

(Mr. LOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2255, a bill to amend the Internet Tax Freedom Act to extend the moratorium through calendar year 2006.

S. 2272

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2272, a bill to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

S. 2280

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2280, a bill to provide for the effective punishment of online child molesters.

S. 2311

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2311, a bill to revise and extend the Ryan White CARE Act programs under title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, to improve access to health care and the quality of health care under such programs, and to provide for the development of increased capacity to provide health care and related support services to individuals and families with HIV disease, and for other purposes.

S. 2314

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2314, a bill for the relief of Elian Gonzalez and other family members.

S. 2323

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) were added as cosponsors of S. 2323, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the treatment of stock options under the Act.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communication services.

S. 2340

At the request of Mr. BROWNBAC, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a program to support research and training in methods of detecting the use of performance-enhancing substances by athletes, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 81

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor

of S. Con. Res. 81, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and permit them to move to the United States if they so desire.

S. J. RES. 3

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. J. Res. 3, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to protect the rights of crime victims.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 103—HONORING THE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES WHO SERVED THE NATION DURING THE VIETNAM ERA AND THE FAMILIES OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES OR REMAIN UNACCOUNTED FOR OR WERE INJURED DURING THAT ERA IN SOUTHEAST ASIA OR ELSEWHERE IN THE WORLD DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES NATIONAL SECURITY INTERESTS

Mr. CLELAND submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 103

Whereas the United States Armed Forces conducted military operations in Southeast Asia during the period (known as the "Vietnam era") from February 28, 1961, to May 7, 1975;

Whereas during the Vietnam era more than 3,403,000 American military personnel served in the Republic of Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia in support of United States military operations in Vietnam, while millions more provided for the Nation's defense in other parts of the world;

Whereas during the Vietnam era untold numbers of civilian personnel of the United States Government also served in support of United States operations in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world;

Whereas May 7, 2000, marks the 25th anniversary of the closing of the period known as the Vietnam era; and

Whereas that date would be an appropriate occasion to recognize and express appreciation for the individuals who served the Nation in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world during the Vietnam era: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) honors the service and sacrifice of the members of the Armed Forces and Federal civilian employees who during the Vietnam era served the Nation in the Republic of Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia or otherwise served in support of United States operations in Vietnam and in support of United States national security interests throughout the world;

(2) recognizes and honors the sacrifice of the families of those individuals referred to in paragraph (1) who lost their lives or remain unaccounted for or were injured during that era, in Southeast Asia or elsewhere in the world, in defense of United States national security interests; and

(3) encourages the American people, through appropriate ceremonies and activities, to recognize the service and sacrifice of those individuals.

SENATE RESOLUTION 285—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THERE SHOULD BE PARITY AMONG THE COUNTRIES THAT ARE PARTIES TO THE NORTH AMERICAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE PERSONAL EXEMPTION ALLOWANCE FOR MERCHANDISE PURCHASED ABROAD BY RETURNING RESIDENTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. GREGG, Mr. KYL, Mr. LEAHY, and Mrs. HUTCHISON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 285

Whereas the personal exemption allowance is a vital component of trade and tourism;

Whereas many border communities and retailers depend on customers from both sides of the border;

Whereas an United States citizen traveling to Canada or Mexico for less than 24 hours is exempt from paying duties on the equivalent of \$200 worth of merchandise on return to the United States, and for trips over 48 hours United States citizens have an exemption of up to \$400 worth of merchandise;

Whereas a Canadian traveling in the United States is allowed a duty-free personal exemption allowance of only \$50 worth of merchandise for a 24-hour visit, the equivalent of \$200 worth of merchandise for a 48-hour visit, and the equivalent of \$750 worth of merchandise for a visit of over 7 days;

Whereas Mexico has a 2-tiered personal exemption allowance for its returning residents, set at the equivalent of \$50 worth of merchandise for residents returning by car and the equivalent of \$300 worth of merchandise for residents returning by plane;

Whereas Canadian and Mexican retail businesses have an unfair competitive advantage over many American businesses because of the disparity between the personal exemption allowances among the 3 countries;

Whereas the State of Maine legislature passed a resolution urging action on this matter;

Whereas the disparity in personal exemption allowances creates a trade barrier by making it difficult for Canadians and Mexicans to shop in American-owned stores without facing high additional costs;

Whereas the United States entered into the North American Free Trade Agreement with Canada and Mexico with the intent of phasing out tariff barriers among the 3 countries; and

Whereas it violates the spirit of the North American Free Trade Agreement for Canada and Mexico to maintain restrictive personal exemption allowance policies that are not reciprocal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, should initiate discussions with officials of the Governments of Canada and Mexico to achieve parity with respect to the personal exemption allowance structure; and

(2) in the event that parity with respect to the personal exemption allowance of the 3 countries is not reached within 1 year after the date of the adoption of this resolution,

the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of the Treasury should submit recommendations to Congress on whether legislative changes are necessary to lower the United States personal exemption allowance to conform to the allowance levels established in the other countries that are parties to the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas and salute the work she has done on behalf of retail businesses in border communities in Texas on the very issue I am about to discuss.

Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution seeking parity among the countries that are parties to the North American Free-Trade Agreement with respect to the personal exemption allowance for merchandise purchased by returning residents. I am pleased to be joined today by Senators MOYNIHAN, KYL, GREGG, HUTCHISON, and LEAHY as original cosponsors.

NAFTA was intended to remove trade barriers among the countries of the United States, Canada, and Mexico. While some of the goals of NAFTA have been realized, glaring inequities remain. One such inequity that affects small businesses, particularly retailers, located in border communities is the difference in personal exemption allowances permitted by the U.S. versus the allowances permitted by Canada and Mexico.

For Maine citizens living near the U.S./Canadian border, moving freely and frequently between the two countries is a way of life. Cross-border business and family relationships abound. The difference in personal exemption allowances, however, puts Maine businesses near the Canadian border at a considerable disadvantage in relation to their Canadian counterparts. Let me explain why. A United States citizen traveling to Canada for fewer than 24 hours is exempt from paying duties on \$200 worth of merchandise. For trips over 48 hours, the exemption increases to \$400 worth of merchandise. Under our laws, Canadian stores are able to serve both Canadian and American customers and, because of the exemption level, can sell Americans a significant amount of merchandise duty-free.

Unfortunately, this situation only works one way. A Canadian citizen is allowed a duty-free personal exemption allowance of only \$50 for a 24-hour visit and \$200 for a 48-hour visit. This means that a Canadian shopping for the day in the border communities of Fort Kent, Madawaska, or Calais or indeed anywhere in Maine can bring home only \$50 worth of merchandise before a duty is imposed. This is a significant deterrent to Canadians who would otherwise shop in Maine communities.

This disparity harms many Maine businesses, including Central Building Supplies, a small, family-owned home building materials business that has been in the same location in Madawaska, Maine for 35 years. Its owner wrote to me concerned about this issue. Over the past couple years,

his small store has lost sales in kitchen cabinets, windows, wood flooring, and ceramic tile largely due to the inequity in duty allowances and the exchange rate. Whether they are located in the St. John Valley or in Washington County, small businesses cite similar problems. The allowance disparity also hurts stores in the Aroostook Centre Mall and the Bangor Mall, which have traditionally attracted Canadian shoppers.

This discrepancy in personal exemption allowances gives an enormous competitive advantage to the Canadian and Mexican retailers. It gives these retailers to our north and the south access to cross-border shoppers while limiting that same opportunity for American retailers. Mr. President, this is not fair trade, and this is not free trade. This parity should be eliminated.

The resolution I am submitting today would express the sense of the Senate that the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of the Treasury should initiate discussions with officials of the Governments of Canada and Mexico to achieve parity with respect to the personal exemption allowance structure. In the event that parity in the personal exemption is not reached within one year after the date of the adoption of this resolution, this resolution would require the United States Trade Representative and the Secretary of the Treasury to submit recommendations to Congress on whether legislative changes are necessary to achieve personal exemption parity. The steps set forth in this resolution would begin to resolve this inequity. I urge my colleagues to support its swift passage.

I thank the Senator from Texas for not only yielding but for cosponsoring this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I commend my colleague from Maine for submitting this resolution. It is very similar to a resolution I submitted 2 years ago. Unfortunately, the U.S. Trade Representative has not taken this cause as a serious cause. I hope with bipartisan support on Senator COLLINS' resolution the U.S. Trade Representative will see this is an issue on the northern border and on the southern border. It is a very serious issue that severely disadvantages retailers in the United States and also is a handicap for the consumers in both Canada and Mexico that want to purchase big items such as television sets, refrigerators, washing machines, and dryers available on the borders that they are not able to purchase without huge tariffs.

We passed the North American Free Trade Agreement to do away with tariffs so we would have free and open trade across our borders. It is not working when it comes to retailing in that cross border area where people walk back and forth. Parity is achieved if you fly in and out of our three countries, but not if you go across by car.

It is a terrible inequity. I hope Senator COLLINS' resolution gets the attention of our U.S. Trade Representative about the seriousness of this issue. I commend her for the resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

LEGISLATION INSTITUTING A FEDERAL FUELS TAX HOLIDAY

COLLINS AMENDMENTS NOS. 3088-3089

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Ms. COLLINS submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by her to the bill (S. 2285) instituting a Federal fuels tax holiday; as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 3088

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Fuels Tax Holiday Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN FUEL TAXES ON GASOLINE, DIESEL FUEL, KEROSENE, AVIATION FUEL, AND SPECIAL FUELS, BY 4.3 CENTS.

(a) TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN FUEL TAXES.—During the applicable period, each rate of tax referred to in subsection (b) shall be reduced by 4.3 cents per gallon.

(b) RATES OF TAX.—The rates of tax referred to in this subsection are the rates of tax otherwise applicable under—

(1) paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 4041(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to special fuels),

(2) subsection (m) of section 4041 of such Code (relating to certain alcohol fuels),

(3) subparagraph (C) of section 4042(b)(1) of such Code (relating to tax on fuel used in commercial transportation on inland waterways),

(4) clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of section 4081(a)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to gasoline, diesel fuel, and kerosene),

(5) paragraph (1) of section 4091(b) of such Code (relating to aviation fuel), and

(6) paragraph (2) of section 4092(b) of such Code (relating to fuel used in commercial aviation).

(c) SPECIAL REDUCTION RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) shall be applied by substituting for "4.3 cents"—

(A) "3.2 cents" in the case of fuel described in section 4041(a)(2)(B)(ii) of such Code (relating to liquefied petroleum),

(B) "2.8 cents" in the case of fuel described in section 4041(a)(2)(B)(iii) of such Code (relating to liquefied natural gas),

(C) "48.54 cents" in the case of fuel described in section 4041(a)(3)(A) of such Code (relating to compressed natural gas), and

(D) "2.15 cents" in the case of fuel described in section 4041(m)(1)(A)(ii)(I) of such Code (relating to certain alcohol fuel).

(2) CONFORMING RULES.—In the case of a reduction under subsection (a)—

(A) section 4081(c) of such Code shall be applied without regard to paragraph (6) thereof,

(B) section 4091(c) of such Code shall be applied without regard to paragraph (4) thereof,

(C) section 6421(f)(2) of such Code shall be applied by disregarding "and, in the case" and all that follows,

(D) section 6421(f)(3) of such Code shall be applied without regard to subparagraph (B) thereof,