



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 8, 2001

No. 62

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ISSA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 8, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DARRELL E. ISSA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2001, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, if Members care about livable communities, they should be encouraged with the recent discussions surrounding the flooding in the Upper Mississippi.

We cannot make families safe, healthy, and economically secure unless we squarely address how we manage these disasters. Despite massive construction efforts to stave off harm over the last 40 years, losses adjusted for inflation are six times greater than before we started. The reasons are quite clear.

First, we have often made the problems worse by our efforts to prevent disasters. We have channelized the rivers, we have narrowed them, we have reduced the capacity to carry water while they increase the velocity. And we leave no place for the water to go when it floods.

Number two, we have a decided lack of careful planning for land around the edges of rivers and other bodies of water. Water is a magnet for development, especially when we implement things that appear to increase safety, like build more and higher sea walls and dikes. This has encouraged people to develop in flood plains, which by their very nature puts people at risk. There is a reason why they are called flood plains.

Nationally, we have developed over half our Nation's wetlands with houses and parking lots. In some communities 90 percent or more of the original wetlands have disappeared, taking with it the capacity for the ground in low-lying areas to soak up water and to have relatively benign pools, ponds, and temporary lakes. The swamps, which are always targeted to be eliminated, were actually very effective devices to prevent floodwater from inflicting more damage.

Into this volatile mix, we need to factor global climate change. There are some who still argue, well, we should just study it. But the strong consensus from the scientific community is that global warming and climate change is a reality. There is a very high degree of probability that the warming we have seen in the last century will continue and even accelerate. And while many people associate this with severe droughts and much higher temperature in urban areas and nighttime temperatures, there is another significant factor, extreme storm events. There have been many incidents recently where communities have set all-time records for rainfall in a 24-hour period. This

combination of mismanaged flood protection, inappropriate development, and the likelihood of things getting worse in terms of increased precipitation makes these questions even more significant.

There is a golden opportunity for environmentalists to join with the administration, for fiscal conservatives to join with people who are concerned about preventing human misery to agree to simple, common sense steps that will provide for true improvement.

First, there ought to be an incentive, an emphasis, on prevention. We should not discourage or eliminate promising programs like Project Impact, which help people prepare to resist disasters before the fact.

Second, there ought to be increased local responsibility. There is no question that local communities must bear the consequences for decisions they make about the location and nature of development. There is no question that more expensive or intrusive measures should require more local or State support. However, the Federal match should be higher for things that are going to be preventative in nature while subsidy should be reduced or eliminated for things that are more likely to make it worse. Local communities should implement sound land-use planning and building codes to help themselves.

There is no excuse to put hog waste lagoons in flood plains, to not have reasonable building requirements for window covering for areas that are subject to extreme tropical storm damage, or to allow people to maintain a residence in repeatedly flooded areas. All these people should be given clear signals that they are going to have to accept responsibility to mitigate these clearly avoidable damages.

Finally, a simple, common sense step should be to reform the flood insurance program to eliminate Federal subsidy for repetitive flood-loss payments.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1931

It is critical that we not make this into a political tug of war at a time when there is consensus in the scientific community, environmentalists, the professionals who work in disaster mitigation about what will work, what will make things better, what will keep people out of harm's way. We need to work cooperatively to make our communities more livable with a better match between private responsibility and government policy at all levels.

ARSENIC STANDARDS IN DRINKING WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned about attacks made on the Bush administration for their decision to not immediately implement the Environmental Protection Agency's decision to reduce the standard on arsenic in drinking water from 50 parts per billion to 10 parts per billion until further research and data is provided. Since nearly everyone has heard of individuals being poisoned with arsenic, it is assumed that any amount of arsenic is detrimental and that not immediately implementing a lower standard of 10 parts per billion is anti-environment and insensitive to human health concerns. The 50 parts per billion standard has been in effect since 1942, and there is no sound evidence that having a standard of 50 parts per billion has led to increased health problems in the United States.

Most people are not aware of the fact that arsenic is a naturally-occurring substance and is present in the groundwater in most western States and parts of the Midwest and even some parts of New England. It is not put there by pesticides, fertilizers or human beings. Ninety-seven percent of the communities exceeding the 10 parts per billion of arsenic in their water supplies are small towns with populations of less than 10,000 people. There are 69 such communities in the State of Nebraska that exceed 10 parts per billion of arsenic. Nearly all of these are small rural communities, and most of them have only 11 to 15 parts per billion of arsenic in their groundwater. In order to meet the 10 parts per billion standard, nearly all of these communities would have to be assessed several hundred dollars per family and several million dollars per community.

Much of the EPA reasoning for dropping the arsenic standards to 10 parts per billion has been extrapolated from studies done in Taiwan where water contains an average arsenic level of 250 parts per billion. Some health problems have been detected as a result of the high levels of arsenic in Taiwan. Now, if there is a linear relationship in regard to the level of arsenic and health concerns, reducing the standard

level of arsenic from 50 parts per billion to 10 parts per billion would theoretically, and this is theoretically only, prevent three cases of bladder cancer and could possibly prevent a handful of deaths from all causes that might possibly be related to arsenic in the United States annually. If a linear relationship exists, even 1 part per billion poses at least some slight health risk.

At the present time, however, there is no clear evidence that there is a linear relationship between arsenic level and health. It is very possible there may be some point that a certain amount of arsenic in the water poses absolutely no health risk. Arsenic is necessary for human life and is present in every person's body. Therefore, 50 parts per billion, 40 parts per billion, 30, or 20 parts per billion could prove to be perfectly safe. We just do not know what that level is.

The cost of lowering this standard from 50 parts per billion to 10 parts per billion has been estimated by the EPA to cost \$181 million annually. However, the American Waterworks Association has stated that the cost would actually be \$600 million annually with an additional \$5 billion in capital outlays to pay for the treatment plants. There is a huge discrepancy, obviously, in these figures.

The EPA told the State of Nebraska's Department of Health to dump extracted arsenic on open fields, as arsenic is nontoxic. However, a short time later the EPA reversed its opinion and said that arsenic extracted from water must be shipped to toxic waste dumps. It does not appear that the EPA has factored the cost of shipping arsenic to toxic waste sites into their cost estimates. It would seem that the Bush administration's decision to delay implementation of standards until further study has been done is warranted. In short, it seems that all of the evidence that we currently have would indicate that an arbitrary level of 10 parts per billion may be excessively low and it is quite likely not based on any sound evidence. Further data from independent sources is clearly warranted.

INTRODUCTION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF "ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER AMERICANS IN CONGRESS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, in celebration of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, I proudly rise to introduce a concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a book entitled "Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in Congress."

Each year during the month of May, we celebrate the rich heritage of Asian

and Pacific Islander Americans throughout the country, thanks to the pioneering efforts of Congressmen Frank Horton and Norman Mineta, who sponsored legislation celebrating the first official Asian Pacific American Week in 1978. In 1992, Congressman Horton authored legislation expanding the week into a permanent month-long celebration of the proud mosaic of histories and ethnicities of this most diverse national community.

Asian and Pacific Islanders are indeed a diverse constellation of peoples from 40 major subpopulation groups of Pacific Islander Americans including Chamorros, Native Hawaiians and Samoans; Southeast Asian Americans such as Cambodians, Vietnamese, Hmong and Laotians; East Asian Americans including Chinese, Japanese and Koreans; and South Asian Americans, including Indians and Pakistanis. Our national community boasts the most diverse minority group within the country, comprised of both immigrant and indigenous populations.

The history of Congress includes 33 Asian and Pacific Islander Americans that have served from 1903 to the present. These Members come from backgrounds ranging from Chinese, Chamorro, Filipino, Asian Indian, Japanese, Korean, Hawaiian, and Samoan. Thirteen of these Members were Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands during the time it was a territory from 1898 until it became independent in 1946. Currently, there are nine Members serving in the 107th Congress. Amongst them are two Senators, two delegates, and five Representatives.

Delegate Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, a Native Hawaiian prince and Member of the Hawaiian royal family, was the first Pacific Islander American elected to Congress. Delegate Kuhio represented the Territory of Hawaii from 1903 to 1923.

Hawaii, not surprisingly being the State with the highest per capita population of Asian and Pacific Islander Americans, has a history of many other firsts in Congress. Senator Hiram Fong was the first Chinese American in Congress. Representative PATSY MINK was the first Asian Pacific American woman in Congress. Senator DANIEL K. INOUE is the first Japanese American and has served in Congress since being elected in 1959 after statehood for Hawaii. Senator DANIEL K. AKAKA is the first U.S. Senator of Native Hawaiian ancestry.

Amongst the other firsts, Representative Dalip Singh Saund of California was the first Asian American U.S. Representative from 1957 to 1963. Guam's first Delegate to Congress, Antonio Borja Won Pat, was the first Chamorro elected in 1973. Delegate Fofa Iosefa Fiti Sunia, the first American Samoan in Congress, was elected in 1981. And Representative Jay Kim was the first Korean American elected to the 103rd Congress.

□ 1245

Benito Y Tuason Legarda and Pablo Ocampo were the first Filipinos elected as resident commissioners in the 60th Congress in 1907. Members also served in a variety of occupations before working in Congress. Seven were educators. Eight held law degrees or practiced law, and two had been judges. Others had won State and local elections before serving in Congress. Nine members have military experience, some such as Brigadier General Ben Blaz earning a Bronze Medal and Captain DANIEL K. INOUE, who was awarded the Medal of Honor by President Bill Clinton last year.

Some became great statesmen after serving in Congress, such as Brigadier General Carlos Pena Romulo who served with distinction as aide-de-camp to General Douglas MacArthur. He was a Pulitzer Prize winner, one of the signatories of the U.N. Charter and President of the U.N. General Assembly from 1949 to 1950.

Asian and Pacific Islander American members have also chaired several congressional committees. In the Senate, Senator INOUE chaired the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Secret Military Assistance to Iran and Nica-

ragua Opposition Select Committee, and Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

In the House, Representative Norm Mineta chaired the House Public Works and Transportation Committee. Mineta later went on to be the first Asian American member of a Presidential Cabinet, who was appointed by President Bill Clinton to serve as Secretary of Commerce. He was tapped again this year by President George Bush to serve as Secretary of Transportation.

As a member of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, one of our goals is to educate other Members and the country about the history and contributions of Asian Pacific Islander Americans.

This concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of this book will enable us to meet this goal.

I include in the RECORD a list of Members of Congress from the Asian Pacific Islander community at the end of my remarks.

This concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of this book will not only enable us to meet that goal but also educate the general public on the diversity that exists in Congress. "Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in Congress" will follow in the same tradition as "His-

panic Americans in Congress", "Black Americans in Congress", and "Women in Congress."

It is not surprising that the top leaders of our great nation have recognized the importance of Asian and Pacific Islander American contributors. President Jimmy Carter was the first to proclaim Asian Pacific American Heritage Week in May 1978. Two years later, President George Bush was the first to issue a proclamation celebrating Asian Pacific American Heritage Month on May 7, 1990. Since then, President Bill Clinton has continued the tradition, proclaiming the celebration of Asian Pacific American Heritage during the Month of May. Clinton also issued an Executive Order establishing a White House Initiative on and Commission on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to urge my colleagues and President George W. Bush to continue and share in the tradition of celebrating Asian and Pacific Islander American culture and history, and to recognize the significant contributions they have made to the growth of our great nation. Finally, I look forward to working with the Bush administration to continue the progress of the White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders.

TABLE 1.—ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN MEMBERS AND DELEGATES IN THE 58TH-107TH CONGRESSES (1903-2003)

Congress	Dates	House	Senate
58th-67th	1903-1923	Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole ¹	—
68th-84th	1923-1957	—	—
85th	1957-1959	Dalip Singh Saund	—
86th	1959-1961	Daniel Ken Inouye Dalip Singh Saund	Hiram Leong Fong.
87th	1961-1963	Daniel Ken Inouye Dalip Singh Saund	Hiram Leong Fong.
88th	1963-1965	Spark Masayuki Matsunaga	Hiram Leong Fong. Daniel Ken Inouye.
89th	1965-1967	Spark Masayuki Matsunaga Patsy Takemoto Mink	Hiram Leong Fong. Daniel Ken Inouye.
90th	1967-1969	Spark Masayuki Matsunaga Patsy Takemoto Mink	Hiram Leong Fong. Daniel Ken Inouye.
91st	1969-1971	Spark Masayuki Matsunaga Patsy Takemoto Mink	Hiram Leong Fong. Daniel Ken Inouye.
92nd	1971-1973	Spark Masayuki Matsunaga Patsy Takemoto Mink	Hiram Leong Fong. Daniel Ken Inouye.
93rd	1973-1975	Spark Masayuki Matsunaga Patsy Takemoto Mink	Hiram Leong Fong. Daniel Ken Inouye.
94th	1975-1977	Antonio Borja Won Pat Spark Masayuki Matsunaga Norman Yoshio Mineta Patsy Takemoto Mink Antonio Borja Won Pat	Hiram Leong Fong. Daniel Ken Inouye.
95th	1977-1979	Daniel Kahikina Akaka Norman Yoshio Mineta Antonio Borja Won Pat	Samuel Ichiye Hayakawa. Daniel Ken Inouye. Spark Masayuki Matsunaga.
96th	1979-1981	Daniel Kahikina Akaka Robert Takeo Matsui Norman Yoshio Mineta Antonio Borja Won Pat	Samuel Ichiye Hayakawa. Daniel Ken Inouye. Spark Masayuki Matsunaga.
97th	1981-1983	Daniel Kahikina Akaka Robert Takeo Matsui Norman Yoshio Mineta Fofu Josefa Fiti Sunia	Samuel Ichiye Hayakawa. Daniel Ken Inouye. Spark Masayuki Matsunaga.
98th	1983-1985	Antonio Borja Won Pat Daniel Kahikina Akaka Robert Takeo Matsui Norman Yoshio Mineta Fofu Josefa Fiti Sunia	Daniel Ken Inouye. Spark Masayuki Matsunaga.
99th	1985-1987	Antonio Borja Won Pat Daniel Kahikina Akaka Ben Garrido Blaz Robert Takeo Matsui Norman Yoshio Mineta Fofu Josefa Fiti Sunia	Daniel Ken Inouye. Spark Masayuki Matsunaga.
100th	1987-1989	Daniel Kahikina Akaka Ben Garrido Blaz Robert Takeo Matsui Norman Yoshio Mineta Patricia Fukuda Saiki	Daniel Ken Inouye. Spark Masayuki Matsunaga.
101st	1989-1991	Fofu Josefa Fiti Sunia ² Ben Garrido Blaz Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Robert Takeo Matsui Norman Yoshio Mineta Patsy Takemoto Mink Patricia Fukuda Saiki	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. ³ Daniel Ken Inouye. Spark Masayuki Matsunaga.
102nd	1991-1993	Ben Garrido Blaz Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Robert Takeo Matsui Norman Yoshio Mineta Patsy Takemoto Mink	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. Daniel Ken Inouye.

TABLE 1.—ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN MEMBERS AND DELEGATES IN THE 58TH-107TH CONGRESSES (1903–2003)—Continued

Congress	Dates	House	Senate
103rd	1995–1997	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Jay C. Kim Robert Takeo Matsui Norman Yoshio Mineta ² Patsy Takemoto Mink Robert C. Scott Robert Anacleto Underwood	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. Daniel Ken Inouye.
104th	1995–1997	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Jay C. Kim Robert Takeo Matsui Norman Yoshio Mineta ⁴ Patsy Takemoto Mink Robert C. Scott Robert Anacleto Underwood	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. Daniel Ken Inouye.
105th	1997–1999	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Jay C. Kim Robert Takeo Matsui Patsy Takemoto Mink Robert C. Scott Robert Anacleto Underwood	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. Daniel Ken Inouye.
106th	1999–2001	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Robert Takeo Matsui Patsy Takemoto Mink Robert C. Scott Robert Anacleto Underwood David Wu	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. Daniel Ken Inouye.
107th	2001–2003	Eni F.H. Faleomavaega Michael M. Honda Robert Takeo Matsui Patsy Takemoto Mink Robert C. Scott Robert Anacleto Underwood David Wu	Daniel Kahikina Akaka. Daniel Ken Inouye.

¹ Del. Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole died on January 7, 1922.

² Del. Fofu Iosefa Fiti Sunia resigned on September 6, 1988.

³ Senator Daniel Kahikina Akaka also served in the House in the 101st Congress until May 15, 1990. However, he appointed was to the Senate and was sworn on May 16, 1990, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Senator Spark Masayuki Matsunaga on April 15, 1990. Subsequently, he was elected to the Senate in November 1990.

⁴ Rep. Norman Yoshio Mineta resigned on October 10, 1995.

TABLE 4.—RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS FROM THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 60th–79th CONGRESSES 1907–1946)

Congress	Dates	Resident commissioners
60th	1907–1909	Benito Y Tuason Legarda. ¹ Pablo Ocampo. ¹
61st	1909–1911	Benito Y Tuason Legarda. ¹ Pablo Ocampo. ¹ Manuel Luis Quezon. ³
62nd	1911–1913	Benito Y Tuason Legarda. Manuel Luis Quezon.
63rd	1913–1915	Manuel Luis Quezon. Manuel Earnshaw.
64th	1915–1917	Manuel Luis Quezon. ⁴ Manuel Earnshaw.
65th	1917–1919	Jaime Carlos de Veyra. Teodoro Rafael Yangco. Jaime Carlos de Veyra.
66th	1919–1921	Teodoro Rafael Yangco. ⁵ Isauro Gabaldon. ⁶
67th	1921–1923	Jaime Carlos de Veyra. Isauro Gabaldon.
68th	1923–1925	Isauro Gabaldon. Pedro Guevara.
69th	1925–1927	Isauro Gabaldon. Pedro Guevara.
70th	1927–1929	Isauro Gabaldon. ⁷ Pedro Guevara.
71st	1929–1931	Pedro Guevara. Camilo Osias.
72nd	1931–1933	Pedro Guevara. Camilo Osias.
73rd	1933–1935	Pedro Guevara. Camilo Osias.
74th	1935–1937	Pedro Guevara. ⁸ Francisco Afan Delgado. ⁹ Quintin Paredes. ⁹ Quintin Paredes. ¹⁰
75th	1937–1939	Joaquin Miguel Elizalde. ¹¹
76th	1939–1941	Joaquin Miguel Elizalde.
77th	1941–1943	Joaquin Miguel Elizalde.
78th	1943–1945	Joaquin Miguel Elizalde. ¹² Carlos Pena Romulo. ¹³ Carlos Pena Romulo. ¹⁴
79th	1945–1947	

¹ Elected November 22, 1907, for a term of two years, granted the privileges of the floor of the House of Representatives, with the right of debate, February 4, 1908.

² Term expired November 22, 1909.

³ Elected for a term of two years beginning November 23, 1909.

⁴ Resigned October 15, 1916, vacancy throughout the remainder of 64th Congress.

⁵ Term expired March 3, 1920.

⁶ Elected for a term of three years beginning March 4, 1920.

⁷ Resigned July 16, 1928, having been nominated for election to the Philippine House of Representatives, vacancy throughout the remainder of the 70th Congress.

⁸ When the new government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands was inaugurated, the terms of office of the Resident Commissioners of the Philippine Islands expired. Both resident Commissioners served until February 14, 1936, when a selected successor qualified (48 Stat. 456). Under this law, the number of Resident Commissioners was reduced from two to one.

⁹ Appointed December 21, 1935, to fill vacancy caused by the expiration of the terms of Pedro Guevara and Francisco A. Delgado, due to the new form of government, and took his seat on February 14, 1936.

¹⁰ Resigned September 29, 1938.

¹¹ Appointed September 29, 1938, to fill vacancy caused by resignation of Quintin Paredes; service began on January 3, 1939, upon convening of 76th Congress.

¹² Resigned August 9, 1944.

¹³ Appointed to fill vacancy caused by the resignation of Joaquin M. Elizalde, and succeeded him on August 21, 1944.

¹⁴ Office of Resident Commissioner terminated on July 4, 1946.

Note.—The Philippine Islands were part of territory ceded to the United States by Spain under the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898. The Act of July 1902 granted the Philippine Islands the right to elect two Resident Commissioners to the United States. In 1935, the Philippine Islands became the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the number of Resident Commissioners was reduced from two to one. In 1946, the Philippines became fully independent, and the office of the Resident Commissioner was terminated.

ARSENIC LEVELS IN DRINKING WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, like my distinguished colleague from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), this Member comes to the floor to urge his colleagues to look at the facts when it comes to the issue of arsenic in drinking water. The Bush administration's recent actions on this matter have led to heated rhetoric, wild exaggerations and soundbite politics.

I suppose that was predictable, since the word "arsenic" is so emotion-loaded. It is important, I believe, to get the full story and to listen to those who would be most affected by the proposed changes.

Many State and local officials, as well as water system administrators, have expressed concerns about the problems which could be caused by the proposed changes. This Member would begin by firmly stating that, of course, everyone recognizes the importance of providing safe drinking water for all of our Nation's citizens. Also some changes in the arsenic standard may well be justified. However, it makes no sense to base those changes on anything like emotion. Instead, they should be based on sound science.

As many of us know now, in the final days of the Clinton administration, a final rule was rushed through which

would have reduced the acceptable level of arsenic in drinking water from 50 parts per billion to 10 parts per billion. However, new EPA administrator, Christie Todd Whitman, later announced that the agency would seek a scientific review of the standard before implementing a new rule. The Bush administration has made it clear that the arsenic level will be significantly reduced. However, it wants the final rule to be based on sound science.

It certainly appears that the Clinton administration made an arbitrary decision based upon questionable studies, most of which involve populations in other countries which were exposed to significantly higher levels of arsenic than those found in the United States. On the other hand, the EPA seems to dismiss the most comprehensive U.S. study on this matter. A 1999 study in Utah, which involved more than 5,000 people, failed to find an increased incidence of cancer associated with arsenic in drinking water.

It is certainly not the intent of this Member to treat lightly the possible adverse health effects of arsenic. However, this Member believes that accurate and relevant studies should be reviewed before water systems, especially those with limited resources, are forced to make such substantial investments in infrastructure and treatment. Smaller communities would have been especially hard hit by the implementation of the proposed arsenic level.

Arsenic levels in York, Nebraska, my birthplace, for example, a community of about 7,500 people, are at 34 parts per billion, and the initial cost to meet the new standard would be \$6 million. Gering, Nebraska, with a level of only 13 parts per billion, only 3 points over the arbitrary level set by the rule, would be compelled to spend about \$4.4 million.

Overall, more than 3,000 community water systems in the United States would have to come into compliance, and the rule would have more than tripled water rates in many small communities.

Now, this Member believes that communities will be willing to spend the money necessary to address this matter if they were convinced that they would see actual health benefits by making the changes.

According to an April 14, 2001 article in the New York Times, Albuquerque, New Mexico, Mayor Jim Baca, a Democrat stated, "What we would like is some definitive scientific evidence that this would be worth doing. I am a pretty strong environmentalist but I was convinced that the data did not justify the new level."

It is important to listen to utility superintendents, city administrators, village boards, mayors and other local and State officials, including public health officials, who are concerned about the effect the proposed rule and its associated costs would have on their communities. These are people who have a powerful incentive to provide safe drinking water, since they and their constituents will be drinking that water. These community leaders know where the buck stops. They certainly would not subject themselves and their families and friends to harmful water. Quite simply, these local officials have not been convinced of the need to lower the arsenic to the level proposed by the Clinton administration.

It is also helpful to note that any community in the country now has the authority to lower arsenic in its drinking water to whatever level it chooses below 50 parts per billion. The reason communities have not lowered their levels to 10 parts per billion is that the health benefits have not been shown to justify the enormous cost.

The American Water Works Association stated in its comment last year, "At the level of 10 ppb or lower, the health risk reduction benefits become vanishingly small as compared to the costs."

The costs, however, are real. The American Water Works Association, which supports a reduction in the current arsenic standard, has estimated the proposed rule would cost \$600 million annually and require \$5 billion in capital outlays. In an ideal world, with unlimited resources, it may make sense to propose changes in the hope that they may provide a benefit. However, the reality is that communities do not have unlimited funds.

Everyone deserves safe drinking water and this Member urges his colleagues to listen to State and local officials on how to provide it.

THE NECESSITY OF THE HOUSE TO BALANCE ITS PRIORITIES AND MOVE FORWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning I wish to address the necessity for this House to balance its priorities and to begin to move forward its legislative agenda. Before I do that, let me associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) and thank him for bringing to the floor and dropping today legislation that will allow the printing of a book honoring Asian Pacific Islander Americans in Congress, particularly as we celebrate the history of our Asian American friends. This is a diverse country and we reflect the wonderfulness of that diversity.

As we do that as well, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am disturbed and concerned. Today we will rush to judgment, having missed two pages of the budget last week and having to delay it until Tuesday, to support a budget resolution that includes an enormous tax cut but fails to include \$294 billion for what we have all come to know as a very important issue, and that is the education of our children. With this budget, we know that we will be invading the Medicare and Social Security Trust Funds by the year 2011.

I would have hoped that we would have been more timely with this budget, giving us more time to debate it and focusing on issues like making sure that uninsured children and uninsured Americans have health care, providing prescription drug coverage the way it should be, and including the \$294 billion for our educational needs, collaborating with our local governments and local school boards.

Tragically, another violent act at school occurred in an Alaska elementary school. This is Children's Mental Health Month and I am delighted to be able to focus on the need for mental health services for all of Americans, but as well to focus on the needs of our children. I would like to see more in-school health clinics for our children to be able to access services for both their physical health needs, immunizations, but as well, their mental health needs.

I believe that as we move forward to address the question of our foreign authorization bill, we will need to seriously debate the question of the loss of the United States' seat on the Human Rights Council in the United Nations. Many of my colleagues will rise in distress and anger, saying that we should no longer be associated with the United Nations. We should be cautious, and certainly we should be understanding of the fact that the United Nations now stands as the only entity where so many countries of so many diverse and disparate viewpoints actually can talk to each other.

Even though it is a very disturbing act to have lost the seat, we too have to look at the policy of the United States as it relates to the nonpayment

of its dues and its actions over the last couple of months that suggest that its world associates are unhappy, but we must not step away from fighting for human rights and we must insist that human rights becomes the call of the day for all nations, including China and Sudan and many others.

I want to thank and congratulate Senator Ellis and Representative Thompson of the State of Texas for getting through the Senate and the House a hate crimes legislative initiative, and I raise that point because it is long overdue for the United States of America's Congress to pass real hate crimes legislation to say and make a statement to those who would do heinous acts on the basis of someone's difference that we will not tolerate that in America. It still goes on in Texas. It still goes on in States across this Nation, and I think that we are long overdue for getting hate crime legislation to the floor.

We do understand that there has been movement in the Cincinnati occurrences, the tragedy of having had 15 African American males shot by the police since 1995. I think it is important that the Attorney General has now indicated that there will be a civil rights investigation, do it expeditiously and quickly, and begin to heal and solve those problems by insisting that the police department and the community work closely together.

Finally, let me say, Mr. Speaker, there are several enormously important issues that we are dealing with as it relates to the energy crisis. We are not doing enough in this Congress. We are not doing enough in the administration by simply saying, handle it yourself; it is not going to go away. I believe it is time to help Americans with gasoline prices. I believe it is time to be able to provide dollars for those who will be overheated in the summer. With more additional funding for LIHEAP dollars in the State of Texas in 1998 and 1999, we lost 130-plus citizens because of the heat and not being able to provide the dollars they needed for utility costs or even having air-conditioners. I think certainly we should be helping with the brownouts. Conservation is important. Exploration is important within reason, but we must have emergency relief now for those who are experiencing the energy crisis, because it is here.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we can focus on a lot of priorities and we are not doing so. Even as we watch the various layoffs of individuals across this Nation, they are asking for the Congress to act. Do not look at the layoffs and ignore them and say it is not in my State, just like we should not look at the energy crisis and ignore it and say it is not in my State. I believe we have priorities. We should act on them.

WHERE DOES THE EDUCATION MONEY GO?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, many say as California goes, so goes the rest of the Nation. Considering that, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a new study of public education spending in California.

The study reveals that the generally accepted per-pupil spending figure of \$6,700 for California students significantly understates the actual per-pupil spending figure that is approximately \$8,500. Moreover, two out of five, two out of every five, public school dollars are spent on bureaucracy and overhead rather than on classrooms. Instructions and internal legal squabbles drain education dollars from the system.

The authors, Dr. Bonsteel of San Francisco and accountant Carl Brodt of Berkeley, intended their analysis to be a nonpartisan one.

□ 1300

Bonsteel is a Democrat and Brodt is a Republican.

I will share some of the key findings of the study entitled, "Where is all the money going? Bureaucrats and Overhead in California's Public Schools," together with the authors' proposal for decreasing bureaucracy and enhancing accountability.

First, consider that inflation-adjusted spending on public education in California has increased by 39 percent since 1978. Nevertheless, textbooks are frequently unavailable, school libraries have been shut down, and art and music programs have been terminated. The authors conclude, "This is primarily because of the explosion in spending on administration and overhead."

Approximately 40 percent of California's K-12 tax dollars are spent on bureaucracy and overhead, not classroom instruction. This figure comes not just from the Bonsteel-Brodt analysis, but also from previous studies conducted by the Rand Corporation and the Little Hoover Commission.

Four levels of administration run K-12 schools in California, and they act as though they are separate fiefdoms. They quarrel frequently, and often those disagreements end in lawsuits among the bureaucratic fiefdoms, with the taxpayers picking up the tab for lawyers on both sides. The California Department of Education and the State Department of Education maintain legal counsel to sue each other.

This Bonsteel-Brodt study presents a sample State Board of Education agenda listing 30 lawsuits confronting the State Board. Seven of those suits pit one layer of the education bureaucracy against another layer.

In one set of lawsuits, the San Francisco Unified School District and the State Department of Education have

squared off over bilingual education. The STAR testing statute mandates that children who have been in the United States at least a year be tested in English, the presumption being they should have learned English by then. But the San Francisco school district contends it must test immigrant students in their non-English native language. San Francisco is the only district making that claim, but taxpayers must cover the cost of that legal spat.

Even more troubling is that special education programs for children with mental and physical handicaps are plagued by bureaucratic gridlock at the Federal, State, county, and local levels, as well as by unfunded mandates from the Federal and State levels. Parents of special-ed children have no effective voice in program decision-making.

Local citizens have diminishing power to influence local school policy, since almost two-thirds of education tax dollars now are funneled through the States. In addition, while the Federal Government furnishes just 6 percent of education funding, its requirements account for close to half of all education paperwork. Lisa Keegan, State Superintendent for Arizona schools, has said it takes 165 members of her staff, 45 percent of the total, just to manage Federal programs.

The Bonsteel-Brodt study notes bureaucracies in all levels "invariably understate true per student spending." At the national level, the figures released by the National Center for Education Statistics are usually the "current expenditures" number, which does not account for the cost of school payments or interest payments on school bonds.

In California, the spending statistics are "even more deceptive," the study's authors charge. The all-inclusive and thus more accurate figure for per-pupil spending in California is approximately \$8,500 per student, more than 25 percent higher. Using the low figure, the California NEA affiliate has advocated hefty spending increases for the express purpose of raising the State's per pupil spending above the national average.

The best hope for decreasing bureaucracy and enhancing accountability, the Bonsteel-Brodt report concludes, is school choice of various kinds. They note, for example, that California's public charter schools have easily outperformed traditional public schools, while operating on about 60 percent of the per-student funding of conventional public schools. The charters have accomplished this by cutting the bureaucratic overhead.

Mr. Speaker, as we look to solve America's education problems, we must first honestly ask, where does the money go? Only then can we make the right and often tough choices to reform education.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISSA). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.)

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Thomas A. Kuhn, Church of the Incarnation, Dayton, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Father, we can never thank You enough for the many blessings You have given to us as a people. You gave all of Your children the same rights as people, and at the same time have given us the means to safeguard those rights. Give us the strength to reach out to those who are unable to safeguard their rights.

You have made us a powerful people. May we always be gentle enough to lift up the fallen, and prepared enough to protect the weak and defenseless.

You have blessed us richly. May we always generously share those blessings with Your children who are poor.

You have given us a beautiful land. May we nurture and preserve it so that those who follow us can always see Your goodness.

Much of what has been given to us has been entrusted to the Members of this great House. Give them a world vision so that they may work for the good of all of Your children. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

REVEREND THOMAS A. KUHN

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, today, it is my privilege to welcome Father Thomas Kuhn as our guest chaplain. Father Tom is currently pastor of the Church of the Incarnation in Centerville, Ohio, one of the largest Catholic parishes in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.

Father Kuhn has been pastor at Incarnation since 1989. He is leading a delegation of some 75 8th graders from Incarnation School, which has won the U.S. Department of Education Blue Ribbon School award for excellence several times, most recently in 1999.

A number of his students from Incarnation are with us this afternoon watching these proceedings from the Gallery. We want to welcome you. I am sure the gentleman from Dayton, Ohio (Mr. HALL) will join me in welcoming Father Kuhn and all of you to the Capitol today.

Father Tom is the former principal of Cincinnati's Elder High School and the former assistant pastor of St. John's Church in West Chester, Ohio, and it was during that time that I came to know him, and he remains a great friend today.

Please join me in welcoming Father Kuhn as our guest chaplain and the students of Incarnation School as they explore our Nation's Capitol.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that they are not to address or refer to the guests in the Gallery.

HIGH GAS PRICES

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, government investigators said, and I quote, there is no conspiracy by petroleum companies to raise gas prices in America. Unbelievable.

Who is kidding whom here? Gas prices are over \$2 a gallon, and, in addition, it just seems every weekend they just raise them 25 cents a gallon just for the sake of it.

Mr. Speaker, if that is not enough to flatulate your rectangle, the oil companies announced that gas prices will hit \$3 a gallon this summer.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker; those so-called government investigators are either on the payroll of those oil companies or they are smoking dope.

I yield back the biggest rip-off in the history of the United States of America.

URGING SOCIAL SECURITY COMMISSION AND ADMINISTRATION TO KEEP SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENT FOR NEXT 75 YEARS

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, through you to the President's Commission on Social Security, I would suggest many of us are very concerned that we are going to review a proposal that might not keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 to 100 years.

I think it is important that we urge the President, that we urge this Commission, to come back to this legislative body with a proposal that is going to at least keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 years. Social Security is a pay-as-you-go program.

It is going broke as we experience demographics that represent a decline in the birth rate and an increase in life expectancy. It is a good program for America. It is a serious problem. We need to protect Social Security.

INTRODUCTION OF IMPACT AID BILL

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, 21 of my bipartisan colleagues and I introduced my first bill, a measure important for the education of military children. Our bill is called GRADE-A, the Government Reservation Accelerated Development for Education Act, and it guarantees that federally-impacted schools receive the dollars they need from the impact aid program.

Mr. Speaker, over 5,000 military personnel qualify for food stamps, and people who wear their country's uniform sometimes fall below the poverty line while their kids go to schools financially teetering on the edge. As we boost military pay and housing, we must also care for military kids.

Mr. Speaker, over 90 percent of the funding for education comes from local funds, from funds such as property taxes. But what happens if that property is owned by the Federal Government and off the tax rolls? Kids report to class with no property tax dollars needed for their school.

GRADE-A guarantees that the Federal Government will step in to ensure that these kids have the resources they need for their education. It ensures that when the military and other children from Federal property report for school that they are welcomed in a good school with sound financial backing. GRADE-A has been endorsed by the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools and many school administrators across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as we make education our priority, let us remember the children of men and women in uniform.

SUPPORTING SMALL BUSINESSES SUPPORTS AMERICA

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the United States was built upon and by small family-owned businesses, and America is today known for its unique, entrepreneurial spirit.

Even today, in the era of corporate mergers, small businesses remain the cornerstone, yes, the foundation of our economy.

They employ 53 percent of our work force and account for 99.7 percent of the Nation's employers. Yet burdensome regulations, a complex Tax Code, and an inaccessible health care system have been stifling the ability of small businesses to remain viable and successful.

As a Congress, we need to ensure that the entrepreneurial spirit that built this country does not diminish due to an unfair tax and regulatory system.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support small business owners in their pursuit of the American dream. I yield back all of the unfair taxes and regulations that have served as obstacles for the small businesses which make our Nation great and prosperous.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK 2001

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call the House's attention to our country's most vital economic sector, our small businesses.

Each year, for the past 38 years, the President has issued a proclamation calling for the celebration of National Small Business Week. This year, National Small Business Week, which is sponsored by the SBA, is being held right now.

Mr. Speaker, this year's celebration will honor the estimated 25.5 million small businesses in America that employ more than half the country's private work force, create 3 out of every 4 new jobs, and generate a majority of American innovations.

Small Business Week also recognizes small business owners all across America for their personal achievements and contributions to our economy. From this group, in Indiana, the Indiana Small Business Person of the Year is Joseph A. Beckman. He is the owner of Home Lumber and Glenlord Lumber Company. This a retail lumber and land development concern that has grown steadily under his leadership and become a successful business in Indiana.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mr. Beckman and all the winners from across America who work long hours and make huge sacrifices to build family small businesses that are the backbone of this economy.

CONGRATULATING JAMES TODD RATHER

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate James Todd Rather of Fairmont, Minnesota.

Todd will be in Washington this week to receive the Star of Life award. The Stars of Life is an American Ambulance Association program to honor dedicated professionals in the ambulance service industry.

Todd, who is a registered paramedic and is a team captain for Fairmont Gold Cross Ambulance Services, has been selected as one of three EMS professionals in Minnesota to receive this honor.

EMS providers are the safety net of the health care system. In rural areas, like the Minnesota district I represent, where physicians and other health care providers do not exist in every community, EMS provides the public their only access point to quality health care. That is why I introduced H.R. 1353, the Sustaining Access to Vital Emergency Medical Services Act to help our EMS providers.

Every day, EMTs and paramedics are heroes in their communities. I want to thank Todd for his commitment to serving his community.

Mr. Speaker, it is people like Todd Rather who give selflessly of themselves that make our communities a better place to live.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

HONORING NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 108) honoring the National Science Foundation for 50 years of service to the Nation.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 108

Whereas Congress created the National Science Foundation in 1950 to promote the progress of science, to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare, and to secure the national defense;

Whereas the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 was signed into law by President Harry S. Truman on May 10, 1950;

Whereas the National Science Foundation strengthens the economy and improves the quality of life in the United States as the

Federal Government's only agency dedicated to the support of education and fundamental research in all scientific and engineering disciplines;

Whereas the National Science Foundation has worked continuously and successfully to ensure that the United States maintains its leadership in discovery, learning, and innovation in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering;

Whereas the National Science Foundation has supported the research of more than half of the United States Nobel laureates in physics, chemistry, and economics;

Whereas the National Science Foundation has been the lead Federal agency in a number of national science initiatives, such as those in information technology and nanotechnology;

Whereas the National Science Foundation funds almost 20,000 research and education projects in science and engineering at over 2,000 colleges and universities, elementary and secondary schools, nonprofit organizations, and small businesses throughout our Nation;

Whereas the National Science Foundation's innovative education programs work to ensure that every American student receives a solid foundation in science, technology, and mathematics through support for the training and education of teachers, the public, and students of all ages and backgrounds, and by supporting research into new teaching tools, curricula, and methodologies;

Whereas the programs funded by the National Science Foundation are an exemplary demonstration of the value of scientific peer review in selecting the most innovative and technically excellent research activities using a network of over 50,000 scientists and engineers each year;

Whereas the National Science Foundation's international programs promote new partnerships and cooperative projects between United States scientists and engineers and their foreign colleagues, and such partnerships play a key role in establishing and strengthening diplomatic and economic ties; and

Whereas research supported by the National Science Foundation has led to discoveries, technologies, and products which affect our daily lives, including a greater understanding of bacteria, viruses, and the structure of DNA; medical diagnostic tools, such as Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI); the Internet, web browsers, and fiber optics, which have revolutionized global communication; polymer materials used in products ranging from clothing to automobiles; Doppler radar used for accurate weather forecasting; artificial skin that can help recovering burn victims; economic research in game and decision theory which has led to a greater understanding of economic cycles; and discoveries of new planets, black holes, and insights into the nature of the universe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) recognizes the significance of the anniversary of the founding of the National Science Foundation;

(2) acknowledges the completion of 50 years of achievement and service by the National Science Foundation to the United States; and

(3) reaffirms its commitment for the next 50 years to support research, education, and technological advancement and discovery through the National Science Foundation, the premier scientific agency in the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 108.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer this resolution H. Con. Res. 108 honoring the National Science Foundation for 50 years of service to our Nation. As chairman of the Committee on Science on Basic Research, which is responsible for oversight and authorization of the National Science Foundation, I wanted to take a few moments to mention some of the highlights of this highly successful and yet often unappreciated agency.

Congress and President Harry S. Truman established the National Science Foundation on May 10, 1950 to fund research in the basic sciences, engineering, mathematics and technology.

It is the Federal Government's only agency dedicated to the support of education and fundamental research in all scientific disciplines from physics and math to zoology and anthropology. For 50 years, NSF-sponsored research has developed the finest science and new technologies that have boosted our economic productivity, enhanced our national security, and preserved our citizens' health and well-being.

Throughout its history, NSF provided support to thousands of researchers and students across the Nation in university labs and in our schools and our industry, support that has fostered innovation, technical achievement, and a greater understanding of our world and our universe. From the depths of space to the depths of the ocean, from the North Pole to the South Pole around the globe, NSF-funded research has helped explain our world and led to innovations that have forever changed it.

The Internet, for example, and the technologies that enable it, began in part because of NSF support for networking technologies.

□ 1415

NSF funded a network, linking computer science departments, then moved on to develop a high-speed backbone called the NSFNET that became the basis for what is now the Internet.

NSF-supported research has also led to miracle drugs, vaccinations, cell phones, and even bar codes that readers in supermarkets now use. NSF supports potentially life-saving research in developing the Doppler, research in weather prediction using the Doppler

radar, earthquake hazard, and identification of the cause of the spread of the deadly Hanta virus.

Today's NSF-led research in nanotechnology, advanced materials, biotechnology and countless other areas are setting the foundation for the technologies of the future and in the process, training the scientists, engineers, and technology entrepreneurs of tomorrow.

Today, we congratulate NSF on 50 years of service to the United States and for its many contributions to our current prosperity. But we also reaffirm our commitment as a Congress to support NSF in the future in its diverse research in educational activities. NSF's peer review system, where grants are reviewed by a panel of researchers in the field to judge the merits of research, is a model of how research should be evaluated at all other Federal agencies.

We must also strive to ensure that NSF invests in a broad range of sciences in order to support the critical work of well-funded mission agencies like the Department of Defense and the National Institute of Health. It is important that we continue to support NSF as part of a balanced Federal research portfolio and recognize that the basic science supported by NSF forms the foundation for research at all other Federal research agencies and for applied innovations and productivity increases in the private sector.

My colleagues and I on the subcommittee will keep this goal in mind as we work towards our reauthorization of NSF, and we will keep it in mind as we work with the administration and the appropriators to work and craft a balanced research budget.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Basic Research, a cosponsor of this resolution, and for all of her work and support of NSF. I would also like to thank the other cosponsors of this resolution and certainly my friend, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, and the 19 Senate cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 36, the companion resolution. Certainly I would like to thank both the Republican and Democratic staffs on our subcommittee and the full Committee on Science for their untiring work.

Mr. Speaker, the NSF is completing its 50th year of service to our Nation. With this resolution, this House will recognize this important anniversary and express our hope for at least another 50 years of continued innovation and education.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON from Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 that created the National Science Foundation directs the agency to initiate and support

basic scientific research and to strengthen scientific research potential and science education programs at all levels.

I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution that salutes the National Science Foundation on its accomplishments and success in carrying out this mission for the past 50 years. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) for putting forth this timely resolution.

The National Science Foundation plays a unique and critical role in the Nation's research and education enterprise. It sponsors research that helps to fill the storehouse of fundamental knowledge about the natural world, without regard for immediate applications of these new ideas and concepts. Equally important, the National Science Foundation supports the development of the Nation's human resource base in science and engineering. In short, the National Science Foundation is charged with helping to create the underpinnings for the Nation's future technological competence and, therefore, for its economic strength and security.

The NSF's record of accomplishment during this 50-year history is remarkable. NSF-supported research have collected 100 Nobel Prizes. They have received recognition for work in the fields of physics, chemistry, physiology and medicine, and economics.

National Science Foundation's contributions are, in part, manifested through the accomplishments of scientists and engineers who were trained under NSF awards. It is well-known that the great majority of the seminal work in developing such technologies as cell phones, fiber optics, and computer assisted design was performed by private industry, at labs like Corning, AT&T and Motorola.

A recent NSF-sponsored study has shown that many scientists and engineers who went to graduate school on NSF fellowships and research assistantships often played important roles in the development of these and other technologies. In a number of cases, they became the entrepreneurs who created new firms and markets.

To use the words of the authors of the study, "NSF emerges consistently as a major, often the major, source of support for education and training of the Ph.D. scientists and engineers who went on to make major contributions."

The resources NSF provides for support of research and education are relatively small, but the impact is great. The agency expends only 3.8 percent of the Federal R&D funds, but provides 23 percent of basic research funding at academic institutions.

For specific research areas, the National Science Foundation's role at universities is even larger. It funds 36 percent of research in the physical sciences, 49 percent in the environmental sciences, 50 percent in engineering, 72 percent in mathematics, and 78 percent in computer science.

The research awards and research fellowships help train over 24,000 graduate students each year. These are the future scientists and engineers who are essential to fuel our high-tech economy.

Further, the NSF programs help to improve science education for all students and prepare them for citizenship in a world increasingly dominated by technology. Today we continue to have a manpower shortage in many high technology fields. The ideal way to alleviate the shortages is by ensuring that children of all races and both genders receive the basic grounding in science and mathematics that will prepare them to pursue careers as scientists, engineers and technologists. The NSF's programs address this need.

Because of the importance of NSF's role in research and education, it is essential that the agency receive adequate resource. Consequently, I am extremely disappointed by the fiscal year 2002 budget request for NSF, which provides only a 1-percent increase. This is much less than what is needed to sustain the NSF's ongoing programs.

In today's Congress Daily, a story mentioned how science funding is increased over Mr. Bush's request. While this is true, it is less than half the story. The conference cut funding for science below any Member's request in either Chamber and below what President Bush asked for in every year but this year.

The House requested \$617 million more and the Senate requested \$1.215 billion more. Indeed, over 5 years, the conference agreement is nearly \$200 million less than the President's anemic numbers for budget authority.

The only positive number from the conference agreement is the fiscal year 2002 budget authority number being \$217 million above the President's request. Every other number is negative, meaning the conference agreement is lower than Mr. Bush's request, the House-passed bill and the Senate-passed bill. How ironic it is now that we stand here today and honor the National Science Foundation, but at best hold their budget below inflation.

Inadequacies in the size of the National Science Foundation's current budget are evident by the fact that the agency currently funds less than a third of the research applications it receives and only about half of those judged to be of high quality. Even when an applicant receives the National Science Foundation award, it is usually sub-optimal and perhaps half the amount of an NIH award. The current situation leaves researchers in NSF-funded fields scrambling for funds and spending too much time chasing limited funding rather than in the laboratory or mentoring students.

In order to address this present situation, I, along with 16 of my Committee on Science colleagues, recently introduced a National Science Foundation authorization bill, H.R. 1472, that provides increases of 15 percent per year

for fiscal years 2002 through 2005. The bill will double the NSF budget based on fiscal year 2000 appropriations level. Such increases are necessary to allow the National Science Foundation to go forward with substantial new research initiatives, provide needed increases in average grant size and duration, and support needed major research facilities for access by academic scientists.

Equally important, a more robust budget for NSF will support expansion of the agency's science education programs. Of particular importance are programs to improve the skills and content knowledge of K through 12 science and math teachers and to increase participation in science and engineering by traditionally underrepresented groups.

It is also important to expand education research programs, including quantifying the most effective uses of educational technology and strengthening efforts to assess education programs to determine and disseminate information about what methods and approaches are most effective in improving student performance in science and math.

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely appropriate that the House endorse the resolution now under consideration, which celebrates the past accomplishments of the National Science Foundation. However, it is of much greater importance that we ensure that the Foundation receives the necessary resources now and in the future to carry out its essential role in support of scientific engineering research and education.

When funding measures for NSF are debated during the coming months, I hope all of my colleagues will remember the Foundation's impact during the last 50 years and the promise represented by its current programs.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues this resolution honoring the National Science Foundation and ask for their support for final passage.

This 50-year report speaks to America's investment in the future. That is what we are talking about when we talk about the funding for the National Science Foundation.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), vice chairman of our full Committee on Science.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and congratulate the National Science Foundation on its 50th anniversary.

What the NSF does is very important to all of us and to future generations of America. The National Science Foundation was created to promote the progress of science, for health, economic, and defense purposes through basic research.

Now basic research is critical to the future of the country because it serves

as the building block for other research that many times private industry will not or cannot afford to do. This base of innovation provided by the NSF can then be utilized and built upon by private industry and help develop new sectors for our economy.

Research and discoveries made and supported by the NSF affect our daily lives, from Doppler radar systems to Magnetic Resonance Imaging, MRIs, to all kind of innovations which we enjoy today in America.

NSF supports research and development in science and engineering through various partnerships from the elementary to the university level, as well as small business and nonprofit organizations, by providing grants to help fund these projects.

In the end, America depends on science. Science fuels our economic booms, medical successes, and national security. Over 50 percent of our future economic growth will come from developments resulting from scientific research.

NSF has a strong connection to my home State of Minnesota. Last year, 301 new NSF awards went to Minnesota. So far this year, there are currently 482 active awards ongoing in Minnesota.

Various universities and colleges, from the University of Minnesota down to the smaller schools such as Carleton and St. Olaf in my district, are contributing to important research in science, in areas like mathematics and engineering.

NSF's crucial role and notable accomplishments include helping universities, because over 40 percent of the basic funding for basic research in the physical sciences and engineering comes from the NSF. NSF helps to fund projects at 2,000 colleges, universities, and elementary schools, as well as nonprofit organizations, small businesses, and other organizations each year.

□ 1430

NSF grants 10,000 new awards each year and just under 20,000 awards per year.

Members, a number of years ago there was a Member of the other body from a bordering State that every month gave out what he called the Golden Fleece Award, and many times he took advantage of some of the things being done at the NSF. The truth of the matter is some of the awards we grant here at the Federal level ultimately are wasted. The problem, of course, is that we never know which ones.

One of the great researchers for an organization back in Minnesota, 3M, a fellow by the name of Arthur Fry, the person who invented the Post-It Note, once made a very brilliant observation. He said, "If we knew what we were doing, it wouldn't be research."

The truth of the matter is some of this basic research is high risk, and we do not know which of these projects

will pay enormous dividends and which will not, but that research must go on nonetheless.

NSF has supported 34,000 science, mathematics, and engineering students through its NSF graduate research fellowship program. Federally supported research has revolutionized many areas, including global communications, with accomplishments, as have been mentioned, as the Internet, early Web browsers, and fiberoptics.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that we recognize the NSF. It is also important we recognize that we need to continue to show our commitment. I am hopeful that by the time the final appropriation bills go to the President's desk, we will be able to find additional funding so that the work of the NSF can go on.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) has 11½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) has 13 minutes remaining.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues as a cosponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 108. This recognition of the NSF is well deserved.

For the last 50 years, the National Science Foundation has been the backbone of basic scientific research throughout the country. It has served as the clearinghouse for hundreds of thousands of grants for graduate research. It has led the way in supporting innovative programs in science for elementary and secondary schools, and it has filled a valuable role in coordinating scientific endeavors in a variety of fields.

The value of basic scientific research is something we cannot overestimate. The mission of the National Science Foundation is to further science, health, prosperity, welfare, and national defense. Research through NSF grants and scientific exchanges has been the basis of innovations in all of these arenas. It has provided the knowledge, the understanding, and then the development to drive our increasingly technological society.

This research has also been the basis of increased comfort, longer lives, and greater economic prosperity. Over the life of NSF, many national priorities, including improved energy efficiency, space flight, improved health, and the mapping of the human genome have been pursued by NSF grants. I genuinely speak in continued support of the National Science Foundation. It represents a valuable contribution of the Federal Government to all of society.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), former chairman of our Subcommittee

on Technology of the Committee on Science.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his elaborate introduction; and, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 108 to congratulate the National Science Foundation on 50 years of exemplary service. From its rocky start and meager initial budgets, the NSF has bloomed into a shining example of government success, producing developments and innovations whose benefits are, frankly, immeasurable in either economic or societal terms.

From its creation in 1950, the NSF has grown from a relatively minor agency which funded only a small portion of the meritorious proposals that are received, to the primary source of support for nonmedical research at our Nation's colleges and universities. Approximately 1,800 academic institutions receive funds from the National Science Foundation each year supporting thousands of researchers and projects.

Developments from research originally funded by NSF grants permeate our lives. No American citizen can say that he or she has been unaffected by the advancements that science has brought. From the common plastics that preserve our food to the complex microprocessors that drive our computer age, from natural discoveries in the environment to synthetic developments in the labs, from fossils to fiberoptics, the NSF has been there to foster and nurture the research that led to these wondrous discoveries and lay the foundation for the discoveries of tomorrow.

The National Science Foundation has also played a crucial role in the education of our Nation's youth. Following the watershed event of Sputnik, the NSF has taken an active role in the direct support of students at the graduate level. Today, these efforts have been expanded to all levels of education, from kindergarten to the Ph.D., and have brought the NSF to the forefront of math and science education in the United States. Their continued efforts are critical to the development of the next generation of scientists and engineers.

I am personally grateful to the NSF for its critical support of my Commission on the Advancement of Women, Minorities and Persons With Disabilities in Science, Engineering and Technology. Its work, resulting in findings, have also helped to establish Federal partnerships. Their support thus enhances partnerships with the private sector and with academia to fulfill its recommendations.

As we look to the future, I hope the NSF will continue to play a prominent role. In his seminal report, "Science: The Endless Frontier," which many credit for the formation of a national science policy and the NSF, Vannevar Bush noted, "The frontier of science re-

mains. It is in keeping with the American tradition, one which has made the United States great, that new frontiers shall be made accessible for development by all American citizens." His words are no less valid today.

For the last 50 years, the National Science Foundation has been there exploring that frontier, bringing its discoveries home to the American people. I shall work to do all I can to increase their budget.

I want to thank Dr. Rita Caldwell for her leadership and all the employees of NSF, congratulate them on their 50th anniversary and wish them luck for the next 50 years and beyond.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that the reason our economy has enjoyed such tremendous growth over the last 8 or 8½ years, and in particular growth in productivity, is because of investments made in science. The investments in information technology have revolutionized the workplace, revolutionized manufacturing, inventory management, and allowed us to reduce unemployment to record lows without having a rise in inflation. So I think this makes a great deal of sense to honor the National Science Foundation.

And of course last year, the Congress, after having gone through 3 years of working towards doubling the budget of the National Institutes of Health, decided very wisely that we would try and double the National Science Foundation budget over a 10-year period, and in a bipartisan way we started down that road. This makes great sense because we should not try to separate NIH from NSF. They are complementary.

Some of the speakers talked about the human genome project, part of which is being done in my district; and there is no question that some of the supercomputer technology used for that came through NSF research. The same is true of a clinical endocrinology lab that I saw in the Methodist Hospital in my district just a couple of weeks ago. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, we are going to pass this resolution today, maybe unanimously, or by an overwhelming vote; then later on today we are going to pass a rule, and tomorrow probably pass a budget, that would actually cut the NSF in real terms.

It seems to me that it is ironic that where a year ago, with strong bipartisan support, the Congress started down the road of doubling the NSF, just as we have gone in doubling the NIH, yet today and tomorrow we are going to say we are going to cut the NSF. Now, I know some of my colleagues have said we hope we will get that worked out when the appropri-

ation bills are done. That maybe says a lot about the quality of the budget document that we are going to take up tomorrow; that perhaps that budget document cannot hold the water that it is supposed to hold and we are not going to meet those spending targets because we are going to pass this one political document and do what we want to. But I think it is a grave mistake to be making these cuts.

I want to quote from a Nobel laureate, who is a constituent of mine, a professor at Rice University, Dr. Richard Smalley, who won the Nobel prize for inventing nanotechnology in the famous buckytubes; and in this article he says, "Promising ideas won't develop if investments in key Federal science agencies are slashed." And yet that is where this House and the other body are heading.

I think it is quite a shame that today we would vote to give the National Science Foundation and all the scientists around the country, both at the big schools and the small schools, and the labs that benefit from this, this very nice piece of paper from the Congress on this very nice piece of parchment honoring them for the 50 years of work they have done, and then the next day say, "We're going to cut your budget in real terms. We're going to cut your budget and we are not going to double the NSF." I think it is a grave mistake that we are doing that.

And if we are not doing that, Mr. Speaker, and I see my dear friend from Michigan who I sat with on the Committee on the Budget for a number of years, and I know he believes strongly in the sanctity of the budget process, but if we are not going to do that, then it means we are not passing a real budget tomorrow; that we are passing a document that has more holes in it than a slice of Swiss cheese.

So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the House does pass this today. I hope that the House, although I do not think it will happen, has a stroke of wisdom and we defeat the budget resolution tomorrow, and we go back and write a realistic one that encompasses the bipartisan support in this House and the other body for increasing and doubling the National Science Foundation budget over the next 10 years, and let us finish out the 9 years left.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the article regarding Dr. Richard Smalley I referred to earlier.

SCALING BACK RESEARCH IS A MISTAKE

(By Richard Smalley)

Stocks are down, and President Bush is talking recession. Yet, he recently targeted three key science agencies for cuts. The research budget at the National Science Foundation would fall 4 percent, at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration 4 percent and at the Energy Department 3.5 percent. That's bad policy at the worst possible time.

Bush officials say they will compensate with tax breaks that will "encourage significant increases in private-sector research and development." That may sound good—give industry incentives, and it'll take care of everything. Problem is, that policy will derail

technology innovation, our nation's economic igniter, which depends on federal investment in research.

Here's how it works: The federal government supports long-range, high-risk research at universities and national labs. Industry transforms promising discoveries into marketable goods.

There are thousands of examples of how the partnership can generate economic booms. I'll mention two homegrown ones.

Fifty years ago, the federal government gave \$50,000 to a university scientist with an idea too risky for industry to support. His far-fetched plan was to create a source of microwaves. He ended up hatching the laser. Texas industries quickly recognized the potential and began developing products. Today, one in every three high-tech jobs in Texas depends on his discovery.

The next revolutionary discovery may come from carbon nano-fibers—hair-thin wisps with the strength of steel and bewildering electrical properties. The key discoveries were made possible by government support of a few adventurous ideas right here in Texas. As nano-fibers start to show promise, no doubt Texas industries will dominate.

Promising ideas like these won't develop if investments in the key federal science agencies are slashed.

There's another reason why it's a bad time to cut the science budget. The proposed cuts would slash the number of people being trained at our nation's universities and national labs. That couldn't happen at a worse time.

The high-tech economy generates thousands of new jobs per day. Tragically, only 20 percent of our workforce is capable of filling those jobs. To satisfy the demand, Congress raised the cap on visas to allow 300,000 more foreign workers into the country.

Importing high-tech workers is an unacceptable long-term solution. Our country must train a domestic workforce to fill those jobs. According to the Commission for National Security, the workforce problem "poses a greater threat to national security over the next quarter-century than any potential conventional war."

Congress' course is clear. It must increase, not slash, the agencies' budgets.

Fortunately, some prominent congressmen know that the strength of the economy depends upon the federal investment in science. A bill to double the federal investment in research, first proposed by Texas' own Sen. Phil Gramm, passed in the Senate last session with 40 co-sponsors. Sadly, there wasn't time to bring it to a vote in the House.

Some senators are championing efforts to support the National Science Foundation and the Energy Department. But their time will be wasted if President Bush doesn't help. He should tell Congress that he is willing to accept increases to the key agencies that underpin the nation's economic growth and standard of living.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my friend from Texas, there needs to be a balanced effort in where we go on research. Certainly all of the other agencies and Departments that do research depend, to a certain extent, on what happens with basic research and primary research mainly conducted through our university systems through the National Science Foundation.

However, I would urge my colleagues, including the gentleman from Texas

(Mr. BENTSEN), to make the suggestions to the appropriators. As he well knows, the 302(a) overall spending is incorporated in the budget resolution that we will be taking up in the next 2 days. The 302(b), how to divide up that money and where we go with the 250 function, is going to be decided through the appropriation process. And again, I would urge all of my colleagues to consider the importance of having a balanced research budget.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the National Science Foundation. The NSF is not only a national treasure, but an example of Federal dollars that reap long-term dividends for our economy and our country.

I hope that we can not just support this resolution, but also adequately fund the National Science Foundation over the next 10 years. At a time when our country's future economic growth and prosperity depend on innovation and scientific advances, we should be investing more of the surplus in scientific research and development. Tax cuts will not provide the same level of long-term stimulus to our economy that Federal investments in R&D will yield in the fields of engineering, mathematics, and the sciences.

Our children are the message we send to a future we will never see, and that future will be shaped even more by technological innovation than what we have seen in our lifetime. NSF today is developing the next generation Internet as well as leading the way in encouraging young people to pursue academic studies and careers in these technical fields.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the NSF for its efforts to encourage women and minorities to pursue careers in math and science. Every Member of Congress should take the opportunity to promote the National Science Foundation's programs in schools in their districts. Federal investments in technology and basic research programs have been the engine of growth for America's economy. The development of the Internet was achieved through Federal investments in a Department of Defense research program called DARPA Net. I am sure Members are aware of that. But who would have thought that this relatively small investment in DOD and the NSF would have had such a profound effect on every sector of our economy and nearly every aspect of our way of life?

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent a district with one of the most vibrant economies in the country, and it is also home to the National Science Foundation. Thanks to the Internet, northern Virginia has become the high tech hub of the East. By investing in R&D in these programs today, we are investing in our future economic po-

tential as a country. Unless we increase the flat budgets which basic research has experienced in the past several years, we cannot expect to yield the kind of scientific advances to ensure the United States remains at the forefront of the global economy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution that recognizes and acknowledges the 50th anniversary of the National Science Foundation and its achievement and service to the United States.

The NSF is not only a national treasure, but an example of federal dollars that reap long-term dividends for our country and our economy.

This resolution reaffirms our commitment for the next 50 years to support research, education, and technological advancement and discovery through the NSF.

At a time when our country's future economic growth and prosperity depend on innovation and scientific advances, we should be investing more of the surplus in scientific research and development. Tax cuts will not provide the same level of long-term stimulus to our economy that federal investments in R&D will yield in the fields of engineering, mathematics and the sciences.

Our children's future will be shaped even more by technological innovation than what we have seen in our lifetime. The NSF is leading the way in encouraging young people to pursue academic studies and careers in these technical fields.

I would also like to commend the NSF for its efforts to encourage women and minorities to pursue careers in math and science. Every Member of Congress should take the opportunity to promote the NSF's programs in the schools in their districts.

Federal investments in technology and basic research programs have been the engine of growth for America's economy. The development of the Internet was achieved through federal investments in a Defense Department research program called DARPA Net.

I am privileged to represent a district with one of the strongest and most vibrant economies anywhere in the United States. Thanks to the Internet, Northern Virginia has become the high-tech hub of the east. Who would have thought this investment in DOD and NSF would have permeated every sector of our economy and way of life?

My district is also home to the National Science Foundation, which has been performing amazing work toward establishing the Next Generation Internet as well as fostering the pursuit of science, math, engineering and other technical sciences in this country.

By investing in R&D in these programs today, we are investing in our future economic potential as a country. Unless we increase the flat budgets which basic research has experienced in the past several years, we cannot expect to yield the kind of scientific advances to ensure the United States remains at the forefront of the global economy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and the ongoing work of the National Science Foundation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may

consume; Let me, in closing, say I think we would all like to also thank the management and staff at the National Science Foundation, certainly the director, the assistant director, those who run the eight directorates; the many program directors, and the support personnel, an estimated 50,000 scientists and engineers throughout the country that are making the research effort, that are offering their time and service on the peer review system, and certainly the hundreds of thousands of teachers that are making a difference in exciting young students about math and science and research.

Last week we had a subcommittee hearing regarding education research, to try to improve K through 12 learning, especially in the areas of math and science. The Education and Human Resource division of the National Science Foundation has done great work.

So again, thanks to our staffs on our full committee and subcommittee, all of the members of our committee, and my colleagues in Congress who are supporting the National Science Foundation and its continued efforts, I hope this resolution will pass with unanimous support.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution honoring the National Science Foundation for its fifty years of service to the Nation. As a member of the Science Committee, I have had the opportunity to witness the efforts and initiatives of this important federal agency and am pleased to say that their recent achievements have been outstanding.

Fifty years ago, the National Science Foundation was created to ensure that this great Nation would continue to be the world leader in discovery, learning, and innovations in the sciences, mathematics and engineering. Without the tireless efforts that this agency and its employees have put forth, the many technological strides our Nation has made in the preceding decades would never have come to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, as the Federal Government's only agency dedicated to the support of education and fundamental research in all scientific and engineering disciplines, the National Science Foundation has been one of the most important contributors to many progressive projects. One such program that touches close to home for me is CONSTRUCT, Connecticut's Statewide Systematic Initiative for science education. This project has received approximately \$15 million from the National Science Foundation since 1991 to implement a comprehensive restructuring of science and mathematics education in my home state.

This ten-year National Science Foundation investment demonstrates a significant partnership with Connecticut to ensure that all students are exposed to challenging mathematics and science curricula. It also ensures that the students are taught by well-prepared teachers who use stimulating instructional practices, and are supported by school districts and communities that expect all students will take, learn, and be able to use their knowledge to continue learning throughout their lives.

Programs like this have been invaluable to our society. That is why I am an original cosponsor of H.R. 1472, a bill to double the

funding of the National Science Foundation. This bill provides for 15 percent annual increases in the agency's budget for Fiscal Years 2002 to 2005 that, together with the 13 percent increase for the current fiscal year, would double the Foundation's budget over that period. The increases provided for in H.R. 1472 will allow the agency to go forward with substantial new and ongoing initiatives, such as the deployment of broadband networks for schools and libraries.

Mr. Speaker, without the significant contributions that the National Science Foundation makes to these many projects across our Nation, we would be far less competitive in our technology-based world. I applaud the past efforts and achievements of the National Science Foundation and I urge all of my fellow Members to vote with me in support of H. Con. Res. 108, which reaffirms this Congress's commitment to support research, education, and technological advancement and discovery through the National Science Foundation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 108.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

□ 1445

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR 20TH ANNUAL NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 74) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 20th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 74

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

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE.

The National Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 20th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service, on the Capitol Grounds on May 15, 2001, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, in order to honor the law en-

forcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2000.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The event authorized by section 1 shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The National Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the National Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary are authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event authorized by section 1.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193d; 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event authorized by section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 74 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 20th Annual Peace Officers' Memorial service on May 15, 2001, or on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Rules and the Committee on Administration jointly designate. The resolution authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the National Fraternal Order of Police, the sponsor of the event, to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out the event in complete compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds. The Capitol Hill Police will be the hosting law enforcement agency. The event will be free of charge and open to the public.

This service will honor the many Federal, State and local law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty in 2000. This is a fitting tribute to the men and women who have given their lives in the performance of their duties.

Mr. Speaker, I support the measure and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 74 authorizes use of the Capitol Grounds for the 20th Annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service, a most solemn and respectful service that honors our fallen police officers, brave men and

women who gave their lives in the daily work of protecting our families and us, at home and in our workplaces.

On average, one officer is killed in this country every other day. Approximately 23,000 are injured every year, and thousands are assaulted going about their daily routines.

During last year, 150 very devoted, brave officers from the ranks of State, local and Federal service were killed in the line of duty. One hundred forty-four men and six women were killed. The average age of those killed in the line of duty was 39 years, and they had an average of 10 years in service.

In my home State of Oklahoma, four brave police officers died in the line of duty in 2000. At this time I would like to read their names into the RECORD:

Deputy Charles Floyd Trivitt, Hughes County Sheriff's Department, died February 21, 2000;

Correctional Officer Joe Allen Gamble, Oklahoma Department of Corrections, Granite Reformatory, died June 6, 2000;

Trooper Matthew Scott Evans, Oklahoma Highway Patrol, and Officer Jeffrey Dean Rominger, Oklahoma Highway Patrol, died August 31, 2000.

Mr. Speaker, the service to be held on May 15 is the 20th anniversary of this memorial service. It represents a national opportunity to honor the contributions and sacrifices of all police officers.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this great tribute to our fallen peace officers.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time just to make the following observation.

Mr. Speaker, in conjunction with this event that occurs on the Capitol Grounds, the police agencies from all over the country will also gather and have a parade beginning on New Jersey Avenue and going to the Police Memorial which is directly across from the National Building Museum.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my colleagues, if they have not been to that parade, they should go. It is a sight to see. There are bagpipers from all across the country.

Mr. Speaker, the United States Congress authorized the minting of a coin which was sold nationwide, and the proceeds of that coin were used to keep up the National Police Memorial in Washington, D.C.; and there is nothing that will ever compare with the strains of Amazing Grace from so many bagpipers in honor of the men and women who have perished creating the thin blue line.

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

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 74 authorizes use of the Capitol Grounds for the 20th annual National Peace Officers Memorial Service—a most solemn and respectful service. I strongly support this resolution that honors police officers—brave men and

women, who gave their lives in the daily work of protecting our families and us.

On average, one officer is killed in this country every other day, approximately 23,000 are injured every year, and thousands are assaulted going about their daily routines.

During last year 150 very devoted, brave officers from the ranks of state, local and federal service were killed in the line of duty—144 men, and 6 women were killed. The average age of those killed was 39 years, and they had an average of 10 years in service.

In my state of Illinois three brave police officers died in the line of duty during 2000—At this time I would like to read their names into the record: Gregory M. Sears, Alane Stoffregen, and William Howard Warren. Their names will be etched on the memorial wall, and will join 4 other officers from Illinois already memorialized.

In addition to those three officers I would also like to read into the record the names of two fallen officers from the St. Louis, Missouri area who have family ties in Southern Illinois. Robert J. Stanze II, St. Louis Police Department, and Richard Eric Weinhold, St. Louis County are police officers who died in the line of duty in 2000.

Mr. Speaker, the service to be held on May 15 is the 20th anniversary of this memorial service. I support the resolution and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this tribute to our fallen Peace Officers.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 74, to authorize the use of the Capitol grounds for the 20th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service on May 15, 2001. This solemn and important ceremony honors the 150 brave law enforcement officers who were killed in the line of duty nationwide during 2000.

Our law enforcement officials represent an integral part of our society in which we have instilled public trust. As the vanguard of our public safety, we sometimes take for granted the risks that these law officers assume in the course of their duties. Regrettably, far too often we are reminded of those risks. Since 1794, nearly 15,000 local, state, and federal law enforcement officers have made the ultimate sacrifice while in the line of duty.

The 20th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service is the culmination of a week of events prepared by the Fraternal Order of Police commemorating National Police Week. By paying tribute to the dedicated officers who were killed while exercising their duty we honor their memory, their sacrifice, and the family and friends they have left behind.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this worthy Resolution and I invite my colleagues to join in supporting its passage.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today there are many citizens of this nation that go to great lengths to ensure the safety of our lives as a priority of their own. Today, I rise in support of the 20th Annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service for the use of the Capitol grounds. I encourage each of you to take note of these individuals who are members of all ranks from municipal, county, state and federal law enforcement agencies, dedicating every moment of their precious life for the betterment of ours. Therefore, I stand to recognize these devoted citizens and to encourage unanimous support for H. Con. Res. 74.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 74.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 74, the measure just considered by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT) at 5 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTER-PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h and clause 10 of rule I, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Mexico-United States Inter-parliamentary Group, in addition to Mr. KOLBE of Arizona, Chairman, appointed on March 28, 2001:

Mr. BALLENGER, North Carolina, Vice Chairman;

Mr. DREIER, California;

Mr. STENHOLM, Texas;

Mr. BARTON, Texas;

Mr. FILNER, California;

Mr. LEWIS, Kentucky;

Mr. MANZULLO, Illinois;

Ms. GRANGER, Texas;

Mr. REYES, Texas;

Mr. THOMPSON, California.

There was no objection.

REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER TO NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON VITAL AND HEALTH STATISTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 306(k) of the Public Health Service Act

(42 U.S.C. 242k), the Chair announces the Speaker's reappointment of the following member on the part of the House to the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics for a term of 4 years:

Mr. Jeffrey S. Blair, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR RECOMMITTAL OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-58) on the resolution (H. Res. 134) providing for recommitment of the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H.Con.Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 581, WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT ACT

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-59) on the resolution (H. Res. 135) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 581) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to facilitate the interagency cooperation required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in connection with wildland fire management, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 131 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 131

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider reports from the Committee on Rules

on the same day they are presented to the House is waived with respect to resolutions reported on the legislative day of May 8, 2001, providing for consideration or disposition of any conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 131 waives clause 6(a) of rule XIII requiring a two-thirds vote to consider a rule on the same day it is reported from the Committee on Rules. The rule applies the waiver to a special rule reported on the legislative day of May 8, 2001, providing for consideration or disposition of a conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 83, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule. I am at a loss to explain why we are once again preparing to circumvent the rules of this body and cram a controversial budget conference down the throats of our colleagues. What aversion does the leadership have to regular order? Last week's paper caper in the midnight hour was a prime illustration of the adage "haste makes waste." In their haste to cover up the details of a flawed budget blueprint, the leadership wasted hour upon hour of time slated for the people's business.

Today's rule is more of the same. Martial law is an extremely heavy-handed process, even for this leadership. Under the rules of the House, a two-thirds vote is required to consider a rule on the same day the Committee on Rules reports it. But the martial law procedures before us allow a rule to be considered on the same day as it is reported rather with a majority, rather than a two-thirds vote.

This rule we are considering would waive the 1-day layover requirement. It would also kick off a chain reaction whereby this body considers several procedural votes in an elaborate game

to recommit last week's ill-fated budget conference report and bring up a revised version for consideration. Given what we have learned about the forthcoming conference bill on the budget, we should not be surprised. I suspect that the longer the measure is exposed to the light of day, the more likely it will shrivel up and die.

I would note for the record that no Democrats had input on the conference report. No Democrats were invited to participate in writing this agreement, nor were any Democrats given any information regarding the document that will be the budget guideline for this Nation. The word in the caucus room is that the Budget chairman refused to return the phone calls of our ranking member. This is a far cry from changing the tone in Washington that the current leadership prides itself on.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just respond to say that the reason we are using the procedures that we are is to get us timely to the debate on the budget which we hope to have tomorrow. The rules covering the conference reports, preserving the prerogatives of both Chambers of the House, require that we recommit the conference report.

We have created a way to do that this evening, it seems appropriate to do, and then we will proceed tomorrow to debate on the budget. I think that the argument now that the minority has not had a chance to see the budget is a little bit strange considering we have just had 4 days, an ample time to review and ample time to consider that document.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this budget. As someone who grew up in relatively humble circumstances, in a one-bedroom home in Orlando, Florida, I learned some important things about life at a young age.

First, I learned that single mothers and working families desperately need tax relief. This budget provides that tax relief to the tune of \$1.35 trillion.

Second, I learned that a first-class education is a child's passport out of poverty. This budget represents the largest investment in education in the history of the United States, including a \$1 billion increase in Pell grants and \$5 billion for reading in grades kindergarten through third grade.

I also learned that senior citizens depend on their Social Security checks and prescription drugs to live. This budget puts the Social Security surpluses in a lockbox and spends up to \$300 billion for prescription drugs for seniors.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the budget. This is what we came here for.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the House-Senate conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2002. Last week, after excluding Democrats from any meaningful participation in the conference, the House leadership tried to ram this resolution down our throats. Fortunately, they failed because they could not even make the entire bill available for Members' consideration. Under closer inspection it is easy to see why they believe the bill could not bear the light of day.

The information we have been able to review to date indicates that in fiscal year 2002 the conferees approved significantly lower funding for veterans programs than the funding levels passed earlier by either the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs or in the House budget resolution. Under the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the House managed to almost double the President's meager request for discretionary spending for the Nation's veterans, but that effort now appears to have been for naught.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership has not kept its promises to America's veterans. After applauding themselves on the funding increases for veterans programs, my Republican colleagues realized that realistically their numbers just did not add up. They will tell you that they will fix the harm they have done to these programs with emergency spending. But if that is the case, why do they not just do it in this resolution? Ultimately they were not able to reconcile their promises to veterans with the giant tax cut they have promised to America's wealthiest taxpayers.

The joint resolution will eliminate the gains made for veterans programs in the House and Senate resolutions for fiscal year 2002. The House added \$730 million to the President's budget for veterans programs while the Senate passed two separate resolutions that would have added about \$1.7 billion to the Bush request of about a \$1 billion increase for veterans programs. So we are now back to Bush, and that is bad news for the Nation's veterans.

Veterans groups agree that the Bush budget is inadequate. In a press release this February, the American Legion said, "The Bush administration's fiscal year 2002 budget for the Department of Veterans Affairs is not good enough. Frankly this is a budget that is insufficient to fulfill the campaign promises George W. Bush made."

In a letter to the Senate from four major veterans service organizations, AMVETS, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans, the increase

recommended by the Bush administration was described as an "amount that would not even cover the costs of mandated salary increases and the effects of inflation."

I will vote against this inadequate funding resolution for veterans. The American people need to understand the effect of this overblown tax cut. Our veterans will pay the price.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I understand that even as we speak, the Senate is rewriting this conference report which we are supposed to vote on today and that there is another breakdown going on.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, as someone who loves baseball, I want to say thank you to the President for bringing tee ball to the White House. Seeing those youngsters enjoy themselves on the White House lawn was really terrific. But let me just say that the President should put his money where his photo op is.

The budget that the President and the Republican leadership are pushing through this House cuts important programs that affect our children's education, health and well-being, all for the sake of a tax cut that provides 43 percent of its benefits to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

Who gets cut? Pediatric graduate medical education, training for future pediatricians to care for our kids, gets cut by \$35 million. No new funding for Head Start, a program that helps to prepare youngsters for school. No new funding for reading and mathematics education programs that serve our children, and not a dime more in this budget for that program for the next 10 years.

There are 7 million children between the ages of 8 and 13 who go home alone every single day. Yet the President cuts the 21st Century Learning Center program that provides after-school educational opportunities for our kids. The President slashes \$1.4 million from the universal newborn hearing screening program, an 18 percent cut.

Photo ops are one thing, but you have to put your money where your values are. That is what budgets are about. They are about values.

□ 1715

It is not about programs. There are some fundamental American values at stake in this debate, values that say everyone should have a chance to succeed, every child should have the best education and a secure retirement. Those values, every child should have the best education, the best health care, and every single senior should have a decent and secure retirement, those values, for all of the President's rhetoric, are not in the President's budget. This is reflective of the priorities and the values of this administra-

tion. They are not focused on American families or American children.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the budget that the Republicans brought to the House late last Thursday has more than just two pages missing. It is a budget full of plugs and placeholders, and what is really missing are real numbers.

Take defense, the largest account in the discretionary budget. This budget allocates \$325 billion to defense, basically what Clinton and Cohen would have spent. But \$325 billion is not a real number. It is a placeholder, pending Mr. Rumsfeld's review of what is needed to transform our military. Reports indicate when the time is right, after the tax cuts are enacted, Mr. Rumsfeld will request at least \$25 billion a year more than this budget provides.

Take next the rest of all appropriated spending. This budget holds discretionary spending to an increase of 3.8 percent next year and in years thereafter to 2.6 percent below inflation. This is tight, really tight, a lot stricter than any limit to which spending has been held in recent years. If spending is capped at these levels, and a few favored programs such as NIH and transportation get outsized disproportionate increases, then many others will have to be cut. Rather than indicate these unpopular and, some would say, unlikely cuts now, the Republican budget simply increases discretionary spending by the rate of inflation in every function across the board, except defense, which gets more. Then they bury in the last catchall function of the budget \$6 billion of unspecified cuts in 2002 and a total of \$67 billion in unspecified cuts over the next 10 years.

Now, if we want to see what happens, what results from indiscriminate budgeting, look at education. Remember how the President said in his State of the Union that education would get the largest increase in his budget? That turned out to be a modest increase of \$21.4 billion above inflation over the next 10 years. When the budget was open to amendment on the Senate floor, Senators voted three times to debit tax cuts and credit education to the tune of 294 billion additional dollars for education. It was a great victory, but short-lived.

Once Republicans got the budget in the closed conference, they not only deleted all the adds made in the Senate but also cut the President's request of \$21.3 billion. This budget now treats education like every other function; inflation only for 10 years, nothing more.

Consider finally the initiative to add prescription drug coverage to Medicare. The President asked for \$153 billion over 10 years to pay for drug benefits. In Congress, key Republicans in both Houses called this amount inadequate. Senate Democrats moved to raise the provision for drugs and prevailed. In their conference then, the Republican leadership did not pare down this increase. In conference this was not pared back. The next worst thing was done to it. Instead of setting aside some of the surplus, general fund surplus, to pay for this added benefit, they allow the \$300 billion for drug benefits to be drawn from the Medicare Trust Fund.

In the long run, this trust fund, the Medicare Trust Fund, faces a serious shortfall, as we all know. If the cost of prescription drugs is drawn from the trust fund, it will only hasten the day of insolvency.

It is tax cuts that drive this budget, and tax reduction is the most understated number of all. The budget calls for tax cuts of \$1.35 billion, \$300 billion less than the President first requested, but Republicans from Senator LOTT to Secretary O'Neill have said this is just round one for tax reduction, and I credit them for their honesty because more tax is surely coming. This is not the final number for tax reduction.

When all of these numbers are added up, all of these plugs, all of these placeholders, and add up the likely action that will be layered on top of it, the bottom line in this budget goes negative as early as next year.

Within the next 10 years, we will be \$342 billion into the Medicare Trust Fund, \$255 billion into the Social Security Trust Fund. Maybe that is why the conference was kept secret and the budget was not shown to us until midnight last Thursday.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to say again that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) played no role whatever in this budget and was unable to even get his phone calls returned, and I regret that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, this budget ought to come out with a warning for senior citizens: Do not look for a decent prescription drug benefit here. President Bush, one may remember, when he was a candidate, promised a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. Instead, this budget has a measly proposal available only to seniors that make under \$11,500 a year. This is not going to help people like the Reinauers in my district. He is 75 and she is 71, but they make too much money to get help under the Republican plan.

Mr. Reinauer wrote to me last February saying, "We are going broke pay-

ing for prescription drugs." He is paying \$324 a month. Mrs. Reinauer has a drug bill that will knock your eyes out, and she pays the full price.

This is a budget that does more for a million millionaires than it does for 39 million Medicare beneficiaries that are waiting for a real prescription drug benefit. That is priorities.

This is not what President Bush promised when he was a candidate and it is not what senior citizens deserve to see in this budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. Last week, the House was kept in session until 3:00 a.m. waiting to vote on a budget that our side had not even seen and had no part in creating. That is bipartisanship, according to the Republican model. Then we could not consider the bill until this week because of two missing pages. Since then, those two pages have apparently been found, but there are three more important elements missing: Those are honesty, common sense and fairness.

The resolution we are considering tonight is missing honesty. It does not include resources necessary to offer seniors a universal voluntary prescription drug benefit under Medicare. In fact, the budget resolution shortens the solvency of the Medicare program. George Bush and his allies in the majority party promised to include prescription drug benefits under Medicare over and over in ad after ad, yet this budget falls woefully and embarrassingly short. This budget is missing common sense. The budget proposes large increases in defense spending but the budget they put forward does not pay for them.

In some instances, like paying our soldiers a decent wage, I fully support defense increases. But when it comes to \$100 billion missile defense systems, that is not common sense, it is uncommon foolishness.

Finally, the resolution is missing fairness. I have written the Tax Deduction Fairness Act of 2001 which would allow taxpayers in States like ours the option to deduct either their State income taxes or their State sales taxes. This would restore fairness to the Tax Code for residents in my State and in the States of Tennessee, Texas, Nevada, Wyoming, Florida and South Dakota. Such proposals as this were not included in this budget. This budget demands that our States subsidize the rest of the tax cuts for the rest of the country. This body deserves better. We deserve true bipartisanship, true discussion, true common sense, and the seniors and children of this country deserve true health care reform.

This budget does not provide it. We deserve better.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, at the onset, I would like to emphatically state my opposition to this rule, because this process is shameful and insulting.

Mr. Speaker, this process is shameful and insulting because it denies an opportunity to act responsibly by informing the American people that the numbers in this budget do not add up unless the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds are reduced drastically.

I regret that the budget process has come to this stage. We started off with such promise in the House Committee on the Budget of having a fair and open debate on priorities in the budget. The Democrats expected to lose many of the votes in discussions because we are in the minority, but we were at least given an opportunity for an open and fair debate.

President Bush has insisted that he wanted to set a new tone of respect and bipartisanship. What really happened to this fair and open bipartisanship with regard to negotiations on the budget?

On last Wednesday, I read an article in the Washington Times that the White House and the so-called congressional budget negotiators agreed on an 11-year \$1.35 trillion tax cut plan. The question in my mind is, who are these negotiators?

The Democrats on the Committee on the Budget were completely shut out of the process. There was no input allowed by the House Democratic leadership or the House Democrats on these budget cuts or tax adjustments. This kind of behavior is unworthy of the honorable Members of Congress and it is very dangerous politics that affects the core of democracy and fair play in our Nation.

This is regrettable because we are balancing the budget on the backs of our seniors. These numbers will not add up unless we reduce the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds. Yet the President is promising Americans that they can have their cake and eat it, too. He is promising a national missile defense system, far-reaching education reform, prescription drug program, and the list goes on to include inevitably a large additional tax cut that would mostly benefit big business and the wealthy.

I want the American citizens to know that they are being overpromised and deceived in this budget process. As a result, we cannot live up to providing improved education, prescription drugs for seniors, securing Social Security and Medicare, while paying down the debt and giving away a \$1.35 trillion tax cut which will probably result in a \$2 trillion tax cut.

The attitude projected in this process is that we are not listening and that we will not consider recommended adjustments or changes. This is in spite of the Senate Democrats' effort to allow for increased educational funding in this conference report. All of the \$294 billion for educational funds were dropped. Certainly this is not a bipartisan process. To pass this budget means we are breaking our commitment to our seniors, and I urge the defeat of the rule.

To pass this budget means—breaking our commitments to our senior citizens by failing to protect the Social Security and Medicare trust funds; denying our youth and children the best educational opportunities possible; and depriving the poor and needy food and services for their welfare.

As we attempt to balance the priorities of our nation, we should have at least agreed with the Senate by passing a conference report that reflects the needs of our people—like reducing the tax package; paying down more of the national debt; committing new resources for Medicare prescription drugs for all seniors, to provide quality education programs, to meet agricultural needs, and health care needs. There is room for tax relief for everyone, but this tax relief should be considered within the context of ALL of our national needs.

I am insulted by the idea of invoking the Martial Rule. This reflects a disrespectful tactic by the House Majority of this budget process which avoids Democratic input into this budget, and implies that their views are irrelevant or insignificant. There is no doubt that this conference report will raid both the Medicare and the social security trust funds. As trustees of this nation's wealth, we must make hard choices about how to allocate the resources of the American people. The wrong choices will affect the lives of millions of Americans for years to come.

My fellow colleagues, I urge you to vote "no" on the Martial Law Rule. I vote "no" out of principle since neither the Democratic Members of the Budget Committee nor the Democratic Leadership were given a level playing field in this process.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the gap between rhetoric and reality has never been wider than in this budget, and I am going to concentrate today especially on the education budget because that gap is truly massive in that area.

We are being asked to support a budget that provides no increase over inflation for education funding, and even falls short of what the President asks for in his budget plan. Despite all the talk from the White House, despite all the talk from our Republican friends, education is not a priority in this budget.

We have serious education needs. We need to reduce class size. We need to construct more schools, get our kids out of trailers. We need to recruit and train teachers. We need to boost Title

I aid for disadvantaged school districts. We need to close the achievement gap between majority and minority children. We need to increase Pell grants for college opportunity. We need to meet the Federal Government's obligation to IDEA special education funding. We need to expand Head Start. The list of needs is long. This budget comes up short on every count.

With this budget, President Bush and the Republicans break their promise to increase the maximum Pell grant to \$5,100. During the campaign, Candidate Bush promised to raise the maximum Pell grant award to \$5,100 for freshmen. Unfortunately, President Bush and the Republicans have fallen at least \$1.5 billion short of the amount needed to fulfill that promise.

The President's budget provides only enough funding to raise the maximum award of \$3,750 by about \$150, which is far less than Pell grant increases in recent years, and this budget does even less than what the President requested.

□ 1730

Then let us talk about Gear Up. Gear Up, that program already underfunded, that program to get colleges and private businesses engaged in mentoring high school students, closing that achievement gap, preparing them for college. This Gear Up program, praised by Secretary of Education Paige when he was in Houston as head of the system there, President Bush wants to cut Gear Up by 20 percent, meaning 200,000 fewer kids being helped; and now this Republican budget provides even less funding.

Bipartisan majorities in the Senate adopted amendments to add \$294 billion over 10 years for education over the House-passed budget, but the final version of this budget eliminates those increases. In fact, education receives less in this budget than the woeful House-passed budget by almost \$1 billion next year and \$21.4 billion over 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to just throw money at education and hope for improvements; but without new resources, crumbling classrooms cannot be repaired, new schools cannot be built, teachers cannot be hired and Pell Grants cannot be increased. We must do better. We need more than talk. Reject this budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota, Mr. POMEROY.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we are debating this motion before us to try and fix the budget filing foul-up of the majority from the other night. You know, it is one thing for the majority to be unfair; it is another thing for the majority to be inept. But for the majority to be both on the same piece of legislative business, it is a bit much.

By delaying until after midnight the attempted consideration of the budget, they utterly deprived almost half of

this body of the chance of even seeing the numbers they are proposing, literally, until the hour of the vote. But, as we know, that fouled copying machine that withheld two critical pages stopped them dead in their tracks.

You know, it kind of shakes your confidence. My goodness, if they cannot collate, you do not know whether they can calculate. And now that we have actually had a chance to survey the numbers, we can see indeed there are some very serious problems in calculation, substance problems that go far beyond the embarrassing procedural foul-up they brought upon themselves.

Let us talk specifically about one area, education. This is an area where our new President has called for more Federal leadership in improving the quality of our schools. In fact, he committed \$900 million over the next year, \$21.4 billion over the 10 years of the budget.

We passed the President's recommendation when the budget was considered in the House over to the Senate, where they said that is a good start, but we need to do more. With a bipartisan vote, they voted to add \$294 billion in additional resources into the budget package.

What happened? Well, when we finally got to the numbers of their package, numbers they hoped we would not get to look at and debate fully before this vote we are about to take, all of that money for our schools, all of that money for better education for our children, was stripped out; even President Bush's recommended funding, gone.

Ultimately, all that was left was an inflationary adjustment that amounts to \$12.90 per kid per year. We are not going to improve schools on that pitance. We need to adhere to the President's recommended levels and beyond. More money for schools. Reject this budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 8½ minutes.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I guess I rise today in opposition to the rule, but the truth is this rule means nothing, this budget means nothing, because there are no numbers here that anyone can tell you an answer to.

Most people in my district over the weekend were asking me what we are going to do this week, what is going to happen with the budget, how much money is going into education, how much money is going into health care? The truth is, not a single Member of this House or Senate can answer those questions based on this budget. They do not know. They have no idea how much money is going into education.

I can tell you one thing, the Medicare system, no matter what number they

use, this budget will bring the Medicare budget to insolvency much more quickly than before. Community health centers will be cut. I do not know how much, but they will be. Housing will be cut in virtually every single program; from \$700 million cut for public housing capital improvement, to a \$25 million cut in rural housing programs.

Training for pediatricians will be cut. We think we know a number on that, but we are not sure. The National Institutes of Health will be cut. We are not sure how much, but we think it will be cut. Ryan White AIDS grants will definitely be cut. Drug elimination grants will be cut. The COPS program will be cut. We are not sure how much, but it will be cut. Retraining programs for all those people who are now unemployed, every day we turn on the TV and read the paper, we read about more Americans getting unemployed, but this budget has no money to deal with that. We are not sure how much the Department of Defense is going to go up. We have no idea.

That is why at the end of this budget, you will see what is a huge slush fund. There is no other way to put it. It is the first time in my adult life I have ever seen a negative slush fund, however. It is negative \$67 billion, because the numbers do not add up, and what that says is when we get around to it, we will cut something; we do not know what, we will cut something to make this work.

I defy anyone at home to tell me what a negative slush fund is, except a budget that does not work. That is why I rise today to oppose this budget, to oppose this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time back to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 6 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. LANGEVIN.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this rule and to a budget conference agreement that jeopardizes fiscal discipline and critical social programs to make room for an enormous tax cut skewed toward the wealthy and based on surplus projections that may never materialize.

Despite a modest reduction in the tax cut originally proposed by the administration, it is still far too large. To pay for it, the agreement usurps funds that should go to other critical priorities, like reducing our debt, creating a stable defense, improving education, providing affordable health care, strengthening Social Security and Medicare, and, yes, a real prescription drug benefit for our seniors, particularly in light of the fact that just today, as reported, spending on prescription drugs has increased by almost 19 percent.

Furthermore, this fundamentally flawed agreement would cut Federal programs that are vital to our Nation's

small businesses: worker, health, environmental protection, energy efficiency and housing needs. This budget also shortchanges our vast transportation and infrastructure needs, decreases funding for critical law enforcement programs, and cuts budget authority for the benefits our veterans have earned.

We would all like to reward hard-working Americans by returning some of their tax dollars, but we would also need to ensure that our most pressing needs are met. These are real concerns that warrant a real budget based on real numbers, not partisan rhetoric that falsely touts cooperation and accord. Bipartisan negotiations involve a lot more than just inviting a couple of folks over to the White House for lunch.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this ill-conceived Republican proposal and supporting instead a sensible, well-balanced budget resolution that speaks to the needs of every American family.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that maybe the Senate copier was on to something when it split these two pages out. This conference report makes me want to gag when I think about what happened. The obfuscation and deception that has been the hallmark of this budget process is truly worthy of the conference report.

The majority insisted on voting on a budget resolution before seeing the President's budget. That was the first thing. Then the majority shut out the Democrats from any consideration on this conference report and then tried to sneak a vote past the American people before they even had a chance to see their cynical handiwork.

I do not blame the Republican leadership for trying to hide the details of this budget from the people. Nobody would be proud of this budget that pays for tax cuts with the futures of our children. Look at all the child-hostile measures in this budget. It cuts Head Start; it makes child care harder and more less affordable for working families. It cuts Individuals With Disabilities Education Act Part C, which helps prepare disabled infants and toddlers for school. It cuts the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program, which keeps kids safe and productive after school. It cuts the Mental Health Services block grant, which is what everyone tells me is what works in our States when providing that crucial community support for our most vulnerable children. It cuts all of these things, and yet we say that we have a President that wants to put his emphasis on education.

It certainly is not relevant in this budget. We need to see the dollars, or else that will be a hollow promise of his being an education President.

Deception seems to be the name of the game because the majority's irre-

sponsibility for what is going on with this tax cut plan is what is making this such a vulnerable budget to begin with, because it will make it unable for us to meet our obligations long-term for this Nation while being able to cut the taxes for the most wealthy in this country. That is why I think that we should make sure these two pages are included, and we ought to know what the full impact of this budget is.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we have to resort to these types of extraordinary rules. We could have bipartisan agreement on a budget. It would not have been difficult for the majority to reach out to the Democrats and come out with a budget that we all could support, that would provide for tax relief as well as protecting Social Security and Medicare and the priority programs, and, most importantly, reducing our national debt.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I will not support this budget is that I believe it provides for tax cuts that will be too large, allowing us to protect Social Security and Medicare, not only this year, but in future years, and would allow us to continue to make the type of investments in education and the environment and other priorities that are important for the people I represent.

But, most tragically, Mr. Speaker, I think this budget will do exactly what the National Review indicates it will do, and that says "Do not fear a deficit." "Do not fear a deficit."

I think that there are many who understand that this budget, if implemented, will lead to deficit spending again and an effort to downsize government. We do not want to see deficits again, yet I believe this budget will lead in that direction.

So, Mr. Speaker, I regret that we have not used the time until now to work together to bring Democrats and Republicans together on a budget that will allow for reasonable tax relief and allow us to pay down our national debt, rather than adding potential red ink to it.

I urge my colleagues to reject this budget and to work together for the American people.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I realize it might be a little late to do this, but in the interest of accuracy and trying to refocus what we are actually about here, what we are debating is the rule that waives the requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to the same day consideration of certain resolutions reported by the Committee on Rules.

We are not debating the budget here, and the vote we are going to take is not on the budget. In fact, if you wish to get to the budget debate, I urge you

to support the rule. The majority is trying to bring the budget to the floor so that the debate we have already heard, some good introductory discussions in this past half-hour, can come to full-blown debate under the conference rules on the floor of the House. So I am going to ask everybody please to support this rule so we can in fact get on with the budget debate tomorrow.

I think that I have heard some concern that was a little puzzling, a lot of conference discussion about this particular budget, which my colleague from New York says is being rewritten by the other body as we speak. If that in fact is the case, then why are we debating a document that is not going to be relevant?

□ 1745

So it seems to me that we should have focused our remarks on the expedition that the majority is trying to bring forth, and that is a journey to the budget debate as quickly as possible in the broad daylight on a beautiful day in Washington, tomorrow, Wednesday, May 9.

I think that those who are still talking about being deprived of the opportunity to see the budget, whether it is the budget we are going to see or not, need to remember that they have had 4 days over the weekend, and indeed, it sounds as if some members have spent some time, and that is useful.

Those who would say that the majority has not been particularly apt or particularly fair in this process are entitled to their opinion, but I think those that come to Washington to look for perfection ought not to be the ones who cast the first stones. I am reminded that I am human and I readily admit I make errors, and I have machines in my office that jam occasionally, they are called copy machines, and if members have copy machines that do not jam, I would like to know what the brand is, because most every brand I have tried jammed, and that, in fact, is what happened. We had a jammed copy machine, and in our interest to try and get the debate started, we were not prudent enough to catch the fact that there were still two pieces of paper caught in the copy machine. We did catch it; but we just did not catch it immediately, so we misfiled.

I know that error takes place, and I do not want to be the one to cast the first stone; but since the stone has been cast, I generally remember in my earlier term here, I think it was back about 1992, there was an embarrassing moment when the present minority was in the majority when somehow or other we lost track of \$25 billion worth of Russian aid and the Speaker of the House went through a very considerable scramble to get it back. I do not recall us making a Federal case out of that, and I think that we solved that problem.

I also believe this problem is a much more minor problem; this only involves

perhaps giving the opportunity of Members 4 more days to review what might, in fact, be our budget document for budget debate.

So I think that we have come out ahead on this. Whether that was by design or by circumstance does not matter. We, in fact, are going to have a good chance to debate this budget; and everybody is going to have a chance to see what is in it.

But all of that is not relevant to what is before us, which is the rule to get on with the same-day provision that will allow us to get on to debating the budget. So without further comment on the fact that I think we have had an interesting preview of what might come in a budget debate, I would urge that we support this rule; and then the Committee on Rules will soon bring another rule which will also get us that much closer to the budget debate. So, if my colleagues will support that rule as well, we will then have two good rules in place to get us to the budget debate tomorrow; and we can vote on the budget rule tomorrow and then on the conference report, if all goes well.

Having said that, I urge the support of all my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this resolution are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1801

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

HONORING NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR 50 YEARS OF SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 108.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 108.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO THE SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 131.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 200, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Crane	Green (WI)
Akin	Crenshaw	Greenwood
Armey	Culberson	Grucci
Bachus	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Baker	Davis, Jo Ann	Hansen
Ballenger	Davis, Tom	Hart
Barr	Deal	Hastings (WA)
Bartlett	DeLay	Hayes
Barton	DeMint	Hayworth
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Hefley
Bereuter	Doolittle	Herger
Biggert	Dreier	Hilleary
Bilirakis	Duncan	Hobson
Blunt	Dunn	Hoekstra
Boehlert	Ehlers	Horn
Boehner	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Bonilla	Emerson	Houghton
Bono	English	Hulshof
Brady (TX)	Everett	Hunter
Brown (SC)	Ferguson	Hutchinson
Bryant	Flake	Hyde
Burr	Fletcher	Isakson
Burton	Foley	Issa
Buyer	Fossella	Istook
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Jenkins
Calvert	Galleghy	Johnson (CT)
Camp	Ganske	Johnson (IL)
Cannon	Gekas	Johnson, Sam
Cantor	Gibbons	Jones (NC)
Capito	Gilchrest	Keller
Castle	Gillmor	Kelly
Chabot	Gilman	Kennedy (MN)
Chambliss	Goode	Kerns
Coble	Goodlatte	King (NY)
Collins	Goss	Kingston
Combest	Graham	Kirk
Cooksey	Granger	Knollenberg
Cox	Graves	Kolbe

Largent	Pombo	Smith (NJ)
Latham	Portman	Smith (TX)
LaTourette	Pryce (OH)	Souder
Leach	Putnam	Spence
Lewis (CA)	Quinn	Stearns
Lewis (KY)	Radanovich	Sununu
Linder	Ramstad	Tancredo
LoBiondo	Regula	Tauzin
Lucas (OK)	Rehberg	Terry
Manzullo	Reynolds	Thomas
McCrery	Riley	Thornberry
McHugh	Rogers (KY)	Thune
McInnis	Rogers (MI)	Tiahrt
McKeon	Rohrabacher	Tiberi
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Toomey
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Trafficant
Miller, Gary	Royce	Upton
Moran (KS)	Ryan (WI)	Vitter
Morella	Ryun (KS)	Walden
Myrick	Saxton	Walsh
Nethercutt	Scarborough	Wamp
Ney	Schaffer	Watkins
Northup	Schrock	Watts (OK)
Norwood	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Nussle	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Osborne	Shadegg	Weller
Ose	Shaw	Whitfield
Otter	Shays	Wicker
Oxley	Sherwood	Wilson
Pence	Shimkus	Wolf
Petri	Simmons	Young (AK)
Pickering	Simpson	Young (FL)
Pitts	Skeen	
Platts	Smith (MI)	

Turner	Waters	Woolsey
Udall (CO)	Watt (NC)	Wu
Udall (NM)	Waxman	Wynn
Velazquez	Weiner	
Viscosky	Wexler	

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)
Allen	LaHood	Rivers
Costello	Lampson	Stump
Cubin	McDermott	Sweeney
Gutierrez	Miller, George	Taylor (NC)
Inslie	Paul	

□ 1824

Mr. SAWYER and Mr. SERRANO changed their vote from “yea” to “nay”.

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 100, I was absent because of mechanical problems with the aircraft I was on. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay.”

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1613

Mr. PASCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 1613.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR RECOMMITTAL OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 134 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 134

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011 is hereby recommitted to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), my friend and colleague from the Committee on Rules; pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only on this matter.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us grants us a rule that provides that

upon adoption of the rule the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 83 shall be recommitted to the conference committee.

Simply put, and in plain English for Members, what we are doing is we are taking care of the necessary procedure to get the budget debate on the floor tomorrow. What is going to happen is we are going to pass this rule, then the matter is going to go to the other body. The Committee on Rules is going to meet a little later in the evening, put out a rule to get the new conference report on the floor tomorrow with an appropriate rule, and the House will go about the business of deliberating and voting on the budget, which we are all anxious to get to after the long opportunity we have had to review it in the past several days.

Therefore, this is somewhat of a technical matter; but it is important that in order to continue our progress towards getting the budget on the floor that we adopt this rule. I do not think there is anything unusual about it or controversial about it, and I urge all Members' support.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule to recommit this flawed document. I urge the leadership to use this opportunity to craft a real budget with input from both Republicans and Democrats.

The infamous two missing pages are hardly the only flaws in this so-called agreement. Other pages are missing as well. For instance, waiting in the wings of this Congress are a number of popular tax cuts, including between \$85 billion and \$115 billion in business tax breaks. Billions more in tax cuts, with the elimination of the estate tax for the Nation's wealthiest citizens, and the elimination of the so-called marriage penalty tax this Congress, are moving through the legislative process. An honest budget would have included these provisions. The House leadership knows full well that at the end of this tax cut frenzy we will surpass the administration's initial proposal of \$1.8 trillion.

Also missing are the President's big-ticket items. For starters, we seem to be missing the page that factors in the likely cost of a missile defense system. Nobody knows if it will work, and nobody knows how much it will cost; but estimates run up to \$300 billion.

We also seem to be missing the page that explains how we pay for the conventional defense buildup being planned by the administration at a cost of \$250 billion over the next decade. How is this consistent with a budget that makes no room for increases in defense spending beyond those already proposed by the Clinton administration?

NAYS—200

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Millender-
Andrews	Gonzalez	McDonald
Baca	Gordon	Mink
Baird	Green (TX)	Moakley
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Mollohan
Baldwin	Hall (TX)	Moore
Barcia	Harman	Moran (VA)
Barrett	Hastings (FL)	Murtha
Becerra	Hill	Nadler
Bentsen	Hilliard	Napolitano
Berkley	Hinchey	Neal
Berman	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Berry	Hoefel	Obey
Bishop	Holden	Olver
Blagojevich	Holt	Ortiz
Blumenauer	Honda	Owens
Bonior	Hookey	Pallone
Borski	Hoyer	Pascarell
Boswell	Israel	Pastor
Boucher	Jackson (IL)	Payne
Boyd	Jackson-Lee	Pelosi
Brady (PA)	(TX)	Peterson (MN)
Brown (FL)	Jefferson	Phelps
Brown (OH)	John	Pomeroy
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Capuano	Kanjorski	Rahall
Cardin	Kaptur	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Kennedy (RI)	Reyes
Carson (OK)	Kildee	Rodriguez
Clay	Kilpatrick	Roemer
Clayton	Kind (WI)	Ross
Clement	Kleczka	Rothman
Clyburn	Kucinich	Roybal-Allard
Condit	LaFalce	Rush
Conyers	Langevin	Sabo
Coyne	Lantos	Sanchez
Cramer	Larsen (WA)	Sanders
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Sandlin
Cummings	Lee	Sawyer
Davis (CA)	Levin	Schakowsky
Davis (FL)	Lewis (GA)	Schiff
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Scott
DeFazio	Lofgren	Serrano
DeGette	Lowe	Sherman
Delahunt	Lucas (KY)	Shows
DeLauro	Luther	Skelton
Deutsch	Maloney (CT)	Slaughter
Dicks	Maloney (NY)	Smith (WA)
Dingell	Markey	Snyder
Doggett	Mascara	Solis
Dooley	Matheson	Spratt
Doyle	Matsui	Stark
Edwards	McCarthy (MO)	Stenholm
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Strickland
Eshoo	McCollum	Stupak
Etheridge	McGovern	Tanner
Evans	McIntyre	Tauscher
Farr	McKinney	Taylor (MS)
Fattah	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Filner	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Ford	Meek (FL)	Thurman
Frank	Meeks (NY)	Tierney
Frost	Menendez	Towns

Also, I have yet to find the page that explains how we will maintain government services in the face of a growing population while increasing spending no faster than inflation. Perhaps the leadership can explain what unspecified drastic cuts to the tune of \$400 billion they have planned and how will these cuts not impact Social Security and Medicare.

I urge the leadership to turn over all missing pages and expose these numbers; and, moreover, I would caution my colleagues on the conference committee against signing their name to a document that is patently and shamelessly dishonest in its current form.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I intend to reserve the balance of my time until further notice.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, over the last 5 years we have increased the education budget, on average, 13 percent a year. This year, President Bush has cut that rate of increase in his budget in half to 5.8 percent. The House Republican budget resolution did the same thing that the President did. The Senate then said, that is woefully inadequate for education; and they added \$240 billion for education over 10 years by taking it out of the jumbo-size tax cuts. This resolution not only eliminates the entire \$240 billion add-on over 10 years for education, it also takes funding for education \$25 billion below the President's own budget over the next 10 years, and for this coming year alone takes the education funding \$1 billion below President Bush's budget. That is no compromise. That is returning to yesteryear.

If this is the Republican idea of how we put education first, I would hate to see their idea of how we do not. Everything, including education, is being sacrificed to jumbo-size tax cuts for people making over \$200,000 a year. That does not represent the priority judgments of the American people. This bill should not only be voted down, it should be laughed down.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule, and I do so with a great deal of disappointment; disappointment in the procedure that is being followed. But I understand why, and I appreciate very much that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has been the lone exception of trying to seek some kind of bipartisanship on this budget. Obviously, he has been overruled by the leadership, the same leadership that brings this rule today that has to have martial law to pass the budget. Martial law to pass the budget, after we spent 16½ hours on this floor last Thursday waiting on the majority to come up with their idea of what the budget should look like.

Now, I can give my colleagues 10 solid reasons why they ought to vote against the budget, but that is not what we are talking about today. What we are talking about today is the rule. I do not know how much longer the majority is going to be in lockstep with breaking every rule and precedent of the House that they used to criticize us on this side of the aisle for doing, only I do not believe we ever did as good a job at it as they are doing tonight and as they did last week. This is ridiculous.

As one who would like to see some semblance of bipartisanship on the budget, I came to the conclusion that was impossible, and I understand why. And as a member of the minority, I understand why we are not going to win any. But at some point in time, I would hope there would be just a tinge of conscience as to the procedures of the House and as to how we might get a little better comity in working on things like defense and education and health care and agriculture, other than the manner in which this particular budget that this rule makes in order will do.

I will guarantee my colleagues there will be bipartisanship when we start dealing with the specifics. So many of my colleagues on the majority have chosen under their leadership to ignore that to bring this rule to the floor. I urge a vote "no," and let us go back and do it right.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

A quarter of a century ago, when the budget process was established, it was established so that we could look at all of the numbers in a measured, considered way, the income and the outgo, and make sure the numbers added up. It was not intended to be done in the dark of night in a hurried manner with some numbers there and some numbers not there and who knows what is there. Well, that is what we have ended up with today and this is a flagrant violation of the whole spirit of the budget process.

And in this hurry to get this tax cut through in an ill-considered way, we end up with a terrible shortchanging of the American people. Take education, for example. Inadequate consideration for our national need to recruit teachers, to find ways to get the 2.2 million teachers that we need in the next 10 years to keep up with the retirement and attrition in the ranks of teaching. Insufficient attention to the need for new facilities and modern classrooms, where classes of a reasonable size can meet in good conditions.

And with insufficient attention to the other concerns. Take special education, for example: under IDEA, if we are going to meet our national obligation, the Federal Government's obligation for special education, that would come to something on the order of \$100

billion over 10 years. Do we find that in this budget resolution? No, we do not.

Education is shortchanged at every turn. And what we have got, coming from the House-Senate conference committee, appears to be a zeroing of the education budget, holding it at a level that does not even keep up with inflation. This is totally inadequate; and it is the result of this hurried, inadequate process.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is outrageous that this week Congress will vote on a budget that threatens the future of our Nation's most valuable asset: our children.

No wonder the Republican leadership tried to rush the budget to the floor last week without allowing adequate consideration. But then I believe they thought they could pull the wool over our eyes by misplacing two of the pages of that budget. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the two missing pages contained the details of the \$1.35 trillion tax cut.

It appears that those two pages are the essence of how the Republican leadership will pay for their massive tax break; by cutting funding for vital services for American women and their families, including temporary assistance for needy families, workforce training and employment programs, community anti-violence and anti-drug programs, and overall education for the funding of our children.

Moreover, by prioritizing tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership is signing away the future of Social Security and the Medicare Trust Fund. In addition to harming children, it appears they want to undermine the future of grandparents, too.

This is unacceptable. I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule to recommit; vote against this budget.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN).

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, in the words of President Reagan, there they go again. Fresh from the missing page debacle, we are back with more of the same. It seems that pieces of paper are not the only things missing as we appear here today.

The administration and the leadership talk a very good game. They tell us they want to increase education spending, they tell us they want a prescription drug plan for seniors, they tell us they want funding for disaster relief. But the numbers say something entirely different, because they just do not compute; they just do not add up. The American public will not be fooled. Because, in fact, it seems there is a lot more missing than two pieces of paper.

Missing: there was \$21 billion in education funding missing from this budget. This budget, as filed last week, provides even less money than the President requested in his budget; \$21 billion

less than requested. The leadership talks a good game about a bipartisan education bill; and that is all well and good, but having a bipartisan bill and talking about it does not do much when a good-faith effort is not made to fund education for our children.

□ 1845

Missing: The explanation. The explanation of how to adequately fund a Medicare prescription plan is missing from the budget. President Bush has suggested that we spend about \$115 billion on a program to help seniors. Everyone else in the country seems to acknowledge that it will take at least a minimum of \$300 billion to provide anything close to a fair and adequate benefit for senior citizens, but this budget fails to pay for such a benefit.

Missing: Another \$5 billion is missing to cover natural disasters. In the years that I have represented my district, we have been hit by tornadoes, floods, droughts, ice storms. My citizens depend on FEMA, and FEMA has provided relief for the citizens of my district. However, this budget completely X's that out. This \$5 billion is important and should not be dropped due to a procedural dispute.

Mr. Speaker, much more is missing than two pieces of paper. Much more is missing than two pages in this budget. The priorities of America are missing. The greatness of America is missing. I urge my colleagues to vote for the motion to recommit.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution. This conference report which we are going to debate tonight has some fundamental flaws in it which should lead us to go back to the drawing board. I want to highlight what I think is the most egregious problem.

We have actually shortchanged education below what the President has proposed. Many of us applauded the President during his campaign for talking about leaving no child behind and doing more to help our schools reduce class size, attract qualified teachers and build safe and clean, modern schools. He proposed an increase in education spending which many of us thought was simply a beginning, simply a start.

Now, here in the House of Representatives tonight, we are going to adopt a conference report that is \$21 billion less than what the President has proposed. Nobody has had the courage to stand on the floor of the House tonight and say why we should do less than the President of the United States has proposed for what we all agree should be our Nation's highest priority. In Tampa, Florida, my district, this is our highest priority, and people I represent want us to pay down the debt and see a fair tax cut that benefits all Americans, but they want us to do something about education.

We ought to have the courage to stand up to where the President has started the debate in terms of leaving no child behind. Instead, this House is breaking from the President, is repudiating this position, is funding education at \$21 billion less than what the President has proposed. How can we go forward debating the Elementary and Secondary Authorization Act we were supposed to take up last week, and we are putting all of the money into a tax cut instead.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting all year to get details of a proposed budget, and we have been forced to vote on crucial issues such as a tax cut without seeing the budget. Now we are being forced to vote on a budget on which we have had no input and only have gotten access to because of human error. This type of process is unfair and extremely heavy-handed.

President Bush promised the American people he would be the education President. He campaigned on a slogan of, "Leave no child behind." When he gave his State of the Union address, he stated, "Education is my top priority, and by supporting this budget you will make it yours as well."

Yet this budget has no substantial new funding for education. The President's ostensible commitment to education, like his ostensible commitment to bipartisanship, is a hoax. He took \$288 billion over the next 10 years out of the budget for education. This amount had bipartisan support in the Senate, yet the conference agreement eliminates 98 percent of that increased funding. This measly 2 percent increase amounts to a mere \$13 per student per year. The balanced budget the Democrats offered and that Republicans unanimously rejected called for a \$112 billion increase in education funding over 10 years. This funding would have provided for class size reductions, school renovation, teacher recruitment, increased funds for special education, expansion of Pell grants and additional funds for Head Start.

Announcing support for education without providing funding to back it up is no more than another empty promise from a President whose legacy will more likely be his consistent flip-flop on crucial issues rather than any proposed commitment to education.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues are going to hear a lot about education this evening. He promised, he promised. He has broken that promise in the way that he has put this budget together. I ask for a "yes" vote on the rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) was quoted in Roll Call as

saying, "The Democrats are whining about the process rather than getting into debate on the substance."

I am going to talk about substance tomorrow, but let me talk about process today. I ask my colleagues on the majority side of the aisle, what do they think about 212 Americans who represent approximately 235 million Americans, not Democrats, 235 million Americans, who had no opportunity to see the substance of your proposal on Thursday night?

Cannot we cry foul over a Republican budget process that completely shuts out the representatives of the people, not us as individuals, but of the people that we represent, Republicans, Democrats, Independents, and, yes, those who are not aligned.

Our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) was not allowed into the conference on this resolution; yet we adopt a rule that today will not debate substance but, by process alone, will recommit this bill to the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am pretty sure I detected a few Republican tears in the wee hours of the morning that they could not get this through. As a matter of fact, I heard the distinguished gentleman from Florida talking about that and lamenting. After all, that is when the majority learned the painful truth: It would have to wait 4 days. Look who is crying now.

Mr. Speaker, the other side of the aisle has had a weekend of bad press on these frankly heavy-handed budget tactics, and people are starting to reexamine the substance in this budget, a budget that provides huge tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans, and let the budget ax fall on education, contrary to the bipartisan agreement in the other body, and seniors who need prescription drugs, and our environment.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote down this rule. Let us return this matter to the American people and have a full and fair debate.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just 4 days ago the lights went out in the House of Representatives, although many of us were here seeking the opportunity to have a full debate on a budget that all of America could support; but unfortunately, it did not happen. We waited and we waited, and all of a sudden pages were missing.

I believe the real key is whether the American people will have their voices heard and whether or not they will know for sure that this is a budget that actually invades the Social Security Trust Fund and the Medicare Trust Fund because of the \$1.3 trillion tax cut over a 10-year period, and 2011 will show us an invasion in Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, today in my district there was an Older American Seminar, and some of the major questions being raised was what is happening to Medicare and what is happening to Social Security? What is happening to the real drug prescription benefit that the President promised us almost 2 and 3 years ago? I can say there is no room at the inn, and there is no money in the House.

When we speak about educating our children, \$294 billion for education is all of a sudden missing. The President, who indicates that education is his chief responsibility, has money for reading and Pell grants, and I agree with that, but where is the money for the other programs that we so sorely need. Whether it is issues like Title I, whether it is issues for special education, whether it is school construction, where is the commitment for the Federal Government collaboration with local government dealing with health?

The National Institutes of Health should be supported, but if you exclude the National Institutes of Health funding from health funding in the budget, you will find that that money is insufficient to take care of the needs, like uninsured children in America, 1 million in the State of Texas. We only enroll 300,000 to 400,000, so children are uninsured and we need the dollars to be able to assist.

If we talk about civil rights and election reform, budgets in the Department of Justice have been cut and so we are not serious about election reform or civil rights in this country.

Mr. Speaker, let us turn the lights on and do this in a bipartisan way and get a real budget and oppose the resolution that is on the floor.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I support sending this bill back to the Committee on the Budget. There is so much work the conference committee still has to do. I say with respect to the gentlewoman who talked about missing pages, there are more than just pages missing from this document. There are whole chapters that are missing. Just look at the President's priorities that are not funded or included.

How are we going to pay for national missile defense? The President is talking about that. That is hundreds of billions of dollars not recognized in this budget document.

How are we going to pay for his military build up that he is going to ask for in 2 weeks, probably \$25 billion a year? How are we going to pay for that? It is not mentioned in this budget.

How are we going to pay for his proposal to privatize Social Security? If that is implemented, there are probably \$1 trillion in transition costs; yet this budget document is completely silent on those Presidential priorities.

There is an awful lot missing in this document, Mr. Speaker. The problem is it cuts taxes too deeply, and it has far too little for debt reduction. The American people want us to pay down the debt. The American people I represent want debt reduction. That is a higher priority for them than large tax cuts, and they do not want us to take our budget process back to unbalanced budgets, deficit spending, and years and years of debt.

Mr. Speaker, we need to return this for the missing pages, the missing chapters to be added. I support a "yes" vote on recommitment.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, the hottest play on Broadway is a play about a washed-up producer and his erstwhile accountant who try to sell a flop to widows, and instead of selling 100 percent they sell 1,000 percent, and when it goes under, they will take the rest.

Mr. Speaker, the hottest play in Washington apparently is the budget resolution that is before us today, and is going back to the Committee on the Budget, and will come back tomorrow, where we claim that we are going to have a tax cut that is contained and we are going to contain spending at a certain amount, as if all around the Capitol and even on the floor today and even over at the White House today when funding issues come up, they say, Do not worry, we will put more education money in later. Do not worry, we will put more money in for FEMA later. Do not worry, we will fund the NSF, the National Science Foundation, later. Do not worry, if my colleagues do not think the tax cut is big enough, we will take care of that later.

What we have produced here is a flop where we are selling the American people 1,000 percent of the shares. It is a total fraud that is being committed through this budget. It is unrealistic, and at the end of the day what is going to happen is they are going to go to the appropriators and they are going to say, Let us waive the Budget Act and let us go ahead. It is not going to be 4 or 5 percent, it is going to be 6 percent, and what we are not going to do is have a strong fiscal policy for the good of the general economy, and we will purport a fraud on the American people in the process by eliminating and finally eviscerating once and for all the Budget Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a great shame that this House and the Senate have decided to follow in the footsteps of Broadway as opposed to doing the American people's business.

□ 1900

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York for yielding me this time.

This budget should be sent back to the conference, and it should be fixed. The way it ought to be fixed is that the budget plan put forth by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) last month ought to be substituted for what will be before us tomorrow.

In the years from the inception of the Republic to 1980, we ran up a public debt of about \$1 trillion to fight and win World War I, World War II, dig our way out of the Great Depression, build the interstate highway system, do all the things America did in those years. In the years between 1980 and 1992, we more than quadrupled that debt. By the time 1993 rolled around, we were in excess of \$5 trillion in debt.

The major difference between the plan that will be before us tomorrow and the plan that should be before us tomorrow is this: at the end of the 10-year period, giving the most charitable interpretation to the majority's plan, when we compare it to the 10-year period under the gentleman from South Carolina's plan, our children will be approximately one-half trillion dollars greater in debt under the majority's plan than if we adopted the gentleman from South Carolina's plan. That is one-half trillion dollars, I think it is really closer to a trillion if we use honest accounting, that we are choosing to saddle our children with.

When I came here in 1990, fiscal conservatives wanted to eliminate the deficit and pay down the debt. Well, the worm has turned and it appears to me that those who call themselves fiscal conservatives now stand up for fiscal irresponsibility.

Send this budget back to the conference and fix it and relieve our children of the debt that we are imposing upon them.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons this budget ought to be sent back to conference. It needs a total overhaul, a complete rewrite. I would like to ask the gentleman from the Committee on Rules if there is a possibility if we send it back if you might reconsider concurrent receipt for veterans disability pay which was passed in the Senate but struck in conference. Is there any chance we can redeem that?

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the interesting things that is going on here is that I am representing the Committee on Rules and am proud to do so and we are dealing with a rule. Other speakers have gotten a little off the track of the rule and are talking about the budget, which is the property and province of the Committee on the Budget and the conference committee

that is discussing it. It is the Committee on Rules' desire to get this legislation back to that conference committee where the gentleman could properly address that question.

Mr. SPRATT. I want to suggest there are many things you ought to do and one of my biggest concerns is the way defense has been treated in this budget. When it left the House, we provided \$70 billion more than the rate of inflation and gave the chairman of the committee the authority, I did not agree with this, but the authority willy-nilly to come back and plus that up by even more. You got to conference and took \$30 billion of that away in order to get the discretionary spending number down.

Let me tell you what my big concern is. Looking at this fairly complicated chart here, if you come to the bottom line, it is the line, the amount of money that remains after all the puts and takes in the conference agreement have been made. There is \$12 billion in 2002, 19 in 2003, 24 in 2004; but we have read in recent weeks about the likely defense request that Mr. Rumsfeld is going to send once he figures out how to transform our military. And the numbers run 2, \$300 billion, \$25 billion a year. We have factored that into this budget. That is this line right here, defense increase. You know it is coming. I know it is coming. This budget ex-

plicitly anticipates it by giving the Committee on the Budget chairman the authority to adjust this number, however it takes.

But what you have got is a thin bottom line here that will not sustain the kind of increase that Mr. Rumsfeld is talking about. I would suggest if you are going to take it back to the conference committee, you might see if you can get these numbers to mesh.

Look, for example, at the year 2003. The Rumsfeld request in that year, if it is \$25 billion, plus let us add the previous year, would be about \$33 billion. But what is left in the contingency reserve? Just \$24 billion. Every year for the next 6 years, there is too little money left over to provide for what the likely defense increase is going to be. So I think this budget needs a huge rework.

Let me mention one other thing. Buried in this budget without any debate in the Committee on the Budget is a provision that prohibits the use of advance appropriations. It so happens that there are entities around here that can make good use of advance appropriations. The United States Navy would like to have that authority so they can move from full funding to incremental funding. This will prohibit them from doing that. It was put in the budget resolution because you shut the doors, you shut us out, there was no

constructive discussion of this. And certainly not of the education increase. The Senate provided a nearly \$300 billion plus-up in education over and above inflation, a huge increase, as a result of three amendments on the Senate floor. A majority of the Senate passed the budget resolution with that increase included; and, bam, it went to conference, it disappeared. Not only did it disappear, the President requested \$21.4 billion more than the rate of inflation for education. It is gone, too.

This was supposed to be an education budget. The President told us from that podium right there a couple of months ago that education would be the account in his budget increased the most. You are bringing this budget back to vote on in the House with nothing more than inflation. Zero inflation. You have maintained real purchasing power.

Recommit to the conference, you bet. But take it back to the conference and put it through a real conference. Put it through an adversarial process and bring us a budget that is worth consideration. This has too many missing numbers, too many unreal numbers, too many plugs and placeholders.

Mr. Speaker, I include a chart pertaining to the budget conference for the RECORD.

BUDGET CONFERENCE AGREEMENT THREATENS MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

(Billions of dollars; CBO January assumptions)

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2008	2010	2011	2002-11
Conference Agreement:												
Baseline Unified Surplus	281	313	359	397	433	505	573	635	710	796	889	5,610
Social Security	156	171	188	201	221	238	257	276	294	312	331	2,488
Medicare Part A	29	36	39	41	40	44	41	41	39	37	34	393
Available Surplus	96	106	132	155	172	223	275	318	377	447	524	2,729
Permanent Tax Cut	0	50	76	84	97	138	141	153	166	171	191	1,269
Stimulus Tax Cut	85	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Medicare Rx and Home Health	0	0	1	11	22	2	2	2	2	2	2	314
Other Health	6	7	12	11	2	29	41	46	49	54	61	44
Agriculture	0	7	8	8	8	8	8	7	6	6	6	70
Veterans	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
All Other	2	7	4	-3	-0	-3	1	1	1	1	1	10
Resulting New Interest	2	7	12	19	26	36	48	62	78	95	114	498
"Contingency Reserve"	1	12	19	24	16	13	33	46	75	118	149	504
Likely Further Action:												
Average Historical Emergencies	0	2	4	5	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	55
Defense Increase	0	13	21	27	32	37	45	48	49	49	49	370
AMT Fix	0	1	4	7	13	21	37	43	49	55	63	293
Tax "Extenders"	0	1	2	3	3	4	4	5	5	6	7	41
Business Tax Cuts	0	3	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	36
Health Tax Cuts	0	0	2	4	6	6	7	7	7	7	7	53
Retirement Tax Cuts	0	1	3	3	4	5	6	6	7	8	8	52
Resulting Net Interest	0	1	2	5	8	13	19	26	34	43	53	203
Resulting Surplus/Deficit	1	-11	-22	-33	-60	-82	-94	-98	-86	-61	-50	-597
Spending of Medicare Surplus	0	-11	-22	-33	-40	-44	-41	-41	-39	-37	-34	-342
Spending of Social Security Surplus	0	0	0	0	-20	-38	-52	-58	-47	-24	-16	-255

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to call on all of my colleagues to vote yes on this rule because the effect will be to deliver last week's budget to the ignominious defeat and death that it so richly deserves.

I urge a yes vote on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am, of course, very pleased that the gentlewoman is approaching this in a bipartisan way and there is full agreement. This is a bipartisan rule. We are both encouraging support for this rule.

If you do not like the budget, send it back to the conference committee. If you do like the budget, send it back to the conference committee. This is actually one of the easiest rules I have ever had to handle.

I do say the gentleman from South Carolina was very instructive. I am going to get myself one of those charts for Rules so that I can get people to understand what it is we are talking about better.

I am looking forward to the budget debate tomorrow when members from the Committee on the Budget will actually be at the microphones and at the leadership and committee tables on this side explaining the budget that we

are proposing. Tonight we are proposing a rule because we are the Committee on Rules. The rule is designed to get the budget on the floor because that is much more interesting and more important. That is what we hope to accomplish. I want to thank all of those for their forbearance as we have gone through this procedure which is not something that we had anticipated when we started; but I appreciate the comity, good humor, and pleasant commentary and the bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie	Crane	Hastings (WA)
Aderholt	Crenshaw	Hayes
Akin	Crowley	Hayworth
Andrews	Culberson	Hefley
Armey	Cummings	Herger
Baca	Cunningham	Hill
Bachus	Davis (CA)	Hilleary
Baird	Davis (FL)	Hilliard
Baker	Davis (IL)	Hinchey
Baldacci	Davis, Jo Ann	Hinojosa
Baldwin	Davis, Tom	Hobson
Ballenger	Deal	Hoeffel
Barcia	DeFazio	Hoekstra
Barr	Delahunt	Holden
Barrett	DeLauro	Holt
Bartlett	DeLay	Honda
Barton	DeMint	Hooley
Bass	Deutsch	Horn
Becerra	Diaz-Balart	Hostettler
Bentsen	Dicks	Houghton
Bereuter	Dingell	Hoyer
Berkley	Doggett	Hulshof
Berman	Doolittle	Hunter
Berry	Doyle	Hutchinson
Biggert	Dreier	Hyde
Billirakis	Duncan	Isakson
Bishop	Dunn	Israel
Blagojevich	Edwards	Istook
Blumenauer	Ehlers	Jackson (IL)
Blunt	Ehrlich	Jackson-Lee
Boehlert	Emerson	(TX)
Boehner	Engel	Jefferson
Bonilla	English	Jenkins
Bonior	Eshoo	John
Bono	Etheridge	Johnson (CT)
Borski	Evans	Johnson (IL)
Boswell	Everett	Johnson, E. B.
Boucher	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Boyd	Ferguson	Jones (NC)
Brady (PA)	Filmer	Kanjorski
Brady (TX)	Flake	Kaptur
Brown (FL)	Fletcher	Keller
Brown (OH)	Foley	Kelly
Brown (SC)	Ford	Kennedy (MN)
Bryant	Fossella	Kennedy (RI)
Burr	Frank	Kerns
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Buyer	Galleghy	Kilpatrick
Callahan	Ganske	Kind (WI)
Calvert	Gekas	King (NY)
Camp	Gephardt	Kingston
Cannon	Gibbons	Kirk
Cantor	Gilchrest	Klecza
Capito	Gillmor	Knollenberg
Capps	Gilman	Kolbe
Cardin	Gonzalez	Kucinich
Carson (IN)	Goode	LaFalce
Carson (OK)	Goodlatte	Lampson
Castle	Gordon	Langevin
Chabot	Goss	Lantos
Chambliss	Graham	Largent
Clay	Granger	Larsen (WA)
Clayton	Graves	Larson (CT)
Clyburn	Green (TX)	Latham
Coble	Green (WI)	LaTourrette
Collins	Greenwood	Leach
Combust	Grucci	Lee
Condit	Gutknecht	Levin
Conyers	Hall (TX)	Lewis (CA)
Cooksey	Hansen	Lewis (GA)
Cox	Harman	Lewis (KY)
Coyne	Hart	Linder
Cramer	Hastings (FL)	Lipinski

LoBiondo	Payne
Lofgren	Pelosi
Lowey	Pence
Lucas (KY)	Peterson (MN)
Lucas (OK)	Peterson (PA)
Luther	Petri
Maloney (CT)	Phelps
Maloney (NY)	Pickering
Manzullo	Pitts
Markey	Platts
Mascara	Pombo
Matheson	Pomeroy
Matsui	Portman
McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)
McCarthy (NY)	Pryce (OH)
McCollum	Putnam
McCrery	Quinn
McGovern	Radanovich
McHugh	Rahall
McInnis	Ramstad
McIntyre	Rangel
McKeon	Regula
McKinney	Rehberg
McNulty	Reyes
Meehan	Reynolds
Meek (FL)	Riley
Meeks (NY)	Rodriguez
Menendez	Roemer
Mica	Rogers (KY)
Millender	Rogers (MI)
McDonald	Rohrabacher
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Miller, Gary	Ross
Miller, George	Rothman
Mink	Roukema
Moakley	Roybal-Allard
Mollohan	Royce
Moore	Rush
Moran (KS)	Ryan (WI)
Moran (VA)	Ryun (KS)
Morella	Sabo
Murtha	Sanchez
Myrick	Sanders
Nadler	Sandlin
Napolitano	Sawyer
Neal	Saxton
Nethercutt	Scarborough
Ney	Schaffer
Northup	Schakowsky
Norwood	Schiff
Nussle	Schrock
Oberstar	Scott
Obey	Sensenbrenner
Oliver	Serrano
Ortiz	Sessions
Osborne	Shadegg
Ose	Shaw
Otter	Shays
Owens	Sherman
Oxley	Sherwood
Pallone	Shimkus
Pascrell	Shows
Pastor	Simmons
Paul	Simpson

NAYS—1

Capuano

NOT VOTING—21

Ackerman	Fattah	LaHood
Allen	Frost	McDermott
Clement	Gutierrez	Rivers
Costello	Hall (OH)	Stump
Cubin	Inslee	Sweeney
DeGette	Issa	Taylor (NC)
Dooley	Jones (OH)	Weldon (PA)

□ 1932

Messrs. TANCREDO, WAMP, ENGEL, MANZULLO, LARGENT, UDALL of Colorado and GREEN of Texas and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 10 H. Res. 134 I was absent because of mechanical problems with the aircraft I was on. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

QUESTIONABLE DECISIONS
COMING FROM SUPREME COURT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address myself this evening to a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States which came down around the end of last month, about 2½ weeks ago. It is a decision by the Supreme Court, a five to four decision, another one of those narrow decisions that is decided by one of the nine justices, which I think has very deep and compelling implications for every American.

Let me tell you what that decision entailed. It involved a case in the State of Texas. The situation was this: A woman, a young mother, was bringing two of her children home from soccer practice. She was driving a pickup truck. The two children were in the cab with her. She was driving through a community at 15 miles per hour.

She was stopped by a police officer of that community, and she was stopped because the police officer observed that she was not wearing a seat belt. There was no other infraction. She was driving below the speed limit, she had not violated any other of the vehicle and traffic laws or anything else. She was simply stopped by the police officer because he observed that she was not wearing a seat belt.

He stopped her, with her two children; and he placed her under arrest. He put her in handcuffs, arrested her, took her into custody, and was about to take the two children into custody when, fortunately, a neighbor came by and took custody of the two children and took them home. But the woman was arrested and taken off to jail in handcuffs. She was later forced to place bond, \$310 bond, for a violation, the fine for which would have been no more than \$50 if the maximum fine had been imposed.

The woman sued the city in Texas. It went through the court system and finally worked its way to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court in a five to four decision declared that the officer was right in arresting her; he was right in putting her in handcuffs; he was right taking her into custody, taking her to jail; and it was right to force her to post a bail of more than \$300.

By the way, in the meantime they searched the vehicle. They searched the pickup truck, and they found some very dangerous equipment in the truck: A bicycle, two tricycles, a cooler

for keeping beverages cool, some barbecue equipment, and a pair of children's shoes. That is what they found in the back of the truck. The Supreme Court said that that was right.

Now, I am here this evening talking about this because I am increasingly disturbed by these right-wing decisions that are being made by a court which places in jeopardy the civil liberties and the civil rights of every single American, because after that Supreme Court decision, the court in effect has made law. It is now the law of the land that any police officer in any community at any time can stop anybody for not wearing a seat belt and take them into custody and take their children into custody too, for that matter, apparently, and search their vehicle, simply because they were not wearing a seat belt.

It is interesting to note as I mentioned earlier it was a five to four decision. We are seeing a lot of these five to four decisions recently. The five justices included Justice Kennedy, who was appointed by President Reagan; Justice Rehnquist, appointed by President Nixon and elevated to be the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court by President Reagan; also joining in the majority was Justice Thomas, who was appointed by President Bush, the first President Bush; and also Justice Scalia, who was appointed by President Reagan. Also, oddly enough, Justice Souter, who usually has better sense than to join these other four in these decisions, but on this particular occasion it seems perhaps his experience as a prosecutor before becoming a judge may have overcome him and he displayed the kind of bad judgment which is exemplified in this five to four Supreme Court decision.

I am worried about this also because we have seen recently that the President of the United States, Mr. Bush, the second Mr. Bush, has made it clear that he is no longer going to take recommendations from the American Bar Association with regard to justices on any of the Federal courts, that is the Federal Appeals Court, the circuit courts or the United States Supreme Court; and instead he is going to take recommendations from the Federalist Society.

I think we all ought to be deeply concerned about what is going on in our courts and about the way that this particular decision typifies or exemplifies at least the kind of bad decisions that are being made on a five to four basis in the Supreme Court of the United States.

UPDATE ON CRISIS AFFECTING KLAMATH BASIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to update my colleagues in the House on the crisis affecting the

people of the Klamath Basin in Oregon and California.

Yesterday I attended what was called a "bucket brigade." We had buckets like these representing each of the 50 States where we took water out of the lake and symbolically handed it down a chain of people 1.2 miles long to dump it in the A-Canal that this year will have no water in it.

These are the people that were at the rally. In all my years in public office, here and in Oregon, I have never seen close to 16,000 people turn out to protest a government action, but that occurred in Klamath Falls yesterday; peaceful, civil disobedience, making the case for reforming the Endangered Species Act.

Let me tell you what people are saying. Let me share with you some of the letters and comments. This from a Vietnam veteran who earned a medal for heroism, who flies in the Klamath Basin in a crop duster: "When the season starts up, we have just about used all our savings from the previous season. Taxes take a huge chunk out of my check. Since I have no retirement plan from work, I have to put what little I can into that. We have house payments due, food to put on the table, heating bills. I have no money left. I am going to have to start drawing from our IRA; and with penalties and interest, that is a poor option, but all I have. We are going to lose our house. We can't sell it, because everyone here is in the same boat. It is worth nothing. Help us."

And this from a woman from Malin: "The decision of no water for irrigation comes as a major disaster to our small communities of Malin and Merrill, Tooley Lake. The government can offer low interest loans, but who will be able to ever pay them back. Our spirit is broken. How can the government ever be trusted again? Contracts for water in the Klamath project, where, by the way, there are 1,000 farmers that will not get water this year for the first time since this project was created nearly 100 years ago, contracts for this water have been broken and our water stolen. Why would we build more storage, to have it taken away by another group? There are school football fields and city parks that will get no water this summer."

Mr. Speaker, there have already been traffic accidents on the major highway because this area is turning into a dust bowl, and it will this summer, because the government has said it needs all the water for the suckers in Klamath Lake and for the salmon in Klamath River.

So the "reasonable" and "prudent" decision of the government, and I put those two words in quotes, is to say the ranchers and the farmers can have no water; the schools that rely on the water for their fields and the cities for their parks will have no water; the people will have no income; the people will have no livelihood.

They have no way to survive if they have no water to put on their crops, be-

cause nothing will be raised, nothing will be grown, nothing will be harvested, because the Endangered Species Act as written today makes no provision for people, for communities like Klamath Falls or Malin or Merrill or Tooley Lake.

□ 1945

No, these people are left off the plate. They have no seat at the table of public policy. They are being wiped out by this decision. It is wrong. The time has come to change and amend the Endangered Species Act so that we do not make these unilateral decisions that wipe people out.

Mr. Speaker, 16,000 people in the Klamath Basin turned out yesterday to try to get the attention of the country, to get the attention of this Congress that change is needed. We can work together to have a cleaner environment, but we do not have to wipe agriculture off the map to do it. We can work together to provide for habitat for fish, but we do not have to create a dust bowl to do it. We do not have to rely on science that is now being questioned by those who have finally had an opportunity to look at it who say, maybe that science is not right.

But let me tell my colleagues, on April 6, the decision was made: the headgates will be closed and they will be closed all year. The water will not flow. It is too late to plant. The contracts will be lost. Farmers have nothing to put in the ground, and if they did, no water to make it grow.

So, we will approach this Congress for disaster relief. It is an option we wish we did not have to take; but we will, because we have no other option for this year. We will approach this Congress and vigorously fight for changes in the Endangered Species Act. This can happen to you, because it has happened to these people who fight for our country and provided for our people and farmed the land.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. NUSSLE submitted the following conference report and statement on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 107-60)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83), establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each

of fiscal years 2003 through 2011, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

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

(a) **DECLARATION.**—Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 is revised and replaced and that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2003 through 2011 as authorized by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.
Sec. 103. Reconciliation in the Senate.
Sec. 104. Reconciliation in the House.

TITLE II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT AND RULEMAKING

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 201. Restrictions on advance appropriations in the House.
Sec. 202. Restrictions on advance appropriations in the Senate.
Sec. 203. Mechanism for implementing increase of fiscal year 2002 discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 204. Compliance with section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

Subtitle B—Reserve Funds

Sec. 211. Reserve fund for Medicare.
Sec. 212. Reserve fund for Family Opportunity Act.
Sec. 213. Reserve fund for agriculture.
Sec. 214. Reserve fund for additional tax cuts and debt reduction.
Sec. 215. Technical reserve fund for student loans.
Sec. 216. Reserve fund for health insurance for the uninsured.
Sec. 217. Reserve fund for defense in the Senate.
Sec. 218. Strategic reserve fund in the House.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous Provisions

Sec. 221. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 222. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE AND CONGRESS PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Sense of the Senate

Sec. 301. Sense of the Senate on conservation.
Sec. 302. Sense of the Senate on aids and other infectious diseases.
Sec. 303. Sense of the Senate on consolidated health centers.
Sec. 304. Funding for Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance.
Sec. 305. Sense of the Senate regarding United States Coast Guard fiscal year 2002 funding.
Sec. 306. Strengthening our national food safety infrastructure.
Sec. 307. Sense of the Senate with respect to increasing funds for renewable energy research and development.
Sec. 308. Sense of the Senate with respect to increased education funding.

Subtitle B—Sense of the Congress

Sec. 311. Asset building for the working poor.
Sec. 312. Federal fire prevention assistance.
Sec. 313. Funding for graduate medical education at children's teaching hospitals.
Sec. 314. Concurrent retirement and disability benefits to retired members of the Armed Forces.
Sec. 315. Federal employee pay.
Sec. 316. Sales tax deduction.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 2001 through 2011:

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

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

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,630,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,638,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,706,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,780,310,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,852,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,901,304,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,994,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,089,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,193,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,318,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,436,550,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001: \$0.
Fiscal year 2002: −\$65,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −\$76,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −\$84,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −\$97,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: −\$138,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: −\$141,081,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: −\$153,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: −\$166,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: −\$171,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: −\$191,343,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,653,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,510,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,668,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,733,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,814,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,866,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,945,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$2,025,075,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,102,398,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,186,341,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,277,143,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001: \$1,600,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$1,476,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$1,641,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$1,709,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$1,790,389,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,837,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,912,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,994,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$2,071,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$2,154,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$2,243,394,000,000.

(4) **SURPLUSES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the surpluses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$29,933,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$161,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$64,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$71,059,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$62,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$63,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$82,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$94,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$122,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$163,852,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: \$193,156,000,000.
(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001: \$5,660,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$5,603,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$5,654,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$5,700,089,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$5,751,561,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$5,803,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$5,832,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$5,847,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$5,988,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$6,343,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$6,720,963,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2001: \$3,243,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$2,924,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$2,691,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$2,437,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$2,170,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$1,882,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$1,555,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$1,194,633,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$939,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$878,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$818,000,000,000.

(7) **SOCIAL SECURITY.**—

(A) **SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642), 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 2001: \$504,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$532,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$560,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$588,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$620,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$649,221,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$679,935,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$712,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$746,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$782,029,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$819,185,000,000.

(B) **SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642), 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 2001: \$343,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: \$356,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: \$369,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: \$382,488,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: \$394,844,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006: \$407,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2007: \$419,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2008: \$432,293,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: \$448,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: \$465,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: \$483,963,000,000.

(C) **SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,525,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,695,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, \$3,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$3,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,064,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,004,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,194,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,132,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,331,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,267,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,471,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,405,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,619,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,551,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,773,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,702,000,000.

SEC. 102. 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 2002 through 2011 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$316,873,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$302,371,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$324,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$319,137,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$333,646,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$326,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$342,294,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$335,184,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$350,876,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$347,073,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$359,807,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$353,482,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$369,023,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$359,774,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$378,505,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$372,416,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$388,323,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$382,242,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$398,338,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$392,227,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$408,821,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$402,579,000,000.
 (2) International Affairs (150):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,424,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,670,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,214,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,082,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,750,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,554,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,214,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,164,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,911,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,431,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,504,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,107,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,494,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,482,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,031,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,937,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,650,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,458,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,065,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,766,000,000.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,043,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,612,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,583,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,725,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,055,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,361,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,379,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,945,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,839,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,429,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,323,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,812,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,280,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,303,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,743,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,816,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,239,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,335,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,749,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,879,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,274,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,225,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$115,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,360,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,328,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$72,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,254,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$91,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,336,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$3,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,411,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$71,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,882,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$440,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,998,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$579,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,021,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$703,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,990,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$691,000,000.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,833,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,361,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,652,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,263,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,368,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,249,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,506,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,091,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,965,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,281,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,767,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,126,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,691,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,903,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,064,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,194,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,111,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,190,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,137,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,190,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,790,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,154,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,265,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,593,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,507,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,924,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,562,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,406,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$24,915,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,452,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,853,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,083,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,509,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,723,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,134,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,921,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,441,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,553,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,174,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,703,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,319,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,516,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$771,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$10,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,587,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,394,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,952,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,042,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,733,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,163,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,387,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,138,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,790,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,245,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,061,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,404,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,894,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,479,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,934,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,597,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,889,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,714,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,915,000,000.

- (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,130,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,681,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,965,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,167,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$62,392,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,521,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,154,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,662,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,907,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,225,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,794,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,702,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,637,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,577,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,490,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,775,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,221,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,412,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,588,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,652,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,183,000,000.
- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,225,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,366,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,892,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,730,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,067,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,731,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,350,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,967,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,664,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,913,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,933,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,936,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,198,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,181,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,476,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,444,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,696,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,048,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,962,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,340,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,233,000,000.
- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,951,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,850,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$81,234,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,742,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,805,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,479,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,386,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$83,574,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,122,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,819,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,233,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,924,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$91,327,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$89,955,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$93,501,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$92,115,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$95,780,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,341,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$98,113,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$96,654,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,517,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$99,017,000,000.
- (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$180,104,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$173,012,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$198,775,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$196,668,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,150,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$219,770,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$235,474,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$234,672,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$242,661,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$241,084,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$259,125,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$257,594,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$278,882,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$276,575,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$299,116,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$297,091,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$320,791,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$319,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$345,380,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$343,729,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$372,407,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$370,945,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$217,531,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$217,708,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$229,179,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$229,121,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$244,838,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$244,596,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$271,378,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$271,579,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$306,158,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$306,079,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$326,564,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$326,298,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$363,686,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$363,901,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$393,686,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$393,578,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$424,278,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$423,993,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$458,957,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$459,194,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$497,379,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$497,366,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$255,942,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$256,932,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$273,840,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$272,122,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$283,864,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$282,611,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$295,030,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$293,420,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,192,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$307,667,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$316,761,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$315,312,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$324,056,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$322,627,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$338,278,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$336,950,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$349,561,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$347,987,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$360,308,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$358,600,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$371,593,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$369,419,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,805,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,805,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,004,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,003,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$11,733,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,733,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,496,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,496,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$13,308,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,207,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$14,207,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,168,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,168,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,241,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,483,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,878,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,878,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,388,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,388,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,675,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,926,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,512,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,921,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,801,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,408,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,161,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,744,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,317,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,863,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,368,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,345,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,853,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,407,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$62,971,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,981,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,570,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,973,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,555,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,063,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,632,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,577,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,003,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,431,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,436,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,545,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,809,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,543,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,420,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,347,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,466,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,036,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,543,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,013,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,665,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,152,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,822,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,292,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,021,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,284,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,728,000,000.
 (17) General Government (800):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,307,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,065,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,496,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,193,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,651,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,493,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,082,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,978,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,560,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,201,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,068,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,641,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,609,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,144,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,791,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,377,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,882,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,968,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,437,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,599,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,048,000,000.
 (18) Net Interest (900):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$275,467,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$275,467,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, \$259,162,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$259,162,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, \$252,364,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$252,364,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, \$247,310,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$247,310,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, \$240,115,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$240,115,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, \$235,642,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$235,642,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, \$232,136,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$232,136,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, \$227,484,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$227,484,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,933,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$221,933,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, \$214,899,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$214,899,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, \$207,328,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$207,328,000,000.
 (19) Allowances (920):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,528,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$84,697,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$103,548,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$99,379,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,115,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,222,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,268,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$5,912,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,423,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,263,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,580,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,503,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,744,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,665,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$6,908,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,828,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$7,079,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$6,994,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$7,251,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$7,165,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$7,429,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$7,340,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2001:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$38,265,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$38,265,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2002:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$38,803,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$38,803,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2003:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$49,508,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$49,508,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$56,315,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$56,315,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$46,463,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$46,463,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$50,461,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$50,461,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$48,179,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$48,179,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$49,141,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$49,141,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$50,203,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$50,203,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$51,778,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$51,778,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$53,287,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$53,287,000,000.

SEC. 103. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Senate Committee on Finance shall report a reconciliation bill not later than May 18, 2001, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than \$1,250,000,000,000 and increase the total level of outlays by not more than \$100,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2011. Provided, That \$100,000,000,000 of these revenues and outlays shall only be available for fiscal years 2001 through 2002.

(b) SURPLUS.—Legislation described in subsection (a) may not, when taken together with all other previously-enacted legislation (except for legislation enacted pursuant to section 211), reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund surplus in any fiscal year covered by this resolution.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that of the total amount reconciled in subsection (a), \$100,000,000,000 will be for an economic stimulus package over the next 2 years.

SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report to the House of Representatives a reconciliation bill not later than May 18, 2001 that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues by not more than \$1,250,000,000,000 for the period of years 2001 through 2011 and the total level of outlays may be increased by not more than \$100,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2011.

(b) SURPLUS.—Legislation described in subsection (a) may not, when taken together with all other previously-enacted legislation (except for legislation enacted pursuant to section 211), reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund surplus in any fiscal year covered by this resolution.

(c) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that of the total amount reconciled in subsection (a), \$100,000,000,000 will be for an economic stimulus package over the next 2 years.

TITLE II—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT AND RULEMAKING

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 201. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE.

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

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

(b) EXCEPTION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2003 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading "Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations" in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$23,159,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "advance appropriation" means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2002 that

first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2002.

SEC. 202. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any reported bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would provide an advance appropriation.

(b) *EXCEPTION.*—An advance appropriation may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2003 for programs, projects, activities or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$23,159,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

(c) *APPLICATION OF POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.*—

(1) *WAIVER AND APPEAL.*—In the Senate, subsection (a) 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 subsection (a).

(2) *FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.*—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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

(d) *DEFINITION.*—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any discretionary new budget authority in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2002 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2002.

(e) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 should be amended to address procedures for advance appropriations for fiscal years beginning with fiscal year 2003.

SEC. 203. MECHANISM FOR IMPLEMENTING INCREASE OF FISCAL YEAR 2002 DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) *FINDINGS.*—The Senate finds the following: (1) Unless and until the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2002 (as set out in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) is increased, aggregate appropriations which exceed the current law limits would still be out of order in the Senate and subject to a supermajority vote.

(2) Except for a necessary adjustment included in function 920 (to comply with section 312(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974), the functional totals contained in this concurrent resolution envision a level of discretionary spending for fiscal year 2002 as follows:

(A) For the discretionary category: \$659,540,000,000 in new budget authority and \$647,780,000,000 in outlays.

(B) For the highway category: \$28,489,000,000 in outlays.

(C) For the mass transit category: \$5,275,000,000 in outlays.

(D) For the conservation category: \$1,760,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,232,000,000 in outlays.

(3) To facilitate the Senate completing its legislative responsibilities for the 1st Session of the 107th Congress in a timely fashion, it is imperative that the Senate consider legislation which establishes appropriate discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 2002 through 2006 as soon as possible.

(b) *ADJUSTMENT TO ALLOCATIONS AND OTHER BUDGETARY AGGREGATES AND LEVELS.*—When-

ever a bill or joint resolution becomes law that increases the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2002 set out in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall increase the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate Committee on Appropriations and shall also appropriately adjust all other budgetary aggregates and levels contained in this resolution.

(c) *SENATE DEFENSE FIREWALL.*—

(1) *DEFINITION.*—In this subsection, for purposes of enforcement in the Senate for fiscal year 2002, the term “discretionary spending limit” means—

(A) for the defense category, \$325,070,000,000 in new budget authority; and

(B) for the nondefense category, \$336,230,000,000 in new budget authority.

(2) *POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—After the adjustment to the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations is made pursuant to subsection (b) and except as provided in subparagraph (B), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that exceeds any discretionary spending limit set forth in this subsection.

(B) *EXCEPTION.*—This paragraph shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

(3) *WAIVER AND APPEAL.*—This subsection 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 subsection.

SEC. 204. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

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

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

Subtitle B—Reserve Funds

SEC. 211. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE.

(a) *MEDICARE REFORM AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.*—If the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment is offered thereto, or a conference report thereon is submitted, which reforms the medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) and improves the access of beneficiaries under that program to prescription drugs, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise committee allocations for that committee and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$0 for fiscal year 2002, \$59,100,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and \$300,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011.

(b) *MEDICARE PAYMENTS TO HOME HEALTH AGENCIES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to paragraph (2), if the Senate Committee on Finance or the House Committee on Ways and Means or Committee on Energy and Commerce report a bill, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that repeals the 15 percent reduction in payments under the medicare program to home health agencies enacted by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 and now scheduled to go into effect on October 1, 2002, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and levels by the amount the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$0 in new budget authority and outlays in 2002, \$4,000,000,000 for the period 2002 through 2006, and \$13,700,000,000 for the period 2002 through 2011.

(2) *SURPLUS.*—Legislation described in paragraph (1) may not, when taken together with all other previously-enacted legislation (except for legislation enacted pursuant to subsection (a)), reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund surplus in any fiscal year covered by this resolution.

SEC. 212. RESERVE FUND FOR FAMILY OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to subsection (b), if the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives reports a bill or joint resolution, or if an amendment thereto is offered or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides States with the opportunity to expand medicaid coverage for children with special needs, allowing families of disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid program for such children (commonly referred to as the “Family Opportunity Act of 2001”), the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise committee allocations for that committee and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$227,000,000 in new budget authority and \$180,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2002, \$3,035,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,724,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and \$8,337,000,000 in new budget authority and \$7,867,000,000 in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011.

(b) *SURPLUS.*—Legislation described in subsection (a) may not, when taken together with all other previously-enacted legislation (except for legislation enacted pursuant to section 211), reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund surplus in any fiscal year covered by this resolution.

SEC. 213. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE .

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—(1) Subject to subsection (b), if the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate or the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted, to reauthorize the Federal Agriculture Improvement Act of 1996, title I of that Act, and other appropriate agricultural production legislation, the appropriate Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee for fiscal years 2003 through 2011 by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed \$66,150,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

(2) In the House of Representatives, if an adjustment is made under paragraph (1), the

Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the fiscal year 2002 level by an amount not to exceed the adjustment that is made for fiscal year 2003 (and reduce the adjustment made for fiscal year 2003 by that amount).

(b) **SURPLUS.**—Legislation described in subsection (a) may not, when taken together with all other previously-enacted legislation (except for legislation enacted pursuant to section 211), reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund surplus in any fiscal year covered by this resolution.

SEC. 214. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL TAX CUTS AND DEBT REDUCTION.

If the report provided pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the budget and economic outlook: update (for fiscal years 2002 through 2011), estimates an on-budget surplus for any of fiscal years 2001 through 2011 that exceeds the estimated on-budget surplus set forth in the Congressional Budget Office's January 2001 budget and economic outlook for such fiscal year, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House may, in an amount not to exceed the increase in such surplus for that fiscal year—

(1) reduce the recommended level of Federal revenues and make other appropriate adjustments (including the reconciliation instructions) for that fiscal year;

(2) reduce the appropriate level of the public debt, increase the amount of the surplus, and make other appropriate adjustments for that fiscal year; or

(3) any combination of paragraphs (1) and (2).

SEC. 215. TECHNICAL RESERVE FUND FOR STUDENT LOANS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b), if the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted, or the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives reports a bill, or an amendment is offered, or a conference report is submitted, that provides additional resources for legislation that repeals the replacement interest rate structure for student loans scheduled to occur on July 1, 2003, the appropriate Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to the appropriate committee—

(1) for fiscal years 2001 and 2002 by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed \$110,000,000 in new budget authority and \$100,000,000 outlays;

(2) for fiscal years 2001 through 2006 by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed \$3,440,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,840,000,000 outlays; and

(3) for fiscal years 2001 through 2011 by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose not to exceed \$7,665,000,000 in new budget authority and \$6,590,000,000 outlays.

(b) **SURPLUS.**—Legislation described in subsection (a) may not, when taken together with all other previously-enacted legislation (except for legislation enacted pursuant to section 211), reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund surplus in any fiscal year covered by this resolution.

SEC. 216. RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH INSURANCE FOR THE UNINSURED.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b), if the Committee on Finance of the Senate or the Committee on Energy and Commerce or Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives report a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted, that pro-

vides health insurance for the uninsured (including a measure providing for tax deductions for the purchase of health insurance for, among others, moderate income individuals not receiving health insurance from their employers), the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise committee allocations for that committee and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) and may revise the revenue aggregates and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$28,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2004 or \$28,000,000,000 in revenues for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2004 or any combination of budget authority and outlays or revenues as long as the sum of all revisions does not exceed \$28,000,000,000. The chairman of the appropriate Committee on the Budget is authorized to allocate these resources over a period of time longer than that specified in the previous sentence.

(b) **SURPLUS.**—Legislation described in subsection (a) may not, when taken together with all other previously-enacted legislation (except for legislation enacted pursuant to section 211), reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund surplus in any fiscal year covered by this resolution.

SEC. 217. RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE IN THE SENATE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b), if the President submits a budget amendment and the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides additional resources for defense spending in response to the recommendations of the President's National Defense Review, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of new budget authority and outlays to that committee for fiscal year 2002 by the amount of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that measure for that purpose.

(b) **SURPLUS.**—Legislation described in subsection (a) may not, when taken together with all other previously-enacted legislation (except for legislation enacted pursuant to section 211), reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund surplus in any fiscal year covered by this resolution.

SEC. 218. STRATEGIC RESERVE FUND IN THE HOUSE.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—In the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates and committee allocations of new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) for fiscal year 2002 for a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense and, for fiscal years 2002 through 2011, a bill making authorizations for the Department of Defense, a bill providing a prescription drug benefit, and any other appropriate legislation. The chairman may also make adjustments for amendments to or conference reports on such bills. In making adjustments under this subsection, the chairman shall consider, as appropriate, the recommendations of the President's National Defense Review and any statement of administrative policy or supplemental budget request relating to any legislation referred to in this subsection.

(b) **LIMITATIONS.**—(1) The adjustments for any bill referred to in subsection (a) shall be in an amount not to exceed the amount by which such bill breaches the applicable allocation or aggregate.

(2) Legislation described in subsection (a) may not, when taken together with all other previously-enacted legislation (except for legisla-

tion enacted pursuant to section 211), reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund surplus in any fiscal year covered by this resolution.

Subtitle C—Miscellaneous Provisions

SEC. 221. 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 Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate; and

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

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, for the purpose of enforcing this concurrent resolution, sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall apply to fiscal year 2002 and the total for fiscal year 2002 and the four ensuing fiscal years.

(2) **APPROPRIATE LEVELS.**—For purposes of enforcement of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the House of Representatives, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority and total budget outlays for fiscal years 2002 through 2011 prescribed by this resolution pursuant to section 301(a)(1) of such Act shall be based upon the table entitled "Conference Report Fiscal Year 2002, Budget Resolution Total Spending and Revenues" in conjunction with the provisions of title II of this resolution.

(e) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE SENATE.**—The Senate, for purposes of enforcement of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and this resolution, measures discharged pursuant to Senate Resolution 8 shall be considered as if the measure had been reported from the committee of jurisdiction.

SEC. 222. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE AND CONGRESS PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Sense of the Senate

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONSERVATION.

It is the sense of the Senate that conservation funding is a priority of the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON AIDS AND OTHER INFECTIOUS DISEASES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it is the sense of the Senate that:

(1) **FINDINGS.**—The Senate finds the following:

(A) HIV/AIDS, having already infected over 58 million people worldwide, is devastating the health, economies, and social structures in dozens of countries in Africa, and increasingly in Asia, the Caribbean and Eastern Europe.

(B) AIDS has wiped out decades of progress in improving the lives of families in the developing world. As the leading cause of death in Africa, AIDS has killed 17 million and will claim the lives of one quarter of the population, mostly productive adults, in the next decade. In addition, 13 million children have been orphaned by AIDS—a number that will rise to 40 million by 2010.

(C) The Agency for International Development, along with the Centers for Disease Control, Department of Labor, and Department of Defense have been at the forefront of the international battle to control HIV/AIDS, with global assistance totaling \$330,000,000 from the United States Agency for International Development and \$136,000,000 from other agencies in fiscal year 2001, primarily focused on targeted prevention programs.

(D) While prevention is key, treatment and care for those affected by HIV/AIDS is an increasingly critical component of the global response. Improving health systems, providing home-based care, treating AIDS-associated diseases like tuberculosis, providing for family support and orphan care, and making antiretroviral drugs against HIV available will reduce social and economic damage to families and communities.

(E) Pharmaceutical companies recently dramatically reduced the prices of antiretroviral drugs to the poorest countries. With sufficient resources, it is now possible to improve treatment options in countries where health systems are able to deliver and monitor the medications.

(F) The United Nations AIDS program estimates it will cost at least \$3,000,000,000 for basic AIDS prevention and care services in Sub-Saharan Africa alone, and at least \$2,000,000,000 more if antiretroviral drugs are provided widely. In Africa, only \$500,000,000 is currently available from all donors, lending agencies and African governments themselves.

(2) *SENSE OF THE SENATE.*—It is the sense of the Senate that the spending levels in this budget resolution shall be increased by \$200,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 and by \$500,000,000 in 2003 and for each year thereafter for the purpose of helping the neediest countries cope with the burgeoning costs of prevention, care and treatment of those affected by HIV/AIDS and associated infectious diseases.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONSOLIDATED HEALTH CENTERS.

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 the next 5 fiscal years in order to double the number of individuals who receive health services at community, migrant, homeless, and public housing health centers.

SEC. 304. FUNDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume increased funding for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Justice State and local law enforcement grant programs.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING UNITED STATES COAST GUARD FISCAL YEAR 2002 FUNDING.

It is the sense of the Senate that any level of budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2002 below the level assumed in this resolution for the Coast Guard would require the Coast Guard to—

(1) close numerous units and reduce overall mission capability, including the counter narcotics interdiction mission which was authorized under the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act;

(2) reduce the number of personnel of an already streamlined workforce; and

(3) reduce operations in a manner that would have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of valuable fish stocks in the North Atlantic and Pacific Northwest and its capacity to stem the flow of illicit drugs and illegal immigration into the United States.

SEC. 306. STRENGTHENING OUR NATIONAL FOOD SAFETY INFRASTRUCTURE.

(a) *FINDING.*—The Senate finds that the United States food supply is one of the safest in the world, but in order to maintain the integrity of our food supply in the face of emerging threats, we must make the necessary investments now, in a time of surplus.

(b) *SENSE OF THE SENATE.*—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the appropriate amount should be invested at the Food and Drug Administration and the Center for Disease Control food activities next year in order to strengthen our national food safety infrastructure by—

(1) increasing the number of inspectors within the Food and Drug Administration to enable the Food and Drug Administration to inspect high-risk sites at least annually;

(2) supporting research that enables us to meet emerging threats;

(3) improving surveillance to identify and trace the sources and incidence of food-borne illness;

(4) otherwise maintaining at least current funding levels for food safety initiatives in the Food and Drug Administration and the United States Department of Agriculture; and

(5) providing additional funds should such needs arise due to emerging food safety threats.

SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO INCREASING FUNDS FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate recognizes the importance of renewable energy resources and that providing for such technologies should be increased by at least \$450,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and at a rate in excess of inflation in subsequent years.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE WITH RESPECT TO INCREASED EDUCATION FUNDING.

It is the Sense of the Senate that—

(1) this budget resolution makes available up to \$6.2 billion in discretionary budget authority for funding domestic priorities in excess of the President's request; and

(2) funding for discretionary education programs (including Head Start and funds for the Department of Education in excess of the President's request of \$44.5 billion in discretionary budget authority for fiscal year 2002) is one such priority; and

(3) these additional funds for education should be devoted to high priority programs including Head Start, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, education for the disadvantaged, Impact Aid, state assessment tests, Pell Grants, reading improvement programs, school construction, and teacher and classroom quality programs.

Subtitle B—Sense of the Congress

SEC. 311. ASSET BUILDING FOR THE WORKING POOR.

(a) *FINDINGS.*—Congress find the following:

(1) For the vast majority of United States households, the pathway to the economic mainstream and financial security is not through spending and consumption, but through savings, investing, and the accumulation of assets.

(2) One-third of all Americans have no assets available for investment and another 20 percent have only negligible assets. The situation is even more serious for minority households; for example, 60 percent of African-American households have no or negative financial assets.

(3) Nearly 50 percent of all children in America live in households that have no assets avail-

able for investment, including 40 percent of Caucasian children and 73 percent of African-American children.

(4) Up to 20 percent of all United States households do not deposit their savings in financial institutions and, thus, do not have access to the basic financial tools that make asset accumulation possible.

(5) Public policy can have either a positive or a negative impact on asset accumulation. Traditional public assistance programs based on income and consumption have rarely been successful in supporting the transition to economic self-sufficiency. Tax policy, through \$288,000,000,000 in annual tax incentives, has helped lay the foundation for the great middle class.

(6) Lacking an income tax liability, low-income working families cannot take advantage of asset development incentives available through the Federal tax code.

(7) Individual Development Accounts have proven to be successful in helping low-income working families save and accumulate assets. Individual Development Accounts have been used to purchase long-term, high-return assets, including homes, postsecondary education and training, and small business.

(b) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal tax code should support a significant expansion of Individual Development Accounts so that millions of low-income, working families can save, build assets, and move their lives forward; thus, making positive contributions to the economic and social well-being of the United States, as well as to its future.

SEC. 312. FEDERAL FIRE PREVENTION ASSISTANCE.

(a) *FINDINGS.*—Congress finds the following:

(1) Increased demands on firefighting and emergency medical personnel have made it difficult for local governments to adequately fund necessary fire safety precautions.

(2) The Government has an obligation to protect the health and safety of the firefighting personnel of the United States and to ensure that they have the financial resources to protect the public.

(3) The high rates in the United States of death, injury, and property damage caused by fires demonstrates a critical need for Federal investment in support of firefighting personnel.

(b) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that the Government should support the core operations of the Federal Emergency Management Agency by providing needed fire grant programs to assist our firefighters and rescue personnel as they respond to more than 17,000,000 emergency calls annually. To accomplish this task, Congress supports preservation of the Assistance to Firefighters grant program. Continued support of the Assistance to Firefighters grant program will enable local firefighters to adequately protect the lives of countless Americans put at risk by insufficient fire protection.

SEC. 313. FUNDING FOR GRADUATE MEDICAL EDUCATION AT CHILDREN'S TEACHING HOSPITALS.

It is the sense of Congress that:

(1) Function 550 includes an appropriate level of funding for graduate medical education conducted at independent children's teaching hospitals in order to ensure access to care by millions of children nationwide.

(2) An emphasis should be placed on the role played by community health centers in underserved rural and urban communities.

(3) Funding under function 550 should also reflect the importance of the Ryan White CARE Act to persons afflicted with HIV/AIDS.

SEC. 314. CONCURRENT RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY BENEFITS TO RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) *FINDINGS.*—Congress finds that the Secretary of Defense is the appropriate official for

evaluating the existing standards for the provision of concurrent retirement and disability benefits to retired members of the Armed Forces and the need to change these standards.

(b) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Secretary of Defense should report not later than 180 days after the date of adoption of this resolution to the congressional committees of jurisdiction on the provision of concurrent retirement and disability benefits to retired members of the Armed Forces;

(2) the report should address the number of individuals retired from the Armed Forces who would otherwise be eligible for disability compensation, the comparability of the policy to Office of Personnel Management guidelines for civilian Federal retirees, the applicability of this policy to prevailing private sector standards, the number of individuals potentially eligible for concurrent benefits who receive other forms of Federal assistance and the cost of that assistance, and alternative initiatives that would accomplish the same end as concurrent receipt of military retired pay and disability compensation;

(3) the Secretary of Defense should submit legislation that he considers appropriate;

(4) upon receiving such report, the committees of jurisdiction, working with the Committees on the Budget of the House and Senate, should consider appropriate legislation; and

(5) CBO and OMB should report not later than 30 days after the date of adoption of this resolution to the Committees on the Budget on the risk that provision of full concurrent receipt of military retired pay and disability compensation would reduce the surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

SEC. 315. FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY.

(a) *FINDINGS.*—Congress finds the following:

(1) Members of the uniformed services and civilian employees of the United States make significant contributions to the general welfare of the Nation.

(2) Increases in the pay of members of the uniformed services and of civilian employees of the United States have not kept pace with increases in the overall pay levels of workers in the private sector, so that there now exists—

(A) a 32 percent gap between compensation levels of Federal civilian employees and compensation levels of private sector workers; and

(B) an estimated 10 percent gap between compensation levels of members of the uniformed services and compensation levels of private sector workers.

(3) The President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2002 includes a 4.6 percent pay raise for military personnel.

(4) The Office of Management and Budget has requested that Federal agencies plan their fiscal year 2002 budgets with a 3.6 percent pay raise for civilian Federal employees.

(5) In almost every year during the past 2 decades, there have been equal adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

(b) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 316. SALES TAX DEDUCTION.

(a) *FINDINGS.*—Congress finds that—

(1) in 1986 the ability to deduct State sales taxes was eliminated from the Federal tax code;

(2) the States of Tennessee, Texas, Wyoming, Washington, Florida, Nevada, and South Dakota have no State income tax;

(3) the citizens of those seven States continue to be treated unfairly by paying significantly more in taxes to the Government than taxpayers with an identical profile in different State because they are prohibited from deducting their State sales taxes from their Federal income taxes in lieu of a State income tax;

(4) the design of the Federal tax code is preferential in its treatment of States with State income taxes over those without State income taxes;

(5) the current Federal tax code infringes upon States' rights to tax their citizens as they see fit in that the Federal tax code exerts unjust influence on States without State income taxes to impose one their citizens;

(6) the current surpluses that our Government holds provide an appropriate time and opportunity to allow taxpayers to deduct either their State sales taxes or their State income taxes from their Federal income tax returns; and

(7) over 50 Members of the House of Representatives have cosponsored legislation to restore the sales tax deduction option to the Federal tax code.

(b) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Finance should consider legislation that makes State sales tax deductible against Federal income taxes.

And the Senate agree to the same.

PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
DON NICKLES,
PHIL GRAMM,
KIT BOND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JIM NUSSLE,
JOHN E. SUNUNU,
Managers on the Part of the House.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the Senate and the House at the conference on disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (House Concurrent Resolution 83), establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal 2003, through 2011, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommend in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck all out of the House resolution after the resolving clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House resolution and the Senate amendment.

DISPLAYS AND AMOUNTS

The contents of concurrent budget resolutions are set forth in section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The years in this document are fiscal years unless otherwise indicated.

House Resolution.—The House budget resolution includes all of the items required as part of a concurrent budget resolution under section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act other than the spending and revenue levels for Social Security (which is used to enforce a point of order applicable only in the Senate).

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment includes all of the items required under section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act. As permitted under section 301(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, Section 102 of the Senate amendment includes advisory levels on debt held by the public.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement includes all of the items required by section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act.

AGGREGATES AND FUNCTION LEVELS

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- HOUSE PASSED RESOLUTION
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
050 - National Defense													
BA	310,328	324,563	333,273	342,578	352,184	362,095	372,224	382,734	393,539	404,535	416,303	1714,693	3684,028
OT	300,591	319,252	325,548	334,048	347,175	354,571	361,909	375,622	386,526	397,616	409,226	1680,594	3611,513
Discretionary	BA	311,051	324,440	342,776	352,375	362,267	372,443	382,935	393,741	404,722	416,493	1715,787	3686,121
Mandatory	OT	301,318	319,659	324,252	334,252	354,748	362,133	375,829	386,735	397,810	409,443	1681,735	3613,685
	BA	-0.723	-0.384	-0.198	-0.173	-0.172	-0.219	-0.201	-0.202	-0.187	-0.190	-1.094	-2.093
	OT	-0.727	-0.407	-0.175	-0.204	-0.177	-0.224	-0.207	-0.209	-0.194	-0.197	-1.141	-2.172
150 - International Affairs													
BA	22,424	23,866	23,885	24,493	25,367	26,165	26,932	27,447	28,036	28,422	29,595	123,776	264,208
OT	19,670	19,560	19,864	20,419	20,780	21,395	22,141	22,826	23,583	24,161	24,997	102,018	219,726
Discretionary	BA	22,641	23,858	23,847	24,502	25,186	26,622	27,295	27,991	28,427	29,600	123,318	263,253
Mandatory	OT	23,259	23,205	23,536	23,977	24,879	25,562	26,210	26,891	27,416	28,288	119,862	254,229
	BA	-0.217	0.008	-0.009	-0.009	0.181	0.310	0.152	0.045	-0.005	-0.005	0.458	0.955
	OT	-3.589	-3.645	-3.672	-3.558	-3.484	-3.421	-3.384	-3.308	-3.255	-3.291	-17,844	-34,503
250 - General Science, Space and Technology													
BA	21,043	22,197	22,633	23,109	23,645	24,295	24,947	25,588	26,240	26,654	27,752	115,879	247,060
OT	19,612	21,043	21,900	22,584	23,174	23,719	24,309	24,925	25,564	26,086	26,868	112,420	240,172
Discretionary	BA	20,901	22,034	22,454	23,072	23,607	24,256	24,907	25,548	26,199	27,709	115,423	246,398
Mandatory	OT	19,562	20,968	21,787	22,440	23,013	24,250	24,866	25,524	26,045	26,827	111,820	239,352
	BA	0.142	0.163	0.179	0.037	0.038	0.040	0.040	0.041	0.042	0.043	0.456	0.662
	OT	0.050	0.075	0.113	0.144	0.107	0.059	0.039	0.040	0.041	0.041	0.600	0.820
270 - Energy													
BA	1,225	0,835	0,760	0,912	0,899	1,023	1,103	2,196	2,290	2,267	2,191	4,429	14,476
OT	-0,115	-0,234	-0,531	-0,590	-0,496	-0,354	-0,248	0,385	0,784	0,955	0,927	-2,205	0,598
Discretionary	BA	3,132	2,783	2,730	2,973	3,084	3,284	3,985	4,045	4,081	4,120	14,773	34,288
Mandatory	OT	3,104	2,926	2,766	2,873	3,016	3,235	3,576	3,916	4,046	4,108	14,709	33,590
	BA	-1,907	-1,948	-1,970	-2,061	-2,185	-2,181	-1,789	-1,755	-1,814	-1,929	-10,344	-19,812
	OT	-3,219	-3,160	-3,297	-3,463	-3,512	-3,483	-3,191	-3,132	-3,091	-3,181	-16,914	-32,992
300 - Natural Resources and Environment													
BA	28,833	26,700	26,837	27,716	27,938	27,954	28,624	29,349	30,620	31,173	32,417	137,145	289,328
OT	26,361	26,403	26,951	27,467	27,666	27,815	28,266	28,774	29,888	30,525	31,509	136,302	285,264
Discretionary	BA	28,740	26,404	26,463	27,192	27,389	28,130	28,842	29,683	30,154	31,387	134,835	283,031
Mandatory	OT	26,358	26,158	26,588	27,021	27,332	27,726	28,279	29,018	29,603	30,575	134,311	279,512
	BA	0,093	0,296	0,374	0,524	0,549	0,494	0,507	0,937	1,019	1,030	2,310	6,297
	OT	0,003	0,245	0,363	0,446	0,454	0,540	0,495	0,870	0,922	0,934	1,991	5,752
350 - Agriculture													
BA	26,290	19,144	18,610	18,482	18,337	17,888	16,520	15,648	15,836	15,894	16,123	92,461	172,482
OT	23,654	17,500	16,981	17,072	16,852	16,288	14,946	14,062	14,359	14,533	14,725	84,693	157,318
Discretionary	BA	4,791	4,834	5,193	5,154	5,298	5,597	5,742	5,890	5,982	6,230	25,930	55,371
Mandatory	OT	4,669	4,765	5,070	5,113	5,232	5,813	5,663	5,813	5,914	6,127	25,555	54,593
	BA	21,499	14,310	13,417	13,328	13,039	12,437	9,906	9,946	9,912	9,893	66,531	117,111
	OT	18,985	12,735	11,911	11,959	11,620	10,913	8,399	8,546	8,619	8,598	59,138	102,725

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- HOUSE PASSED RESOLUTION
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
370 - Commerce and Housing													
Credit													
BA	3,516	8,715	8,450	14,120	12,730	12,660	13,533	13,851	14,267	18,724	13,519	56,675	130,569
OT	0,229	5,657	3,078	9,885	9,013	8,365	9,223	9,308	9,609	12,834	9,807	35,998	86,779
Discretionary													
BA	1,363	-0,234	-0,234	-0,520	-0,642	-0,593	0,269	0,530	0,976	5,421	0,217	-2,223	5,190
OT	2,008	0,127	-0,274	-0,622	-0,815	-0,805	0,194	0,292	0,613	3,972	1,017	-2,389	3,699
Mandatory													
BA	2,153	8,949	8,684	14,640	13,372	13,253	13,264	13,321	13,291	13,303	13,302	58,898	125,379
OT	-1,779	5,530	3,352	10,507	9,828	9,170	9,029	9,016	8,996	8,862	8,790	38,387	83,080
370 on-budget													
BA	2,516	7,415	8,550	12,820	12,730	12,660	13,533	13,851	14,267	18,724	13,519	54,175	128,069
OT	-0,771	4,357	3,178	8,585	9,013	8,365	9,223	9,308	9,609	12,834	9,807	33,498	84,279
Discretionary													
BA	1,363	-0,234	-0,234	-0,520	-0,642	-0,593	0,269	0,530	0,976	5,421	0,217	-2,223	5,190
OT	2,008	0,127	-0,274	-0,622	-0,815	-0,805	0,194	0,292	0,613	3,972	1,017	-2,389	3,699
Mandatory													
BA	1,153	7,649	8,784	13,340	13,372	13,253	13,264	13,321	13,291	13,303	13,302	56,398	122,879
OT	-2,779	4,230	3,452	9,207	9,828	9,170	9,029	9,016	8,996	8,862	8,790	35,887	80,580
400 - Transportation													
BA	62,130	60,991	58,721	59,219	59,720	60,276	60,800	61,314	61,843	62,194	63,056	298,927	608,134
OT	51,681	55,615	58,299	60,233	61,955	63,709	64,922	66,374	68,007	69,301	71,198	299,811	639,613
Discretionary													
BA	18,964	16,199	16,554	17,017	17,483	17,992	18,469	18,934	19,414	19,710	20,517	85,245	182,289
OT	49,680	53,871	56,215	58,177	59,997	61,747	62,981	64,366	65,972	67,319	69,159	289,947	619,744
Mandatory													
BA	43,166	44,792	42,167	42,202	42,237	42,284	42,331	42,380	42,429	42,484	42,539	213,682	425,845
OT	2,001	1,744	2,084	2,056	2,018	1,962	1,941	2,008	2,035	1,982	2,039	9,864	19,869
450 - Community and Regional Development													
Discretionary													
BA	11,225	10,120	10,318	10,567	10,920	11,243	11,545	11,844	12,146	12,338	12,844	53,168	113,885
OT	11,366	11,422	10,961	10,660	10,354	10,262	10,460	10,757	11,038	11,309	11,606	53,659	108,829
Mandatory													
BA	11,577	10,089	10,360	10,587	10,882	11,202	11,504	11,801	12,101	12,292	12,796	53,120	113,614
OT	12,048	11,740	11,460	11,073	10,841	10,777	10,986	11,292	11,585	11,869	12,181	55,891	113,804
Mandatory													
BA	-0,352	0,031	-0,042	-0,020	0,038	0,041	0,041	0,043	0,045	0,046	0,048	0,048	0,271
OT	-0,682	-0,318	-0,499	-0,413	-0,487	-0,515	-0,526	-0,535	-0,547	-0,560	-0,575	-2,232	-4,975
500 - Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services													
Discretionary													
BA	76,896	82,134	82,013	83,888	87,345	90,205	92,846	95,701	98,444	100,510	104,626	425,585	917,712
OT	69,790	76,220	81,671	82,281	84,831	87,685	90,364	92,962	95,910	98,366	101,360	412,688	891,650
Mandatory													
BA	61,189	65,322	65,577	67,565	69,473	71,539	73,462	75,557	77,498	78,704	81,957	339,476	726,644
OT	54,012	59,658	65,362	65,959	67,606	69,578	71,592	73,442	75,591	77,211	79,355	328,163	705,354
Mandatory													
BA	15,697	16,812	16,436	16,323	17,872	18,666	19,384	20,144	20,956	21,806	22,669	86,109	191,068
OT	15,778	16,562	16,309	16,322	17,225	18,107	18,772	19,520	20,319	21,155	22,005	84,525	186,296
550 - Health													
Discretionary													
BA	175,512	201,117	225,847	244,687	251,455	264,574	284,223	305,213	327,566	352,522	380,214	1,187,680	2,837,418
OT	33,770	38,124	41,540	44,682	46,503	48,115	49,635	50,966	52,270	53,401	54,782	218,984	480,018
Mandatory													
BA	143,833	162,961	184,200	199,582	205,338	216,740	235,623	254,979	275,742	295,421	325,499	968,821	2,350,085
OT	141,742	162,993	184,307	200,005	204,952	216,459	234,588	254,247	275,296	299,121	325,432	968,716	2,357,400

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- HOUSE PASSED RESOLUTION
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
570 - Medicare	217,531	229,128	243,946	260,240	291,770	309,921	336,143	362,842	391,122	423,445	459,396	1,335,005	3,307,953
OT	217,708	229,075	243,718	260,446	291,696	309,660	336,366	362,744	390,848	423,698	459,390	1,334,595	3,307,641
Discretionary	3,357	3,449	3,448	3,545	3,645	3,752	3,852	3,952	4,052	4,116	4,286	17,839	38,097
OT	3,269	3,416	3,451	3,512	3,609	3,714	3,813	3,910	4,007	4,076	4,233	17,702	37,741
Mandatory	214,174	225,679	240,498	256,695	288,125	306,169	332,291	358,890	387,070	419,329	455,110	1,317,166	3,269,856
OT	214,439	225,659	240,267	256,934	288,087	305,946	332,553	358,834	386,841	419,622	455,157	1,316,893	3,269,900
600 - Income Security	255,942	271,512	281,824	293,331	308,066	315,915	323,428	337,855	349,303	359,890	371,642	1,470,648	3,212,766
OT	256,932	272,093	282,335	292,461	306,673	314,382	321,895	336,473	347,618	358,217	369,424	1,467,944	3,201,571
Discretionary	39,454	42,836	44,471	46,187	47,955	49,435	50,846	52,244	53,768	55,088	57,212	230,884	500,042
OT	43,974	45,879	47,234	47,546	48,515	49,668	51,006	52,455	53,740	54,925	56,522	238,842	507,490
Mandatory	216,488	228,676	237,353	247,144	260,111	266,480	272,582	285,611	295,535	304,802	314,430	1,239,764	2,712,724
OT	212,958	226,214	235,101	244,915	258,158	264,714	270,889	284,018	293,878	303,292	312,902	1,229,102	2,694,081
650 - Social Security	435,181	457,247	479,657	503,759	529,173	555,826	584,078	614,734	649,513	685,200	725,476	2,525,662	5,785,663
OT	433,121	455,011	477,255	501,544	526,861	553,421	581,478	611,748	646,257	683,437	722,812	2,514,092	5,759,824
Discretionary	3,448	3,520	3,518	3,619	3,719	3,829	3,930	4,033	4,135	4,201	4,373	18,205	38,877
OT	3,388	3,474	3,497	3,574	3,667	3,774	3,875	3,977	4,079	4,148	4,309	17,986	38,374
Mandatory	431,733	453,727	476,139	500,140	525,454	551,997	580,148	610,701	645,378	681,999	721,103	2,507,457	5,746,786
OT	429,733	451,537	473,758	497,970	523,194	549,647	577,603	607,771	642,178	679,289	718,503	2,496,106	5,721,450
650 on-budget	9,805	11,005	11,733	12,497	13,308	14,207	15,168	16,241	17,482	18,877	20,387	62,750	150,904
OT	9,805	11,004	11,733	12,497	13,308	14,207	15,168	16,241	17,482	18,877	20,387	62,749	150,904
Discretionary	0.017	0.019	0.019	0.020	0.020	0.021	0.021	0.022	0.022	0.023	0.024	0.099	0.211
OT	0.017	0.018	0.019	0.020	0.020	0.021	0.021	0.022	0.022	0.023	0.024	0.098	0.210
Mandatory	9,788	10,986	11,714	12,477	13,288	14,186	15,147	16,219	17,460	18,854	20,363	62,651	150,694
OT	9,788	10,986	11,714	12,477	13,288	14,186	15,147	16,219	17,460	18,854	20,363	62,651	150,694
700 - Veterans Benefits and Services	46,675	52,261	53,033	55,270	59,329	58,807	58,138	61,998	63,354	64,740	67,114	278,700	594,044
OT	45,926	51,595	52,778	54,884	58,881	58,325	57,668	61,590	62,975	64,394	66,674	276,463	589,764
Discretionary	22,512	24,215	23,447	24,124	24,800	25,541	26,234	26,919	27,606	27,942	29,217	122,127	260,045
OT	22,062	23,850	23,493	23,958	24,591	25,297	25,975	26,642	27,324	27,690	28,872	121,189	257,692
Mandatory	24,163	28,046	29,586	31,146	34,529	33,266	31,904	35,079	35,748	36,798	37,897	156,573	333,999
OT	23,864	27,745	29,285	30,926	34,290	33,028	31,693	34,948	35,651	36,704	37,802	155,274	332,072
750 - Administration of Justice	30,577	30,870	31,899	33,592	34,629	35,651	36,609	37,563	38,539	39,189	40,767	166,641	359,308
OT	30,003	30,328	32,116	34,056	34,688	35,279	36,119	37,116	38,090	38,842	40,204	166,467	356,838
Discretionary	29,987	29,726	31,563	31,442	32,340	33,315	34,225	35,129	36,051	36,645	38,163	158,386	338,599
OT	29,335	29,530	31,478	31,780	32,386	33,077	33,864	34,808	35,732	36,424	37,725	158,251	336,804
Mandatory	0,590	1,144	0,336	2,150	2,289	2,336	2,384	2,434	2,488	2,544	2,604	8,255	20,709
OT	0,668	0,798	0,638	2,276	2,302	2,202	2,255	2,308	2,358	2,418	2,479	8,216	20,034

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- HOUSE PASSED RESOLUTION
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
800 - General Government													
BA	16.307	16.671	16.313	16.680	17.035	17.492	17.921	17.981	18.426	18.706	19.430	84.191	176.655
OT	16.065	16.326	16.263	16.627	16.726	17.100	17.504	17.691	17.995	18.285	18.911	83.042	173.428
Discretionary	14.028	14.797	14.753	15.197	15.559	16.014	16.438	16.866	17.298	17.574	18.290	76.320	162.786
OT	13.795	14.463	14.709	14.969	15.286	15.665	16.046	16.447	16.871	17.175	17.794	75.092	159.425
Mandatory	2.279	1.874	1.560	1.483	1.476	1.478	1.483	1.115	1.128	1.132	1.140	7.871	13.869
OT	2.270	1.863	1.554	1.658	1.440	1.435	1.458	1.244	1.124	1.110	1.117	7.950	14.003
900 - Net Interest													
BA	205.109	182.168	169.879	155.381	137.968	121.911	105.477	87.027	66.823	44.585	20.929	767.307	1092.148
OT	205.109	182.168	169.879	155.381	137.968	121.911	105.477	87.027	66.823	44.585	20.929	767.307	1092.148
Discretionary	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
OT	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mandatory	205.109	182.168	169.879	155.381	137.968	121.911	105.477	87.027	66.823	44.585	20.929	767.307	1092.148
OT	205.109	182.168	169.879	155.381	137.968	121.911	105.477	87.027	66.823	44.585	20.929	767.307	1092.148
900 on-budget													
BA	273.584	257.570	253.243	248.531	242.355	238.959	236.545	233.269	229.324	224.395	219.099	1240.658	2383.290
OT	273.584	257.570	253.243	248.531	242.355	238.959	236.545	233.269	229.324	224.395	219.099	1240.658	2383.290
Discretionary	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
OT	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mandatory	273.584	257.570	253.243	248.531	242.355	238.959	236.545	233.269	229.324	224.395	219.099	1240.658	2383.290
OT	273.584	257.570	253.243	248.531	242.355	238.959	236.545	233.269	229.324	224.395	219.099	1240.658	2383.290
920 - Allowances													
BA	-0.472	5.004	5.481	6.017	6.190	6.366	6.583	6.720	6.986	7.151	7.452	29.058	63.950
OT	-0.303	1.842	3.993	4.796	5.701	6.073	6.267	6.445	6.626	6.773	6.986	22.405	55.502
Discretionary	-0.472	5.004	5.481	6.017	6.190	6.366	6.583	6.720	6.986	7.151	7.452	29.058	63.950
OT	-0.303	1.842	3.993	4.796	5.701	6.073	6.267	6.445	6.626	6.773	6.986	22.405	55.502
Mandatory	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
OT	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
950 - Undistributed Offsetting Receipts													
BA	-46.173	-50.808	-61.475	-63.089	-56.170	-57.901	-60.346	-62.242	-64.210	-66.757	-69.459	-289.443	-612.457
OT	-46.173	-50.808	-61.475	-63.089	-56.170	-57.901	-60.346	-62.242	-64.210	-66.757	-69.459	-289.443	-612.457
Discretionary	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
OT	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mandatory	-46.173	-50.808	-61.475	-63.089	-56.170	-57.901	-60.346	-62.242	-64.210	-66.757	-69.459	-289.443	-612.457
OT	-46.173	-50.808	-61.475	-63.089	-56.170	-57.901	-60.346	-62.242	-64.210	-66.757	-69.459	-289.443	-612.457
950 on-budget													
BA	-38.265	-42.303	-52.308	-53.215	-45.463	-46.461	-48.179	-49.141	-50.203	-51.778	-53.287	-239.750	-492.338
OT	-38.265	-42.303	-52.308	-53.215	-45.463	-46.461	-48.179	-49.141	-50.203	-51.778	-53.287	-239.750	-492.338
Discr.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
OT	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mand.	-38.265	-42.303	-52.308	-53.215	-45.463	-46.461	-48.179	-49.141	-50.203	-51.778	-53.287	-239.750	-492.338
OT	-38.265	-42.303	-52.308	-53.215	-45.463	-46.461	-48.179	-49.141	-50.203	-51.778	-53.287	-239.750	-492.338

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- HOUSE PASSED RESOLUTION
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
Total	1907.181	1977.284	2035.745	2112.813	2200.869	2264.582	2344.090	2437.775	2532.815	2634.089	2743.581	10591.293	23283.643
OT	1856.739	1941.185	2007.430	2085.852	2175.783	2236.279	2312.943	2409.800	2505.856	2609.682	2718.328	10446.529	23003.138
BA	635.434	660.788	678.553	697.415	716.781	736.931	758.157	779.678	801.380	823.630	846.928	3490.468	7500.241
Discr.	645.308	683.655	707.627	725.080	747.918	765.754	784.661	809.485	832.307	855.817	878.303	3630.034	7790.607
Mand.	1271.747	1316.496	1357.192	1415.398	1484.088	1527.651	1585.933	1658.097	1731.435	1810.459	1896.653	7100.825	15783.402
OT	1211.431	1257.530	1299.803	1360.772	1427.865	1470.525	1528.282	1600.315	1673.549	1753.865	1840.025	6816.495	15212.531
BA	1557.188	1613.649	1660.452	1723.275	1800.998	1851.451	1918.415	1998.625	2077.292	2161.555	2252.834	8648.925	19057.646
OT	1508.806	1579.785	1634.539	1698.529	1777.324	1825.553	1889.868	1973.636	2053.589	2139.911	2230.245	8515.730	18802.979
BA	632.003	657.287	675.054	693.816	713.082	733.123	754.248	775.667	797.267	819.452	842.579	3472.362	7461.575
OT	641.937	680.199	704.149	721.526	744.271	762.001	780.807	805.530	828.250	851.692	874.018	3612.146	7752.443
BA	925.185	956.362	985.398	1029.459	1087.016	1118.328	1164.167	1222.958	1280.025	1342.103	1410.255	5176.563	11596.071
OT	866.869	899.586	930.390	977.003	1033.053	1063.552	1109.061	1168.106	1225.339	1286.219	1356.227	4903.584	11050.536
Revenues	2128.788	2168.069	2259.955	2344.414	2436.749	2521.375	2628.575	2754.151	2889.595	3038.582	3206.212	11730.562	26247.677
Revenues on-budget	1624.679	1635.761	1699.017	1755.74	1816.689	1872.154	1948.64	2041.697	2143.156	2256.553	2387.027	8779.361	19556.434
Surplus	272.049	226.884	252.525	258.562	260.966	285.096	315.632	344.351	383.739	428.900	487.884	1284.033	3244.539
On-budget	115.873	55.976	64.478	57.211	39.365	46.601	58.772	68.061	89.567	116.642	156.782	263.631	753.455
Off-budget	156.176	170.908	188.047	201.351	221.601	238.495	256.860	276.290	294.172	312.258	331.102	1020.402	2491.084

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- SENATE PASSED RESOLUTION
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
050 - National Defense	310,328	334,514	333,428	342,728	352,292	362,163	372,279	382,774	393,559	404,547	416,308	1725.125	3694.592
BA	300,591	326,813	325,703	334,198	347,283	354,639	361,964	375,662	386,546	397,628	409,251	1688.636	3619.687
OT	311,051	334,801	333,440	342,776	352,357	362,267	372,443	382,935	393,741	404,722	416,493	1725.641	3695.975
Discretionary	301,318	327,123	325,723	334,252	347,353	354,748	362,133	375,829	386,735	397,810	409,443	1689.199	3621.149
BA	-0.723	-0.287	-0.012	-0.048	-0.065	-0.104	-0.164	-0.161	-0.182	-0.175	-0.185	-0.516	-1.383
OT	-0.727	-0.310	-0.020	-0.054	-0.070	-0.109	-0.169	-0.167	-0.189	-0.182	-0.192	-0.563	-1.462
150 - International Affairs	22,424	24,116	24,435	24,543	25,417	26,215	26,982	27,497	28,086	28,472	29,645	124.726	265.408
BA	19,670	19,793	20,414	20,469	20,830	21,445	22,191	22,876	23,633	24,211	25,047	102.951	220.909
OT	22,641	24,108	24,397	24,552	25,975	26,972	27,345	28,041	28,477	29,650	30,650	124.268	264.452
Discretionary	23,259	23,438	24,086	24,027	24,929	25,929	26,612	26,260	26,941	27,466	28,338	120.795	255.412
BA	-0.217	0.008	0.038	-0.009	0.181	0.240	0.310	0.152	0.045	-0.005	-0.005	0.458	0.955
OT	-3.589	-3.645	-3.672	-3.558	-3.485	-3.484	-3.421	-3.384	-3.308	-3.255	-3.291	-17.944	-34.503
250 - General Science, Space and Technology	21,043	22,798	21,852	22,307	22,859	23,493	24,122	24,741	25,370	25,769	26,829	113.309	240.140
BA	19,612	21,201	21,059	21,825	22,380	22,925	23,496	24,091	24,707	25,211	25,966	109.390	232.861
OT	20,901	22,635	21,673	22,270	22,821	23,454	24,082	24,701	25,329	25,727	26,786	112.853	239.478
Discretionary	19,562	21,126	20,946	21,681	22,219	22,818	23,437	24,052	24,667	25,170	25,925	108.790	232.041
BA	0.142	0.163	0.179	0.037	0.038	0.039	0.040	0.040	0.041	0.042	0.043	0.456	0.662
OT	0.050	0.075	0.113	0.144	0.161	0.107	0.059	0.039	0.040	0.041	0.041	0.600	0.820
270 - Energy	1,225	1,676	0,965	1,117	1,104	1,228	1,308	2,401	2,495	2,472	2,396	6.090	17.162
BA	-0.115	0.018	-0.266	-0.355	-0.291	-0.149	-0.043	0.590	0.989	1.160	1.132	-1.043	2.785
OT	3,132	3,588	2,935	3,178	3,289	3,408	3,489	4,190	4,250	4,286	4,325	16.398	36.938
Discretionary	3,104	3,178	3,031	3,108	3,221	3,333	3,440	3,781	4,121	4,251	4,313	15.871	35.777
BA	-1,907	-1,912	-1,970	-2,061	-2,185	-2,180	-2,181	-1,789	-1,755	-1,814	-1,929	-10.308	-19,776
OT	-3,219	-3,160	-3,297	-3,463	-3,512	-3,482	-3,483	-3,191	-3,132	-3,091	-3,181	-16.914	-32,992
300 - Natural Resources and Environment	28,833	29,644	27,390	28,169	28,392	28,408	29,074	29,799	31,070	31,623	32,867	142.003	296.436
BA	26,361	29,252	27,480	27,913	28,118	28,268	28,735	29,231	30,338	30,975	31,958	141.031	292,268
OT	28,740	28,998	26,663	27,292	27,489	27,487	28,230	28,942	29,783	30,254	31,487	137,929	286,625
Discretionary	26,358	28,660	26,788	27,121	27,312	27,432	27,826	28,379	29,118	29,703	30,675	137,313	283,014
BA	0.093	0.646	0.727	0.877	0.903	0.857	0.844	0.857	1.287	1.369	1.380	4.074	9.811
OT	0.003	0.592	0.692	0.792	0.806	0.836	0.909	0.852	1.220	1.272	1.283	3.718	9,254
350 - Agriculture	35,290	26,189	25,655	25,527	25,382	23,933	22,565	20,693	19,881	18,939	19,168	126.686	227,932
BA	32,654	24,541	24,026	24,117	23,897	22,333	20,991	19,107	18,404	17,578	17,770	118.914	212,764
OT	4,791	4,879	5,238	5,199	5,343	5,496	5,642	5,787	5,935	6,027	6,275	26,155	55,821
Discretionary	4,669	4,806	5,115	5,158	5,277	5,420	5,566	5,708	5,858	5,959	6,172	25,776	55,039
BA	30,499	21,310	20,417	20,328	20,039	18,437	16,923	14,906	13,946	12,912	12,893	100,531	172,111
OT	27,985	19,735	18,911	18,959	18,620	16,913	15,425	13,399	12,546	11,619	11,598	93,138	157,725

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- SENATE PASSED RESOLUTION
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
370 - Commerce and Housing													
Credit													
Discretionary	3,516	8,994	8,503	14,189	12,800	12,729	13,598	13,918	14,332	18,793	13,587	57,215	131,443
Mandatory	0,229	5,759	3,131	9,954	9,083	8,434	9,288	9,375	9,674	12,903	9,875	36,361	87,476
OT	1,363	-0,022	-0,181	-0,451	-0,572	-0,524	0,334	0,597	1,041	5,490	0,285	-1,750	5,997
Discretionary	2,008	0,229	-0,221	-0,553	-0,745	-0,736	0,259	0,359	0,678	4,041	1,085	-2,026	4,396
Mandatory	2,153	9,016	8,684	14,640	13,372	13,253	13,264	13,321	13,291	13,303	13,302	58,965	125,446
OT	-1,779	5,530	3,352	10,507	9,828	9,170	9,029	9,016	8,996	8,862	8,790	38,387	83,080
370 on-budget	2,516	7,694	8,603	12,889	12,800	12,729	13,598	13,918	14,332	18,793	13,587	54,715	128,943
Discretionary	0,771	4,459	3,231	8,654	9,083	8,434	9,288	9,375	9,674	12,903	9,875	33,861	84,976
Mandatory	1,363	-0,022	-0,181	-0,451	-0,572	-0,524	0,334	0,597	1,041	5,490	0,285	-1,750	5,997
OT	2,008	0,229	-0,221	-0,553	-0,745	-0,736	0,259	0,359	0,678	4,041	1,085	-2,026	4,396
Mandatory	1,153	7,716	8,784	13,340	13,372	13,253	13,264	13,321	13,291	13,303	13,302	56,465	122,946
OT	-2,779	4,230	3,452	9,207	9,828	9,170	9,029	9,016	8,996	8,862	8,790	35,887	80,580
400 - Transportation													
Discretionary	62,130	62,156	64,751	66,248	67,741	69,347	70,953	72,578	74,248	75,759	77,835	330,243	701,616
Mandatory	51,681	56,082	58,952	60,797	62,549	64,303	65,535	67,008	68,664	69,976	71,900	302,683	645,766
OT	18,964	17,089	17,135	17,619	18,069	18,594	19,094	19,581	20,084	20,395	21,240	88,506	189,900
Discretionary	49,680	54,338	56,868	58,741	60,531	62,341	63,594	65,000	66,629	67,994	69,861	292,819	625,897
Mandatory	43,166	45,067	47,616	48,629	49,672	50,753	51,859	52,997	54,164	55,364	56,595	241,737	512,716
OT	2,001	1,744	2,084	2,056	2,018	1,962	1,941	2,008	2,035	1,982	2,039	9,864	19,869
450 - Community and Regional													
Development	11,225	11,228	10,318	10,567	10,920	11,243	11,545	11,844	12,146	12,338	12,844	54,276	114,993
Discretionary	11,366	11,560	11,088	10,780	10,408	10,179	10,325	10,507	10,783	11,048	11,345	54,015	108,023
Mandatory	11,577	11,197	10,360	10,587	10,882	11,202	11,504	11,801	12,101	12,292	12,796	54,228	114,722
OT	12,048	11,878	11,640	11,343	11,091	10,937	11,096	11,292	11,585	11,869	12,181	56,889	114,912
Discretionary	0,352	0,031	-0,042	-0,020	0,038	0,041	0,041	0,043	0,045	0,046	0,048	0,048	0,271
Mandatory	-0,682	-0,318	-0,552	-0,563	-0,683	-0,758	-0,771	-0,785	-0,802	-0,821	-0,836	-2,874	-6,889
500 - Education, Training, Employment,													
and Social Services													
Discretionary	76,886	111,857	98,870	105,875	113,361	120,752	127,924	134,409	143,285	149,583	159,533	550,715	1,265,449
Mandatory	69,790	79,353	94,064	100,270	107,509	115,992	123,602	130,230	140,009	146,697	156,324	497,188	1,194,050
OT	61,189	74,921	66,234	68,252	70,189	72,286	74,240	76,365	78,329	79,577	82,864	351,882	743,257
Discretionary	54,012	61,111	65,955	66,648	68,284	70,285	72,330	74,210	76,390	78,042	80,219	332,283	713,474
Mandatory	15,697	36,936	32,636	37,623	43,172	48,466	53,684	58,044	64,956	70,006	76,669	198,833	522,192
OT	15,778	18,242	28,109	33,622	39,225	45,707	51,272	56,020	63,619	68,655	76,105	164,905	480,576
550 - Health													
Discretionary	182,604	216,052	242,906	260,309	257,859	271,154	291,758	312,905	335,471	360,544	389,308	1,248,280	2,938,266
Mandatory	176,512	213,242	239,126	258,514	255,591	269,004	289,047	310,457	333,359	358,901	387,174	1,235,477	2,914,415
OT	38,771	46,131	50,108	52,296	54,286	56,410	58,292	60,176	62,156	63,738	66,599	259,231	570,192
Discretionary	33,770	43,242	46,160	50,012	52,333	54,475	56,565	58,496	60,470	62,331	64,472	246,222	548,556
Mandatory	143,833	169,921	192,798	208,013	203,573	214,744	233,466	252,729	273,315	296,806	322,709	989,049	2,368,074
OT	141,742	170,000	192,966	208,502	203,258	214,529	232,482	251,961	272,889	296,570	322,702	989,255	2,365,859

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- SENATE PASSED RESOLUTION
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
570 - Medicare													
BA	217,531	229,128	243,946	260,240	291,770	309,921	336,143	362,842	391,122	423,445	459,396	1,335,005	3,307,953
OT	217,708	229,075	243,718	260,446	291,696	309,660	336,366	362,744	390,848	423,698	459,390	1,334,595	3,307,641
Discretionary													
BA	3,357	3,449	3,448	3,545	3,645	3,752	3,852	3,952	4,052	4,116	4,286	17,839	38,097
OT	3,269	3,416	3,451	3,512	3,609	3,714	3,813	3,910	4,007	4,076	4,233	17,702	37,741
Mandatory													
BA	214,174	225,679	240,498	256,695	288,125	306,169	332,291	358,890	387,070	419,329	455,110	1,317,166	3,269,856
OT	214,439	225,659	240,267	256,934	288,087	305,946	332,553	358,834	386,841	419,622	455,157	1,316,893	3,269,900
600 - Income Security													
BA	255,942	278,801	281,124	292,431	307,066	314,915	322,128	336,555	348,003	358,590	370,342	1,474,337	3,209,955
OT	256,932	274,943	281,560	291,586	305,698	313,407	320,620	335,198	346,343	356,942	368,149	1,467,294	3,194,546
Discretionary													
BA	39,454	46,306	44,471	46,187	47,955	49,435	50,846	52,244	53,768	55,088	57,212	234,354	503,512
OT	43,974	49,349	47,234	47,546	48,515	49,668	51,006	52,455	53,740	54,925	56,522	242,312	510,960
Mandatory													
BA	216,488	232,495	236,653	246,244	259,111	265,480	271,282	284,311	294,235	303,502	313,130	1,239,983	2,706,443
OT	212,958	225,594	234,426	244,040	257,183	263,739	269,614	282,743	292,603	302,017	311,627	1,224,982	2,683,586
650 - Social Security													
BA	435,181	457,247	479,657	503,759	529,173	555,826	584,078	614,734	649,513	686,200	725,476	2,525,662	5,785,663
OT	433,121	455,011	477,255	501,544	526,861	553,421	581,478	611,748	646,257	683,437	722,812	2,514,092	5,759,824
Discretionary													
BA	3,448	3,520	3,518	3,619	3,719	3,829	3,930	4,033	4,135	4,201	4,373	18,205	38,877
OT	3,388	3,474	3,497	3,574	3,667	3,774	3,875	3,977	4,079	4,148	4,309	17,986	38,374
Mandatory													
BA	431,733	453,727	476,139	500,140	525,454	551,997	580,148	610,701	645,378	681,999	721,103	2,507,457	5,746,786
OT	429,733	451,537	473,758	497,970	523,194	549,647	577,603	607,771	642,178	679,289	718,503	2,496,106	5,721,450
650 on-budget													
BA	9,805	10,865	11,315	11,852	12,387	13,038	13,739	14,750	15,927	17,289	18,799	59,457	139,961
OT	9,805	10,864	11,315	11,852	12,387	13,038	13,739	14,750	15,927	17,289	18,799	59,456	139,960
Discretionary													
BA	0,017	0,019	0,019	0,020	0,020	0,021	0,021	0,022	0,022	0,023	0,024	0,099	0,211
OT	0,017	0,018	0,019	0,020	0,020	0,021	0,021	0,022	0,022	0,023	0,024	0,098	0,210
Mandatory													
BA	9,788	10,846	11,296	11,832	12,367	13,017	13,718	14,728	15,905	17,266	18,775	59,358	139,750
OT	9,788	10,846	11,296	11,832	12,367	13,017	13,718	14,728	15,905	17,266	18,775	59,358	139,750
700 - Veterans Benefits and Services													
BA	46,675	53,789	54,088	56,024	60,007	59,395	58,637	62,418	63,767	65,075	67,366	283,303	600,566
OT	45,926	53,060	53,771	55,641	59,567	58,929	58,180	62,020	63,396	64,736	66,931	280,968	596,231
Discretionary													
BA	22,512	26,150	25,165	25,842	26,518	27,259	27,952	28,637	29,324	29,660	30,935	130,934	277,442
OT	22,062	25,688	25,120	25,655	26,297	27,015	27,693	28,360	29,042	29,408	30,590	129,775	274,868
Mandatory													
BA	24,163	27,639	28,923	30,182	33,489	32,136	30,685	33,781	34,443	35,415	36,431	152,369	323,124
OT	23,864	27,372	28,651	29,986	33,270	31,914	30,487	33,660	34,354	35,328	36,341	151,193	321,363
750 - Administration of Justice													
BA	30,577	32,370	31,899	33,592	34,629	35,651	36,609	37,563	38,539	39,189	40,767	168,141	360,808
OT	30,003	31,828	32,116	34,056	34,688	35,279	36,119	37,116	38,090	38,842	40,204	167,967	358,338
Discretionary													
BA	29,987	31,226	31,563	31,442	32,340	33,315	34,225	35,129	36,051	36,645	38,163	159,886	340,099
OT	29,335	31,030	31,478	31,780	32,386	33,077	33,864	34,808	35,732	36,424	37,725	159,751	338,304
Mandatory													
BA	0,590	1,144	0,336	2,150	2,289	2,336	2,384	2,434	2,488	2,544	2,604	8,255	20,709
OT	0,668	0,798	0,638	2,276	2,302	2,202	2,255	2,308	2,358	2,418	2,479	8,216	20,034

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- SENATE PASSED RESOLUTION
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
800 - General Government	BA 16.307	16.671	16.313	16.680	17.035	17.492	17.921	17.981	18.426	18.706	19.430	84.191	176.655
	OT 16.065	16.326	16.263	16.627	16.726	17.100	17.504	17.691	17.995	18.285	18.911	83.042	173.428
Discretionary	BA 14.028	14.797	14.753	15.197	15.559	16.014	16.438	16.866	17.298	17.574	18.290	76.320	162.786
	OT 13.795	14.463	14.709	14.969	15.286	15.665	16.046	16.447	16.871	17.175	17.794	75.092	159.425
Mandatory	BA 2.279	1.874	1.560	1.483	1.476	1.478	1.483	1.115	1.128	1.132	1.140	7.871	13.869
	OT 2.270	1.863	1.554	1.658	1.440	1.458	1.458	1.244	1.124	1.110	1.117	7.950	14.003
900 - Net Interest	BA 206.999	187.261	176.213	162.276	144.815	128.456	111.705	92.939	72.136	49.184	24.834	799.022	1149.819
	OT 206.999	187.261	176.213	162.276	144.815	128.456	111.705	92.939	72.136	49.184	24.834	799.022	1149.819
Discretionary	BA 0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	OT 0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mandatory	BA 206.999	187.261	176.213	162.276	144.815	128.456	111.705	92.939	72.136	49.184	24.834	799.022	1149.819
	OT 206.999	187.261	176.213	162.276	144.815	128.456	111.705	92.939	72.136	49.184	24.834	799.022	1149.819
900 on-budget	BA 275.474	262.661	259.569	255.407	249.170	245.457	242.709	239.097	234.530	228.860	222.839	1272.265	2440.299
	OT 275.474	262.661	259.569	255.407	249.170	245.457	242.709	239.097	234.530	228.860	222.839	1272.265	2440.299
Discretionary	BA 0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	OT 0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mandatory	BA 275.474	262.661	259.569	255.407	249.170	245.457	242.709	239.097	234.530	228.860	222.839	1272.265	2440.299
	OT 275.474	262.661	259.569	255.407	249.170	245.457	242.709	239.097	234.530	228.860	222.839	1272.265	2440.299
920 - Allowances	BA 80.528	-6.056	0.399	0.180	-0.176	-0.561	-0.945	-1.438	-1.875	-2.472	-2.965	-6.214	-15.909
	OT 80.697	-8.600	-0.821	-0.972	-0.624	-0.814	-1.221	-1.673	-2.193	-2.808	-3.388	-11.831	-23.114
Discretionary	BA -0.472	-5.376	0.399	0.180	-0.176	-0.561	-0.945	-1.438	-1.875	-2.472	-2.965	-5.534	-15.229
	OT -0.303	-7.920	-0.821	-0.972	-0.624	-0.814	-1.221	-1.673	-2.193	-2.808	-3.388	-11.151	-22.434
Mandatory	BA 81.000	-0.680	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.680	-0.680
	OT 81.000	-0.680	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.680	-0.680
950 - Undistributed Offsetting Receipts	BA -46.173	-47.308	-58.875	-66.389	-57.370	-62.101	-60.536	-62.422	-64.370	-66.897	-69.569	-292.043	-615.837
	OT -46.173	-47.308	-58.875	-66.389	-57.370	-62.101	-60.536	-62.422	-64.370	-66.897	-69.569	-292.043	-615.837
Discretionary	BA 0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	OT 0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mandatory	BA -46.173	-47.308	-58.875	-66.389	-57.370	-62.101	-60.536	-62.422	-64.370	-66.897	-69.569	-292.043	-615.837
	OT -46.173	-47.308	-58.875	-66.389	-57.370	-62.101	-60.536	-62.422	-64.370	-66.897	-69.569	-292.043	-615.837
950 on-budget	BA -38.265	-38.803	-49.708	-56.515	-46.663	-50.661	-48.369	-49.321	-50.363	-51.918	-53.397	-242.350	-495.718
	OT -38.265	-38.803	-49.708	-56.515	-46.663	-50.661	-48.369	-49.321	-50.363	-51.918	-53.397	-242.350	-495.718
Discretionary	BA 0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	OT 0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mandatory	BA -38.265	-38.803	-49.708	-56.515	-46.663	-50.661	-48.369	-49.321	-50.363	-51.918	-53.397	-242.350	-495.718
	OT -38.265	-38.803	-49.708	-56.515	-46.663	-50.661	-48.369	-49.321	-50.363	-51.918	-53.397	-242.350	-495.718

FUNCTION SUMMARY -- SENATE PASSED RESOLUTION
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
Total	1999.071	2051.127	2083.837	2160.372	2245.076	2309.659	2397.848	2494.731	2595.204	2699.859	2815.397	10850.072	23853.110
OT	1948.629	1979.210	2046.077	2123.297	2209.414	2270.710	2355.346	2454.495	2555.608	2661.707	2776.016	10628.709	23431.880
Discretionary a/	635.434	688.397	681.319	699.582	718.949	739.098	760.320	781.843	803.543	825.797	849.094	3527.345	7547.942
OT	645.308	698.629	710.759	727.602	750.327	768.081	786.934	811.650	834.470	857.984	880.469	3655.398	7826.905
Mandatory	1363.637	1362.730	1402.518	1460.790	1526.127	1570.561	1637.528	1712.888	1791.661	1874.062	1966.303	7322.727	16305.168
OT	1303.321	1280.581	1335.318	1395.695	1459.087	1502.629	1568.412	1642.845	1721.138	1803.723	1895.547	6973.311	15604.975
Total on-budget	1649.078	1687.350	1708.118	1770.170	1843.352	1895.312	1970.680	2054.006	2138.019	2225.603	2322.897	8904.303	19615.507
OT	1600.696	1617.668	1672.760	1735.310	1810.002	1858.768	1930.778	2016.756	2101.679	2190.214	2286.180	8694.509	19220.115
Discretionary	632.003	684.896	677.820	695.983	715.250	735.290	756.411	777.832	799.430	821.619	844.745	3509.239	7509.276
OT	641.937	695.173	707.281	724.048	746.680	764.328	783.080	807.695	830.413	853.859	876.184	3637.510	7788.741
Mandatory	1017.075	1002.454	1030.298	1074.187	1128.102	1160.022	1214.269	1276.174	1338.589	1403.984	1478.152	5395.064	12106.231
OT	958.759	922.495	965.479	1011.262	1063.322	1094.440	1147.698	1209.061	1271.266	1336.355	1409.996	5056.999	11431.374
Revenues	2134.399	2177.131	2283.552	2380.422	2473.967	2564.678	2675.782	2807.658	2953.339	3102.648	3279.146	11879.750	26698.323
Revenues on-budget	1630.290	1644.823	1722.614	1791.748	1853.907	1915.457	1995.847	2095.204	2206.900	2320.619	2459.961	8928.549	20007.080
Surplus	185.770	197.921	237.475	257.125	264.553	293.988	320.436	353.163	397.731	440.941	503.130	1251.041	3266.443
On-budget	29.594	27.155	49.854	56.438	43.905	56.689	66.069	78.448	105.221	130.405	173.781	234.040	786.965
Off-budget	156.176	170.766	187.621	200.687	220.648	237.279	255.367	274.715	292.510	310.536	329.349	1017.001	2479.478

a/ Discretionary spending in this summary reflects the levels that will apply once new discretionary limits are enacted.

CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2002
BUDGET RESOLUTION TOTAL SPENDING AND REVENUES
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
050 - National Defense	316.873	324.832	333.646	342.294	350.876	359.807	369.023	378.505	388.323	398.338	408.821	1711.455	3654.465
Discretionary	302.371	319.137	326.643	335.184	347.073	353.482	359.774	372.416	382.242	392.227	402.579	1681.519	3590.758
Mandatory	317.596	325.070	333.707	342.418	351.006	359.950	369.231	378.695	388.520	398.516	409.005	1712.151	3656.118
150 - International Affairs	303.098	319.398	326.712	335.314	347.208	353.630	359.987	372.612	382.446	392.412	402.770	1682.262	3592.490
Discretionary	-0.723	-0.238	-0.061	-0.124	-0.143	-0.143	-0.208	-0.190	-0.197	-0.178	-0.184	-0.696	-1.653
Mandatory	-0.727	-0.261	-0.069	-0.130	-0.135	-0.148	-0.213	-0.196	-0.204	-0.185	-0.191	-0.743	-1.732
250 - General Science, Space and Technology	22.424	23.214	23.750	24.214	24.911	25.504	26.107	26.482	26.937	27.458	28.065	121.593	256.642
Discretionary	19.670	19.082	19.554	20.164	20.431	20.900	21.494	22.031	22.650	23.235	23.766	100.131	213.307
Mandatory	22.641	23.206	23.712	24.223	24.730	25.264	25.797	26.330	26.892	27.463	28.070	121.135	255.687
300 - Natural Resources and Environment	23.259	22.727	23.226	23.722	23.916	24.384	24.915	25.415	25.958	26.490	27.057	117.975	247.810
Discretionary	-0.217	0.008	0.038	-0.009	0.181	0.240	0.310	0.152	0.045	-0.005	-0.005	0.458	0.955
Mandatory	-3.589	-3.645	-3.672	-3.558	-3.485	-3.484	-3.421	-3.384	-3.308	-3.255	-3.291	-17.844	-34.503
350 - Agriculture	21.043	21.583	22.055	22.379	22.839	23.323	23.812	24.303	24.816	25.335	25.879	112.179	236.324
Discretionary	19.612	20.725	21.361	21.945	22.429	22.847	23.280	23.743	24.239	24.749	25.274	109.307	230.592
Mandatory	20.901	21.876	22.342	22.801	23.284	23.772	24.263	24.775	25.293	25.836	26.336	111.723	235.662
370 - Commerce and Housing Credit	19.562	20.650	21.248	21.801	22.268	22.740	23.221	23.704	24.199	24.708	25.233	108.707	229.772
Discretionary	0.142	0.163	0.179	0.037	0.038	0.039	0.040	0.040	0.041	0.042	0.043	0.456	0.662
Mandatory	0.050	0.075	0.113	0.144	0.161	0.107	0.059	0.039	0.040	0.041	0.041	0.600	0.820
270 - Energy	1.225	1.360	1.328	1.309	1.254	1.336	1.411	1.882	1.998	2.021	1.990	6.587	15.889
Discretionary	-0.115	-0.019	-0.072	-0.120	-0.091	-0.003	0.071	0.440	0.579	0.703	0.691	-0.305	2.179
Mandatory	3.104	3.141	3.225	3.343	3.421	3.479	3.554	3.671	3.711	3.835	3.919	16.931	35.701
300 - Natural Resources and Environment	-1.907	-1.948	-1.970	-2.061	-2.185	-2.180	-2.181	-1.789	-1.755	-1.814	-1.929	-10.344	-19.812
Discretionary	-3.219	-3.160	-3.297	-3.463	-3.512	-3.482	-3.483	-3.191	-3.132	-3.091	-3.181	-16.914	-32.992
Mandatory	28.833	30.381	31.263	32.249	33.091	33.965	34.767	35.691	37.064	38.111	39.137	160.949	345.719
350 - Agriculture	26.361	28.652	30.368	31.506	32.365	33.281	34.126	34.903	36.194	37.190	38.190	156.172	336.775
Discretionary	28.740	29.735	30.536	31.372	32.188	33.044	33.923	34.834	35.777	36.742	37.757	156.875	335.908
Mandatory	26.358	28.060	29.676	30.714	31.559	32.445	33.217	34.051	34.974	35.918	36.907	152.454	327.521
370 - Commerce and Housing Credit	0.093	0.646	0.727	0.877	0.903	0.921	0.844	0.857	1.287	1.369	1.380	4.074	9.811
Discretionary	0.003	0.592	0.692	0.792	0.806	0.836	0.909	0.852	1.220	1.272	1.283	3.718	9.254
Mandatory	31.790	26.265	26.507	26.562	26.406	25.452	24.083	22.723	21.921	21.553	21.703	131.192	243.175
300 - Natural Resources and Environment	29.154	24.593	24.924	25.120	24.915	23.853	22.509	21.134	20.441	20.174	20.319	123.405	227.982
Discretionary	4.791	4.955	5.090	5.234	5.367	5.515	5.660	5.817	5.975	6.141	6.310	26.161	56.064
Mandatory	4.669	4.858	5.013	5.161	5.295	5.440	5.584	5.735	5.895	6.055	6.211	25.767	55.257
370 - Commerce and Housing Credit	26.999	21.310	21.417	21.328	21.039	19.937	18.423	16.906	15.946	15.412	15.393	105.031	187.111
Discretionary	24.485	19.735	19.911	19.959	19.620	18.413	16.925	15.399	14.546	14.119	14.098	97.638	172.725
Mandatory	3.516	11.474	11.294	17.342	16.163	16.138	16.245	16.404	16.479	16.597	16.714	72.411	154.850
300 - Natural Resources and Environment	0.229	7.887	5.852	13.033	12.387	11.790	12.061	11.894	11.934	11.889	11.915	50.949	110.642
Discretionary	1.363	2.525	2.610	2.702	2.885	2.981	3.083	3.188	3.198	3.294	3.412	13.513	29.471
Mandatory	2.008	2.357	2.500	2.526	2.559	2.620	2.878	3.022	3.022	3.022	3.125	12.562	27.562
300 - Natural Resources and Environment	2.153	8.949	8.684	14.640	13.372	13.253	13.264	13.321	13.291	13.303	13.302	58.898	125.379

CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2002
BUDGET RESOLUTION TOTAL SPENDING AND REVENUES
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
370 on-budget													
OT	-1.779	5.530	3.352	10.507	9.828	9.170	9.029	9.016	8.996	8.862	8.790	38.387	83.080
BA	2.516	10.174	11.394	16.042	16.163	16.138	16.245	16.404	16.479	16.597	16.714	69.911	152.350
OT	-0.771	6.587	5.952	11.733	12.387	11.790	12.061	11.894	11.934	11.889	11.915	48.449	108.142
BA	1.363	2.525	2.610	2.702	2.791	2.885	2.981	3.083	3.188	3.294	3.412	13.513	29.471
OT	2.008	2.357	2.500	2.526	2.559	2.620	3.032	2.878	2.938	3.027	3.125	12.562	27.562
BA	1.153	7.649	8.784	13.340	13.372	13.253	13.264	13.321	13.291	13.303	13.302	56.398	122.879
OT	-2.779	4.230	3.452	9.207	9.828	9.170	9.029	9.016	8.996	8.862	8.790	35.887	80.580
400 - Transportation													
BA	62.130	64.965	62.392	64.154	65.907	67.794	69.637	71.490	73.377	76.412	78.652	325.212	694.780
OT	51.681	56.167	60.521	62.662	64.225	65.702	66.577	67.775	69.221	70.588	72.183	309.277	655.621
BA	18.984	19.652	20.215	20.797	21.364	21.981	22.577	23.217	23.874	24.551	25.257	103.989	223.465
OT	49.680	54.423	58.437	60.606	62.207	63.740	64.636	65.767	67.186	68.606	70.144	299.413	635.752
BA	43.166	45.313	42.177	43.357	44.543	45.833	47.060	48.273	49.503	51.861	53.395	221.223	471.315
OT	2.001	1.744	2.084	2.056	2.018	1.962	1.941	2.008	2.035	1.982	2.039	9.864	19.869
450 - Community and Regional Development													
BA	11.225	11.892	12.067	12.350	12.664	12.933	13.198	13.476	13.759	14.048	14.340	61.906	130.727
OT	11.366	11.730	11.731	11.967	11.913	11.936	12.181	12.444	12.696	12.962	13.233	59.277	122.793
BA	11.577	11.861	12.109	12.370	12.626	12.892	13.157	13.433	13.714	14.002	14.292	61.858	130.456
OT	12.048	12.048	12.230	12.380	12.400	12.451	12.707	12.979	13.243	13.522	13.808	61.509	127.768
BA	-0.352	0.031	-0.042	-0.020	0.038	0.041	0.041	0.043	0.045	0.046	0.048	0.048	0.271
OT	-0.682	-0.318	-0.499	-0.413	-0.487	-0.515	-0.526	-0.535	-0.547	-0.560	-0.575	-2.232	-4.975
500 - Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services													
BA	76.951	81.234	82.805	84.386	87.122	89.233	91.327	93.501	95.780	98.113	100.517	424.780	904.018
OT	69.850	76.742	81.479	83.574	85.819	87.924	89.955	92.115	94.341	96.654	99.017	415.538	887.620
BA	61.189	64.377	65.734	67.063	68.375	69.747	71.133	72.537	73.979	75.442	76.963	335.296	705.350
OT	54.012	60.140	64.780	66.472	67.774	69.067	70.458	71.865	73.277	74.734	76.227	328.233	694.794
BA	15.762	16.857	17.071	17.323	18.747	19.486	20.194	20.964	21.801	22.671	23.554	89.484	198.668
OT	15.838	16.602	16.699	17.102	18.045	18.857	19.497	20.250	21.064	21.920	22.790	87.305	192.826
550 - Health													
BA	180.104	198.775	221.150	235.474	242.661	259.125	278.882	299.116	320.791	345.380	372.407	1157.185	2773.761
OT	173.012	196.668	219.770	234.672	241.084	257.594	276.575	297.091	319.017	343.729	370.945	1149.788	2757.145
BA	38.771	39.827	40.725	41.634	42.536	43.479	44.439	45.412	46.426	47.449	48.523	208.201	440.450
OT	33.770	37.688	39.238	40.409	41.345	42.229	43.167	44.119	45.098	46.098	47.128	200.909	426.519
BA	141.333	158.948	180.425	193.840	200.125	215.665	234.443	253.704	274.365	297.931	323.884	948.984	2333.311
OT	139.242	158.980	180.532	194.263	199.739	215.365	233.408	252.972	273.919	297.631	323.817	948.879	2330.626

CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2002
BUDGET RESOLUTION TOTAL SPENDING AND REVENUES
(\$ billions)

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
570 - Medicare	217,531	229,179	244,838	271,378	306,158	326,564	363,686	393,686	424,278	458,957	497,379	1378,117	3516,103
OT	217,708	229,121	244,596	271,579	306,079	326,298	363,901	393,578	423,993	459,194	497,366	1377,673	3515,705
BA	3,357	3,500	3,640	3,783	3,933	4,085	4,275	4,476	4,688	4,908	5,149	18,951	42,447
OT	3,269	3,462	3,629	3,745	3,892	4,052	4,228	4,424	4,632	4,852	5,089	18,780	42,005
BA	214,174	225,679	241,198	267,595	302,225	322,489	359,411	389,210	419,590	454,049	492,230	1359,166	3473,656
OT	214,439	225,659	240,967	267,834	302,187	322,442	359,673	389,154	419,361	454,342	492,277	1358,893	3473,700
600 - Income Security	255,942	273,840	283,864	295,030	309,192	316,761	324,056	338,278	349,561	360,308	371,593	1478,687	3222,483
OT	256,932	272,122	282,611	293,420	307,667	315,312	322,627	336,950	347,987	358,600	369,419	1471,132	3206,715
BA	39,454	44,845	46,511	47,886	49,081	50,281	51,474	52,667	54,026	55,506	57,163	238,604	509,440
OT	43,974	45,828	47,485	48,480	49,484	50,573	51,713	52,907	54,084	55,283	56,492	241,850	512,329
BA	216,488	228,995	237,353	247,144	260,111	266,480	272,582	285,611	295,535	304,802	314,430	1240,083	2713,043
OT	212,958	226,294	235,126	244,940	258,183	264,739	270,914	284,043	293,903	303,317	312,927	1229,282	2694,386
650 - Social Security	435,181	457,324	479,853	503,978	529,413	556,082	584,363	615,054	649,872	686,642	725,901	2526,650	5788,482
OT	433,121	455,079	477,432	501,752	527,095	553,672	581,756	612,060	646,606	683,864	723,230	2515,030	5762,546
BA	3,448	3,597	3,714	3,838	3,959	4,085	4,215	4,353	4,494	4,643	4,798	19,193	41,696
OT	3,388	3,542	3,674	3,782	3,901	4,025	4,153	4,289	4,428	4,575	4,727	18,924	41,096
BA	431,733	453,727	476,139	500,140	525,454	551,997	580,148	610,701	645,378	681,999	721,103	2507,457	5746,786
OT	429,733	451,537	473,758	497,970	523,194	549,647	577,603	607,771	642,178	679,289	718,503	2496,106	5721,450
650 on-budget	9,805	11,004	11,733	12,496	13,308	14,207	15,168	16,241	17,483	18,878	20,388	62,748	150,906
OT	9,805	11,003	11,733	12,496	13,308	14,207	15,168	16,241	17,483	18,878	20,388	62,747	150,905
BA	0,017	0,018	0,019	0,019	0,020	0,021	0,021	0,022	0,023	0,024	0,025	0,097	0,212
OT	0,017	0,017	0,019	0,019	0,020	0,021	0,021	0,022	0,023	0,024	0,025	0,096	0,211
BA	9,788	10,986	11,714	12,477	13,288	14,186	15,147	16,219	17,460	18,854	20,363	62,651	150,694
OT	9,788	10,986	11,714	12,477	13,288	14,186	15,147	16,219	17,460	18,854	20,363	62,651	150,694
700 - Veterans Benefits and Services	46,675	51,512	53,801	56,161	60,317	59,863	59,345	63,407	64,981	66,973	69,063	281,654	605,423
OT	45,926	50,921	53,408	55,744	59,847	59,368	58,853	62,971	64,570	66,555	68,632	279,288	600,869
BA	22,512	23,466	24,215	25,015	25,788	26,597	27,441	28,328	29,233	30,175	31,166	125,081	271,424
OT	22,062	23,176	24,123	24,818	25,557	26,340	27,160	28,023	28,919	29,851	30,830	124,014	268,797
BA	24,163	28,046	29,586	31,146	34,529	33,266	31,904	35,079	35,748	36,798	37,897	156,573	333,999
OT	23,864	27,745	29,285	30,926	34,290	33,028	31,693	34,948	35,651	36,704	37,802	155,274	332,072
750 - Administration of Justice	30,577	32,431	32,545	35,330	36,420	37,466	38,543	39,665	40,822	42,021	43,284	174,192	378,527
OT	30,003	31,436	32,809	35,543	36,347	37,036	38,013	39,152	40,292	41,483	42,728	173,171	374,839
BA	29,987	31,287	32,209	33,180	34,131	35,130	36,159	37,231	38,334	39,477	40,680	165,937	357,818
OT	29,335	30,638	32,171	33,267	34,045	34,834	35,758	36,844	37,934	39,065	40,249	164,955	354,805
BA	0,590	1,144	0,336	2,150	2,289	2,336	2,384	2,434	2,488	2,544	2,604	8,255	20,709
OT	0,668	0,798	0,638	2,276	2,202	2,202	2,255	2,308	2,358	2,418	2,479	8,216	20,034
800 - General Government	16,307	16,496	16,651	17,082	17,560	18,068	18,609	18,791	19,377	19,968	20,599	85,857	183,201
OT	16,065	16,193	16,493	16,978	17,201	17,641	18,144	18,445	18,882	19,437	20,048	84,506	179,462
BA	14,028	14,622	15,091	15,599	16,084	16,590	17,126	17,676	18,249	18,836	19,459	77,986	169,332
OT	13,795	14,330	14,939	15,320	15,761	16,206	16,686	17,201	17,758	18,321	18,931	76,556	165,459
BA	2,279	1,874	1,560	1,483	1,476	1,478	1,483	1,115	1,128	1,132	1,140	7,871	13,869
OT	2,270	1,863	1,554	1,658	1,440	1,435	1,458	1,244	1,124	1,110	1,117	7,950	14,003

**CONFERENCE REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2002
BUDGET RESOLUTION TOTAL SPENDING AND REVENUES
(\$ billions)**

Function	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2002-06	2002-11
Total	2003.674	1990.203	2049.949	2129.714	2221.841	2286.679	2378.718	2472.687	2566.898	2668.427	2777.954	10678.386	23543.071
OT	1948.462	1951.945	2020.513	2103.122	2195.832	2255.976	2343.601	2439.456	2532.731	2633.511	2741.534	10527.388	23218.221
Discretionary a/	641.979	661.300	678.877	696.558	713.777	731.734	750.208	769.114	788.819	809.022	830.330	3482.246	7429.739
OT	647.088	682.776	707.084	725.949	746.329	761.752	777.511	799.616	819.686	840.153	861.470	3623.890	7722.326
Mandatory	1361.695	1328.903	1371.072	1433.157	1508.064	1554.945	1628.510	1703.573	1778.080	1859.405	1947.624	7196.140	16113.332
OT	1301.374	1269.169	1313.429	1377.174	1449.503	1494.224	1566.089	1639.840	1713.045	1793.359	1880.064	6903.498	15495.895
Total on-budget	1653.681	1626.488	1674.452	1739.937	1820.798	1873.245	1952.694	2033.133	2110.910	2195.318	2286.518	8734.920	19313.594
OT	1600.529	1590.474	1647.437	1715.571	1797.107	1844.952	1920.184	2002.896	2080.009	2163.180	2252.869	8595.541	19014.679
Discretionary	638.548	657.721	675.182	692.739	709.838	727.670	746.014	764.783	784.348	804.403	825.557	3463.150	7388.255
OT	643.717	679.251	703.429	722.186	742.448	757.748	773.379	795.349	815.281	835.602	856.768	3605.082	7681.441
Mandatory	1015.133	968.767	999.270	1047.199	1110.960	1145.575	1206.680	1268.350	1326.563	1390.915	1461.061	5271.770	11925.339
OT	956.812	911.223	944.008	993.386	1054.659	1087.204	1146.804	1207.547	1264.728	1327.579	1396.101	4990.479	11333.238
Revenues	2134.571	2170.510	2266.982	2368.984	2472.706	2550.525	2674.609	2802.180	2940.393	3100.084	3255.735	11829.707	26602.708
Revenues on-budget	1630.462	1638.202	1706.044	1780.310	1852.646	1901.304	1994.674	2089.726	2193.954	2318.055	2436.550	8878.506	19911.465
Surplus	186.109	218.565	246.469	265.862	276.874	294.549	331.008	362.724	407.662	466.573	514.201	1302.319	3384.487
On-budget	29.933	47.728	58.607	64.739	55.539	56.352	74.490	86.830	113.945	154.875	183.681	282.965	896.786
Off-budget	156.176	170.837	187.862	201.123	221.335	238.197	256.518	275.894	293.717	311.698	330.520	1019.354	2487.701
Debt Held by the Public	3243.211	3037.867	2810.731	2563.647	2303.144	2022.464	1702.918	1349.973	947.307	878.000	818.000		
Accumulated Excess Cash	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	392.678	843.560		

a/ Discretionary spending in this summary reflects the levels that will apply once new discretionary limits are enacted.

May 8, 2001

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H1981

ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

Section 301(g)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act requires that the joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on a budget resolution set forth the common economic assumptions upon which

the joint statement and conference report are based. The Conference Agreement is built upon the economic forecasts developed by the Congressional Budget Office and presented in CBO's "The Economic and Budget Outlook: Fiscal Years 2002-2011" (January 2001).

House Resolution.—CBO's economic assumptions were used.

Senate Amendment.—CBO's economic assumptions were used.

Conference Agreement.—CBO's economic assumptions were used.

FUNCTIONS AND REVENUES

Pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Budget Act, the budget resolution must set appropriate levels for each major functional category based on the 302(a) allocations and the budgetary totals.

The respective levels of the House resolution, the Senate amendment, and the Conference Agreement for each major budget function are discussed in the following section. The Conference Agreement provides aggregate discretionary spending in 2002 of \$661.3 billion in budget authority (BA) and \$682.8 billion in outlays.

These two aggregate numbers are allocated to the Appropriations Committees to be sub-allocated to their 13 individual appropriation subcommittees. For the purposes of presentation in this Conference Agreement, functional discretionary numbers are set at fiscal year 2002 Congressional Budget Office baseline estimates, and do not reflect any specific policy orientation except for the defense function, which assumes President Bush's budget authority request for fiscal year 2002. For years beyond 2002 this report assumes that the 2002 discretionary function levels grow by inflation.

The only specific discretionary policy decision inherent in this resolution is a \$661.3 billion discretionary budget authority allocation. The Appropriations Committees are responsible for allocating this budget authority to their subcommittees to address specific policy priorities.

FUNCTION 050: NATIONAL DEFENSE

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 050, National Defense, will total \$310.3 billion in BA and \$300.6 billion in outlays for 2001. This function includes funding for the Department of Defense (about 95 percent of the function), the defense activities of the Department of Energy (about 5 percent of the function), and other defense activities in other departments and agencies, including the Department of Transportation, the Department of Justice, the General Services Administration, and the Selective Service (less than 1% of the function).

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$324.6 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$319.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 4.6 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The function totals are \$1.71 trillion in BA and \$1.68 trillion in outlays over 5 years, and \$3.68 trillion in BA and \$3.61 trillion in outlays over 10 years. Funding in the resolution accommodates the President's proposal to increase military pay and other compensation by \$1.4 billion in 2002. The resolution also assumes an additional \$400 million to improve the quality of housing for military personnel and their families, and \$3.9 billion for the first year of expanded health benefits for over-65 military retirees (Tricare for Life). In addition, the resolution accommodates the President's proposed \$2.6-billion initiative (\$20 billion over 5 years) to fund research and development of new technologies. The Department of Defense intends to apply this funding to create new capabilities to defend against projected future threats, following a comprehensive review by the Secretary of Defense to assess national security needs. To potentially augment the levels in this function, the resolution creates two reserve funds that could accommodate additional defense spending: one, in fiscal year 2001, to eliminate Department of Defense shortfalls; and a second, in fiscal year 2002, for possible legislation pursuant to the President's defense review. See also section 1218A.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment provides \$334.5 billion in BA and \$326.8 billion in outlays in 2002, and \$3.69 trillion in

BA and \$3.62 trillion in outlays over 2002–2011. These amounts include full funding for the President's request, which for 2002 constitutes a \$14.3 billion increase in BA over 2001—a 4.6 percent nominal increase—and which in 2002 accommodates increases of \$1.4 billion in BA for military personnel pay and retention, \$0.4 billion for military housing, \$2.6 billion for research and development for missile defense and "transformation," and \$3.9 billion for the Tricare for Life program enacted in the 106th Congress. The President's request also incorporated reductions below inflated baseline levels for the Department of Energy defense activities (subfunction 053) and other defense-related activities in subfunction 054, amounting to approximately \$1 billion per year over 2002–2011.

The Senate amendment includes the President's proposal to make the Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund a mandatory program and to delay payments to certain beneficiaries pending the scientific findings of a study by the National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health.

The Senate amendment also encompasses increases directed by certain amendments adopted by the Senate for 2002. These include an amendment adding \$8.5 billion in BA and \$6.5 billion in outlays to redress serious and pressing Defense Health Program shortfalls (\$3.1 billion), unfunded Department of Energy non-proliferation and "Stockpile Stewardship" activities (\$900 million), and readiness shortages (\$4.5 billion). Another floor amendment added \$1.0 billion in additional BA and \$0.7 billion in outlays for the Department of Energy's Environmental Management program.

Conference Agreement.—For 2001, the Conferees adopted \$316.9 billion in BA and \$302.4 billion in outlays. This is an increase of \$6.5 billion in BA over previously enacted—appropriations for 2001. For 2002, the Conferees adopted \$324.8 billion in BA and \$319.1 billion in outlays. This is an increase of \$14.5 billion above levels enacted to date for 2001. For 2002–2011, the Conference Agreement totals \$3.65 trillion in BA and \$3.59 trillion in outlays.

Regarding discretionary spending, the Conferees adopted the House amendment with certain understandings and alterations. Among the understandings, the primary ones are to redress shortfalls in the National Defense budget function for 2001 and 2002 regarding the Defense Health Program, readiness, and certain Department of Energy defense activities. The key alteration is a revised mechanism to accommodate the as yet unspecified additional funding needed for the results of the President's Defense Review to adjust U.S. national security strategy and defense programs to the requirements twenty-first century.

To redress shortfalls in 2001, the Conferees have revised the Section 302(a) allocation up to the level of the statutory cap for 2001 to accommodate a 2001 supplemental for the Department of Defense totaling \$6.5 billion in BA and \$1.8 billion in outlays. The Conferees assume and urge in the strongest possible terms that this budget authority be used, in the amounts specified, exclusively for urgent shortfalls in the Defense Health Program (\$1.4 billion) and immediate readiness needs, including spare parts, training, depot and other maintenance, fuel and energy costs, and base operations (\$5.1 billion).

For discretionary spending in 2002, the Conferees adopted \$325.1 billion in BA and \$319.4 billion in outlays. These totals match the President's request as scored by CBO, together with the outlays estimated by CBO from the 2001 supplemental allocation described above. In addition, the Conferees adopted reserve funds, described more fully in the discussion of Title II, to accommodate

a Presidential budget amendment in response to the President's Defense Review.

The Conferees assume that, taken together, the National Defense budget as originally submitted by the President and the subsequent budget amendment will fully fund the "transformation" initiatives recommended by the President and the Secretary of Defense and all pre-existing priority national security programs in the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy. The Conferees are particularly concerned that the amended budget request fully address all shortfalls that have heretofore been identified for 2002, including those in the Defense Health Program (up to \$3.1 billion), activities where readiness has in recent years fallen below optimal levels (totaling several billions of dollars), and essential national security programs in the Department of Energy, including Stockpile Stewardship (\$800 million), non-proliferation activities (\$100 million), and Environmental Management programs (up to \$1 billion, which could occur in the fiscal year deemed most appropriate, 2001 or 2002). The Conferees agree that it is essential for the National Defense budget as amended, to fully fund each of these concerns respecting both shortfalls and "transformation."

Regarding mandatory spending, the Conferees adopted the Senate amendment concerning the Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund, revised to reflect more recent CBO scoring. This updated scoring amounts to \$172 million in 2002 and \$655 million for 2002–2011 with an offsetting reduction of expenses in the Energy Occupation Illness Compensation fund that brings net costs to \$146 million in 2002 and \$440 million for 2002–2011.

FUNCTION 150: INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 150, International Affairs, will total \$22.4 billion in BA and \$19.7 billion in outlays for 2001. This function includes funding for the operation of the foreign affairs establishment including embassies and other diplomatic missions abroad, foreign aid loan and technical assistance activities in developing countries, security assistance to foreign governments, activities of the Foreign Military Sales Trust Fund, U.S. contributions to international financial institutions and the United Nations, the Export-Import Bank and other trade promotion activities, and refugee assistance.

House Resolution.—The resolution fully funds the President's requested levels of \$23.9 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$19.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 6.4 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The function totals are \$123.8 billion in BA and \$102.0 billion in outlays over 5 years, and \$264.2 billion in BA and \$219.7 billion in outlays over 10 years. The levels fully fund the President's request and accommodate his proposal to increase the Administration of Foreign Affairs funding by \$888 million above the 2001 level, to a total of \$5.7 billion for fiscal year 2002, and his request to increase military assistance to Israel by \$60 million. In addition, to maintain and expand programs to stem the flow of cocaine and heroin from Colombia and its Andean neighbors, the budget assumes the President's \$624-million increase for international narcotics control and law enforcement. The resolution also assumes sufficient resources for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act [TFCA].

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment provides \$24.1 billion in BA and \$19.8 billion in outlays in 2002, and \$265.4 billion in BA and \$220.9 billion in outlays over 2002–2011. These amounts include full funding for the President's request, which for 2002 constitutes a \$1.5 billion increase in BA over

2001—a 6.7 percent nominal increase. The Senate amendment also reflects the Senate's adoption of a floor amendment to increase the President's request by \$200 million in BA in 2002 and by \$500 million in BA in 2003—with commensurate outlays—for the purpose of assisting the response of needy counties to the international HIV/AIDS pandemic. The Senate also adopted an amendment regarding conservation that affected several budget functions, including the addition of \$50 million in BA in every year over the 2002–2011 period in Function 150.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement totals \$23.2 billion in BA and \$19.1 billion in outlays for 2002. For 2002–2011, the Conference Agreement totals \$256.6 billion in BA and \$213.3 billion in outlays, a reduction of \$7.6 billion in BA below the request and the House resolution. The BA and outlays for International Affairs equal the amounts of CBO's inflated baseline for 2002–2011, plus the outlays needed in 2002 to address the payment of arrearages to the UN discussed below.

Regarding discretionary spending, the conferees strongly support Secretary of State Powell's proposals to reinvigorate the US foreign policy establishment and to expand some international programs. The Senate expressed this support in the form of expanding even further proposed programs to address the HIV/AIDS epidemic in regions, such as Africa.

Regarding the payment of arrearages to the United Nations, the conferees recognize that Congress has appropriated funds for the payment of arrears to the UN and related agencies in 1999 and 2000. Those funds have not been obligated because not all of the reforms required by authorizing statute have been met, in particular the requirement that the United States' assessment for contributions to international peacekeeping activities be reduced to no more than 25 percent of the total. Recognizing the substantial reforms that have been negotiated, the President has proposed legislation, not subject to PAYGO, that would release the funds for obligation. The legislative proposal would increase outlays by \$582 million in 2001 and \$244 million in 2002. This resolution accommodates the increased spending in its estimates of outlays from prior year's appropriations. The conferees direct that if the legislative proposal is included in authorizing legislation, the cost of such legislation up to the amounts included in the fiscal year 2001 and 2002 allocations of the appropriations committee shall not be charged against the allocation of the authorizing committee for purposes of enforcing this resolution.

FUNCTION 250: GENERAL SCIENCE, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 250, General Science, Space and Technology, will total \$21.0 billion in BA and \$19.7 billion in outlays for 2001. The General Science, Space and Technology function consists of funds in two major categories: general science and basic research, and space flight, research, and supporting activities. The general science component includes the budgets for the National Science Foundation [NSF], and the fundamental science programs of the Department of Energy [DOE]. The largest component of the function, nearly two thirds of the total, is for space flight, research, and supporting activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA] (except for NASA's air transportation programs, which are included in Function 400).

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$22.2 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$21.0 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 5.7 percent in BA

compared with fiscal year 2001. The function totals are \$115.9 billion in BA and \$112.4 billion in outlays over 5 years, and \$247.1 billion in BA and \$240.2 billion in outlays over 10 years. The resolution assumes \$4.5 billion for the National Science Foundation [NSF], a \$56-million increase from 2001. It assumes \$14.5 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration [NASA], a 2-percent increase over 2001. This total allows for the President's recommendations, including increased funds for International Space Station development and operations; a 64-percent increase over 2001 for NASA's Space Launch Initiative; six space shuttle flights a year; and continued funding for safety improvements in NASA.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth \$22.8 billion in BA and \$21.2 billion in outlays in 2002, and \$240.1 billion in BA and \$232.9 billion in outlays over 2002–2011. The total spending within Function 250 was amended by the following two amendments:

The Senate adopted an amendment that added \$1.441 billion in BA and \$530 million in outlays in 2002 to the function total proposed by President Bush. The amendment assumed an increase of \$674 million for NSF in 2002. The increase is intended to provide additional funding for NSF along a doubling path similar to that of the National Institutes of Health. NASA would also receive an increase of \$518 million, and DOE science would increase by \$469 million in 2002. The amendment would allow funding for all of the President's initiatives in Function 250, as well as address other needs within the scientific community. The total assumed increase above the 2001 appropriated level is \$1.661 billion.

The Senate also adopted an amendment related to global climate changes that affected several functional categories, including Function 150, 250, 270, 300, and 350. In this function, the amendment reflected an increase in BA of \$50 million each year for 10 years, for a total increase of \$500 million in BA from FY2002–2011.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement assumes \$21.6 billion in BA and \$20.7 billion in outlays in 2002, and \$236.3 billion in BA and \$230.6 billion in outlays over the 2002–2011 period.

FUNCTION 270: ENERGY

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 270 Energy, will total \$1.2 billion in BA and –\$0.1 billion in outlays for 2001. This Function includes civilian activities of the Department of Energy, the Rural Utilities Service, the power programs of the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). Mandatory spending in this function contains large levels of offsetting receipts, resulting in net mandatory spending of –\$1.9 billion in BA and –\$3.2 billion in outlays for 2001. Congress provided \$3.1 billion in discretionary BA for 2001.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$835 million in budget authority [BA] and –\$234 million in outlays in fiscal year 2002, a decrease of 33 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The 5-year function totals are \$4.4 billion in BA and –\$2.2 billion in outlays; and the 10-year totals are \$14.5 billion in BA and \$598 million in outlays. The resolution assumes the President's proposed \$1.4 billion over 10 years (a \$120-million increase) for the Department of Energy's Weatherization Assistance Program to help low-income families who live in poorly insulated housing or have insufficient heating or cooling systems. It also assumes a total of \$8 million to support the Northeast Heating Oil Reserve that was established because of low heating oil stocks. Finally, in

light of past management and security problems, the resolution accommodates the President's efforts to reform the Department of Energy.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth \$1.676 billion in BA and \$0.18 billion in outlays in 2002, and \$17.162 billion in BA and \$2.785 billion in outlays over the 2002–2011 period. The Senate amendment assumes the President's budget with the following Senate adopted amendments to discretionary spending: \$205 million in BA each year over the 2002–2011 period to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, \$450 million in BA in 2002 for Renewable Energy R&D, and \$150 million in BA in 2002 for Fossil Energy R&D. The Senate amendment does not assume the President's proposal for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR).

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement assumes \$1.36 billion in BA and –\$0.02 in outlays in 2002 and \$15.9 billion in BA and \$2.2 billion in outlays over the 2002–2011 period.

FUNCTION 300: NATURAL RESOURCES AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 300 Natural Resources and the Environment, will total \$28.8 billion in BA and \$26.4 billion in outlays for 2001. This Function includes funding for water resources, conservation and land management, recreation resources, and pollution control and abatement. Agencies with major program activities within the Function include the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Army Corps of Engineers, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the Forest Service (within the Department of Agriculture), and the Department of the Interior, including the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, among others.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$26.7 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$26.4 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, a decrease of 7.3 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The 5-year function totals are \$137.1 billion in BA and \$136.3 billion in outlays; and the 10-year totals are \$289.3 billion in BA and \$285.3 billion in outlays. The resolution accommodates the President's recommendation to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation [LWC] Fund at \$900 million starting in 2002, an increase of \$356 million over 2001. It also provides for an addition of \$440 million in 2002 as a down payment on eliminating the National Park Service's deferred maintenance backlog, currently pegged at \$4.9 billion. In addition, it assumes more than \$1 billion in EPA grants for States and tribes to administer environmental programs, and a total of \$3.7 billion in funding for the EPA's Operating Program, which comprises the agency's core regulatory, research, and enforcement activities. The resolution would support substantially reducing the backlog of school repairs and maintenance in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with the goal of eliminating the backlog within 5 years, and assumes increased funding for the Army Corps of Engineers program evaluating proposed development in wetlands. The resolution also accepts the administration's proposed extension of a user fee pilot program in the National Park Service, but does not include increase in Corps of Engineers recreation fees.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment sets forth \$29.6 billion in BA and \$29.3 billion in outlays in 2002, and \$296.4 billion in BA and \$292.3 billion in outlays over 2002–2011. The Senate amendment assumes the President's budget with the following Senate adopted amendments to discretionary spending: \$250 million in BA and \$199 million in

outlays in 2002 to fully fund the Conservation Spending Cap, \$44 million in BA in 2002 for water system improvements, \$1.3 billion in BA and outlays in 2002 for agriculture conservation programs, \$100 million in BA in 2002 to reduce greenhouse gases, \$800 million in BA in 2002 for wastewater infrastructure improvements, and \$100 million in BA in 2002 for the Bureau of Reclamation construction account.

The Senate amendment assumes mandatory spending of \$350 million in BA and outlays each year over the 2002–2011 period to address agricultural conservation needs.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement assumes \$30.4 billion in BA and \$28.7 billion in outlays in 2002, and \$345.7 billion in BA and \$336.8 billion in outlays over the 2002–2011 period. The Conference Agreement accepts the Senate position on the extension of the recreational fee demonstration program. The Conference Agreement assumes mandatory agriculture spending of \$350 million in BA and outlays in 2002. Section 213 establishes a reserve fund for agriculture that permits the chairman of the appropriate Committee on the Budget to adjust the Agriculture Committee's allocation to accommodate legislation providing, among other things, as much as \$350 billion for the period of 2003 through 2011 for conservation programs.

FUNCTION 350: AGRICULTURE

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 350 Agriculture, is estimated to total \$26.3 billion in budget authority (BA) and \$23.7 billion in outlays for FY 2001. This Function includes funding for federal programs intended to promote the economic stability of agriculture through direct assistance and loans to food and fiber producers; provide regulatory, inspection and reporting services for agricultural markets; and promote research as well as education in agriculture and nutrition.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$19.1 billion in budget authority [BA] in fiscal year 2002, and \$17.5 billion in outlays. The 5-year function totals are \$92.5 billion in BA and \$84.7 billion in outlays; and the 10-year totals are \$172.5 billion in BA and \$157.3 billion in outlays. The resolution accommodates the President's recommendations, including: support of United States Department of Agriculture [USDA] food safety activities, including providing 7,600 meat and poultry inspectors; allocation of conservation assistance to 650,000 landowners, farmers, and ranchers; maintaining funding for priority activities in the Forest Service's wildland fire management plan, including hazardous fuels reduction; re-directing USDA research to provide new emphasis in key areas such as biotechnology, the development of new agricultural products, and improved protection against emerging exotic plant and animal diseases as well as crop and animal pests; and expanding overseas markets for American agricultural products by strengthening USDA's market intelligence capabilities and the Department's expertise for resolving technical trade issues with foreign trading partners. The resolution contains two reserve funds that would accommodate additional agricultural needs: a fiscal year 2001 reserve fund that could be used for emergency Agricultural Market Transition payments; and a fiscal year 2002 reserve fund that could accommodate a reauthorization of the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act or additional emergency relief.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the 2001 spending levels. It increases BA and outlays by \$9 billion to \$35.3 and \$32.7 respectively. For 2002, the Senate assumes \$26.2 billion in BA and \$24.5 billion

in outlays. Over the ten-year period 2002–2011, the Senate assumes a total of \$227.9 billion in BA and \$212.8 billion in outlays. The Senate adopted mandatory amendments which increased CCC spending by \$9 billion in BA and outlays in 2001 and a total of \$55 billion in BA and outlays over the 2002–2011 period. The Senate adopted a discretionary amendment which added \$0.045 billion in BA and \$0.041 billion in outlays in 2002 and \$0.45 billion in BA and \$0.446 billion in outlays over the ten-year period 2002–2011.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the 2001 spending levels. It increases both BA and outlays by \$5.5 billion to \$31.8 billion and \$29.2 billion respectively. For 2002, the Conference Agreement assumes \$26.3 billion in BA and \$24.6 billion in outlays. Over the ten-year period 2002–2011, the agreement assumes a total of \$243.2 billion in BA and \$228.0 billion in outlays. The 2001 and 2002 levels assume \$12.5 billion of new mandatory BA and outlays. This money would be allocated to the Senate and House agriculture authorizing committees. It is assumed that the additional funds for 2001 and 2002 will address low income concerns in the agriculture sector today. For 2003 to 2011, the Conference Agreement assumes increased mandatory BA and outlays totaling \$63 billion to be made available for the extension and revision of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, which expires in 2002. Fiscal Year 2003 monies may be made available for 2002 crop year support. The money would be placed in a reserve fund for the authorizing committees. This function assumes the necessary funding for the modernization plan of USDA's National Animal Disease Center and National Veterinary Services Laboratory in Ames, IA.

FUNCTION 370: COMMERCE AND HOUSING CREDIT

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 370, Commerce and Housing Credit, will total about \$3.5 billion in BA and \$0.2 billion in outlays for 2001. Function 370 includes both on-budget and an off-budget (Postal Service) components, but the budget resolution text includes only the on-budget portion. Both on-budget and total spending are shown, however, in the summary tables contained in this Conference Agreement. This budget function includes funding for discretionary housing programs, such as subsidies for single and multifamily housing in rural areas and mortgage insurance provided by the Federal Housing Administration; off-budget net spending by the Postal Service; discretionary funding for commerce programs, such as international trade and exports, science and technology, the census, and small business; and mandatory spending for deposit insurance activities related to banks, savings and loans, and credit unions.

House Resolution.—For on-budget spending in this function, the resolution establishes levels of \$7.4 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$4.4 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 195 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The on-budget function totals are \$54.2 billion in BA and \$33.5 billion in outlays over 5 years, and \$128.1 billion in BA and \$84.3 billion in outlays over 10 years. The resolution assumes the President's recommendation that premiums for specified Federal Housing Administration [FHA] programs, such as condominiums, rehabilitation loans, and multifamily loans, are to be increased so that all single-family FHA borrowers pay the same premiums, and that the programs operate without the need for a subsidy.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment does not revise the levels for 2001. For 2002, the resolution provides \$7.7 billion in

BA and \$4.5 billion in outlays. Over 10 years, the resolution provides \$128.9 billion in BA and \$85.0 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment does not include the House's assumption of a reduction in fees charged by the Securities and Exchange Commission. Because of an amendment adopted by the Senate that dropped the President's proposal to charge exam fees for state-chartered banks, the Senate amendment is now comparable to the House resolution in this regard. Further, the Senate amendment reflects the Senate's adoption of an amendment to increase spending on the International Trade Administration by \$655 million over 2002–2011 and of another amendment to restore \$264 million in funding in 2002 for programs of the Small Business Administration to offset cuts that had been proposed in the President's budget.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement does not revise the fiscal year 2001 levels. For 2002, the resolution provides \$10.2 billion in BA and \$6.6 billion in outlays. Over 10 years, it provides \$152.4 billion in BA and \$108.1 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 400: TRANSPORTATION

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 400, Transportation, will total \$62.1 billion in BA and \$51.7 billion in outlays for 2001. The function primarily comprises funding for the Department of Transportation, including ground transportation programs, such as the federal-aid highway program, mass transit, motor carrier safety, and the National Rail Passenger Corporation (Amtrak); air transportation through the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airport improvement program, facilities and equipment program, research, and operation of the air traffic control system; water transportation through the Coast Guard and Maritime Administration; the Surface Transportation Board; the National Transportation Safety Board; and related transportation safety and support activities within the Department of Transportation. In addition, funds for air transportation programs under the auspices of NASA are included within this function.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$61.0 billion in BA and \$55.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002; \$298.9 billion in BA and \$299.8 billion in outlays over 5 years; and \$608.1 billion in BA and \$639.6 billion in outlays over 10 years. The resolution accommodates the President's proposal to fully fund the authorized levels provided for highways (\$32.3 billion) and transit (\$6.7 billion) under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century and for the Federal Aviation Administration's operating (\$6.9 billion), capital (\$2.9 billion), and airport grants (\$3.3 billion) programs under the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century. To assist Americans with disabilities in overcoming transportation barriers to work, the resolution assumes the President's \$145-million proposal to fund two new programs under his New Freedom Initiative to increase the ability of individuals with disabilities to integrate into the workforce. The resolution also assumes an increase in Coast Guard operating expenses of \$250 million above the fiscal year 2002 level recommended by the President for fiscal year 2002 and subsequent years. This increase is provided to eliminate Coast Guard vessel and aircraft spare parts problems, to improve personnel training, to fund new Department of Defense entitlements, and to operate drug interdiction assets at optimal levels. (The resolution acknowledged that the Office of Management and Budget's budget submission contained recently identified errors, and indicated conferees would seek to address them.)

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment does not revise the 2001 levels. For 2002,

the resolution provides \$62.2 billion in BA and \$56.1 billion in outlays. Over 10 years, the resolution provides \$701.6 billion in BA and \$645.8 billion in outlays. The Senate amendment assumes the President's budget plus a Senate adopted amendment to add \$250 million in BA and outlays for the Coast Guard in 2002.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement does not revise the 2001 levels. For 2002, the resolution provides \$65.0 billion in BA and \$56.2 billion in outlays. Over 10 years, it provides \$694.8 billion in BA and \$655.6 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 450: COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 450, Community and Regional Development, will total \$11.2 billion in BA and \$11.4 billion in outlays for 2001. This function reflects programs that provide Federal funding for economic and community development in both urban and rural areas. Funding for disaster relief and insurance—including activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency—also is provided in this function.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$10.1 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$11.4 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, a decrease of 9.8 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The 5-year totals are \$53.2 billion in BA and \$53.7 billion in outlays; and the 10-year totals are \$113.9 billion in BA and \$108.8 billion in outlays. Consistent with the President's recommendations, the budget assumes continuation of Community Development Block Grant [CDBG] formula funding at the 2001 level. It also assumes that the Rural Housing and Economic Development Program, begun in 1999, will be terminated due to its duplication of other programs, such as CDBGs.

Senate Amendment.—For 2002, the Senate amendment sets forth \$11.2 billion in BA and \$11.6 billion in outlays. Over the 2002–2011 ten year period, it assumes \$115.0 billion in BA and \$108.0 billion in outlays. The Senate adopted an amendment to increase by \$108 million Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funds in 2002. Also adopted was an amendment to increase clean water grants by \$1.0 billion in 2002.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement does not revise the fiscal year 2001 levels. For 2002, it sets forth \$11.9 billion in BA and \$11.7 billion in outlays. Over the 2002–2011 ten year period, it sets forth \$130.7 billion in BA and \$122.8 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 500: EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL SERVICES

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 500, Education, Training, Employment and Social Services, will total \$76.9 billion in BA and \$69.8 billion in outlays for 2001. This function includes funding for elementary and secondary, vocational, and higher education; education research and other education activities; job training and employment services; aging services; children and families services; adoption and foster care assistance; and funding for the arts and humanities.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$82.1 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$76.2 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 6.8 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The 5-year function totals are \$425.6 billion in BA and \$412.7 billion in outlays; and the 10-year totals are \$917.7 billion in BA and \$891.7 billion in outlays.

The resolution assumes the President's proposal to redirect the \$1.2 billion provided for school renovation, first funded in 2001, allowing States to reallocate the 2001 funds among school renovation, technology, or spe-

cial education. For 2002, the budget assumes States can use this funding stream for priorities such as special education, help for low-performing schools, or accountability reforms.

The resolution also accommodates the President's proposed increase in program spending of the Department of Education by \$4.6 billion, or 11.5 percent, in fiscal year 2002. It provides sufficient funding in elementary and secondary education for the President's "No Child Left Behind" education reform plan. Key initiatives include the following:

—A tripling of reading education funds, to \$900 million in 2002, and a total increase in reading education spending of \$5 billion over 5 years.

—The provision of \$2.6 billion for States to improve teacher quality through high-quality professional development, recruitment and retention activities.

—A total of \$320 million to help States to develop annual assessments of students, and to establish strong accountability systems; and \$69 million to expand State participation in the National Assessment of Education Progress, so that parents, teachers and policymakers can ensure that students are improving.

—Consolidation and streamlining of existing Federal elementary and secondary education programs.

The resolution also assumes the following recommendations by the President: an increase of \$137 million for the Impact Aid construction program, which currently receives only \$12.8 million; consolidation and increased funding for teacher training and recruiting; a sum of \$175 million to help charter schools acquire, construct, or renovate facilities; an increase for "character education" from \$9.3 million to \$25 million; an increase for the Troops to Teachers program to \$30 million; an expansion of the teacher student loan forgiveness program by increasing the loan forgiveness limit from \$5,000 to \$17,500 for math and science majors who teach those subjects in high-need schools for 5 years.

To provide fiscal assistance to low-income college students, the budget accommodates the President's proposal to increase the Pell Grant program by \$1 billion. This will increase the maximum award for all qualifying students to \$3,850.

The budget also assumes an increase of 6.4 percent in funding for historically black colleges and graduate institutions, and Hispanic serving institutions, with a goal of increasing these programs 30 percent by 2005. The resolution also accommodates the President's proposed expansion of programs to protect abused and neglected children under the Safe and Stable Families Act, and provision of education or training vouchers to children aging out of foster care.

The resolution creates a \$1.25-billion reserve fund for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act [IDEA] Part B grants to States.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate Amendment does not revise the 2001 levels. For 2002, the Senate provides \$111.9 billion in BA and \$79.4 billion in outlays. Over the ten-year period 2002–2011, the Senate provides a total of \$1,265.4 billion in BA, and \$1,194.1 billion in outlays.

The Senate adopted the following amendments to the President's budget:

—For unspecified education funding, an amendment adding \$8.3 billion in discretionary BA and \$1.0 billion in outlays in 2002, and adding \$242.0 billion in mandatory BA and \$223.6 billion in outlays over the period 2003–2011.

—For IDEA (special education), an amendment adding \$70.0 billion in mandatory BA

and \$70.0 billion in outlays over the ten-year period 2002–2011.

—For the Social Services Block Grant, an amendment adding \$680 million in mandatory BA and outlays in 2002.

—For education technology, an amendment adding \$628 million in discretionary BA and \$35 million in outlays in 2002.

—For Impact Aid, an amendment adding \$300 million in discretionary BA and \$150 million in outlays in 2002.

—For children's services, an amendment adding \$271 million in discretionary BA and \$243 million in outlays in 2002.

—For American history education, an amendment adding \$100 million in discretionary BA and \$25 million in outlays in 2002.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises 2001 levels to \$77.0 billion in BA and \$69.9 billion in outlays. For 2002, the Conference Agreement provides \$81.2 billion in BA and \$76.7 billion in outlays. Over the ten-year period 2002–2011, the Conference Agreement provides a total of \$904.0 billion in BA and \$887.6 billion in outlays. The Conference assumes that within these aggregate numbers, the Grants to States program under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) will receive funds of at least \$7.59 billion in 2002, and that further additional resources for education should be focused on this program.

FUNCTION 550: HEALTH

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 550, Health, will total \$180.1 billion in BA and \$173.0 billion in outlays for 2001. The major programs in this function include Medicaid, the State Children's Health Insurance Program, health benefits for federal workers and retirees, the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, the Health Resources Services Administration, Indian Health Services, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$204.0 billion in BA and \$201.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 13.3 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The function totals are \$1.20 trillion in BA and \$1.19 trillion in outlays over 5 years, and \$2.86 trillion in BA and \$2.84 trillion in outlays over 10 years. Funding in the resolution accommodates the President's proposal to double the National Institutes of Health [NIH] 1998 funding level of \$13.6 billion by 2003. To accomplish this, the 2002 budget assumes \$23.1 billion for NIH, a \$2.8 billion increase above the 2001 level. To strengthen the health care safety net, the budget assumes the President's \$124-million increase for community health centers. The budget also assumes \$8.3 billion over 10 years for the enactment of H.R. 600, the Family Opportunity Act of 2001. Under the Act, States would have the option to expand Medicaid coverage for children with special needs, allowing families of disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the Medicaid program for such children.

Finally, Function 550 assumes \$43.1 billion (fiscal years 2002–2005) of the President's proposed Medicare reform, including the Immediate Helping Hand Prescription Drug Plan. (The costs for fiscal years 2006 through 2011 are reflected in Function 570.) The resolution also assumes the outlay effect of the President's proposed refundable health care tax credits, and the impact of the extension of an OBRA 1990 provision limiting Department of Veterans Affairs [VA] pensions for Medicaid recipients in nursing homes.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises 2001 BA and outlays by \$2.5 billion for the President's Immediate Helping

Hand prescription drug program for seniors. The amendment sets forth \$216.1 billion in BA and \$213.2 billion in outlays in 2002, and \$2,938.3 billion in BA and \$2,914.4 billion in outlays over 2002-2011.

The Senate amendment as introduced assumed the President's budget for both mandatory and discretionary spending. The following provisions were added through floor amendments. For mandatory spending, an additional \$28 billion was added over 2002-2004 for health spending for the uninsured. A reserve fund of \$200 million in 2002 and \$7.9 billion over 10 years was included for the Family Opportunity Act. In discretionary spending, an additional \$700 million was assumed for NIH spending in 2002. The Indian Health Service was increased by \$67.3 billion over 10 years. Budget authority for the FDA was increased by \$40 million in 2002 and \$400 million over 10 years. Amendments were adopted to increase funding for graduate medical education at children's hospitals by \$50 million in 2002 and to provide an additional \$136 million in 2002 for both graduate medical education and consolidated health centers.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement does not revise the 2001 levels. For 2002, the resolution provides \$198.8 billion in BA and \$196.7 billion in outlays. Over 10 years, it provides \$2,773.8 billion in BA and \$2,757.1 billion in outlays.

Under the Conference Agreement, funding for the President's Immediate Helping Hand prescription drug proposal (\$43.1 billion over 2002-2005 plus an additional \$2.5 billion in 2001) was moved to Function 570 (Medicare). The Conference Agreement includes a reserve fund for the Family Opportunity Act of \$227 million in 2002 and \$8.3 billion over 10 years. The function totals also include a reserve fund of \$28 billion over 3 years for additional health spending for the uninsured. This reserve fund can be used for either direct spending or revenue changes associated with legislation to improve health insurance coverage. The Conference Agreement also assumes Medicaid Upper Payment Limit savings of \$11.7 billion over 10 years.

FUNCTION 570: MEDICARE

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 570, Medicare, will total \$217.5 billion in BA and \$217.7 billion in outlays for 2001. Medicare provides health insurance coverage for persons over age 65 and qualified disabled workers.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$229.1 billion in budget authority [BA] and outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 5.3 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The function totals are \$1.34 trillion in BA and \$1.33 trillion in outlays over 5 years, and \$3.31 trillion in BA and outlays over 10 years. As proposed in the President's budget, the budget resolution assumes \$153 billion over 10 years for Medicare Reform, including the Immediate Helping Hand Prescription Drug Plan. This total is shared by Function 550 and Function 570; Function 570 incorporates \$109.9 billion of the total over 10 years. The budget is consistent with the provisions of the Social Security and Medicare Lock-Box Act of 2001, which stipulates that the Medicare Hospital Insurance [HI] surplus can be used only for debt reduction or Medicare reform. The resolution establishes a reserve fund that could be used to accommodate an expanded Medicare reform/prescription drug proposal. It also establishes a general purpose reserve fund that could address Medicare initiatives.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment does not revise 2001 levels. For 2002, the amendment provides \$229.1 billion in BA and outlays. Over 10 years, the amendment provides \$3,308.0 billion in BA and \$3,307.6 billion

in outlays for this function, the same as the House resolution.

The Senate amendment as introduced assumed the President's budget for both mandatory and discretionary spending. The following provisions were added through floor amendments. A reserve fund was adopted that allows for additional spending for Medicare reform and prescription drugs that goes beyond the \$153 billion over 10 years already included in the functional totals and budget aggregates. (This amount includes \$43.1 billion in Function 550 and \$109.9 billion in Function 570.) The amount allocated from the reserve fund will be determined by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee using a Congressional Budget Office cost estimate of the President's Medicare reform proposal or a comparable proposal submitted by the Committee on Finance. In no case will the amount exceed \$300 billion over 10 years (including the \$153 already reflected in the budget totals). The Senate amendment also includes a reserve fund of \$13.7 billion over 10 years for additional Medicare home health spending.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement does not revise 2001 levels. For 2002, the resolution provides \$229.2 billion in BA and \$229.1 billion in outlays. Over 10 years, the resolution provides \$3,516.1 billion in BA and \$3,515.7 billion in outlays for this function. The Conference Agreement includes a reserve fund of up to \$300 billion for Medicare reform and a prescription drug benefit. The amount allocated from the reserve fund will be determined by the Chairmen of the Budget Committees of the House and Senate. The resolution also includes a reserve fund of \$13.7 billion over 10 years for additional Medicare home health spending. This reserve fund is to be used to finance the repeal of the 15% reduction in Medicare home health payments, currently scheduled to take effect on October 1, 2002.

FUNCTION 600: INCOME SECURITY

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 600, Income Security, will total \$255.9 billion in BA and \$256.9 billion in outlays for 2001. This function contains: (1) major cash and in-kind means-tested entitlements; (2) general retirement, disability, and pension programs excluding Social Security and Veterans' compensation programs; (3) federal and military retirement programs; (4) unemployment compensation; (5) low-income housing programs; and (6) other low-income support programs. This last category includes Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Security Income (SSI), and spending for the refundable portion of the Earned Income Credit (EIC).

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$271.5 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$272.1 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 6.1 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The function totals are \$1.47 trillion in BA and outlays over 5 years, and \$3.21 trillion in BA and \$3.20 trillion in outlays over 10 years. Consistent with the President's budget, the resolution accommodates continued State innovation, and the mobilization of private-sector, corporate, and faith-based sources, for addressing the needs of low-income Americans—a process that began with the historic 1996 welfare reform law. In particular, the budget proposes a number of initiatives to encourage more charitable giving to community organizations that are effectively helping disadvantaged Americans to improve their lives and increase their families' well-being. Other initiatives are intended to strengthen low-income families and to address the needs of children caught in the Nation's foster care system. The budget pro-

vides sufficient funding to renew all expiring public housing contracts, and adds funding for 34,000 new section 8 vouchers. Additionally, the budget provides new funding to increase home-ownership among low-income families. Beyond these priorities, the focus in fiscal year 2002 will be to improve management of HUD's programs, several of which have been designated among the General Accounting Office's "High Risk" programs, vulnerable to substantial amounts of fraud and mismanagement.

Other assumptions of the resolution are the following:

—Providing \$1.4 billion for Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program [LIHEAP] funding to help low-income families heat their homes.

—Funding the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children [WIC] at 7.25 million individuals per month, maintaining current program level.

—Maintaining current law policies for the Food Stamp Program, which will result in \$20 billion in outlays for benefits and program administration in fiscal year 2002.

The resolution also accommodates the outlay effects related to the President's refundable tax proposals.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment does not revise 2001 levels. For 2002, the resolution provides \$278.8 billion in BA and \$274.9 billion in outlays. Over 10 years, the resolution provides \$3,210.0 billion in BA and \$3,194.5 billion in outlays. The Senate adopted three amendments to the President's budget. In mandatory funds for 2002, the Senate amendment includes \$319 million to extend TANF supplemental grants. In discretionary funds for 2002, the Senate amendment includes an additional \$2.6 billion for Low Income Home Energy Assistance and \$870 million for child care. The remaining difference between the House resolution and the Senate amendment is due to the Senate's treatment of advance appropriations and the greater amount of BA and outlays provided in the House resolution for the refundable portion of tax credits.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement does not revise 2001 levels. For 2002, the resolution provides \$273.8 billion in BA and \$272.1 billion in outlays. Over 10 years, it provides \$3,222.5 billion in BA and \$3,206.7 billion in outlays. The Conference Agreement adopts the Senate amendment regarding TANF supplemental grants.

FUNCTION 650: SOCIAL SECURITY

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 650, Social Security, will total \$435.2 billion in BA and \$433.1 billion in outlays for 2001. This function includes Social Security benefits and administrative expenses. Under provisions of the Budget Enforcement Act, Social Security trust funds are off-budget. The figures below reflect the on-budget portions of this function, primarily payments from the general fund to the trust funds to credit the trust funds for income taxes collected on Social Security benefits. Both on-budget and off-budget spending are shown, however, in the summary tables contained in the statement of managers accompanying the Conference Agreement.

House Resolution.—For on-budget spending in this function, the resolution establishes levels of \$11.0 billion in budget authority [BA] and outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 12.2 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The on-budget function totals are \$62.8 billion in BA and \$62.7 billion in outlays over 5 years, and \$150.9 billion in BA and outlays over 10 years. The resolution supports the President's approach to Social Security reform through the following specific measures:

—It assumes provisions of the Social Security and Medicare Lock-Box Act of 2001 (H.R. 2), recently passed by the House, which prohibits using Social Security surpluses for any purpose other than debt reduction or Social Security reform.

—It assumes the President's proposal to provide \$7.7 billion for the SSA, an increase of \$456 million, or 6.3 percent, above fiscal year 2001. The increase will allow SSA to process 100,000 more initial disability claims in 2002 than in 2001.

—It makes no changes in current Social Security benefits or taxes.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment does not revise 2001 on-budget totals of \$9.8 billion in BA and outlays. For 2002, the resolution assumes \$10.9 billion in both BA and outlays. Over 10 years, the resolution provides \$140.0 billion in both BA and outlays.

The President's budget assumes no changes to Social Security benefits. Indirectly, however, the tax cut proposal would decrease both on-budget spending and the trust fund surplus. The President's tax proposal would reduce marginal income rates, thereby decreasing the amount of income taxes paid on Social Security benefits. This reduces on-budget payments from the general fund to the trust funds to credit the trust funds for income taxes paid on Social Security benefits by \$11 billion over 10 years. The difference between the House resolution and the Senate amendment is that the House holds the Social Security trust funds harmless for the impact of the tax cut.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement does not revise 2001 on-budget totals. The Senate recedes to the House and agrees to hold the trust funds harmless for the impact of any tax cuts resulting from this agreement. For 2002, the Conference Agreement assumes \$11.0 billion in both BA and outlays. Over 10 years, it provides \$150.9 billion in BA and \$150.9 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 700: VETERANS BENEFITS AND SERVICES

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 700 Veterans Benefits and Services, will total \$46.7 billion in BA and \$45.9 billion in outlays for 2001. This budget function includes income security needs of disabled veterans, indigent veterans, and survivors of deceased veterans through compensation benefits, pensions, and life insurance programs. Major education, training, and rehabilitation and readjustment programs include the Montgomery GI Bill, the Veterans Educational Assistance program, and the Vocational Rehabilitation and Counseling program. Veterans can also receive guarantees on home loans. Roughly half of all spending in this function is for the Veterans Health Administration, which is comprised of hospitals, nursing homes, domiciliarys, and outpatient clinics.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$52.3 billion in BA and \$51.6 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 12 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The function totals are \$278.7 billion in BA and \$276.5 in outlays over 5 years, and \$594.0 billion in BA and \$589.8 billion in outlays over 10 years.

The budget assumes the enactment of veterans' burial benefits enhancements in H.R. 801, the Veterans' Opportunity Act of 2001. It also assumes increases in mandatory spending for Montgomery GI Bill education benefits improvements. The budget assumes the permanent extension of several expiring provisions of existing law pertaining to veterans benefits. These include IRS income verification for means-tested veterans and survivor benefits; limiting VA pension to Medicaid recipients in nursing homes; and continuing current housing loan fees.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment assumes \$53.8 billion in BA and \$53.1 billion in outlays in 2002, and \$600.6 billion in BA and \$596.2 billion in outlays over 2002–2011. The Senate adopted two amendments to increase funding for Veterans Medical Care. The first amendment added \$1.718 billion in BA each year from 2002 to 2011 and the second amendment added, \$967 million in BA for 2002.

Conference Agreement.—For 2002, it sets forth \$51.5 billion in BA and \$50.9 billion in outlays. Over 10 years, it provides \$605.4 billion in BA and \$600.9 billion in outlays.

The agreement also assumes an increase in funding in mandatory spending for improvements to the Montgomery GI Bill and veterans burial benefits. The agreement also assumes an extension of several expiring provisions of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990.

FUNCTION 750: ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 750, Administration of Justice, will total \$30.6 billion in BA and \$30.0 billion in outlays for 2001. This function provides funding for federal law enforcement activities. These activities include criminal investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Drug Enforcement Administration, and border enforcement and the control of illegal immigration by the Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Also funded through this function are the federal courts, federal prison operation and construction, and criminal justice assistance.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$30.9 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$30.3 billion in outlays in 2002, an increase of 1.0 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The function totals are \$166.6 billion in BA and \$166.5 billion in outlays over 5 years, and \$359.3 billion in BA and \$356.8 billion in outlays over 10 years. The resolution accommodates the President's proposals to increase funding for the Drug Enforcement Agency by 9 percent; the Federal Bureau of Investigation by 8 percent; the Federal Bureau of Prisons by 8 percent; the U.S. Attorneys by 7 percent; and to hire and train 550 new Border Control agents.

Senate Amendment.—For 2002, the resolution sets forth \$32.4 billion in BA and \$31.8 billion in outlays. Over the 2002–2011 ten year period, it sets forth \$360.8 billion in BA and \$358.3 billion in outlays. These levels reflect adoption of an amendment to increase Department of Justice state and local law enforcement assistance grant programs by \$1.5 billion in 2002.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement sets forth \$32.4 billion in BA and \$31.4 billion in outlays for 2002. Over the 2002–2011, the agreement sets forth \$378.5 billion in BA and \$374.8 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 800: GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 800 General Government, will total \$16.3 billion in BA and \$16.1 billion in outlays for 2001. This function consists of the activities of the Legislative Branch, the Executive Office of the President, U.S. Treasury fiscal operations (including the Internal Revenue Service), personnel and property management, and general purpose fiscal assistance to states, localities, and U.S. territories.

House Resolution.—The resolution establishes levels of \$16.7 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$16.3 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002, an increase of 2.2 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001. The function totals are \$84.2 billion in BA and \$83.0 billion in outlays over 5 years, and \$176.7 billion in BA and \$173.4 billion in outlays over 10 years.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment does not revise the 2001 levels. For 2002,

the resolution assumes \$16.6 billion in BA and \$16.3 outlays. Over 10 years, the resolution provides \$176.7 billion in BA and \$173.4 billion in outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement does not revise the 2001 levels. For 2002, the Conference Agreement assumes \$16.5 billion in both BA and \$16.2 billion outlays. Over 10 years, it provides \$183.2 billion in BA and \$179.5 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 900: NET INTEREST

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, on-budget spending for Function 900, Net Interest, will total \$254.8 billion in BA and outlays for 2002. Net interest is the interest paid for the federal government's borrowing minus the interest income received by the federal government. Net interest includes both on-budget and off-budget components, but the budget resolution text includes only the on-budget portion. Both on-budget and total interest spending are shown, however, in the summary tables contained in the statement of managers accompanying the Conference Agreement. Interest is a mandatory payment, with no discretionary component.

House Resolution.—The accounting of net interest in the budget includes only the on-budget component of interest spending. This spending declines at a relatively steady but moderate pace from \$274 billion in 2001 to \$219 billion in 2011. But even this decline understates—by significant amounts—the benefits to taxpayers of the debt reduction incorporated in this budget. When off-budget interest is taken into account (the increasing Federal credit accruing to the Social Security Trust Fund surplus in the form of government IOUs, and entered as negative spending), the overall net interest spending of the Federal Government is being virtually eliminated. It declines from \$205 billion in 2001 to just \$21 billion, in 2011.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the 2001 on-budget levels to \$275.5 billion in BA and outlays. For 2002, it sets forth on-budget levels of \$262.1 billion in BA and outlays. Over ten years, it provides on-budget amounts of \$2,410.0 billion in BA and outlays.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the 2001 on-budget levels to \$275.5 billion in BA and outlays. For 2002, it sets forth on-budget levels of \$262.1 billion in BA and outlays. Over ten years, it provides on-budget amounts of \$2,410.0 billion in BA and outlays.

FUNCTION 920: ALLOWANCES

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, spending for Function 920, Allowances, will total –\$0.5 billion in BA and –\$0.3 billion in outlays for 2001. This function usually displays the budgetary effects of proposals that cannot be easily distributed across other budget functions. In the case of 2001, it reflects the 0.22% across-the-board cut that was enacted in the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001. CBO could not display those cuts by account and by function until the Administration could display how the cuts would be implemented in the release of the full President's budget request.

In past years, Function 920 has also included total savings or costs from proposals associated with emergency spending or proposals contingent on possible future events that have uncertain chances of occurring. Most recently, in the Senate amendment and Conference Agreement on budget resolutions for both 2001 and 2002, the figures expressed in the budget resolution text (as well as the summary tables) for all other budget functions reflect the total level of discretionary spending contemplated by the budget resolution (e.g., as described in section 203 of the

Conference Agreement on the 2002 budget). These levels are higher than the statutory cap on discretionary spending in place for those years. But because a budget resolution would be out of order in the Senate if it contains a level of discretionary spending higher than the statutory cap, the figures in the budget resolution text in Function 920 have had to reflect a negative entry that reduces the net level of discretionary spending from the contemplated level (as aggregated across all other budget functions) to the statutory level. The summary tables, however, omit this negative entry for Function 920 so that their aggregates reflect the levels ultimately intended by the resolution.

House Resolution.—For discretionary spending, the budget resolution calls for \$5.0 billion in budget authority [BA] and \$1.8 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2002. The 5-year spending totals are \$29.1 billion in BA and \$22.4 billion in outlays; and the 10-year totals are \$64.0 billion in BA and \$55.5 billion in outlays. There is no mandatory spending in this function.

The funds identified constitute primarily a set-aside fund for unanticipated emergency needs during the fiscal year.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the 2001 levels to \$80.5 billion in BA and \$80.7 billion in outlays in 2001, reflecting the Senate's adoption of an amendment to further increase a tax refund for that year. For 2002, the resolution sets forth -\$6.1 billion in BA and -\$8.6 billion in outlays. The resolution provides -\$15.9 billion in BA and -\$23.1 billion in outlays over 2002-2010. These figures (as shown in the summary tables) reflect the effect of 13 amendments adopted by the Senate that sought to suggest an increase in spending in other functions and that appeared to "offset" such increased spending by bookkeeping the same amount with a negative value in Function 920. These figures do not include the entry necessary to reduce the overall discretionary level to the statutory cap.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement revises the 2001 levels to \$84.5 billion in BA and \$84.7 billion in outlays. For 2002, the resolution provides -\$6.0 billion in BA and -\$3.7 billion in outlays. Over 10 years, it provides -\$66.8 billion in BA and -\$62.6 billion in outlays.

FUNCTION 950: UNDISTRIBUTED OFFSETTING RECEIPTS

Major Programs in Function.—Under current law, receipts in Function 950, Undistributed Offsetting Receipts, will total about \$46.2 billion (negative BA and outlays) for 2001. Function 950 includes both on-budget and off-budget components, but the budget resolution text includes only the on-budget portion. Both on-budget and total receipts are shown, however, in the summary tables contained in this Conference Agreement. This function records offsetting receipts (receipts, not federal revenues or taxes, that the budget shows as offsets to spending programs) that are too large to record in other budget functions. Such receipts are either intrabudgetary (a payment from one federal agency to another, such as agency payments to the retirement trust funds) or proprietary (a payment from the public for some type of business transaction with the government). The main types of receipts recorded as "undistributed" in this function are: the payments federal agencies make to retirement trust funds for their employees, payments made by companies for the right to explore and produce oil and gas on the Outer Continental Shelf, and payments by those who bid for the right to buy or use the public property or resources, such as the electromagnetic spectrum.

House Resolution.—The resolution calls for -\$42.3 billion in budget authority [BA] and outlays in fiscal year 2002, a decrease of 10.6 percent in BA compared with fiscal year 2001, (or an increase of 10.6 percent in receipts compared with fiscal year 2001). The 5-year function totals are -\$239.8 billion in BA and outlays; and the 10-year totals are -\$492.3 billion in BA and outlays.

These totals comprise entirely of mandatory spending. There is no discretionary spending in this function.

The resolution does not assume lease bonuses from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or an analog spectrum license fee or other spectrum offsets. It also assumes permanent extension of the Balanced Budget Act [BBEDCA] provision that increased, by 1.51 percentage points, Federal agency contributions to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Trust Fund [CSRDF] on behalf of their CSRS-participant employees. That provision had been scheduled to sunset after fiscal year 2002.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment does not revise the 2001 levels. For 2002, the resolution provides -\$38.8 billion in BA and outlays. Over 10 years, the resolution provides -\$495.7 billion in BA and outlays. The Senate amendment is the same as the House resolution, except that it reflects both the President's proposals to delay certain spectrum auctions and to impose a fee on broadcasters using spectrum channels for analog broadcasts to encourage the transition to digital television.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement does not revise the 2001 levels. For 2002, the resolution provides -\$38.8 billion in BA and outlays. Over 10 years, it provides -\$494.1 billion in BA and outlays. The conferees agree to the President's proposal to delay certain spectrum auctions that was assumed in the Senate amendment, but do not agree to the President's proposal for an analog lease fee.

REVENUES

Federal revenues are taxes and other collections from the public that result from the government's sovereign or governmental powers. Federal revenues include individual income taxes, corporate income taxes, social insurance taxes, excise taxes, estate and gift taxes, custom duties and miscellaneous receipts (which include deposits of earnings by the Federal Reserve System, fines, penalties, fees for regulatory services, and others).

Under current law, federal tax collections are projected to total \$28 trillion over the next ten years. This year, total revenues are projected to equal 20.7 percent of GDP, slightly below the World War II record level of 20.9 percent. Over the projection period 2002-2011, under current law, total revenues are projected to average 20.3 percent of GDP, far above historical averages for any time period, including times of war.

House Resolution.—The House resolution provides for \$1.62 trillion in tax reduction over the next 10 years. This level would accommodate the President's priority tax cut proposals: reducing marginal tax rates, doubling the per-child tax credit; providing relief from the marriage penalty, and providing death tax relief. It also provides for additional tax reduction, subject to the discretion of the Committee on Ways and Means. Such measures might include charitable deduction expansion; refundable tax credits for private health insurance; Education Savings Account expansion and other education provisions; Individual Retirement Account [IRA] increases and other pension reform; and permanent extension of the research and development [R&D] tax credit.

(The refundable elements of the President's tax proposals, which are treated as spending, appear in the functional areas to which they apply.) It also assumes, but does not reconcile, the revenue effect of a proposed reduction in fees levied by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and a requirement that the Federal Reserve pay interest on deposits at the Reserve. The resolution also establishes a reserve fund for further tax reduction should the Congressional Budget Office's summer update indicate additional non-Social Security surpluses. The reserve fund could allow for measures such as extension of Medical Savings Accounts, repeal of transportation deficit reduction fuel taxes, and reduction of the capital gains rate.

Senate Amendment.—The Senate amendment revises the 2001 on-budget revenue level to \$1,630.3 billion. It sets forth on-budget revenues of \$1,644.8 billion in 2002, and \$20,007.1 billion over the ten years 2002-2011. The Senate amendment assumes a tax reduction, relative to the CBO baseline, of \$1,188.1 billion over the period 2002-2011, about \$450 billion less than the tax relief assumed in the House resolution. The Senate amendment includes an allowance (in Function 920) for a surplus refund of up to \$85 billion in 2001. The refund represents about 88 percent of the \$96 billion non-Social Security, non-Hospital Insurance surplus projected under current law for 2001. The tax relief assumed in the Senate amendment represents just four percent of all projected revenues over the next ten years, and less than one percent of GDP over the next ten years.

Conference Agreement.—The Conference Agreement includes language for reconciliation of tax relief including a surplus refund of \$1.350 trillion over the period 2001-2011. (see description of reconciliation). In addition, the Conference Agreement accepts the House position to assume a one-year extension of tax provisions expiring in 2001, legislation to reduce SEC fees, and legislation to permit the Federal Reserve System to pay interest on reserve balances. These three provisions would not be reconciled, and are assumed to reduce revenues by \$19 billion over ten years. The total amount of tax relief, surplus refund, and other revenue changes assumed in the Conference Agreement, both reconciled and non-reconciled, is \$1.369 trillion over the 2001-2011 period.

DEBT LEVELS

Debt held by the public peaked at \$3.773 trillion in 1997. At the end of 2001, debt held by the public is projected to be \$3.243 trillion, \$530 billion lower than just four years ago. This is a reduction of 14 percent from peak levels.

The table on the following page shows the levels of debt held by the public resulting from the policies assumed in the Conference Agreement. The policies assumed in the Conference Agreement result in a reduction in debt in every year through 2011 and total debt reduction of \$2.425 trillion from the end of 2001 through the end of 2011. Debt held by the public falls to 4.8 percent of GDP, its lowest level since 1916, prior to World War I.

The Conference Agreement proposals result in retiring the maximum amount of public debt that can reasonably be retired. Under the budget resolution, the debt remaining in 2010 and 2011 is considered (by CBO's estimates) to be the minimum debt level. It consists mostly of marketable bonds that will not have matured and that will be too expensive to buy back, savings bonds, and special bonds for State and local governments.

Debt Held by the Public
[\$ billions]

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Debt Held by the Public	3,243.2	3,037.9	2,810.7	2,563.6	2,303.1	2,022.5	1,702.9	1,350.0	947.3	878.0	818.0

RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS

Under section 310(a) of the Budget Act, the budget resolution may include directives to the committees of jurisdiction to make revisions in law necessary to accomplish a specified change in spending or revenues. If the resolution includes directives to only one committee of the House or Senate, then that committee is required to directly report to its House legislative language of its design that would implement the spending or revenue changes provided for in the resolution. Any bill considered pursuant to a reconciliation instruction is subject to special procedures set forth in sections 310 and 313 of the Budget Act.

House resolution

Section 4 provides for five different reconciliation bills. It contains directives to the Ways and Means Committee to report three tax-only bills to the floor by May 2, May 23, and June 20 of fiscal year 2001. Additional directives to the Ways and Means and the Energy and Commerce Committees are designed to allow those committees to reform the Medicare program and provide a prescription drug benefit. The Medicare-related legislation must be submitted to the House

Budget Committee no later than July 24, 2001. An additional omnibus bill will be composed of submissions from six different committees that will contain both spending and revenue changes. These Committees are required to submit their recommendations to the Budget Committee by September 11, 2001.

Senate amendment

The Senate amendment provides a reconciliation instruction to the Senate Committee on Finance to reduce revenues for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2011 by not more than the amount of revenue reductions set out in the revenue aggregates in the resolution. It also instructs the Committee on Finance to increase outlays by not more than \$60 billion for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2011. This reconciliation instruction was added by an amendment offered by Senator Domenici. The reduction in the revenue aggregates plus the \$60 billion in outlays would permit up to \$1.248 trillion in "tax relief" over this 11-year period.

Conference agreement

The Conference Agreement provides a reconciliation instruction to the Senate Committee on Finance to report by May 18, 2001,

legislation to reduce revenues by not more than \$1.25 trillion and increase outlays by not more than \$100 billion for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2011 provided that \$100 billion of the revenues and outlays changes shall only be available for 2001 and 2002. The Conference Agreement also provides a reconciliation instruction to the House Committee on Ways and Means to report legislation by May 18, 2001 to reduce revenues by not more than \$1.250 trillion for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2011 and to increase outlays by not more than \$100 billion for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2011. The total reconciliation instruction to both the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance is for \$1.350 trillion over the period 2001 through 2011.

ALLOCATIONS

As required in section 302 of the Budget Act, the joint statement of the managers includes an allocation, based on the Conference Agreement, of total budget authority and total budget outlays among each of the appropriate House and Senate committees.

The allocations are as follows:

**ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY
TO HOUSE COMMITTEES
Appropriations Committee
(In millions of dollars)**

		2001	2002
General Purpose *	BA	641,979	659,540
	OT	615,529	647,780
Highways *	BA		
	OT	26,920	28,489
Mass Transit *	BA		
	OT	4,639	5,275
Conservation *	BA		1,760
	OT		1,232
Total Discretionary Action	BA	641,979	661,300
	OT	647,088	682,776
Current Law Mandatory	BA	332,768	357,786
	OT	316,432	350,418

* - Shown for display purposes only.

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES
Committees Other than Appropriations

		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	
													2002-2006	2002-2011
Agriculture Committee														
Current Law	BA	21,035	14,020	3,570	3,436	3,486	3,537	3,580	3,362	3,855	3,997	4,062	28,049	46,905
	OT	17,238	10,701	67	-11	-8	33	38	-284	361	720	830	10,782	12,447
Discretionary Action	BA	5,500	7,350	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,350	7,350
	OT	5,500	7,350	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7,350	7,350
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	30,479	31,321	31,777	31,732	30,897	30,574	31,331	31,972	32,579	125,309	282,662
	OT	0	0	29,137	31,690	31,654	31,654	30,825	30,507	31,268	31,918	32,533	123,703	280,754
Total	BA	26,535	21,370	34,049	34,757	35,263	35,269	34,477	33,936	35,186	35,969	36,541	160,708	336,917
	OT	22,738	18,051	29,204	31,211	31,682	31,687	30,863	30,223	31,629	32,638	33,363	141,835	300,551
Armed Services Committee														
Current Law	BA	50,884	52,630	59,578	61,763	63,987	66,156	68,382	70,624	72,894	75,262	77,684	304,114	668,960
	OT	50,761	52,536	59,494	61,675	63,905	66,070	68,293	70,535	72,806	75,177	77,599	303,680	668,090
Discretionary Action	BA	0	146	106	74	43	29	11	11	5	9	6	398	440
	OT	0	146	106	74	43	29	11	11	5	9	6	398	440
Total	BA	50,884	52,776	59,684	61,837	64,030	66,185	68,393	70,635	72,899	75,271	77,690	304,512	669,400
	OT	50,761	52,682	59,600	61,749	63,948	66,099	68,304	70,546	72,811	75,186	77,605	304,078	668,530
Financial Services Committee														
Current Law	BA	9,629	6,697	6,978	6,404	6,189	5,904	5,833	5,668	5,637	5,737	5,865	32,172	60,912
	OT	4,149	1,366	1,228	763	187	-710	-886	-1,092	-1,147	-1,196	-1,245	2,834	-2,732
Committee on Education and the Workforce														
Current Law	BA	5,408	5,698	4,774	4,123	5,099	5,302	5,396	5,498	5,624	5,752	5,867	24,996	53,133
	OT	4,544	5,049	4,627	4,137	4,519	4,844	4,901	4,997	5,116	5,236	5,342	23,176	48,768
Discretionary Action	BA	5	5	5	5	7	10	10	10	10	10	10	32	82
	OT	5	5	5	5	7	10	10	10	10	10	10	32	82
Reauthorizations	BA	0	305	305	757	774	793	3,640	3,731	3,820	3,914	4,012	2,934	22,051
	OT	0	58	244	669	772	790	2,789	3,622	3,794	3,887	3,984	2,533	20,609
Total	BA	5,413	6,008	5,084	4,885	5,880	6,105	9,046	9,239	9,454	9,676	9,889	27,962	75,266
	OT	4,549	5,112	4,876	4,811	5,298	5,644	7,700	8,629	8,920	9,133	9,336	25,741	69,459
Energy and Commerce Committee														
Current Law	BA	1,852	9,774	11,636	16,674	17,773	17,853	18,852	13,903	13,891	13,928	13,967	73,710	148,251
	OT	3	9,660	10,240	16,538	17,592	17,887	17,867	17,189	17,594	14,925	13,919	71,717	153,211
Discretionary Action	BA	0	2,687	1,925	-4,042	-2,013	-5,094	-1,180	-1,275	-1,377	-1,490	-1,615	-6,537	-13,474
	OT	0	2,687	1,925	-4,042	-2,013	-5,094	-1,180	-1,275	-1,377	-1,490	-1,615	-6,537	-13,474
Reauthorizations	BA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0	20,000
	OT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	893	833	3,721	4,993	0	10,440
Total	BA	1,852	12,461	13,561	12,632	15,760	12,759	17,672	17,628	17,514	17,438	17,352	67,173	154,777
	OT	3	12,347	12,165	12,496	15,579	12,593	16,687	16,807	17,050	17,156	17,297	65,180	150,177

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES
Committees Other than Appropriations

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	
												2002-2006	2002-2011
Government Reform Committee													
Current Law	60,669	62,982	65,455	68,016	70,498	73,038	75,736	78,477	81,347	84,403	87,520	339,989	747,472
Discretionary Action	59,270	61,610	64,142	66,808	69,358	71,963	74,709	77,574	80,423	83,676	86,797	333,881	737,060
Total	0	0	-496	-523	-501	-475	-446	-413	-378	-340	-299	-1,995	-3,871
Discretionary Action	0	0	-496	-523	-501	-475	-446	-413	-378	-340	-299	-1,995	-3,871
Total	60,669	62,982	64,959	67,493	69,997	72,563	75,290	78,064	80,969	84,063	87,221	337,994	743,601
Discretionary Action	59,270	61,610	63,646	66,285	68,857	71,488	74,263	77,161	80,045	83,336	86,498	331,886	733,189
Committee on House Administration													
Current Law	112	87	89	86	87	87	87	88	88	88	88	436	875
Discretionary Action	68	33	60	252	42	27	59	221	88	70	64	414	916
International Relations Committee													
Current Law	11,390	11,727	11,813	11,829	12,114	12,369	12,694	12,661	12,607	12,566	12,629	59,852	123,029
Discretionary Action	10,463	10,482	10,599	10,838	11,039	11,281	11,607	11,817	11,935	12,005	12,078	54,239	113,681
Resources Committee													
Current Law	2,682	2,742	2,552	2,291	2,324	2,363	2,507	2,512	2,624	2,728	2,691	12,272	25,334
Discretionary Action	2,551	2,636	2,662	2,354	2,312	2,330	2,455	2,443	2,550	2,656	2,614	12,294	25,012
Total	0	0	87	89	93	96	0	0	0	0	0	365	365
Discretionary Action	0	-3	-58	4	56	89	149	88	31	0	-1	88	365
Total	2,682	2,742	2,639	2,380	2,417	2,459	2,507	2,512	2,624	2,728	2,691	12,637	25,699
Discretionary Action	2,551	2,633	2,604	2,358	2,368	2,419	2,604	2,531	2,581	2,656	2,613	12,382	25,367
Judiciary Committee													
Current Law	5,064	5,221	4,346	4,410	4,410	4,416	4,475	4,543	4,630	4,706	4,782	22,803	45,939
Discretionary Action	4,847	4,695	4,541	4,469	4,444	4,392	4,415	4,425	4,494	4,556	4,632	22,541	45,063
Total	5,064	5,221	4,346	4,410	4,410	4,416	4,475	4,543	4,630	4,706	4,782	22,803	45,939
Discretionary Action	4,847	4,695	4,541	4,469	4,444	4,392	4,415	4,425	4,494	4,556	4,632	22,541	45,063
Transportation and Infrastructure Committee													
Current Law	52,510	54,581	51,787	10,815	10,930	11,154	11,273	11,890	12,198	12,437	12,798	139,267	199,863
Discretionary Action	9,662	9,781	9,901	9,868	9,643	9,545	9,487	9,967	10,194	10,378	10,690	48,738	99,454
Total	0	0	0	42,665	43,420	44,663	45,843	47,007	48,188	50,491	51,970	130,748	374,247
Discretionary Action	0	0	0	86	307	495	569	601	620	633	639	888	3,950
Total	52,510	54,581	51,787	53,480	54,350	55,817	57,116	58,997	60,386	62,928	64,768	270,015	574,110
Discretionary Action	9,662	9,781	9,901	9,954	9,950	10,040	10,056	10,568	10,814	11,011	11,329	49,626	103,404
Science Committee													
Current Law	158	192	213	72	74	77	78	80	81	84	85	628	1,036
Discretionary Action	66	104	147	179	197	145	97	79	80	83	83	772	1,194
Small Business Committee													
Current Law	-375	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Discretionary Action	-475	-100	-100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-200	-200

ALLOCATIONS OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES
Committees Other than Appropriations

		2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	Total	
													2002-2006	2002-2011
Veterans' Affairs Committee														
Current Law	BA	1,249	1,356	1,358	1,365	1,356	1,349	1,344	1,335	1,301	1,271	1,243	6,784	13,278
	OT	1,041	1,195	1,220	1,259	1,262	1,274	1,300	1,303	1,277	1,261	1,240	6,210	12,591
Discretionary Action	BA	0	264	479	761	816	885	953	1,008	594	640	687	3,205	7,087
	OT	0	264	479	761	816	885	953	1,008	594	640	687	3,205	7,087
Reauthorizations	BA	0	445	1,035	1,641	2,431	2,888	3,211	4,012	4,644	5,294	5,963	8,440	31,564
	OT	0	407	985	1,590	2,355	2,798	3,111	3,960	4,591	5,240	5,907	8,135	30,944
Total	BA	1,249	2,065	2,872	3,767	4,603	5,122	5,508	6,355	6,539	7,205	7,893	18,429	51,929
	OT	1,041	1,866	2,884	3,610	4,433	4,957	5,364	6,271	6,462	7,141	7,834	17,550	50,622
Ways and Means Committee														
Current Law	BA	697,787	684,366	680,440	697,193	718,687	729,999	752,688	771,900	791,581	810,744	831,149	3,510,685	7,468,747
	OT	696,886	684,537	679,418	695,843	716,988	728,179	751,350	770,209	789,680	809,335	829,471	3,504,965	7,455,010
Reauthorizations	BA	0	285	19,793	19,994	20,001	20,007	20,014	20,022	20,036	20,045	20,053	80,080	180,250
	OT	0	208	20,036	20,913	21,121	21,227	21,284	21,342	21,356	21,365	21,373	83,505	190,225
Discretionary Action	BA	85,000	1,360	3,089	2,834	3,879	4,247	4,984	4,983	4,945	4,902	4,862	15,409	40,085
	OT	85,000	900	3,060	2,867	3,950	4,292	5,019	4,998	4,960	4,907	4,867	15,069	39,820
Total	BA	782,787	686,011	703,322	720,021	742,567	754,253	777,686	796,905	816,562	835,691	856,064	3,606,174	7,689,082
	OT	781,886	685,645	702,514	719,623	742,059	753,698	777,653	796,549	815,996	835,607	855,711	3,603,539	7,685,055

**SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT
TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT
BUDGET YEAR TOTAL 2001
(in millions of dollars)**

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations	640,803	617,507	0	0
General Purpose Discretionary	637,372	614,136		
<i>Memo:</i>				
<i>on-budget</i>	3,431	3,371		
<i>off-budget</i>	0	26,920	0	0
Highways	0	4,639	0	0
Mass Transit	332,768	316,432	0	0
Mandatory	973,571	965,498	0	0
Total				
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	26,339	22,544	29,963	12,133
Armed Services	50,881	50,764	54	54
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs	11,512	4,075	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	394	(3,472)	751	749
Energy and Natural Resources	2,691	2,609	40	51
Environment and Public Works	39,185	1,838	0	0
Finance	793,558	790,942	169,158	169,328
Foreign Relations	11,369	10,433	0	0
Governmental Affairs	60,669	59,270	0	0
Judiciary	5,064	4,847	264	264
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions	9,726	8,740	1,852	1,851
Rules and Administration	112	68	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	1,249	1,245	23,556	23,465
Indian Affairs	267	233	0	0
Small Business	(375)	(475)	0	0
Unassigned to Committee	(330,341)	(313,341)	0	0
TOTAL	1,655,871	1,605,818	225,638	207,895

**SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT
TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT
BUDGET YEAR TOTAL 2002
(in millions of dollars)**

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations				
General Purpose Discretionary	546,945	537,091	0	0
<i>Memo:</i>	543,366	533,566		
<i>on-budget</i>	3,579	3,525		
<i>off-budget</i>	0	28,489	0	0
Highways	0	5,275	0	0
Mass Transit	1,760	1,232	0	0
Conservation	358,567	350,837	0	0
Mandatory	907,272	922,924	0	0
Total				
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	21,175	17,856	22,293	13,209
Armed Services	53,053	52,964	54	54
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs	8,417	1,273	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	13,452	9,630	805	801
Energy and Natural Resources	2,543	2,435	40	56
Environment and Public Works	41,494	1,799	0	0
Finance	699,700	699,169	185,672	185,713
Foreign Relations	11,706	10,454	0	0
Governmental Affairs	62,982	61,610	0	0
Judiciary	5,195	4,669	264	264
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions	10,179	9,419	1,804	1,822
Rules and Administration	87	33	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	1,620	1,622	26,902	26,762
Indian Affairs	272	280	0	0
Small Business	0	(100)	0	0
Unassigned to Committee	(329,947)	(320,947)	0	0
TOTAL	1,509,200	1,475,090	237,834	228,681

**SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT
TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT
5-YEAR TOTAL: 2002-2006
(in millions of dollars)**

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	69,640	52,349	106,745	71,186
Armed Services	305,980	305,551	274	274
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs	59,463	2,355	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	72,789	50,419	4,493	4,468
Energy and Natural Resources	11,145	10,947	200	230
Environment and Public Works	181,030	8,380	0	0
Finance	3,740,350	3,737,604	1,086,697	1,086,656
Foreign Relations	59,747	54,108	0	0
Governmental Affairs	337,994	331,886	0	0
Judiciary	22,667	22,405	1,320	1,320
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions	48,155	46,411	8,972	8,995
Rules and Administration	436	414	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	9,989	9,964	148,529	147,804
Indian Affairs	1,103	1,116	0	0
Small Business	0	(200)	0	0

**SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT
TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT
10-YEAR TOTAL: 2002-2011
(in millions of dollars)**

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts	
	Budget Authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry	114,692	80,210	225,304	156,220
Armed Services	671,521	670,656	549	549
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs	132,028	(3,390)	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation	164,611	118,775	10,178	10,292
Energy and Natural Resources	22,064	21,882	400	430
Environment and Public Works	371,833	15,995	0	0
Finance	8,261,320	8,254,702	2,663,216	2,662,654
Foreign Relations	122,819	113,442	0	0
Governmental Affairs	743,601	733,189	0	0
Judiciary	45,724	44,848	2,640	2,640
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions	102,173	97,860	17,950	17,973
Rules and Administration	875	916	0	0
Veterans' Affairs	19,277	19,318	317,909	316,669
Indian Affairs	2,112	2,108	0	0
Small Business	0	(200)	0	0

The Conferees agree that it would be ideal to enforce this resolution using CBO's best cost estimates based on its most recent baseline. Typically, CBO prepares a preliminary baseline published in January and then a revised baseline in March that incorporates information CBO learns in reestimating the President's budget, which is usually released in early February. Almost always, the budget resolution is based on CBO's revised baseline. This year, however, the President's budget was not released until April 9, so CBO will not release its full analysis of the President's budget and accompanying revised baseline until May 18. Thus, this budget resolution is still based on CBO's preliminary baseline. Therefore the Conferees intend that the Chairmen of the Committees on the Budget will enforce this resolution (pursuant to Section 312 of the Budget Act) with respect to appropriation measures consistent with the assumptions underlying CBO's revised baseline only after CBO publishes its analysis of the President's budgetary proposals for fiscal year 2002 including its revised baseline and only to reflect the revised baseline, and may use CBO's estimates (that are consistent with the revised baseline) for purposes of enforcing the budget resolution.

The Conferees also agree that transfers from non-budgetary governmental entities such as the Federal Reserve Banks shall not be used to offset increased on-budget spending when such transfers produce no real budgetary effects. It has long been the view of both Committees on the Budget that transfers of Federal Reserve surpluses to the Treasury are not valid offsets for increased spending. Nonetheless, such transfers have been legislated in the past—as recently as the fall of 1999. The Conferees agree to a scoring rule to make clear that such transfers will not be taken into account when determining compliance with the various Budget Act and Senate paygo points of order.

RULEMAKING AND BUDGETARY PROCEDURES ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES

The Budget Act contains procedures for the enforcement of the levels contained therein. In addition, many budget resolutions have contained additional enforcement procedures. In general, enforcement is accomplished by setting forth new scoring rules or new points of order which can be raised by any member of either House. Subtitle A of title II of the Conference Agreement contains 4 such provisions.

House resolution

Section 5: Reserve Fund for Emergencies

Section 5 modifies Congressional procedures related to emergency spending in fiscal year 2001. It establishes a separate allocation to the Appropriations Committee for emergencies of \$5.6 billion. In lieu of the current practice of automatically increasing the appropriate levels in the budget resolution for designated emergencies, it permits the Appropriations Committee to make such adjustments only if emergency-designated appropriations meet a statutory definition of an emergency and key disaster accounts have been fully funded.

Section 13: Restrictions on Advance Appropriations

Section 13 establishes a scoring rule and budgetary control designed to limit advance appropriations. It provides that for purposes of enforcing the budget resolution, advance appropriations are to be scored in the year in which they are enacted. Under current scorekeeping conventions, appropriations are scored in the year in which they are available for obligation. An exception is provided for programs for which advance appropriations do not exceed a specified level that

will be identified in the joint statement of managers.

Section 12: Compliance with Section 13301

Section 12 provides the House the authority to include the administrative expenses related to Social Security in the 302(a) allocation to the Appropriations Committee. As part of an agreement between the House and Senate Budget Committees in 2000, the administrative expenses of the Social Security trust funds are no longer included in the budget resolution. The Budget Committees, however, continue to include these expenses in the 302(a) allocations of the Appropriations Committee because they are controlled through the annual appropriations process. Absent the authority provided under section 12, these expenses could not be included in the 302(a) allocations because the allocations must be consistent with the amounts set forth in the budget resolution.

Senate amendment

Section 201: Restrictions on Advance Appropriations

The Senate amendment contains a new scoring rule with respect to advance appropriations. The new rule provides that both the BA and the outlays for an advance appropriation will be scored for the budget year regardless of the fiscal year in which the funds actually become available for obligation. An exception is provided for advance appropriations which provide full funding for a capital project. The exception is intended to apply to the federal buildings fund within the General Services Administration and not as a means of providing incremental funding to other federal acquisitions.

Section 202: Mechanism for implementing increase of fiscal year 2002 discretionary spending limits

The Senate amendment contains a mechanism virtually identical to that which was included in section 206 of the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution. The Senate amendment provides the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget the authority to increase the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations after the statutory discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2002 (set forth in section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) has been amended. Such adjustment is limited to the levels set forth in the mechanism. As passed the Senate, the allocation may be adjusted up to \$689.2 billion in BA and \$666.5 in outlays for the general discretionary category, \$28.5 billion in outlays for the highway category, \$5.3 billion in outlays for the mass transit category, and \$1.76 billion in BA and \$1.38 in outlays for the conservation category. Note that with an exception for a necessary adjustment within Function 920 (to bring the Senate-passed resolution in compliance with section 312(b) of the Budget Act) these numbers are intended to reflect the sum of the functional totals. However due to mathematical inconsistency within some of the amendments adopted during the Senate debate of the resolution, this may not be the case.

Section 207: Limitation on consideration of amendments under reconciliation and a budget resolution

The Senate amendment contains language which modifies the time for debate on budget resolutions, reconciliation bills, and amendments thereto. The language was added by an amendment offered by Senator Byrd. The Senate amendment modifies the procedural rules as follows: (1) limits overall debate time (including the offering of amendments) for both budget resolutions and reconciliation bills to 50 hours (current rules permit 50 hours for budget resolutions and 20 for rec-

onciliation bills); (2) eliminates the non-debatable motion to reduce the time, so that time may only be reduced by unanimous consent; (3) reduces time on 1st degree amendments from 2 hours to 1 hour, and reduce time on amendments to amendments (and debatable motions and appeals) from 1 hour to 30 minutes; (4) requires that 1st degree amendments be offered or filed with the Clerk prior to the end of the 10th hour of consideration and that 2nd degree amendments be offered or filed with the Clerk prior to the end of the 20th hour of consideration; (5) requires that after 40 hours of consideration, the resolution be set aside for 1 calendar day; (6) provides that waiver or appeal from these new rules requires 60 votes in the Senate.

Conference Agreement

Section 201: Restrictions on Advance Appropriations—House

Section 201 of the Conference Agreement adopts a limitation on advance appropriations similar to the approach taken in last year's budget resolution. The Conference Agreement establishes a rule against any advance appropriation for 2003 and any year thereafter with two exceptions: (1) advance appropriations may be provided for the accounts in the appropriation bills listed below, provided that their sum does not exceed \$23.159 billion in budget authority for 2003 and (2) advance appropriations may be provided for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations:

Commerce, Justice, State
Patent and Trademark Office (13 1006 01 376)
Legal Activities and U.S. Marshals, Antitrust Division (15 0319 01 752)
U.S. Trustee System (15 5073 02 752)
Federal Trade Commission (29 0100 01 376)
Interior
Elk Hills (89 5428 02 271)
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education
Employment and Training Administration (16 0174 01 504)
Health Resources (75 0350 01 551)
Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (75 1502 01 609)
Child Care Development Block Grant (75 1515 01 609)
Elementary and Secondary Education [reading excellence] (91 0011 01 501)
Education for the Disadvantaged (91 0900 01 501)
School Improvement (91 1000 01 501)
Children and Family Services [head start] (75 1536 01 506)
Special Education (91 0300 01 501)
Vocational and Adult Education (91 0400 01 501)
Treasury, General Government
Payment to Postal Service (18 1001 01 372)
Federal Building Fund (47 4542 04 804)
Veterans, Housing and Urban Development
Section 8 Renewals (86 0319 01 604)

The Conference Agreement adopts the definition of "advance appropriation" that was used in section 203(b)(2) of last year's budget resolution (which was the provision applicable in the House of Representatives). This limitation can be enforced by points of order, which may be raised against advance appropriations not falling within the exception. The effect of a point of order under this section, if sustained by the Chair, is to cause the appropriation(s) to be stricken from the bill or joint resolution. The bill itself, however, continues to be considered.

Section 202: Restrictions on Advance Appropriations—Senate

Section 201(a) of the Conference Agreement adopts a limitation on advance appropriations similar to the approach taken in last year's budget resolution. The Conference Agreement prohibits any advance appropriation for 2003 and any year thereafter with two exceptions: (1) advance appropriations may be provided for the accounts in the appropriation bills listed below, provided that their sum does not exceed \$23.159 billion in budget authority for 2003 and (2) advance appropriations may be provided for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations:

Commerce, Justice, State

Patent and Trademark Office (13 1006 01 376)

Legal Activities and U.S. Marshals, Anti-trust Division (15 0319 01 752)

U.S. Trustee System (15 5073 02 752)

Federal Trade Commission (29 0100 01 376)

Interior

Elk Hills (89 5428 02 271)

Labor, Health and Human Services, Education

Employment and Training Administration (16 0174 01 504)

Health Resources (75 0350 01 551)

Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (75 1502 01 609)

Child Care Development Block Grant (75 1515 01 609)

Elementary and Secondary Education [reading excellence] (91 0011 01 501)

Education for the disadvantaged (91 0900 01 501)

School Improvement (91 1000 01 501)

Children and Family Services [head start] (75 1536 01 506)

Special Education (91 0300 01 501)

Vocational and Adult Education (91 0400 01 501)

Treasury, General Government

Payment to Postal Service (18 1001 01 372)

Federal Building Fund (47 4542 04 804)

Veterans, Housing and Urban Development

Section 8 Renewals (86 0319 01 604)

The Conference Agreement adopts the definition of "advance appropriation" that was used in section 203(b)(2) of last year's budget resolution (which was the provision applicable in the Senate). Both the overall cap on advanced appropriations for fiscal year 2002 for the specified accounts and the prohibition for subsequent fiscal years will be enforced in the Senate by a 60-vote point of order. The effect of a point of order under this section, if sustained by the Chair, is to cause the appropriation(s) to be stricken from the bill or joint resolution. The bill itself, however, continues to be considered.

Section 203: Mechanism for Implementing Increase of Fiscal Year 2002 Discretionary Spending Limits

Section 203 of the Conference Agreement retains the language from section 202 of the Senate amendment. Virtually identical language was included in section 206 of last year's budget resolution. It provides the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget the authority to increase the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations after the statutory discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2002 (set forth in section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) has been amended. The Conference Agreement permits the allocation to be adjusted up to \$659.540 billion in BA and \$647.780 billion in outlays for the general discretionary category, \$28.489 billion in outlays for the high-

way category, \$5.275 billion in outlays for the mass transit category, and \$1.760 billion in BA and \$1.232 billion in outlays for the conservation category. Note that with an exception for a necessary adjustment within Function 920 (to bring the Conference Agreement in to compliance with section 312(b) of the Budget Act), the functional totals of this Conference Agreement reflect a level of discretionary spending equal to the levels provided in this section.

Section 203 of the Conference Agreement also includes a mechanism for establishing a budget authority firewall in the Senate with respect to defense and nondefense discretionary spending. This firewall would be enforced by a 60-vote point of order only after the section 251 discretionary spending limit for 2002 has been amended. Similar language was included in section 207 of last year's budget resolution. The Conferees feel that a firewall is necessary to add credibility to the total level of discretionary spending provided for in this resolution given the additional authority set out in section 218 of the resolution to increase the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for additional defense spending. The Conferees stress the need for the President to transmit to Congress a budget amendment requesting additional resources for defense after the completion of the President's National Defense Review prior to the Chairman of the Budget Committee considering any increase in the 302(a) allocation pursuant to section 218.

Section 204: Compliance with Section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990

Section 204 of the Conference Agreement retains the language of section 12 of the House Resolution regarding the budgetary treatment in the House of discretionary spending for the Social Security Administration. Similar language was included in section 231 of last year's resolution.

Other issues

The Conference Agreement does not include any language reflecting section 206 of the Senate amendment which provided limitations on consideration of amendments to budget resolutions and reconciliation bills in the Senate.

Senate Pay-as-you-go Point of Order

For convenience, and in keeping with previous years, the text of the Senate's current Pay-go point of order (see Section 207 of H. Con. Res. 68 (106th Cong. 1st Sess.) and the starting balances for the Senate pay-go scorecard are set out below. The starting balance represents the Congressional Budget Office's baseline estimate of the on-budget surpluses over the ten-year period. The Conferees note that the levels of spending and revenue reductions set out in the Conference Agreement, if enacted, would not result in a violation of the Senate pay-as-you-go point of order.

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

(a) PURPOSES.—The Senate declares that it is essential to—

(1) ensure continued compliance with the balanced budget plan set forth in this resolution; and

(2) continue the pay-as-you-go enforcement system.

(b) 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 the purposes of this subsection the term "applicable time period" means any one of the three following time 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 by 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, motion, 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; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affect 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.

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

(A) use the baseline used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget, and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsection (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 cause an on-budget deficit when taken individually, then it must also increase the on-budget deficit or causes 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 the direct spending or revenue effects resulting from legislation enacted pursuant to the reconciliation instruction included in that concurrent resolution on the budget shall not be available.

(c) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(d) 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 appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. 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.

(e) 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.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 23 of H. Con. Res. 218 (103rd Cong.) is repealed.

(g) SUNSET.—Subsections (a) through (e) of this section shall expire September 30, 2002.

2002 BUDGET RESOLUTION

(\$ Billions)

	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Baseline on-budget surpluses	142.097	171.286	195.686	211.605	266.799	316.203	359.195	416.669	484.265	558.187

RESERVE FUNDS

Reserve funds are special procedures which permit the consideration of specified legislation by making available the resources that are assumed within the aggregate levels of the budget resolution, but are not initially allocated to the appropriate committee of jurisdiction. In general, such provisions provide that upon the reporting of the legislation by the appropriate committee, the Chairmen of the Committees on the Budget may adjust the appropriate allocations to accommodate the legislation provided that all the terms of the reserve fund have been satisfied. The Chairmen intend to make reserve fund adjustments only for legislation reported by the appropriate committee. Subtitle B of Title II of the Conference Agreement contains nine reserve funds.

House resolution

Section 6: Strategic Reserve

Section 6 establishes a reserve fund for Department of Defense spending following the President's National Defense Review and a potential reauthorization of the Federal Agriculture Improvement Act of 1996. It could also accommodate other legislation. In order to be eligible for adjustments under this section, the legislation must be reported before July 11, 2001.

Section 7: Supplemental Reserve for Medicare

Section 7 establishes a reserve fund to accommodate a potentially more expensive Medicare bill than was reflected in the budget resolution. The Budget Committee chairman is authorized to make the adjustment for reconciliation legislation that provides for Medicare reform and prescription drug coverage. The Budget Committee chairman may increase the 302(a) allocations to the appropriate committees of jurisdiction by the amount of the Congressional Budget Office [CBO] reestimate of the cost of the President's Medicare plan or an alternative plan submitted by the Ways and Means and Commerce Committees. As a further limit on the cost of the bill, the adjustment under this section may not cause the on-budget surplus in the budget resolution to be less than \$36 billion in fiscal year 2002 and comparable levels in fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

Section 8: Reserve for FY 2001

Section 8 establishes a reserve fund for fiscal year 2001. The Chairman of the Budget Committee is authorized to make adjustments for Department of Defense shortfalls, emergency agricultural assistance, and other measures. It also limits the amount of the adjustments to the amount the bill exceeds the Committee's allocation. The adjustments may also not cause the on-budget surplus to be less than \$29 billion in fiscal year 2001.

Section 9: Reserve for Education

Section 9 establishes a reserve fund to allow additional spending for programs authorized by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) in fiscal year 2002. It permits the Budget Committee chairman to increase the allocation when an appropriation increases spending for IDEA above the baseline level of \$6.37 billion. The adjustment may not exceed \$1.25 billion.

Section 10: Reserve for Additional Tax Cuts and Debt Reduction

Section 10 permits the budget resolution to be adjusted to accommodate a larger tax cut

or debt reduction if the surplus estimates increase in the Congressional Budget Office update of its budget and economic forecast for any fiscal years 2001 through 2011. If the estimate of the on-budget surplus increases, the chairman of the Budget Committee may increase the tax cut or reduce the debt levels by up to the amount of the increase in the surplus.

Senate amendment

Section 203: Reserve fund for prescription drugs and Medicare reform in the Senate

The Senate amendment contains language creating a reserve fund for Medicare reform and a prescription drug benefit. This reserve fund replaced the language in the initial substitute amendment offered by Senator Domenici and was added by an amendment offered by Senator Grassley. The Senate amendment permits budget resolution levels and committee allocation to be adjusted for legislation reported from Senate Committee on Finance that reforms medicare and improves access to prescription drugs for beneficiaries. The adjustments may not exceed the Congressional Budget Office's cost estimate of either a plan submitted by the President or a comparable plan submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on Finance and in no case may total spending exceed \$300 billion for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011. Note that the aggregates and function levels in the Senate amendment assume only \$153 billion (of the potential \$300 billion) over ten years.

Section 206: Reserve fund for medicare payments to home health agencies

The Senate amendment contains language creating a reserve fund to restore Medicare payments to home health agencies. This reserve fund was added by an amendment offered by Senator Collins. The Senate amendment permits budget resolution levels and committee allocation to be adjusted for legislation reported from Senate Committee on Finance that repeals the scheduled 15% reduction in home health payments. Adjustments may not exceed \$4 billion for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006 and \$13.7 billion for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011. In addition, no adjustments may be made if the cost of such legislation, taken together with all previously enacted legislation would reduce the on-budget surplus before the level of the Medicare HI Trust Fund surplus for any fiscal year covered by this budget resolution. Note that the function levels and aggregates in the Senate amendment assume the reductions would have gone into effect.

Section 208: Reserve fund for the payment of retired pay and compensation to disabled military retirees

The Senate amendment contains language creating a reserve fund to provide for the payment of retired pay and veterans' disability benefits to disabled military retirees. This reserve fund was added by an amendment offered by Senator Reid. The Senate amendment permits budget resolution levels and committee allocation to be adjusted for legislation reported from Senate Committee on Armed Services (and the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives) that funds the payment of full retired pay and veterans' disability benefits to disabled military retirees. The amendment does not, however, make any provision for the additional \$14.4 billion in discretionary spending that

the Congressional Budget Office has estimated would also be required to fully fund these benefits. Adjustments may not exceed \$2.9 billion for fiscal year 2002 or \$40 billion for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011. In addition, no adjustment may be made if the sum of the cost of this legislation taken together with previously enacted legislation would reduce the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance trust fund for any fiscal year covered by the budget resolution.

Section 209: Reserve fund for refundable tax credits

The Senate amendment contains language which in effect provides "fungibility" between outlays and revenues in a reconciliation tax legislation. This provision was added by an amendment offered by Senator Bingaman. The Senate amendment permits budget resolution levels, committee allocation, and reconciliation instruction to be adjusted for legislation reported from the Senate Committee on Finance that provides refundable tax credits. Adjustments are limited such that the sum of the spending increase and revenue reductions must not exceed the total amount of the reconciliation instruction. This will have the same effect as the "fungibility" language set out in section 310(c) of the Budget Act—and is superfluous in this case since the reconciliation instruction in the Senate amendment to Senate Finance contains an outlay component.

Section 212: Reserve fund for Family Opportunity Act

The Senate amendment contains a reserve fund to facilitate the consideration of the Family Opportunity Act in the Senate. This reserve fund was added by an amendment offered by Senator Grassley. The Senate amendment permits budget resolution levels and committee allocation to be adjusted for legislation reported from Senate Committee on Finance that expands Medicaid coverage for children with special needs to permit their parents to purchase such coverage. Adjustments may not exceed \$200 million for fiscal year 2002 or \$7.9 billion for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011. In addition, no adjustment may be made if the sum of the cost of this legislation taken together with previously enacted legislation would reduce the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance trust fund for any fiscal year covered by the budget resolution.

Section 213: Reserve fund for Veterans' education

The Senate amendment contains a reserve fund to provide additional resources for veterans' education benefits. This reserve fund was added by an amendment offered by Senator Collins. The Senate amendment permits budget resolution levels and committee allocation to be adjusted for legislation reported from Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs (and the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives) that increases the basic monthly benefit under the G.I. bill. Adjustments may not exceed \$775 million for fiscal year 2002 or \$4.3 billion for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006 or \$9.9 billion for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011. In addition, no adjustment may be made if the sum of the cost of this legislation taken together with previously enacted legislation would reduce the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance trust fund for any fiscal year covered by the budget resolution.

Section 214: Reserve fund for payments in lieu of taxes

The Senate amendment contains a reserve fund to provide additional resources for payments in lieu of taxes and for refugee revenue sharing. This reserve fund was added by an amendment offered by Senator Bingaman. The Senate amendment permits budget resolution levels and committee allocation to be adjusted for legislation reported from Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources that fully funds payments in lieu of taxes for entitlement lands under chapter 69 of title 31 of the U.S. Code. Adjustments may not exceed \$353 million for fiscal year 2002 or \$3.709 billion for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011. In addition, no adjustment may be made if the sum of the cost of this legislation taken together with previously enacted legislation would reduce the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance trust fund for any fiscal year covered by the budget resolution.

Conference agreement

Section 211: Medicare Reserve Fund

Section 211 of the Conference Agreement is in two parts. Section (a) retains the language from the House and Senate resolutions to accommodate Medicare reform and prescription drug legislation. The language is modeled on section 203 of the Senate Amendment. The aggregate level of spending for such legislation has been assumed within the Function 570 levels and the aggregates in the Conference Agreement, but will not be allocated to the committees. The Conference Agreement applies in both the House of Representatives and the Senate and permits the appropriate Budget Committee chairman to adjust committee allocations and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations for legislation which is reported from the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce if the committee report legislation providing for Medicare reform and a prescription drug benefit provided that the cost of such legislation does not exceed \$59.1 billion in BA and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2006 and \$300 billion in BA and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2011. The Conferees note that in the Senate the authority granted under this section does not permit the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to make any adjustments for floor amendments offered to unrelated legislation.

The Conferees note that it would be appropriate for the cost of such legislation (but no other legislation) to be funded in whole or in part from the surpluses of the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

Section 211(b) of the Conference Agreement retains the language of section 206 of the Senate Amendment which provides a reserve fund for legislation regarding payments under Medicare to home health providers—with a modification. The Conference Agreement applies in both the House of Representatives and the Senate and permits the appropriate Budget Committee chairman to adjust committee allocations and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations for legislation which is reported (or for amendments thereto or conference report thereon) from the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce if the committees report legislation that repeals the scheduled 15% reduction in home health payments. The aggregate level of spending for such legislation has been assumed within the Function 570 levels and the aggregates in the Conference Agreement, but will not be allocated to the committees. Adjustments may not exceed \$4 billion in BA and outlays

for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2006 and \$13.7 billion in BA and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2011. The Conferees note that in the Senate the authority granted under this section does not permit the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to make any adjustments for floor amendments offered to unrelated legislation. Subsection (b) provides, however, that no adjustments may be made if the cost of such legislation, taken together with all previously enacted legislation, would reduce the surplus below the level of the Medicare HI Trust Fund surplus for any fiscal year covered by this budget resolution.

Section 212: Reserve Fund for the Family Opportunity Act

Section 212 of the Conference Agreement retains the language of section 212 of the Senate Amendment which provides a reserve fund for legislation to enable the expansion of Medicaid coverage for children with special needs to permit their parents to purchase such coverage—with a modification. The Conference Agreement applies in both the House of Representatives and the Senate and permits the appropriate Budget Committee chairman to adjust committee allocations and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations for legislation which is reported (and amendments thereto, or any conference report thereon) from the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce if the committees report legislation that expands Medicaid coverage for children with special needs to permit their parents to purchase such coverage. Adjustments may not exceed \$227 million in BA and \$180 million in outlays for fiscal year 2002, \$3.035 billion in BA and \$2.724 billion in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006 and \$8.337 billion in BA and \$7.867 billion in outlays for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011.

The Conferees note that the authority granted under this section does not permit the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to make any adjustments for floor amendments offered to unrelated legislation. Note that the aggregate level of spending for such legislation has been assumed within the Function 550 levels and the aggregates in the Conference Agreement, but will not be allocated to the committees. The Conference Agreement provides, however, that no adjustments may be made if the cost of such legislation, taken together with all previously enacted legislation would reduce the surplus below the level of the Medicare HI Trust Fund surplus for any fiscal year covered by this budget resolution.

Section 213: Reserve Fund for Agriculture

Section 213 of the Conference Agreement includes a new reserve fund for legislation reauthorizing the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform (FAIR) Act of 1996, Title I of such act, and other appropriate agriculture production legislation. Funding for agriculture was assumed in the budget totals but not the allocation. The Conference Agreement applies in both the House of Representatives and the Senate and permits the appropriate Budget Committee chairman to adjust committee allocations and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations for legislation which is reported (and amendments thereto, or any conference report thereon) from the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture if the committees report such legislation. Adjustments may not exceed \$66.15 billion in BA and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

The Conferees note that the authority granted under this section does not permit

the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to make any adjustments for floor amendments offered to unrelated legislation. Note that the aggregate level of spending for such legislation has been assumed within the levels for Function 300 and 350 and within the aggregates in the Conference Agreement, but will not be allocated to the committees. The Conference Agreement provides however that no adjustments may be made if the cost of such legislation, taken together with all previously enacted legislation would reduce the surplus below the level of the Medicare HI Trust Fund surplus for any fiscal year covered by this budget resolution.

Section 214: Reserve Fund for Additional Tax Cuts and Debt Reduction

Section 214 of the Conference Agreement retains the language of Section 10 of the House Resolution, which provides a mechanism by which the assumed tax cuts or debt levels may be adjusted by an increase in CBO's mid-session update of the surplus. Similar language was included in section 213 of last year's budget resolution.

Section 215: Technical Reserve Fund for Student Loans

Section 215 of the Conference Agreement includes a new technical reserve for legislation that permanently retains the interest rate schedule currently in effect for student loans and that repeals the switch to a replacement interest rate structure scheduled to occur under current law on July 1, 2003. This technical reserve would permit extension of the overwhelmingly bipartisan agreement reached in the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 to support the interest rate structure of the student loan programs as it operates today.

The Conference Agreement permits the appropriate Budget Committee chairman to adjust committee allocations and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations for legislation (reported from the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions and within the jurisdiction of House Committee on Education and the Workforce) that repeals an provision (from 1993) that, if left in place, would dismantle the existing interest rate structure for student loans starting July 1, 2003. The adjustment may not exceed \$110 million in BA and \$100 million in outlays for the combined period 2001–2002, nor may it exceed \$3.440 billion in BA and \$2.840 billion in outlays for the combined period 2001–2006, nor may it exceed \$7.665 billion in BA and \$6.590 billion in outlays over the 2001–2011 period. The Conferees note that the Senate the authority granted under this section does not permit the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to make any adjustments for floor amendments offered to unrelated legislation.

Section 216: Reserve Fund for the Purchase of Health Insurance by the Uninsured

Section 216 of the Conference Agreement includes a reserve fund for legislation which provides resources to facilitate the purchase of health insurance for the uninsured. The Conference Agreement applies in both the House of Representatives and the Senate and permits the appropriate Budget Committee chairman to adjust committee allocations and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations (including the revenue aggregates) for legislation which is reported (and amendments thereto, or any conference report thereon) from the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Energy and Commerce if the committees report legislation that enables the uninsured to purchase health insurance. The aggregate level of spending for such legislation has been assumed within the Function 550 levels and the

spending aggregates in the Conference Agreement, but will not be allocated to the committees. Adjustments may not exceed \$28 billion in BA and outlays or \$28 billion in revenues or any combination of spending and revenues for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2004.

The Conferees note that in the Senate the authority granted under this section does not permit the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to make any adjustments for floor amendments offered to unrelated legislation. The Conferees intend, however, to provide complete flexibility to the authorizing committees to draft such legislation providing spending or tax changes. The Conference Agreement provides however that no adjustments may be made if the cost of such legislation, taken together with all previously enacted legislation would reduce the surplus below the level of the Medicare HI Trust Fund surplus for any fiscal year covered by this budget resolution.

Section 217: Reserve Fund for Defense in the Senate

Section 217 of the Conference Agreement includes a mechanism in the Senate to increase the section 302(a) allocation (and other appropriate budgetary aggregates) to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate for 2002 in order to make additional resources available in response to the President's National Defense Review. The Conference Agreement permits the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to increase the 302(a) allocation only when two requirements are satisfied. First, the President must submit a specific budget amendment to the Congress requesting additional funding for fiscal year 2002 in response to the National Defense Review. Second, the Committee on Appropriations must have reported an appropriations measure which provides funding for such budget amendment.

The Conferees note that the authority granted under this section does not permit the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to make any adjustments for floor amendments offered to unrelated legislation. Note that neither the Function 050 levels nor the aggregates of the resolution contain any additional resources for this National Defense Review. Therefore, any adjustments made pursuant to the authority in this section will reduce the surplus aggregates contained in the resolution. The Conferees acknowledge that because of the limitation contained in section 302(a)(3)(A) of the Budget Act, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may not adjust the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations until the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 has been increased for 2002 by an amount sufficient to accommodate the increase envisioned by this section. The Conference Agreement provides, however, that no adjustments may be made if the cost of such legislation, taken together with all previously enacted legislation would reduce the surplus below the level of the Medicare HI Trust Fund surplus for any fiscal year covered by this budget resolution.

Section 218: Strategic Reserve Fund in the House

Section 218 of the Conference Agreement establishes a reserve in the House of Representatives for authorizing or appropriations measures for the Department of Defense, following the President's National Defense Review; it also may be used for legislation that would provide for a prescription drug benefit, or for other appropriate legislation. The adjustment may only be made for the amount that the relevant legislation exceeds the applicable committee's allocation

or the aggregate provided for in the budget resolution. The reserve fund is further limited in that the adjustment may not be made if it would cause the on-budget surplus to be less than an amount equal to the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

Additional items

The Conferees note that the Conference Agreement does not include any reserve fund language from section 9 of the House resolution regarding additional discretionary funding for programs authorized in the Individuals with Disabilities Act.

The Conferees note that the Conference Agreement does not include any reserve fund language from section 208 of the Senate Amendment regarding the payment of retired pay and veterans' disability benefits to disabled military retirees. The Conference Agreement does however retain the Sense of the Congress language from section 19 of the House Resolution which is set out in section 314.

Section 314 of the conference report includes a sense of the Congress directing the Secretary of Defense to report within 180 days after the adoption of this Conference Agreement to the relevant congressional defense committees and to the House and Senate Budget Committees on the provision of concurrent retirement and disability benefits for retired members of the Armed Forces. The report shall address the number of individuals retired from the Armed Forces who would otherwise be eligible for disability compensation under the proposed legislation (S. 170 in the Senate and H.R. 303 in the House of Representatives); the comparability of the policy to Office of Personnel Management guidelines for civilian Federal retirees; the comparability of this proposed policy to prevailing private sector standards; the numbers of individuals potentially eligible for concurrent benefits who receive other forms of Federal assistance and the cost of that assistance; and alternative initiatives that would accomplish the same result as concurrent receipt of military retired pay and disability compensation at different levels of cost. The Secretary of Defense may submit legislation that he considers appropriate.

Section 314 of the Conference Agreement also includes a Sense of Congress requesting the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget to report to the Budget Committees within 30 days after the adoption of this conference report on the risk that providing full concurrent receipt of military retired pay and disability compensation under the proposed legislation identified above could reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

The Conferees also note that the Conference Agreement does not include any reserve fund language from section 209 of the Senate Amendment which purported to provide "fungibility" between outlays and revenues in reconciliation tax legislation. Given the language in section 310(c) of the Budget Act which statutorily provides for "fungibility," the language from section 209 was superfluous.

The Conference Agreement does not include the language from section 213 of the Senate Amendment regarding increased funding for veterans' education benefits. Instead the Conferees agreed to include the funding within the Function 700 levels, the resolution aggregates, and the allocation to the appropriate authorizing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

The Conference Agreement does not include the language from section 214 of the Senate Amendment regarding additional resources for payments in lieu of taxes and for refuge revenue sharing.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

In addition to enforcement provisions and reserve funds, budget resolutions may contain miscellaneous provisions that may affect the level of spending or that provide additional enforcement mechanisms or additional guidance in interpreting the resolution. Subtitle C of Title II of the Conference Agreement contains two of these provisions.

House resolution

Section 11: Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates

Section 11 establishes the procedures for making adjustments pursuant to the reserve funds included in this resolution. It provides that the adjustments may only be made during the interval that the legislation is under consideration and do not take effect until the legislation is actually enacted. It also requires the Budget Committee chairman to submit any revisions in the budget resolution pursuant to the reserves for printing in the Congressional Record.

Senate Amendment

Section 204: Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates

The Senate amendment contains language which is similar to the language found in section 222 of the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution and clarifies the application and effectiveness of the adjustments made by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to the "reserve funds" set out in the resolution.

Section 205: Exercise of rulemaking powers

The Senate amendment contains language identical to section 234 of the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution and states the authority by which Congress adopts the various budgetary enforcement rules and procedures for the consideration of certain legislation set out in the resolution.

Section 210: Additional Revenue reductions

The Senate amendment contains a provision which states that revenue reductions set out in the underlying resolution should be increased by an additional \$69 billion for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011—in order to provide marriage penalty relief. The language was added by an amendment offered by Senator Hutchison (TX).

Section 211: Increase funding for IDEA

The Senate amendment contains a provision that states that the revenue reductions set out in the underlying resolution should be reduced by \$70 billion for the period of fiscal years 2002 through 2011 and an additional \$70 billion in BA and outlays should be added to Function 500 (Education) over that same time period—in order to provide additional resources to IDEA. This language was added by an amendment offered by Senator Breaux.

Conference Agreement

Section 221: Application and Effect of Changes in Allocations and Aggregates

Section 221 of the Conference Agreement retains the language of section 11 of the House Resolution (which is virtually identical to Section 204 of the Senate Amendment) clarifying the process for implementing any adjustment made pursuant to the reserve funds and the status of these adjusted levels. It further clarifies that the Budget Committee determines scoring for purposes of points of order. This section also makes clear that levels in the joint statement will be used for purposes of budget enforcement rather than the levels in the conference report. Finally the Budget Committee chairmen are given the authority to score legislation for enforcement purposes based on CBO's updated baseline.

Section 222: Exercise of Rulemaking Powers

Section 222 of the Conference Agreement retains the language of section 205 of the

Senate Amendment. It states the authority by which Congress adopts the various budgetary enforcement rules and procedures for the consideration of certain legislation set out in the budget resolution. An identical provision was included in section 234 of last year's budget resolution.

The Conference Agreement does not include the language from either section 210 or 211 of the Senate Amendment because all assumptions regarding revenues are taken into account within the actual revenue aggregates set out in the Conference Agreement. In addition, the issue of the level of funding for programs authorized in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act is taken into account within the levels for Function 500.

SENSE OF CONGRESS, HOUSE AND SENATE
PROVISIONS

House Resolution

The House budget resolution contains the following Senses of the House or Congress that have no legal force but reflect the Congress' views on a variety of budget-related issues. The section numbers and section headings of these reserve funds are as follows:

Section 14 states a Sense of the House concerning Federal pay.

Section 15 states a Sense of Congress relating to Individual Development Accounts and the working poor.

Section 16 provides a Sense of Congress relating to Federal fire prevention assistance.

Section 17 states a Sense of the House regarding the deduction of state sales tax from Federal income taxes.

Section 18 states a Sense of Congress regarding funding for Graduate Medical Education.

Senate Amendment

The Senate amendment contains the following Sense of the Senate provisions:

Section 301 Sense of the Senate on Debt Reduction.

Section 302 Sense of the Senate on AIDS and Other Infectious Diseases.

Section 303 Sense of the Senate on Consolidated Health Centers.

Section 304 Sense of the Senate on Funding for Department of Justice Programs for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance.

Section 305 Sense of the Senate on United States Coast Guard Fiscal Year 2002 Funding.

Section 306 Sense of the Senate on Strengthening our National Food Safety Infrastructure.

Section 307 Sense of the Senate with Respect to Increasing Funds for Renewable Energy Research and Development.

Conference agreement

The Conference Agreement contains the following Sense of the Senate and Sense of Congress provisions:

Subtitle A—Sense of the Senate provision.
Section 301 Sense of the Senate on conservation.

Section 302 Sense of the Senate on AIDS and other infectious diseases.

Section 303 Sense of the Senate on Consolidated Health Centers.

Section 304 Sense of the Senate on Funding for Department of Justice Programs for State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance.

Section 305 Sense of the Senate on United States Coast Guard Fiscal Year 2002 Funding.

Section 306 Sense of the Senate on Strengthening our National Food Safety Infrastructure.

Section 307 Sense of the Senate with Respect to Increasing Funds for Renewable Energy Research and Development.

Section 308 Sense of the Senate with respect to increased education funding.

Subtitle B—Sense of the Congress provisions.

Section 311 Asset building for the working poor.

Section 312 Federal Fire prevention assistance.

Section 313 Funding for graduate medical education at children's teaching hospitals.

Section 314 Concurrent retirement and disability benefits to retired members of the armed forces.

Section 315 Federal Employee Pay.

Section 316 Sales tax deduction.

JIM NUSSLE,
JOHN E. SUNUNU,

Managers on the Part of the House.

PETE DOMENICI,
CHUCK GRASSLEY,
DON NICKLES,
PHIL GRAMM,
KIT BOND,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINOJOSA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS ON
VTOL TECHNOLOGY WILL EXAMINE
FAILED OSPREY PROJECT
AND NEW TECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss an issue that relates directly to the safety of the men and women whose task it is to defend our country. It also goes to the heart of the American lead in the aviation technology upon which we depend so much.

For over a decade, I backed a project that I believed would permit America to take the lead in the next major step in aviation technology, that is, Vertical Takeoff and Vertical Landing aircraft. Unfortunately, it is clear now that the project, the Osprey project, has been a costly and a dangerous failure.

Of the 11 aircraft built, four have crashed, and three of the crashes resulted in 30 fatalities. That is 30 dead heroes whom we cannot bring back.

The flight crews that were lost were the most experienced on this craft and some of the best and the brightest of the Marine Corps.

On page 32 of the most recent copy of the Marine Corps Gazette, there is an article by a pilot who is also a weapons and tactics instructor that underscores the skepticism about the viability of the Osprey program. Then there is the alarming allegations of a cover-up, a cover-up and records falsification by Marine officers directly involved in the Osprey's operational testing. Recently, the Defense Department's Blue Ribbon panel echoed the finding of the Marine Corps' Accident Mishap Board in recommending extensive redesign of the craft. All of this calls into question the Osprey's future use by the military and, of equal significance, its commercial viability. No commercial aviation company in this country is ever going to get insurance on a craft with this kind of safety record.

The Blue Ribbon panel mandates that we go back to the drawing board. That is not a condemnation of vertical landing, vertical takeoff; it is a condemnation of the Osprey program. Vertical Takeoff and Vertical Landing technologies are the way to alleviate our overcrowded airports, to ease our overburdened air traffic control systems, and to ensure our military's ability to respond when our runways have been destroyed by a wartime adversary. To pull us into the 21st century, we need a simple Vertical Takeoff, Vertical Landing aircraft with longer range, higher speed, and greater payload capacity. Perhaps like a transport version of the Harrier jet.

Tomorrow, the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, a subcommittee that I chair, will be holding a hearing on one such aircraft that holds promise for the future, and it will fly for the first time this summer. Let me note that my father was a Marine pilot.

Mr. Speaker, these 30 casualties during the testing of the Osprey program are unconscionable, 30 dead Marines. We do not need any more dead Marines. The Osprey program is a failure, but the Vertical Takeoff, Vertical Landing concept is not. We should not abandon that technology, and we should try to keep America first in aviation technology by ensuring that new concepts of Vertical Landing, Vertical Takeoff will be available to the American military and also available to commercial aviation so that the United States of America will be able to fly its up-to-date, cutting-edge aircraft throughout the world and remain the leader in aviation technology, creating jobs for our people and creating a capability, both militarily and commercially, that will keep America ahead of the competition and ahead of our adversaries.

So I would ask my colleagues tomorrow to pay attention to our hearing, and I would ask the public to pay attention to the hearing of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics

that I chair, and we will be examining the Vertical Takeoff and Vertical Landing concept, and perhaps some of the reasons why the old program failed and why there is hope that better technology is available in the future, technology that would protect our military people and offer great commercial possibilities for our country.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit for the RECORD the article in the Marine Corps Gazette entitled, "MV-22 Osprey or Edsel?"

[Ideas & Issues, MV-22 Osprey]

MV-22 OSPREY OR EDELSEL?

(By LtCol Bruce A. Milton, USMCR)

IS THE OSPREY 'TOO MUCH' AIRCRAFT?

Mishaps have been an aviation bane ever since Orville and Wilbur made those first epic flights amid the dunes of Kitty Hawk. The early days of powered flight took an incredible toll on those intrepid airmen who ventured forth to challenge gravity. Despite tremendous losses, the potential benefits to both the civil and military complexes enabled a fledgling enterprise to evolve into the technologically advanced industry that we have today. I doubt few events in modern history can compare with the meteoric accomplishments of the aviation field. To think that Neil Armstrong walked on the moon less than 65 years after the Wrights' first powered flight is simply phenomenal.

Throughout these ever-evolving phases of aviation, countless steps have been taken to reduce the inherent risks associated with flying. There isn't adequate space in this article to pay homage to all the positive changes incorporated by manufacturers, operators, government entities, and others to enhance flight safety. Suffice it to say that the mishap rate—a tangible statistic that measures how safe we really are—has improved markedly over the years as a result of these positive changes.

However, just as the automotive industry has had models that were not successful, the annals of aviation history also include numerous aircraft that were "scrapped" or pulled from production. Unlike the doomed Edsel, a car that the driving public simply did not find aesthetically pleasing, many prematurely canceled aircraft, certainly many military aircraft, had their operational lives shortened because they were deemed too dangerous.

With a new aircraft, as with any complicated machine, there is a learning curve. This wringing out period includes the time that skilled test pilots put the aircraft through its paces. They "push the envelope" to establish limitations, procedures, and guidelines for subsequent squadron pilot usage. During this wringing out, the aircraft also undergoes operational test and evaluation (OTE). During OTE, more guidelines and procedures are established as how to best employ the aircraft in a tactical environment. Once the new aircraft has successfully completed this rigorous testing, it is ready for introduction to the fleet.

When speaking of the MV-22, it is with this latter portion of the learning curve that I am most concerned. I am not now, nor have I ever been, a test pilot. I have, however, spent the majority of my aviation career in some type of instructional capacity. From my days on active duty as a weapons and tactics instructor to my current duties as a training captain for a large commercial emergency medical services operator, I have amassed literally thousands of hours of flight instruction in both fixed- and rotary-wing aircraft. This experience has provided me with some insights into pilot performance and behavior.

Collectively, pilots are merely a cross section of society. As such, among pilots there exists a widely varying degree of aeronautical prowess and ability. I have flown with pilots whose seemingly effortless skill I admired. I have flown with those who struggled very hard to make the required grade. I have also flown with pilots whose performance made me wonder how they had progressed as far as they had. Interestingly enough, I suppose most of the pilots I have flown with over the last 19 years can be defined as being average.

In most communities and subcultures of naval aviation, there is certainly nothing wrong with average. Average can be equated to someone who is safe, reliable, and aware of his or her capabilities and limitations. However, in the case of the Osprey, I am concerned that average may not be good enough. As recent tragic events illustrate, "above average" or even "outstanding" may not be sufficient skill levels to successfully master the MV-22. We have lost the two most experienced Osprey aircrews, senior test pilots even, in the first stages of fleet incorporation. What happens when we man this aircraft with less than stellar experienced aircrews? I'm not sure the jury is "in" on this subject.

In my capacity as an instructor, I have more than a layman's appreciation for helicopter aerodynamics. I understand such phenomena as "settling with power" and "vortex ring state." I have deliberately induced this condition at altitude to show pilots how dangerous it can be if encountered in close proximity to the ground. I opine that in most helicopters, under most conditions—even tactically—it is rare to enter the vortex ring state. Reports I have read about the Marana incident attribute the mishap to the pilot having entered a vortex ring state. The speed and rates of descent reported certainly did not seem to me to be excessive. I have seen conditions far worse with no hint of loss of control. Is the margin of error or more correctly, margin of safety, of the Osprey so narrow as to put the aircrews at a disadvantage?

If the Osprey is as demanding to fly as it might seem, what happens when we man it with the inevitable average crew, cloak them in the fog of war, and send them forth in harm's way? Send them into a hot landing zone on a dark night wearing night vision goggles? Send relatively inexperienced crews into tactical situations where it is prudent to expedite time spent in the vulnerable landing phase? I cannot help but ponder such questions.

I do not particularly care about the politics involved in the overwhelming process of aircraft acquisition and employment. Instead, I worry about the troops tasked to fly in those aircraft. It is time to take a long, unbiased, nonpartisan look at the MV-22's future in the Corps. If it can be proven that cockpit workload and aircrew skill requirements are reasonable, then let us welcome its capabilities into our arsenal. If the aircraft needs further redesign or modification to make it safer, then we should pursue those changes. If it turns out that there is no rational or cost-effective solution to the current woes, then perhaps we should consider tabling MV-22 acquisitions until such time that it is safe.

We owe this analysis to our Marines. After all, the Edsel may have been unsightly, but it wouldn't kill you.

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak tonight to discuss a report that was just released yesterday from the National Institute for Health Care Management Foundation, which stated that spending on prescription drugs has increased almost 19 percent in the last year. I am deeply troubled by this report, as it underscores a critical need for this Congress to modernize Medicare to include a prescription drug benefit.

Spending on retail outpatient prescription drugs rose almost 19 percent in 2000, from \$111 billion to \$131.9 billion. Approximately half of that spending increase can be attributed to just 23 prescription drugs or pharmaceuticals. Among those drugs are the blockbuster ones we hear about, Vioxx, Lipitor, Celebrex and Glucophage, which I am not pronouncing correctly, but the very drugs that seniors rely on every day to treat chronic long-term illnesses such as diabetes, arthritis or high cholesterol. In fact, my mother-in-law, of those four drugs, actually takes three of them every day.

For the seniors that have no prescription drug coverage, they simply have no choice but to pay top dollar for these expensive medications or go without; and that is what they are doing every day, they are going without, because they cannot afford them. Fully one-third of our Medicare beneficiaries, and these are old numbers, because that was before so many of our Medicare HMOs withdrew from the market, at least one-third of them have no prescription drug coverage at all.

I hear from constituents literally every day who have to make these tough choices on whether to pay their electric bill or their prescription drugs. In fact, I have a letter I just received today from a constituent who tells me: "I am holding off on some of my medications until my Social Security checks are deposited in the bank on the 3rd, and I am out of some of them already." Seniors are struggling literally from Social Security check to Social Security check hoping they have enough medication until the end of the month.

Another constituent of mine was hospitalized for a severe infection. When she was dismissed from the hospital she was given three new prescriptions, one which cost more than \$700. Imagine an 85-year-old woman being asked to pay \$700 for one prescription. The other two cost her an additional \$150, bringing her grand total for these new prescriptions, only new ones for this current illness, to \$850 on one trip to the pharmacy. Talk about adding insult to injury.

Unfortunately, the high costs of prescription drugs are only getting worse. The recent government study predicts that the mapping of the human genome, the aging of the baby boom generation that I am a part of, and the increase in spending on biomedical research will lead to the introduction of

more and more prescription drugs. This is the good part of it, because we are living longer and healthier, but this is sometimes a mixed blessing from a policy perspective. The influx of these drugs can only mean new treatments and therapies for what are now incurable and serious diseases, but it also means that the demand for these drugs and also the cost of these drugs will rise.

Congress cannot sit idly by while our seniors, our parents and our grandparents, are forced to pay more and more of their hard-earned retirement on prescription drugs, and they cannot afford it. Unfortunately, we have seen little action during this Congress. We have actually had one or two hearings in the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, but we have not gone any further.

For the past 100 days, all we have heard about is a tax cut. What we need to do is start addressing prescription drugs for senior citizens, those 40 million hard-working Americans who now rely on Medicare.

The \$300 billion I understand that may be in the budget that will actually come out of the Medicare reform legislation for prescription drugs is just not adequate. The real problem for our seniors is every time I go to the grocery store at home or a town hall meeting or visit with my seniors, I am approached on what we can do about prescription drugs for seniors. They want to know why in Washington we are not doing something about it, because they see it as an imperative that if it is not a problem today, it has been a problem for over a year and we have not addressed it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides, the majority and the minority, we need to pass a prescription drug benefit that is part of Medicare. Just like a doctor or hospital, our prescription drugs should be paid for for our seniors as part of Medicare. We may not be able to afford the 80 percent that we do now for doctors and hospitals, but we ought to be able to grow into that.

Mr. Speaker, \$300 billion is a start, but we have a long way to go. It is a crisis now for our senior citizens. It is a crisis for our parents and our grandparents, and we need to do something about it now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

LEGISLATION TO DESIGNATE THE "M. CALDWELL BUTLER POST OFFICE BUILDING" IN ROANOKE, VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I introduced legislation today to name the main Roanoke United States Post Office at 419 Rutherford Avenue in Roanoke, Virginia, for my good friend, former Congressman M. Caldwell Butler.

Mr. Butler is a gentleman whom I admire greatly. He served as a United States naval officer during World War II. He received his undergraduate degree from the University of Richmond in 1948 where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and Omicron Delta Kappa. In 1950 he received an LL.B. degree from the University of Virginia School of Law where he was elected to the Order of the Coif. In 1978, he received an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Washington and Lee University.

Mr. Butler served in the Virginia House of Delegates from 1962 until 1972, where he was minority leader. He practiced law in Roanoke from 1950 until his election to Congress in 1972. He served five full terms in the House of Representatives, representing the sixth district of Virginia. It was my privilege to serve as Congressman Butler's district director from 1977 until 1979.

While in Congress, Mr. Butler was a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Government Operations. Mr. Butler's start in Congress was memorable. As a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, he served with distinction as part of the panel that conducted impeachment hearings involving President Richard Nixon.

□ 2000

Mr. Speaker, following his service to our Nation, Mr. Butler returned home to Roanoke to practice law as a partner of the firm of Woods, Rogers & Hazelgrove, which he continued to do until his retirement in 1998. In addition, he contributed his expertise on a national level by serving as a member of the National Bankruptcy Review Commission from 1995 until 1997.

Mr. Butler is a pillar of the civic community as well, serving as a member of the board of directors of the John Marshall Foundation and the board of trustees of the Virginia Historical Society, a fellow of the American Bar Foundation, a fellow of the American College of Bankruptcy, and a fellow of the Virginia Law Foundation.

Mr. Butler has shown great leadership and personal integrity in his service as a member of the Virginia General Assembly and as a United States Congressman.

It is with great pleasure that I honor a true public servant by introducing legislation that will make Roanoke, Virginia home to the M. Caldwell Butler Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RUSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE ENERGY CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about what is fast becoming one of the largest problems our country faces, and that is the energy crisis. It is not just a California problem. It has spread certainly to the Northwest, where I am from, but also throughout the country, as we see prices for all sorts of energy consumption, from gas at the pump to electricity in the home, go up considerably.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very good that the President has focused a large number of resources on deciding what to do about this problem. He has put together a task force and the Vice President is taking the leadership role on that. I think this is a problem that we need to focus on.

I am not as excited about the initial reports from the Vice President and the President about the direction they need to go in, but I feel, and so does the new Democratic coalition, which I rise tonight in part to represent, that it is a good first step and we can get there on the policy.

But where should we go? The Vice President's approach and some of his initial remarks were, first of all, that we are going to need to build a power plant a week for the next 20 years, and that conservation, while a personal virtue, is not an energy policy.

The vision that is laid out from those initial statements is that we are going to be building a lot of power plants and power plants that are focused on existing fuel sources, fossil fuel, oil, natural gas, coal, and we are simply going to try to burn and drill our way out of the problem.

Is this a good solution to our energy crisis? I would argue, and my fellow new Democrats also argue, that this is not the best solution. There are a lot of damaging side effects to taking that approach, and what is more, there is a better option, a better approach. Building a power plant every week for the

next 20 years is going to be an incredibly costly endeavor, costly in terms of money and costly in terms of the impact that it has on our environment.

When you are drilling for oil all over the place, you have a tendency to damage the environment and have an impact. When you burn that oil, when you burn those fossil fuels, you have a very damaging impact on the quality of our air and on the overall quality of our environment. This is not the best direction to go in.

One final reason why I do not think it is the best direction to go in, it has been a constant focus on our dependency on foreign sources for our energy. In fact, ironically, that is one of the arguments that the administration gives for drilling in the Alaskan National Wildlife Reserve and the Gulf of Mexico and a variety of different places for oil domestically: to reduce our dependency on foreign oil.

Drilling for more oil is not going to reduce our dependency on foreign energy sources. As long as we have a fossil fuel base system, as long as we are dependent on oil, we are going to be dependent on foreign sources for that oil, because you could drill the entire country and you would not come up with as much oil as they have in the Middle East and Russia and in a variety of other places that we are dependent on.

The only way to reduce our foreign dependency on energy is to come up with new sources of that energy, and that is what we and the new Democrats are talking about doing.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear; we need more generation. Some of that generation will have to be traditional natural gas, coal-burning, fossil fuel-generating plants. We understand that we cannot simply tomorrow shift to new sources of energy and get off of this, but we would like to be able to do so as soon as possible, for all of the reasons that I stated.

What are the possibilities here? Is it simply a matter of generating a megawatt here, a megawatt there? It is much better than that. The possibilities of what we can accomplish in terms of shifting our focus and energy dependency away from fossil fuels towards greater conservation and new technologies is far greater than I feel most people realize.

Even before we get into the new sources of energy discussion, even focusing on conservation, the thing the Vice President said was a personal virtue but not an energy policy, if we were to improve in homes and businesses the way we consume energy, electricity, natural gas, a variety of different things, improve conservation, we could save an unbelievable amount of energy.

A recent survey on conservation just cited a couple of things that we could do: tuning up residential air-conditioning, tuning up commercial buildings, more efficient air-conditioning systems in those commercial buildings, and more efficient commercial light-

ing. All of those things combined could save sufficient megawatts to save us well over 100 of those new power plants that the Vice President has proposed that we needed.

If we could then move on to new technologies, solar, wind, fuel cell technology, biomass, a variety of different programs that are out there, we could save even more. By a very conservative estimate, we could cut in half the number of new power plants that we need; maybe more if we went out and spent the money and experimented and found out what we could do.

This is a much better, more balanced approach. It is better for the environment. It is better for domestic security, so that we are not dependent on those foreign sources of energy, and it will build us a long-term sustainable energy policy, instead of thinking that we could simply drill our way out of it by depending on fossil fuels.

We need this balanced approach. What I sincerely hope that the President and the Vice President do is engage Congress to work on this, to balance out this approach and come up with a sustainable long-term policy.

A lot of people will say on a number of these subjects that I talked about, whether it is wind, solar, fuel cell, increased conservation, it is just not cost effective. It does not work. In other words, it is too expensive right now to generate wind power, and you do not really get that much.

Conservation will not really save you that much because you have to spend a lot of money to get there. We do not have the technology to accomplish this.

I would like to draw an analogy to another topic that we have been debating here recently in Congress, and that is the national missile defense system. The President has also recently come out and said we need to build a national missile defense system, basically a system where we could protect at least some portion of the United States, actually, I think it is all of the United States, by being able to shoot down one or two rogue ICBMs if they are fired at the U.S.

We will not find a scientist in this country right now who says that currently that can work at this moment. You will find some who say it will never work. You will find some others who think we can work our way out of it, but the bottom line is the President is saying that whatever you think about this policy, that it is so important to this country that we be able to protect ourselves from a rogue missile or ICBM coming from a rogue nation, that we should spend the money and find out.

Figure it out. He is willing to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to come up with this solution. Like I said, I am not speaking against that policy. He may well be right. That may be such an important policy to do that, but transfer that to energy. Why not spend at least a fraction of that developing some of these new technologies?

If we can figure out in the President's estimation how to hit a bullet with a bullet, with the national missile defense system, by spending enough money, why can we not figure out how to conserve energy better and develop new sources of energy so that we are not relying on the fossil fuel system we have right now?

The answer is that we can. We can develop those technologies, wean our dependence on fossil fuels and better use conservation so we have a cleaner future in addition to ones that generate the energy that we need.

We need to take this balanced approach. It is not enough to simply say, coal, natural gas, oil, that is all we have, that is all that works, let us move on and not change, not look at conservation, not look at alternatives. We need to strike that balanced approach.

I have some colleagues here who are going to participate in the debate as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, the energy issue is clearly an issue that is on everyone's mind right now. I just this past week invited a number, a cross section of individuals, to attend a meeting where we would discuss what was the appropriate role for the Federal Government with respect to energy policy.

I had people who represented investor-run utilities. I had municipal utilities at the meeting, rural electric cooperative participants. We had large industrial consumers. We had low-income energy advocates. We had people from the State Regulatory Commission in Utah as well.

I can tell my colleagues that if we need any other indication that this is a significant issue, everyone who we invited came to this meeting. It was a fascinating discussion, and what we talked about was the notion of a balanced approach, a balanced approach that incorporates a number of different solutions to what is an energy problem.

Admittedly, this meeting tended to focus more on the electrical side of the equation than on the oil and the gasoline side, so my comments are going to focus more on that as well. But I would suggest that as we look at this energy issue, we really need to sequence time periods in which we are talking about what can we do, what can we do to put ourselves in a better position. In the short term, our options are rather limited.

Clearly we have a supply and demand imbalance, and in the short term, you are not going to be building any new power plants very quickly. In the short term, the best available option we have right now is to increase energy efficiency.

I want to make sure that people understand. As I say, energy efficiency, that is a notion where it is not like you have to give up something; it is not like you have to turn the thermostat

down to 60 degrees and put on five different sweaters. Efficiency means we can have the same comfort level but using less energy to get there.

The technologies are there and, quite frankly, in the short term, which I describe for the next 2 years in the western United States, energy efficiency gains are one of the best tools we have to try to mitigate a very difficult circumstance that we are in in terms of that supply and demand dynamic.

Mr. Speaker, let us talk about the midterm, which is the 2-year time frame to, let us say, the 30-year time frame. Energy efficiency is still going to be part of the equation, but there are more factors that can be added to the equation. This is where we can pursue new sources of supply.

We are going to have to create additional sources of electric supply. We should probably take a balanced approach that incorporates a number of technologies, that is going to be part of the equation.

If we look at the 25-30 years and beyond, that is what I call the real long-term perspective, we need to make a concerted effort, a concerted effort on research and development for technology to provide some solutions; solutions in terms of creating energy more efficiently, solutions in terms of using energy more efficiently and solutions in terms of creating energy from new sources that are not a significant part of our energy supply today.

That is why as a Member of the Committee on Science, I am very concerned about the DOE budget numbers proposed by the administration that show cuts in research and development spending for energy efficiency programs and for energy supply, research and development as well. I am very concerned about that, because I think in the long term, it is good public policy for us to encourage development of good research and technology in this regard.

I mentioned this energy forum and I mentioned all of these people who came and attended this forum. The fact is we talked about a whole bunch of policy areas where the Federal Government should or should not have a role.

I just want to focus on one of those issues that we discussed as a group that I thought was very interesting and something that Members of Congress should keep in mind, and that is the sense that we have gotten into the situation we are in now partly due to the fact that we just had a lack of a predictable public policy.

I used to work in the energy business. I developed cogeneration facilities in the independent power business, and I can tell my colleagues that by the time we got to about 1990, it became very difficult to make rational decisions about investing in new power plants because there was so much uncertainty about what the market was going to be.

Congress was moving towards passage of something called the Energy

Policy Act, which deregulated the whole cell side of our electric industry. But they said, you know what, it is up to the States to figure out what to do on the retail side. Right then we had a bit of a dysfunctional market where wholesale prices were deregulated and working in one marketplace and retail were working in a different situation.

This is a complicated issue. Admittedly, it is hard to implement policy quickly, but we had a series of actions over the years since the Energy Policy Act was passed, FERC Order 888, FERC Order 889, FERC Order 2000. We are still trying to resolve what to do with our electric transmission systems in terms of regional transmission organizations.

□ 2015

We need to resolve those issues because decisions about investing in infrastructure, investing in new supply are difficult to make in the face of uncertainty. So I would suggest that, as a rule, we should try to develop unified predictable policies.

The same applies in terms of dealing with regulatory rules for environmental permitting. Everyone in this meeting that I had in Salt Lake City last week indicated that they are concerned about following the rules. They want to follow the rules. No one suggested rolling back environmental regulations. But they all expressed a desire that we know what the rules are and that there is a process to work through an appropriate permitting activity.

We have got to make sure, again, that we create that unified predictable policy environment where people can make rational decisions. I think that is an important goal for us as Members of Congress. I think that is an important part of developing the balanced energy policy that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) has been discussing.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I just want to follow up on a couple of points that the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) made.

First of all, in the investments in alternative energy and conservation programs, the cut in the President's proposed budget is 36 percent from what was already a fairly meager amount. It was \$373 million last year. It goes down to \$237 million in the President's budget. On something that is so important, we can certainly make a better investment and move, hopefully, forward towards finding some of these new technologies and finding that balanced approach.

The second thing is I think it is critical to point out that this is not a one-sided problem, either on the conservation, new technology side. We do have a problem in locating plants. We did a bad job over the course of the last 10 years in preparing for what somebody should have seen coming, which was the offset of supply and demand that we currently are experiencing.

Part of that problem is what the gentleman said, not knowing what the

rules are. It is not a matter of we want to be able to build whatever power plant we want wherever, we just want to know what the rules are so that people can make an intelligent investment decision to build the plant where we want them to build it in the manner in which we want them to build it.

There are a variety of different things we can do in that side of the technology, too. I mean, the way we have the system set up now, it costs more money to bring new plants online in terms of the sort of pollution credits that one has to buy, basically buying the right to pollute, but at the same time one is generating energy. That is the way we do it.

But the newer plants are more efficient and more environmentally sensitive. The older plants that are not do not have to buy those credits, or at least they do not have to buy as much and pay as much. So.

There is a whole lot of things we can look at, both on the generation of typical fossil fuels and conservation and new technology. It is a balanced approach that we really need to take to make this work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) who is going to give us some further perspective on the issue.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I appreciate him pulling together this special order tonight to talk about an issue I think is very important. It is going to have such a significant impact in this country on so many areas of our economy. I do not think we even realize today what a tremendous impact it will have if it continues.

We talk about the problems in California as if they are isolated, and the gentleman touched on them earlier. The issue of providing for encouraging people to save energy is critically important. One of the pieces, as we are seeing tremendous escalation in cost, is we are going to see a tremendous wealth transfer in this country as it relates to those who have very little, who are trying to make it to those who have considerably amount.

I want to talk a little bit for a few minutes about the ever-increasing cost of energy, because certainly we need a long-term policy. Certainly we need to do all those things. But energy is a lot like eating. One can talk about it in the long run, but we eat in the short run. We stay cool. We get in our cars. We need energy in the short term.

As I travel through my district now over the last several months, I continue to hear complaints from constituents there about how energy prices are rising and there is no end in sight. Even when they go up and they come down, they do not come back down anywhere near where the last level was, hoping people are comfortable, knowing they are going up again. As I talk to my distributors and retailers, they say it is not us. So I ask, where is it?

I hear from the farmers in my district. I have heard them talk about the high price of propane and natural gas prices are driving up the cost associated with farming. That is not just true in North Carolina, it is true all over this country.

Many people here may not be aware of how farmers use propane. Certainly in North Carolina, they use it to dry the crops, whether it be peanuts or tobacco or corn or whatever it may be. But it is also used to run irrigation systems. It is used for heating purposes; because in the rural areas, propane is the gas of choice. They do not have pipelines.

The farmers in North Carolina use it to heat their barns in the summer to cure products; and they use it when they have animals, for pigs or chickens or turkeys or whatever they may be. It is a part of their production process as well as running the irrigation system.

They also use it in the homes and they have seen those prices virtually double when they spiked up this winter and they have not come back to the level they were last year.

The natural gas price rise also has an impact on fertilizers that are used in the farming. We will not see that until next year. Mr. Speaker, natural gas is used as a feedstock for ammonia, which is used for anhydrous ammonia that goes on the corn in the Midwest and all the products grown in this country. We are going to see it at the grocery store. And if the prices do not rise for the farmers, they are going broke.

Many of my colleagues may not know that natural gas accounts for about 90 percent of the cost of producing fertilizer. That is a substantial amount of the cost. With the doubling of the price of natural gas from last year, farmers are facing prices of anhydrous ammonia doubling this year. Double.

Now, that is going to have a significant price on the cost of product. They are already having a difficult time making a living; and these additional costs associated with other energy costs for their diesel fuel, for the gasoline and other things they use on the farm, and the low commodity prices are going to drive more farmers out of business.

The increase in energy price is also imposing a real economic hardship on thousands of urban citizens in my State, especially seniors on fixed income. They need that energy in the short run, and this cost is driving it up. Families on limited and fixed income face enough challenges without these unexpected increases that are associated with the necessities that they need.

Let me just share two examples that were in the paper recently. Because of the high cost of natural gas, Gloria Williams, a single mother in southeast Raleigh, who goes to school during the day to improve her lot in life and works at a Target store in the evening to sustain and support her family, did

not even turn on the gas last winter in her home. She could not afford it. So she used wood or any other alternative fuel she could get just to keep it warm and get through the winter.

Another person in Garner by the name of Fred Joyner, a retired logger who has a disability payment, he said his bill was usually \$75 a month, and it doubled. He said, "it digs deep that bill, but you gotta stay warm. It's like eating." One has got to pay the bill. He said, I do without other things.

No family in America should be required to do this so that just a very few could put more on the bottom line.

Gasoline prices are creeping up, Mr. Speaker, and some are jumping. My district does not enjoy much of the benefits of an extensive and expansive public transportation system. The only public system we have of any extent is the one that transports our children to and from school. One needs to understand that those prices are going up at a rapid rate, and that is going to affect the public till for those who are paying for it.

The State is facing an \$850 million shortfall in their budget. My constituents are car people. That is how they get back and forth to work. Heck, the interstate outside Raleigh just got HOV lanes about a year ago. When gas goes up, they feel it in their pocket-books. Their daily commutes to and from work or trips to the beach or the mountains when they used to make them, they will be cut back. There is no end in sight.

According to a recent report issued by the Department of Energy Information Administration, they have forecast the prices to continue to increase. Last year, natural gas wellhead prices averaged \$3.62 per thousand cubic feet. For this year, EIA predicts the average wellhead price will be almost 50 percent above that. There is a reason for that. It is hard to believe that the wellhead prices have escalated at this level.

The price of propane is heavily tied to natural gas, as propane is a natural byproduct of natural gas. When propane prices rise and spike like they did last winter, they do not come back down to their previous level. We have already seen that.

As EIA is predicting natural gas prices, it is also predicting foreseeable higher propane prices extending out for the next 20 months. I would like to know why it is keeping increasing, and we have not heard anyone talk about how we get it down.

Last year, there was a lot of grumbling over gas prices. They were high, but not high enough to dissuade Americans from taking vacations. That may happen this year.

When the Energy Department testified last Wednesday, they said that EIA forecast that the average retail price for gasoline over the summer would range from \$1.50 to \$1.65 a gallon. That compares with \$1.53 last year at the highest level.

Yesterday, I read in The Washington Post that the range had already expanded to a \$1.75, and that is 5 percent above last year's record highest prices. I have even heard the prediction for some of the energy analysts that the price in this country might even reach \$3. I raise the question, how do you know it is going to be \$3?

Folks were quite patient last summer, but I do not know if Americans are willing to put up with the gas prices as they continue to get higher. If gas prices run up to \$3, the American people will want to know why it happened. So far, they have not liked the explanations that they have been hearing, that price increases are simply an example of the market at work.

I ask the question: What market? Is the market working when the Federal Trade Commission approves of a merger between two of the largest oil companies as is expected in June between Texaco and Chevron? Will consumers think that removing one more competitor from the field will help lower gas prices? I do not think so.

I have been brought up to believe that competition is good, that it helps keep prices down. I believe more people would agree with me if they think it through. When one cuts the number of companies fighting over customers, how will that price go down. The American people are going to want answers to these questions. But they may not feel we have reached a crisis proportion concerning energy, but it may be coming.

Now I know some people do not want to characterize our energy predicament as a crisis. That word gets people worried. It can upset the stock market, and I understand that. But I do believe the situation is urgent and, as a result, demands an urgent and prompt response from the Bush administration.

I think the American people deserve the same level of urgency, the same sense of urgency from President Bush that Governor Bush demonstrated to oil producers when they were hurting by the drop in oil prices in 1999. I urge the administration to demonstrate its understanding of the urgency of this situation by developing an energy policy that does not tell Americans they have to wait a few years before any relief will be found to higher energy prices.

I thank the gentleman from Washington for this opportunity to participate in this special order this evening because this is an issue that is important, not only to my constituents in North Carolina, but as the gentleman has indicated, to all Americans.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), from my home State. As Washingtonians, we know this is not just a California problem. It is certainly not even just a West Coast problem.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk a little bit about the energy crisis in the West, how it is affecting families and businesses in my home district, the second district of Washington State and what I and other new Democrats are doing to try to provide a balanced comprehensive long-term solution.

□ 2030

In many ways we are facing "The Perfect Storm" of energy. The energy crisis in Washington State is the result of a number of factors happening, seemingly impossibly, at the same time: a failed deregulation plan in California, an inefficient supply of energy, congested transmission pathways, inaction by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to ensure just and reasonable rates in the Pacific Northwest, and, ironically, for the Pacific Northwest, the lack of rain.

Many people refer to this crisis as just a California crisis, but clearly this has not been the case in my district. It is a Washington State energy crisis, an Oregon crisis, Idaho, Montana. Definitely the Northwest and soon to be a national crisis. And the impact of this crisis is being felt all across my district through decreased economic growth, job loss, and unbelievably high energy bills for working families and senior citizens.

Across my district consumers and businesses are currently experiencing utility price increases of 35 percent. And as the summer and fall arrive, we will see those rates jump another 40 to 100 percent. At the State level, increased energy costs threaten over 100,000 jobs statewide and over a quarter million jobs region-wide. Clearly, this crisis is immediate, intense, and far reaching.

High energy costs will decimate industry and working families in my district. In March of this year, Georgia Pacific, a pulp mill that had been employing hundreds of workers in Bellingham, Washington, since 1926, shut its pulp factory for good due to high energy prices, costing 400 working-wage families in Bellingham, Washington, their jobs.

Not only has the city lost revenue and workers lost jobs, but local restaurants have lost business. The port has lost shipping revenue, and the suppliers who supplied materials to GP for years have now lost their top customer, costing thousands of dollars in lost revenues. The plant closure alone will cost the city of Bellingham \$235,000 a month in tax revenues and cost the economy in Whatcom County at least \$100 million a year.

Recently, Intalco, an aluminum company, announced if its energy costs are not reasonable by October, they too will have to close their plant, and that is another 930 jobs threatened in my district.

I have with me just a box of about a thousand letters I have received from employees, family members, relatives, and friends of those employees at

Intalco. Clearly this energy crisis is having a huge impact. One constituent wrote, "I'm an employee at Alcoa/Intalco Works in Ferndale and as it looks like right now, my job will vaporize due to the forces beyond my or my company's control; namely, the exorbitant price of power our plant must have to survive. It is a situation that may require me and my family moving from Washington permanently. We don't want to do this, but we have to make a living too. Please come to our aid."

Another woman from Ferndale wrote, "My husband has worked at Intalco/Alcoa in Ferndale, Washington, for 22 years. We have three daughters. One will be in college for 2 years, the two others to follow. Don't let one year of drought destroy the aluminum industry. Give them time to come up with solutions."

Another woman in Bellingham pleaded, "I would like to know what I can tell my 10-year-old when she asks me what we're going to do when Intalco shuts down. I have worked there for 5 years now, and it has been a good job for my family. But, with the shutdown of this plant, I'll be out of work. And with GP also shut down, there are two less places that will pay a wage you can raise a family on."

In Sedro Woolley one person wrote, "My husband Brent works for Intalco. He is scared he will lose his job due to the energy crisis. We are having to give our power, as well as conserve, just to lose our jobs and turn our community into a ghost town. The situation is real, as you well know, and our children see the concern we have for our community and the people around us. Time is running out."

Small businesses are suffering as well. One business owner wrote, "I have lived in Whatcom County all of my life. I have owned a home and business for over 20 years, and about one-third of all my customers are in the aluminum or steel industries. Losing any or all of them will have a dramatic impact on my business. Ravaging a prosperous and important community like ours is a terrible and destructive solution for the short-term goal of meeting energy demand."

Our Nation is badly in need of a national energy policy that is balanced, that is comprehensive, that is visionary, that answers the call that we are hearing from people in my district and people all over this country. The crisis I have commented on tonight in the West threatens to spread throughout this country, and this summer will bring higher utility bills and gasoline prices for far too many Americans.

Much of what has been offered so far by the administration is, unfortunately, short on vision and offers no truly long-term solutions to the energy problem. The Vice President recently noted that conservation is simply a virtue and the only real solution is to continue with fossil fuels and consuming them at an unprecedented pace.

In fact, he continued to argue, in order to keep up with the demand, we need to build a power plant a week for the next 20 years.

I would say only an approach that includes both short- and long-term solutions will truly ensure the energy independence our Nation is calling for and must have. Many of my Democratic colleagues and I believe we do not have to choose between growing our economy and protecting our environment. We can do both. In fact, a growing economy is dependent upon a cleaner, reliable energy source for generations to come.

The gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and others have been talking about a new Democrat approach to our national energy policy; and our approach will expand and diversify our energy supply, providing a balanced vision that does more than simply find and consume fossil fuels. I recognize a comprehensive energy policy requires a combination of traditional fossil fuels and natural gas, but it also requires expanding wind and solar power viability that will not only make for a cleaner energy supply but will also stabilize prices and ensure reliability.

In the short-term we can harness the power of technology and modernize our regulations to make existing fossil fuel sources of power cleaner and more efficient. I feel this requires an important incentive for the installation of cogeneration and other technologies and a drive to ensure we continue to utilize these new technologies in years to come.

As we seek to expand and diversify our energy supply, we must upgrade our transmission system to ensure that the creation of new forms of energy can be transferred efficiently. We must encourage private and public efforts to greatly increase the investment in building and improving existing transmission lines and pipelines, while ensuring an expansion of infrastructure is both safe and efficient.

Conservation and efficiency programs will ensure that our limited supply of fossil fuels last longer. It makes little sense to embrace an energy plan based almost exclusively on a finite resource without also aggressively encouraging the conservation of those resources. And I believe conservation should not just be a personal virtue, it must be our national priority. Empowering consumers to make energy-wise decisions has to be a key component to a fully-functioning energy market.

As we seek to develop new forms of environmentally responsible forms of new generation, again we must improve the efficiency of these new forms of generation. I believe this includes public-private sector partnerships to improve extraction methods and encourage cleaner, more efficient generation. This approach must also include an aggressive focus to increase the supply of renewable energy as a component of our national energy portfolio.

We must have a substantial increase in funding for research and development into these programs which will encourage energy efficiency and renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, biomass, incremental hydropower, and geothermal. We must also work to provide realistic market incentives to develop and use renewable energy at the residential, commercial, and at the national level.

We must push for high-efficiency standards, whether it is for vehicles, buildings, homes, or appliances. Improving efficiency will require mechanisms to encourage Federal, State, and local governments to use and purchase alternative fuel vehicles and make all government buildings energy efficient. We must also provide market incentives, low-interest loans and grants to make capital improvements to increase energy efficiency and encourage the manufacture and purchase of fuel efficient vehicles.

And to be specific on one point, we must reauthorize and strengthen the Renewable Energy Production Incentive program as soon as possible, which will help bring an incentive to renewable energy in this country.

Finally, we must ensure that no group is left behind by the current crisis, including seniors and low income. I commend the administration for their budget increases in LIHEAP and State weatherization funding, which are key components for empowering local efforts to deal with the effects of this crisis adequately. However, programs within other Federal agencies, like the public housing operating fund with Housing and Urban Development, must be increased to help our local housing authorities to keep rents down for low-income families.

In closing, I believe very simply that new Democrats understand that a comprehensive energy plan for the future is critical to our Nation's long-term prosperity. The livelihood of families in my district, in Washington State, and across the country depend upon it. And I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for the opportunity to speak on this tonight, and I yield back to him.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman very much.

We also have, for a Midwest perspective, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND). As has been mentioned frequently, but I do not think can be mentioned often enough, this is a national problem that we need to step up to. It will have a profound effect on our economy if we do not figure out some way to provide affordable energy sources to our Nation for a long time to come, which will be a big challenge.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Washington State for yielding to me and also for organizing this Special Order tonight. I want to commend the gentleman and also our colleague, the gentleman from Wash-

ington (Mr. LARSEN), for the initiative and the leadership you have taken within the new Democratic coalition forming a comprehensive long-term energy task force, which is a work in progress but nevertheless long overdue as far as this institution is concerned and, obviously, the American people.

But in a lot of ways this is not really a new conversation that is being started amongst many of us, but rather a continuation of a conversation we have been having for quite some time but, quite frankly, have not received any attention or any work on because of the plentiful cheap energy sources that the country has been enjoying for many, many years. In fact, I think, in a lot of ways, former President Jimmy Carter was before his time. He was criticized and even laughed at at times when he was walking around the White House with a sweater on preaching the values of energy conservation. Of course, that happened during the OPEC crisis. But as soon as the crisis abated and oil became cheap again and OPEC start opening up their supply lines, any talk about conservation or energy efficiency went out the window, and we have not had much progress administration after administration.

I think the previous administration, the Clinton administration, deserves much more credit than they have received in regard to the energy budgets they submitted time and time again on Capitol Hill. But again it was received with laughter, saying that it was too green, unnecessary and drastic proposals, when actually what they were asking to do was trying to fund and create some incentives to explore alternative and renewable energy sources in the country, realizing that that has got to be a part of any long-term energy policy.

But I think we all realized that nothing significant was going to be accomplished on this front until ultimately the American people felt the pain, and we have seen that now in the recent year. We have the crisis on the West Coast, whether it is California and the rolling blackouts, but even the Pacific Northwest, where you two gentlemen are confronting with the low water and the reduced hydroelectric supply that the Northwest relies upon for their energy needs. But this is true from State to State. And if truth be known, even a State like Wisconsin, which is the State I represent, is on the margin as far as delivering the energy capacity and the need that the people back home require. We could be a whisker away from having our own energy crisis because of transmission problems and some of tin fracture problems that have developed in the State of Wisconsin.

I am glad the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) brought a few of the letters from constituents and how they are feeling the pain, because I think all of us right now in our respective offices are getting a lot of phone calls and a lot of letters. Back home I

can point to many family farmers that are on the margin already because of low commodity and milk prices that are getting pinched and many forced out of the business because of the spike in energy costs right now.

But this is true for small business owners; we are seeing the impact on school budgets and the energy needs our schools have. It is true for families on fixed incomes, large and small businesses alike. This has a universal effect throughout the country. It is not just a regional problem, but one that will require a national solution. It is going to require bipartisan cooperation and some creative thinking in this body and throughout the country to come up with a long-term sustainable comprehensive energy policy.

All of us are anxious to see where the Bush and Cheney administration goes with their report. I think some of the preliminary indications are a little disheartening, the fact that they are concentrating so much and focused so much on the exploration and production of more fossil fuels. I do not think having greater dependence and reliance on fossil fuels is a sustainable or a sensible long-term energy policy: A, fossil fuels are in finite supply to begin with; but, B, there is a plethora of scientific evidence and the scientific community has rallied around the evidence that exists pointing to global warming and the greenhouse effect, which has been spurred by the increase in consumption and the burning of fossil fuels. So naturally, you would not think that any long-term energy policy would require an increased reliance on fossil fuel consumption.

□ 2045

I hope that is not the report that they produce next week, but I was also disheartened by Vice President CHENEY's discussion about the role of conservation in this country. He does not think it should be part of the long-term solution. That was surprising given the fact that corporate America has been investing hundreds of millions of dollars to upgrade their machines and tools that they are using, trying to invest in the latest technology, whether it is heat exchanges or cooling equipment, things which are reducing energy costs and increasing worker productivity.

I think the Vice President should talk with corporate America about the role of conservation, because they see the need and they are taking affirmative action.

The work product that we have been involved with so far is long-sighted, and it is reasonable. I am talking about the benefits of increased energy efficiency, a new generation of energy resources that will look at the possibility and the potential of renewable and alternative energy sources.

I am also talking about the need to upgrade our energy infrastructure in this country so it is efficient and cleaner and it is safer in whatever region that we are talking about.

The role of conservation I think many people just intuitively understand and get; otherwise why do we have so many Americans participating in recycling programs, for instance? But also the greater need for industry cooperation and collaboration. These answers are not going to be just found in the public sector by elected representatives, but it requires an integral public and private partnership to pull this off.

The United States of America has 4 percent of the world's population, but we are consuming over 25 percent of the fossil fuels produced in the world. We are increasing our energy consumption 20 percent every 5 years in this country. If we do not have a long-term solution with multiple pieces to find the right answers, that obviously is not going to be a sustainable energy policy.

I am ranking member on the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources on the Committee on Resources. We have been holding hearings in regards to energy policy and fossil fuels and the role of fossil fuels. Last week we had a very good hearing on the potential of geothermal power in this country; a tremendous potential, especially on the West Coast in Nevada and California. California already is consuming roughly 10 percent of their energy from geothermal power.

Other countries are taking a lot of action, a lot of proactive steps. Even a country as small as Kenya is making a major infrastructure investment in geothermal power for their long-term energy needs. It is projected right now in Kenya, over 25 percent of their energy will come from geothermal sources within the next 15 years. This is true whether you talk about South America, some of the countries in Asia, except for the United States.

I submit that one of the reasons for that is because we have become complacent and take for granted the cheap energy sources, mainly fossil fuels, which have perpetuated the industry without enough investment and forward-thinking with alternatives and renewables.

Wind power, to give you another example, it was a short period ago where it was costing anywhere from 20 to 30 cents per kilowatt hour with wind that is being generated. Today that is down to about 2 to 3 cents, a tremendous increase in efficiency in bringing it into market competition.

The same is true for solar and biomass opportunities. The research and development on fuel cells is tremendously exciting. We are starting to see prototype automobiles being developed by these companies at the forefront of fuel cell development. It is already powering our space shuttle on the missions up there. There is no reason why we cannot implement this at home, in our appliances and our machines that we are using to produce goods.

All of this needs to be a part of the equation. I do not think anyone standing alone is going to be the answer.

Needless to say, we have our work cut out for us in this body, the current administration, the private sector, and the American people. By working together, I think we do have the ingenuity to come up with something that is going to be sustainable for future generations.

I look forward to working with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) as we move forward in the new Democratic Coalition trying to put together this comprehensive piece, something that makes sense from region to region and is national in scope. Certainly there is enough interest being generated by our folks back home. They are looking for some long-term answers to this energy crisis that they see.

Hopefully by working together, and again in a bipartisan fashion, we will be able to come up with a plan that is needed in the future, given our current consumption levels, but also given the incredible potential that exists with technological breakthroughs and the research and development that is already ongoing. I thank the gentleman from Washington for organizing this special order tonight. I am sure that this will not be the last of our conversations on this topic.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for doing an excellent job of talking about the problem and where we need to go in terms of finding solutions. This is a great opportunity for this Congress and this President to work together in a bipartisan way. The President has talked a great deal about wanting to change the tone in Washington and work in a different way. There is some frustration, particularly amongst moderate Democrats like myself, that that has been more rhetorical at this point than actual, but there is still plenty of time. We are a little over 100 days into this, and there are some very important policies that are yet to be fleshed out.

The President, by taking a focus on energy, could make a huge difference by bringing people in. I think if there is any issue out there that should be bipartisan, it is certainly energy. It is critical to everything that we do, as was outlined by my colleagues quite well.

But I think the critical element in all of this is understanding both the cost of taking the approach that says fossil fuels are the only way to get us out of this, and also the rich field of opportunities to go a different route. Just think about it.

Building a power plant a week for the next 20 years to burn more fossil fuels, the impact of that cannot be underestimated; the sheer cost of doing it, the damage to the environment of both building the plants and also of the consumption of those fossil fuels. That is not to say, as all of my colleagues have done a great job of saying, that this should not be a critical part of it. We

are going to have to use fossil fuels and build power plants; but we should look at the cost and difficulties in doing that and understand that an alternative is preferable, and then look at the alternatives and say, you know, it is not an impossible dream.

There are alternative technologies out there right now that are working. There are ways to conserve energy in a way that will save us dramatically, and that is with what has been a relatively meager investment in those technologies and conservation techniques. Think of what we could do if we actually committed ourselves to solving that problem.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is worth the investment and worth the time and energy on our part to do that and come up with the alternatives and build a brighter future that is not as dependent on the constant fossil fuel cycle that we are going through and make us so dependent on foreign nations for the future of our country.

I thank the new Democrat Coalition in putting this special order together, and I look forward to working with them as well as everyone else in the Congress and the administration and throughout this country to come up with an energy policy which will sustain us for the future.

ENVIRONMENTALIST ORGANIZATIONS EXPOSED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLAKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, many years ago when I was a student at the University of Utah, I recall working at different jobs after class at night and weekends in order to make ends meet and pay my tuition. Money was tight. I was newly married. I had a wife and child to support, but I still remember sending \$25 to the Sierra Club in response to their advertisements because I felt strongly about protecting our air and water and preserving our forests. But I was moved to donate to that particular organization by what they had to say, and during the 1960s and 1970s, I believed that our Nation urgently needed a wake-up call to action to stop the dumping of raw sewage and industrial waste into the Nation's waterways, and to find ways to try to save endangered species like the bald eagle and the grizzly bear.

I saw some of those problems firsthand, and I felt strongly about that, and contrary to what groups are saying, I still do. I believe some advocacy groups like the Sierra Club played a constructive and valuable part in helping to focus public attention on these problems.

In those days I recall the Sierra Club actually funding some restoration projects which were laudable. They were doing more than just sounding

the alarm. They were out on the ground, physically doing something constructive by themselves, cleaning up a lake or making a trail, for example, in partnership with local or State organizations.

I felt good about supporting that because I had always been taught that it was not sufficient to just point out faults or problems of others; what we need to do is put our money where our mouth is and pitch in and do something ourselves. It is ironic, given what some vocal environmentalist groups today have to say about me, that as a member of the Utah legislature and Speaker of the Utah House that I was labeled by some of my colleagues as being too green because I often sponsored or supported environmental legislation.

What is more ironic is that my personal philosophy for protecting the environment has not changed one iota. I still believe in the principles of conservation and environmental protection, like Teddy Roosevelt, our first conservation President. I believe man has been given the responsibility to be wise stewards of our natural resources, that we can find environmentally responsible ways to obtain the energy and raw materials that we need as a Nation and as families and as individuals to sustain life; and that as human beings we need to not apologize for having been born, and that we are part of the Earth's ecosystem.

Unfortunately, it has been the environmental movement which has changed. As too often the case, what begins as a good idea and needed catalyst has in many respects been corrupted by money and by power.

I have witnessed over the years how environmental groups have changed from actually doing constructive work into self-interest business organizations whose main goals seems to be marketing, self-perpetuating power and growth, and to achieve those ends by any means. They become masters at slashing and burning the character and reputation of those elected officials or reporters who dare to challenge them or who dare to take different points of view on specific environmental issues.

Mr. Speaker, I have witnessed over the years how increasingly strident and nasty many of them become in our civil discourse, and how increasingly radical many of their proposals have become.

Finally, what I have noticed as well is that these groups by and large are now all about big business, and that is their bottom line. When looking at the Sierra Club, the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the League of Conservation Voters, or several other environmental groups, what begins as a small, bare-bones organization with issues motivating people, soon blossoms into larger and larger organizations which must rent offices, hire workers and meet their payroll.

These are not grassroots organizations operating out of some guy's base-

ment we are talking about. They are slick, well-organized companies, employing rafts of accountants, marketers, and attorneys. There is none better. In order to feed that beast or make the payroll, they have to raise money. How do they do this? They do it very well. They are masters at it. If they were public corporations listed with the stock exchange, they would be listed by analysts in the "buy" category. They pour massive amounts of tax-exempt and tax-deductible contributions into emotion-based media and marketing. They are spending millions on direct marketing campaigns in order to generate more and more contributors and donor lists. They hire impressionable young college students, normally at a minimum wage, to go door to door to sign up new members, and hire still others to attend public hearings to applaud or to boo as directed, in a cynical, purchased attempt to influence public opinion.

What is truly shocking is the amount of money these groups are raising and spending, and they are beginning to hit the big-time contributions, millions of dollars at a time, disappointingly, from such previously venerable entities as the Pew Charitable Trust. This is how they can pay for millions of dollars in slick brochures, calendars, videos, radio and television advertisements, all designed to shock and stimulate individuals to reach into their pocket-books.

Like any other pitchmen hawking their wares, they use sensational pictures and distortion of facts in order to grab attention, as some unscrupulous marketers are prone to do. They take advantage of many hard-working Americans who are too busy earning a living and paying taxes and raising their families, who do not have the time to investigate the claims themselves. These groups take advantage of people's natural goodwill and desire to protect green spaces and clean water by asserting that their tax-deductible \$10, \$20, \$50, or \$100 donated to them, for example, will keep those blankety-blank, nasty Republicans or other Congresspersons from raping and pillaging the environment.

□ 2100

As it was for me as a young college student to be influenced by their solicitation, so it remains today with many of us. Only there is so much more media influence by those groups than in the 1960s. They have a very loud and a very strident voice.

When I hear the completely overblown rhetoric they put out about many of my colleagues who are working hard, honestly motivated by wanting to do the right thing by the environment and by finding a balanced approach, it can be very disheartening. Some days it is tempting to ask why do we keep trying?

Despite years of trying to reach out to these groups, to enter into a constructive dialogue to come up with leg-

islative solutions to vexing environmental problems, all I have received is the hammer to the head. At least to this point they have not shown an interest in doing what Isaiah counseled in the Old Testament, "Come now, let us reason together." I am still waiting for the phrase to be uttered, "Mr. Chairman, we would like to work with you on that proposal." I have been here 21 years and still have not heard it. Indeed, all we get is the fire hose approach of heated and hostile rhetoric.

I still believe that a majority of Americans when presented with all the facts will support the right environmental policies. They will recognize the need to achieve balance between obtaining resources and preservation. The key becomes getting all the facts out on the table. At the present time those of us who are often cast by these groups as being on the wrong side of their issues are outgunned in terms of money and media access. With their vast sums of tax-exempt money pouring in, they buy huge media influence, which they do not call lobbying, but rather public education. This is an abuse of our tax laws and lobbying disclosure statutes.

These groups have also shown a propensity to try to intimidate Members of Congress mainly from urban, eastern districts into supporting radical proposals affecting many large western States like Utah, Idaho and Colorado. These groups advocate locking up huge areas into formal wilderness designations even though most people do not understand what those designations mean, or draining Lake Powell. After all, most of the Members from eastern States have not even been to those areas in the West that the legislation would affect, so maybe it is just a throwaway vote for them. However, if they do not sign as a cosponsor to their radical legislation such as H.R. 1613, locking up nearly 10 million acres of Utah lands, these groups will openly attack them in their States and districts by vocally and visibly labeling them an enemy to the environment. Nothing could be further from the truth.

In my opinion, it is shameful that tactics such as these are sometimes employed by these organizations. Those tactics ought not to be rewarded by Members, and I urge Members who feel they are threatened politically to show these men and women to the door.

Raising all this money would be okay if the money was being used mostly to go toward preservation and conservation projects. I would applaud it. However, what we are seeing is the abuse of the IRS guidelines by many of these groups who disguise their extensive lobbying activity and very often very partisan lobbying activities under the guise of public education. If the true costs of lobbying were to be ascertained, I believe that some of these groups would be in jeopardy of

losing their 501(c)3 tax-exempt charitable status, as well they should if they are violating the law.

That is something, Mr. Speaker, that Congress ought not to be shy about looking into. While some on the Hill and elsewhere seem fixated on campaign finance reform aimed at cleaning up perceived corruption of the American political process by money, I wonder who is actually watching these self-appointed and self-ordained watchdogs and special interest groups who are shoveling in money by the truckload. Where is their accountability? Where are the news cameras following them as they drive to the bank to make these big deposits? While liberals and extreme environmentalists lambast their contrived bogeyman big oil and those nasty extractive industries, I can tell you that big oil such as it exists cannot hold a candlestick to the money and influence these environmental groups assert these days in this city of Washington, DC.

How long will they get away with these distortions and character assassinations unchallenged and unchecked? Is their abuse of our Nation's tax laws and lobbying disclosure requirements not worthy of examination?

This abuse is the untold story that too many people are afraid to explore, and it is something that Congress ought to look into. This is the purpose for me and my colleagues coming to the floor tonight to raise awareness of how many of these groups are exploiting the public for their own selfish reasons.

I have often wondered where the national press has been on looking critically upon these groups. Are they too cowered by political correctness or afraid of offending their liberal constituencies, or are they card-carrying members of these groups themselves? How long will the press releases and bald-faced assertions issued hourly by these groups remain unchallenged by the media?

While Members of Congress are scrutinized up one side and down the other for every word we utter and every vote we take, these groups are somehow coated with Teflon. It must always be accepted by the media as un rebuttable truth. Must they always be given the last word?

At least one reporter has recently had the nerve and the courage and professionalism to explore and investigate these groups, their fund-raising and their tactics. I commend the members to a five-part series of articles which appeared recently in the Sacramento Bee newspaper by Mr. Tom Knudson, and all these are posted on the Committee on Resources Web site. Mr. Knudson has come under fire in the last few days by the very groups he scrutinized by having published his series, which unfortunately is to be expected these days.

I am afraid that the truth must hit a little close to home. Therefore, the natural self-preservation response has

been to simply attack the reporter personally and professionally. Having been a chairman for a long time of a subcommittee and chairman of another committee, I am always amazed how when you cannot beat them with issues and fact, you always go to personal assassination. I found Mr. Knudsen's series to be balanced and confirms many of the concerns that I have had myself for some time. I wish that more reporters would follow his lead and look to what he has uncovered.

Now, I would like to point out on this chart that I have here, executive salaries. According to the information compiled by Mr. Knudson, a good share of the money raised by these groups goes to pay salaries for their top officials. They are easily within the top 1 percent of all wage earners in the country. For example, this chart shows that the executive directors of the Nation's top environmental organizations are paid very well.

The salary of the National Wildlife Federation top executive, Mr. Mark Van Putten, was nearly a quarter of a million dollars last year. This represents a 17 percent raise over his salary the year before. Think about that the next time you contemplate your 3 percent cost of living adjustment.

If you were among those who sent in a \$25 contribution to this group, do you realize it took over 10,000 of you contributing in order just to pay his salary?

The salary of the World Wildlife Fund president, Kathryn Fuller, was \$241,000. The salary of the National Audubon Society president, John Flicker, was \$240,000. The salary of the Natural Resources Defense Council director, John Adams, was \$239,000. The salary of the Wilderness Society president was \$204,000. The salary of the Defenders of Wildlife president and CEO was \$201,000. Earth Justice Legal Defense Fund president, Buck Parker, was \$157,000. And the Sierra Club's Carl Pope's salary was \$138,000 in 1998 and listed as \$199,577 in 1999, nearly a 50 percent raise. The list goes on.

Now, folks, think about it. How many of those \$25 contributions does it take you as you did like I did as a young college student, send a few bucks there because you believe in what they are doing just to pay these salaries? Where are these missionary zealots who had a great idea back in the 1960s and thought we were going too far? Where are these people that were in there doing the thing because it had the burning in their heart to do it, not because it was a big business? Unfortunately, you can see new environmentalism has grown into a big growth industry.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding the time and for setting aside this hour to talk a little bit about what is happening in the environmental community. As the gentleman from Utah has suggested, I

think all of us are environmentalists. In fact as he once said that in college he gave his money and dues to the Sierra Club, I believe it was, I gave money to the Idaho Conservation League because I believed in what they were doing and in fact in many things that they are still doing, I think they are doing a good job but like most environmental groups or groups that call themselves environmental groups, they have stepped over the edge. They have gone beyond simple environmental issues and trying to save our environment.

Before I get into that for just a minute, I want to talk for a second about another environmental issue that was just talked about previously by the minority party here in their hour that they reserved and that was the energy policy which deals with the environment as much as these issues that we will be talking about here today. I was glad to hear that the Members suggested that we need a bipartisan effort in energy, a solution to the energy problem that we have in this country.

They were, it seemed, very critical of the Bush administration and some of the stances that he takes, but I will tell you that when the report comes out and in our conversations with Vice President CHENEY, conservation will be a part of the report, renewable, sun and wind power will be a part of the report, new sources of energy, discovering new sources of oil and coal and natural gas will be a part of the report, nuclear energy will be a part of the report. New technologies such as fuel cells will be a part of the report. They suggested geothermal power. Geothermal is a power that is used in some areas.

But if we look at some of the things that the Democratic Party has done just recently on TV, I saw the chairman of the Democratic National Committee on TV slamming Bush for his energy policy and holding up a picture of Yellowstone National Park with an oil well over it and said, this is Bush's policy. Then next was one of the Grand Canyon with an oil derrick over the top of it saying this is what Bush wanted, drilling in our national parks. Nobody has suggested drilling in Yellowstone. Nobody has suggested drilling in any of our national parks. They have said that we ought to look in our national monuments which we do drilling in now and look at the reserves we have there such as the ANWR and other places. And then the DNC put on a commercial which suggested a young lady holding up a glass of water and saying, "Mommy, could I have more arsenic in my water?" And then there was a child with a hamburger saying, "Could I have more salmonella in my hamburger?" It seems to me that the DNC has taken on the same characteristic that the extreme environmental movement has taken on where raising money has become more important than the truth. They will say anything to try to discredit this President and the policies that he sets forward.

That is exactly what the extreme environmental movement has done. They have stolen the true grass-roots environmental movement. This series of articles that was written in the Sacramento Bee newspaper, and I would commend them to anyone who wants to look at how these groups are funded and some of the things that they are doing, I would like to go through some of the provisions of these articles and some of the things that they are doing because I think it is important for the American people to know where that \$15 that they are contributing or that \$25 or \$100 or \$10,000 that they are contributing to some of these groups is going and what they are going for. One of the concerns is that, as I said earlier, the extreme environmental movement has taken over the grass-roots environmental movement. It is no longer about saving the environment; it is about raising money. They spend an awful lot of their funds raising money.

One of the letters written by the Defenders of Wildlife says:

"Dear Friend, I need your help to stop an impending slaughter. Otherwise, Yellowstone National Park, an American wildlife treasure, could soon become a bloody killing field. And the victims will be hundreds of wolves and defenseless wolf pups."

So begins a fund-raising letter from one of America's fastest-growing wildlife groups, Defenders of Wildlife.

Using the popular North American gray wolf as the hub of an ambitious campaign, Defenders has assembled a financial track record that would impress Wall Street.

In 1999, donations jumped 28 percent to a record \$17.5 million. The group's net assets, a measure of financial stability, grew to \$14.5 million, another record. And according to its 1999 annual report, Defenders spent donors' money wisely, keeping fund-raising and management costs to a lean 19 percent of expenses.

But there is another side to Defenders' dramatic growth.

Pick up copies of its Federal tax returns and you will find that its five highest paid business partners are not firms that specialize in wildlife conservation. They are national direct mail and telemarketing companies.

You will also find that in calculating its fund-raising expenses, Defenders borrows a trick from the business world. It dances with digits, finds opportunity in obfuscation. Using an accounting loophole, it classifies millions of dollars spent on direct mail and telemarketing not as fund-raising but as public education and environmental activism.

Take away that loophole and Defenders' 19 percent fund-raising and management tab leaps above 50 percent, meaning more than half of every dollar donated to save wolf pups helped nourish the organization instead.

□ 2115

That was high enough to earn Defenders a D rating from the American

Institute of Philanthropy, an independent, nonprofit watchdog that scrutinizes nearly 400 charitable groups.

It is interesting when one looks down the list of some of the groups, some of the environmental groups did very well. The Nature Conservancy was an A minus; Environmental Defense was a B; Greenpeace was a D; Defenders of Wildlife was a D. That is based on the amount of money they actually give to the cause for which they are raising the funds; how much of it goes into their organization to support fund-raising.

So many of the dollars that people are giving, because they read these articles in the newspaper that support protecting wolves and other types of things, people send in their \$15 or so. Much of that money, over half of it in many cases, does not go to saving wolves; it goes to raising more money or to the organization or, as the chairman suggested, to the salaries of some of these individuals in these organizations.

One of the other things that sort of concerns me, well it concerns me a lot, is the massive waste in this fund-raising. The Wilderness Society mailed 6.2 million membership solicitations; an average of 16,986 pieces of mail a day. This is mail fatigue.

The letters that come with the mailers are seldom dull. They are steeped in outrage. They tell of a planet in perpetual environmental shock, a world victimized by profit-hungry corporations, and they do so not with precise scientific prose but with boastful and often inaccurate sentences that scream and shout. Some of the examples were given in the Sacramento Bee. From the New York-based Rain Forest Alliance, "By this time tomorrow, nearly 100 species of wildlife will tumble into extinction."

The fact is, no one knows how rapidly species are going extinct. The Alliance figures an extreme estimate that counts tropical beetles and other insects, including ones not yet known to science, in its definition of wildlife.

Another example from the Wilderness Society: We will fight to stop reckless clear-cutting on national forests in California and the Pacific Northwest that threatens to destroy the last of America's unprotected ancient forests in as little as 20 years.

Fact: The national forest logging has dropped dramatically in recent years. In California, clear-cutting on national forests dipped to 1,395 acres in 1998, down 89 percent from 1990.

From the Defenders of Wildlife again, "Will you not please adopt a furry little pup like Hope?" Hope is a cuddly brown wolf. Hope was triumphantly born in Yellowstone.

Fact: There never was a pup named Hope. Says John Valerie, Chief of Research at Yellowstone National Park, "We do not name wolves. We number them."

Since wolves were reintroduced into Yellowstone in 1995, their numbers

have increased from 14 to about 160. The program has been so successful that Yellowstone officials now favor removing animals from the Federal endangered species list.

One of my favorites that I want to talk for just a minute about again comes from the Defenders of Wildlife, and I wish I had some blow-ups of it, but it is a poison alert. "Wolves in Danger," one of the sections that runs in the newspaper or letter that goes out to individuals, a fund-raising letter. Another one that says, "a special gift when you join our pack," and it has pictures of these cuddly wolves.

More than 160 million environmental fund-raising pitches swirled through the U.S. mail last year. Some used the power of cute animals to attract donors. The problem is that in many cases those campaigns were less than honest. And this was the pitch, and this is the one that caught my attention, in Salmon, Idaho, which is in my district. In Salmon, Idaho, antiwolf extremists committed a horrible crime; they killed two Yellowstone wolves with lethal poison, compound 1080. "Please do not allow antiwolf extremists to kill our wild wolves. These wolf families do not deserve to die. Please, we need your help now." And then, of course, they solicit a contribution.

The fact is, the two wolves were not Yellowstone wolves but wolves reintroduced by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service into central Idaho, against the objections of the State of Idaho to reintroduction of those wolves.

Some wolves were killed illegally, but the population of wolves continues to increase at a pace faster than Federal wolf recovery officials had anticipated. The government expects to remove wolves from the Federal endangered species list in 3 to 4 years. In fact, in Idaho we have already met our commitment of 10 mating pairs. The problem is that they take Montana and Wyoming together and say we have to have 30 breeding pairs within the entire region.

Wolves are overpopulating Idaho better than anyone had anticipated, and they are using these instances, this group, Defenders of Wildlife, to raise money to try to save wolves. Unfortunately, much of the pleading that they do with the American public at best can be called dishonest.

I, like the chairman, want to save the environment. We want to make sure that what we do is compatible with the species and protecting species. But we also think that human beings play a role in this environment and in our world, and that human beings ought to be considered in this whole equation.

Look at what the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) is going through right now, where they have taken 170,000 acres of 200,000 acres of irrigated land that will not have water this year because a judge has ruled that the sucker fish that they are trying to protect is more important than those people.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) for his very interesting comments.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out, we both got into the idea of how much money these folks bring in. I have a chart here that points out some of the money that is brought in. Look at the amount of money that came in in one year to these organizations. And then the question comes up, well, what do they spend it for?

When we first got into this thing, we were arguing the idea, are these the people that have the fire in their bosom to go out and take care of the public land? Well, no, as we both discussed in the last while, it is not that. It is more of an idea of raising more money and more money and more money. And where is it spent?

I would like to give a little example, if I could, about an environmental group in the State of Utah, and I would hasten to say that if that is what the public wants, fine. If the public wants this money to just go into paying lawyers, paying marketers, paying advertising, K Street-type of thing, Madison Avenue, fine. But I thought that most of us who got involved in this thing did not want that. I thought we wanted to restore the forests and the clean water and the wildlife, and do it in a way that is environmentally sound and at the same time to take good care of the energy.

Let me just refer to this one group. They are called the Southern Utah Wilderness Society. Nice people are there, and some of them, I think, are a little misled, but they probably think the same thing about me. This group raises more than \$2 million each year in donations from hard-working people who care about protecting our environment. The money is raised under the idea of protecting Utah wilderness lands. Send this group some money and you will help wilderness in the Colorado plateau, you are told.

So they send out these beautiful calendars saying, this is what you will protect. However, some of it is in national parks. Only one was in that area, but it was a pretty calendar anyway.

However, when you look at their tax reports, you find that not one dime of this money is actually spent on the environment. Not a penny goes to plant a tree, restore a streambed, or protect an acre of ground in Utah or anywhere else; not a dollar to create a habitat to take care of an animal.

What this group does is, they lobby for the passage of a wilderness legislation. In fact, they lobby to pass virtually the same old, tired, worn-out legislation every year, but they keep raising the ante.

I find it interesting that that group went with me and we have said, now, look, no one from Utah really wants this. They said, oh, go back to the time that Congressman OWENS was here; he wanted it and he introduced it.

In those days, what they do not realize is Congressman OWENS was then a member of the majority party, which was then the Democratic Party. The President was a Democrat. The House and the Senate were Democrat, and I was the ranking member of the committee and they never, ever asked for a hearing. So I wonder how serious they were about it in those days.

As a recent Associated Press story noted, the only impact this bill has in the last decade are the trees that were killed to provide for the paper on which the bill is printed year after year. They are fierce lobbyists. They have a staff of 20 attorneys, lobbyists, and strategists who operate offices in four cities, including Washington, D.C.

They spent only \$11,000 in 1999 in grassroot efforts to reach out to the public, though they claim their primary reason for existence is to educate the public about the environment; but they spent nearly \$1 million in the last 4 years to lobby to get their wilderness legislation passed.

I privately believe that the last thing in the world this group wants is to pass that bill. That is why they keep moving the goal posts. That is why the numbers keep going up. Above all, this organization is a self-perpetuating consumer of resource and energy. They deal in volumes of paper and plastic. They issue their own credit cards, the Affinity credit card. That is what our environment needs, more credit cards.

They do a rich business in the sale of videos, T-shirts, hats, books, posters. Most of these products are made from nondegradable materials like plastic, or require the cutting down of trees and the use of paper. They send out more than 100,000 newsletters, fliers and bulletins each year. That is a lot of trees, and that does not even include their reports, press releases, and lawsuits. They are aggressive users of electricity. Four offices. All these things they talk about.

Now I would like to just say something about the lawsuits. If I could move this one chart here, look at the number of lawsuits that the environmental community has done between 1992 and 2000; 435 environmental lawsuits. Now I thought we were out here taking care of the environment. I did not know we were just in this thing of litigating. It is the most litigious society we have ever had, but let us litigate again.

This is how much they have made, \$36.1 million in legal fees paid by the U.S. Government, whether they won or lost. That is your taxpayer money, \$31 million right there. If they win or lose, they get that money. One case netted \$3.5 million for the Sierra Club, and it was questionable whether it was even endangered.

The average award is in excess of \$70,000 and they risk nothing. So why go out and get you to give them money to plant a tree, to pick up the garbage, to be aware of these things, to take good care of the environment, when

you can get in court and make that kind of money?

Let us be smart about this thing. This thing is not in there to protect the environment.

That reminds me of when I was back here as a freshman in 1981. The Secretary of Interior was Jim Watt. He was supposed to come in and see me with Senator Garn over in Indian School. That morning I received in the mail something from a group who was going to save the Chesapeake Bay that was all ruined. It said, "Mr. Hansen, if you will send us \$10, \$20, \$30, \$40, \$50, we will do our best to meet with the Interior Committee and Secretary Watt who is ruining the Chesapeake Bay."

So that afternoon, the Secretary walked in. I said, "Jim, I want to show you this." He laughed, and he said, "What do you mean? I put \$285 million into protecting the Chesapeake Bay." And he said, "That is just poppycock."

So I sent them \$10 because I was curious what was going to happen. Six months later, I got a letter back. It said, "Mr. Hansen, due to your generous contribution, we have met with the Interior Committee of the House," which I sit on or was sitting on in those days also, and they never walked in. "And we have influenced the Interior Department to do their very best to take care of this terrible problem, and we have that. And if you will send us some more money, another generous contribution, we will be there to help do these other things." And I thought, what poppycock. It is just like these people who prey upon the elderly regarding Social Security when half of those allegations are not true.

□ 2130

Well, I can just tell you, you just rest assured. Members here on the Committee on Resources, we are not going to drill in parks as the gentleman from Idaho was mentioning some people say. That is not going to happen. We are not going to hurt or rape or pillage the ground. If anything, in a moderate and reasonable way, we are standing ready to take care of the ground.

So I guess we can ask ourselves the question, do you want to pay attorneys? Do we not do enough with the attorneys retirement bills around here anyway? I do not know why we have to make it easy for other people to do that. Those folks seem to do pretty well. American trial attorneys do extremely well. I do not think we want to do that.

I think your money should go to take care of the public grounds of America and take good care of it. I would hope that every American is a good conservationist and a good environmentalist in the true sense of the word, and that is what I am hoping would happen.

So if you want to spend your money, put it somewhere where it does some good. Put it somewhere where we can have access to the public ground, and while we have access to the public

ground, let us each one of us take good care of it.

I took my children, we went to the very top of the Uenda mountains, King's Peak, highest peak in the Uendas. I have taught my children when we go in an area, and we find all kinds of things, we found 5 beer cans right on the top of this beautiful pristine area. Of course, we crushed them and took them out. Our theory is, is clean up ours and somebody else's, and take it out when we are backpacking. I wish we would all do that.

I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) the chairman of the Western Caucus and an extremely important member of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I want to thank the gentleman for putting together this special order regarding this topic, which I think is very important to the American people. As we are speaking here with an audience of probably over 1 million people tonight, I really want to kind of pose a question to the American people.

We were dealing with an issue that is important to you and important to me with regard to local influence over Federal Government lands and the management plans of our National Forests and our Federal lands, and it was said by some critic about local influences that those people that are closest to the resources really do not speak in the interests of the American people on public lands, which are lands for the American people, and that somehow the national organizations that send out contribution forms like which the gentleman just mentioned are somehow speaking for them.

In some ways I wanted to agree that the local perspective on some of these resources, and keep in mind the Quincy Library Group, which is a group in California of local people that work together with Federal forest lands to develop forest policies that are not only good for the forests, but also good for the local communities, and it was a better plan than by far any Washington bureaucrat could put together.

My concern was that while people might understand that a local person's influence may not represent the best interests in the American public for public lands, there is another side to that too, and that is when you have extreme sellouts like the list that you just mentioned of people that solicit, for any reason or another, money to keep their influence, it does not necessarily mean that those groups have the environment as the best interest in their minds and in their hearts, and that they pursue public policy that is good for the American people and good for America's public lands and environment, because it is not.

What it really boils down to is power and influence and keeping that. I think you have done that in an excellent way in demonstrating tonight it is not necessarily about good environmental policy for Federal lands; it is about power,

keeping power, keeping power and influence. I think that the Federal policies become secondary to that.

It is proven by some of the foolish notions that have come up in these last years, like roads moratoriums and the Sierra Nevada framework, a nightmare for the people in our Sierra Forest in California, and some issues where people with good intentions and maybe fears that on the Earth we are becoming too populated and that we have to reserve and guard these public lands at all costs, but are basically operating out of fear and not good common sense when it comes to management of public lands.

So I just am grateful that the gentleman has pinpointed even the Sacramento Bee in California did a series of articles on the environmental community and how they are such a money-raising operation, whose sole interest I think these days has become to remain an influence, and secondarily was the environmental policy that they promoted, that it has really has become out of control.

I think the American public needs to take a second guess, because groups like the Sierra Club and NRDC do not corner the market on good environmental policy in this country. I think the American people need to realize that. It needs to be balanced by somebody who is there.

It is like an on-site landlord, rather than somebody who is never on-site on a piece of rental property. The one who is on site knows what is going on, knows the detail, knows the property better than anybody else. It is no different in our Federal lands with the Sierra Club and the NRDC and groups like that depend on people that are miles and miles away and never see the resource. So how do they know one way or the other if they are being improperly influenced by these groups or not?

They do not know. They tend to react on the pictures of Bambi on the TV or mailers that they get, and they give money. But these people need to know those groups are not necessarily promoting the best environmental policy for public lands. That is why I wanted to come down and kind of reinforce it as to what you were saying, is that people need to really be aware of these groups, and they need to learn to second guess them and do not take for granted that what they are doing is good environmental policy.

I thank the gentleman for holding this special order in order to bring up points like that, as well as many of the other points that you brought up.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the gentleman from California.

I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. I thank the chairman, and I thank the gentleman from California for his comments. I agree with him fully.

The chairman made a good point that, unfortunately, this money that is spent on litigation is money that could go, it is taxpayers' money to start

with, and could go to protecting the environment. When I met with Chief Dombek a couple of years ago and talked with him about some of the problems we were having in Idaho in our natural forest, he said to me one of the problems they have in the Forest Service is making a decision, because they know that no matter what decision they make, they are going to be sued.

Last year in this article from the Sacramento Bee, during the 1990's, the government paid out \$31.6 million in attorney's fees for 434 environmental cases brought against Federal agencies. The average award per case was more than \$70,000. One long-running lawsuit in Texas that involved an endangered salamander netted lawyers for the Sierra Club and other plaintiffs more than \$3.5 in taxpayers' funds, as the chairman has already pointed out.

That is money that could be used for other environmental purposes and actually cleaning up the environment and taking care of the backlog in maintenance we have in our National Forests and in our National Parks.

Again, it is taxpayer money. One of the main arguments for the roadless issue was that the Forest Service did not have the money to maintain the roads that they currently had, and so if they couldn't maintain those, how could they justify building more roads, so we might as well make them roadless. If we are spending all that money on lawsuits, then certainly we do not have the money to take care of the roads.

One of the things that was interesting in this series of articles is that the effect of these things are actually damaging to the environment oftentimes. Let me read a portion of these articles.

Wildfire today is inflicting nightmarish wounds, injuries made worse by a failure to heed scientific warnings. For example, and there are three of them here that they list. In 1994, Wallace Covington, a Professor of Forest Ecology at Northern Arizona University and a nationally recognized fire scientist and a colleague warned that the Kendrick Mountain wilderness area in northern Arizona was so crowded with vegetation that it was ready to explode. "Delay will only perpetuate fuel build-up and increase the potential for uncontrolled and destructive wildfires," they wrote in a scientific analysis for the Kaibab National Forest. Some thinning was done, but not enough. Last year, a large fire swept through the region carving an apocalyptic trail of destruction.

What happened is much worse ecologically than a clear cut, much worse, Covington said, and that fire is in the future. It is happening again and again. We are going to have skeletal landscapes.

The other example, listening to fire and forest scientists, Martha Kettle pleaded in 1996 for permission to log and thin an incendiary mass of storm-

killed timber in California's Trinity Alps. "This is a true emergency of vast magnitude," Ketelle, then supervisor of the Six Rivers National Forest, wrote to her boss in San Francisco. "It is not a matter of if a fire will occur, but how extensive the damage will be when the fire does occur."

Because of an environmental appeal, the project bogged down. Then, in 1999, a fire found its way into the area. It spewed smoke for hundreds of miles, incinerated Spotted Owl habitat and triggered soil erosion and key damage in a key salmon spawning watershed.

These stories are something I hear about daily as I go back to Idaho from my resource advisory group and my ag advisory groups and I talk to them. We did more damage last year in Idaho with the Nation's largest wildfires. We did more damage to the environment, to salmon habitat, to spawning habitat, than was done by any logging practices that ever have been done. And today as the snow melts and the rains come, hopefully the rains come, that erosion is going to filter down into those streams and it is going to cover the beds, and consequently you are going to have a difficult time with managing salmon habitat.

So, oftentimes these efforts to address these environmental concerns, the potential for catastrophic wildfire, today the Forest Service says something like 35 million acres of our National Forests are at risk of catastrophic wildfires. These are not just fires, but these are cataclysmic fires that burn everything, they burn so hot. They burn the micro-organisms, they sterilize the soil down to as much as 18 inches, and for years and years those forests never recover, if they ever do recover.

We still have spots in Idaho from the 1910 fire that nothing will grow on. We do more damage to the environment by not proactively managing it. Of course, every time you try to do that, there is an environmental lawsuit from someone.

Now, they say, well, maybe we can do thinning if it is not for commercial purposes, as if commercial or business or profit adds some damage to the environment that thinning just to thin does not do. Of course, there are the Sierra Club groups that want no cut.

The fact is we have to proactively manage these forces, and we can do that. It was managed by fire before. Now we have to get in and do some management so that we do not have these catastrophic fires. Unfortunately, at every step of the way, we are fought by groups who think that man should not touch the forest, that they should be left as natural as they ever were before we came.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say a word about what the gentleman from Idaho just talked about. We were having a hearing not too long ago and, lo and behold, one of the big clubs was there, and I asked this vice president the

question, why is it that you resist managing the public ground? Why is it that you resist the idea that we can go in and do some cleaning, thinning, prescribe fires and take care of it and keep a wholesome forest, like many of the private organizations have?

We now have, as the gentleman from Idaho said, fuel load. What is that? It is dead trees, it is dead fall, it is brush. So now you have the potential of this summer, as last summer, is a careless smoker, a fire caused by a campfire that is left unattended, or a lightning strike, which is one of the bigger ones, and here we go again, we are going to burn the forest.

This person from this organization answered me and said, because it is not nature's way. Nature's way is just let it do its thing.

I do not know if I bought into that. You get down to the idea of 1905 we started the Forest Service, and if you read the charter of the Forest Service, it is to maintain and take care of the forests of America. And that means cleaning it, thinning it, fighting fires, instead of getting ourselves in what we had in the year 2000, the heaviest fire year in record. And I dare say, and I am no prophet, but I think the fuel load is still there after these 8 years of mismanagement we have had, and we now have 2001 waiting for another one, because talk to your local forester and the people, Mr. Speaker, those who are watching this should talk to their district rangers, talk to them and ask the question have we still got that fuel load? The answer is a resounding yes.

Here we go again. We are going to spend taxpayers' money all over the place, because we have not done what they said in 1905 we should have done, and that is manage the forest.

This new administration luckily has a man of the stature of Dale Bosworth, now the chief; and I am sure we will see some management.

I have to ask the question. Does it mean to be a good environmentalist if we let the forest burn to the ground? Does that mean being a good environmentalist? If that is so, I hope there are not too many of them out there. Does it mean the idea that we drain some of our water resources, like Lake Powell that services the whole southwest part of America, and that is the way we live because we have got water, does that mean being a good one? Yet one of the biggest organizations around in their book, the Sierra Club, had a whole four or five pages on let a river run through it and drain Lake Powell.

Does the gentleman want to comment on that?

□ 2145

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I do, and I want to comment on one specific thing, because I think I have an unusual perspective on being from California, I say to the gentleman, and that is because we are going through the California energy crisis.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have to be careful there to the gentleman.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I know, and I love my State and it is the best State in the world, and do not mess with California.

But what I am saying is that we have really seen the overinfluence of environmental zealotism in California and we are viewing that in our energy policy. We have had the worst problem with the nimby attitude on the development of energy generation resources in California, but it has all been backed by our top environmental groups who have really wanted not the population of California to grow, so they basically forced officials to stick their heads in the sand and pretend it was not happening until we have an energy crisis like now and an upcoming water shortage.

Unfortunately, California is going to get to the point where they turn the faucet, they get no water; they flip the switch, they get no electricity because of the environmental influence on public policy in the State of California, and it is not just in California, it is happening all over the world.

This summer, we are going to have to face the fact of we either force a temporary relaxation of air quality standards or we are going to have rolling blackouts and people are going to be dead, and those are the choices that we are facing in California. People are going to face that choice all over the country because of the undue influence of the environmental community in this country right now.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are going to see it this summer, if I may say to the gentleman from California. This summer is going to be the biggest wakeup call that America has had for a long time. We have had 8 years of neglect on these things which is now going to catch up with us.

We are asking, what does it mean to be a good environmentalist? Does it mean to deny access to the public grounds of America for Americans? I think not. Does it mean that we protect the Housefly over children? I do not think so. In southern Utah we have a desert tortoise and we have spent \$33,000 per turtle and we cannot really say that it is endangered. Do you want to know what our per pupil unit is to pay for our kids every year down there? Mr. Speaker, \$3,600. So I guess the turtle is more important in some people's mind.

So it comes down to this: can Americans, who are great and wonderful and good-thinking people, can we come to some common sense on this, or have we become way too extreme in this issue? I think tonight we have tried to make that case that we feel we have.

I yield the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I think the point has been made that unfortunately, the environmental movement has become far too extreme. That does not mean that there are not good environmentalists out there. There are many housewives and husbands across the Nation that want to take care of

our land and our country, I being one of those, and I am sure the gentleman from Utah and the gentleman from California also. But as I was saying earlier, many of these things do not really address the environment, they hurt it more than they address it. They are trying to use environmental issues for other means, and I will tell my colleagues an example in Idaho.

We have a sage grouse problem, declining sage grouse populations, and we are trying to find out why and what we can do to control it. The Fish and Wildlife Service and the Idaho Fish and Game have been studying this for 20 years, and they decided that predators are a main problem with sage grouse populations. They eat the young chicks. So they proposed a study to take 2 areas, one where they do some predator control this year and the other one where they did not do any predator control and examined the 2 of them and watch the sage grouse populations. But 2 environmental groups have sued them to stop the study because they want to protect the sage grouse, they say, but their real goal is, their argument is to get cattle off of this land. And if it is shown that sage grouse can be protected by removing some of the predators, the argument for removing cattle goes away. So they do not want this study done.

So is it truly their aim to try to save the sage grouse, or is it their true aim to try to get cattle off of public land, regardless of what cattle does to the sage grouse?

When I want to look at a true conservationist, an original conservationist, I look at the farmers and ranchers of this country, because it is the land that produces the crop that produces the grass that the cows eat, that is what they do for living and they take care of it; overwhelming majorities of them take care of it. So when I want some true conservation issues, I generally talk to my farmers and ranchers.

I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for joining me this evening.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules (during special order of the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-61) on the resolution (H. Res. 136) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary

levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. JONES of Ohio (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. STUMP (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and May 9 and 10 on account of being honored on the 50th anniversary of his graduation from Arizona State University.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of flight delays.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MATHESON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODLATTE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and May 9 and 10.

Mr. ROHRBACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. EMERSON, for 5 minutes, May 9.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOODLATTE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH, for 5 minutes, May 10.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 9, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1756. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's

final rule—Opting Out of Segregation (RIN: 3038-AB67) received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1757. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Privacy of Consumer Financial Information (RIN: 3038-AB68) received April 27, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1758. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Additional Safeguards for Children in Clinical Investigations of FDA-Regulated Products [Docket No. 00N-0074] (RIN: 0910-AC07) received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1759. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion [FRL-6968-6] received April 27, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1760. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Oxygenated Gasoline Program [DC049-2026a; FRL-6973-7] received April 27, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1761. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Reasonably Available Control Technology Requirements for Volatile Organic Compounds and Nitrogen Oxides [PA143-4115a; FRL-6973-4] received April 27, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1762. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: South Carolina [SC-038-200102(a); FRL-6973-9] received April 27, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1763. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans (SIP); Texas: Control of Gasoline Volatility [TX-114-2-7494; FRL-6969-4] received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1764. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Memorandum Opinion and Order addressing pending petitions for reconsideration of the Report and Order [WT Docket No. 98-143] received April 27, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1765. A letter from the Senior Legal Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act [CC Docket No. 97-213] received April 27, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1766. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to the United Kingdom [Transmittal No. DTC 039-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1767. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Spain [Transmittal No. DTC 012-01], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1768. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Acquisition Policy, GSA, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contractor Responsibility, Labor Relations Costs, and Costs Relating to Legal and Other Proceedings (RIN: 9000-AI40) received April 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1769. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, Department of Transportation, transmitting copies of the inventories of commercial positions in the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1770. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Participants' Choices of Investment Funds—received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1771. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Employee Elections to Contribute to the Thrift Savings Plan—received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1772. A letter from the Chief, Division of Scientific Authority, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes in List of Species in Appendices to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (RIN: 1018-AH63) received April 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1773. A letter from the Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Determination of Critical Habitat for the Bay Checkerspot Butterfly (RIN: 1018-AH61) received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1774. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Use and Distribution of the San Carlos Apache Tribe Development Trust Fund and San Carlos Apache Tribe Lease Fund (RIN: 1076-AE10) received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1775. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; 2000-2001 Catch Specifications for Gulf Group King Mackerel [Docket No. 001005281-0369-02; I.D. 082900C] (RIN: 0648-AN85) received April 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1776. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Visas: Documentation of Immigrants and Nonimmigrants—Visa Classification Symbols—received April 18, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1777. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Premerger Notification; Antitrust Improvements Act Notification and Report Form—received April 26, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1778. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes Powered by General Electric Engines [Docket No. 99-NM-127-AD; Amendment 39-12159; AD 2001-06-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1779. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30242; Amdt. No. 428] received April 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1780. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, -700C, and -800 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-312-AD; Amendment 39-12162; AD 2001-06-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1781. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30241; Amdt. No. 2045] received April 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1782. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30240; Amdt. No. 2044] received April 20, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1783. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. Models PA-31, PA-31-300, PA-31-325, PA-31-350, PA-31P, PA-31T, PA-31T1, PA-31T2, PA-31T3, and PA-31P-350 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-CE-29-AD; Amendment 39-12148; AD 2001-06-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1784. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica, S.A. (EMBRAER), Model EMB-120 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2001-NM-36-AD; Amendment 39-12165; AD 2001-06-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1785. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dowty Aerospace Propellers Model R381/6-123-F/5 Propellers, Correction [Docket No. 99-NE-43-AD; Amend-

ment 39-12143; AD 99-18-18 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1786. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA—Groupe AEROSPATIALE Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-CE-70-AD; Amendment 39-12152; AD 200106-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1787. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA—Groupe AEROSPATIALE Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-CE-70-AD; Amendment 39-12152; AD 200106-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 12, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1788. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Red Mountain Viticultural Area (99R-367P) [T.D. ATF-448; Re: Notice No. 897] (RIN: 1512-AA07) received April 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1789. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Workforce Development, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Treatment of Indian Tribes under Federal Unemployment Compensation Law—Amendments made by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001—received April 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1790. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Rev. Proc. 2001-27] received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1791. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Appeals Coordinated Issue Settlement Guideline Excise Tax Specialty Area; Excise Tax On Virtual Private Networks—received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1792. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, Miscellaneous [Rev. Proc. 2001-30] received April 23, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1793. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting a report on the proposed fiscal year 2002 budget; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Government Reform.

1794. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Annual Report to Congress on activities of the Department of Energy in response to recommendations and other interactions with the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2286e(b); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Armed Services.

1795. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's budget justification for the Office of Inspector General for fiscal year 2002; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 134. Resolution providing for recommitment of the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011. (Rept. 107-58). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 135. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 581) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001, to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service to facilitate the inter-agency cooperation required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in connection with wildland fire management (Rept. 107-59). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NUSSLE: Committee of Conference. Conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 83. Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011 (Rept. 107-60). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 136. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011 (Rept. 107-61). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 1745. A bill to provide that all American citizens living abroad shall (for purposes of the apportionment of Representatives in Congress among the several States and for other purposes) be included in future decennial censuses of population, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 1746. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs establish a single "1-800" telephone number for access by the public to veterans benefits counselors of the Department of Veterans Affairs and to ensure that such counselors have available to them information about veterans benefits provided

by all Federal departments and agencies and by State governments; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 1747. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking a child hostage in order to evade arrest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 1748. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 805 Glen Burnie Road in Richmond, Virginia, as the "Tom Bliley Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1749. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 685 Turnberry Road in Newport News, Virginia, as the "Herbert H. Bateman Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FRANK, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. JOHN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 1750. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize funding for the State water pollution control revolving fund program for fiscal year 2002 through 2006; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FRANK, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. JOHN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 1751. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2002 through 2006 for the municipal construction grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 1752. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the at-risk rules for publicly traded nonrecourse debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1753. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 419 Rutherford Avenue, N.E., in Roanoke, Virginia, as the "M. Caldwell Butler Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. McHUGH):

H.R. 1754. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that ancestors and lineal descendants of past or present members of the Armed Forces shall be taken into account in determining whether a veterans' organization is exempt from tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 1755. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent the use of reinsurance with foreign persons to enable domestic nonlife insurance companies to evade United States income taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1756. A bill to amend section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to make certain products eligible for drawback and to simplify and clarify certain drawback provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 1757. A bill to amend section 313 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to make certain products eligible for drawback; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 1758. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under part B of the Medicare Program of certain beta interferons and other biologicals and drugs approved by the Food and Drug Administration for treatment of multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself and Ms. DUNN):

H.R. 1759. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payment under the Medicare Program for more frequent hemodialysis treatments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr.

TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. REYES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BACA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 1760. A bill to authorize emergency disaster assistance for recovery from the earthquakes of January and February 2001 in the Republic of India and the Republic of El Salvador, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1761. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8588 Richmond Highway in Alexandria, Virginia, as the "Herb E. Harris Post Office

Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PAUL:

H.R. 1762. A bill to restore the second amendment rights of all Americans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 1763. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the personal needs allowance applied to institutionalized individuals under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STRICKLAND (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HORN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 1764. A bill to ensure that the incarceration of inmates is not provided by private contractors or vendors and that persons charged or convicted of an offense against the United States shall be housed in facilities managed and maintained by Federal, State, or local governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 1765. A bill to increase penalties for common carrier violations of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1766. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4270 John Marr Drive in Annandale, Virginia, as the "Stan Parris Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1767. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 205 South Main Street in Culpepper, Virginia, as the "D. French Slaughter Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Con. Res. 128. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the continued participation of the Russian Federation in the Group of Eight must be conditioned on the Russian Federation's voluntary acceptance of and adherence to the norms and standards of democracy; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York (for herself and Ms. NORTON):

H. Con. Res. 129. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the establishment of Million Mom March Day; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD (for himself, Mr. WU, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs.

MINK of Hawaii, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STARK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 130. Concurrent resolution authorizing printing of the book entitled "Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in Congress"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Res. 137. A resolution congratulating the Kalmyk community of the United States on the 50th anniversary of their emigration to the United States from displaced persons camps in Germany after World War II; to the Committee on International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. BONIOR introduced A bill (H.R. 1768) for the relief of Thomas Patrick McEvoy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 17: Ms. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 25: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PASCARELL.
 H.R. 41: Mr. WOLF, Mr. ISSA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HEFLEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 51: Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 61: Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 68: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 80: Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 133: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 148: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
 H.R. 168: Mr. BAKER.
 H.R. 183: Ms. BERKLEY.
 H.R. 218: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 280: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
 H.R. 281: Mr. BORSKI.
 H.R. 286: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 287: Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 294: Mr. WAMP.
 H.R. 303: Mr. OTTER and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 321: Mr. FILNER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HOFFFEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 326: Mr. SCHIFF and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
 H.R. 331: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. OTTER, and Mr. WATKINS.
 H.R. 340: Mr. MCNULTY.
 H.R. 348: Mr. DOOLEY of California and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
 H.R. 394: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. WICKER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. TIAHRT.
 H.R. 400: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 432: Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 433: Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H.R. 439: Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 442: Mr. HEFLEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. BACA, Mrs. JONES of

Ohio, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. FALCOMA.

H.R. 448: Mr. PAUL, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 458: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 510: Mr. DEFABIO and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 511: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 536: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 537: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 547: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 570: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 572: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. LANGEVIN.

H.R. 580: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 582: Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 586: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 590: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 602: Mr. BECERRA and Mr. QUINN.
 H.R. 606: Mr. CONDIT and Mr. MATSUI.
 H.R. 609: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 611: Mr. POMEROY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. BEREUTER.
 H.R. 612: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 622: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 633: Mr. BONIOR and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
 H.R. 635: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. HOFFFEL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GREENWOOD.
 H.R. 638: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.
 H.R. 654: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 663: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 664: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 668: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BASS, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 678: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 686: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 701: Mr. HOLT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. INSLEE, and Ms. HART.

H.R. 708: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 710: Mr. DOYLE and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 716: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 730: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 737: Mr. MASCARA and Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 742: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BARRETT, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 755: Mr. EVANS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 758: Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 778: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 786: Mr. RANGEL and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 814: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 823: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 875: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 876: Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. EVANS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GANSKE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FRANK, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WU, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 879: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 917: Mrs. CLAYTON.
 H.R. 921: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
 H.R. 936: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 945: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 948: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 950: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
 H.R. 953: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. BLIRAKIS.
 H.R. 954: Ms. SOLIS.
 H.R. 972: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. ANDREWS. 071
 H.R. 981: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 1004: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. FRANK.
 H.R. 1013: Mr. WHITFIELD and Mr. BOSWELL.
 H.R. 1020: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. McNULTY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COBLE, Mr. REHBERG, and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.
 H.R. 1048: Mr. FILNER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 1072: Mr. DEAL of Georgia and Mr. TIERNEY.
 H.R. 1073: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. WU, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. REYES, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. PLATTS.
 H.R. 1076: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. HOLT.
 H.R. 1090: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. REYES and Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 1108: Mr. FILNER and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1109: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mr. GANSKE.
 H.R. 1110: Mr. HEFLEY.
 H.R. 1143: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. SANDLIN.
 H.R. 1146: Mr. DUNCAN.
 H.R. 1155: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Ms. LEE, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. COYNE.
 H.R. 1170: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 1192: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 1199: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
 H.R. 1210: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 1232: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
 H.R. 1242: Mr. FRANK.
 H.R. 1252: Mr. RANGEL and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 1254: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1266: Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 1271: Mr. ROTHMAN and Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.R. 1280: Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 1290: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
 H.R. 1293: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. STENHOLM.
 H.R. 1306: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
 H.R. 1310: Mr. TIBERI and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1330: Mr. CONDIT.
 H.R. 1340: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1345: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1351: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. HART, Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. GORDON.
 H.R. 1354: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HORN, and Mr. CROWLEY.
 H.R. 1358: Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 1367: Mr. HOLT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. GREENWOOD.
 H.R. 1401: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PAUL, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 1406: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. LEE, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1407: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1408: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. NEY, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.
 H.R. 1413: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. COYNE.
 H.R. 1433: Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 1449: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1451: Mr. GANSKE.
 H.R. 1490: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COLLINS, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H.R. 1501: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 1510: Mr. SOUDER.
 H.R. 1520: Mr. SHOWS.
 H.R. 1522: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1535: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
 H.R. 1536: Mr. FROST, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LEE, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H.R. 1542: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. BENTSEN.
 H.R. 1556: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. WALSH.
 H.R. 1568: Mr. McNULTY.
 H.R. 1581: Mr. RILEY.
 H.R. 1582: Mr. OWENS.
 H.R. 1585: Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. HILLIARD.
 H.R. 1589: Mr. BURR of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1594: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 1597: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
 H.R. 1599: Mr. OTTER.
 H.R. 1601: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. HILLEARY.
 H.R. 1620: Mr. WAXMAN.
 H.R. 1622: Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 1624: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BERRY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. NEY.
 H.R. 1630: Mr. TOOMEY.
 H.R. 1642: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. FRANK.
 H.R. 1644: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KING, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. MCINTYRE.
 H.R. 1650: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1651: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FILNER.
 H.R. 1674: Mr. EVANS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SHADEGG, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. COOKSEY.
 H.R. 1688: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. NEY.
 H.R. 1690: Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 1711: Mr. MCINNIS.
 H.R. 1713: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. BECERRA, of Mr. FRANK.
 H.R. 1727: Mr. WELLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. SUNUNU.
 H.R. 1733: Ms. LEE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H.J. Res. 13: Ms. LEE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.J. Res. 38: Mr. BARR of Georgia.
 H.J. Res. 42: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FILNER, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
 H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. CRANE, Mr. COX, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. WEXLER.
 H. Con. Res. 56: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. CANTOR.
 H. Con. Res. 60: Ms. LEE, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. DEFazio.
 H. Con. Res. 68: Mr. NEY and Mr. AKIN.
 H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. WU.

H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. ROYCE.
 H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PETRI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. RIVERS.
 H. Con. Res. 104: Mr. BAKER, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
 H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. HOLT, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. HART, Mr. BACA, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. GRUCCI.
 H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. BONIOR.
 H. Res. 73: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H. Res. 97: Mr. KILDEE.
 H. Res. 108: Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HART, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BLIRAKIS, and Mr. SCHAFFER.
 H. Res. 117: Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. WATERS.
 H. Res. 120: Mr. PASCRELL and Ms. MCKINNEY.
 H. Res. 123: Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. KELLER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1613: Mr. PASCRELL.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1646

OFFERED BY: MR. TERRY

AMENDMENT NO. 1. Page 124, after line 12, add the following:

SEC. 747. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO THE REMOVAL OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The United Nations Commission on Human Rights, located in Geneva, Switzerland, provides a forum for discussing human rights and expressing international support for improving human rights performance.

(2) The United States is a founding member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council of the United Nations.

(3) The United States has been a member of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights since it was established in 1947 and has used membership on the Commission to internationally condemn countless acts of inhumanity and human rights violations.

(4) The United States vigorously opposes human rights violations, such as those perpetrated by the People's Republic of China, Cuba, and Sudan, which have violently repressed religious, spiritual, cultural, and political movements and continue to ban, criminalize, and harass groups they label as cults or heretical organizations and detain, incarcerate, and generally violate the human rights of individuals they accuse of being participants in those organizations.

(5) Nations on the United Nations Commission on Human Rights that violate the

human rights of their own citizens are in a position to remove from the Commission nations that are vigilant for violations of human rights and vocal in their opposition to such violations.

(6) The United States has an essential voice in the global community on issues pertaining to the protection of individual freedoms and human rights, and the United Nations Commission on Human Rights provides a platform from which the United States may advance these issues in the international community.

(7) The other members of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights voted on May 3, 2001, to not re-elect the United States to the Commission.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) protests the removal of the United States from the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, on which the United States has an international obligation to participate;

(2) urges the United Nations to redesign the format of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to include each of the

5 permanent members of the Security Council of the United Nations;

(3) denounces human rights violations perpetrated by other current members of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, including the People's Republic of China, Cuba, and Sudan; and

(4) strongly supports any efforts by the United States Government to rejoin the United Nations Commission on Human Rights and to continue to decry and work to end human rights violations in nations around the world.