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 We repealed it permanently in this body, starting with the year 2010.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.

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 non-germane 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 non-nation 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 multi-culturalism 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 Government 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 Government 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 Government 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 Government 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 Government 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 Government 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 Government 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 Government 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 factfinding 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 counter-terrorism 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, decrease 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.