

(Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 982, a bill to halt Syrian support for terrorism, end its occupation of Lebanon, stop its development of weapons of mass destruction, cease its illegal importation of Iraqi oil, and hold Syria accountable for its role in the Middle East, and for other purposes.

S. 1273

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to provide for a study to ensure that students are not adversely affected by changes to the needs analysis tables, and to require the Secretary of Education to consult with the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance regarding such changes.

S. 1331

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1331, a bill to clarify the treatment of tax attributes under section 108 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 for taxpayers which file consolidated returns.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of certain expenses of rural letter carriers.

S. 1379

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1379, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of veterans who became disabled for life while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

S. 1380

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1380, a bill to distribute universal service support equitably throughout rural America, and for other purposes.

S. 1396

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1396, a bill to require equitable coverage of prescription contraceptive drugs and devices, and contraceptive services under health plans.

S. 1400

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1400, a bill to develop a system that provides for ocean and coastal observations, to implement a research and development program to enhance security at United States ports, to implement a data and information system required by all compo-

nents of an integrated ocean observing system and related research, and for other purposes.

S. 1414

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1414, a bill to restore second amendment rights in the District of Columbia.

S. 1419

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1419, a bill to support the establishment or expansion and operation of programs using a network of public and private community entities to provide mentoring for children in foster care.

S.J. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 17, a joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to broadcast media ownership.

S. CON. RES. 40

At the request of Mrs. CLINTON, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 40, a concurrent resolution designating August 7, 2003, as "National Purple Heart Recognition Day".

S. RES. 153

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 153, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that changes to athletics policies issued under title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 would contradict the spirit of athletic equality and the intent to prohibit sex discrimination in education programs or activities receiving Federal financial assistance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 1432. A bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to establish a program to provide assistance to small communities for use in carrying out projects and activities necessary to achieve or maintain compliance with drinking water standards; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to talk about two things: One is strictly domestic and another is international.

First, I am introducing a bill today in behalf of myself, Senator HAGEL, and Senator BINGAMAN.

I will start this discussion with a chart. The dark brown on this map are counties in these United States—you will note that they are predominantly in the West—with arsenic concentrations exceeding 10 parts per billion or more in the water sampling. The little bit lighter ones are counties with 5 parts per billion. The little bit lighter ones are counties with 3 parts per billion. And, the very light ones are counties with fewer than 10 parts per billion.

Arsenic is a very prevalent compound or chemical in the United States. Communities in the State of New Mexico and throughout the country are going to face, very soon, a very costly situation not of their own making. Beginning in the year 2000, Federal drinking water regulations established by the Environmental Protection Agency will require substantial reductions in the amount of arsenic present in water.

Today, the limit is 50 parts per billion. In 2006, it will become 10 parts per billion.

When I was referring a while ago to these colorations, this dark brown is parts per billion. Today the limit is 50. In 2006, it will become 10 parts per billion. Arsenic is indeed poisonous if used in large amounts. It is naturally occurring, however, in much of the ground water throughout the Nation.

That means there have been people living for as long as they have lived in areas that have naturally occurring arsenic in the ground water. Believe it or not, fellow citizens, they have been drinking that water.

What is so strange about it is that we don't have any evidence it has been killing them. We don't have any evidence it has been hurting them. But actually there are scientific tests on which the Environmental Protection Agency relied, I regret to tell you, that, in this Senator's opinion, are very meager in terms of their strength, and they predominate in foreign countries. However, the law has been interpreted to say that, in 2006, drinking water systems will be down to 10 parts per billion or they will be in violation of this Federal law.

In my home city of Albuquerque, which is shown on this second map I have put up—there is Albuquerque; you see there is the very dark brown—there are around 13 parts per billion. This illustrates the problem the new standard

will create. This bill recognizes that in some parts of the United States, and of my State, the burden will become so great that some communities just will not be able to bear it. They have to go through—at least today—a whole new cleanup system for their domestic water. Whatever they have been doing, they must do it all another way.

Although our scientists are busy at work, No. 1, trying to figure an easier way to clean it up, we are also having some of them busy at work trying to offer us more evidence that it is not dangerous to have Albuquerqueans drink the water that must be cleaned up and water in water systems in many other parts of my State and in other parts of America.

But this bill goes on to say that small communities may not have the resources to meet these standards and may need help, and it creates a grant program for the small communities to help them upgrade these systems and ensures them that not less than 20 percent of the grant moneys go to communities with fewer than 50,000 residents. And the bill authorizes appropriations of \$1.9 billion for fiscal year 2004 and for each year through 2009.

In New Mexico, the geology, the make up of the rocks and dirt, results in relatively high levels of arsenic in the groundwater. However, over time, New Mexico residents have not experienced higher levels of diseases associated with arsenic. Be that as it may, many small communities throughout New Mexico and the west will not be able to meet the financial burden. Because of this, I believe it is important to aid communities in meeting the coming standards. The financial burden facing many communities and individuals is great.

The new standards could cost New Mexico communities between \$370 to \$440 million to improve treatment systems, plus \$18 million a year in operating costs.

Albuquerque, alone, is looking at having to spend \$150 million to come into compliance. Its sister city, right across the river, Rio Rancho—our second largest city—is facing \$60 million in improvements. And many individuals in small communities throughout the West are facing increases in their water bills of \$50 to \$90 a month just to pay for the cleanup. Most people cannot afford such an increase.

This legislation will help these communities in upgrading their systems and training their people. We are forcing communities to comply with drinking water standards that many believe will not increase public health. The least we can do is help them meet the burden.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1432

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Community Drinking Water Assistance Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) drinking water standards proposed and in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act will place a large financial burden on many public water systems, especially those public water systems in rural communities serving small populations;

(2) the limited scientific, technical, and professional resources available in small communities complicate the implementation of regulatory requirements;

(3) small communities often cannot afford to meet water quality standards because of the expenses associated with upgrading public water systems and training personnel to operate and maintain the public water systems;

(4) small communities do not have a tax base for dealing with the costs of upgrading their public water systems;

(5) small communities face high per capita costs in improving drinking water quality;

(6) small communities would greatly benefit from a grant program designed to provide funding for water quality projects;

(7) as of the date of enactment of this Act, there is no Federal program in effect that adequately meets the needs of small, primarily rural communities with respect to public water systems; and

(8) since new, more protective arsenic drinking water standards proposed by the Clinton and Bush administrations, respectively, are expected to be implemented in 2006, the grant program established by the amendment made by this Act should be implemented in a manner that ensures that the implementation of those new standards is not delayed.

SEC. 3. ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS.

(a) **DEFINITION OF INDIAN TRIBE.**—Section 1401(14) of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f(14)) is amended in the second sentence by striking "1452," and inserting "1452 and part G,".

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"PART G—ASSISTANCE FOR SMALL PUBLIC WATER SYSTEMS

"SEC. 1471. DEFINITIONS.

"In this part:

"(1) **ELIGIBLE ACTIVITY.**—

"(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term 'eligible activity' means a project or activity concerning a small public water system that is carried out by an eligible entity to comply with drinking water standards.

"(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term 'eligible activity' includes—

"(i) obtaining technical assistance; and

"(ii) training and certifying operators of small public water systems.

"(C) **EXCLUSION.**—The term 'eligible activity' does not include any project or activity to increase the population served by a small public water system, except to the extent that the Administrator determines such a project or activity to be necessary to—

"(i) achieve compliance with a national primary drinking water regulation; and

"(ii) provide a water supply to a population that, as of the date of enactment of this part, is not served by a safe public water system.

"(2) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term 'eligible entity' means a small public water system that—

"(A) is located in a State or an area governed by an Indian Tribe; and

"(B)(i) if located in a State, serves a community that, under affordability criteria established by the State under section 1452(d)(3), is determined by the State to be—

"(I) a disadvantaged community; or

"(II) a community that may become a disadvantaged community as a result of carrying out an eligible activity; or

"(ii) if located in an area governed by an Indian Tribe, serves a community that is determined by the Administrator, under affordability criteria published by the Administrator under section 1452(d)(3) and in consultation with the Secretary, to be—

"(I) a disadvantaged community; or

"(II) a community that the Administrator expects to become a disadvantaged community as a result of carrying out an eligible activity.

"(3) **PROGRAM.**—The term 'Program' means the small public water assistance program established under section 1472(a).

"(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Indian Health Service.

"(5) **SMALL PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM.**—The term 'small public water system' means a public water system (including a community water system and a noncommunity water system) that serves—

"(A) a community with a population of not more than 200,000 individuals; or

"(B) a public water system located in—

"(i) Bernalillo or Sandoval County, New Mexico;

"(ii) Scottsdale, Arizona;

"(iii) Mesquite or Washoe County, Nevada;

or

"(iv) El Paso County, Texas.

"SEC. 1472. SMALL PUBLIC WATER SYSTEM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

"(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this part, the Administrator shall establish a program to provide grants to eligible entities for use in carrying out projects and activities to comply with drinking water standards.

"(2) **PRIORITY.**—Subject to paragraph (3), the Administrator shall award grants under the Program to eligible entities based on—

"(A) first, the financial need of the community for the grant assistance, as determined by the Administrator; and

"(B) second, with respect to the community in which the eligible entity is located, the per capita cost of complying with drinking water standards, as determined by the Administrator.

"(3) **SMALL COMMUNITIES.**—In making grants under this section, the Administrator shall ensure that not less than 20 percent of grant funds provided for each fiscal year are used to carry out eligible activities in communities with a population of less than 50,000 individuals.

"(b) **APPLICATION PROCESS.**—

"(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An eligible entity that seeks to receive a grant under the Program shall submit to the Administrator, on such form as the Administrator shall prescribe (not to exceed 3 pages in length), an application to receive the grant.

"(2) **COMPONENTS.**—The application shall include—

"(A) a description of the eligible activities for which the grant is needed;

"(B) a description of the efforts made by the eligible entity, as of the date of submission of the application, to comply with drinking water standards; and

"(C) any other information required to be included by the Administrator.

"(3) **REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF APPLICATIONS.**—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of an application under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall forward the application to the Council.

“(B) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL.—Not later than 90 days after receiving the recommendations of the Council under subsection (e) concerning an application, after taking into consideration the recommendations, the Administrator shall—

“(i) approve the application and award a grant to the applicant; or

“(ii) disapprove the application.

“(C) RESUBMISSION.—If the Administrator disapproves an application under subparagraph (B)(ii), the Administrator shall—

“(i) inform the applicant in writing of the disapproval (including the reasons for the disapproval); and

“(ii) provide to the applicant a deadline by which the applicant may revise and resubmit the application.

“(c) COST SHARING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal share of the cost of carrying out an eligible activity using funds from a grant provided under the Program shall not exceed 90 percent.

“(2) WAIVER.—The Administrator may waive the requirement to pay the non-Federal share of the cost of carrying out an eligible activity using funds from a grant provided under the Program if the Administrator determines that an eligible entity is unable to pay, or would experience significant financial hardship if required to pay, the non-Federal share.

“(d) ENFORCEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF STANDARDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Administrator shall not enforce any standard for drinking water under this Act (including a regulation promulgated under this Act) against an eligible entity during the period beginning on the date on which the eligible entity submits an application for a grant under the Program and ending, as applicable, on—

“(A) the deadline specified in subsection (b)(3)(C)(ii), if the application is disapproved and not resubmitted; or

“(B) the date that is 3 years after the date on which the eligible entity receives a grant under this part, if the application is approved.

“(2) ARSENIC STANDARDS.—No standard for arsenic in drinking water promulgated under this Act (including a standard in any regulation promulgated before the date of enactment of this part) shall be implemented or enforced by the Administrator in any State until the earlier of January 1, 2006 or such date as the Administrator certifies to Congress that—

“(A) the Program has been implemented in the State; and

“(B) the State has made substantial progress, as determined by the Administrator in consultation with the Governor of the State, in complying with drinking water standards under this Act.

“(e) ROLE OF COUNCIL.—The Council shall—

“(1) review applications for grants from eligible entities received by the Administrator under subsection (b);

“(2) for each application, recommend to the Administrator whether the application should be approved or disapproved; and

“(3) take into consideration priority lists developed by States for the use of drinking water treatment revolving loan funds under section 1452.

“SEC. 1473. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part \$1,900,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2004 through 2009.”

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, and Mr. GREGG):

S. 1433. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in implementing cultural heritage, conservation, and recreational activities in the Connecticut River watershed of the States of New Hampshire and Vermont; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Upper Connecticut River Partnership Act that will help bring recognition to New England's largest river ecosystem and help the communities along the river protect and enhance their natural, cultural and recreational resources. I am pleased to add Senators JEFFORDS and GREGG as original cosponsors of this bill.

For years, our offices and our States have worked together to help communities on both sides of the river develop local partnerships to protect the Connecticut River valley of Vermont and New Hampshire. This valley is a scenic region of historic villages located in a working landscape of farms and forests.

Citizens on both sides of the river know just how special this region is and have worked side by side for years to protect it. The two States came together to create the Connecticut River Joint Commissions, which help coordinate the efforts of towns, watersheds and other local groups to implement the Connecticut River Corridor Management Plan. This Plan has become the blueprint for how communities along the river can work together, with the States of Vermont and New Hampshire and with the Federal Government to protect the river's resources.

The Upper Connecticut River Partnership Act would help carry out the recommendations of the Connecticut River Corridor Management Plan and help communities along the river protect their cultural, natural and recreational resources. This Act would provide the Secretary of Interior with the ability to assist the States of New Hampshire and Vermont with technical and financial aid for the Upper Connecticut River through the Connecticut River Joint Commissions. The people living in the Upper Connecticut Watershed region would be able to learn about the river and be given knowledge on how to protect it. Also, the Act would assist local community efforts to continue cultural heritage outreach and education programs while enriching the recreational activities already active in the Connecticut River Watersheds of Vermont and New Hampshire.

The bill also will require that the Secretary of Interior establish a Connecticut River Grants and Technical Assistance Program to help local community groups develop new projects and build on existing ones to enhance the river basin. Over the next few years, I hope this bill will help bring new recognition to the Connecticut River as one of our Nation's great water resources.

By Mr. NELSON of Florida (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM of Florida, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1436. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for State and local sales taxes in lieu of State and local income taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Mr. GRAHAM of Florida. Mr. President, when Congress enacted the Tax Reform Act of 1986, it was heralded for its simplicity, efficiency and fairness. Yet the legislation was not fair to states such as Florida that choose not to finance the government through the imposition of an income tax. Residents from these States are forced to pay a higher Federal income tax liability than comparable citizens of other States. This results from the 1986 Act's elimination of the Federal income tax deduction for State sales taxes.

Today, Senators NELSON of Florida, DASCHLE, JOHNSON and I are introducing the Sales Tax Equity act to remedy this inequity and lift our constituents from second-class status. The bill allows taxpayers to elect a deduct State and local sales taxes in lieu of a deduction for State and local income taxes. Although the election is available to residents of all States, the practical effect of the bill is to make the deduction for State taxes available to residents of States with no State income tax. Residents from these States should not be forced to pay higher Federal tax bills simply because their State government's funding does not derive from an income tax.

To avoid burdensome record-keeping requirements, the deduction for State and local sales taxes would be determined by tables produced by Treasury. Those tables will take into consideration the sales tax rates in the various States and average consumption.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates the cost of restoring this fairness to the citizens of non-income tax States at \$26 billion over ten years. Under most circumstances it should not be incumbent upon those of us who are trying to restore equity in our Federal tax laws to find offsets for this cost. The problem we face, however, is that last week the Office of Management and Budget announced that the deficit for this year would be 455 billion dollars—165 billion dollars greater than the previous record deficit. The fiscal hole in which we now find ourselves—primarily as a result of the fiscal mismanagement of the Bush Administration—places an extra burden on us. The responsible approach to fixing this problem, therefore, requires us to put together a proposal that will not exacerbate the deficit. Fortunately, offsets exist that will fully offset the cost of the restored sales tax deduction and improve the Nation's tax laws by making it tougher for taxpayers to avoid paying their fair share.

In his last report to the IRS Oversight Board, former Commissioner Rossotti identified corporate tax shelters as one of the top problems facing the IRS. To combat this growing problem, the bill includes measures to crack down on the proliferation of tax shelters. The purpose of these provisions is to reinforce the Treasury department's administrative enforcement regime. A key element of the Service's enforcement regime is their ability to detect potentially abusive transactions. Thus, the bill promotes disclosure of such transactions through a framework of increased penalties and limited defenses in the event of non-disclosure.

The legislation also clarifies the judicially created doctrine of economic substance and imposes a new 40 percent strict-liability penalty for those transactions that fail this new requirement. Clarification of the economic substance doctrine requires that the taxpayer establish that (1) The transaction changes in a meaningful way, apart from the Federal income tax consequences, the taxpayer's economic position, (2) the taxpayer has a substantial non-tax purpose of entering into the transaction, and (3) the transaction is a reasonable means of accomplishing such non-tax purpose.

In addition to cracking down on potentially abusive transactions, our bill will shut down known abusive transactions. Last year, at the request of the Chairman and Ranking Members of the Senate Committee on Finance, the Joint Committee on Taxation investigated Enron's tax returns. One of the areas on which the Joint Committee focused was the tax shelter arrangements, offshore entities, and special purposes entities that Enron used to reduce its tax liability. The Joint Committee issued its report on this investigation on February 13, 2003 and included recommendations for shutting down some of the tax shelters used by the company. This legislation includes those recommendations.

The legislation also eliminates incentives in our tax code that encourage individuals and corporations to renounce their U.S. citizenship to avoid paying U.S. tax. For individuals, the legislation generally subjects U.S. citizens who relinquish their U.S. citizenship and certain long-term U.S. residents who terminate their U.S. residence to tax on the net unrealized gain in their property as if such property were sold at fair market value on the day before the expatriation or residency termination. Only a gain in excess of \$600,000, \$1.2 million for a married couple, is subject to tax.

The legislation also establishes new rules to thwart efforts by some U.S. corporations to reincorporate in a foreign country in order to avoid paying U.S. tax. These proposals are identical to legislation passed previously by the Senate.

There is one additional, and crucial, benefit of our legislation. It will not

slow down the current conference negotiations on legislations extending the child credit expansion to low-income families. As my colleagues know, legislation resolving this matter has passed both the House and Senate and the differences between the two bills must be reconciled. It is important for that legislation to get resolved as soon as possible so that the IRS has ample time to send checks out to these families this summer. Some have suggested that resolution of the sales tax issue—a matter not included in either the House or Senate bill—be attached to the child credit bill. I fear that such an attempt would further complicate resolution of that important legislation.

I hope our colleagues will look upon this legislation in the spirit with which it is offered. It is fundamentally unfair that for the past seventeen years the residents of our States have faced higher Federal income tax liabilities than their fellow citizens living in other States. We feel that we have structured our legislation in a manner that corrects this inequity without jeopardizing the tax benefits available to residents of other States. Furthermore, the bill is fiscally responsible and improves the tax system by making it more difficult for those who would use tax shelters and other devices to lower their taxes.●

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED & PROPOSED

SA 1317. Mr. BYRD (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2555, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1317. Mr. BYRD (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2555, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2004, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 75, Line 6, insert the following:
TITLE VII—FULFILLING HOMELAND SECURITY PROMISES

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR BORDER AND TRANSPORTATION SECURITY
CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Customs and Border Protection", \$238,500,000, to remain available until December 31, 2004, of which not less than \$100,000,000 shall be for border ports-of-entry infrastructure improvements, and not less than \$138,500,000 shall be for staffing at the northern border.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
AVIATION SECURITY

For additional amounts for necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Administration related to aviation security services pursuant to Public Law 107-71 and Public Law 107-296 and for other purposes, \$100,000,000, to remain available until expended, for air cargo security.

TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
MARITIME AND LAND SECURITY

For additional amounts for necessary expenses of the Transportation Security Ad-

ministration related to maritime and land transportation security services pursuant to Public Law 107-71 and Public Law 107-296 and for other purposes, \$532,000,000 to remain available until December 31, 2004, of which not less than \$57,000,000 shall be available for grants to public transit agencies in urbanized areas for enhancing the security of transit facilities against chemical, biological and other terrorist threats, not less than \$460,000,000 shall be for shortfalls pursuant to Public Law 108-10, for port security grants for the purpose of implementing the provisions of the Maritime Transportation Security Act, and not less than \$15,000,000 for inter-city bus security grants for enhancing inter-city bus and facility protection against terrorists threats.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD
OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Operating Expenses", \$70,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2004, of which not less than \$70,000,000 shall be for costs pursuant to Public Law 107-295 for implementing the Maritime Transportation Security Act including those costs associated with the review of vessel and facility security plans and the development of area security plans.

OFFICE FOR DOMESTIC PREPAREDNESS

For additional amounts for the "Office for Domestic Preparedness," \$729,500,000: Provided, That of the amount made available under this heading: \$250,000,000 shall be available for grants pursuant to section 1014 of the USA PATRIOT Act of 2001 (42 U.S.C. 3711); \$250,000,000 shall be for discretionary grants for use in high-threat urban areas, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security; \$79,500,000 shall be for interoperable communications equipment; \$150,000,000, to remain available through December 31, 2004, shall be for programs authorized by section 33 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2201 et seq.).

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR INFORMATION

ANALYSIS AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION

For an additional amount for the "Office of the Under Secretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection", \$80,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 2004, for chemical facility security assessments.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Governmental Affairs' Subcommittee on Financial Management, the Budget, and International Security be authorized to meet on Monday, July 21 at 2 p.m. for a hearing titled, "Oversight Hearing on Government Sponsored Enterprises: The Risks and Benefits to Consumers."

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Appropriations Committee staff members and intern be granted the privilege of the floor for the consideration of the fiscal year 2004 Homeland Security appropriations bill and any votes that may occur in relation thereto: Les Spivey, Rachele Schroeder, Carol Cribbs, James Hayes, Josh Manley, and Elizabeth Ferriday Mansel.