

For once, Secretary Richardson and I agree. The workers do deserve better. But rather than threatening USEC, as the Secretary of Energy did when he recommended "serious consideration of replacing USEC as executive agent" for the Russian HEU Agreement, he should have been drafting a plan to assist the workers in Portsmouth to make the transition from operating the Department of Energy owned gaseous diffusion plant to cleaning up the site. This is an environmental restoration mission that is likely to take many years. We are all aware of the environmental contamination at the plants and the desperate need for action to restore them to reasonable environmental condition.

When Congress created the United States Enrichment Corporation as part of the 1992 Energy Policy Act, and when we later passed the 1996 USEC Privatization Act, we recognized that a privately owned USEC could better respond to the needs of the marketplace and thereby sustain a viable domestic uranium enrichment capability. Now that USEC has taken what it believes is a necessary step to ensure that it can compete in the world uranium enrichment marketplace, the first response by the Secretary of Energy is to second-guess the company's intentions and actions. Apparently the Secretary would keep facilities open regardless of the fundamental laws of economics that are evident to even the most modest businesses.

It has been suggested that the solution is to nationalize USEC—to have the government buy it back. I have no sympathy for such a proposal. While I am sympathetic to those who will be affected by the closure of Portsmouth, I do not believe that a return to the past is the remedy that will provide for a competitive domestic uranium enrichment capability in the future. I do not favor an appropriation of substantial sums, perhaps well over a billion dollars to buy USEC back, nor do I favor the then obligatory commitment to annually appropriate funds to make up for uneconomic operations.

It has been only two years since we privatized USEC. On the one hand the Congress and the Administration made an extraordinary effort to provide a private USEC with a strong foundation for a successful private enterprise competing in world markets—in the words of the '96 Act ". . . in a manner that provides for the long-term viability of the Corporation . . ." But at the same time, contradictory restraints imposed on the Corporation detract from its ability to compete. In retrospect, perhaps Congress and the Administration should not have placed so many burdens on USEC as it faced private sector dynamics and demands. Ensuring that the vital national security interests of the United States are protected is paramount, but preserving the com-

petitiveness of our domestic uranium enrichment capability—at minimal costs to the federal government—is important too. We need to stop thinking of USEC as a Federal agency and respect it for what it is—a private business enterprise.

Challenges remain in the implementation of the Russian HEU Agreement and the long-term viability of the domestic uranium enrichment enterprise. These have proven to be complex, and at times conflicting tasks, but I believe that the National interest more than justifies our continued efforts to see these programs through to a successful conclusion. As part of these efforts we should encourage the Clinton Administration to approve the market-based pricing amendment to the Russian HEU Agreement. Now is also the time to secure a future for the workers in Portsmouth who face plant closure. We need to help them achieve their third transition—from Cold War patriots, to peacetime producers of fuel, to the task of environmental restoration

Thank you, Mr. President.

OMNIBUS LONG-TERM CARE ACT OF 2000

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today as an original cosponsor of the "Omnibus Long-Term Care Act of 2000." This bill brings together very important initiatives for making long-term care more affordable for Americans. In particular, this bill contains a \$3,000 tax credit for caregivers and a tax deduction for the purchase of long-term care insurance.

There are over 22 million people providing unpaid help with personal needs or household chores to a relative or friend who is at least 50 years old. In Indiana alone, there are 568,300 caregivers. The government spent approximately \$32 billion in formal home health care costs and \$83 billion in nursing home costs. If you add up all the private sector and government spending on long-term care it is dwarfed by the amount families spend caring for loved ones in their homes. As a study published by the Alzheimers Association indicated, caregivers provide \$196 billion worth of care a year.

As a member of the Special Committee on Aging, I held a field hearing in Indiana on making long-term care more affordable. At this hearing, I learned first hand the importance of this tax credit. Jerry and Sue Cahee take care of Jerry's mother who has Alzheimers. At the hearing Jerry Cahee shared the following: "Mother is a wonderful and friendly person to everyone—except her caregivers. We have discovered that life, aging, and illness are not fair. We have discovered that love is hard—that love is not enough to make the difference. We know that memories are all that we have left of the happy times in Mother's life. To

care for her, make her last days comfortable, to meet her ever increasing medical needs, to offer her the security of a loving safe home, and to let her know that she is loved—these things have become our purpose for living. The financial drain has been difficult, the emotional strains are enormous."

Paul Severance, the Director of United Senior Action, a senior advocacy group in Indiana represented his constituency at the hearing when he stated "The burden on families who are trying to provide long-term care at home is tremendous; they typically face substantial expenses for special care, such as nursing visits, they often have lost wages because of the demands of caring for a loved one; and there can be a great cost to their own health as a result of the constant demands of caregiving."

In addition to the tax credit, a deduction for the purchase of long-term care insurance makes it more affordable for Americans to purchase long-term care policies that can provide them with the coverage they will need. Congress needs to continue to explore ways in which to ensure long-term care options are available for all Americans.

I am encouraged by the introduction of this bill and the bipartisan support it has received. It is my hope that we can work together to implement this legislation and make it more affordable for seniors to receive long-term care. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

FCC REGULATION OF PAY PHONES

Mr. BURNS. Mr. President, in the four years since the passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, dramatic changes have occurred in our telecommunications markets. We have seen competitive environments in such areas as wireless communication and long distance service. Advanced telecommunications services have great potential for deployment in the near term, if only the Federal Communications Commission would more aggressively promote them. All of this change is occurring in the context of an explosion of information technologies and the Internet.

Yet the '96 Act dealt with much more than the high tech changes we read so much about these days. The legislation was designed to transform the entire telecommunications industry under the leadership of the FCC, to the benefit of all consumers. And the Act was designed to ensure that all Americans could have access to the vast array of services the Act will stimulate.

Today I would like to briefly address one aspect of the '96 Act that is often overlooked in the glamour of "high-tech." Public payphones are a critical piece of this access. For millions of Americans, public payphones are the only access to the telecom network.

And when the batteries or the signal for the wireless device fail, public payphones are a reliable source of inexpensive access, in an emergency or otherwise. Public payphones are emerging as public information portals, true on-ramps to the information highway, available to anyone at anytime.

In order to ensure that these instruments of public access would continue serving as gateways of last resort and continue evolving using new technologies, the issue of adequate compensation for pay phone operators was addressed by the '96 Act. This requirement of the '96 Act was designed to promote fair competition and benefit consumers by eliminating distorting subsidies and artificial barriers. However, the law has not been successfully implemented, and I am calling on the FCC to act expeditiously to address this regulatory oversight. Payphones are an important segment of the telecommunications industry, especially in low income neighborhoods and in rural areas like those in my home state of Montana.

Local telephone companies operated payphones as a legal monopoly until 1984, when an FCC ruling mandated that competitors' payphones be interconnected to local networks. Still, local telephone companies were able to subsidize their payphone service in competition with independent payphones. The '96 Act was designed to change all of this. It was designed to create a level playing field between all competitors and to encourage the widespread deployment of payphones. It did this by requiring local telephone companies to phase out subsidies; by mandating competitive safeguards to prevent discrimination by the ILECs and ensure fair treatment of competitors when they connect to local systems; and by assuring fair compensation for every call, including so-called "dial around" calls which bypass the pay phones' traditional payment mechanism.

Yet the basic requirements of the '96 Act are not being implemented by the FCC to assure fair competition. Pay phone operators are not being compensated for an estimated one-third of all dial-around calls, particularly when more than one carrier is involved on long distance connections. An industry proposal to remedy this situation has been pending at the FCC for more than a year without any action being taken. And the FCC also needs to bring to a hasty resolution the issue of the appropriate line rate structure for payphone providers. Today, there are about 2.3 million pay phones nationwide. While all payphones are threatened by the gaps in dial-around payments, 600,000 of them are independently owned and are under particularly intense pressure; many small payphone operators now find themselves being forced to pull payphones or go out of business alto-

gether. They are also in need of certainty regarding the rates they pay the telephone companies. This situation should not exist more than four years after the enactment of the 1996 legislation.

I hope the FCC will act quickly to assure adequate compensation for each call. I hope the FCC will take immediate steps to enforce the requirement for non-discriminatory and fair line rates. I hope the FCC will take those basic steps required by the 1996 law. Fair competition—and the resulting benefits to consumers envisioned by Congress—will not occur until these actions are taken. As Chairman of the Senate Communications Subcommittee, I will be carefully monitoring actions taken by the FCC on these important issues in the weeks and months ahead.

THE BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wanted to inform the Republican leadership that the House of Representatives today passed the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000, H.R. 4033, by an overwhelming vote of 413-3. I hope that the Senate will quickly follow suit and pass the House-passed bill and send it to the President. President Clinton has already endorsed this legislation to support our nation's law enforcement officers and is eager to sign it into law.

Senator CAMPBELL and I have introduced the Senate companion bill, S. 2413. Unfortunately, someone on the other side of the aisle has a hold on our bill. We have been working for the past week to urge the Senate to pass the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000, S. 2413. The Senate Judiciary Committee passed our bill unanimously on June 29. It has been cleared by all 45 Democratic Senators.

But it still has not passed the full Senate. This is very disappointing to our nation's law enforcement officers who need life-saving bulletproof vests to protect themselves. Protecting and supporting our law enforcement community should not be a partisan issue.

Senator CAMPBELL and I worked together closely and successfully with the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the last Congress to pass the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998 into law. Senator HATCH is an original cosponsor this year's bill to reauthorize this grant program. Senators SCHUMER, KOHL, THURMOND, REED, JEFFORDS, ROBB, REID, SARBANES, BINGAMAN, ASHCROFT, EDWARDS, BUNNING, CLELAND, HUTCHISON, and ABRAHAM are also cosponsors of our bipartisan bill.

But for some reason a Republican senator has a hold on this bill to provide protection to our nation's law enforcement officers. According to the

Federal Bureau of Investigation, more than 40 percent of the 1,182 officers killed by a firearm in the line of duty since 1980 could have been saved if they had been wearing body armor. Indeed, the FBI estimates that the risk of fatality to officers while not wearing body armor is 14 times higher than for officers wearing it.

To better protect our nation's law enforcement officers, Senator CAMPBELL and I introduced the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998. President Clinton signed our legislation into law on June 16, 1998. Our law created a \$25 million, 50 percent matching grant program within the Department of Justice to help state and local law enforcement agencies purchase body armor for fiscal years 1999-2001.

In its two years of operation, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program has funded more than 180,000 new bulletproof vests for police officers across the country.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 builds on the success of this program by doubling its annual funding to \$50 million for fiscal years 2002-2004. It also improves the program by guaranteeing jurisdictions with fewer than 100,000 residents receive the full 50-50 matching funds because of the tight budgets of these smaller communities and by making the purchase of stab-proof vests eligible for grant awards to protect corrections officers in close quarters in local and county jails.

More than ever before, police officers in Vermont and around the country face deadly threats that can strike at any time, even during routine traffic stops. Bulletproof vests save lives. It is essential the we update this law so that many more of our officers who are risking their lives everyday are able to protect themselves.

I hope this mysterious "hold" on the other side of the aisle will disappear. The Senate should pass without delay the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 and sent to the President for his signature into law.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, July 25, 2000, the Federal debt stood at \$5,670,717,940,248.21 (Five trillion, six hundred seventy billion, seven hundred seventeen million, nine hundred forty thousand, two hundred forty-eight dollars and twenty-one cents).

Five years ago, July 25, 1995, the Federal debt stood at \$4,940,346,000,000 (Four trillion, nine hundred forty billion, three hundred forty-six million).

Ten years ago, July 25, 1990, the Federal debt stood at \$3,161,885,000,000 (Three trillion, one hundred sixty-one billion, eight hundred eighty-five million).

Fifteen years ago, July 25, 1985, the Federal debt stood at \$1,798,533,000,000