most interesting discussion we are having. I guess two and two equals five here in the Senate. We are told repeatedly that this Senate and Congress should increase defense spending, and it does; increase spending on homeland security, and it does. And then cut other domestic discretionary spending. But now we are told, we don't really cut other domestic discretionary spending.

The President apparently wants to increase defense spending, increase homeland security spending, increase other spending, and then have tax cuts, as if somehow that all adds up. I don't know where you get that kind of schooling. Does two and two equal five? I don't think so.

Either there are cuts in domestic discretionary spending or there are no cuts. We all know the truth. I will bring charts down here and talk about these areas of the Government where they will be spending less this year than they did last year. With respect to homeland security, I wonder if my colleagues really make the case that the President has not in any way ignored the needs of homeland security when in fact we appropriated \$2.5 billion for homeland security that the President would not spend, in spite of the fact that, for example, with port security, that is the security of America's seaports, we have 5.7 million containers coming in every year to the seaports, and 100,000 of them are inspected and 5.6 million are not.

Everyone in this country understands, all law enforcement understands, that that is a very difficult problem. The homeland security issue with respect to seaports is a very serious issue. It is unaddressed.