Calendar No. _____

107TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. CON. RES. _____

[Report No. 107–____]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH ____ (legislative day, _____), 2002

Mr. CONRAD, from the Committee on the Budget, reported the following original concurrent resolution; which was placed on the calendar

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2003 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2004 through 2012.

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2003 including the appropriate

budgetary levels for fiscal years 2004 through 2012 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 2003.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RESERVE FUNDS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Restraints

Sec. 201. Circuit breaker to protect Social Security.
Sec. 202. Extension of supermajority enforcement.
Sec. 203. Pay-as-you-go rule in the Senate.
Sec. 204. Advance appropriations.
Sec. 205. Emergency designations.
Sec. 206. Improvement in budget projections dedicated toward further debt reduction.
Sec. 207. Discretionary spending limits.

Subtitle B—Reserve Funds

Sec. 211. Reserve fund for Medicare, prescription drugs, and health care.
Sec. 212. Reserve fund for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.
Sec. 213. Reserve fund for defense.
Sec. 214. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Subtitle C—Rulemaking

Sec. 221. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE

Sec. 301. Sense of the Senate regarding estimates of the cost of small business credit programs.
Sec. 302. Sense of the Senate regarding Federal employee pay.
Sec. 303. Sense of the Senate regarding broadband capabilities for underserved areas.
Sec. 304. Rejecting reductions in guaranteed Social Security benefits.
Sec. 305. Sense of the Senate on mental health parity.
Sec. 306. Sense of the Senate on beneficiary access to health services.
Sec. 307. Sense of the Senate on cost of prescription drugs and competition.
Sec. 308. Sense of the Senate on equal access to Medicare.
Sec. 309. Sense of the Senate regarding home health care.
Sec. 310. Sense of the Senate regarding Medicare equity.

Sec. 311. Sense of the Senate on expanding access to affordable health care coverage for the uninsured.
Sec. 312. Sense of the Senate on adequate stockpile for childhood immunizations.
Sec. 313. Sense of the Senate on Medicaid Commission.
Sec. 314. Sense of the Senate on child care funding.
Sec. 315. Sense of the Senate regarding the child tax credit.
Sec. 316. Sense of the Senate on defense science and technology.
Sec. 317. Sense of the Senate on Department of Defense review of Tail-to-Tooth Commission.
Sec. 318. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Guard.
Sec. 319. Sense of the Senate on concurrent receipt of military retired pay and Veterans' Administration disability compensation.
Sec. 320. Sense of the Senate on full funding for the assistance to Firefighters Grant Program.
Sec. 321. Sense of the Senate on National Infrastructure Protection Center.
Sec. 322. Sense of the Senate regarding tribal colleges and universities.
Sec. 323. Sense of the Senate regarding the Pell Grant.
Sec. 324. Sense of the Senate on Superfund.
Sec. 325. Sense of the Senate regarding PILT funding.
Sec. 326. Sense of the Senate on the State and local costs of providing services to illegal immigrants.
Sec. 327. Sense of the Senate on balanced budget constitutional amendment.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 2003 through 2012:

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

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

Fiscal year 2003: $1,500,834,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $1,606,274,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $1,735,686,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $1,832,375,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $1,924,256,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $2,030,363,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $2,143,982,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $2,254,498,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: $2,482,760,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: $2,712,387,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2003: −$210,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: −$310,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: −$320,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: −$330,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: −$350,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: −$380,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: −$410,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: −$440,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: −$500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: −$550,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2003: $1,798,940,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $1,851,626,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $1,947,779,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $2,031,257,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $2,116,783,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $2,219,009,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $2,315,099,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $2,416,349,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: $2,536,918,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: $2,609,207,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2003: $1,768,699,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $1,826,825,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $1,920,906,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $1,997,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $2,074,582,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $2,184,029,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $2,280,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $2,384,277,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: $2,509,649,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: $2,574,710,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2003: −$267,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: −$220,551,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: −$185,220,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: −$164,925,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: −$150,326,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: −$153,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: −$136,739,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: −$129,779,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: −$26,889,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: $137,677,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $6,415,335,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $6,776,248,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $7,118,567,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $7,443,740,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $7,757,704,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $8,077,822,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $8,387,173,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $8,695,850,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: $8,907,147,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: $8,963,757,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2003: $3,516,892,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $3,557,513,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $3,548,330,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $3,503,374,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $3,427,567,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $3,338,847,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $3,217,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $3,072,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: $2,806,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: $2,361,593,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $545,376,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $573,537,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $602,159,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $630,920,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $660,899,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $692,320,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $726,627,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $764,167,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: $802,485,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: $842,255,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays

of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2003: $368,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: $379,402,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005: $392,066,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006: $405,559,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007: $420,407,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008: $436,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009: $455,622,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010: $477,036,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011: $498,899,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012: $524,658,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 2003 through 2012 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $393,353,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $380,145,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $401,073,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $394,354,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $411,744,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $405,833,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $422,785,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $411,587,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $434,118,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $415,278,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $445,471,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $432,871,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $457,340,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $446,216,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $469,247,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $459,693,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $481,283,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $476,730,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $493,723,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $481,935,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $25,698,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $21,964,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $26,324,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $26,885,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,809,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $27,352,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $23,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $27,892,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $23,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $28,372,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,163,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $28,819,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,435,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $29,597,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,906,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $29,983,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $25,346,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $30,406,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $25,826,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $22,942,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $23,213,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,766,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $23,604,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $23,098,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $24,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $23,440,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $24,417,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $23,838,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $24,834,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,315,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $25,270,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $24,739,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $25,705,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $25,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $26,134,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $25,596,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $26,584,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $26,033,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $2,740,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $813,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $2,908,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,029,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $2,731,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,013,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $2,494,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $978,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $2,434,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,027,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $2,295,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $2,252,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $873,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $2,312,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $2,371,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,085,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $2,380,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,235,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $33,290,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $31,549,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $34,365,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $32,772,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $35,314,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $33,888,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $36,224,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $35,216,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $35,383,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $35,574,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $36,272,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $36,212,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $37,943,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $37,260,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $38,654,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $38,149,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $39,511,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $38,971,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $40,247,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $39,676,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $29,950,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $28,654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $23,871,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,507,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $24,935,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $23,616,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $22,075,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $20,825,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $21,801,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $20,719,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $20,273,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $19,158,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $19,205,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,126,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $18,797,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,797,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $18,654,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,656,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $18,890,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,908,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $5,563,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,223,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $5,518,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $1,017,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $7,485,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,044,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $7,358,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,067,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $7,409,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,198,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $7,572,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $7,771,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $7,927,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,562,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $8,090,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $3,946,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $8,258,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $4,172,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $65,780,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $65,081,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $65,174,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $63,198,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $67,033,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $64,046,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $68,348,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $65,296,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $69,703,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $66,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $71,098,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $67,991,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $72,536,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $69,411,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $73,987,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $70,881,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $75,466,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $72,356,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $76,981,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $73,807,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $15,855,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $15,941,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $16,195,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,056,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $16,452,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $16,620,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,162,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $16,901,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,839,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $17,182,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,022,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $17,461,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,244,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $17,734,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,508,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $18,026,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,780,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $85,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $79,544,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $92,216,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $85,337,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $95,921,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $91,247,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $99,696,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $95,461,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $103,482,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $99,271,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $106,026,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $103,121,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $107,764,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $106,022,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $109,170,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $107,802,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $110,762,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $109,505,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $112,401,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $111,134,000,000.

(11) Health (550):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $221,534,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $217,927,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $242,153,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $241,847,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $261,669,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $260,993,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $279,377,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $278,785,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $299,646,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $298,148,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $320,960,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $319,792,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $343,678,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $342,257,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $369,262,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $367,786,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $396,366,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $394,948,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $426,447,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $425,094,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $240,075,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $239,952,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $256,183,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $256,458,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $290,523,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $290,422,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $312,426,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $312,173,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $342,947,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $343,183,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $382,127,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $381,979,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $415,754,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $415,485,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $452,431,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $452,688,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $497,998,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $497,821,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $531,753,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $531,456,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $322,668,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $325,682,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $319,229,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $319,714,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $326,508,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $326,353,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $336,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $335,731,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $344,006,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $342,513,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $357,806,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $356,284,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $369,640,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $367,703,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $382,653,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $380,601,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $400,665,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $398,371,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $392,275,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $389,890,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $13,428,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $13,428,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $14,414,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $14,414,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $15,316,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $15,316,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $16,223,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,223,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $17,398,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,398,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $18,779,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,779,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $20,466,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $20,466,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $22,404,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $22,404,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $25,621,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $25,621,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $28,108,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $28,108,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $56,196,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $55,309,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $58,211,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $57,818,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $62,274,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $61,816,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $61,779,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $61,276,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $61,148,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $60,553,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $64,980,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $64,690,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $66,651,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $66,283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $68,391,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $67,999,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $72,731,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $72,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $70,127,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $69,654,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $38,437,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $38,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $37,912,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $38,524,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $36,584,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $36,710,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $37,410,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $36,951,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $38,287,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $37,731,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $39,170,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $38,757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $40,120,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $39,692,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $41,061,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $40,630,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $41,998,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $41,575,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $42,981,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $42,550,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $16,680,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,605,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $16,521,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,770,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $16,746,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,687,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $17,025,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,822,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $17,306,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,002,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $17,167,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $16,981,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $17,469,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,099,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $17,778,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,381,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $18,106,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $17,697,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $18,451,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $18,167,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, $259,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $259,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, $286,714,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $286,714,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, $302,269,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $302,269,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, $312,913,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $312,913,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, $322,316,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $322,316,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, $331,273,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $331,273,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, $339,874,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $339,874,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, $347,333,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $347,333,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, $354,127,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $354,127,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, $354,828,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $354,828,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, −$5,442,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$1,182,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, −$12,109,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$10,348,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, −$14,593,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$13,946,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, −$14,943,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$14,656,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, −$15,135,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$14,971,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, −$15,811,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$15,704,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, −$16,284,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$16,174,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, −$17,104,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$16,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, −$17,589,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$17,475,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, −$18,140,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$18,024,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2003:

(A) New budget authority, −$44,467,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$44,467,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004:

(A) New budget authority, −$58,205,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$58,205,000,000.

Fiscal year 2005:

(A) New budget authority, −$61,364,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$61,364,000,000.

Fiscal year 2006:

(A) New budget authority, −$54,337,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$54,337,000,000.

Fiscal year 2007:

(A) New budget authority, −$54,395,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$54,395,000,000.

Fiscal year 2008:

(A) New budget authority, −$56,556,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$56,556,000,000.

Fiscal year 2009:

(A) New budget authority, −$58,351,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$58,351,000,000.

Fiscal year 2010:

(A) New budget authority, −$60,717,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$60,717,000,000.

Fiscal year 2011:

(A) New budget authority, −$63,093,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$63,093,000,000.

Fiscal year 2012:

(A) New budget authority, −$65,519,000,000.

(B) Outlays, −$65,519,000,000.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RESERVE FUNDS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Restraints

SEC. 201. CIRCUIT BREAKER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) CIRCUIT BREAKER.—Effective January 1, 2003, if in any year the Congressional Budget Office, in its report pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 projects an on-budget deficit (excluding Social Security) for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, then the concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year shall reduce on-budget deficits relative to the projections of CBO and put the budget on a path to achieve on-budget balance within 5 years, and shall include such provisions as are necessary to protect Social Security and facilitate deficit reduction, except it shall not contain any reduction in Social Security benefits.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—Effective January 1, 2003, if in any year the Congressional Budget Office, in its report pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional

Budget Act of 1974 projects an on-budget deficit for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget for the budget year or any conference report thereon that fails to reduce on-budget deficits relative to the projections of CBO and put the budget on a path to achieve on-budget balance within 5 years.

(c) AMENDMENTS TO BUDGET RESOLUTION.—Effective January 1, 2003, if in any year the Congressional Budget Office, in its report pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 projects an on-budget deficit for the budget year or any subsequent fiscal year covered by those projections, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider an amendment to a concurrent resolution on the budget that would increase on-budget deficits relative to the concurrent resolution on the budget in any fiscal year covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget or cause the budget to fail to achieve on-budget balance within 5 years.

(d) SUSPENSION OF REQUIREMENT DURING WAR OR LOW ECONOMIC GROWTH.—

(1) LOW GROWTH.—If the most recent of the Department of Commerce's advance, preliminary, or final reports of actual real economic growth indicate

that the rate of real economic growth (as measured by real GDP) for each of the most recently reported quarter and the immediately preceding quarter is less than 1 percent, this section is suspended.

(2) WAR.—If a declaration of war is in effect, this section is suspended.

(e) BUDGET YEAR.—In this section, the term ''budget year'' shall have the same meaning as in section 250(c)(12) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 202. EXTENSION OF SUPERMAJORITY ENFORCEMENT.

Notwithstanding any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or any other rules of the Senate, sections 904(c)(2) and 904(d)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall remain in effect as rules of the Senate through September 30, 2007.

SEC. 203. PAY-AS-YOU-GO RULE IN THE SENATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 207 of H. Con. Res. 68 (106th Congress, 1st Session) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by inserting after ''would'' the following: ''decrease the on-budget surplus,''; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking all after the dash and inserting ''If direct spending or

revenue legislation decreases the on-budget surplus, increases the on-budget deficit, or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, then it must also decrease the on-budget surplus, increase the on-budget deficit, or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A).''; and

(2) in subsection (g), by striking ''2002'' and inserting ''2007''.

(b) TREATMENT OF ESTIMATES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of Senate rules or of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, estimates for purposes of Senate enforcement of section 207 of H. Con. Res. 68 (106th Congress, 1st Session) shall exclude—

(1) amounts of committee allocations provided in this resolution above the baseline; and

(2) amounts of revisions made to total budget authority and outlays, functional totals, and allocations pursuant to reserve funds in this resolution.

SEC. 204. ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 204 of H. Con. Res. 290 (106th Congress) is amended by striking subsections (a) through (f) and (h).

(b) LIMITATION.—Section 202 of H. Con. Res. 83 (107th Congress) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' after the semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) for fiscal year 2004, in an amount not to exceed $25,403,000,000''; and

(2) in subsection (d), by striking ''2002'' in both places it appears and inserting ''2003''.

SEC. 205. EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.

Section 205(g) of H. Con. Res. 290 (106th Congress) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading by striking the three words after ''EXCEPTION''; and

(2) by striking the last four words.

SEC. 206. IMPROVEMENT IN BUDGET PROJECTIONS DEDICATED TOWARD FURTHER DEBT REDUCTION.

If the report provided pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal years

2003 through 2012 estimates a surplus for any of fiscal years 2003 through 2012 that exceeds the surplus for that year set forth in the report provided pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal years 2003 through 2012, or a deficit for any of fiscal years 2003 through 2012 that is less than the deficit for that year set forth in the report provided pursuant to section 202(e)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal years 2003 through 2012, the difference between such estimates shall be dedicated toward further debt reduction.

SEC. 207. DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, for the purposes of enforcement in the Senate the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means for fiscal year 2003 $768,089,000,000 in new budget authority and $794,736,000,000 in outlays.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), 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 section.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS.—The adoption of a supplemental appropriations Act or supplemental appropriations Acts shall adjust the 2003 caps in this resolution.

Subtitle B—Reserve Funds

SEC. 211. RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE, PRESCRIPTION DRUGS, AND HEALTH CARE.

(a) HEALTH CARE.—If the Committee on Finance reports legislation that would expand health insurance coverage to the uninsured, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may, in consultation with the Members of the Budget Committee and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the appropriate committee, revise the allocations in this resolution to the Committee on Finance for a bill, amendment thereto, or conference report thereon, that would expand health insurance coverage to the uninsured (and build upon and strengthen public and private coverage), by the amount provided in such legisla-

tion for such purpose, but not to exceed $95,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays over the total of fiscal years 2003 through 2012, except as provided in subsection (d).

(b) MEDICARE.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may, in consultation with the Members of the Budget Committee and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the appropriate committee, revise the allocations to the Committee on Finance for a bill, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides a prescription drug benefit that is voluntary, accessible to all beneficiaries, and affordable and sustainable over time;

(2) protects beneficiary access to covered health care services and providers; and

(3) strengthens the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, but not to exceed $500,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2012, except as provided in subsection (d).

(c) TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS.—The total of adjustments allowed under subsections (a) and (b) shall not exceed

$500,000,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2003 through 2012.

(d) OFFSET PERMITTED.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the consideration or enactment of legislation that includes provisions that would otherwise exceed the limitations in this section, as long as such provisions are contingent upon the enactment of legislation producing savings sufficient to offset the cost of such provisions.

SEC. 212. RESERVE FUND FOR THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, in consultation with the Members of the Committee on the Budget and the Chairman and Ranking Member of the appropriate committee, increase the allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate by up to $2,500,000,000 in new budget authority and $50,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003, $37,500,000,000 in new budget authority and $21,375,000,000 in outlays for the total of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and $112,498,000,000 in new budget authority and $90,578,000,000 in outlays for the total of fiscal years 2003 through 2012, for a bill, amendment, or conference report that would provide increased funding for part B grants, other than section 619, under the Indi-

viduals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), with the goal that funding for these grants, when taken together with amounts provided by the Committee on Appropriations, provides 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure for children with disabilities in the sixth year.

SEC. 213. RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE.

Upon the favorable reporting of legislation by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate authorizing discretionary appropriations in excess of the levels assumed in this resolution for defense-related expenses including those generated by the war on terrorism in fiscal years 2005 through 2012, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may, in consultation with the Chairman and Ranking Member of the appropriate committee, revise the level of total new budget authority and outlays, the functional totals, and levels of surpluses and debt in this resolution by up to the following amounts:

(1) For fiscal year 2005, $10,642,000,000 in budget authority and $7,119,000,000 in outlays.

(2) For fiscal year 2006, $21,261,000,000 in budget authority and $16,617,000,000 in outlays.

(3) For fiscal year 2007, $32,223,000,000 in budget authority and $27,072,000,000 in outlays.

(4) For fiscal year 2008, $33,471,000,000 in budget authority and $31,338,000,000 in outlays.

(5) For fiscal year 2009, $34,512,000,000 in budget authority and $33,403,000,000 in outlays.

(6) For fiscal year 2010, $35,904,000,000 in budget authority and $34,994,000,000 in outlays.

(7) For fiscal year 2011, $37,513,000,000 in budget authority and $36,585,000,000 in outlays.

(8) For fiscal year 2012, $39,063,000,000 in budget authority and $38,114,000,000 in outlays.

To the extent the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate does not report such legislation and the Committee on the Budget of the Senate does not revise the levels in this resolution pursuant to this section, the amounts provided in paragraphs (1) through (8) shall be dedicated for debt reduction.

SEC. 214. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

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

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

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

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

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

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

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

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

Subtitle C—Rulemaking

SEC. 221. 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

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ESTIMATES OF THE COST OF SMALL BUSINESS CREDIT PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Small businesses play a critical role in our Nation and our economy, and the Federal Government assists that role by providing small businesses with loans and loan guarantees.

(2) Since the enactment of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, the Small Business Administration and Office of Management and Budget have repeatedly reestimated downward the subsidy cost for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) and 504 credit programs. For the 7(a) program alone,

SBA and OMB have reestimated more than $1,000,000,000 in subsidy costs.

(3) These overestimates have resulted in borrowers and lenders in both programs having to pay higher than necessary fees to participate in the programs.

(4) In addition, these overestimates have diverted more than $1,000,000,000 in resources from other discretionary programs.

(5) In its 2003 budget, the Administration expects to further revise downward in fiscal year 2002 the estimated cost of small business loan programs.

(6) The Administration has begun working on substantially revising its model for the section 7(a) program, but was unable to complete its work in time for the 2003 budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the performance of the SBA and OMB in administering the Federal Credit Reform Act for small business credit programs has been unsatisfactory;

(2) the Administration should expeditiously complete its work on the new model for the section 7(a) program and share the results of that work

with the Budget and Small Business Committees by no later than this August;

(3) the Administration should immediately begin work on similarly improving its subsidy model for the section 504 program; and

(4) the Administration should work with Congress to ensure that adequate funding is provided in fiscal year 2003 for small business credit programs.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FEDERAL EMPLOYEE PAY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate 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 2003 includes a 4.1 percent pay raise for military personnel.

(4) The Office of Management and Budget has requested that Federal agencies plan their fiscal year 2003 budgets with a 2.6 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 THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that there should continue to be parity between the adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the adjustments in the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING BROADBAND CAPABILITIES FOR UNDERSERVED AREAS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) In many parts of the United States, segments of large cities, smaller cities, and rural areas are experiencing population loss and low job growth that hurt the surrounding communities.

(2) The availability and use of broadband telecommunications services and infrastructure in rural and other parts of America is critical to economic development, job creation, and new services such as distance learning, telework capabilities, and telemedicine.

(3) Existing broadband technology cannot be deployed or is underutilized in many rural and other areas, due in part to technical limitations or the cost of deployment relative to the available market.

(4) Today's small and medium-sized businesses need an extension program that provides access to cutting edge technology.

(5) There is a need to create partnerships to reduce the time it takes for new developments in university and other laboratories to reach the manufacturing floor and to help small and medium-sized businesses transform their innovations into jobs.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Congress should—

(1) facilitate the deployment of and demand for broadband telecommunications networks and capabilities (including wireless and satellite networks and capabilities) in underserved and rural areas;

(2) encourage the adoption of advanced technologies by small and medium-sized businesses to improve productivity, and to promote regional partnerships between educational institutions and businesses to develop such technologies in the surrounding areas; and

(3) invest in research to identify and address barriers to increased availability and use of broadband telecommunications services in rural and underserved areas.

SEC. 304. REJECTING REDUCTIONS IN GUARANTEED SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Social Security was designed as a social insurance program to ensure that Americans who work hard and contribute to our Nation can live in dignity in their old age.

(2) For ⅔ of seniors, Social Security is their primary source of income, and for ⅓, Social Security is their only source of income.

(3) In fiscal year 2001, the annual level of Social Security benefits for retired workers averaged approximately $10,000, an amount insufficient to maintain a decent standard of living in most parts of the country, especially for seniors with relatively high health care costs.

(4) In 2001, President George W. Bush's Commission to Strengthen Social Security (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'') produced 3 proposals for Social Security reform that included individual accounts and significant reductions in the level of guaranteed benefits.

(5) The proposed changes to guaranteed benefits could reduce benefits to future retirees by 45 percent.

(6) The Commission proposals also suggested reducing benefits for early retirees, forcing many Americans to delay retirement.

(7) The Commission justified proposed cuts in guaranteed benefits by pointing to long-term projected shortfalls in the Social Security Trust Fund, however, the Commission's proposals to divert payroll tax revenues from the Trust Fund into private accounts would substantially accelerate the date by which the Trust Fund would become insolvent.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should reject the reductions in guaranteed Social Security benefits proposed by the President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MENTAL HEALTH PARITY.

It is the sense of the Senate that in providing for mental health parity—

(1) nothing in this budget resolution shall be construed to alter or amend title II of the Social Security Act (or any regulation promulgated under that Act);

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury will annually estimate the impact of enactment of such a policy on the income and balances of the trust funds established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401); and

(3) that if the Secretary of the Treasury estimates that the enactment of mental health parity has a negative impact on the income and balances of the trust funds established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401), the Secretary shall transfer, not less frequently than quarterly, from the general revenues of the Federal Government an amount sufficient so as to ensure that

the income and balances of such trust funds are not reduced as a result of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BENEFICIARY ACCESS TO HEALTH SERVICES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) All types of local and community providers have expressed deep concern with the instability caused by unpredictable and ever-changing reimbursement rates that fail to reflect the increasing costs of providing care.

(2) Many communities have reported critical problems with beneficiary access to quality services and providers.

(3) Other providers, including teaching hospitals, who continue to provide services to the sickest and the poorest, despite inadequate reimbursements, confront severe capacity strains and the threat of deterioration in the quality of services provided.

(4) The health care delivery system is suffering a grave workforce shortage, and the costs of attracting and retaining quality health care personnel, which are further exacerbated in geographically isolated rural areas with low population density and poor economic conditions, have placed additional burdens on providers nationwide.

(5) Many providers have experienced serious reductions in reimbursement and some confront additional reductions starting in October 2002.

(6) New funding is needed to assure that the availability of important services does not come at the expense of beneficiary access to other needed services.

(7) Economic conditions have forced many States to decrease reimbursement rates and investments in health care.

(8) An aging baby boomer population will only further strain the fragile status of many providers, including rural and frontier health caregivers.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should provide sufficient resources to ensure beneficiary access to high-quality health services provided by home health agencies, skilled nursing facilities, physicians, and hospitals, including rural, teaching, community, and safety net hospitals that serve communities across the Nation.

SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS AND COMPETITION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The average senior citizen uses 18 different medications each year.

(2) From 1992 to 2000, annual per-capita spending for seniors grew from $559 to $1,205, an increase of 116 percent.

(3) In 1999, the cost of prescription drugs was 4.2 times higher than the rate of inflation.

(4) There are several bills pending in Congress that would use market forces and competition to help lower the cost of prescription drugs to consumers, health plans, government health programs, and businesses.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that if Congress passes legislation that utilizes market forces and competition to lower the cost of prescription drugs, and if CBO says that these measures save the Federal Government money, these savings should be set aside to enhance a prescription drug benefit for Medicare recipients.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EQUAL ACCESS TO MEDICARE.

It is the sense of the Senate that none of the funds provided for in this resolution should be used to provide reimbursements under the Medicare program to any provider who requires beneficiaries to pay an access or membership fee, or requires the purchase of non-Medicare cov-

ered services as a precondition for receiving Medicare-covered care.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING HOME HEALTH CARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) rapid growth in home health spending from 1990 through 1997 prompted Congress and the Administration, as part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, to initiate changes that were intended to slow this growth in spending and make the program more cost-effective and efficient;

(2) these measures have produced cuts in home health spending far beyond what Congress intended;

(3) the savings goals set for home health in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 have been far surpassed. The most recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections show that the post-Balanced Budget Act reductions in home health will be about $72,000,000,000 between fiscal years 1998 and 2002;

(4) these savings are 4 times the $16,000,000,000 that the CBO originally estimated for that time period and are a clear indication that Medicare home health cutbacks have been far deeper and wide-reaching than Congress intended;

(5) an additional 15 percent cut in Medicare home health payments would harm access to home health care for Medicare beneficiaries by jeopardizing low-cost, efficient providers who are struggling under the current system;

(6) for rural residents, hospitalization sometimes means stays that are a considerable distance from family and community. These stays impose burdens on family members by virtue of their distance from home. In rural areas, availability of home health services can permit patients to return home more quickly, reducing travel and time burdens of supportive family members and friends;

(7) according to the June 2001 Medicare Payment Advisory Council Report, there are 3 factors that can lead to an increase in costs for rural home health providers: travel, volume of services, and the lack of sophisticated management and patient care procedures. Traveling to sparsely populated areas that are often miles apart may increase the costs of providing services to beneficiaries; and

(8) the March 2002 MedPAC report states: ''Although we have no evidence to suggest that access to care in rural areas is impaired with rural

payments at their current level, we do not know if that would persist without the rural add-on.''.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that within the funding allocated to the Committee on Finance for Medicare reform, Congress and the Administration should work together to—

(1) avoid the 15 percent reduction in the prospective payment system for home health care; and

(2) extend the 10 percent bonus payment for rural Medicare home health providers.

SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MEDICARE EQUITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Medicare payment systems should accurately compensate providers who deliver high-quality, cost-effective services to Medicare beneficiaries in all areas of the country;

(2) geographic adjustments in the current Medicare payment systems contain inaccuracies which, in many cases, harm low-cost and rural providers;

(3) Medicare today could also be improved by adding new payment adjustments to reflect the true costs of low-cost and rural providers;

(4) accurate and adequate payment adjustments for low-cost and rural providers would increase access of beneficiaries in such areas to needed Medicare services;

(5) research demonstrates that low-cost and rural providers deliver high-quality, cost-effective services, despite the flaws of current Medicare payment system; and

(6) Congress is currently considering proposals to reduce regional inequities in Medicare spending and reward, rather than punish, providers which deliver high-quality, cost-effective Medicare services.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that within the funding allocated to the Committee on Finance for Medicare reform, the committee is encouraged to promote geographic equity in Medicare fee-for-service payments and reward, rather than punish, providers which deliver high-quality, cost-effective Medicare services in all areas of the country.

SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON EXPANDING ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR THE UNINSURED.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) 40,000,000 Americans are without health care coverage, including many poor individuals who are not eligible for public programs; and

(2) employers face escalating costs for private coverage, jeopardizing their ability to provide coverage.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—This resolution assumes that—

(1) sufficient funding will be made available to expand access to affordable health coverage for the uninsured; and

(2) such funding shall—

(A) permit a mix of options for private and public coverage;

(B) build upon and strengthen private and public coverage;

(C) target those who need it most; and

(D) avoid creating new bureaucracies and promote flexibility in expanding coverage.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ADEQUATE STOCKPILE FOR CHILDHOOD IMMUNIZATIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Our nation is currently facing severe vaccine shortages that threaten the continued success of

childhood immunization, one of the most important public health achievements of the last century.

(2) Currently, vaccines against eight of eleven vaccine preventable diseases are in shortage, and providers have had to deny vaccines to children for whom these vaccines were previously recommended.

(3) Stockpiles for all routine immunizations universally recommended for children would have helped mitigate these acute supply shortages, but could not be established given existing resources.

(4) The Administration's budget drastically underfunds the stockpiling of routine vaccines universally recommended for children.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that adequate stockpiles be made available for all routine immunizations universally recommended for children.

SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MEDICAID COMMISSION.

It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should establish a National Commission on Medicaid and State-Based Health Care Reform to study and make recommendations to Congress, the President, and the Secretary of Health and Human Services with respect to the program under title XIX of the Social Security Act.

SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CHILD CARE FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds—

(1) 14,000,000 children under 6 are regularly in child care;

(2) 75 percent of mothers with school-age children are in the workforce;

(3) 65 percent of mothers with children under 6 are working today;

(4) the Child Care and Development Block Grant only reaches 12 to 15 percent of eligible children;

(5) the national average salary for a child care worker is between $15,000 to $16,000 a year with few benefits;

(6) almost half of all States provide reimbursements to child care providers lower than the current Federal guideline of 75 percent;

(7) almost ⅖ of all States report that most families don't know that they can access child care assistance;

(8) according to the General Accounting Office, 20 States do not even conduct 1 unannounced child care visit per year to child care programs;

(9) 46 percent of kindergarten teachers report that ½ or more of their children are not ready to learn when they start school;

(10) 1 out of 7 children eligible for the Child Care and Development Block Grant is currently receiving it;

(11) as of March 2000, only 4 States allowed families with incomes up to the maximum level allowed under Federal law (85 percent of the State median income) to qualify for assistance; and

(12) 46 States require families at the poverty line ($14,150 for a family of 3 in 2000) to pay a fee for their child's care.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that—

(1) access to quality child care is essential to the future success of children and to their parents' ability to maintain employment;

(2) as Congress considers the reauthorization of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, it must ensure that the families of America have the ability to meet the work requirements under law by having their child care needs met; and

(3) Congress should increase the funding for the Child Care and Development Fund to meet the work requirements under the reauthorization of wel-

fare programs and to allow States to expand their child care programs to meet the needs of lower income working families.

SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE CHILD TAX CREDIT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The child tax credit, now scheduled to reach $1,000 per eligible child in the year 2010, is a valuable tax benefit for families.

(2) The child tax credit should not be allowed to revert to the $500 per eligible child level in 2011, as provided under current law.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Committee on Finance extend the child tax credit for 2011 and succeeding years; and

(2) the Committee on Finance offset the cost of such an extension by enacting legislation to close down abusive corporate tax shelters and other abusive tax practices brought to light as a result of its investigations into the collapse of the Enron Corporation.

SEC. 316. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON DEFENSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The Secretary of Defense has indicated his support for the recommendations of the 1998 Defense Science Board Task Force and the recently completed Quadrennial Defense Review, which encourages the Administration and Congress to provide 3 percent of the total Department of Defense budget for basic research, applied research, and advanced technology development, which make up the Department of Defense Science and Technology program.

(2) Science and technology funding in the President's budget for the Department of Defense would decline to 2.68 percent in 2003 and continue to fall as a percentage of the Department's budget in every subsequent year of the Future Years Defense Plan.

(3) Robust investment in science and technology is integral to full realization of the promise of the hi-tech Revolution in Military Affairs.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that science and technology should be no less than 3 percent of the budget of the Department of Defense by 2007.

SEC. 317. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REVIEW OF TAIL-TO-TOOTH COMMISSION.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate finds that according to the Business Executives for National Security Tail-to-Tooth Commission almost 70 percent of Department of Defense dollars are spent on overhead and support functions (''tail'') and no more than 30 percent are spent on fighting forces (''tooth'').

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that Congress should request that the Department of Defense review the findings of the ''Tail-to-Tooth Commission'' and closely evaluate ways to streamline overhead and support functions and any savings made in this area could be used to provide the best support to our troops fighting the war on terrorism or critical resources for homeland defense.

SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Army National Guard relies heavily upon thousands of full-time employees, Active Guard/Reserves and Military Technicians, to ensure unit readiness throughout the Army National Guard;

(2) these employees perform vital day-to-day functions, ranging from equipment maintenance to

leadership and staff roles, that allow the National Guard to dedicate drill weekends and annual active duty training of part-time personnel to preparation for the National Guard's war fighting and peacetime missions;

(3) the role of full-time National Guard personnel is especially important as tens of thousands of our National Guard and Reserve forces are being mobilized to help fight the war on terrorism;

(4) when the ability to provide sufficient Active Guard/Reserves and Military Technicians end-strength is reduced, unit readiness, as well as quality of life for soldiers and families, is degraded;

(5) the Army National Guard, with agreement from the Department of Defense, requires a minimum essential requirement of 24,492 Active Guard/Reserves and 25,702 Military Technicians; and

(6) the fiscal year 2003 budget request for the Army National Guard provides resources sufficient for approximately 23,768 Active Guard/Reserves and 25,215 Military Technicians, end-strength shortfalls of 724 and 487, respectively.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this resolution assume that the Department of Defense will give priority to fund-

ing the Active Guard/Reserves and Military Technicians at least at the minimum required levels.

SEC. 319. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF MILITARY RETIRED PAY AND VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION DISABILITY COMPENSATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Under present law, law passed in 1891, today's service-disabled military retirees must surrender a portion of their military retired pay in order to receive the Veterans' Administration disability compensation to which they are entitled.

(2) Because career military service-members receive no separate payment for their service-connected disabilities, our Government is effectively requiring disabled military retirees to fund their own disability benefits.

(3) Over 500,000 disabled military retirees have their retired pay offset by their disability compensation.

(4) Current law discriminates against the dedicated men and women who have given the best years of their lives in the service of our country, defending our freedom.

(5) Career uniform service retirees are the only group of Federal retirees required to waive their retirement pay in order to receive Veterans' Administration disability compensation. Military retirees with service-connected disabilities should be able to receive compensation for their injuries above their military retired pay.

(6) Elimination of the offset is supported by all of the Nation's veterans and military service organizations.

(7) Seventy-nine members of the Senate support the elimination of the requirement and are cosponsors of S. 170 allowing concurrent receipt of military retired pay and veterans disability compensation.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—Therefore, it is the Sense of the Senate that—

(1) Congress should repeal any law that established the offset of military retired pay by Veterans Disability Compensation;

(2) Congress should enact legislation that fully funds restoration of military retired pay to eligible disabled veterans; and

(3) the President should provide full funding for military retired pay in future budget requests.

SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FULL FUNDING FOR THE ASSISTANCE TO FIREFIGHTERS GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(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; and

(3) the high rates in the United States of death, injury, and property damage caused by fires demonstrate a critical need for Federal investment in support of firefighting personnel.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—In the wake of the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, and the ultimate sacrifice paid by over 300 firefighters, it is the sense of the Senate that the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, should—

(1) at a minimum, be fully funded; and

(2) remain a separate and distinct program, that provides financial resources for basic fire fighting needs.

SEC. 321. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION CENTER.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) should not receive the additional $21,000,000 in budget authority requested for the National Infrastructure Protection Center (NIPC) until the Attorney General reports to Congress that NIPC will remain an interagency organization and will not be transferred solely to the FBI.

SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) More than 30,000 full- and part-time Native American students from 250 federally recognized tribes nationwide attend tribal colleges and universities, a majority of whom are first-generation college students.

(2) The colleges and universities are located in rural and isolated areas and are often the only accredited institutions of higher education in their service area. The colleges serve students of all ages, about 20 percent of whom are non-Indian. With rare exception, tribal colleges and universities do not receive operating funds from the State for these non-Indian students. Yet, if these same students attended any other public institution in the State, the State would provide that institution an average of

$9,000 toward its operating budget, for each full-time student.

(3) While annual appropriations for tribal colleges have increased modestly in recent years, the President's fiscal year 2003 budget recommends no increase in institutional operating funds. The combination of annual increases in enrollments and reduced Federal funding would result in a devastating decrease in funding of $390 per student below the previous fiscal year.

(4) Per-Indian student funding for tribal colleges is currently $3,916, less than ⅔ of the $6,000 authorized for tribal colleges' institutional operations.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) this resolution recognizes the funding challenges faced by tribal colleges and assumes that priority consideration will be provided to them through funding through the Tribally Controlled College or University Assistance Act, the Equity in Educational Land Grant Status Act, and title III of the Higher Education Act; and

(2) such priority consideration reflects Congress' intent to continue to work toward statutory

Federal funding goals for the tribal colleges and universities.

SEC. 323. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE PELL GRANT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) public investment in higher education yields a return of several dollars for each dollar invested;

(2) higher education promotes economic opportunity; for example recipients of bachelor's degrees earn an average of 75 percent per year more than those with high school diplomas and experience half as much unemployment as high school graduates;

(3) access to a college education has become a hallmark of American society, and is vital to upholding our belief in equality of opportunity;

(4) for a generation, the Federal Pell Grant has served as an established and effective means of providing access to higher education;

(5) over the past decade, the Pell Grant has failed to keep up with inflation; over the past 25 years, the value of the average Pell Grant has decreased by 20 percent—it is now worth only 70 percent of what Pell Grants were worth in 1975;

(6) grant aid as a portion of student aid has fallen significantly over the past 5 years; where

grant aid used to constitute 55 percent of total aid awarded and loans constituted just over 40 percent, now that trend has been reversed so that loans constitute nearly 60 percent of total aid awarded and grants constitute only 40 percent of total aid awarded;

(7) the percentage of freshmen attending public and private 4-year institutions from families whose income is below the national median has fallen since 1981; and

(8) last year, eligible Pell Grant applicants grew by 8.3 percent in comparison to the 2.5 percent growth projected, and this has caused a shortfall in funding for the program, but represents the increase in low-income students who now have access to college.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) within the discretionary allocation provided to the Committee on Appropriations the maximum Pell Grant award should be raised to the maximum extent practicable, and funding for the Pell Grant program should be higher than the level requested by the President;

(2) the Student Aid Alliance, which represents many students and those concerned with higher education funding, has identified the need for funding of the Pell Grant program to achieve a level that ensures a $4,500 level in the individual maximum Pell Grant; and

(3) funding for the Pell Grant shortfall should be provided to ensure that the additional students attending college receive the grants for which they qualify.

SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SUPERFUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) The most contaminated, toxic sites in the country are cleaned up through the Superfund program;

(2) The President's budget assumes sharp reductions in the number of Superfund sites to be cleaned up in fiscal year 2003; and

(3) This resolution provides a significant increase in funding for the Superfund program for fiscal year 2003 compared to the President's budget proposal.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that funding for Superfund be at a level sufficient

to significantly increase the number of toxic waste sites cleaned up through the Superfund program.

SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING PILT FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that:

(1) if certain Federal lands are not to become part of the local tax base, then compensation should be offered to local governments to make up for the presence of non-taxable land within their jurisdictions;

(2) PILT funds are critical to the budget of local governments, which supply many valuable local social services, such as law enforcement, road maintenance and firefighting, as well as services for adjacent Federal lands such as search and rescue operations;

(3) the Administration has proposed funding PILT at $165,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, which is 22 percent less than the current funding level—of $325,000,000; and

(4) many counties with high percentages of Federal land ownership that rely on PILT payments have higher than average unemployment and poverty.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that within the discretionary allocation provided to the Committee on Appropriations that the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program should be fully funded.

SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE STATE AND LOCAL COSTS OF PROVIDING SERVICES TO ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should pay for the costs incurred by State and local governments for providing services to illegal immigrants.

SEC. 327. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.

It is the sense of the Senate that there be a vote by the full Senate on an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require a balanced budget.