

profound reach of public broadcasting stations. They connect people with their local community, their Nation, and their world in a way that no other outlet can or does.

The caliber of public broadcasting is unmatched by any other programming. Public radio and public television provide valuable commercial-free educational, informational, and cultural programming for communities all across America.

But it is not just an addition; it is not just an add-on and a frill. Many communities rely on public broadcasting stations as their only source of news and information. Some even use the public broadcasting system for day-to-day or emergency communications, such as AMBER Alerts and severe weather detection. As we work to improve our hometown security, Federal funding for these services is increasingly important.

Sadly, the future is cloudy. Nationally, while 41 States have public broadcasting operations, the source of the State support, which averages \$7 million a year, is in jeopardy. Given the current times of economic slowdown and State budget crises, many stations are facing severe financial cuts.

I am sad to say in my home State of Oregon, which faces one of the Nation's worst budget deficits, our State is considering eliminating funding for Oregon Public Broadcasting altogether. Even though only 6 percent of that \$33 million budget for the last 2 years comes from State funding, slightly more than \$2 million, right now the loss of any of that funding is compounded by the recession and the squeeze on corporate and individual donors.

Oregon is not alone in its public broadcasting cuts. Minnesota's Governor has recommended a 25 to 35 percent reduction in its public broadcasting budget. But there are some States that are standing firm. I was pleased to note that Nebraska, for example, reaffirmed its commitment to public broadcasting. Despite a 14 percent shortfall in its biannual budget, it will maintain its yearly State funding of approximately \$8 million.

Madam Speaker, we are all in this together: the Federal and State governments, our listeners, viewers and private sector donors. This is all the more reason for us to keep our commitment to public broadcasting. If we do not, many of the award-winning programs, like the one I just mentioned, "The Mideast: A Century of Conflict," will be at risk. All of us need to do our part, whether elected officials or individual listeners, to support this critical national resource.

REVISIONS TO THE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS AND BUDGETARY AGGREGATES ESTABLISHED BY THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEARS 2004 THROUGH 2013

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Madam Speaker, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregates established by H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2004. The authority to make these adjustments is derived from Sections 421 and 507 of H. Con. Res. 95 (H. Rept. 108-71).

As enacted, H.R. 1559, a bill making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, contains changes in new budget authority, outlays and revenues that differ from those assumed in the budget resolution. For fiscal year 2003, the supplemental provides \$4,432,000,000 in budget authority, \$3,745,000,000 in outlays, and \$2,000,000 in revenues above the amounts assumed in H. Con. Res. 95. The supplemental also provides \$215,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$332,000,000 in additional outlays for fiscal year 2004; over the period of fiscal years 2004 through 2013, it provides an additional \$888,000,000 in budget authority and \$1,406,000,000 in outlays over the amounts assumed in the resolution.

Under section 421 of the resolution, the Chairman of the Budget Committees are authorized to adjust the budget resolution to reflect the differences between the levels assumed in the budget resolution for the supplemental and the levels provided in the enacted bill. The adjusted levels of budget authority and outlays in the functional levels for net interest (900) and allowances (920) are as follows:

NET INTEREST (900)

Fiscal year 2003: \$240,203,000,000 in new budget authority and \$240,203,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2004: \$259,528,000,000 in new budget authority and \$259,528,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2005: \$310,822,000,000 in new budget authority and \$310,822,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2006: \$352,463,000,000 in new budget authority and \$352,463,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2007: \$380,846,000,000 in new budget authority and \$380,846,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2008: \$405,947,000,000 in new budget authority and \$405,947,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2009: \$429,867,000,000 in new budget authority and \$429,867,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2010: \$450,997,000,000 in new budget authority and \$450,997,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2011: \$473,746,000,000 in new budget authority and \$473,746,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2012: \$496,401,000,000 in new budget authority and \$496,401,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2013: \$514,926,000,000 in new budget authority and \$514,926,000,000 in outlays.

ALLOWANCES (920)

Fiscal year 2003: \$79,190,000,000 in new budget authority and \$42,024,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2004: -\$7,406,000,000 in new budget authority and \$22,678,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2005: -\$6,366,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,921,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2006: -\$7,151,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$5,581,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2007: -\$8,835,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$8,666,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2008: -\$9,875,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$9,873,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2009: -\$11,476,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$9,922,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2010: -\$12,860,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$10,864,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2011: -\$16,396,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$12,653,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2012: -\$21,444,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$15,691,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2013: -\$25,608,000,000 in new budget authority and -\$19,171,000,000 in outlays.

The changes in the functional levels cause changes in the budgetary aggregates. Accordingly, I also modify the budgetary aggregates and revenues for fiscal years 2003 through 2013 to the following levels:

BUDGET AUTHORITY, OUTLAYS, AND REVENUES

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,867,072,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,819,167,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2003: \$1,303,113,000,000 in revenues.

The amount by which revenues should be reduced, fiscal year 2003: \$56,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2004: \$1,861,333,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,884,280,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2005: \$1,990,603,000,000 in new budget authority and \$1,981,995,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2006: \$2,122,725,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,089,892,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2007: \$2,233,213,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,190,978,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2008: \$2,349,256,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,307,637,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2009: \$2,454,814,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,420,227,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2010: \$2,555,986,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,528,260,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2011: \$2,669,845,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,651,603,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2012: \$2,754,409,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,724,337,000,000 in outlays.

Fiscal year 2013: \$2,875,544,000,000 in new budget authority and \$2,855,914,000,000 in outlays.

DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET)

Fiscal year 2003: \$516,054,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004: \$558,828,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005: \$488,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$432,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$400,727,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$405,793,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$366,465,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$360,323,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$381,063,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$314,765,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$301,929,000,000.

DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT

Fiscal year 2003: \$6,750,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004: \$7,388,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005: \$7,982,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$8,540,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$9,069,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$9,608,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$10,109,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$10,608,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$11,132,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$11,596,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$12,048,000,000,000.

DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC

Fiscal year 2003: \$3,921,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2004: \$4,303,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2005: \$4,604,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2006: \$4,835,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2007: \$5,013,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2008: \$5,175,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2009: \$5,278,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2010: \$5,356,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2011: \$5,435,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2012: \$5,432,000,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2013: \$5,402,000,000,000.

These changes in the budget resolution also affect the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations. The 302(a) allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations becomes \$844,986,000,000 in new budget authority and \$846,706,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2003. For fiscal year 2004, the allocation to the Appropriations Committee is \$784,675,000,000 in new budget authority and \$861,084,000,000 in outlays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE REAL AMERICAN AGENDA IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this evening I would like to include in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Toronto Star written by the editorial page's editor emeritus, Haroon Siddiqui. The focus of this article is looking at the United States and our role in the Middle East and Central Asia. Though I cannot read the entire editorial tonight, I thought it had some excellent observations that are important for the American people to hear. It is often helpful to have a country from the outside looking at us,

rather than us looking out at the world.

Mr. Siddiqui writes that a superpower like the United States would find it somewhat easy to defeat an incidental power like Iraq, but to do so not only for its publicly stated reasons, fighting terrorism, liberating Iraq and triggering a domino effect of democratization of the Middle East.

But, he observes, the real American agenda is now only becoming clearer. The conquest of Iraq, he says, is enabling a new Pax Americana, the exertion of American power. That goes well beyond control of oil, though that surely remains a central enterprise.

He points out that America is pulling out of traditional bases of allies like Saudi Arabia and Turkey, and probably doing so because of the rising conservative backlash in those countries to our very presence. He mentions that U.S. relations with Egypt have been placed upon the back burner; Egypt, of course, being the most populace Islamic and Arab country.

It is no accident that the three nations, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and Egypt, are the region's most populous, but that America's newest partners are some of the most thinly populated, Qatar, Bahrain, Oman and the United Arab Emirates, all as well tightly controlled monarchies.

People are a problem for America, he observes in the Arab and Muslim world. They are bristling with anti-Americanism, principally over the Israeli-Palestinian dispute, which remains unresolved.

He points out that the pullout just announced by the Bush administration of 10,000 U.S. troops from a Saudi air base was long overdue, but it so embarrassed the ruling House of Saud, which had to place it very far away from public view at a remote base in the desert.

I would point out in a way I was very disappointed that the Bush administration announced this current withdrawal so quickly, because Osama bin Laden has been given a victory. Osama bin Laden on 9-11 said to us that he wanted the infidels out of Saudi Arabia, and, among others, he was referring to U.S. troops based on Saudi soil. Why did we have to give him that victory? I think that helps to ripen terrorism globally.

The article goes on to say that the kingdom with the world's largest oil reserves, Saudi Arabia, and the highest output, will lose clout as America now controls the second largest reserves in the world in Iraq. And he states that America now has a vise grip on the region with 14 new post-9-11 bases, from eastern Europe, through Iraq, the Persian Gulf, Pakistan and Afghanistan, to the two Central Asian republics of Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan.

□ 2000

The singular feature of all those new allies, he says, is that they are weak states. Most are undemocratic, if not repressive. So America is replicating

its failed model of using unrepresentative regimes to suppress people, but doing it on new turf. He says this short-term gain, therefore, of victory in Iraq may come at the expense of long-term pain and rising terrorism, as he sees America determined to install its own puppet regime in Baghdad with the majority Shiites being shunted aside.

He then comments on the Bush administration quietly cozying up to a most notorious terrorist group, the leftist Mujahideen-e-Khalq in Iraq, and he questions why would the Bush administration even want to do that, a terrorist group that killed Americans when we were having difficulties in Iran.

Taken together, he says, these American moves bear an uncanny resemblance to the British colonial enterprise of nearly a century ago which is still being paid by the people there. As America confronts this new world in the Middle East and Central Asia, it is worth reading Mr. Siddiqui's very perceptive comments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING THE SONGWRITING TEAM OF HOLLAND-DOZIER-HOLLAND

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

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, today I take the well to celebrate one of the great music writing teams in contemporary writing history, and that is the fabulous legendary song writing team of Brian Holland, Lamont Dozier and Edward Holland, who wrote frequently with the Berry Gordy Motown group creating the enduring Motown sound that is still being heard in this country and all over the world.

I am happy to point out that these three great songwriters, all from Detroit, Michigan, will be honored by the Broadcast Music Incorporated, BMI, on May 13 with the ICON Award which is reserved for songwriters who have been unique and had indelible influences on generations of music makers. They will receive this award at the 51st Annual BMI Awards Dinner in Beverly Hills, California, and its president and CEO, Ms. Frances Preston, will present the award.

I am happy to tell you that I have had the honor of watching this great musical system of Berry Gordy and his family and these writers develop over the years. How interesting to now turn back only a little while ago to find that the Hollands had to go to church