

fee schedule for 2002 and to direct the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission to conduct a study on replacing the use of the sustainable growth rate as a factor in determining such update in subsequent years.

S. 1749

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) were added as cosponsors of S. 1749, a bill to enhance the border security of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1752

At the request of Mr. CORZINE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1752, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to facilitating the development of microbicides for preventing transmission of HIV and other sexually transmitted diseases.

S. 1779

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1779, a bill to authorize the establishment of "Radio Free Afghanistan", and for other purposes.

S. 1788

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1788, a bill to give the Federal Bureau of Investigation access to NICS records in law enforcement investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 1793

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1793, a bill to provide the Secretary of Education with specific waiver authority to respond to conditions in the national emergency declared by the President on September 14, 2001.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. AKAKA and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1799. A bill to strengthen the national security by encouraging and assisting in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical needs at the elementary, secondary, and higher education levels; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. AKAKA, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1800. A bill to strengthen and improve the management of national security, encourage Government service in areas of critical national security,

and to assist government agencies in addressing deficiencies in personnel possessing specialized skills important to national security and incorporating the goals and strategies for recruitment and retention for such skilled personnel into the strategic and performance management systems of Federal agencies; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in the fall of 1957, the United States received a national wake-up call. The Soviet Union launched sputnik into orbit. The space race was on, and we were already behind. Not only were we caught off guard by sputnik, it was suddenly clear that major changes had to be made to preserve our national security and to pull ahead in scientific and technological innovation.

One year later, Congress passed landmark legislation, the National Defense Education Act. The purpose of the act was to "strengthen the national defense and to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational program to meet critical national needs." The National Defense Education Act provided assistance to State and local school systems to strengthen instruction in science, math, foreign languages, and other critical subjects. It also created low-interest student loan programs and fellowships to open the door to higher education to a greater number of young people. This coordinated national effort helped our Nation meet its goals.

By 1969, Americans had landed on the Moon. The United States was the most technologically advanced Nation in the world. A new generation of highly skilled mathematicians, scientists, and technology experts staffed laboratories, universities, and Federal agencies. Colleges and universities had established centers for foreign language study and research.

Sadly, this Nation received another wake-up call on September 11, 2001.

The week after the attacks, FBI Director Robert Mueller made a public plea for Arabic and Farsi speakers to assist as translators, illustrating the alarming deficiency in fluent speakers of languages crucial to our national security needs. It does our Nation no good to have sophisticated weapons programs if we don't have the scientists to back them up. It does our Nation no good to have expanded intelligence gathering capabilities if what we retrieve sits untranslated. The United States must have the brainpower to match its firepower.

Today I join Senators THOMPSON and AKAKA to introduce two initiatives that serve two important purposes, to meet the immediate needs of the Federal Government in areas of national security, and to make investments in our future through investments in education.

The Homeland Security Federal Workforce Act authorizes funds for key national security agencies to repay student loans for employees in national security positions who pledge to serve for a minimum of three years. This expands the existing loan forgiveness program for Federal employees by permitting these agencies to repay up to \$10,000 per year in student loans.

The bill also establishes a National Security Fellowship Program for graduate students who agree to enter Federal service in a position key to national security upon the completion of their degree. The fellowship program will also be open to current Federal employees, encouraging the enhancement and development of their skills.

To give Federal employees more flexibility and experience, the bill creates a National Security Service Corps to allow Federal employees to serve in rotational assignments in other agencies with national security responsibilities.

Along with these immediate remedies, homeland security and preparedness depend on a well-educated citizenry who leave school with the tools they need to succeed in science, math, technology, and foreign languages. Unless broader education reforms are implemented, we will continue to find ourselves playing catch-up to secure the skilled professionals our government needs.

The Homeland Security Education Act would fund partnerships between local school districts and foreign language departments in institutions of higher education. These new foreign language partnerships will provide intensive professional development opportunities for foreign language teachers at every level from kindergarten to 12th grade. The partnerships will foster contact and communication between university faculty and K-12 teachers in order to improve teachers' knowledge of the languages they teach as well as their teaching skills. Partnerships would also use grant funds to recruit foreign language majors to the classroom. Our bill will give priority to partnerships that include high-need school districts and that put a focus on the less-commonly taught languages.

Our bill will encourage more undergraduates to complete degrees in mathematics, science, engineering, and the less-commonly taught foreign languages by establishing a program to forgive the interest on a borrower's student loans if he or she earns a degree in one of these subjects. The program aims to provide an incentive for students who are interested in these areas of study to earn their degrees.

The bill establishes grants for partnerships between school districts and private entities to help schools improve science and math curriculum, upgrade laboratory facilities, and purchase scientific equipment. In turn, the

private sector partner will donate technology or equipment to the school district; provide scholarships for district students to study math, science, or engineering at college; establish internship or mentoring opportunities for district students; or sponsor programs aimed at young people who are underrepresented in the fields of math, science, and engineering.

In order to stay on top of innovations in science and technology, more professionals in these fields will have to also be proficient in a foreign language. This is imperative to our national security, even some scientific documents and articles in the public domain are beyond the translation capabilities of our government. The Homeland Security Education Act would make grants available to colleges and universities to establish programs in which students take courses in science, math and technology taught in a foreign language. Funds will also support immersion programs for students to take science and math courses in a non-English speaking country.

The Homeland Security Education Act authorizes \$20 million for the National Flagship Language Initiative, which was funded as a one-year pilot program in this year's Defense Appropriations bill. The funds will be used to provide institutional grants to universities to graduate specific numbers of students with the foreign language proficiencies needed by the government. Participating institutions will make available a negotiated number of slots to student applicants who are Federal employees.

With these bills, we hope to address some of the gaps in homeland security that have been identified by numerous experts and panels, including the Hart-Rudman Commission on National Security in the 21st century. We must do everything possible to ensure that our intellectual preparedness is equal to that of our military preparedness. Without these investments, we may find that the war against terrorism is unwinnable, and our status in the global community severely diminished.

Our Nation has demonstrated that we have the moral resolve to fight a war to end terrorism. We must match that resolve with the willingness make investments in education and training that will pay off well into the next century.

Mr. AKAKA. Madam President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation, and Federal Services, I am honored to work with my colleagues from the Governmental Affairs Committee, Senator DURBIN and Senator THOMPSON, to introduce the Homeland Security Federal Workforce Act and the Homeland Security Education Act.

Alarmed at the Soviet Union's successful launch of the first space vehicle, Congress passed the National De-

fense Education Act of 1958. Our country faced a changed national security landscape, and our Government was determined to make certain the United States never came up short again in the areas of math, science, technology and foreign languages.

Although we face new national security threats, our Government's response is built on the talents and dedication of our Federal workforce. Recently the U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century, also known as the Hart-Rudman Commission, concluded that "... the excellence of American public servants is the foundation upon which an effective national security strategy must rest ... because future success will require the mastery of advanced technology ... as well as leading-edge concepts of governance."

The recent terrorist attacks strengthened our will and exposed the weaknesses of our great country. We were quickly reminded of the importance of our Federal Government and its workforce. For every essential service these attacks disrupted, we expected our government to respond quickly and effectively, and those in government did.

However, the events of September 11 and the anthrax attacks through the mails underscored how much government needs people with the critical skills to fill critical national security positions. We need to recruit the best people with the best skills and ensure that government service remains attractive. Our legislation does that.

The Homeland Security Federal Workforce Act and the Homeland Security Education Act provide needed tools and resources to agencies expressly for hiring new employees in critical national security positions and establishes a student loan repayment program and fellowships to future and current federal employees in exchange for government service.

It provides additional training opportunities for the great people already committed to the Federal service whose expertise guide agencies daily in meeting their missions. For example, Federal employees in national security positions will be eligible to apply for fellowships, which includes full tuition and a stipend, to pursue degrees in fields deemed critical to national security.

Our bills also respond to future national security needs by helping schools better prepare students for the demands of the 21st century. We must act now to identify and develop the right balance of skills in science, math, and foreign languages. We must make resources available to our schools and their teachers so that our students graduate with a greater proficiency in these areas.

The bills will strengthen the specific foreign language skills that the Gov-

ernment has identified as critical to our national security. We would help establish an advanced foreign language program that matches foreign language program efforts in leading universities with national security requirements.

I would like to note that the University of Hawaii is recognized as a model university in foreign language instruction and is noted for the strength of its faculty and curriculum particularly in Mandarin Chinese, Korean, and Japanese, language deemed important by the Defense Language Institute. The University of Hawaii is also an authority in the development of enhanced foreign language teaching methods.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to see that this bipartisan legislation is passed.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire):

S. 1804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for economic recovery and provide for the payment of emergency extended unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, the economy has been struggling for about a year now. We have had a number of difficulties that have made our economy not as healthy as we would like it to be. Oddly enough, for the week of September 11, according to the hearing we had in the Joint Economic Committee, unemployment actually dropped. There was an increase in employment that week. So maybe our economy was moving in the right direction. But immediately after September 11, and the shock this Nation went through, we slipped back into what has now been called a recession.

Factories are closing in a number of places. Quite a few have closed in my State. It has been quite discouraging that this tends to happen more often in small towns where you have just a few businesses. That is where you see more of the closings than in the urban areas.

The National Bureau of Economic Research has declared that we have slipped into recession. And the terrorist attacks have hurt us in a lot of different ways involving jobs for families in America. So I have been pushing for some time that we make sure we complete this Congress with a good, healthy stimulus package.

I have raised that observation with quite a number of people. But we are not, to my knowledge, making any progress. I have referred to the people who I understand are working on it as "the masters of the universe." They are back there somewhere outside of this Chamber, working and manipulating and talking to people about what ought to be in the package. And, yes, they take input, and I have talked to them, and other people have talked

to them—and I did not suggest it is not a tough job; it is a tough job—but we are getting close to the time when we should recess, and people are suggesting that we might even complete this Congress without a stimulus package. I think that would be a very bad mistake.

Even the most conservative economists have suggested we would have a one-half of 1 percent increase in the GDP if we have a stimulus package of \$75 billion to \$100 billion. I believe that is clearly worth the effort. That one-half of 1 percent, in an economy as large as ours, is very significant. It means many people will continue to have jobs that they would not have otherwise. It means that many people will be working and paying taxes to the Government which will help us with our deficit situation. It means many people will be working and taking care of their families and not going into debt and will be buying things, such as at the grocery store, that they would not otherwise be buying.

So I think we need to be sure we move in that direction. That is why I have offered today S. 1804, which is cosponsored by Senators TIM HUTCHINSON, GEORGE ALLEN, and BOB SMITH. And I intend to move this bill if we do not see progress. Really, I intend to seek a vote on it if it is in any way appropriate and possible this session.

Let me mention a few things that are in the bill which I think are common sense and would be good policy. One of the things I have been wrestling with is the earned-income tax credit. This is a program that began in 1975. It is now a \$31 billion program that provides a tax credit to low-income working Americans. It is designed to make work more beneficial and more rewarding so that, particularly, families can live off of low-income jobs. In fact, the program is quite generous for a family of four or more who qualify appropriately. They can receive \$4,000 a year. An average family with one qualifying child, that receives the earned-income tax credit, receives almost \$2,000 a year. On average, it is over \$1,900 per year that they receive.

This totals out, if you figure it on an hourly basis for the average family of four that receives the earned-income tax credit, to almost \$1 an hour pay raise over whatever they are making. If they are making \$6 an hour and they get another \$1, that is a big increase. If you are at \$5 an hour and you get \$1 an hour, that is a 20-percent increase in your pay. It is more than that in take-home because you don't have any withholding out of a tax credit.

The way this thing has been working, however, is not healthy. The way this thing has been working is, the money goes to the worker when they fill out their income-tax return the next year. In February or March, when they fill out the tax return, they get this \$1,900

in a lump sum check sometime in the spring after they worked.

Congress wrestled with that. They didn't believe that was furthering a policy of the Congress, and so they tried to provide the credit on the worker's paycheck. In years past, in the 1970s and all, when this passed, people didn't have the computers we have today, and requiring small businesses to calculate this and put it on the paycheck caused some grief. But today, because everything is automated, it is much easier to do.

In recent years, Congress tried to do something about it. In 1978, they passed legislation that said a worker could have it put on their paycheck if they want to. Oddly enough, only 5 percent of workers have chosen this or know they can.

Therein lies a problem, and there are several reasons. One, they probably don't know about it. Another one is that oftentimes they are told that if you get this advanced payment on your check instead of getting a refund next year, you may owe money to the Government next year. And that caused some to not take advantage of it. At any rate, only 5 percent of Americans are taking advantage of this policy.

I believe it ought to be the policy. I believe the policy was founded to begin with, with the idea of helping people, encouraging people to go to work. If you are not making much more than the minimum wage, sometimes people may wonder if they are not better staying at home on welfare. The money should be put on there. Most economists, most good public policy students of the situation believe that.

That is one of the points of this stimulus bill that I have. Let me tell you why it is such a good stimulus package. It is good because the money for people who have worked this year, who receive the benefit of the earned-income tax credit, they will get their refund next year.

What my proposal says is in January, they would begin to receive next year's \$1,900, on their paycheck. Current law allows a recipient to get about 60 percent of their earned income tax credit in advance, on their paycheck. We calculate, of the \$31 billion that is annually being spent on the earned income tax credit, this proposal would bring to the average worker, infused into the economy next fiscal year, \$15 billion, a year before the time it would normally be in the economy. I believe that is good public policy. It is good to encourage work. It will help people who need money now to take care of their families. It will be coming to them in a regular way, and it will help them take care of their families.

That would be a good stimulus package. It would help us next year when we have to balance the budget because we would have \$15 billion less to spend on the tax refunds because it would

have been paid out throughout this fiscal year. It would help us get back into a balanced budget which is important. This year, we are not going to be in a balanced budget. We are going to be in deficit unfortunately. Next year, we have an opportunity to get out. This package in that regard would help us do so.

I strongly believe that is a good thing that should be considered. It would infuse money into the economy and have a net drain on the economy of zero over a 2-year period, except perhaps some interest loss to the Government.

Another matter that we believe should be in this package is a proposal for relief for those who are unemployed. Everybody has been talking about that. We ought to be able to reach agreement on that. Senator BAUCUS had a proposal. The House Republicans had a proposal that came out of that chamber. A centrist proposal has been put forward by Senators COLLINS, SMITH and LANDRIEU that hits the area about right. It increases the weeks for unemployment for up to 13 additional weeks, and it begins calculating that for anybody who was unemployed at the time of September 11. It is more expansive in that regard. We have a good bipartisan unemployment compensation package.

Another thing it is time for us to do would be to complete the reduction of the 27-percent tax bracket down to the 25-percent tax bracket. We committed to doing that over the 10-year tax plan. This would accelerate that next year, and working Americans would receive a little more take-home money every week as a result of a reduction in that tax rate. That has a lot of support.

One thing that has not been mentioned, but I strongly believe would be one of the most beneficial proposals, is to advance the child tax credit. Under our current 10-year tax reduction package that passed, we will increase the child tax credit for families to \$1,000, but it will take nine years for it to become \$1,000. I believe for next year alone we ought to do that. So every family who obviously is hurt the most in a recessionary environment would receive an additional \$400 per child tax credit that they could use to help their families. That would be a good impact.

The cost of that is about \$20 billion in terms of estimated revenue lost to the Government, but it is a real stimulus into the economy, into the hands of families who will be spending it on their children. It will help keep the economy moving in a healthy way. That is a good step. It is good public policy. Families trying to raise children would have additional income to take care of them.

A lot of people are at a point where they have had to cash in stocks and other investments that they have and have taken losses for it. For individuals, this allows them to deduct those

losses on their tax return, but the limit on loss deductions is \$3,000 per year. We believe that, particularly in light of the fact that many people may be cashing in investments, we should at least raise it up to \$5,000 per year which could be helpful to people in desperate circumstances.

One other thing that is important—and Senator ALLEN has been a champion of this and has won me over—is the need to provide a tax credit to encourage American families to become technologically literate, to encourage American families to purchase computers for children who are in school so they will have a computer at home so they can become a part of the high-tech world that is all about us today. He has proposed, and we have put as a part of this bill, a \$500 tax credit for the purchase of software or computer systems for a family. To really get a jolt out of it, we are only going to propose that for a 3-month period. And the computer companies, I am sure, and all the marketing companies and the stores will be promoting that you have a \$500 rebate on your purchase of a computer for your family, if you have a student in school.

I think that is a good step. The computer industry has been hurting badly, and having this money available could get them off the ground, get them moving again and, at the same time, help children, help them become educated and to become an active part of the high-tech world in which we now live.

Some of the matters that are in the legislation we proposed, I don't believe there is a single thing in it that somebody could say is a special interest. It has a business provision. It has Senator BAUCUS's 10-percent advance depreciation, which would encourage businesses to purchase equipment and allow them to depreciate a little faster, and encourage them, perhaps, to recapitalize in their business. That was Senator BAUCUS's 1-year proposal.

I don't believe there is anything in this bill that does violence to fairness or justice. I don't think there is anything in this bill that in any way could be considered special interest or unfair. I believe we have a simple package—myself and the three Senators who have introduced this with me—that would infuse \$75 billion into the economy, with virtually no bureaucracy, virtually no overhead, targeted to middle and lower income America—putting \$75 billion into their hands early, allowing them to spend it and get this economy going again.

I am not sure businesses—and I have heard a number of economists say this—are in a mood to do a lot of investing in new equipment to produce a lot more product if there is nobody to buy. So I think that the way we proceed would be to allow people who have families and who work every day, and who need every dollar they get to sur-

vive—give them a little bit more to take home. If they do, they will spend it and help get the economy moving again. If nothing else, it will help them get by, whether it improves the economy or not.

Of course, we do have \$5 billion in grant money to the States that would allow them to deal with emergency situations in their States for people who are hurting also. That has been a bipartisan project, and it has a little more than has been proposed in the President's request. We think that is a good figure that everybody can rally around.

I believe getting a tax stimulus package together and passed is not that hard. It doesn't have to be lockstep the way everybody is negotiating now. They have dug in on every position. Some of the issues in my package they are dealing with and some of them they are not considering. My provisions do the job just as well—in fact, better than what I am hearing discussed in a lot of ways.

I think the majority leader needs to be sure we don't get to the end of this session without time to bring this up. If they can't reach an agreement, we are going to have a problem. The bill was up and amendments were being offered. When debate and amendments were not shut off, the bill was pulled down. It has gone behind closed doors and we are sitting around here saying: Maybe they will reach an agreement; maybe they will not reach an agreement.

I have a bill that I think we need to vote on if we can't get some agreement with which I and other Members are comfortable. We need to vote on this bill because it is a good bill. It is not that complicated in any way to administer or put together.

I thank the Chair for her attention. I look forward to further discussions on this issue. I certainly look forward to making sure before this Congress recesses we bring up and pass legislation that will help this economy. I don't know how much it would take to do it. The experts say \$75 billion is worth half a GDP percentage point in growth. That is good news. I think it is exactly the kind of shot that might be helpful.

If we don't pass something, that could be a sad event also. In fact, the markets and people might lose confidence even more than they have already if we don't pass a stimulus package. It is a double burden to move that forward.

I thank the Chair for listening. I thank my colleagues in the Senate for their consideration of this legislation. We look forward to making sure a stimulus package clears before we recess.

I yield the floor.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. ENZI, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. COLLINS, Ms.

LANDRIEU, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INOUE, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1806. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to health professions programs regarding the practice of pharmacy; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise today, joined by my colleagues, Senator JOHNSON of South Dakota and Senator ENZI of Wyoming, to introduce legislation that will address the growing shortage of pharmacists.

The Pharmacists Education Act takes a multi-faceted approach to the problem of workforce shortages in the pharmacy sector. In December 2000, the Health Resources and Services Administration, HRSA, Bureau of Health Professions published a report entitled, "The Pharmacist Workforce: A Study of the Supply and Demand for Pharmacists". This study considered the factors influencing the demand for pharmacists in the health care sector and also looked at the ability of our academic institutions to supply the quantity of pharmacy students required to meet this growing demand. The report concluded that there was indeed evidence of a shortage in the field, due primarily to the rapid increase in demand for pharmacists and the array of services they provide, coupled with a constrained ability to expand the number of pharmacy education programs to accommodate the need for more practicing pharmacists. The study also indicated that the shortage was unlikely to abate in the future without significant changes to the current system.

Pharmacists represent the third largest health professional group in the United States with about 190,000 active pharmacists last year. This figure is expected to grow to 224, 500 by 2010. Yet, despite this anticipated increase in the number of practicing pharmacists, the demand for the services is expected to continue to outpace supply. A recent employment survey conducted by the National Association of Chain Drug stores found that the number of vacancies among their member companies had increased by 1,000 positions in the last six months alone.

Remarkable advancements in medical science have made treatments for diseases once thought impossible to treat a reality. And what is possible is quickly what is practiced in the medical profession. Many of these dynamic breakthroughs have been in the area of pharmaceuticals.

These remarkable changes in health care have resulted in dramatic upswings in the number of retail prescriptions dispensed annually, from 1.9 billion in 1992 to 2.8 billion in 1999. Moreover, as medications become more complex and diverse, and our population becomes older and sicker, the

role of the pharmacist in the health care setting has become evermore important. For these reasons, my colleagues and I felt it was very important that steps be taken to avert a more serious shortage of these critical health professionals.

The Pharmacy Education Act seeks to enhance not only the supply of pharmacists, by providing much needed support to Colleges of Pharmacy, it also aims to improve the distribution of pharmacists by building upon the National Health Service Corps. Specifically, the bill expands eligibility of certain existing Federal grant programs to Colleges of Pharmacy to upgrade and expand facilities and laboratory space and recruit and retain talented faculty to educate pharmacy students.

The bill also provides a number of new sources of financial aid to students interested in pursuing a career in pharmacy. First, the bill allows students entering pharmacy school and students who have graduated with a PharmD degree to apply for National Health Service Corps, NHSC, Scholarship and Loan Repayment funds. Second, it allows students who demonstrate financial need to apply for scholarships to qualifying schools of pharmacy.

This bill is endorsed by a number of organizations, including the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, the National Association of Chain Drug Stores, National Community Pharmacists Association, American College of Clinical Pharmacy and American Society of Health-System Pharmacists.

Increasing demand for pharmacists makes it imperative that a proactive response to current trends be undertaken before the situation becomes critical. I hope my colleagues will join me in seeking expeditious consideration and passage of this timely and important legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Pharmacy Education Act be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1806

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 "Pharmacy Education Aid Act of 2001".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Pharmacists are an important link in our Nation's health care system. A critical shortage of pharmacists is threatening the ability of pharmacies to continue to provide important prescription related services.

(2) In the landmark report entitled "*To Err is Human: Building a Safer Health System*", the Institute of Medicine reported that medication errors can be partially attributed to factors that are indicative of a shortage of pharmacists (such as too many customers, numerous distractions, and staff shortages).

(3) Congress acknowledged in the Healthcare Research and Quality Act of 1999

(Public Law 106-129) a growing demand for pharmacists by requiring the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study to determine whether there is a shortage of pharmacists in the United States and, if so, to what extent.

(4) As a result of Congress' concern about how a shortage of pharmacists would impact the public health, the Secretary of Health and Human Services published a report entitled "*The Pharmacist Workforce: A Study in Supply and Demand for Pharmacists*" in December of 2000.

(5) *The Pharmacist Workforce: A Study in Supply and Demand for Pharmacists* found that "While the overall supply of pharmacists has increased in the past decade, there has been an unprecedented demand for pharmacists and for pharmaceutical care services, which has not been met by the currently available supply" and that the "evidence clearly indicates the emergence of a shortage of pharmacists over the past two years".

(6) The same study also found that "The factors causing the current shortage are of a nature not likely to abate in the near future without fundamental changes in pharmacy practice and education." The study projects that the number of prescriptions filled by community pharmacists will increase by 20 percent by 2004. In contrast, the number of community pharmacists is expected to increase by only 6 percent by 2005.

(7) The demand for pharmacists will increase as prescription drug use continues to grow.

SEC. 3. INCLUSION OF PRACTICE OF PHARMACY IN PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS.

(a) INCLUSION IN CORPS MISSION.—Section 331(a)(3) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254d(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (D), by adding at the end the following: "Such term includes pharmacist services."; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(E)(i) The term 'pharmacist services' includes drug therapy management services furnished by a pharmacist, individually or on behalf of a pharmacy provider, and such services and supplies furnished incident to the pharmacist's drug therapy management services, that the pharmacist is legally authorized to perform (in the State in which the individual performs such services) in accordance with State law (or the State regulatory mechanism provided for by State law)."

(b) SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—Section 338A of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254j) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting "pharmacists," after "physicians,"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting "pharmacy" after "dentistry,".

(c) LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM.—Section 338B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254j-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting "pharmacists," after "physicians,"; and

(2) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting "pharmacy," after "dentistry,".

(d) FUNDING.—Section 338H(b)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254q(b)(2)) is amended in subparagraph (A), by inserting before the period the following: ", which may include such contracts for individuals who are in a course of study or program leading to a pharmacy degree".

SEC. 4. CERTAIN HEALTH PROFESSIONS PROGRAMS REGARDING PRACTICE OF PHARMACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part E of title VII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 294n et seq) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 770 as section 771; and

(2) by adding at the end the following subpart:

"Subpart 3—Certain Workforce Programs

"SEC. 771. PRACTICING PHARMACIST WORKFORCE.

"(a) RECRUITING AND RETAINING STUDENTS AND FACULTY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may make awards of grants or contracts to qualifying schools of pharmacy (as defined in subsection (f)) for the purpose of carrying out programs for recruiting and retaining students and faculty for such schools, including programs to provide scholarships for attendance at such schools to full-time students who have financial need for the scholarships and who demonstrate a commitment to becoming practicing pharmacists or faculty.

"(2) PREFERENCE IN PROVIDING SCHOLARSHIPS.—An award may not be made under paragraph (1) unless the qualifying school of pharmacy involved agrees that, in providing scholarships pursuant to the award, the school will give preference to students for whom the costs of attending the school would constitute a severe financial hardship.

"(b) LOAN REPAYMENT PROGRAM REGARDING FACULTY POSITIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may establish a program of entering into contracts with individuals described in paragraph (2) under which the individuals agree to serve as members of the faculties of qualifying schools of pharmacy in consideration of the Federal Government agreeing to pay, for each year of such service, not more than \$20,000 of the principal and interest of the educational loans of such individuals.

"(2) ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUALS.—The individuals referred to in paragraph (1) are individuals who—

"(A) have a doctoral degree in pharmacy or the pharmaceutical sciences; or

"(B) are enrolled in a school of pharmacy and are in the final academic year of such school in a program leading to such a doctoral degree.

"(3) REQUIREMENTS REGARDING FACULTY POSITIONS.—The Secretary may not enter into a contract under paragraph (1) unless—

"(A) the individual involved has entered into a contract with a qualifying school of pharmacy to serve as a member of the faculty of the school for not less than 2 years;

"(B) the contract referred to in subparagraph (A) provides that, in serving as a member of the faculty pursuant to such subparagraph, the individual will—

"(i) serve full time; or

"(ii) serve as a member of the adjunct clinical faculty and in so serving will actively supervise pharmacy students for 25 academic weeks per year (or such greater number of academic weeks as may be specified in the contract); and

"(C) such contract provides that—

"(i) the school will, for each year for which the individual will serve as a member of the faculty under the contract with the school, make payments of the principal and interest due on the educational loans of the individual for such year in an amount equal to the amount of such payments made by the Secretary for the year;

"(ii) the payments made by the school pursuant to clause (i) on behalf of the individual

will be in addition to the pay that the individual would otherwise receive for serving as a member of such faculty; and

“(iii) the school, in making a determination of the amount of compensation to be provided by the school to the individual for serving as a member of the faculty, will make the determination without regard to the amount of payments made (or to be made) to the individual by the Federal Government under paragraph (1).

“(4) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—The provisions of sections 338C, 338G, and 338I shall apply to the program established in paragraph (1) to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions apply to the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program established in subpart III of part D of title III, including the applicability of provisions regarding reimbursements for increased tax liability and provisions regarding bankruptcy.

“(5) WAIVER REGARDING SCHOOL CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Secretary may waive the requirement established in paragraph (3)(C) if the Secretary determines that the requirement will impose an undue financial hardship on the school involved.

“(c) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The Secretary may make awards of grants or contracts to qualifying schools of pharmacy for the purpose of assisting such schools in acquiring and installing computer-based systems to provide pharmaceutical education. Education provided through such systems may be graduate education, professional education, or continuing education. The computer-based systems may be designed to provide on-site education, or education at remote sites (commonly referred to as distance learning), or both.

“(d) FACILITIES.—The Secretary may award grants under section 1610 for construction projects to expand, remodel, renovate, or alter existing facilities for qualifying schools of pharmacy or to provide new facilities for the schools.

“(e) REQUIREMENT REGARDING EDUCATION IN PRACTICE OF PHARMACY.—With respect to the qualifying school of pharmacy involved, the Secretary shall ensure that programs and activities carried out with Federal funds provided under this section have the goal of educating students to become licensed pharmacists, or the goal of providing for faculty to recruit, retain, and educate students to become licensed pharmacists.

“(f) QUALIFYING SCHOOL OF PHARMACY.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualifying school of pharmacy’ means a college or school of pharmacy (as defined in section 799B) that, in providing clinical experience for students, requires that the students serve in a clinical rotation in which pharmacist services (as defined in section 331(a)(3)(E)) are provided at or for—

“(1) a medical facility that serves a substantial number of individuals who reside in or are members of a medically underserved community (as so defined);

“(2) an entity described in any of subparagraphs (A) through (L) of section 340B(a)(4) (relating to the definition of covered entity);

“(3) a health care facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs or of any of the Armed Forces of the United States;

“(4) a health care facility of the Bureau of Prisons;

“(5) a health care facility operated by, or with funds received from, the Indian Health Service; or

“(6) a disproportionate share hospital under section 1923 of the Social Security Act.

“(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this section,

there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2006.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORM AMENDMENTS.—Section 1610(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300r(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “or” at the end thereof;

(ii) in clause (ii), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) expand, remodel, renovate, or alter existing facilities for qualifying schools of pharmacy or to provide new facilities for the schools in accordance with section 771(d).”;

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “and” at the end thereof;

(ii) in clause (ii)(II), by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) a qualifying school of pharmacy (as defined in section 771(f)).”;

(2) by striking the first sentence of paragraph (3) and inserting the following: “There are authorized to be appropriated for grants under paragraph (1)(A)(iii), such sums as may be necessary.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) RECAPTURE OF PAYMENTS.—If, during the 20-year period beginning on the date of the completion of construction pursuant to a grant under paragraph (1)(A)(iii)—

“(A) the school of pharmacy involved, or other owner of the facility, ceases to be a public or nonprofit private entity; or

“(B) the facility involved ceases to be used for the purposes for which it was constructed (unless the Secretary determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the school or other owner from such obligation);

the United States is entitled to recover from the school or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the current value (as determined by an agreement between the parties or by action brought in the United States District Court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of the construction of such facility.”.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1807. A bill to amend the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 to permit any Federal law enforcement agency to enter into a cooperative agreement with the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia to assist the Department in carrying out crime prevention and law enforcement activities in the District of Columbia if deemed appropriate by the Chief of the Department and the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. HATCH. 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. 1807

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 “District of Columbia Police Coordination Amendment Act of 2001”.

SEC. 2. PERMITTING ADDITIONAL FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY TO ENTER INTO COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS WITH METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Section 11712(d) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (D.C. Code, sec. 4-192(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following: “(33) Any other law enforcement agency of the Federal government that the Chief of the Metropolitan Police Department and the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia deem appropriate to enter into an agreement pursuant to this section.”.

STATEMENTS ON SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 189—TO AMEND THE RULES OF THE SENATE TO IMPROVE LEGISLATIVE EFFICIENCY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCCAIN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 189

Resolved, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

“RULE XXV

“STANDING COMMITTEES

“1. The following standing committees shall be appointed at the commencement of each Congress, and shall continue and have the power to act until their successors are appointed, with leave to report by bill or otherwise on matters within their respective jurisdictions:

“(a)(1) **Committee on National Priorities**, to which committee shall be referred all concurrent resolutions on the budget (as defined in section 3(4) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) and all other matters required to be referred to committee under titles III and IV of that Act, and messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating thereto.

“(2) Such committee shall have the duty—

“(A) to report the matters required to be reported by committee under titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

“(B) to make continuing studies of the effect on budget outlays of relevant existing and proposed legislation and to report the results of such studies to the Senate on a recurring basis;

“(C) to request and evaluate continuing studies of tax expenditures, to devise methods of coordinating tax expenditures, policies, and programs with direct budget outlays, and to report the results of such studies to the Senate on a recurring basis; and

“(D) to review, on a continuing basis, the conduct by the Congressional Budget Office of its functions and duties.

“(b)(1) **Committee on Agricultural Policy**, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating primarily to the following subjects:

“1. Agricultural economics and research.

“2. Agricultural extension services and experiment stations.