

I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 2657, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 2004:
SPENDING COMPARISONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

[Fiscal year 2004, in millions of dollars]

	General purpose	Mandatory	Total
Conference Report:			
Budget authority	3,539	109	3,648
Outlays	3,737	109	3,846
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority	3,612	109	3,721
Outlays	3,737	109	3,846
2003 level:			
Budget authority	3,620	104	3,724
Outlays	3,327	103	3,430
President's request:			
Budget authority	3,851	109	3,960
Outlays	3,867	109	3,976
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority	3,480	109	3,589
Outlays	3,599	109	3,708
Senate-passed bill:			
Budget authority	3,575	109	3,684
Outlays	3,689	109	3,798
CONFERENCE REPORT COMPARED TO—			
Senate 302(b) allocation:			
Budget authority	(73)		(73)
Outlays			
2003 level:			
Budget authority	(81)	5	(76)
Outlays	410	6	416
President's request:			
Budget authority	(312)		(312)
Outlays	(130)		(130)
House-passed bill:			
Budget authority	59		59
Outlays	138		138
Senate-passed bill:			
Budget authority	(36)		(36)
Outlays	48		48

Note: Details may not add to totals due to rounding. Totals adjusted for consistency with scorekeeping conventions.
Prepared by SBC Majority Staff, 9/24/2003.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the conference report is agreed to and the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
SEPTEMBER 25, 2003

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 25. I further ask unanimous consent that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period for morning business for 60 minutes, with the first 30 minutes under the control

of the minority leader or his designee, and the remaining 30 minutes under the control of Senator HUTCHISON or her designee; provided that following morning business the Senate then proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2658, the Defense appropriations bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. For the information of all Senators, tomorrow, following morning business the Senate will begin debate on the Defense appropriations conference report for 2004. We do not anticipate a great deal of debate on that important conference report prior to a vote on its adoption. In addition, the Senate will resume consideration of the DC appropriations bill. Senators therefore should expect rollcall votes throughout the day, and Members will be notified when the first vote is scheduled.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STEVENS. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks to be offered by Senator PRYOR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RATIFYING THE DO-NOT-CALL
REGISTRY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I rise today to support legislation that would clearly allow the Federal Trade Commission to move forward with its national do-not-call registry. I have submitted an amendment to that effect, amendment No. 1786 to the DC appropriations bill, as well as cosponsored S. 1652, a bill to ratify the do-not-call registry provision of the telemarketing sales rule. As we have heard today, the U.S. District Court in Oklahoma issued a decision that the Federal Trade Commission lacked the authority to develop its national do-not-call list. The court ruled that, although Congress appropriated the funds to the FTC in order to have the program, it did not actually have the language necessary to authorize the establishment of the program and the implementation of the program.

Today, I rise in support of my proposal that would basically give the

Federal Trade Commission the clear authority and the statutory responsibility to establish a national do-not-call program. In addition, it affirms the finding that the Federal Trade Commission was authorized in the Telemarketing and Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act to implement and enforce the national do-not-call registry.

Last, it specifically ratifies the do-not-call registry provision of the FTC's telemarketing sales rule.

Before I was elected to this august body, I had the great privilege of being the attorney general of my State. I remember back in 1998 when I ran for attorney general of Arkansas, everywhere I would go, every little town I would go into, and every time I would talk to a group, whether it was veterans or whoever it happened to be, senior citizens or townspeople at large, they would tell me: Please, please, if you can do anything about telemarketers calling us at home and bothering us and trying to sell us something over the telephone, do it.

I was proud to do that. When I was elected to the office and began serving in January of 1999, the first thing I did was pull the staff together at the attorney general's office and write the State's do-not-call program. It was very different from the one the Federal Trade Commission came up with but both are equally good. They both get to the problem and I think can be very effective fighting against unwanted telephone calls.

Listen, we have all been there. We have all received those calls. We have all been eating dinner, trying to put our children down, trying to do homework, or watching our favorite TV show, whatever the situation might be, when we have been subjected to these unwanted calls. For most people it is an inconvenience. They don't like to be bothered. They want us to find a way to respect the integrity of the privacy of their own homes. After all, they are paying the phone bill; they are paying for the service. They should be able to have some control on the amount of calls coming in and to put a stop to these unwanted calls. Some of the phone companies actually offer a service that blocks calls from people who block their caller ID. That is another subject. That can be fairly expensive for some consumers. It's not always expensive.

The Federal Trade Commission came up with an idea to do this nationwide, to do it free, and to do it by use of toll-free numbers and Web sites allowing people to sign on. In fact, I signed on in the first week because one thing I noticed in Virginia is they do not have do-not-call laws, as far as I can tell, and we get bombarded in our home in Virginia. Unlike in Arkansas where we signed up for the AG's list and we may get one or two telemarketing calls a month, in Virginia we get 3 or 4 a day, and it seems they always try to call at an inopportune time.

One thing I noticed, one fact that apparently is true, as I understand it, the Federal Trade Commission now has 50 million phone numbers that have been registered under the Federal do-not-call program. Fifty million Americans can't be wrong. They want relief. They want us, as their lawmakers, as their elected Representatives here in Washington, to do something to stop these calls.

The Federal Trade Commission, to its credit, and I appreciate them greatly for doing this, tried to come to their aid, come to their assistance, to make a national do-not-call registry a reality.

I think this is something the Nation is ready for. Fifty million people have already tried to sign up in the first few weeks after the announcement of the national do-not-call program. It is something we as Members of this body and as Members of the Congress, of the Federal Government, should try to do to ensure that the people of this country, if they want it, on a voluntary basis, can have some relief from unwanted telemarketing calls.

Congress mandated that this list be implemented on a national scale, and the President signed it into law. The legislation I am proposing now clarifies our intentions, and I certainly ask my colleagues to support the legislation in any way they can. I hope we will have a vote on this matter in very quick order.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE INTERNET TAX NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, S. 150, the Internet Tax Non-discrimination Act of 2003, will be referred to the Finance Committee for a brief 30-day review. As many of my colleagues are aware, this consensus legislation was unanimously approved by a voice vote by the Senate Commerce Committee on July 31. In addition, the House passed a similar measure on September 17. The current moratorium ends on November 1 and I am committed to acting before it expires.

As the strong bipartisan support of these measures indicates, there is a growing consensus that the Internet should never be singled out for mul-

tipled or discriminatory taxation. Rather, the unprecedented benefits of the Internet to our society and economy should be encouraged by policymakers. I am confident that the Finance Committee's review of this matter will confirm Congress' intent to permanently extend the moratorium, and I look forward to an expedited and non-controversial review of this matter as a member of the committee.

NORTHERN KENTUCKY UNIVERSITY'S METROPOLITAN EDUCATION AND TRAINING SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Northern Kentucky University's Metropolitan Education and Training Services, METS, program. The ceremony to formally dedicate the METS center is scheduled for this morning in Boone County, KY.

The rapid rate of economic growth in the Northern Kentucky / Cincinnati metropolitan area has created a need for better-trained workers. In an attempt to address this problem, Northern Kentucky University has developed an innovative partnership with the Tri-County Economic Development Corporation, the Northern Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, and Delta Air Lines. The partnership ensures that the workforce has the skills needed to promote the region's growth.

Businesses that need educational services or a certain skill-set for its employees can contact METS, who will work with Northern Kentucky University to design the appropriate curriculum. If Northern Kentucky University does not offer a particular set of classes, METS arranges for students to take classes at other institutions via the Internet or Tele-conferencing.

The opening of this new state-of-the-art corporate training center is exciting for the region's business community and Northern Kentucky University. I am confident that METS can serve as a model for rapidly growing metropolitan communities, and I am pleased that this facility is in the Commonwealth. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the official dedication of Northern Kentucky University's METS center.

FCC MEDIA OWNERSHIP RULES

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senator DORGAN's effort to overturn the Federal Communication Commission's media ownership rules. I commend Senator DORGAN on his resolve to work with his colleagues in a bipartisan manner to bring forward a commonsense solution to this pressing issue.

Every 2 years the FCC is required to review its media ownership rules. This most recent decision to roll back media ownership limitations was the most sweeping in a generation. Was it in response to the American people

asking for this reform? No, in fact over 2 million Americans contacted the FCC opposing the rule changes. In my office, I received over 1,000 letters from Montanans opposing the decision. It seems that the FCC turned a deaf ear to the will of the American public. I hear them loud and clear.

I support Senator DORGAN's effort for three basic reasons: diversity, localism, and economics. First, if America is to have a vibrant democracy, one where our citizens are free to express their views and have equal accessibility to the news, we as policymakers must protect that right. The FCC's decision allows large corporations that already have considerable clout over what we hear and see to further consolidate. The decision allows TV networks to own more stations reaching more Americans. Even worse, these same stations could own the local newspaper in the same market.

We as Americans must have access to diverse news and information. The FCC's decision runs contrary to this axiom and would allow a few large television stations to reach nearly one-half of the viewing public. If the UHF discount is factored, nearly 90 percent of our Nation's households could be covered by one entity. Diversity is jeopardized when one company has this much leverage over what we see and hear.

Senator DORGAN has pointed out that localism is being lost to the bottom line. I can not agree more. A generation ago, Americans sat around the radio and listened to local news. We huddled around the TV to watch our local news anchor give us the latest information about our communities. Today, news and information is being portrayed as local, when, in reality, it is being broadcast to us from hundreds or even thousands of miles away. Instead of broadcasting news about our communities from our communities, media companies are broadcasting about our communities even though they are nowhere near us. This is not localism and we should not stand idle to this emerging trend.

This decision has the potential to cause job loss in Montana. In Montana we have many "mom-and-pop" newspapers and television stations. Typically, these companies serve the rural areas of our State and do a tremendous job reporting about local activities and news. And they are often owned and operated by local citizens living in the communities they serve. And very often they are run on a very tight budget. The FCC's ruling jeopardizes our local stations and newspapers because these new larger companies will be able to squeeze these companies out of the market through advertising revenues with sheer economic clout. With additional leverage over the media landscape, these small, rural companies will find it harder and harder to compete and keep their doors open. As Montana's senior Senator, I will fight to protect our small TV and newspaper owners.