

up to \$50,000 per year spent less than 20 percent of their 2001 tax rebate. But Americans who earned more than \$50,000 a year spent over 25 percent of their rebate checks.

It would appear to me rebates are not the way to go if we want to stimulate the economy. Yet that is what our colleagues on the other side seem to think is the gold standard to help get the economy going.

I would now like to address the part of the President's package that has drawn the most attention, the plan to end the double taxation of dividends. Ending the double taxation of dividends will make stocks more valuable, it will make businesses more financially sound, and it will make it harder for a few wrongdoers to hide their corporate shenanigans.

Why do America's corporations load up on debt financing despite the fact that the higher debt levels increase the risk of bankruptcy? I will tell you why. Because our Nation's tax laws have always given them massive financial incentives to do just exactly that.

The reason is simple. When a corporation pays interest to bondholders, that payment is taxed only once. That is at the bondholder level. But, in contrast, when it pays dividends to stockholders, that payment is taxed twice—to both the corporation and the shareholder.

President Bush's economic growth plan contains a proposal to end this absurd incentive and, by doing so, his plan will strengthen the foundations of our economy and help ensure growth and new jobs for years to come.

This chart—"How the Double Taxation of Dividends Harms Our Nation"—shows that bankruptcies go up, corporate accountability goes down, and investment in capital formation also goes down. And that is where jobs are thrown to the wind.

Our Tax Code's harsh and unfair treatment of dividend payments harms the foundation of our economy in those three ways. It increases the number of bankruptcies, it weakens corporate accountability, and it slows the formation of capital.

By loading up on tax-deductible bonds and bank loans rather than issuing new shares of stock, corporations increase their chance of going bankrupt.

Our Tax Code should not encourage this behavior. When corporations load up on debt, they commit too much of their cash flow to making interest payments, and the danger of bankruptcy becomes all too real. Once we change this policy, businesses will find they have people lined up out the door to buy stocks that pay dividends. When companies hear of the clamor for dividend-paying stocks, they will have a much stronger incentive to pay for new projects and new factories by issuing new shares of stock rather than running to the bank or the bond market for a loan.

And then, if times get tough, businesses will not be as likely to declare

bankruptcy and head to Federal court for a painful reorganization, as we are seeing today. Instead, many companies will be able to cut their dividend to shareholders, and continue business more or less as usual.

This is not speculation on my part. Just open up any textbook on corporate finance—books that are on the shelves of many an MBA—and you will see it yourself in black and white: Business managers are taught to weigh the benefits of tax-favored debt finance against the increased risk of bankruptcy. They even have a name for it. They call it the Trade-off Theory of Capital Structure. And it is caused by the double taxation of dividends.

Our Tax Code's inequitable treatment of equity also weakens corporate accountability. Dividend payments are cash-on-the-barrelhead evidence that a company is profitable.

While not a perfect measure by any means, it can be an important signal that a firm is solvent. As they say on Wall Street, "Profit is an opinion, but cash is a fact."

The Wall Street Journal reported recently that only about 30 percent of S&P 500 corporations pay any dividends at all. A crucial reason for this dividend drought is our Tax Code, which requires corporations to pay 35 cents in taxes for every dollar in profit and then, on top of that, requires taxpayers who get those profits in the form of dividends to pay personal income tax. The total government take, when state taxes are added, can exceed 70 percent. So what is the incentive to pay dividends—something we ought to be encouraging, rather than destroying.

Finally, our inequitable treatment of equity slows innovation and the formation of capital. The double taxation of dividend income cuts the flow of equity funding to all but the most promising investments. Good ideas go unexplored and promising investments go unfunded because they cannot guarantee enough after-tax profit to investors.

I believe it is important for Congress to eliminate the double taxation of dividends. It is important for our country and the stability of our business community. That is why I support President Bush's plan. By making shares a more attractive investment, his plan will boost demand for stocks and push up their value. By reducing the long-run risk of bankruptcy and encouraging companies to take on promising projects, it will be good for employees. And most importantly, ending the double taxation of dividends will make American corporations stronger, much more accountable, than they are today and more innovative in the years to come.

I am proud to be able to support the President's growth and jobs package, and I am looking forward to working with my colleagues on the Finance Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, to pass out a bill that give tax cuts to America's families, that

gives small businesses an opportunity to grow, and that end the double taxation of dividends to strengthen both our stock market and the financial foundations of American business. This is an economic agenda that addresses the needs of today as well as the challenges of the future. The American people deserve no less.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are in morning business, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for up to 32 minutes.

STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have listened to some of the conversation that has gone on. Obviously, much of it has been pointed toward this evening's speech that we all look forward to from the President, the State of the Union, at which time he will outline at least some of his plans for the direction this country will take.

I am looking forward to it. The President has committed himself to going in certain directions. All of us understand that. All of us are in favor of the things the President wants to do. I suppose we have different views of how that might be done. That is the way it ought to be.

I do hope we don't spend all of our time simply criticizing; that we not use this as a sort of political fulcrum, but we really talk about the issues. No one could disagree with the notion that we are looking for ways to grow the economy and create jobs. Who can argue with that? No one. How you do it, yes, I suppose there are different views.

To strengthen and improve health care, certainly that is one of the issues all of us are faced with, whether it be Medicare, Medicaid, the CHIP program, or just general health care. We are all very much interested in it.

In my State of Wyoming, a rural State, we have a little different problem, but interestingly enough, we have problems the same as they do in Chicago or New York City. The cost, for instance, of liability insurance is higher in our State than it is some others, which is kind of strange. Nevertheless, we would all agree with the fact that we need to do something about that.

Obviously, the defense of our country against terrorism, the defense of our country against challenges overseas and security at home, no one disagrees. Again, we have different ways of doing it.

I would like to deviate from the issue for a moment to talk a little bit about—I guess, philosophically or in a broader sense—the notion of dealing

with these issues in terms of a longer term view. We have held in my State of Wyoming over the last couple years several meetings; in fact, about 26 meetings in 23 counties. We call them Vision 20/20. We met with the people in the community, all of whom would come—some invited for special reasons—to talk about what they wanted their community and their family and their business to be in 20 years or 10 years or 15 years, how they envisioned the way things should be. Of course, as you might imagine, we found out there are different views from different people, but pretty much some of the same consistency in terms of wanting better jobs, better security, having health care, having freedom.

We find ourselves in this body, as in many bodies, as a matter of fact, dealing almost exclusively with those issues that are right now upon us, fixing what is going to happen tomorrow.

Of course, that is necessary. But it seems to me we would help ourselves a great deal and help our country a great deal if we could look a little further out into the future and say: What do we want this Government to look like in 15 years, what kind of a system would we think would be best for health care in 15 or 20 years, and then begin to get some kind of a general conception of where we want to be and where we think it is best to be for our country and for the people who live here. And then as we move through the daily issues and as we move toward the issues that we have to resolve, we can measure those against where we want to be and see if in fact they are contributing to the attainment of the goals we have set.

One of them certainly is the role of Government. We haven't talked about this as much lately as we used to. What is the role of the Federal Government? How much Federal Government do we want in our lives over a period of time? This, after all, is the United States of America. This is a federation of States. Most of us would agree that the Government that rules best is the one closest to the people. Obviously, there are roles for the national organization, there are roles for the Federal Government. But there are also limits that ought to be there, if we don't want the Federal Government to be the end-all of governmental activity.

What do we see there? How do we want to do that? Most people would believe there are some constitutional limits to the role of the Federal Government. We seem to have dismissed those to a large extent and find Government involved in nearly every aspect of our life.

That becomes kind of a political thing that we talk about. We talked about that last week—what can we do this week for somebody? We ended up with the other side of the aisle, in that week we spent trying to catch up with the appropriations, having proposals of \$500 billion worth of spending that would grow Government over 10 years,

at the same time complaining about a deficit. So we didn't have a good concept of where we wanted to go and measure against balancing spending and balancing the budget. Of course, we want to deviate from that from time to time, and the circumstances now require that we do something unusual, I am sure, about defense and terrorism and about the economy.

So we are obviously going to spend more money now than we would normally spend because it is not a normal situation. We hear all the time "back in 1998 we didn't have a lot of the problems that we have now." We have to deal with them. Overall, what do we want? We want a balanced budget. I think we want to be able to hold down spending, not increase it, which is what we hear about, frankly, all the time.

We need to take a look at terminating activities that are out of date. It seems when we get something going in the Federal Government, it is there forever. In the private sector, when you have a company or an operation of your own and you find something is not contributing to that, you have to change it. Not so in the Government. But that ought to be one of the directions we want to take.

Certainly, we ought to be able to do health care. What do we want over time with health care? We have already indicated pretty clearly over the past number of years, when it was tried in the last administration to have a Government-run program, we didn't accept that and most of us do not now. Obviously, some work needs to be done to help people who need help. But where do we want to be? Do we want this health care to be primarily in the private sector? I think so. Most people do. So these are things we need to talk about and think about and have a good deal of attention paid to. What is the role of the Federal Government on these issues?

I noticed the other day a quotation from President Clinton that Government's responsibility is to create more opportunities, and the people's responsibility is to make the most of it. I agree with that. I don't think his policies were in line with that, but I agree with that statement. So what we are talking about here primarily tonight—and I am sure for several months—is about strengthening America's economy. The President's economic agenda has two main goals: To encourage consumer spending that will boost economic recovery, and promote investment by individuals and businesses that will lead to the economic growth and job creation. Those are two different points of view, and I respect that. Their point of view is to distribute money to everybody. Over here, it is to create incentive to create jobs so you have a long-term, positive impact. We need to do that.

So we will have great discussions, of course, on all of these issues. That is the way it ought to be and, indeed, that is the way it is.

I see my friend from New Mexico here. I hope we can address ourselves on these issues and do it in a way that we can disagree without making a total political issue of each of them—talk about them on their merits, on what they will do for the country, and not the impact they will have in 2004. Frankly, we have had an awful lot of that. We need to move beyond that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. I thought I was to have 10 minutes. Am I too late for that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 22 and a half minutes available on the Republican side at this point. The Senator can take that time if he chooses.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will use 10 at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is rather amazing, in the United States we only have one country, we have one people, we have one President, and he gives one State of the Union Address. Today we began to see how difficult partisan politics has made the idea of having one President, because before our President—the one President we have—takes the one opportunity to address the American people as to what he would like to do and what he would like help from the Congress and the people on, we have an array of Democratic Senators come to the floor, all of whom have today set their own standard for what he ought to do, all of whom have criticisms of what he might say, all of whom suggest if he doesn't do this, it will not work.

Well, I submit the President will have a myriad of healthy ideas for the American economy, and I would like to discuss one major one for a few minutes with the Senate and the American people—that is, the concern we have in the United States about our economy not producing jobs as it should and, thus, creating worry among our people beyond the unemployed. Many Americans who are employed will not spend money, purchase, or build a new house because their fear causes restraint. The American economy is not producing jobs. The business investors don't want to invest because they are not sure what is going to happen, so they too are withholding. They are being investigated and have all kinds of pressures so they are holding back. Even with this combination, the American economy, when you add it all together, is moving ahead quite well. That piece of the economy or that element that we call the gross domestic product is increasing.

Normally, when it is increasing, you produce more jobs. The gross product is not going down, which is negative, meaning a recession; it is going up. In fact, sometimes in history, if it went up this amount, jobs would be increasing in large numbers. This time it is

not happening. That is why we call it a "jobless" recovery.

Our President isn't laying blame on the Bill Clinton Presidency, when this recession started. I don't believe he has uttered a word about who caused it. I hope he does not tonight. As a matter of fact, on that score, we can all waste America's time talking about 3 years ago, what was going on—was the American economy on the downturn, and was President Clinton to blame or the Democrats?

The truth of the matter is a series of phenomena have occurred, including a huge terrorist strike that occurred in New York, and a huge drop in the stock market of the United States. You cannot blame that on this President.

All of those things, and others, have combined with a 10 or 11-year growth cycle that had to come down, bringing the American economy into a non-growth era for a while. Now it is starting up, and we want our President to tell us how we can improve that situation for America. That is what it means to speak about the economy and jobs.

Our President says: You all may have a lot of good ways, but I believe we ought to cut taxes. Most economists suggest cutting taxes, if you cut them right, will stimulate economic growth. The more money that is put into the economy—that means into the pockets of people and the pockets of business so they can spend it—the more you do that, the more you have a chance of moving the American economy.

I understand the Democrats, with Senator DASCHLE as their leader, have a \$141 billion package, a portion of which is giving money to the States because their treasuries are broke. If you want to do that, don't call it a stimulus package. We may do that in another event in the Senate, but our President, rightfully, is not including that in a stimulus package. That is not a stimulus, to help our States. At one time, we had a countercyclical problem. I don't know if DON NICKLES remembers, but Senator Muskie started it, and every time the economy would go down, you give the States money. Well, the President doesn't have that in this budget, in this proposal on taxes; but it may be considered separately if we have to help. What he does is look at accelerated expansion of the 10 percent bracket, accelerated reduction in income tax rates, accelerated elimination of the marriage penalty, with some refund of money, and an accelerated increase in the tax credits. It has the exclusion of dividends from individual taxable income and increases in small business expensing. That means if they can expense more, they keep more, which I just said you must do. Let them keep more so they can buy more equipment, spend more on jobs. The President has a hold harmless provision under the alternative minimum tax, a very necessary provision, and the cost of the plan is \$98 billion in the first calendar year and \$670 billion over 10 years.

The Democrat plan is so small I think we ought to nickname it. I think we ought to call it "the mouse."

The American economy is \$10 trillion. If we are talking about 5 years, it is \$50 trillion. That means the sum of the transactions going on, paychecks, car purchases, house purchases, financing, equals \$10 trillion a year.

When my colleagues say let's accelerate it, that means let's put money into the economy that stirs that up enough and shakes up all those transactions where a little bit more fever is put in each one of them so some action is occurring which we would equate with growth and jobs.

Clearly, that cannot be done unless enough is put in to move the giant battleship called the American economy. So how can that be moved with a mouse? It cannot. If a mouse is put out there to do it, the mouse will die and nothing will happen.

If my colleagues don't want to throw away taxpayers' money, then produce a plan that purports to create jobs and is so small it does nothing. Otherwise, that money will have been thrown away and my colleagues would be back in 18 months or 2 years asking the American people to give them another shot at it because we did not do enough.

So I submit that the President's proposal, which he has already given us a glimpse of, which he will tell the American people about tonight in detail, is the right one for America. Am I alone? Of course I am not alone in thinking this. There are 110 economists. One would think from what some on the other side say that the President called on a few people and they gave him ideas and he picked this one and said: Oh, here is a new idea. Let's not tax dividends on the individuals who receive them.

That idea has been around. I have been in Congress 30 years. It was around when I arrived. This is what 110 economists, with three Nobel prize winners, said. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of their approach.

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

110 ECONOMISTS BACK BUSH TAX PLAN; 3 NOBEL LAUREATES JOIN GROUP URGING CONGRESS' SUPPORT

(By James G. Lakely)

The Washington Times—January 18, 2003.—A letter signed by 100 economists, including three Nobel Prize winners, urges Congress to support the main elements of President Bush's \$647 billion tax-cut plan, make his 2001 tax cut permanent and restrain federal spending to spur the sluggish economy.

"As a rule, government cannot create wealth or expand the economy. Only the private sector can do that," said the letter this week to all members of Congress. "Government can, however, hinder economic growth through excessive taxes, high marginal tax rates, over-regulation, or unnecessary spending." The economists, including Nobel laureates Milton Friedman, James Buchanan and 2002 winner Vernon Smith, said increased spending to combat terrorism is warranted

but that "excessive federal spending has a dampening effect on the American economy."

To remedy that, Congress should "end programs that outlive their usefulness and roll back government's share of the Gross Domestic Product."

According to the Congressional Budget Office, government spending represented 19 percent of the GDP in 2002, a level that has remained roughly stable during the past 15 years but threatens to explode to 40 percent because of entitlement spending by 2075.

The "wobbly" financial markets can gain solid footing again, said the economists, if Mr. Bush's \$1.35 trillion tax cut in 2001 is made permanent.

"Investors and individual taxpayers will be able to make better decisions on their finances if they have greater confidence about what tax laws they will be facing in coming years," the letter said. "It is imperative for Congress to make the entire 2001 tax cut permanent."

The economists also applauded Mr. Bush's proposal to eliminate the double-taxation on corporate dividends, a policy they said is "especially harmful to economic growth."

Support for Mr. Bush's tax plan largely follows party lines. House Democratic leaders have scheduled an event Tuesday on Capitol Hill to argue that the president's plan is neither fair nor fiscally responsible and would leave state governments starving for money.

The various Democratic tax-cut proposals are dramatically smaller, short-term, targeted more narrowly and feature payments of at least \$300 to all families, including those who pay no federal income tax.

A spokesman for the Democrats on the House Appropriations Committee criticized the president's plan for being too skewed toward "the superwealthy."

"The White House needs to wake up and realize that giving their rich cronies another tax break is not going to halt the Bush recession," the Democratic aide said.

"We need to put money in the hands of people who are having trouble putting food on their table, not people who want to buy a second yacht."

But Sen. Evan Bayh, Indiana Democrat, said he is "keeping an open mind" on supporting a pro-growth tax bill that has many of the features of the president's package. "I'm not someone who has an allergic reaction to the dividend proposal as some do," Mr. Bayh said.

"I think you'll see a great many elements of the president's proposal [in the final bill]. I think, frankly, we'll improve it to make it even more growth-oriented for the economy today."

Mr. DOMENICI. They suggest that only the private sector can do what is required. Government cannot create wealth or expand the economy. Friedman, Buchanan, and Vernon Smith, all Nobel laureates, said increased spending to combat terrorism must be done, but to the extent that it is a lot of money, it will not help the American economy. They go on to say we need what the President is suggesting in his plan.

This summary I have before me, News World Communications, from the Washington Times quotes this series of communications.

I see Mr. NICKLES, the Senator from Oklahoma. I was going to speak about Iraq for a few minutes but I think I will not because I assume he will speak on the economy and taxes. I think it would be good today to have my speech and his back to back.

IRAQ

Mr. DOMENICI. I conclude with some comments on Iraq. I hope that tonight our President will tell our people the issue in Iraq is why has Saddam Hussein not destroyed the weapons of mass destruction that are in his country; not that we did not find them, not that we did not find a smoking gun.

The United Nations verified that he had thousands of weapons in his country, thousands of weapons of biological and chemical makeup that can kill millions of people.

I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFFEE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Some 9 or 10 years ago, the United Nations said Saddam must get rid of them, and then we pulled out. The United Nations sat around, Iraq started selling oil again, and Saddam started being Saddam. Then we decided we will go in and see if he has gotten rid of them. Non-compliance by him means he has not shown what happened to the weapons.

The 12,000-page document, which was all over the press as if they had submitted 12,000 pages of real explanation, was presented some days ago as though it explained where these thousands of weapons went. The United States and its agents of absolute integrity have read every single page, every single line. The conclusion is that the 12,000-page document is a farce. It does not explain what happened to all of those weapons. It is a joke.

They put in those pages what they wanted, and they described what they wanted. The sum total is, where are they?

He continues to say: I am showing them everything. And we continue to say: It is your responsibility to show us what you did with them. After all, it is not like every country in the world would accept thousands of these chemical weapons. Some nation that is crazy enough to take them would have to be found. So we have to be told they are not here. But where are they? If they are dumped in the ocean, somebody would find out. They cannot easily be gotten rid of so he has not gotten rid of them. He hid them.

Now we are telling the world there is noncompliance. I hope the world sees it our way, but more importantly I hope Saddam sees it our way. I hope he understands there are a lot of us that understand what is going on and that it is like I just said: He better come clean or, in fact, something will happen. I hope he does it himself and I hope our friends realize they better join us in putting him on the spot or he will put the world on the spot, and he will do it very soon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

IRAQ, THE ECONOMY, AND THE BUDGET

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I compliment my colleague, Senator DOMENICI, for his speech and also for many of the comments he made relating to the economy, the budget, and Iraq. I think the Senator from New Mexico is exactly right. The issue with Iraq is not whether the arms control inspectors can find a few weapons. It is whether or not Saddam Hussein is going to disarm and whether he is going to comply with the United Nations and whether the United Nations is going to enforce compliance.

We can pass 17 resolutions, all of which say the international community says he must disarm, but if we do not compel him to disarm, it makes the United Nations somewhat irrelevant to the whole proposal. Do those resolutions mean anything besides rhetoric or are we going to enforce them?

The previous administration did not enforce them. As a result, we did not even have arms control inspectors, much less enforcing the existing resolutions. Now we have a President who is going to lead the world, who says we should enforce these resolutions, and we should compel his disarmament.

When we think of the dangerousness of these weapons, I mentioned earlier today that two envelopes with anthrax that unfortunately were destined to the Senate killed a few people. They were not even opened in the post office. Yet they still killed people. They are very deadly materials. He happens to have tons of similar-type weapons, some even more dangerous such as VX.

I think the President is right in drawing a line in the sand and saying he must comply. The world community, the United Nations, agreed with the President last year. I hope they continue to support compelling Saddam Hussein to comply with existing U.N. resolutions.

I will submit for the RECORD a table which summarizes the Senate's action on H.J. Res. 2, the fiscal year 2003 omnibus appropriations resolution. This table was prepared by my staff based upon estimates of the Congressional Budget Office. I also wish to congratulate the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator STEVENS, for working to limit the total fiscal year 2003 appropriations bills to amounts requested by the President.

As adopted by the Senate, H.J. Res. 2 contains \$386.864 billion in discretionary spending when added to the amounts in the defense and military construction appropriations bills already enacted, which total \$752.193 billion in fiscal year 2003 discretionary spending. These totals include a 1.6 percent across-the-board reduction amounting to \$6.4 billion from all accounts funded in the other 11 appropriations bills, plus amounts for classified defense programs, \$3.9 billion in fire and management, \$825 million for which the President submitted separate requests.

Compared to fiscal year 2002, total discretionary spending under H.J. Res. 2 would grow by 2.4 percent, defense discretionary spending would grow by 6.9 percent, and domestic discretionary spending would decrease by 1.9 percent; compared to fiscal year 2002, less spending for one-time nonrecurring projects. Total discretionary spending under H.J. Res. 2 would grow by 4.7 percent, defense discretionary spending would grow by 7.3 percent, and domestic discretionary spending would grow by 2.1 percent. H.J. Res. 2 also includes several changes in mandatory programs not counted on the discretionary side of the budget.

The increased spending, which would total \$4.221 billion in 2003, includes changes in agriculture payments for drought, payments to physicians in rural hospitals, and TANF payments to States.

I ask unanimous consent a table displaying the Budget Committee scoring of H.J. Res. 2 and enacted appropriations with comparison to 2002 be printed in the RECORD.

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

CBO ESTIMATES OF THE SENATE PASSED APPROPRIATIONS BILLS FOR FY 2003 COMPARED TO FY 2002

[Budget authority, in billions of dollars]

Subcommittees	2002	Senate appropriations bills	Percent increase or decrease
Divisions A-K, and Defense and Military Construction Bills			
Agriculture	17.171	18.350	6.9
CJS	42.995	41.505	-3.5
Defense	0.560	0.574	2.5
Nondefense	42.435	40.931	-3.5
Defense	334.113	354.830	6.2
DC	0.607	0.512	-15.7
Energy and Water	25.334	26.164	3.3
Defense	15.164	15.899	4.8
Nondefense	10.170	10.265	0.9
Foreign Ops	16.433	16.429	-0.0
Interior	19.135	18.952	-1.0
Labor, HHS	127.659	136.519	6.9
Legislative	3.254	3.362	3.3
Mil Con	10.604	10.499	-1.0
Transportation	23.095	21.574	-6.6
Defense	0.440	0.340	-22.7
Nondefense	22.655	21.234	-6.3
Treasury, Postal	18.515	18.220	-1.6
VA, HUD	95.758	90.349	-5.6
Defense	0.153	0.144	-5.9
Nondefense	95.605	90.205	-5.6
Deficiencies	-0.350	0.000
Defense	-0.196	0.000
Nondefense	-0.154	0.000
Total, Divisions A-K	734.323	757.265	3.1
Defense	360.838	382.286	5.9
Nondefense	373.485	374.979	0.4
Division M			
Classified Defense Programs ..	0.000	3.895
Division N			
Election Reform—Title I	0.000	1.500
Wildland Fire Management—			
Title III	0.000	0.825
Fisheries Disasters—Title V	0.000	0.100
2.85 percent across the board rescission on accounts (except Head Start) in 11 bills—Title VI	0.000	-11.392
Subtotal	0.000	-8.967
Total, Discretionary	734.323	752.193	2.4
Defense	360.838	385.680	6.9
Nondefense	373.485	366.513	-1.9
One-time, non-recurring projects	15.946	0.000
Defense	1.338	0.000
Nondefense	14.608	0.000
Total, Discretionary less one-time	718.377	752.193	4.7
Defense	359.500	385.680	7.3
Nondefense	358.877	366.513	2.1
Total, without enacted Defense and Mil Con		386.864
Defense		20.351
Nondefense		366.513