

law Raymond Kemmerer; daughter Carole O'Hare and son-in-law Thomas O'Hare; and granddaughter Melissa Lata and Melissa's husband, Edward Lata. I offer this tribute to her.

DANIEL LEE

Daniel Lee lost his life on September 11, 2001. Mr. Lee was 34 years old when the plane he was on, American Airlines Flight 11, was hijacked by terrorists. As we all know, that plane crashed into the World Trade Center, killing everyone on board.

Daniel Lee grew up in Palm Desert, CA. He was a carpenter and a drummer in a local southern California band. He met his wife, Kellie, in 1991 at a rock concert in which he was playing the drums. They were married October 7, 1995 and their first child, Amanda Beth, was born December 11, 1998.

Mr. Lee was a dedicated and successful set carpenter in the music industry, known to work 20 hour days when necessary. He worked with many talented musicians including Neil Diamond, Barbara Streisand, N'Sync, Aerosmith and Yanni. He was touring with the Backstreet Boys when, on September 11, 2001, he left to fly home to be with his wife as she was about to give birth to their second child. Allison Danielle Lee was born September 13, 2001.

Kellie Lee recalls Dan's bright, relaxed and charming smile. "He was caring, loving, funny and romantic. He loved being a Dad and was so excited about having another child on the way," she says. One of his special joys was getting friends together for barbecues and pool parties," Kellie remembers.

Dan Lee is survived by his wife, Kellie Lee, his daughters, Amanda and Allison, mother and stepfather Elaine and John Sussino, brothers Jack Fleishman and Stuart Lee and sister, Randi Kaye. I offer this tribute to Daniel Lee.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to share with the Senate the memory of one of my constituents, Mari-Rae Sopper, who lost her life on September 11, 2001. Ms. Sopper was a 35-year-old lawyer and gymnastics coach when the flight she was on, American Airlines Flight 77, was hijacked by terrorists. As we all know, that plane crashed into the Pentagon, killing everyone on board.

Ms. Sopper was a native of Inverness, IL, and attended William Fremd High School in Palatine, IL. At the age of 15 she set the goal of becoming a champion gymnast. She succeeded, becoming all-American in 4 events, the school's Athlete of the Year and the state's Outstanding Senior Gymnast of the Year.

Larry Petrillo, her high school gymnastics coach, remembers her as brash and committed. "One thing she taught me is, you never settle for less than you are capable of. We should never accept limits. We should always fight the good fight. She was a staunch supporter of gymnastics and what's right," he recalls.

Upon graduating from Iowa State University with a degree in exercise science, Ms. Sopper earned a master's degree in athletics administration from the University of North Texas and a law degree from the University of Denver. Ms. Sopper was an accomplished dancer and choreographer and continued to coach at gymnastics clubs.

Ms. Sopper practiced law as a Lieutenant in the Navy's JAG Corps, focusing on Defense and Appellate Defense. She had left the Navy JAG Corps and was an associate with the law firm Schmeltzer, Aptaker & Sheperd, P.C. when she found her dream job: to coach the women's gymnastics team at the University of California at Santa Barbara.

It was a 1-year appointment and Ms. Sopper was looking forward to the challenge. Her mother, Marion Kminek, says Mari-Rae was excited about the opportunity. "I said go for it. Life is too short. It was something she had always wanted to do and she was so happy and excited," recalls Kminek.

At the time of her death, Ms. Sopper was moving to Santa Barbara to begin her appointment. Her close friend, Mike Jacki, recalls "This was to be a new adventure for Mari-Rae, and an opportunity to get back into the sport she loved. We have lost a very special person. She was prepared to make her dream come true, and in an instant it was gone."

Mari-Rae Sopper is remembered for her loyalty, strong values, excellent work ethic and spirit for life. She is survived by her mother, Marion Kminek and stepfather, Frank Kminek, her father Bill Sopper, sister Tammy and many loving friends.

Mr. President, the last story I share with the Senate is the memory of one of my young constituents, Deora Bodley, who lost her life on September 11, 2001. Ms. Bodley was a 20-year-old college student when the flight she was on, United Airlines Flight 93, was hijacked by terrorists. As we all know, that plane crashed in a Pennsylvania field, killing everyone on board.

Ms. Bodley grew up in San Diego, California. As a high school student, she visited local high schools to discuss HIV/AIDS with her peers. She volunteered with the Special Olympics and a local animal shelter. Chris Schuck, her English teacher at La Jolla Country Day School, recalls, "Deora was always thinking big and going after big game."

At the time of her death, Ms. Bodley was studying psychology at Santa Clara University. She coordinated volunteers in a literacy program for elementary school students. Kathy Almazol, principal at St. Clare Catholic Elementary, recalls Ms. Bodley had "a phenomenal ability to work with people, including the children she read to, her peer volunteers, the school administrators and teachers. We have 68 kids who had a personal association with Deora."

In the words of her mother, Deborah Borza, "Deora has always been about peace." At the tender age of 11 years, Deora wrote in her journal, "People ask who, what, where, when, why, how. I ask peace." A warm and generous person, Deora was a gifted student and a wonderful friend. Wherever she went, her light shined brightly.

Deora's father, Derrill Bodley, of Stockton, CA, feels her life was about "getting along" and sharing a message of peace. Her 11-year-old sister, Murial, recalls Deora taught her many things and says, "Most of all she taught me to be kind to other people and animals. I cherish the memories of my sister and plan to work hard in school and in everything I do so she can be proud of me like I was of her."

Mr. President, none of us is untouched by the terror of September 11th, and many Californians were part of each tragic moment of that tragic day. Some were trapped in the World Trade Center towers. Some were at work in the Pentagon. And the fates of some were sealed as they boarded planes bound for San Francisco or Los Angeles.

So I am honored and very moved to have had this chance to put into the RECORD today the names of these more than 50 Californians, every one now a bright and shining star in the sky. Their memories will live on and their legacies will live on, as will the memories and legacies of every American and every person, every innocent victim, who was cut down in the most hateful way on that tragic day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAYTON). The Senator from Alabama.

#### TERRORISM

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator from California for her eloquent remarks. It is time for a memory indeed. Tomorrow I will be going to the Pentagon for a memorial service, as will many other Senators, to memorialize that terrible day on September 11, when we lost the people at the Pentagon. Five of those lost at the Pentagon happened to be from the State of Alabama, but the State has lost 10 or more personnel since this war on terrorism began. It has touched the entire country.

Some of our finest people, innocent of any wrongdoing, innocent of any involvement in what might be considered to be oppression or disagreements with the terrorists who did these acts, paid the price. Historically, the civilized world has rejected these acts.

But there is afoot today terrorist groups and terrorist cells throughout the country. A significant number of people would believe they have a right to use terrorism and weapons of mass destruction to kill and maim people who have done nothing in their lives to wrong them. I believe we have to confront that.

The President has been talking about Iraq and the problem it presents. It is

a real problem. It is a problem that will not go away.

We could wish it would go away, but it will not go away. The reason is they have been in such continual violation of the agreements they made with regard to not participating in weapons of mass destruction.

We are in a critical time right now. I think the President has done the right thing, to say he wants Congress to participate in a debate and to give him a resolution of support of his action with regard to Iraq. I believe that is a good step. I think it is good, not because it is absolutely clear to me that it is required—I know Senator DAYTON is a member of the Armed Services Committee and has been through a lot of these hearings—but we are at this point with regard to Iraq because we held back. We did not complete the job. We did not continue to move into Baghdad and capture or kill Saddam Hussein and completely take that country in 1991 during the gulf war—Desert Storm. We didn't do that.

We said OK, and the U.N. sort of stepped in, and they wrote up this agreement, and Saddam Hussein agreed to many different things. He agreed to reject weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological weapons, and not only did he agree not to do those things, he agreed U.N. inspectors could be sent there to actually go into his country and examine anything that looked unusual, he would not attempt to stop that, and we could send inspectors to prove he was not participating in weapons of mass destruction—chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons.

But what has happened? The history is very sad. It is a circumstance that is particularly frustrating. We wish we did not have to direct our attention to it, but we do. It is not going away. He has broken virtually every one of the promises he made, and I suspect, from what I read, the President is going to talk about that at the U.N.

Let me say this about the United Nations. The United Nations is a noble organization, with noble goals, that deserves respect. Remember in the Declaration of Independence, they, the fathers of the American Revolution, used the phrase "a decent respect for the opinions of mankind" to require them to set forth the reasons for separation, the reasons for revolution.

So I think the President should explain to the world—and the U.N. is a great forum to do that—precisely why he believes we should act now.

I suspect what he is going to talk a lot about is resolutions that Saddam Hussein agreed to and that were put forth by the U.N. and were U.N. resolutions that have been violated. Resolution after resolution, for a decade or more, they have been in violation. He will raise that tomorrow—or Thursday, as he should.

The gravity of the problem is clear. Saddam Hussein's violations are matters of life and death. I wish it were not so. I wish it were just some disagree-

ment over tariffs, or maybe oil prices, or something like that. But what we are talking about is that Saddam Hussein has, with determination and consistency for many years before the gulf war—11, 12 years ago, and since—persisted to develop weapons that he has used in this world. So it is a matter of life and death.

They demonstrate not just technical infringements on their agreements but they constitute a deliberate and determined program to develop weapons of mass destruction that he himself can use if he desires, or he can in secret provide to stateless terrorists so they can use these weapons on law-abiding American citizens and people of the world. So there is a real danger here.

Some say: What new evidence do you have to go forward? What new evidence do we have? Apparently, from some of the things you read in the papers—and I will not make reference to anything that is confidential—there have been indications that there is new evidence to indicate continued progress toward achieving dangerous weapons. We know, for example—we were shocked to find, at the time of the gulf war when we were victorious and did the inspection of the nuclear facilities, that Saddam Hussein had—that they were within 6 months of being able to produce a nuclear bomb when the United States successfully defeated Iraq in that war—6 months. The experts did not think that at the time, but the inspection of the country afterwards found that.

So I would say first of all, as Secretary Rumsfeld said: Oftentimes we know what we don't know. We know some things that indicate that he has continued steadfastly to improve chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons. We know that. But precisely how far he has gone we cannot say. But we know what his goal is. It has not changed. So I would say that is important for us to remember.

These things should not come as a surprise to any serious observer of the scene. We have been dealing with this man and his deliberate plans to obtain weapons of mass destruction for quite a number of years, and virtually daily since the gulf war. The fact is, he had no intention of complying with the world's demands to stop. He will not stop. Will a single person in this Congress, will a single person, come forth and say that they believe he will even unequivocally promise to stop? Which I doubt he will—but he might. But more important, will he actually stop production of these weapons? I challenge this body and the House of Representatives, and I will ask that question. Is there anyone here who thinks he sincerely will stop his activities to build weapons of mass destruction? I do not think anyone would.

Why? Is it just anger we are involved in here? Are we just angry over his bellicose statements about the United States? Are we just angry over his attempt to assassinate the President of the United States? Is it just anger over

the fact that he gave \$25,000 rewards to families of suicide bombers in Israel or other places, people who would murder innocent civilians, that cause us to say we don't trust him? No. It is not anger—although we have a right to be indignant over what he does. But we must not act solely out of anger.

I used to try criminal cases as a Federal prosecutor. Many times, the evidence from credible, honest witnesses would be contradicted solely by the words of the defendant. He would say: I didn't do it.

I used to do a little deal sometimes and talk to the jury. I said: Just because somebody says they won't do it doesn't mean they will not. I can say: I don't have a pencil in my hand, and if I do, I am not going to drop it. And I didn't drop it. I didn't drop the pencil.

Does that change the fact that I had a pencil and I dropped it? I think not.

This man is not credible. What we have to do when we deal with a man of this kind is look at his acts. Can they be just short-term acts? That is important, but long-term acts are even more important.

I think a decision that is to be made by a great nation, a nation that desires to protect its citizens and has the protection and security of its citizens in this country and around the world as its highest priority, that nation has to be serious. We cannot deal in wishful thinking. We cannot do so.

People say to me, basically: Can't we get along? Why do you want to talk about war?

Why do we have to wrestle with these issues? Isn't it possible that Saddam Hussein has seen the light and will change? I think people are not saying that. I don't think people are saying it. But in their hearts they are hoping that. Sometimes I think the same way. Isn't it just possible that this will change?

But let us consider the matter rationally and reasonably. What are the facts? What is the evidence? Is there a case here?

When solely evaluated, I submit there is overwhelming evidence that the facts present a demonstration that Saddam Hussein is manipulating the world, acting to keep them at bay while he steadfastly pursues his plan for weapons of mass destruction in direct violation of the agreement that saved his monstrous regime 11 years ago.

There are many ways to detail the charges against this most vicious dictator with the possible exception of North Korea, the most brutal dictator in the world today, and one who has been more active to export his violence than any other nation in the world today.

At this time, I think we should talk about the Iraq Liberation Act of 1998. This Congress voted on it. It passed the House of Representatives almost unanimously. There were maybe 30 "no" votes. It passed in this body unanimously by consent.

This is what we found in 1998 at a time when Saddam Hussein ejected the inspectors that he agreed to have come into his country. We did nothing about it. This is what the findings say:

The Congress makes the following findings. On September 22nd, 1980, Iraq invaded Iran, starting an 8-year war in which Iraq employed chemical weapons against Iranian troops, and ballistic missiles against Iranian cities.

This country is not Iraq. It is not a backward country. It has a government of laws, longstanding. It has for that region of the world an educated population. They are capable of doing so much better than they are today.

Unfortunately, the people of Iraq are suffering more than anyone else as a result of Saddam Hussein's bad leadership.

It goes on in paragraph 2:

In February of 1988, Iraq forcibly relocated Kurdish civilians—

These are citizens of Iraq—

from their home villages in the Anfal campaign, killing an estimated 50,000 to 180,000 Kurds—

Fifty-thousand to 100,000 of his own civilians in 1988 after he lost the war, after he signed an agreement not to use weapons of mass destruction, and after he agreed to inspections—

On March 16th, 1988, Iraq used chemical weapons against the Iraqi Kurdish civilian opponents in the town of Halabja killing an estimated 5,000 Kurds—

Causing numerous birth defects that affect the town to this day.

How long has it been since a nation in the world used chemical weapons against anyone, much less their own citizens, killing 5,000 Kurds? It is a despicable act by a despicable man who is not worthy to be a part of civilized nations, I submit.

On August 2nd, 1990, Iraq invaded and began a 7-month occupation of Kuwait.

This is a sovereign, independent nation on its border that happened to have substantial oil reserves that Saddam Hussein wanted. So on August 2, 1990, he invaded and began a 7-month occupation killing and committing numerous abuses against Kuwaiti citizens and setting Kuwaiti oilfields ablaze in his retreat.

Do you remember that? Just out of perversion and pure meanness, he set the oilwells on fire, polluting the atmosphere, putting at risk thousands of lives, and causing tremendous expense to bring those fires under control. In fact, they were brought under control better than we had any right to expect. At first, people expected it would take much longer than the long period it ultimately took.

No. 5—this is our findings, the Congress:

Hostilities in Operation Desert Storm ended on February 28th, 1991, and Iraq subsequently accepted the cease-fire conditions in the United Nations Security Council Resolution 687 on April 3, 1991, requiring Iraq, among other things, to disclose and fully permit the dismantlement of his weapons of mass destruction program, and submit to long-term monitoring and verification of such a dismantlement.

That was the basic condition of it. We said: OK. Mr. Saddam Hussein, we will not continue this war. We have ousted you from Kuwait where you had no right to be, but you have to agree to dismantle your weapons of mass destruction. OK. He agreed to that. That was the U.N.-brokered deal.

Paragraph 6:

In April of 1993, Iraq orchestrated a failed plot to assassinate former President George Bush during his April 14 through 16, 1993, visit to Kuwait.

What a despicable act. I submit to you as a Member of the Senate of any party that when a head of a foreign nation deliberately sets about to assassinate the leader or former leader of any great nation, that is something that should not be lightly dealt with. Frankly, I think we dealt with it too lightly at the time. We did take some action but not enough.

This man attempted to kill, assassinate the President, former President of the United States of America while he was visiting Kuwait, a country that former President Bush had led the liberation of and freed from this oppressive regime.

So it continues. That was in April of 1993:

In October of 1994, Iraq moved 80,000 troops to areas near the border of Kuwait posing an imminent threat of renewed invasion of or attack against Kuwait.

This is a man who wants us to get along with him and says, If you want complete destruction of my Government, I will behave and end weapons, and I will get along with my neighbors. And here he is moving 80,000 troops down on the border towards Kuwait where he does not station them normally. It just shows the aggressive hostilities of which he is capable.

On August 31 of 1996, paragraph 8:

In the findings of the U.S. Congress, Iraq oppressed many of its opponents by helping one Kurdish faction capture the seat of a Kurdish regional government.

Since March of 1996, Iraq has systematically sought to deny weapons inspectors from the United Nations Special Commission on Iraq—UNSCOM—access to key facilities and documents, has on several occasions endangered the safe operation of UNSCOM's helicopters transporting UNSCOM personnel in Iraq, and has persisted in a pattern of deception and concealment regarding the history of its weapons of mass destruction program—

And persisted in a pattern of deception and concealment regarding the history of his weapons of mass destruction programs—

The U.S. Congress, U.S. Senate unanimously found:

On August 5 of 1998, Iraq ceased all cooperation with UNSCOM, and subsequently threatened to end long-term monitoring activities by the International Atomic Energy Agency and UNSCOM.

The International Atomic Energy Agency is monitoring Iraq's nuclear bomb capability.

Paragraph 11:

On August 14, 1998, President Clinton signed Public Law 105-235 which declared that "the Government of Iraq is in material and unacceptable breach of its international

obligations" and urged the President "to take appropriate action, in accordance with the Constitution and relevant laws of the United States, to bring Iraq into compliance with its international obligations."

No. 12:

On May 1, 1998, President Clinton signed Public Law 105-174, which made \$5,000,000 available for assistance to the Iraqi democratic opposition for such activities as organization, training, communication and dissemination of information, developing and implementing agreements among opposition groups, compiling information to support the indictment of Iraqi officials for war crimes, and for related purposes.

It goes on to say:

Sense Of The Congress Regarding United States Policy Toward Iraq.

In Section 3, this is what we found as a Congress:

It should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime.

I repeat that. That is so important. We voted unanimously in this Senate that:

It should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq and to promote the emergence of a democratic government to replace that regime.

I suppose we have tried to do so in many different ways. The problem is, we have not been very successful. Iraq continues to make a mockery of its agreements and continues to build and develop weapons of mass destruction.

So the President is, I am sure, from newspaper reports, going to talk about that to the United Nations. I am so glad that he is because we have to think about an important subject.

Mr. President, you are aware that the Economist magazine, a London publication, in England, which is seriously reviewed around the world—and people give its opinions great weight—has expressed a view that there is no alternative but to war in this circumstance.

A couple months ago, they had an insert on the role of American foreign policy in the world, and they talked about this tension between multilateralism and unilateral action by the President, or can the United States act alone or with a few allies? They raised this question.

Multilateralists say we ought to reach agreements, and those agreements ought to be for the purpose of making our world safer. And they can work in that regard. The question the Economist posed is: What if the people who sign them do not abide by them? What if the people who have signed them deliberately, deceitfully operate in violation of those agreements, thereby threatening the safety and security of the rest of the world? Does the world just sit by and do nothing? Is that a credible response?

Do you think that is what was on President Bush's mind when he said, in recent words—and I think I can quote

him directly—"the credibility of the world is at stake"?

Yes, it is one thing to have resolutions. It is one thing to say we are going to have agreements so we can go away and wash our hands and say the matter is solved and the danger is over. That may be OK if it is a trade issue or some such event as that. But if it is a matter of life and death, dealing with a country that is capable of and has proven in the past it will use weapons of mass destruction against enemies in its own country and outside their country, if that is so, then we have a big problem.

So I think the President is determined to confront this issue and that the status quo in Iraq is not sufficient. We need to go back and remember what has already occurred. And that is where we are.

They say: Well, you have to have a unanimous vote. The United Nations has to support this action. I think a decent respect for the United Nations calls on the President to go there and state his case. I think it is important for the President to explain it to good and decent leaders all over the world, and seek their support wherever he can get it. But as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I can tell you, we do not have to have the support of any one nation to defeat Iraq. I hope we can do it promptly.

One thing I do believe is, he does not have popular support in his country and many of the people will be delighted to see him go. And I think it is not as if we are attacking a country that has loyal and decent people willing to die for their country. There may be some, but it is not nearly that many because this man is a brutal dictator.

But the President is required to state his case around the world. That is important. I hope he does not feel compelled to describe, in any detailed way, precisely how he might conduct a war, if a war becomes necessary. Maybe it will not be. I hope it will not be. But from my reading of this history, both before Desert Storm and after, of Saddam Hussein's absolutely steadfast determination to frustrate the world and do what he wants to do, I do not believe he is going to change. So I think we are going to be confronted with that situation sooner or later.

The question is, shouldn't we have the support of the United Nations? The problem there is this: A United Nations resolution requires a Security Council vote, a unanimous vote of the Security Council.

The American people have spent a lot of money building up the greatest military force in the history of the world. We will spend, next year, \$370 or so billion on a national defense system for this country. And on the United Nations Security Council there are countries such as France and Germany and England, and also China and Russia. So what are we going to do? Are we going to say that the Chinese or the Russians, or any other member of the Se-

curity Council, for any reason they choose, has the right to say: No, Mr. President, we don't agree. You can't use force against Iraq. You can't use force to liberate Kuwait. You can't use force against Panama, as President Bush did. You can't act against Kosovo because we say no?

That is not something that a great nation, the preeminent world power—let's say it frankly—can allow. The preeminent world power—a good and decent nation, whose actions are not for self gain but to vindicate legitimate rights and interests—cannot allow its power to be curtailed by the vote of one nation in the U.N. Security Council.

So the President cannot say: I am going to defer this matter to the U.N. That would be absolutely wrong. It would be unwise. And the American people would not support that. It is our military. We did it to protect our just national interests—not our unjust national interests, but our just, legitimate national interests. I believe the President understands that distinction. I hope that we, as Americans, think that through because some tend to believe we have to have a vote of the U.N. before we can act to defend our national security interests around the world, and that is not correct. Very few would agree with that.

We are in a time of remembrance as we move toward September 11. We will be at the Pentagon tomorrow. Others will be in New York. Others will be in Pennsylvania. Others will have memorials in their communities and towns, as I will be visiting one in Birmingham, hosted by the religious community, to commemorate this sad occasion of September 11.

The President told us we were going to have to return to our fundamental beliefs, we were going to have to be courageous, and if we stepped out and took on these people, and we chased them to their lairs and went after them, we could make the world safer.

I believe the world is safer today. I believe it is an unacceptable policy to allow any nation to harbor terrorists, to allow any nation to allow their territory to be used as a training base or where they can build their weapons and plot their diabolical actions. We cannot allow that to happen. It is against the policy of the United States and this Congress, I believe.

We are in a time that all of us need to study how we got to where we are, being quite serious about this entire circumstance. I am coming to the conclusion that it is very unlikely, based on the consistent, long-term history of Saddam Hussein, that we can reach any kind of agreement with him.

As the Economist magazine said, for 11 years we have been trying to contain him in a box. The box is leaking. Who has suffered most? The people and children of Iraq. They are the ones who have been suffering for these 12 years. It is difficult for us to defend to the Arab world this kind of oppression that

falls mainly on the innocent. They said, concluding their very serious editorial: Painful as it is, our vote is for war.

I hope we don't come to that, but I am afraid that is where we are heading. It is a subject we have to talk about. I believe that debate will now commence.

I yield the floor.

#### REVISIONS TO THE 2002 APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS AND THE BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the budgetary aggregates and the allocation for the Appropriations Committee by the amount of appropriations designated as emergency spending pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

On July 23, I filed adjustments to the 2002 budgetary aggregates and allocation for the Appropriations Committee resulting from the \$29.9 billion in emergency funding included in the conference report to H.R. 4775, the 2002 Supplemental Appropriations Act for Further Recovery From and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States (Public Law 107-206). The legislation, however, included \$5.1 billion in emergency funding that the Congress made contingent on the President designating the total amount as emergency spending within 30 days of enactment. On August 13, the President announced that he would not declare the \$5.1 billion as emergency spending, thereby vitiating the entire amount. Consequently, I am lowering the adjustments I made on July 23 by the amount of the contingency—\$5.1 billion in budget authority—as well as by the estimated amount of the contingency's impact on 2002 outlays—\$0.96 billion.

Pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby revise the 2002 allocation provided to the Senate Appropriations Committee in the concurrent budget resolution in the following amounts:

TABLE 1.—REVISED ALLOCATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, 2002  
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays
<b>Current Allocation:</b>		
General Purpose Discretionary .....	734,126	700,500
Highways .....	0	28,489
Mass Transit .....	0	5,275
Conservation .....	1,760	1,473
Mandatory .....	358,567	350,837
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>1,094,453</b>	<b>1,086,574</b>
<b>Adjustments:</b>		
General Purpose Discretionary .....	- 5,139	- 962
Highways .....	0	0
Mass Transit .....	0	0
Conservation .....	0	0
Mandatory .....	0	0
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>- 5,139</b>	<b>- 962</b>
<b>Revised Allocation:</b>		
General Purpose Discretionary .....	728,987	699,538
Highways .....	0	28,489