INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 3212. 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.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 3213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an individual to designate $3 or more on their income tax return to be used to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3214. A bill to amend the Assets for Independence Act (Title IV of the Community Opportunities, Accountability, and Training and Educational Services Act of 1998) to enhance program flexibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 3215. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize women's health research award programs conducted through the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 3216. A bill to provide for review in the Court of International Trade of certain determinations of binational panels under the North American Free Trade Agreement; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MACK (for himself and Mr. BROWNBACK):

S. 3217. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for individuals who are residents of the District of Columbia a maximum rate of tax of 15 percent on income from sources within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 3218. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to exclude beverage alcohol compounds emitted from aging warehouses from the definition of volatile organic compounds; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. BYRD, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. ROBB, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. CLELAND, Ms. SNOWE, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. REED, Mr . ALLARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOND, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. MILLER, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 378. A resolution honoring the members of the crew of the guided missile destroyer U.S.S. *Cole* (DDG–67) who were killed or wounded in the terrorist bombing attack on that vessel in Aden, Yemen, on October 12, 2000, expressing the sympathies of the Senate to the families of those crew members, commending the ship's crew for their heroic damage control efforts, and condemning the bombing of that ship; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. ROBB, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. BOND, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. REED, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 379. A resolution memorializing the sailors of the Navy lost in the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole* (DDG–67) in the port of Aden, Yemen, on October 12, 2000; extending condolences to their families and other loved ones; extending sympathy to the members of the crew of that vessel who were injured in the attack and commending the entire crew for its performance and professionalism in saving the U.S.S. *Cole*; considered and agreed to.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 3212. 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.

UPPER CONNECTICUT RIVER PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2000

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the Upper Connecticut River Partnership Act of 2000. This legislation is a truly locally-led initiative. I believe it will result in great environmental benefits for the Connecticut River.

The Connecticut River forms the border to New Hampshire and Vermont and provides for a great deal of recreational and tourism opportunities for residents of both States. This legislation takes a major step forward in making sure this River continues to thrive as a treasured resource.

To understand just how significant this legislation is, I would like to share with my colleagues some history about the Connecticut River program. In 1987–88, New Hampshire and Vermont each created a commission to address environmental issues facing the Connecticut river valley. The commissions were established to coordinate water quality and various other environmental efforts along the Connecticut river valley. The two commissions came together in 1990 to form the Connecticut River Joint Commission. The Joint Commission has no regulatory authority, but carries out cooperative education and advisory activities.

To further the local influence of the Commission, the Connecticut River Joint Commission established five advisory bi-state local river subcommittees comprised of representatives nominated by the governing body of their municipalities. These advisory groups developed a Connecticut River Corridor Management Plan. A major portion of the plan focuses on channeling federal funds to local communities to implement water quality programs, nonpoint source pollution controls and other environmental projects. Over the last ten years, the Connecticut River Joint Commission has fostered widespread participation and laid a strong foundation of community and citizen involvement.

As a Senator from New Hampshire and chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, as well as someone who enjoys the beauty of the Connecticut river, I am proud to be the principal author and cosponsor of this locally led, voluntary effort that accomplishes real environmental progress. Too often we depend on bureaucratic federal regulatory programs to accomplish environmental success. This bill takes a different approach and one that I bet will achieve greater results on the ground. I hope that other communities and neighboring states will look at this model as an example of how to develop and implement true voluntary, on the ground, locally-led environmental programs.

I want to thank my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator GREGG, and the two distinguished Senators of Vermont, Senators LEAHY and JEFFORDS, for joining me as original cosponsors to this legislation. I look forward to working with them as we move this important legislation through the Senate.

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 be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3212

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 ''Upper Connecticut River Partnership Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the upper Connecticut River watershed in the States of New Hampshire and Vermont is a scenic region of historic villages located in a working landscape of farms, forests, and the mountainous headwaters and broad fertile floodplains of New England's longest river, the Connecticut River;

(2) the River provides outstanding fish and wildlife habitat, recreation, and hydropower generation for the New England region;

(3) the upper Connecticut River watershed has been recognized by Congress as part of the Silvio 0. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge, established by the Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge Act (16 U.S.C. 668dd note; Public Law 102–212);

(4) the demonstrated interest in stewardship of the River by the citizens living in the watershed led to the Presidential designation of the River as 1 of 14 American Heritage Rivers on July 30, 1998;

(5) the River is home to the bistate Connecticut River Scenic Byway, which will foster heritage tourism in the region;

(6) each of the legislatures of the States of Vermont and New Hampshire has established a commission for the Connecticut River watershed, and the 2 commissions, known collectively as the ''Connecticut River Joint Commissions''—

(A) have worked together since 1989; and

(B) serve as the focal point for cooperation between Federal agencies, States, communities, and citizens;

(7) in 1997, as directed by the legislatures, the Connecticut River Joint Commissions, with the substantial involvement of 5 bistate local river subcommittees appointed to represent riverfront towns, produced the 6-volume Connecticut River Corridor Management Plan, to be used as a blueprint in educating agencies, communities, and the public in how to be good neighbors to a great river;

(8) this year, by Joint Legislative Resolution, the legislatures have requested that Congress provide for continuation of cooperative partnerships and support for the Connecticut River Joint Commissions from the New England Federal Partners for Natural Resources, a consortium of Federal agencies, in carrying out recommendations of the Connecticut River Corridor Management Plan;

(9) this Act effectuates certain recommendations of the Connecticut River Corridor Management Plan that are most appropriately directed by the States through the Connecticut River Joint Commissions, with assistance from the National Park Service and United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

(10) where implementation of those recommendations involves partnership with local communities and organizations, support for the partnership should be provided by the Secretary.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to authorize the Secretary to provide to the States of New Hampshire and Vermont (including communities in those States), through the Connecticut River Joint Commissions, technical and financial assistance for management of the River.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) RIVER.—The term ''River'' means the Connecticut River.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means—

(A) the State of New Hampshire; or

(B) the State of Vermont.

SEC. 4. ASSISTANCE FOR STATES.

The Secretary of the Interior may provide to the States, through the Connecticut River Joint Commissions, technical and financial assistance in managing the River, including assistance in—

(1) developing a joint policy for water quality, flow management, and recreational boating for the portion of the River that is common to the States;

(2) developing protection plans for water quality in the tributaries that flow into the River;

(3) developing a coordinated, collaborative approach on the part of the States for monitoring the quality of the River for human use and ecological health;

(4) restoring and protecting priority riverbanks to improve water quality and aquatic and riparian habitat;

(5) encouraging and assisting communities, farmers, and other riverfront landowners in—

(A) establishing and protecting riparian buffers; and

(B) preventing nonpoint source pollution;

(6) encouraging and assisting communities in—

(A) protecting shoreland, wetland, and flood plains; and

(B) managing and treating stormwater runoff;

(7) in cooperation with dam owners—

(A) evaluating the decommissioning of uneconomic dams in the watershed; and

(B) restoring natural riverine habitat;

(8) protecting and restoring the habitat of native trout, anadromous fisheries, and other outstanding fish and wildlife resources;

(9) encouraging new and improved markets for local agricultural products;

(10) encouraging the protection of farm land and economically sustainable agriculture;

(11) developing and promoting locally planned, approved, and managed networks of heritage trails and water trails in the River valley;

(12) coordinating and fostering opportunities for heritage tourism and agritourism through the Connecticut River Scenic Byway;

(13) demonstrating economic development based on heritage tourism;

(14) supporting local stewardship;

(15) strengthening nonregulatory protection of heritage resources;

(16) encouraging the vitality of historically compact village and town centers;

(17) establishing indicators of sustainability; and

(18) monitoring the impact of increased tourism and recreational use on natural and historic resources.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 3213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an individual to designate $3 or more on their income tax return to be used to reduce the public debt; to the Committee on Finance.

TAXPAYERS CHOICE DEBT REDUCTION ACT

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I have introduced S. 3213. I want to take a few moments to talk about this important piece of legislation for paying down the national debt.

As the 106th Congress comes to an end, I rise to make a few comments on the evolution of an issue of great concern to myself and to many Americans. The issue is the $5,661,548,045,674 national debt we had as of October 2, 2000.

In August of 1993, while serving in the House of Representatives, I introduced House Joint Resolution 251 with the support of a number of my colleagues. The intention of this resolution was to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide for budgetary reform by requiring the reduction of the deficit, a balanced Federal budget, and the repayment of the national debt. During my years in the House, I had the good fortune to work with many Republican colleagues who were committed to these fiscally sound and enormously important issues.

Today, a scant 7 years later, we are enjoying unsurpassed Federal budget surpluses and the many difficulties that accompany such prosperity. I am concerned that the running dialog in Washington is far too focused on today's spending, today's enormous Federal programs, today's immediate wants and needs. I am concerned that we are talking too much about spend today and not enough about the consequences of tomorrow. As we conclude the appropriations process, it is apparent that many Members of this body are eager to transform the Federal budget surplus into new Federal spending, creating more Federal programs that will begat future obligations.

I am primarily concerned that efforts to recklessly spend every nickel of the taxpayers' money will threaten the long-term fiscal health of our Nation, the Nation our children and grandchildren will inherit. The majority of my colleagues on this side of the aisle are focusing on returning the surplus to its rightful owners—the American people.

In recent months, the current administration has taken a hardline against tax cuts, making it clear that the President believes the Federal budget surplus belongs to Washington and not the hard-working men and women who send far more money to the Internal Revenue Service than they often save for retirement, college, or for buying a home.

I find it frustrating and the height of arrogance to assume that the Federal Government can do more with this money than the taxpayers. So many of my Republican colleagues have such a profound conviction regarding returning the money to the working man and woman that, in fact, they have been hesitant to engage in development of a comprehensive long-term debt repayment plan.

I have come to the floor before, and I will come to the floor again, to make clear what is required to manage the national debt in a comprehensive repayment strategy. The sheer enormity of the national debt demands such diligence. I admit that I have no desire to increase the growth of the Federal Government instead of paying down the debt. I am, as many of my colleagues, however, personally committed to cutting taxes.

I have come to the floor today for no other reason than to make one thing crystal clear: We can pay down the debt and cut taxes. It is not an either/or proposition. It takes planning, and it takes commitment. It takes a plan to repay the debt and a commitment to cut taxes and the discipline to refrain from pouring ever more money into newer or larger programs.

At the end of fiscal year 1999, the gross Federal budget was $5,656,270,901,615 and at the end of fiscal year 2000, the gross Federal budget was $5,674,178,209,886.

Our past fiscal irresponsibilities have created this overwhelming mess, and an unpleasant task lies before us. For the health and well-being of our national economy and the future security of our young people, we must commit to the elimination of this debt.

The journey of 5½ trillion miles begins with a single step. Early in the 106th Congress, I introduced the American Debt Repayment Act. A year

later, I followed that legislation with the American Social Security Protection and Debt Repayment Act. I believe each of these bills provided a sensible first step toward debt repayment and the 5 trillion steps to follow.

Both pieces of legislation suggested we treat the Federal debt just as every American treats the largest purchase they will ever make. That is their home. In February of this year, I came to the floor with my friends, GEORGE VOINOVICH, ROD GRAMS and MIKE ENZI, with an amortization schedule for debt repayment to be offered to the budget resolution. Just as any American home buyer would amortize the purchase of their home with a mortgage, we offered a dutiful and moderate restriction on Federal spending combined with a specific debt repayment schedule. Our amendment was defeated. I believe the chief reason for the defeat of the amendment was the fear of being locked into a long-term repayment plan that would prohibit future tax cuts. The July 2000 budget economic and outlook update by the Congressional Budget Office disputes this understandable fear.

According to the CBO, assuming spending is frozen at fiscal year 2000 levels, the next 10 years will yield an on-budget surplus of $3.4 trillion. If this Congress had exercised some discipline this year and appropriated within a freeze, the on-budget surplus in fiscal year 2001, which we have just begun, is projected to be $116 billion.

One criticism of the long-term debt amortization plan that I brought to the floor was that it would prevent tax cuts and tie the hands of appropriators by absorbing all of the surplus. My most recent plan simply dedicates $15 billion of on-budget surplus to debt repayment and adds $15 billion each year thereafter. The sum total after 10 years of structured debt repayment is $825 billion from on-budget surplus.

This repayment schedule would have left $2.6 trillion remaining for tax cuts and new spending over the next 10 years.

It is important to note that these numbers do not take into account the off-budget surplus created by Social Security. I have said on the floor many times before that paying down the national debt is one of the best ways to provide long-term fiscal stability to Social Security.

In the past, I proposed restricted use of the Social Security surplus to help pay down the debt. This not only provides for the future stability of Social Security by paying down the debt but protects Social Security money from Federal discretionary spending.

Social Security surplus money should be used for debt repayment only until such time as Congress can initiate sensible reform to preserve the long-term integrity of Social Security. Social Security reform has been a priority of this Congress, and we can act to reduce the debt and reform this important program in one commitment.

When the new Congress convenes in 2001, I intend to continue to work with my colleagues on developing a sensible and concrete debt repayment plan. I am also interested in working with my colleagues on other innovative ways to reduce the national debt. Legislation was recently introduced in the House, and I am pleased to come to the floor today on behalf of myself and the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO, to introduce the Taxpayers Choice Debt Reduction Act.

Every year, millions of taxpaying Americans have the opportunity to designate on their tax form a $3 contribution to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund. This checkoff on all 1040 forms would allow for the taxpayers themselves to designate that $3, or $6 for joint filers, would be dedicated to a special Department of the Treasury account to pay down the national debt.

Checking the box on the tax document would not increase the amount of taxes to be paid, nor would it decrease any refund. Checking ''yes'' in this box would simply provide a directive from the taxpayer that 3 of the dollars they were paying in taxes be used solely to pay down the Nation's debt. Importantly, these funds would be beyond any money set aside by Congress for debt reduction.

In my annual town meetings around the State of Colorado, I often speak with my constituents over the enormous debt owed by this country. I can say with great confidence that this is an issue where the public desires action. It is my hope that with this legislation Congress will empower these concerned taxpayers to act on their impulse to eliminate the debt.

Before I yield the floor, I extend my thanks to all of my Senate colleagues who have expressed an interest in debt repayment during this Congress, particularly Senators VOINOVICH, ENZI, GRAMS of Minnesota, CRAPO, REID of Nevada, and FEINGOLD. I have enjoyed working with each of these Members over the course of the year as we have brought debt repayment amendments to the floor. I look forward to continuing to work on this important issue with my colleagues.

Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 3214. A bill to amend the Assets for Independence Act (Title IV of the Community Opportunities, Accountability, and Training and Educational Services Act of 1998) to enhance program flexibility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ASSETS FOR INDEPENDENCE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, in his 1991 book ''Assets and the Poor: a New American Welfare Policy,'' Washington University Professor Michael Sherraden argues that people move forward economically through savings and investment, not through spending and consumption. Owning assets gives people a stake in the future—a reason to save, to dream, and to invest time, effort and resources in creating a future for themselves and their children. As Sherraden puts it, ''income may feed people's stomachs, but assets change their heads.''

I am pleased today to be joined by Senator HARKIN in introducing legislation designed to further promote innovative asset-building strategies for the poor.

Over the past two years, asset-building strategies have gained widespread, bi-partisan support at both the federal and state levels. Legislation has been introduced and laws have been enacted to develop and promote Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) among low income Americans. IDAs reward the monthly savings of working poor families who are trying to buy their first home, pay for post secondary education, or start a business.

In some respects, IDAs are like Individual Retirement Accounts for the working poor. IDAs are dedicated savings accounts that can be used for purchasing a first home, paying for post-secondary education, or capitalizing business. These investments are associated with extremely high rates of return that have the potential to bring a new level of economic and personal security to families and communities. Participants also are able to make emergency withdrawals in limited circumstances and must pay back such withdrawals within 12 months.

The individual or family deposits whatever dollar amount they can save (typically $5 to $20 a month) into the account. The sponsoring organization matches that deposit with funds provided by local churches and service organizations, corporations, foundations, and state or local governments. The sponsoring organization determines the ratio at which they will match an individual's contribution (not less than $0.50 and not more than $4 for every $1).

In 1998, Congress enacted legislation entitled the ''Assets for Independence Act''. This Act established a five year demonstration program to determine the social, civic, psychological and economic effects that individual development account, IDA, savings accounts can have on low income individuals and their families. The assets for independence demonstration program is presently the largest source of federal funding for individual development accounts.

The intent of this demonstration program is to encourage participants to develop and reinforce strong habits for saving money. To assist this, sponsor organizations provide participating individuals and families intensive financial counseling and counseling to develop investment plans for education, home ownership, and entrepreneurship. In addition, participating welfare and low-income families build assets whose high return on investment has the capacity for propelling them into independence and stability.

The community also benefits from the significant return on investment in IDAs: we expect welfare rolls to be reduced, tax receipts to increase, employment to increase, and local enterprises and builders can expect local businesses to benefit from increased activity. Neighborhoods will be rejuvenated as new micro-enterprises and increased home renovation and building drive increased employment and community development.

In fact, it is estimated that an investment of $125 million in assert building through these individual accounts will generate 7,050 new businesses, 68,799 new jobs, $730 million in additional earnings, 12,000 new or rehabilitated homes, $287 million in savings and matching contributions and earnings on those accounts, $188 million in increased assets for low-income families, 6,600 families removed from welfare rolls, 12,000 youth graduates from vocational education and college programs, 20,000 adults obtaining high school, vocational, and college degrees.

IDA programs currently exist in about 250–300 communities, with another 100 in development. Overall, at least 10,000 people are currently saving in an IDA and another 30,000–40,000 are expected to be reached by the year 2003. All but three states have IDA programs in their states or mechanisms in place to permit the start up of an IDA program.

The field of economic development has rapidly changed over the course of the last few years, and as a result, those administering IDAs on a national basis have sought to work within the structure defined by Congress. Unfortunately, because of changes in the field and certain unforeseen difficulties with the implementation of the demonstration in its current form, we have been asked to consider making a handful of technical changes that will help with program administration and make the program run more consistently and effectively.

Those changes include: (1) changing the legal accounting structure of IDAs; (2) expanding the potential field of grantees to include low-income credit unions and community development financial institutions; (3) providing additional flexibility for withdrawals from IDA accounts for the purchase of a home; (4) expanding the availability of funds for economic literacy training; and (5) adding a Federal poverty measure to the current eligibility criteria; and (6) making the AFIA and TANF Individual Development Account programs consistent with respect to the treatment of funds for purposes of determining eligibility for Federal programs based on need.

These are modest but needed changes in the law that will help Federal IDA programs function more as originally intended. I urge their adoption.

I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

ASSETS FOR INDEPENDENCE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2000—SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

NOTE: Except where otherwise specified, references in this summary to provisions of law are references to provisions of the Assets for Independence Act (the Act), title IV of the Community Opportunities, Accountability, and Training and Educational Services Act of 1998.

SEC. 2. MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS UNAVAILABLE FOR EMERGENCY WITHDRAWALS.

This section amends section 404(5)(A) (which defines the term ''Individual Development Account'' (IDA) and specifies required IDA elements), in clause (v), to eliminate language which permits use of matching contributions by the qualified entity serving as IDA trustee for emergency withdrawals. As amended, clause (v) would permit use of matching contributions only for qualified expenses (as defined in section 404(8)). The amendment would eliminate the inconsistency between section 404(5)(A)(v) as currently drafted and section 404(3), which defines the term ''emergency withdrawal'' to mean a withdrawal by the eligible individual of some or all of the funds deposited by that individual for specified emergency situations.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL QUALIFIED ENTITIES.

This section amends section 404(7) (the definition of ''qualified entity'') to expand the category of entities eligible to operate IDA programs under the Act to include low-income credit unions (as designated by the National Credit Union Administration) and organizations designated as community development financial institutions by the Secretary of the Treasury (or the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund) that can demonstrate a collaborative relationship with a community-based organization.

SEC. 4. HOME PURCHASE COSTS.

Section 4(a) amends section 407(8)(B) (which includes the purchase of a first home in the definition of ''qualified expenses'' for which IDA funds can be withdrawn by the participant) to increase the purchase price limit to 120 percent of the average area purchase price for such a residence.

SEC. 5. INCREASED SET-ASIDE FOR ECONOMIC LITERACY TRAINING AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

Section 5 amends section 407(c)(3) by increasing from 9.5 percent of 15 percent the amount of funds that grantee organizations may use to provide economic literacy training and other administrative functions. Of this amount, not more than 7.5 percent may be used for administrative functions.

SEC. 6. ALTERNATIVE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA.

This section amends section 408(a) (which sets forth IDA participation criteria) by adding an additional criteria for eligibility as an IDA program participant. Under this amendment, an individual with an income less than 200% of the poverty line (as defined by OMB), would be eligible to participate.

SEC. 7. REVISED ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT DEADLINE.

Section 7 amends Section 412 © which currently requires the first Annual Progress Report to be delivered not later than 60 days after the end of the calendar year. This amendment would require the first report to be delivered not later than 60 days after the end of the project year.

SEC. 8. REVISED INTERIM EVALUATION REPORT DEADLINE.

This section amends section 414(d) which currently requires the first interim evaluation to be delivered not later than 90 days after the end of the calendar year in which the Secretary first authorizes a demonstration project. This amendment would require the first interim evaluation to be delivered not later than 90 days after the end of the project year.

SEC. 9. INCREASED APPROPRIATIONS FOR EVALUATION EXPENSES.

The section amends section 414(e) (which sets forth the amount the Secretary may set aside to evaluate the IDA program) by changing from 2% to not more than $500,000 the amount of IDA appropriations set aside for such evaluation.

SEC. 10. NO REDUCTION IN BENEFITS.

This section strikes section 415 which pertains to the treatment of funds deposited in IDA accounts for purposes of determining eligibility for Federal or federally assisted program based on need and replaces it with similar language found in P.L. 104–193, the TANF block grant. Currently, only funds contributed into an IDA by a sponsoring organization are disregarded for purposes of determining eligibility for federal needs tested programs. With this change, both an individual's own contributions and the contributions made on behalf of an individual by a sponsoring organization will be disregarded for this purpose.

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 3215. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize women's health research award programs conducted through the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

WOMEN'S HEALTH RESEARCH CAREER ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today the Women's Health Research Career Enhancement Act of 2000. This legislation addresses a critical shortage of qualified clinician researchers available to investigate the diseases and conditions that primarily affect women.

As the brother of two sisters lost to breast cancer and the father of two daughters, I know first-hand the importance of making women's health initiatives a top priority. More can and must be done to guarantee that women have the quality care they deserve. This includes making sure that qualified researchers are out there leading the search for cures and treatments.

In 1985, the United States Public Health Task Force on Women's Health Issues concluded that women's health care was getting short shrift by the lack of research focus on women's health concerns. Since then we have made good progress to expand women's health research, but more needs to be done.

In 1990, the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) found that the National Institutes of Health (NIH) had been slow and ineffective in implementing a policy to include women in research study populations. At the urging of myself and others, and in response to passage of the NIH Revitalization Act of 1993, the NIH began to take more comprehensive measures to increase research on health problems affecting women.

And more recently, at my request, along with Senators OLYMPIA SNOWE and BARBARA MIKULSKI, and Representative HARRY WAXMAN (D–CA), the GAO published a report last May assessing the NIH's progress on conducting research on women's health in the past decade. The GAO's report found that while NIH has made significant progress in implementing a strengthened policy on including women in clinical research, they have failed to fully analyze clinical data on women's health.

It is clear we can and must do more to advance a comprehensive women's health agenda.

A growing body of evidence is emerging that demonstrates significant differences between men and women and how they get sick and how they react to potential treatments. Women and men metabolize food, alcohol, medication and environmental toxins differently.

And certain diseases and conditions disproportionately affect women. For example, women comprise 80% of those suffering from osteoporosis. Seventy-five percent of those afflicted with autoimmune diseases are women. And although we have made significant progress, we are still fighting the terrible epidemic of breast cancer in this country, a disease that strikes 1 out of every 8 American women.

Women everywhere will benefit through more and better scientific research on the diseases and conditions that affect them. And our scientific enterprise will reap maximum returns when it involves teams of investigators with expertise in various disciplines. A comprehensive, targeted approach is necessary to develop a multi-disciplinary cadre of researchers with the interest and expertise to broaden the field of women's health research.

In addition, mentoring between junior and senior scientists is important to promoting an inclusive and diverse research environment. Mentoring relationships can lead to the retention and advancement of talented scientists from all segments of the population and enhance our investment in medical research.

Mr. President, my legislation authorizes two important initiatives to expand the number of qualified investigators in women's health research by providing improved career development opportunities through the National Institutes of Health (NIH):

First, the Building Interdisciplinary Research Careers in Women's Health Program—will support the career development of junior women's health scientists by providing new opportunities to improve their research skills in interdisciplinary settings. The NIH, through the Office of Research on Women's Health, will provide grants to research institutions to pair junior investigators with seasoned senior investigators, who will mentor them for 2–5 years.

Second, the Women's Reproductive Health Research Career Development Centers—will help build the next generation of investigators in obstetrics and gynecology by giving clinicians the experience they need to become women's health scientists. The NIH, through the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the Office of Research on Women's Health, will provide grants to research institutions and hospitals for the training of new women's health researchers.

The Women's Reproductive Health Research Career Development Centers program and the Building Interdisciplinary Research Careers in Women's Health grant program have already stimulated women's health research across a variety of disciplines. Authorizing and expanding these programs will speed breakthroughs in women's health research by building and improving the network of scientific investigators expert in the diseases and conditions that affect women.

Mr. President, I have a long tradition of supporting research and specifically women's health research both as Chairman and now Ranking Member of the Senate Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Subcommittee. This year we will provide an unprecedented, $2.7 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health, keeping us well on track towards our goal of doubling the NIH budget over 5 years.

But all the funding in the world will do us no good if we don't have talented investigators ready and able to take on the challenge of finding the cures and treatments for the diseases that afflict us. We must do more to make sure we grow and strengthen a diverse network of our best and brightest clinicians and scientists to keep pace with our increased investment in medical research. The bill I am introducing today will help to do just that. It has the support of the National Institutes of Health, the Society for Women's Health Research, the Women's Health Research Coalition and the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3215

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 ''Women's Health Research Career Enhancement Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Public Health Service's Task Force on Women's Health Issues concluded in 1985 that women's health care was compromised by the lack of research focus on women's health concerns. Since then, progress has been made to expand women's health research, but more can be done to strengthen our nation's capacity to aggressively investigate the diseases and conditions primarily affecting women.

(2) A growing body of evidence demonstrates dramatic differences between women's and men's biology, including symptoms of disease, mechanism of disease and responses to treatment.

(3) Women and men differ in disease presentation and treatment outcomes of coronary heart disease. Women comprise 80 percent of the population suffering from osteoporosis. Women comprise 75 percent of those afflicted with autoimmune diseases. Women and men metablolize food, alcohol, medication, and atmospheric toxins differently.

(4) Scientific research will reap maximum returns when it involves teams of investigators with expertise in various disciplines. A comprehensive, targeted effort is necessary to develop a multi-disciplinary cadre of researchers with the interest and expertise to develop the field of gender based health research so that it has the greatest impact on all women and men.

(5) Mentoring between junior and senior scientists is vitally important to promoting an inclusive and diverse research environment, leading to the retention and advancement of talented scientists from all segments of the population and enhancing the nation's investment in treatments and cures for the diseases and conditions that affect Americans.

(6) The Women's Reproductive Health Research Career Development Centers and the Building Interdisciplinary Research Careers in Women's Health grant programs have stimulated women's health research across a variety of disciplines.

(7) Expanding the initiatives described in paragraph (6) will speed breakthroughs in women's health research by building and improving the network of scientific investigators who are experts in the diseases and conditions that affect women.

SEC. 3. BUILDING INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH CAREERS IN WOMEN'S HEALTH.

Part A of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 310A. BUILDING INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH CAREERS IN WOMEN'S HEALTH.

''(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of the section to provide funding to enable the Director of the Office of Research on Women's Health, in coordination with the Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and other Institutes and centers of the National Institutes of Health, to carry out the Building Interdisciplinary Research Careers in Women's Health program (as authorized under section 301) to support the career development of scientists who are commencing basic, translational, clinical, behavioral or health services research relevant to women's health in an interdisciplinary scientific setting.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2006 to enable the Director of the Office of Research on Women's Health to carry out program described in subsection (a).

''(c) REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANTS.—

''(1) ELIGIBILITY.—In making awards under the program described in subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Research on Women's Health, acting through the Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and other Institutes and centers of the National Institutes of Health, shall, with respect to an institution, consider—

''(A) domestic profit and nonprofit, non-Federal, public or private organizations;

''(B) the extent to which the institution has the clinical specialities and subspecialities, and the clinical and research facilities, sufficient to meet the objective of the program of bridging clinical or post-doctoral training with a career in interdisciplinary research relevant to women's health; and

''(C) other factors determined appropriate by the Directors.

''(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—With respect to the program described in subsection (a), nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the application by the Director of the Office of Research on Women's Health of eligibility or other requirements, including requirements applied to applicants under such program in the fiscal year prior to the date of enactment of this section.''.

SEC. 3. WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH RESEARCH CAREER DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Part A of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 241 et seq.), as amended by section 3, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 310B. WOMEN'S REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH RESEARCH CAREER DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

''(a) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to provide for the funding of Women's Reproductive Health Research Career Development Centers to enable the Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, in collaboration with the Director of the National Institutes of Health, to—

''(1) assist in improving the health of women and infants by training new researchers in reproductive health science;

''(2) address concerns raised in a recent study by the National Research Council about the declining number of physician-investigators; and

''(3) provide newly trained obstetric-gynecologic clinicians with training and support, through the Women's Reproductive Health Research Career Development Centers, to assist in such clinicians in their pursuit of research careers to address problems in women's obstetric and gynecologic health.

''(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2006 to enable the Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development to fund Women's Reproductive Health Research Career Development Centers for the purposes described in subsection (a).

''(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—With respect to the program described in subsection (a), nothing in this section shall be construed to prohibit the application by the Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development of eligibility or other requirements, including requirements applied to applicants under such program, in the fiscal year prior to the date of enactment of this section.''.

Mr. CRAIG (for himself and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 3216. A bill to provide for review in the Court of International Trade of certain determinations of binational panels under the North American Free Trade Agreement; to the Committee on Finance.

INTEGRITY OF THE U.S. COURTS ACT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise to introduce important legislation designed to correct a fundamental flaw within the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) dispute resolution mechanism, known as Chapter 19. As many of my colleagues are aware, Chapter 19 has revealed itself to be unacceptable in its current form. The Integrity of the U.S. Courts Act, that I introduce today with my colleague Mr. BAUCUS, is necessary to make certain bilateral dispute resolution decisions from the NAFTA are made pursuant to U.S. trade laws.

At present, antidumping and countervailing duty determinations made by NAFTA members are appealed to ad hoc panels of private individuals, instead of impartial courts created under national constitutions. These panels are supposed to apply the same standard of review as a U.S. court in order to determine whether a decision is supported by substantial evidence on the agency record, and is otherwise in accordance with the law. This standard requires that the agency's factual findings and legal interpretations be given significant deference. Unfortunately, in spite of the panels's mandate, they all too often depart from their directive and fail to ensure that the correct standard of review is applied.

The Integrity of the U.S. Courts Act would permit any party to a NAFTA dispute involving a U.S. agency decision to remove appellate jurisdiction from the Extraordinary Challenge Committees (ECC) to the U.S. Court of International Trade. Doing so would resolve some of the constitutional issues raised by the Chapter 19 system, expedite resolution of cases, and ensure conformity with U.S. law.

The infirmities of Chapter 19 are real, and have been problematic from the beginning. The Justice Department, the Senate Finance Committee, and other authorities are on record of having expressed serious concern about giving private panelists—sometimes a majority of whom are foreign nationals—the authority to issue decisions about U.S. domestic law that have the binding force of law. These appointed panelists, coming from different legal and cultural disciplines and serving on an ad hoc basis, do not necessarily have the interest that unbiased U.S. courts have in maintaining the efficacy of the laws, as Congress wrote them.

One of the most egregious examples of the flaws of Chapter 19 is reflected in a case from early in this process, reviewing a countervailing duty finding that Canadian lumber imports benefits from enormous subsidies. Three Canadian panelists outvoted two leading U.S. legal experts to eliminate the countervailing duty based on patently erroneous interpretations of U.S. law—interpretations that Congress had expressly rejected only months before. Two of the Canadian panelists served despite undisclosed conflicts of interest. The matter was then argued before a Chapter 19 appeals committee, and the two committee members outvoted the one U.S. member to once again insulate the Canadian subsidies from U.S. law.

The U.S. committee member was Malcolm Wilkey, the former Chief Judge of the Federal Court of Appeals for the D.C. circuit, and one of the United States' most distinguished jurists. In his opinion, Judge Wilkey wrote that the lumber panel decision ''may violate more principles of appellate review of agency action than any opinion by a reviewing body which I have ever read.'' Judge Wilkey and former Judge Charles Renfrew (Also a chapter 19 appeals committee member) have since expressed serious constitutional reservations about the system. While some have claimed that Chapter 19 decides many cases well, its inability to resolve appropriately large disputes, and its constitutional infirmity, demand a remedy.

It is clear that the time is long past due to remedy Chapter 19. From the outset, the NAFTA agreement contemplated that given the sensitive and unusual subject matter, signatories might have to alter their obligations under Chapter 19. The Integrity of the U.S. Courts Act is a reasonable solution to a serious problem.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator BAUCUS and me in our effort to fix this problem that is unfairly harming American industry, and more important, the U.S. Constitution. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3216

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 ''Integrity of the United States Courts Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF BINATIONAL PANEL DECISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title IV of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3431 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 404 the following new section:

''SEC. 404A. REVIEW OF BINATIONAL PANEL DETERMINATIONS.

''(a) BASIS FOR REVIEW IN COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If, within 30 days after publication in the Federal Register of notice that a binational panel has issued a determination following a review under article 1904 of a decision of a competent investigating authority in the United States, a party or person within the meaning of paragraph 5 of article 1904 alleges that—

''(A)(i) the determination of the panel was based on a misinterpretation of United States law;

''(ii) a member of a panel was guilty of a gross misconduct, bias, or a serious conflict of interest, or otherwise materially violated the rules of conduct,

''(iii) the panel seriously departed from a fundamental rule of procedure, or

''(iv) the panel manifestly exceeded its powers, authority, or jurisdiction set out in article 1904, as in failing to apply the appropriate standard of review, and

''(B) any of the actions described in subparagraph (A) has materially affected the panel's decision and threatens the integrity of the binational panel review process,

then such party or person may file an appeal with the United States Court of International Trade, seeking review of the binational panel determination, pursuant to section 516A of the Tariff Act of 1930.

''(2) REVIEW IN COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE WHERE BINATIONAL PANEL DOES NOT ACT.—If a request for a panel review has been made under article 1904 and a panel is not convened within 315 days of the request, the Party requesting the panel review or person within the meaning of paragraph 5 of article 1904 may file an appeal of the antidumping or countervailing duty determination with respect to which the request was filed with the United States Court of International Trade.

''(b) DECISIONS OF THE COURT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In any appeal filed under subsection (a)(1) for review of a binational panel determination, the Court of International Trade shall, after examining the legal and factual analysis underlying the findings and conclusions of the panel's decision, determine whether any of the actions described in subsection (a)(1)(A) has been established. If the court finds that any of those actions has been established, the court shall vacate the original panel decision and enter judgment accordingly. If the actions are not established, the court shall affirm the original binational panel decision. Decisions of the Court of International Trade under this section shall be binding on the parties with respect to the matters between the parties that were before the panel.

''(2) DECISIONS WHERE PANEL NOT CONVENED.—In the case of an appeal filed under subsection (a)(2) for review of a determination of a competent investigating authority, the Court of International Trade shall, after examining the legal and factual analysis underlying the findings and conclusions of the investigating authority's determination, determine whether the determination was made in accordance with article 1904. If the court finds that the determination was not in accordance with article 1904 or is not supported by the legal and factual analysis, the court shall vacate the investigating authority's determination and enter judgment accordingly. If the court finds that the determination was in accordance with article 1904 and is supported by the legal and factual analysis, the court shall affirm the investigating authority's determination. Decisions of the Court of International Trade under this section shall be binding on the parties with respect to the matters between the parties that would have been before a panel had the panel been convened.

''(c) EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION.—If a party or person within the meaning of paragraph 5 of article 1904 timely files a notice of appeal to the Court of International Trade pursuant to this section, then jurisdiction exclusively resides with the United States Court of International Trade, and such determinations are not subject to review by an extraordinary challenge committee under paragraph 13 of article 1904.

''(d) APPLICABILITY.—Subsections (a)(1), (b)(1), and (c) apply to all goods from NAFTA countries which were subject to an antidumping duty or countervailing duty determination of a competent investigating authority in the United States.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the North American Free Trade Implementation Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 404 the following:

''Sec. 404A. Review of binational panel determinations.''.

SEC. 3. JURISDICTION OF THE COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE.

Section 516A of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1516a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i)(I), by striking ''or (viii)'' and inserting ''(viii), (ix), or (x)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following:

''(ix) A final determination of a binational panel convened pursuant to article 1904 of the NAFTA.

''(x) A final determination of an investigating authority described in section 404A(a)(2) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.'';

(2) in subsection (a)(5), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''(other than a determination described in subsection (g)(3)(A)(vii))'' after ''apply''; and

(3) in subsection (g)(3)(A)—

(A) in clause (v), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in clause (vi), by striking the period and inserting '', or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(vii) a determination of which either a party or person within the meaning of paragraph 5 of article 1904 of the NAFTA has requested review pursuant to section 404A of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.''.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, the amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to any final determination of a binational panel convened pursuant to article 1904 of the North American Free Trade Agreement or to a final determination of a competent investigating authority with respect to which section 404A(a)(2) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act applies, notice of which is published in the Federal Register on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 61

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 61, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to eliminate disincentives to fair trade conditions.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

S. 922

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 922, a bill to prohibit the use of the ''Made in the USA'' label on products of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and to deny such products duty-free and quota-free treatment.

S. 1536

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1536, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend authorizations of appropriations for programs under the Act, to modernize programs and services for older individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1822

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1822, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a minor child's congenital or developmental deformity or disorder due to trauma, infection, tumor, or disease.

S. 2068

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2068, a bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from establishing rules authorizing the operation of new, low power FM radio stations.

S. 2341

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2341, a bill to authorize appropriations for part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to achieve full funding for part B of that Act by 2010.

S. 2393

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2393, a bill to prohibit the use of racial and other discriminatory profiling in connection with searches and detentions of individuals by the United States Customs Service personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 2440

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2440, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve airport security.

S. 2698

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2698, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive to ensure that all Americans gain timely and equitable access to the Internet over current and future generations of broadband capability.

S. 2699

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2699, a bill to strengthen the authority of the Federal Government to protect individuals from certain acts and practices in the sale and purchase of social security numbers and social security account numbers, and for other purposes.

S. 2726

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2726, a bill to protect United States military personnel and other elected and appointed officials of the United States Government against