

FY 2002-11 Outlays	118,775
Adjustments:	
FY 2002 Budget Authority	+2,000
FY 2002 Outlays	+3,200
FY 2002-06 Budget Authority	+2,000
FY 2002-06 Outlays	+4,700
FY 2002-11 Budget Authority	+2,000
FY 2002-11 Outlays	+4,700
Revised Allocation to the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee:	
FY 2002 Budget Authority	15,452
FY 2002 Outlays	12,830
FY 2002-06 Budget Authority	74,789
FY 2002-06 Outlays	55,119
FY 2002-11 Budget Authority	166,611
FY 2002-11 Outlays	123,475
Current Budget Resolution Spending Aggregate Allocation:	
Budget Authority for 2002	1,517,719
Budget outlays for 2002	1,481,928
Adjustments:	
Budget authority for 2002	+2,000
Budget outlays for 2002	+3,200
Revised Budget Resolution Spending Aggregate Allocation:	
Budget authority for 2002	1,519,719
Budget outlays for 2002	1,485,128

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Madam President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of this year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred August 25, 1991 in San Francisco, CA. John Quinn, a gay man, was attacked by a man who threw a bar stool at him, yelling "Faggot, faggot, faggot!" The assailant, Mai Nguyen, was arrested in connection with the incident.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

IN SUPPORT OF THE TERRORIST VICTIM CITIZENSHIP RELIEF ACT

Mr. TORRICELLI. Madam President, I rise today to support the Terrorist Victim Citizenship Relief Act, legislation introduced yesterday by Senator CORZINE. While we all know the horror of the terrorist attacks of September 11, many who lost a loved during those tragic events face additional difficulties that our fellow Americans do not.

One such person is Deena Gilbey, a young women living with her family in New Jersey. On September 11, Mrs. Gilbey lost not only her husband Paul, but because she had been residing in the United States on her husband Paul's work visa, she faced deportation upon his passing.

There are still many unresolved issues that Mrs. Gilbey and those like

her face. The Terrorist Victim Citizenship Relief Act is designed to provide relief to families that face potential deportation and other difficulties because of the death of their primary visa holder on September 11. It would enable them to address many of the daunting issues by conferring United States citizenship upon them.

I want to thank Senator CORZINE for introducing this legislation and am pleased to be a cosponsor of it. I urge my fellow Senators to join in support of this measure.

THE CONTINUING NEED FOR FISCAL DISCIPLINE

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, 2001 has been a year of tragedy for the United States as well as a year of resolve. I am proud of the way my fellow Americans have united behind efforts to heal and comfort their fellow citizens who have been devastated by the attacks of September 11.

Just as the American people have opened their wallets to provide hundreds of millions of dollars to those in need, the Federal Government so too has provided billions of dollars to make our homeland safe, rebuild, comfort and provide, and wage war against the terrorist enemies of freedom.

Protecting our homeland and fighting terrorism are our Nation's top priorities right now, and the work of this body and the use of our Nation's resources must reflect that.

One critical way we do that is to vigilantly guard against the misuse of the taxpayer's hard-earned dollars and ensure that we get the most out of every dollar spent on homeland defense and the war on terrorism. Those who seek to use the current crisis as an excuse to spend more on pet projects should be ashamed of themselves and their efforts must be defeated. We simply cannot afford pork barrel politics right now, period.

Just look how quickly things have changed in our country—with amazing speed we went from an environment where some of us were worried the government would run out of national debt to repay, to an environment where not only is the Federal Government no longer paying off debt, but regrettably, it is adding to it.

The year started out with the President proposing a budget with a roughly 4 percent increase in discretionary spending. Given last year's enormous 14.5 percent increase in non-defense discretionary spending, I thought a 4 percent increase was reasonable and realistic, and I was pleasantly surprised that the Senate budget resolution didn't dramatically exceed this figure, as I feared, but instead was largely inline with the President's budget plan. Because of this, I supported the \$661 billion in discretionary spending it contained.

Besides supporting the budget resolution, I also supported the President's tax cut, because I saw it fit within a

plan whereby spending increases would be limited and the Social Security surplus would be reserved for reducing the national debt. Clearly the situation has changed.

Even before the events of September 11, Congress was on-track to increase overall discretionary spending by approximately 8 percent. To facilitate the completion of the annual appropriations process, a deal was struck by the Administration and the members of the appropriations committee to set a discretionary spending cap of \$686 billion in fiscal year 2002—\$25 billion more than agreed to in the budget resolution.

This number was agreed to by the appropriators and leaders in both parties in both Houses, and the President. In the President's letter to the leaders agreeing to this new, revised number he wrote, "And I expect that all parties will now proceed expeditiously and in full compliance with the agreement."

While I was disappointed that this deal circumvented the budget resolution, I believe it quite likely would have been worse if no deal had been struck, and Congress had been able to steam roll the budget resolution in the urge to spend. Now Congress is poised to leave this number and this agreement in the dust as appropriators seek billions more.

Some justify this by saying that the current crisis requires the death of fiscal discipline. Nothing is further from the truth. The current crisis requires us to be more fiscally disciplined than ever before, to carefully direct funds to the most pressing needs of defending against and fighting terrorism.

Compounding the problem is the softening economy and the need to walk the tightrope of crafting a stimulus package to provide short-term relief without causing long-term harm.

We are certainly in a grave fiscal situation. Spending is required but not too much, stimulus is required but it cannot be overly zealous. If we fall from this tightrope, there is no safety net to catch us. Instead our Nation falls into the grasping arms of structural deficits, from which we only recently freed ourselves after decades of imprisonment.

After working so hard to free ourselves from deficit spending, starting to pay off our debt, and beginning to prepare for Social Security's looming insolvency, isn't it worth it for us to do all we can to keep from slipping back into the clutches of deficits?

The only way to avoid this is through self-discipline. Every member must sacrifice individual political wants for the greater good of the nation. We need to avoid pet projects. We need to set aside our parochial interests.

We should proceed very carefully and very deliberately with every piece of legislation that authorizes any additional spending or equally importantly, reduces revenues. Unless we get a handle on our spending habits, we are going to add to the national debt that

we stand to pass on to our children and grandchildren.

Sometimes I wonder if my colleagues actually realize how dire the condition of the Federal Government has become. As it now stands, for fiscal year 2002, we are poised to spend every last tax dollar we collect and the entire \$174 billion projected Social Security surplus. On top of that, we are going to issue new debt to the tune of \$52 billion to pay for the fiscal stimulus bill and another \$15 billion on top of that if the senior Senator from West Virginia gets his way.

OMB Director Mitch Daniels, in a speech last week before the National Press Club, relayed the same sobering message. According to Director Daniels, the Federal Government is on track to run a deficit through the remainder of this presidential term.

So, as we discuss every piece of legislation that will cost money or reduce revenues, whether on efforts to fight terrorism or anything else we do, we must ask ourselves: Do these new spending initiatives warrant issuing new debt to pay for them?

With this in mind, I am utterly amazed that some of my colleagues are proposing new spending.

For example, the Agriculture Committee is proposing a new farm bill that would increase agricultural spending by roughly \$70 billion over the next 10 years. I ask my colleagues, should we issue new federal debt to increase payments to farmers?

Wasn't the Freedom to Farm bill designed to free farmers from dependency upon federal handouts so they could farm as they wished in response to international market conditions? Would the farming community support these proposals if they knew that we were going to have to issue debt to provide such payments? We're poised to debate a farm bill yet the old farm programs don't even expire until next year. Is this money and this bill the most critical thing we should be doing at this time?

Other colleagues of mine today are proposing additional spending increases over and above the \$686 billion agreed to with the President earlier this Fall, and the \$40 billion emergency supplemental passed in the aftermath of September 11; \$20 billion of which is included in this Department of Defense Appropriations bill. They think the Federal Government needs to spend an additional \$15 billion on homeland security.

The fact of the matter is the Director of Homeland Security, Governor Tom Ridge, says we don't need any more funds for homeland defense at this time than the amount requested by the President because of what we've already passed here on Capitol Hill. Why are we unwilling to take his word on this issue? It seems to me that he and the President, our Commander in Chief, are more qualified to advise us on what the nation needs and we should heed their advice.

Other colleagues are considering increasing education spending by billions

of dollars over and above the already large increases agreed to by the President and the Appropriations Committee. Again, I ask, should we issue new federal debt to increase education spending—which as we all know has been, is, and should be primarily a state and local responsibility?

I am flabbergasted to watch this parade of spending proposals at a time when we have to dig ourselves deeper in debt to pay for them.

I am encouraged that the President has taken a stand by pledging to veto an emergency supplemental spending measure that would exceed the \$686 billion spending agreement. I stand squarely behind the President.

And if the President indeed uses his veto to control spending, I will vote against any attempt to override it. Hopefully my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who care about fiscal responsibility and who care about honoring an agreement we made with the President will join me in supporting his veto. It is fortunate we have a President with the courage to hold fast against rampant spending, even if that spending is cloaked in the guise of homeland safety and national defense. The Administration recognizes that we have to draw a line and is willing to lay it on the line.

The Senate is supposed to be a deliberative body, a cooling saucer if you will. At this crucial time, it is important that the Senate carry out its appointed role. If we do increase spending, it should be limited to measures that truly enhance domestic and international security and efforts that truly stimulate the economy. We should not accept the fact that the Treasury Department must once again issue new debt to finance the operation of the Federal Government for any longer than is absolutely necessary, and every dollar we spend is going to be borrowed money.

The current crisis is not an excuse to spend but is a call to vigilance. As we fight for the future security of our country and our ideals, let us also fight for the future fiscal health of our nation which will in turn help provide for the continued and future stability and prosperity of the American people.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING, 107TH CONGRESS

Mr. DAYTON. Madam President, on November 21, 2001, the Joint Committee on Printing organized, elected a Chairman, a Vice Chairman, and adopted its rules for the 107th Congress. Members of the Joint Committee on Printing elected Senator MARK DAYTON as Chairman and Congressman ROBERT W. NEY as Vice Chairman. Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the Committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RULE 1.—COMMITTEE RULES

(a) The rules of the Senate and House insofar as they are applicable, shall govern the Committee.

(b) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record as soon as possible following the Committee's organizational meeting in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Where these rules require a vote of the members of the Committee, polling of members either in writing or by telephone shall not be permitted to substitute for a vote taken at a Committee meeting, unless the ranking minority member assents to waiver of this requirement.

(d) Proposals for amending Committee rules shall be sent to all members at least one week before final action is taken thereon, unless the amendment is made by unanimous consent.

RULE 2.—REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House and Senate are in session. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered and after appropriate notification is made to the ranking minority member. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman, as he may deem necessary or at the request of the majority of the members of the Committee.

(b) If the Chairman of the Committee is not present at any meeting of the Committee, the vice-Chairman or ranking member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE 3.—QUORUM

(a) Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, which is required for the purpose of closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders or changing the rules of the Committee.

(b) Three members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE 4.—PROXIES

(a) Written or telegraphic proxies of Committee members will be received and recorded on any vote taken by the Committee, except for the purpose of creating a quorum.

(b) Proxies will be allowed on any such votes for the purpose of recording a member's position on a question only when the absentee Committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded.

RULE 5.—OPEN AND CLOSED MEETINGS

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No such vote shall be required to close a meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(b) No person other than members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and other representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business session that has been closed to the public.

RULE 6.—ALTERNATING CHAIRMANSHIP AND VICE-CHAIRMANSHIP BY CONGRESSES

(a) The Chairmanship and vice Chairmanship of the Committee shall alternate between the House and the Senate by Congresses: The senior member of the minority party in the House of Congress opposite of that of the Chairman shall be the ranking minority member of the Committee.

(b) In the event the House and Senate are under different party control, the Chairman and vice Chairman shall represent the majority party in their respective Houses. When the Chairman and vice-Chairman represent different parties, the vice-Chairman shall