The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Presiding Officer, the Honorable Judd Gregg, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

PRAYER
The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Yayeh our Adonai, how excellent is Your name in all the Earth. Today, as we return from recess and at the beginning of Jewish Heritage Week, we praise You for the immense contribution Jews have made to America. We remember the first Jewish community in Newport, Rhode Island comprised of Sephardim, persecuted Spanish and Portugese Jews who arrived in the spring of 1658. This group of refugees began to worship together in private homes or rented buildings until a synagogue building, the Touro Hebrew Congregation, was constructed. On the wall of this synagogue is a letter from George Washington expressing his belief in religious freedom as the standard for civil liberty: “To bigotry give no sanction, to persecution no assistance.” We also echo the words of Roger Williams, the founder of Rhode Island: “All men may walk as their consciences persuade them, everyone in the name of his God.”

On this day we thank You for the ten Jewish Senators and their strong moral and social consciences. May Your shalom rest upon us all. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
The Honorable Harry Reid, a Senator from the State of Nevada, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

To the Senate:
Under the provisions of Rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable Judd Gregg, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
President pro tempore.

Mr. GREGG thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 2 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each.

Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. Durbin, or his designee.

The Senator from Nevada.

BROWNFIELDS
Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an important piece of legislation that I believe we should be working on today, certainly tomorrow. This legislation, the bipartisan brownfields bill, S. 350, was reported from the Environment and Public Works Committee on February 27 by a vote of 15-3. This legislation now has 66 cosponsors. It is ready for floor action and has been for more than a month. There were a couple of people in committee who voiced concerns about specific bill language, particularly Senator Voinovich. I indicated at that time that we would work with him prior to the bill being ready for floor action to satisfy any problems he might have, and we did that. We worked with him, and I think Senator Voinovich is satisfied. Actually we worked day and night to reconcile these differences.

The bill is very important. The bill would produce almost 600,000 jobs around our country. It would increase annual tax revenues up to $2.4 billion. This is important environmental legislation. We need to move forward immediately. There has been a lot of controversy over what President Bush has done and what he has not done, but the one thing that he campaigned on was this legislation. He campaigned on the importance of this legislation. This is a bill the administration endorses. This is a bill the Clinton administration endorsed. This legislation that we should move forward. I see no reason we cannot. We are ready on this side to move forward. We hope that our friends on the other side of the aisle are ready to move forward. We have worked on this legislation for years. It is just not in the best interests of this country not to move forward. We have to move forward. This bill is truly a compromise. It is a consensus. I think its passage would indicate the true nature of this Senate. We are split 50-50, and this legislation, certainly with 66 cosponsors, indicates our ability to reach across the aisle both ways. When we entered into this historic power sharing agreement this year, we indicated that we had a thoughtful, bipartisan Senate. I think it indicates the bipartisan nature of this bill. There is no need to wait any longer. We have a half million contaminated abandoned sites in the United States that are waiting to be cleaned up to become thriving parts of our communities. Some of these sites would take only a few dollars to clean up.

For example, Mr. President, in Las Vegas, where we have the old National Guard armory, $50,000 in brownfields money cleaned that up and produced a site that is now really a thriving economic entity within the State of Nevada. It is creating jobs. There is now a tax base that will help support the people of Las Vegas and the State of Nevada.

I do not want to be partisan today and I will not be partisan today, but as the days go on I am going to have to be more direct as to what the problem is in holding up this legislation. As I said, we are clear on this side. It is not right to hold up this bill. And I also say that this legislation has the support of the Senate. If we do not move this bill forward—and I think we could finish in just a few hours—in the regular course, I am going to be obligated to attach this bill to other legislation that moves through this body. I repeat, with 600,000 jobs, 500,000 abandoned sites, increasing annual tax revenues up to $2.4 billion, this is a bill that is good for the environment. It is good for jobs. We should not delay its consideration any longer. It is supported by the last administration, supported by this administration, and I hope the leadership in the Senate, the majority leader, will allow this matter to be brought before the Senate.

This legislation has been worked on very closely by Senators Voinovich, Inhofe, Bond, and CRAPO, as well as Senators CLINTON, BOXER, CORZINE, and GRAHAM to accommodate all their interests. Senator Smith and I have worked hard to have this bill reported out of committee. I hope we can have action on the Senate floor at an early date—maybe this afternoon, maybe tomorrow. But I think we should move forward quickly.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FEINSTEIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE DUKE UNIVERSITY MEN’S NCAA CHAMPIONSHIP BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, pursuant to the permission given me by the majority leader, and with the agreement of the minority leader, it is my honor to have invited the Duke University basketball team, the NCAA champions of this year, along with the wives of those who have wives, and the coaches and their wives, to come to the Senate floor.

RECESS

Mr. HELMS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for no more than 12 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:04, recessed until 1:16 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

EDUCATION

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I wish to speak in morning business on the issue of education, which the Senate will take up over the next few weeks. There has been a considerable amount of discussion on this issue within the Senate membership but even more discussion within the populace in general. The President ran for election on the issue of education and the education of low-income children. Unfortunately, both of these Federal programs have fairly significant flaws.

In the special education area, the Federal Government has failed to live up to its obligations. It has not produced a bill which gives the full share of special education. Originally, the Federal Government said it would pick up 40 percent of the cost of special education. Unfortunately, as of 4 years ago, the Federal Government was only picking up 6 percent of the cost.

Due to a concerted effort by myself, quite honestly, and a number of others on this side of the aisle, the majority leader, chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee, Chairman SPECTER, and chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, Chairman Jeffords, we took on the issue of funding special education. We have dramatically increased funding—2½ percent of the needs of special education. In fact, President Bush has proposed the single largest increase in special education funding ever proposed by a President in the history of this country. At least we are trying to address that issue.

The bill that will come to the floor later this week addresses the needs of kids from lower income families. In this area, regrettably, although the Federal Government has chosen to step up and do what it thinks it should, it has done a poor job of pursuing this responsibility.

This program was begun 35 years ago. It is called title I. It helps kids with lower incomes get the same education as their peers. We have spent $120 billion on this program over its life. The vast majority of the spending has occurred since 1990. What have been the results? The results have been that the educational achievement of low-income kids has actually gone down or, at best, has remained stagnant. The average fourth grader today from a low-income family reads at two grade levels lower than his or her peers in that same classroom. The graduation rate, the dropout rate, the academic ability of kids from low-income families in each grade level have been falling back. We have left a lot of children behind even though we spent $120 billion.

We have proved unalterably that money cannot solve the problem. If it could solve the problem, it would have significantly improved or we could have at least seen a marginal improvement in academic achievement.

The President of the United States, President Bush, came into office saying he would change this. He has put forward a series of proposals, the purpose of which is to fundamentally adjust the Federal role as we pursue the improvement of education of low-income kids.

It has four basic themes:

First, we will change the Federal role so we don’t focus on the bureaucracy; we don’t focus on the structure; we don’t focus on the administration; rather, we focus on the child. That may seem logical. One may ask, aren’t we already doing that? No, the money today does not flow to the child. The money flows to the school system and the bureaucracy. The President said let’s look at the child and make our program child centered.

The second thing stressed by this administration and by those on this side of the aisle is, let’s give the local school districts, the parents, the teachers, and the principals, flexibility when they get that race; and

Today and, unfortunately, for a number of years, the Federal Government, especially the Congress, has believed it knows best how to educate the child in Epping, NH, or Tuscaloosa, AL, or in Cheyenne, WY. Even though we have never met the children—at least I haven’t met the ones in Cheyenne or Tuscaloosa—we know best how to educate them, so we have attached innumerable strings to the dollars we have to give for the purpose of helping the low-income children get better educated. We have had program after program that has been categorical; it specifically says what the money should
be spent for, who gets it, when they get it, and where they get it.

The bureaucracy behind the Federal dollars is absolutely staggering. Some States spend almost two-thirds of their time complying with Federal regulations, which represents 7 percent of their actual spending. As a result, we have created a bureaucratic maze of disproportionate complexity. We have strings running out from the desks that intertwine, and we are pulling the strings as they attach to the people who try to teach the kids in the local school districts. The President has said: Let’s cut those strings. We have said on this side: Let’s cut those strings. Send the money back to the local school districts. Acknowledge the fact that parents, teachers, and principals have as much or more knowledge of how to educate children, and especially their school system than we do. Let’s give them credibility for being concerned about their kids—something this Congress over the years has not been willing to acknowledge. This money will come back in a flexible form. That is a proposal the President has suggested.

The first proposal is that it be child centered. The second proposal is that the money be flexible. The third proposal is, in exchange for this new flexibility, in exchange for getting the money with very few strings attached, we are going to ask for one thing. We are going to ask that the children learn, that they have academic achievement levels which reach and exceed, hopefully, their peers, that low-income kids are not left behind in the academic world. That is what we will ask. Instead of controlling all the input and instead of controlling the way the money goes in and how it is spent, you can take the money, but in exchange for taking the money, you have to make sure the children learn; you have to make them academically capable of competing in the world so they have a prosperous life. Academic achievement is what we are going to request.

The fourth item is an accountability system so we can be assured that there is academic achievement. We are no longer going to allow a system to take the low-income child, and especially the minority child, merge them with a peer group of children in the classroom, have the group achieve an average score that is acceptable, and say everybody in that classroom is learning. We know that by not doing it that way you end up with a lot of problems being masked by the majority. So we are going to require disaggregation. We are going to say for different ethnic groups, different racial groups, different income groups, explain whether or not they are learning along with the whole group in the classroom.

We are going to put in place a testing regime developed at the local level, designed at the local level, which simply says, OK, local school system, decide what a third grader should know, what a fifth grader should know, and what a sixth grader should know. Once you decide what that third, fifth, or sixth grader should know in math or English, then make sure the kids actually know that. We are not going to tell them what they should know; we are not going to tell them what the standard should be. We are going to say, after you set the standards, we will expect all the kids in that classroom to achieve at the level that meets that standard.

That is the system being proposed—four new proposals, four new concepts which merge together to, hopefully, create a system where no child will be left behind: One, that it is child centered approach to how we ensure that; three, that there is academic achievement; and four, that there is accountability.

As we move forward with the debate on this bill, there are going to be a lot of ideas tossed at us to how we accomplish those goals. The jury is still out. There are ways this bill could be amended on this floor which would make it hard for me to support, although it came out of the committee 20–0. But there is good intention, I believe. There is a desire to reach a bipartisan agreement and move it forward. That is reflected not only in the committee bill but in the fact that over the last month we have been negotiating, in a very conscientious effort, to reach agreement on some of the more difficult issues of policy and the most difficult issue of money.

As we go forward in this debate, I hope we understand that we are not going to be able to change the educational system for everyone in this country. That is not our role. It is the local school district and the States that control local education, primarily. We do have an obligation to do a much better job for low-income kids. We have extended into this issue. We have spent $120 billion of American taxpayers’ hard-earned income, and we have produced very weak results.

It is time for a change. It is time to recognize that we need to take a different approach to how we ensure that the low-income child is not left behind. So we have come up with some creative ideas, and we are going to try to pass them. We are going to try to pass them in a bipartisan way. Then we are going to hope they will be used in the system to produce a much better result for a large percentage of our students who, up until now, have been left behind.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition? The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New Hampshire. Certainly no one in the Senate is more knowledgeable than he about the bill, about the funding, and about the opportunities we have to strengthen education in this country.

This week, as was mentioned, we are going to take up, hopefully, commonsense reform. It means increasing accountability for student performance. It means supporting programs that work, reducing bureaucracy, increasing flexibility, and empowering parents. I think these are the goals we seek to attain. Certainly all of us have to establish goals, to establish where we want to be, and then, as the details come forth, see if indeed what we are proposing to do leads us towards the accomplishment of those goals. I think that is where we are.

When we talk to people about the cost of learning in school, certainly education is always at the top of the list. In general terms, I want to share a little bit of my view of what we ought to be talking about. It seems to me that America stands at the dawn of a new century, a shining moment of opportunity certainly for all of us, a moment of hope that our families can, more fully than in the past, achieve the American dream. We dream of peace and continued prosperity in a world where every nation looks to America for leadership. We are challenged to develop new technologies that will improve our lives and find medical breakthroughs to cure cancer and AIDS and Alzheimer’s.

If America is to fulfill its dreams in a new century, we cannot forget that tomorrow’s leaders, tomorrow’s Nobel prize winners, are sitting in the classroom today. We must ask ourselves, do we have a first-class public education system that teaches our children how to compete and how to succeed in this century? Average is not good enough. That is why I am committed to helping parents, teachers, and local leaders build a foundation of excellence and opportunity for every child. That means making sure all children have the best teachers, can learn in safe schools, and they can learn right from wrong in addition to the ABCs.

Fifty years ago, the principal obstacles to learning in schools were talking out of turn or chewing gum in class. Today—just turn on the news—it is violence; it is drug abuse; it is teenage pregnancy. Our test scores, as compared to those of children in other countries, are still too low. The achievement gap between poor and middle-income students is still too wide. Too many students do not read at their own grade level or meet minimum standards in math or science. Too many young people are unfairly promoted and fall further and further behind. Too many enter college unprepared and have to take remedial courses to improve their basic skills. That is wrong.
It does not have to be that way. Republicans at every level—Congress, governors, local officials—are committed to help children learn and to build better, safer schools for a new century.

Education is first, last, and always, of course, about children. Success is defined by how much our children learn. We must make sure parents, teachers, and local leaders have the power to use Federal dollars as they are needed to meet our children’s most important needs. Those closest to the classroom, of course, know better than bureaucrats in Washington what the students need, be it more teachers, math and reading tutors, better textbooks, or new classrooms and computers.

I just returned from Wyoming and have been again reminded of the difference that red tape makes. Sundance, WY, to Pittsburgh, PA. We ought to have the flexibility to do what needs to be done in that community to make education the most effective. Who cares more about children’s future, parents or bureaucrats? Our children’s future should not be limited by what seems right in Washington, DC but what is wrong with the schools they attend.

We are spending more money. Republicans are for spending more money on education than the President has requested. The issue, as pointed out by my friend from New Hampshire, is who sets the priorities. We are for more construction, putting more teachers in schools, putting more computers into schools, but we believe State and local administrators, working with parents, ought to decide on how to prioritize those issues based on their needs.

The Senate will begin debate, probably tomorrow, on the Education Opportunity Act, a bill which returns power to the classroom to help kids. Congress needs to work to make sure the Federal dollars actually get where they can be spent and where they can be effective, with the fewest possible strings attached.

We need more innovators and fewer bureaucrats. Stop and think back to your own education. Each of us can remember at least one teacher who made a positive difference in our lives, a positive impact. Why should such great teachers be rare?

Our children deserve the best teachers, teachers who are qualified, teachers who are experts in the subjects they teach. Local officials should be able to set high teacher standards and reward the best teachers with more pay.

I want not only the best teachers but also the best schools. I am sure you do as well. To achieve that goal we must ensure schools in special education have account of. Unfortunately, reports show the schools in the District are not what we would like them to be. Madam President, 75 percent of fourth graders can barely read. Only 5 percent of students do eighth grade work in math and science. Forty percent of all high school students drop out before they graduate. That is not good. That is not good at all.

Just this year, the superintendent announced there were 70,762 students in the District—the first time, apparently, they have known the total. We need to change that.

No child should be trapped in an education system that is unworkable. Parents have the right to choose the best public school for their child. Students should have the opportunity for scholarships that allow them to escape failing schools. Schools that fail year after year and refuse to change must be overhauled from top to bottom. Administrators should be fired and new teachers should be hired. It is wrong to do anything less.

We must, of course, do more to make sure our schools do not fail a different kind of test—providing for a safe learning environment. We should empower teachers and principals to remove dangerous students from the classroom. They cannot be allowed to keep other children from learning. Local officials must have the power to put troubled students in classrooms where they can get the attention they need when they need it. None of us want any child to fall through the cracks.

We must demand that our schools be safe and drug free. For those young people who refuse to change or endanger the lives of their classmates or teachers, we need to get tough. If they refuse to change, they must be punished. If they can only learn one lesson, it must be that society’s laws mean something.

It is a Federal crime to bring a gun to school. In 1998, more than 6,000 students were expelled for bringing firearms to school, but the Clinton-Gore administration only prosecuted 8 students—8. What kind of signal does that send?

We should not tolerate one more school shooting. When our society gets used to it, our society is finished. We all had an exposure to this just last week with the anniversary of Columbine, and it affected all our schools and affected the kids who were there.

Certainly there is one more thing that ought to be mentioned—it is probably the most important factor in determining a child’s success in school—and that is parents. We are the child’s first and most important teachers. The most difficult truth is that the reason our schools are failing, sometimes, is because a lot of families are failing to do their part. Teachers are there to teach. They are not there to raise our children. They are there to help the best teachers they can be unless they have the support of mom and dad.

Nothing is more important to us than education. It is hard to determine sometimes—and we will argue about it at great length—the role of the Federal Government vis-a-vis State and local. We will talk about where money ought to go and what ought to be required in terms of accountability. Indeed, we should. But to really know, we should pause for a while and ask: What do we want the outcome to be? What is it that we visualize for ourselves and our family and our community? What do we think education ought to be?

We have a responsibility as parents particularly in terms of determining how that can be accomplished. The role I think for the Federal Government is to help provide some additional funding—be it a relatively small percent of all funding. I think it is important we have some kind of testing that is common throughout the country, so that we can be sure our kids move around when they graduate from college or high school. We need to ensure our schools in Casper, WY, are preparing students as well as they are in Denver or Los Angeles. That is part of today’s world.

I think we have a great opportunity now for better education, and one of which I hope we will certainly take full advantage. As I mentioned before, the Republican plan puts more money in education than the President asked for. But money alone does not provide a good education. I don’t think you can have good education without it, but there are other requirements as well.

You have to have some accountability and much more.

I am delighted and excited about the opportunity to deal with this bill, S. 1. Why? Because it was considered to be the most important issue before the Congress. This was the issue that the President talked more about than any other and it is the issue that has more to do with the future of this country. The people run the Government. The people must be prepared to do that as
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Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of April 6 with respect to conferees to the budget resolution be modified to add Senator BOND and Senator MURRAY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is good to be back in the Chamber. I don’t think we are going to take all of the 4 hours, from what I understand, unless somebody wants to join us. I have two unanimous consent requests, both of which the Senator from North Dakota is aware, and then I will proceed with a few remarks. It won’t be much. Then I will yield, unless he prompts me to give a 2-hour speech, and we will be out.
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well as being successful in a free country and a free market.

Thank you, Madam President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Nelson of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is good to be back in the Chamber. I don’t think we are going to take all of the 4 hours, from what I understand, unless somebody wants to join us. I have two unanimous consent requests, both of which the Senator from North Dakota is aware, and then I will proceed with a few remarks. It won’t be much. Then I will yield, unless he prompts me to give a 2-hour speech, and we will be out.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is good to be back in the Chamber. I don’t think we are going to take all of the 4 hours, from what I understand, unless somebody wants to join us. I have two unanimous consent requests, both of which the Senator from North Dakota is aware, and then I will proceed with a few remarks. It won’t be much. Then I will yield, unless he prompts me to give a 2-hour speech, and we will be out.
where we are going as we go into the conference.

I have prepared this chart in order to help me do that in as efficient a way as I can. In this column, we have what President Bush proposed. The second column is what we proposed in the Democratic alternative. The third column is what the Senate passed. If we look at the top, this is the projected surplus over the next 10 years, and we are all in agreement. The agencies that make these forecasts have told us we can anticipate $5.6 trillion over the next 10 years. I am quick to point out that I would not bet the farm on any 10-year forecast or any 10-year projection. The agency that made this forecast themselves warned us of its uncertainty. They have said very clearly there is only a 10-percent chance that reserved none of it for one true.

There is a 45-percent chance that there will be more money, according to them. There is a 45-percent chance there will be less money.

After the performance of the economy over the past weeks, since the forecast has been made, I would be willing to bet a lot more money that there is going to be less than what is forecast. With that said, that is the official forecast. Then we go to the various elements of the proposals by the President, and by us on our side, and what passed the Senate.

The next major item is the Social Security trust fund. The President forecasts $2.6 trillion of Social Security surplus over this next 10 years. He allocates $2 trillion of it to paying down national debt. We allocated $2.5 trillion to paying down the debt.

By the way, we had a somewhat different estimate by the Congressional Budget Office, the unallocated, uncommitted. We believe that is fully committed to the Medicare trust fund. Unless you use it for that purpose, you hasten the insolvency of the Medicare trust fund. So we don’t believe it is usable for any other purpose, nor should it be.

So in our alternative—again, there is somewhat of a different estimate from the President’s, who estimates there is over $500 billion in that category, and the CBO estimates $400 billion—we reserve all of it for the Medicare trust fund. That is what the final Senate result did as well.

1 should make very clear that while, in total, they reserve the full amount for the Medicare trust fund, in 4 of the years they have raided the Medicare trust fund. In 2002, 2005, 2006, and 2007, they go into the Medicare trust fund to fund other priorities. We don’t support that; we don’t believe in it. We don’t believe any private sector company could do such a thing. We don’t believe we should be doing it either. That left, under the President’s proposal $3.6 trillion and under both the Democratic alternative and what passed the Senate, $2.7 trillion available for other uses.

The President, of the $3.6 trillion in his plan that was available, using $1.6 trillion for a tax cut. We proposed $745 billion. The Senate passed $1.2 trillion—rather halfway in between the two proposals.

Then we go to the question of high-priority domestic needs. The President proposed $212 billion of spending for high-priority areas. We proposed on our side $744 billion. The Senate actually passed $849 billion. The Senate actually passed spending of $105 billion over and above what we on the Democratic side proposed. If you look at the constituent elements, you can see the President proposed on education over the next 10 years $13 billion—a very modest sum of new money in the President’s plan. We don’t believe that is sufficient. We proposed $130 billion to strengthen education in the country. The Senate actually passed $308 billion, which is far more than we proposed and obviously dramatically more than the President proposed.

On defense, the President proposed $515 billion over 10 years. We proposed $311 billion, and the Senate actually passed $300 billion, very close to what we suggested.

On prescription drugs, the President proposed $153 billion over 10 years. We proposed $311 billion, and the Senate actually passed $300 billion, very close to what we suggested.

On agriculture, the President actually proposed a cut of $1 billion. We proposed in our Democratic alternative some $88 billion to match what our major competitors are doing for their producers or match it as closely as we can under current trade law. One can see the Senate actually passed an increase of $58 billion, again somewhere in between our proposal and the President’s proposal.

On agriculture, the President actually proposed a cut of $1 billion. We proposed in our Democratic alternative some $88 billion to match what our major competitors are doing for their producers or match it as closely as we can under current trade law. One can see the Senate actually passed an increase of $58 billion, again somewhere in between our proposal and the President’s proposal.

On agriculture, the President actually proposed a cut of $1 billion. We proposed in our Democratic alternative some $88 billion to match what our major competitors are doing for their producers or match it as closely as we can under current trade law. One can see the Senate actually passed an increase of $58 billion, again somewhere in between our proposal and the President’s proposal.

On agriculture, the President actually proposed a cut of $1 billion. We proposed in our Democratic alternative some $88 billion to match what our major competitors are doing for their producers or match it as closely as we can under current trade law. One can see the Senate actually passed an increase of $58 billion, again somewhere in between our proposal and the President’s proposal.

On agriculture, the President actually proposed a cut of $1 billion. We proposed in our Democratic alternative some $88 billion to match what our major competitors are doing for their producers or match it as closely as we can under current trade law. One can see the Senate actually passed an increase of $58 billion, again somewhere in between our proposal and the President’s proposal.

On agriculture, the President actually proposed a cut of $1 billion. We proposed in our Democratic alternative some $88 billion to match what our major competitors are doing for their producers or match it as closely as we can under current trade law. One can see the Senate actually passed an increase of $58 billion, again somewhere in between our proposal and the President’s proposal.

On agriculture, the President actually proposed a cut of $1 billion. We proposed in our Democratic alternative some $88 billion to match what our major competitors are doing for their producers or match it as closely as we can under current trade law. One can see the Senate actually passed an increase of $58 billion, again somewhere in between our proposal and the President’s proposal.

On agriculture, the President actually proposed a cut of $1 billion. We proposed in our Democratic alternative some $88 billion to match what our major competitors are doing for their producers or match it as closely as we can under current trade law. One can see the Senate actually passed an increase of $58 billion, again somewhere in between our proposal and the President’s proposal.
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Security, but in addition to that, we ought to take money out of this general fund surplus to strengthen Social Security for the long term as well. We believe that is just common sense.

We hope very much before this conference is done that not only will we reserve the trust fund moneys for the trust funds but that we will make an additional commitment in a contribution from general fund surpluses that are projected.

Remember, these are projections. This is not money in the bank. This $5.6 trillion is not money in the bank. This is money that is forecast. That is why we think the President’s proposal is especially unwise because he is taking virtually all of the non-trust-fund money and committing it to a tax cut. We just do not think that is wise. We do not think that is prudent.

We do not think any institution, if they were faced with a similar set of facts, would make this kind of decision. Why would we think we would be going to take virtually all of our non-trust-fund money and put it out in a tax cut or, if you were a private sector enterprise, if you were a company promising a shareholder dividend, lock it in now for the next 10 years, virtually every penny outside the trust funds for the retirement funds of your employees and the health care trust funds of your employees.

That is what the President has proposed.

Is that really what people would do if they were running a company? Is that what they would do? I do not think so. I believe they would pay down their debts to the full extent possible. They would hold the line in the future. Yes, they would have a dividend for the shareholders, but they certainly would not commit all of their non-trust-fund money for that purpose based on a 10-year forecast that the people who made the forecast themselves say is highly uncertain.

Then we have the final differences in the interest costs. The President’s interest cost is $461 billion. Ours is $490 billion. The Senate-passed package will cost $572 billion.

People say to me: Gee, what are you talking about, interest cost? What is that about?

Simply, to the extent we provide a tax cut or we spend money, that requires additional interest costs because to the extent we have a tax cut, to the extent we have additional spending, that reduces the amount that is going to pay down the debt. That means we have more debt than we would otherwise have. That means higher interest costs.

Most of the President’s additional interest cost is generated by his tax cut. In fact, his tax cut that is advertised to cost $1.6 trillion does not cost $1.6 trillion. It costs, just with the interest cost associated with it, at least $2 trillion.

Then, of course, there are other things that have not been factored into the President’s proposal because we know that because of his proposal we are going to have to reform the alternative minimum tax.

The alternative minimum tax currently affects 2 million American taxpayers. Under the President’s proposal, 35 million people are going to be affected, and it costs over $300 billion to fix it. It is nowhere in the President’s budget, but we know that cost is there. We know this Congress is never going to allow one in every four taxpayers in America to be caught up in the alternative minimum tax. It makes no sense. It will not happen, and it should not happen. It costs money to fix it. It is not in the President’s budget, but it should be because it is a hidden cost.

In addition to that, we have the whole series of other things the President has not included that also cost money. We know that certain tax breaks currently provided in law are going to be extended. Research and development is a perfect example. We certainly are not going to change the energy tax credits that are in current law in the middle of an energy crisis, and we should not.

That costs money, but it is not in the President’s proposal. Oh, it is there, it is just not funded, and that is another part of the problem of the President’s plan.

He imposes a lot of costs, but he doesn’t fund them. You can stick your head in the sand and say we will not fund them, but we know the reality is different.

Finally, on the unallocated category, the President has $345 billion; we propose nothing in the unallocated category. What the Senate was $129 billion. On the President’s side of his $345 billion, I hasten to point out that $526 billion of that is from the Medicare trust fund. His unallocated category is really much less than is advertised. About two-thirds of that money is Medicare trust fund money. All of a sudden he uncommits that money. I don’t know from where that idea came. You cannot unallocate it. You cannot uncommit it. It is fully committed. Doing such a thing as the President proposes moves up the insolvency of the Medicare trust fund by 16 years. By 16 years sooner the Medicare trust fund goes broke—sooner than if the money is left where it is supposed to be in the Medicare trust fund.

These are the fundamental differences between what the President Bush proposed, what we proposed on our side, the Democratic alternative, and what actually passed the Senate. The major differences are in the areas where the President proposed a tax cut, twice as big as what we proposed. On the other hand, we proposed $900 billion more in debt reduction than the President proposed. That is the biggest set of differences between the President and the Democrats. He has a tax cut that is about $800 billion more than ours but has about $900 billion more in debt reduction than the President.

There is the fundamental difference between the two sides.

In addition to that, there are also differences in high-priority areas. Let’s review them. In education, we propose far more in new resources for education than does the President. The Senate agreed with us. In fact, it went well beyond our proposal.

On prescription drugs, we proposed twice as much as the President. And the Senate adopted a number very close to what we proposed. There is no magic to this. There is no secret in it. What the President proposed is totally inadequate. Only 25 percent of people are getting the drug benefits. About two-thirds of that under the President’s plan; 25 percent of the people would be helped and 75 percent would not be helped. It is no wonder the Senate adopted a number very close to what the Democrats proposed. Most objective observers say that is what is necessary to provide a meaningful prescription drug benefit.

On defense, we proposed more than the President and more than what passed the Senate.

On agriculture, the final result was somewhere in between. The President proposed a cut—a cut when we are in the midst of an agricultural crisis. It is the worst we have seen in 50 years. The President is proposing less resources. He is proposing the Congress not be able to respond as we have in each of the last 3 years to pass an economic disaster bill for our Nation’s farmers.

It makes no sense. We propose to be able to fund what we have been doing the last 3 years, and the Senate came somewhere in between.

On health coverage, another major difference, the President proposed no new resources. We proposed $30 billion. The Senate, again, was somewhere in between. As I see it, those are major differences. Those are the issues that will have to be resolved in a conference committee. The House plan is close to what the President proposed.

I say to the conferees, you will have to resolve the differences between what the Senate proposed or the conference report simply will not pass in this body. That tells me we will have to make adjustments. The President’s tax cut plan will have to be reduced. There will have to be more resources for education, prescription drug benefits, our Nation’s defense, and agriculture than what the President has proposed and what the House has adopted.

Also, I hope we come out with a report that will have better funded the Senate or the House with respect to strengthening Social Security for the long term. Nothing has been done—nothing in the House or Senate
versions—to strengthen Social Security for the long term. It has gotten almost no attention, it is going to receive little. It will require the attention at the end of this 10-year period when the baby boomers start to retire and the surpluses today turn into massive deficits. That is why we ought to take this opportunity with our surpluses to strengthen Social Security for the future. That is our responsibility. That is our obligation. We ought to take it seriously. I hope the conference will.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, obviously I have on numerous occasions in the Senate Chamber discussed these issues, and on many of them I disagree with the President and lead us to prosperity. I certainly appreciate his thoughts as to what kind of conference report we will have to have in order for it to pass. He suggests it will have to be close to the Senate version. I don’t know how anyone else can accept anything like the version passed in the Senate. Nonetheless, we will proceed. We will work carefully to make sure we have enough people in the Senate willing to vote on final passage.

I certainly don’t go there operating on the premise discussed with the ranking member on how to get that done. We have to be careful and accept some of the Senate wishes. We certainly don’t have to accept them all.

I will go back in history for a moment. The Presiding Officer is a member of the committee and will probably recall on January 23 Dr. Alan Greenspan appeared before the committee. That was the first testimony before a committee by Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, during this post-December era, where some serious changes in the American economy became very public and notorious. I have confidence that Alan Greenspan is correct in suggesting the “new” economy is here to stay and the comeback will be in the new economy along with the old economy. The future is built on the new economy which took us through these years of prosperity and which he assumes will come back in due course and lead us to prosperity and which he assumes will come back in due course and lead us to prosperity and which he assumes will come back in due course and lead us to prosperity and which he assumes will come back in due course and lead us to prosperity.

The House is a little higher than 1.6 in total taxes for a 10-year period. They don’t have very much allowed for this year, the year we are in, in which we have a very large surplus for the rest of Government. It does not take anything out of Social Security or Medicare. What ought to happen is we ought to get out of this conference quickly, recognize some of the other issues where clearly we disagree, and then we ought to prove to the American people that we can get something done. I think getting something done means a tax bill that will come out of the Finance Committee under our reconciliation instructions, which we debated thoroughly and the Senate decided to do that by a 51–49 vote. We decided our committee would work under the expedited process and get us a tax bill.

I am very hopeful they will find a way to allocate back to the American people as much of the surplus that exists for the year 2001—which we said in our Senate resolution was up to $85 billion, which actually in my estimation I introduced was up to $60 billion—but somewhere in that area. I hope they will find a way. I hope they will apply their wills to finding a way to get back in circulation somewhere between $60 billion and $85 billion, meaning this year Americans will get some tax money back in their hands.

I do not hear anybody who thinks that is anything but the right thing to do. We ought to show the American people we are working in harmony with the Congress. That is how we affect the current short-term problems in the economy, hoping if we right them, and if there is a way, that will bring into play a long-term growth all of us very much desire for our people.

In addition, with that same bill under the expedited process—kind of the hurry-up-and-get-it-done process to show Americans you can do it in a timely manner, the part which is called reconciliation—I hope we will produce a tax bill that is the remainder of what we agree upon.

In the House they say $1.6 trillion over 11 years. We say $1.3 trillion over 11 years. Whatever the number, I hope they do the early stimulus as I have described and then proceed to give us some long-term tax reductions.

Why did I start with Dr. Alan Greenspan? Because I want to close with him. This year, on January 23, and previously to this on two occasions, addressing the issue of surplus and what we should do with it, he said: You should pay the debt down as much as possible. No. 1; No. 2, he did not just say cut taxes, he said reduce or cut marginal tax rates. We asked him, How do we help the economy? That was the precursor question to the answer I just gave. First, pay down the debt as much as possible. Second, reduce or cut marginal tax rates.

I know a lot of people say: Let’s help the economy. But then they say: I don’t know about this marginal rate business. We would like to do other things.

It would be nice to do other things, but the truth of the matter is we are behind from the very best that if you do have a surplus that you are going to give back to the people, and you are in a mode of doing right-now stimulus because we already addressed that issue, do that as much as you can, the answer has been: To help the economy, reduce marginal rates.

I regret to say what was not said was reduce marginal rates for halfway up the tax structure and not the other half. What has been said is reduce the marginal rates. We hope when our work under the expedited process and will get a bill that helps with the long-term economy in the mode and manner discussed by Dr. Greenspan every year for the last three when we addressed surpluses.

I do not choose today to get into an argument about how much debt reduction is the right amount. My good friend from New Mexico thinks we voted more than we voted in in the Senate, we should have more than I provided in the underlying proposal, and more than the President suggested. But we think we have a very good debt reduction proposal and still can have a good number for tax cuts. We believe when you start with debts—the U.S. Government has debts taking about 17 percent of the budget—and we can say to the public at the end of this time it will be down to between 5 percent and 2 percent, we think we are making a giant stride in reducing the public debt.

I have in my mind showing a pie graph of where the Government money goes. People always say: Why so much to the debt? Because we have a lot of debt. How much are you going to reduce it? We are going to reduce it down to where that silver, that piece, is going to be between 5 percent and 7 percent; that is going to be the cost restraining. In my opinion that is exactly what we ought to do.

I want to close with one thought. Frankly, I hear the ranking member
from the other side, whom I admire and respect, I hear him talking about whether we want to agree and find out that we have the surplus of $5.6 trillion over a decade. I want to remind every- body those who have figured the numbers and the variables on what might happen if we dig—when for people to ask them which is it going to be, the $11 trillion that it might be or the $1.6 trillion that it might be or the $5.6 trillion—that 50 percent or 75 percent. I think, where the lines end up when you do a model and ask them—if you have to decide which one is right the answer is, use $5.6 trillion.

We can do anything we would like. We could use $2 trillion as the starting point and say that is all we can expect. Some folks say $6 trillion. Instead of $5.6 trillion, you ought to use $7.5 trillion or $8 trillion because it could be much higher. I think the number that has been chosen, $5.6 trillion, from which you will pay Medicare for sure, from which you will pay for all the Social Security indebtedness that we have—every penny that belongs in that trust fund is used to pay that debt down—when you end up doing that, I think you have a very balanced package and that leaves open the issue of how much do we spend.

Those who are interested have seen the divergence of how we spend, how we spend under what I will call the Democratic proposal, how we would do it under the Domenici proposal, and how we would do that under the proposal that passed the Senate. Clearly, in the Senate, many amendments were accepted on the side of either entitle- ments or appropriation expectations—the amount we can use in appropri- ations. Many were accepted on the floor and nobody should believe we are going to take all of those and accept them all in a conference with the House which has started with the President’s num- ber. There has to be some give and some take. I think that will happen.

I look forward to chairing the con- ference in a spirit of getting it done as quickly as we can so we can get on with passing the bills that will carry it out and stopping as quickly as we can the debate of what we ought to do and get into a mode of what we are going to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen- ator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, there is clearly an area of major agreement be- tween the two sides. That is the need for fiscal stimulus now. We had in our budget resolution $60 billion in budget stimulus this year, in the year 2001. Maybe I should point for people to understand the differences between what I was talking about and the budget for the years 2002 through 2011. But we are in the year 2001 right now. So when we compare the tax cut under the Bush budget and our proposal and what passed the Senate, we are talking about years from 2003 through 2011. The President proposed $1.6 tril- lion. For that period we proposed $745 billion. The Senate passed something roughly in between. But this does not cover the year 2001, the year we are in right now.

Both Senator DOMENICI in his budget proposal, and me in ours, proposed $60 billion of budget stimulus this year, fi- nancial stimulus this year, fiscal stim- ulus now to give a lift to this economy. That actually passed the Senate was even more generous, $85 billion of fiscal stimulus for the year 2001.

What Senator DOMENICI is saying is perhaps we cannot do quite that much in conference, and perhaps we cannot. Money for the purposes intended available outside of the trust funds of Medicare and Social Security, so we know we have budgeted already enough money to accommodate a fiscal stimulus of up to $85 billion without invading the trust funds of Medicare and Social Se- curity, and we are obviously in very close agreement on this question. I think the American people should take heart from that, that we are going to be working together, fighting together, trying to put together a fiscal stimulus package for this year, the year we are in right now, 2001, to get out to the American people to give some lift to this economy. And that would be a good thing to do.

The chairman made mention of a number of other issues that we have talked about in the past—how much debt reduction can you do? We have a disagreement on this question. We be- lieve we can do more debt reduction than they have proposed, certainly than the President has proposed.

I note that the Senate agreed with our position. The Senate provided a good deal more debt reduction than the President has said that he believes is possible. That was a good outcome. I hope we do not shrink from that.

But the place we really did not do as well is in strengthening Social Secu- rity for the long term and beyond the trust funds themselves. All of us know just saving the trust fund money for Social Security double. That is the major difference. So that is the major difference.

That is why on our side we believe not only should we reserve all of the trust fund money for the Social Secu- rity and Medicare trust funds, but then, in addition to that, we ought to take some of the general fund money and use that to strengthen Social Secu- rity for the long term because that is what it is going to take to do the job and to prevent a massive buildup of debt over the 15 years to dig out. I do not want to repeat that exercise. That put our country in a deep hole. It took us 15 years to dig out. I do not want to be digging out for the next 15 years.

The difference between the 1980s and now is that in the 1980s you had time to dig out. If we make a mistake now, there is no time to dig out because in 11 years the baby boom generation starts to retire, and then these surplus dollars in the number of people eligible for Medicare and Social Security double. That is what is going to happen. We know it. It is not a projection. The people are
Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, on April 6 my colleagues and I introduced the Medicare and Medicaid Nursing Services Quality Improvement Act of 2001. This legislation is intended to help address a problem currently facing nursing homes in North Dakota and Wisconsin and potentially other nursing homes across the country.

I know that many nursing homes nationwide are facing a looming staffing crisis that is expected to worsen as the baby boomers reach retirement. An American Health Care Association report, entitled “Staffing of Nursing Services in Long Term Care,” estimates that the need for registered nurses will grow 66 percent between 1991 and 2020 and the number of licensed practical nurses needed will grow by nearly 72 percent over the same time. Likewise, the number of nurse aides who will be necessary is projected to grow by 69 percent.

In my State, nursing home administrators have a thousand open nurse aide positions that they have been unable to fill. A number of nursing home administrators in North Dakota have told me that they have had to refuse patients because they do not have adequate staff to care for them.

Unfortunately, a problem has arisen in my State that will exacerbate this staffing shortage. By way of background, North Dakota nursing homes have been using trained resident assistants —called feeding assistants in North Dakota—to help feed nursing home patients. This legislation is intended to address a problem currently facing many nursing homes in North Dakota and Wisconsin. In particular, the number of resident assistants needed is projected to grow by nearly 72 percent over the same time.

I appreciate the superb job the National Guard does in operating the National Guard. The United States Customs Service, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, are dedicated professionals committed to protecting our great nation from the devastating affects of the illegal drug trade. They are frequently called to place their lives in harm’s way in an effort to keep our national security.

As announced by the Attorney General in January 2001, DEA successfully concluded a 10-month narcotics trafficking investigation named Operation White Horse, that involved the movement of heroin by “swallowers” from Colombia to the United States via the cities of Philadelphia and New York. Sixty-five members of the organization, from the Colombia headquarters to the street-level dealers, were arrested in what was described as a “wholesale dismantling” of the smuggling organization.

The United States Customs Service also had an impressive spring 2001, including a recent week on the Southwest border that netted 61 drug seizures, yielding 5,449 pounds of marijuana and 82 pounds of cocaine, as well as 16 export violations, 6 seizures of prohibited medications, and additional seizures of marijuana, cocaine, imported vehicles, counterfeit credit cards, and illegal fireworks. The Customs Service is rapidly distinguishing itself with the front-line use of X-ray, Gamma-ray, and other non-intrusive technologies at their inspection stations and ports of entry. Customs also completed major domestic and international child pornography cases involving Germany and Russia, as well as continued interdiction of large amounts of the drug Ecstasy.

Coast Guard successes, supported by the Department of Defense, include a 6-day period in February 2001 when it seized 28,845 pounds of cocaine and arrested 24 smugglers, on numerous vessels in both the Caribbean and Eastern Pacific. To date, the Coast Guard has seized 60,636 pounds of cocaine, 20,194 pounds of marijuana, as well as interdicted 1,681 illegal migrants at sea, all in a period of 10-percent operational reduction from the previous year.

Finally, I appreciate the superb job the National Guard does in operating the four domestic counterdrug training schools, and hopefully soon a fifth one in Iowa, throughout the country that provide much needed training of Federal, State, local, and community personnel in various topics.

I am extremely proud of these successes and the personnel involved. As we consider the budgets for these agencies in the weeks ahead, we need to remind ourselves from time to time that it is real, flesh-and-blood individuals out there on the front lines and not bland numbers on spreadsheets and in our briefing books. Their commitment does us all proud.

NURSING SERVICES QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, on April 6 my colleagues and I introduced the Medicare and Medicaid Nursing Services Quality Improvement Act of 2001. This legislation is intended to help address a problem currently facing nursing homes in North Dakota and Wisconsin and potentially other nursing homes across the country.

I know that many nursing homes nationwide are facing a looming staffing crisis that is expected to worsen as the baby boomers reach retirement. An American Health Care Association report, entitled “Staffing of Nursing Services in Long Term Care,” estimates that the need for registered nurses will grow 66 percent between 1991 and 2020 and the number of licensed practical nurses needed will grow by nearly 72 percent over the same time. Likewise, the number of nurse aides who will be necessary is projected to grow by 69 percent.

In my State, nursing home administrators have a thousand open nurse aide positions that they have been unable to fill. A number of nursing home administrators in North Dakota have told me that they have had to refuse patients because they do not have adequate staff to care for them.

Unfortunately, a problem has arisen in my State that will exacerbate this staffing shortage. By way of background, North Dakota nursing homes have been using trained resident assistants —called feeding assistants in North Dakota—to help feed nursing home patients. This has been the practice for the last decade with positive results. The data in North Dakota indicates that our nursing home patients experience less weight loss and dehydration than patients nationally, and nursing home officials in North Dakota attribute this to the use of resident assistants.

The problem, however, is that the Health Care Financing Administration has told North Dakota and other nursing homes that they can no longer continue to use these trained resident assistants because they lack certification. In North Dakota, this means that hundreds of resident assistants may need to be laid off later this year.
even while my State’s nursing homes are experiencing difficulty finding certified aide staff.

The bill that I introduced along with Senators KOHL and CONRAD would allow North Dakota and Wisconsin to continue using resident assistants for feeding and hydration, while a demonstration project is conducted in our states and others to evaluate what kind of impact the use of these staff has on the quality of feeding and hydration services provided to nursing home patients and on the recruitment and retention of nursing staff. If after the three-year demonstration project, the Secretary of Health and Human Services determines that the use of resident assistants does not result in a reduction in the quality of feeding and hydration of nursing home residents or in a decrease in the need for certified nursing staff, other nursing homes around the country would be allowed to use resident assistants to help with feeding and hydration tasks.

This legislation includes a number of safeguards designed to protect nursing home patients. For instance, nursing homes are prohibited from using resident assistants to replace existing nursing staff or to count these assistants toward minimum nursing staffing requirements. In addition, resident assistants would have to complete a state-approved training program related to the feeding and hydration tasks they would be performing. Of course, nursing homes would not be able to use resident assistants to administer medication, provide direct medical care, or perform other nursing tasks.

I recognize that this bill is not the only answer or the whole answer for addressing the staffing crisis in nursing homes. In fact, because they do not have the minimum certified nursing staff, other nursing homes in North Dakota will suffer.

One resident assistant in North Dakota told me about a patient she feeds who has difficulty holding her head up when she eats. The resident assistant said that when she was on vacation, her patient lost seven pounds. Fortunately, after a few weeks back on the job, the resident assistant got her patient’s weight back up to where it needed to be. However, if this resident assistant was forced to leave her post permanently, that weight loss may have been long-term and ultimately life-threatening.

I believe that Medicare and Medicaid Nursing Services Quality Improvement Act is a step that Congress can take to address both the staffing shortage and the malnutrition of patients. This is not the only solution and it may not be the best solution, but I hope my colleagues will work with Senator KOHL, Senator CONRAD and me to tackle these serious issues confronting long-term care facilities and their patients.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, April 20, 2001, the Federal debt stood at $5,713,631,168,647.61. Five trillion, seven hundred thirteen billion, six hundred thirty-one million, one hundred forty-eight thousand, six hundred four billion, sixty-one cents during the past 25 years.

AdDITIONAL STATEMENTS

MORmEOUSc SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, 25 years ago the National Medical Association and other prominent organizations endorsed the development of the Medical School at Morehouse College in Atlanta, GA. This came in light of studies that revealed a severe shortage of African American and other minority physicians in the United States, particularly in Georgia and second, that African Americans suffered disproportionately from major diseases. Since its inception, Morehouse School of Medicine has worked to help solve our nation’s health care crisis by graduating top-quality physicians who dedicate themselves to serving the more than 32 million people in this country who live in medically neglected communities. More than 80 percent of Morehouse School of Medicine graduates practice in underserved communities. Each year, the School graduates five times the national average of African Americans completing their stents, leaving credentialed medical schools in this country.

Since 1975, Morehouse School of Medicine has grown from an entry class of 25 students to a current 40 students per class. Each year, over 20,000 Georgians who are disadvantaged students are identified by approximately 50 community health promotion projects sponsored by Morehouse School of Medicine, these projects include prevention initiatives associated with substance abuse, teen pregnancy, geriatric services, cancer, lead poisoning and violence prevention. In addition to the Medical School’s activities in community health promotion, Morehouse School of Medicine provides about 25,000 patient encounters for approximately 10,000 people per year in community clinics throughout metropolitan Atlanta area. The student body of Morehouse School of Medicine continues to excel and 100 percent of the institution’s family medicine and surgery residents passed their board exams in their first sitting for 2 years in a row.

These accomplishments stem in part from the strong leadership of Morehouse School of Medicine’s founding dean and president, Louis W. Sullivan, M.D, who has been with the Medical School since its inception. Aside from his years in Washington as U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Sullivan has dedicated his life’s work to producing top-quality physicians. During his tenure, Morehouse School of Medicine established several programs. These include a 4-year undergraduate medical education program, seven residency programs and several centers of excellence including the National Center for Primary Care, the Neuroscience Institute, the Cardiovascular Institute and the NASA/Space Medicine and Life Science Research Center, the first of its kind at a minority medical institution.

Dr. Sullivan has worked tirelessly to provide vision and direction for the institution’s future, while continuing to preserve the very best traditions of its past. Morehouse School of Medicine,
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which were referred to the appropriate States submitting sundry nominations from the President of the United States. The people of our state look upon them with tremendous reverence in the area of customer satisfaction.

New Hampshire Postal Employees have been honored along with four other districts in the nation receiving the Order of the Yellow Jersey Award for Excellence in customer service. This prestigious award is based on the percentage of residential customers who rate the postal service employees as excellent in four areas: overall performance, courteous and friendly clerks, consistency of mail delivery and accuracy of mail delivery.

The Postal Employees of the New Hampshire Performance Cluster have provided dedicated service to the citizens of our state. The people of our state look upon them with tremendous gratitude for all that they have done.

It is an honor and a privilege to serve the Postal Employees of the New Hampshire Performance Center in the United States.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-1395. A communication from the General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Office of Inspector General and the designation of an Acting Inspector General, to the Committee on Intelligence.

EC-1396. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certification of Evidence for Proof of Service" (RIN2900–AJ55) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-1397. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering those cases in which equitable relief was granted for 2000; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-1398. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Office of Inspector General Strategic Plan for 2001 through 2006; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-1399. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering those cases in which equitable relief was granted for 2000; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-1400. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the Imposition of Foreign Export Controls for Exports to Persons in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Inducers of the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1401. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Food Starch-Modified by Amylolytic Enzymes" (Doc. No. 99F–2082) received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1402. A communication from the President of the United States Institute of Peace, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the discontinuation of service in acting role of Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1403. A communication from the Chairwoman of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance" (Doc. No. FEMA–7750) received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1404. A communication from the Attorney General, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the discontinuation of service in acting role of Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1405. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the annual performance evaluation for fiscal year 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1406. A communication from the Director of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Recreational Programs" (RIN1630–ZA12) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-1407. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of the Wassenaar Arrangement List of Dual-Use Items; Revisions to Export Control List of Foreign Blind Switches and Other Revisions" (RIN9694–AC30) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1408. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Entity List: Revisions and Additions" (RIN0694–AB90) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1409. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certification of Evidence for Proof of Service" (RIN2900–AJ55) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-1410. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance" (Doc. No. FEMA–7750) received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1411. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Additives Permitted for Direct Addition to Food for Human Consumption; Food Starch-Modified by Amylolytic Enzymes" (Doc. No. 99F–2082) received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1412. A communication from the Chairman of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance" (Doc. No. FEMA–7750) received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1413. A communication from the Attorney General, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the discontinuation of service in acting role of Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1414. A communication from the Director of Regulations Policy and Management, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices; Reclassification of Six Classes of Medical Devices to a New Class 'Class III Devices into Class II'" (Doc. No. 99N–0035) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food" (Doc. No. 94F-0008) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–1386. A communication from the Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Acquisition and Technology, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Animal Feed and Pet Food; Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food" (Doc. No. 94F-2799) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–9. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the State of Kansas relative to the assistance with Gulf War Illness; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs: House Resolution 2049.

Whereas, Nearly 700,000 members of the United States armed forces, including 7,500 Kansans, deployed to the Persian Gulf region during 1990 and 1991 to participate in Operation Desert Shield – Desert Storm to liberate Kuwait; and

Whereas, These Gulf War veterans have been, and continue to be, afflicted by an abnormally high rate of unexplained health problems. To date federal research efforts have not identified the prevalence, patterns,
Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives be directed to provide an enrolled copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and to each member of the Kansas Congressional delegation; to the Governor of the State of Kansas, the Secretary of Health and Environment, the Secretary of Human Resources, and the Chairman of the Kansas Commission on Veterans Affairs; and to the National and State Commanders of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans, National Retired Officers Association, National Retired Enlisted Association and the National Order of the Purple Heart.

POM–10. A resolution adopted by the Brook Park City Council in the State of Ohio relative to the steel industry; to the Committee on Finance.

POM–11. A petition from a citizen of the State of Georgia relative to Senator Max Cleland; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

POM–12. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas relative to the establishment of a federal energy policy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 1607

WHEREAS, The nation faces a growing shortage of domestic oil and the world may face petroleum shortages in the next fifty years; and

WHEREAS, Natural gas has risen dramatically in price because demand has increased faster than supplies are discovered; and

WHEREAS, Domestic consumers are faced with ever-increasing price spikes and lowered expectations of the market meeting the demand for energy; and

WHEREAS, The American association of petroleum geologists, in concert with other scientific professional learned societies, is concerned that America’s families and businesses will have the necessary tools to address the need for a national energy supply and to look for new sources of energy; and

WHEREAS, The United States does not have a public policy on energy. Now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Senate of the State of Kansas, the House of Representatives concurring there- in, That the legislature of the state of Kan- sas encourages the development of a federal energy policy that considers all possible fu- ture sources of energy; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be di- rected to send enrolled copies of this resolu- tion to the President of the United States; Major- ity Leader and Minority Leader of the United States Senate; the Speaker, Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives; the Secre- tary of the United States Department of Energy; to each member of the Kansas Con- gressional Delegation; and to the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, P.O. Box 979, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101-9779.

POM–13. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas rel- ative to life time health care benefits for military retirees and their families; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 5011

WHEREAS, Insomuch as many of our citizens have risen to the defense and safeguard of our state and nation, this Concurrent Reso- lution recognizes and acknowledges the contribution these veterans of military serv- ice have made to the state of all our citi- zens, and we ask the Congress of the United States to acknowledge these retired veterans by continuing to support and improve their quality of life through extended health care; and

WHEREAS, This population of retired vet- erans served during foreign and domestic cri- ses of the 20th century, where their involve- ment with names such as Ardennes, Wake, Guadalcanal, Normandy, Bastogne and Iwo Jima earned our nation’s highest respect and accolades; while other names not so common to America were added during the Korean conflict, like Inchon and Choson; later came other Asian names like DaNang, Khe Sanh, Hue and Quang Tri; places these vet- erans know all too well as a battleground which tested their will to survive and return; and

WHEREAS, These retired veterans now con- stitute a significant portion of the aging population in this country and, in particular, our state; and

WHEREAS, These retired veterans were guar- anteed through contract, both stated and im- plied, lifetime access to medical benefits for themselves and their immediate family members upon retirement for serving their nation selflessly and honorably for 20 years or more; and

WHEREAS, Prior to retirement at age 65 years, this population were provided health care service through the military health care system or through other U.S. Department of Defense programs; however, upon reaching the age of 65 years and through recent Federal regulatory changes in entitlements for military health care benefits, these individuals that served the nation and their family members are significant portions of their health care support system; and

WHEREAS, The medical benefits which were lost through changes in Federal legislation forced these retired veterans to pay out-of- pocket for medical coverage from alternative sources; and those changes forced these citi- zens into omnibus national health care pro- grams, such as Medicare; and

WHEREAS, Many retired veterans and their immediate family members live on fixed in- comes where the loss of medical benefits sig- nificantly impacts their quality of life, dis- rupts their needed levels of care and puts out of reach certain health care capabilities and pharmaceutical support to which they had been previously entitled; and

WHEREAS, Many of these retired veterans suffering from service connected injuries, se- rious illnesses, or medically-related quality of life developments have found that their access to medical treatment facilities is now limited due to significant downsizing or in many rural areas be it Kansas nonexistent; and

WHEREAS, These honorable men and women of Kansas and of this nation who have sac- rificed for our freedom and theнологes coun- try are deserving of the health care pro- grams to sustain their quality of life that they were guaranteed for 20 or more years of unhampered service; and

WHEREAS, The Legislature of the state of Kansas has a special charge to safeguard and

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be di- rected to send enrolled copies of this resolu- tion to the President of the United States; Major- ity Leader and Minority Leader of the United States Senate; the Speaker, Majority Leader and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives; the Secre- tary of the United States Department of Energy; to each member of the Kansas Con- gressional Delegation; and to the American Association of Petroleum Geologists, P.O. Box 979, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74101-9779.
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maintain the quality of life for its citizens that has earned it a reputation from military service: Now, therefore, be it
Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Kansas, the Senate concurring therein, That the Kansas Legislature respectfully requests and petition its Congressional representatives of the United States to address, for rectification, the aforementioned concerns, and so that the health care coverage of our retired military veterans and their immediate families; and be it further
Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send enrolled copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the president pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each member of the Kansas Congressional Delegation.


JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the United States, generally and the western states specially are experiencing severe energy shortages, particularly a shortage of electrical energy; and
Whereas, modern electric generation facilities are urgently needed to prevent these shortages and the damaging consequence of these shortages as they permeate the economy; and
Whereas, in recent years the timely construction of these necessary facilities has been obstructed through endless litigation and other delaying tactics; and
Whereas, the majority of people of the State of Wyoming desire to pursue sound energy and economic development; and
Whereas, Wyoming is richly endowed with natural resources, including Powder River Basin super compliant coal and Wyoming gas and oil that could solve the pending electrical energy supply crisis: Now, therefore, be it
Resolved By The Members of the legislature of the State of Wyoming:
1. That the President, the Vice-President, the Congress and the Executive Branch of the federal government are urged to immediately secure the construction of critically needed new electric generation facilities, oil, and gas pipeline and transmission facilities using Wyoming Powder River Basin super compliant coal, Wyoming gas and oil that could solve the pending electrical energy supply crisis.
2. That the United States Congress is urged to enact any legislation that will support the construction of energy and electric generation facilities, transmission facilities and gas pipelines.
3. That the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice-President of the United States, the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the United States Secretary of Energy, and the Wyoming Congressional Delegation.

POM–15. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relative to the metal industry; to the Committee on Energy and Public Transportation.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Metal manufacturing is integral to the economy of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, employing over 72,900 workers in the primary metal industry and 86,200 workers in the fabricated metal products industry; and
Whereas, The American steel industry holds a strong position in the history of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for its contribution to business and industry; and
Whereas, The American steel industry plays a vital role in national security, which depends on a strong domestic steel economy, and in our national defense, which relies on a strong steel manufacturing base, including concern for America and our allies; and
Whereas, The specialty steel industry, which includes stainless steel, tool steel and other alloyed metal steel, holds an important position in the economic and industrial history of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the United States and has made significant improvements to restructure, modernize and become a world leader in productivity and competitiveness; and
Whereas, The current economic and financial crises in Russia, Asia and other foreign nations have involved severe devaluation of the currencies of several primary steel producing and consuming countries along with a collapse in the domestic demand for steel and specialty steel in these countries; and
Whereas, The crises have generated and will continue to generate surges of steel imports into the United States, flooding the American market with foreign steel and foreign steel products at prices severely below production cost, thereby disadvantaging the American steel industry and its workers and families in the marketplace while the United States is still providing all remedies available under our Nation’s Fund, continues to participate in a massive financial bailout of these countries in a manner that encourages exports; and
Whereas, Imports of specialty steel from foreign producers are being dumped into this country in large quantities at unfair, below-market prices, contributing significantly to reduced employment and investments in employment for American workers; and
Whereas, The dumping of stainless steel plate in coils and other specialty steel is prevalent in the United States market, causing an adverse impact on domestic steel production and the thousands of jobs in this Commonwealth and throughout the Nation which are associated with the regular and specialty steel industry; and
Whereas, Recent reports confirm that this country is headed for a downturn in the economy, thereby requiring prompt Federal action and initiatives; and
Whereas, Recent reports confirm that 14 steel companies have filed for bankruptcy protection, and the impact of this problem goes well beyond one industry; and
Whereas, Statistics over the last three years have proven that the dumping of foreign steel into the American marketplace has had a devastating economic effect on American jobs; and
Whereas, There is a serious need for improvements in the enforcement of United States trade laws to provide an effective response to this problem; and
Whereas, The American steel industry has repeatedly requested that the Federal government take all remedies available under trade laws, including duties relating to stainless steel plate in coils; (2) continue to impose antidumping duties on stainless steel plate in coils from these foreign nations; (3) work to establish a more equitable distribution of the burden of accepting imports of specialty steel from foreign nations; (4) establish the appropriate forum or mechanism for executive branch interagency cooperation to closely monitor imports of stainless steel and special stainless steel plate in coils; and (5) report to the Congress of the United States as soon as possible a comprehensive, workable plan for addressing all steel imports, including the negative effects on employment, prices and investments in the American specialty and regular steel industry; and
Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the United States Trade Representative and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM–17. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia relative to Interstate Route 81 corridor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

JOINT RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Virginia portion of Interstate Route 81 is among the most heavily traveled highway corridors in the United States; and
Whereas, Interstate Route 81 was originally designed to accommodate ten percent truck traffic, but, over time, the percentage of truck traffic has continued to grow, until the highway’s traffic today is composed of approximately forty percent trucks; and
Whereas, this large number of heavy vehicles not only contributes to traffic congestion and exacerbates the severity of highway crashes, but also increases the frequency and the cost of highway maintenance and reconstruction on Interstate Route 81 and other highways in the corridor; and
Whereas, transferring freight from highway trucks to rail saves fuel, reduces congestion, minimizes air and water pollution, reduces highway maintenance and reconstruction costs, and promotes safety; and
Whereas, Interstate Route 81 is paralleled for its entire length through Virginia by a rail line through much of which is engineered and constructed more than 100 years ago, and which does not currently provide a competitive alternative to the use of Interstate Route 81 by heavy trucks; and
Whereas, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation has studied whether improvements to the parallel rail infrastructure are likely to result in the diversion of some of the interstate heavy truck traffic from Interstate Route 81 to the railroad, and whether investing public funds in improving the railroad infrastructure would result in measureable benefit to the public; and
Whereas, the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation study concluded that specified improvements to the rail infrastructure in the Interstate Route 81 corridor could divert the railroad as much as 19 percent of the interstate truck traffic, and substantially reduce accidents. Reduced fuel consumption, reduced air and water pollution, reduced accidents, and is clearly in the public interest; and
Whereas, public funding of improvements to the railroad infrastructure, together with completion of the scheduled improvements to Interstate Route 81, would provide an example to the nation of the significant public benefits resulting from the use of public funds to provide a rail alternative for the transportation of interstate freight; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, the House of Delegates concurring, That the United States Congress be urged to appropriate funds for improvement of rail infrastructure in the Interstate Route 81 corridor. Such improvement shall ensure that the railroad that parallels Interstate Route 81 in Virginia provides a viable alternative to the use of Interstate Route 81 for the movement of interstate freight traffic; and, be it

Resolved further, That the General Assembly of Virginia support the conclusions of the study conducted by the Virginia Department of Rail and Public Transportation and commend it to the United States Congress for consideration; and, be it

Resolved finally, That the Clerk of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of Transportation, and the members of the Virginia Congressional Delegation in order that they may be apprised of the Sense of the General Assembly in this matter.

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. GRASSLEY:

S. 756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credit for electricity produced from biomass, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPECTER:


ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 21

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to establish an off-budget lockbox to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

S. 133

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 152

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire) was added as a cosponsor of S. 152, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the 60-month limit and increase the income limitation on the student loan interest deduction.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. Reid, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 170, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces disabled as a result of service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability.

S. 225

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. CARNANAH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the manner in which pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs for postmasters are established.

S. 219

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 219, a bill to suspend for two years the definition of “refunding transaction” under section 49(b)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to foster greater multilateral cooperation in international counternarcotics programs, and for other purposes.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for partnerships in character education.

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 326, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 15 percent reduction in payment rates under the prospective payment system for home health services and to permanently increase payments for such services that are furnished in rural areas.
At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 388, a bill to protect the energy and security of the United States and decrease America's dependency on foreign oil sources to 50 percent by the year 2011 by enhancing the use of renewable energy resources, conserving energy resources, improving energy efficiencies, and increasing domestic energy supplies; improve environmental quality by reducing emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases; mitigate the effect of increases in energy prices on the American consumer, including the poor and the elderly; and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 389, a bill to protect the energy and security of the United States and decrease America's dependency on foreign oil sources to 50 percent by the year 2011 by enhancing the use of renewable energy resources, conserving energy resources, improving energy efficiencies, and increasing domestic energy supplies; improve environmental quality by reducing emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases; mitigate the effect of increases in energy prices on the American consumer, including the poor and the elderly; and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 440, a bill to establish a National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a program to support research and training in methods of detecting the use of performance-enhancing drugs by athletes, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLMAN) were added as co-sponsors of S. 497, a bill to express the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should field currently available weapons, other technologies, tactics and operational concepts that provide suitable alternatives to anti-personnel mines and mixed anti-tank mine systems and that the United States should end its use of such mines and join the Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Mines as soon as possible, to expand support for mine action programs including mine victim assistance, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICE) were added as co-sponsors of S. 590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit for health insurance costs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. McCAIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 655, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from income taxation income derived from natural resources-related activity by a member of an Indian tribe directly or through a qualified Indian entity.

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 656, a bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain nationals of Liberia to that of lawful permanent resident.

At the request of Mr. McCAIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 660, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the issuance of tax-exempt bonds by Indian tribal governments, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHAIQ) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 707, a bill to provide grants for special environmental assistance for the regulation of communities and habitat (''SEARCH grants'') to small communities.

At the request of Mr. McCAIN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) were added as co-sponsors of S. 718, a bill to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a program to support research and training in methods of detecting the use of performance-enhancing drugs by athletes, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 742, a bill to provide for pension reform, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) were added as co-sponsors of S. Res. 66, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the release of twenty-four United States military personnel currently being detained by the People's Republic of China.

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) were added as co-sponsors of S. Con. Res. 14, a concurrent resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it.

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as co-sponsors of S. Con. Res. 24, a concurrent resolution expressing support for a National Reflex Sympathetic Dystrophy (RSD) Awareness Month.

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) were added as co-sponsors of S. Con. Res. 28, a concurrent resolution calling for a
United States effort to end restrictions on the freedoms and human rights of the enclaved people in the occupied area of Cyprus.

STATMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 756. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credit for electricity produced from biomass, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce important tax legislation to help address the current energy shortage in our country. The legislation, entitled the “Growing Renewable Energy for Emerging Needs [GREEN] Act,” will extend and expand the tax credit for homegrown, clean-burning, renewable biomass.

As many of my colleagues know, I authorized the section 45 credit in the Senate in 1980. It was included in the Energy Policy Act of 1992. However, the tax credit for the production of energy from biomass is set to expire on January 1, 2002. For this reason, I am introducing legislation to extend and expand the credit to help sustain the many benefits derived from biomass.

Last month, I introduced S. 530 to extend the wind energy portion of section 45, which has been extremely successful. Today’s bill is to extend and expand the biomass portion of section 45 to include technologies such as biomass combustion and cofiring biomass with coal-fired facilities. Formerly, section 45 only allowed the use of closed-loop biomass (such as paper that is commonly recycled from paper that is available to be recycled, and other crop by-products or residues). The clean, controlled combustion of biomass, which consists of sawdust, tree trimmings, agricultural byproducts, and untreated construction debris, is another proven, effective technology that currently generates enormous pollution avoidance and waste management public benefits across the nation.

In addition, biomass energy displaces more polluting forms of energy generation while decreasing our dependence on foreign oil. Our national security is currently threatened by a heavy reliance on foreign oil.

Biomass can also produce enormous economic benefits for rural America. Rural economies will grow because of the development of a local industry to convert biomass to electricity. Moreover, studies show that biomass crops could produce between $2 to $5 billion in additional farm income.

In order to protect the environment, waste management, and the rural employment benefits that we could receive from the existing “open-loop” biomass facilities, my bill rewrites section 45 to allow tax credits for clean combustion and similar residues in these unique facilities.

Importantly, we have also ensured that the definition of qualifying biomass materials is limited to organic, nonhazardous materials that are clearly proven to burn cleanly without any pollution risk. Also, to address any concern that biomass plants might burn paper and thus possibly jeopardize the amount of paper that is available to be recycled, I have specifically excluded paper that is commonly recycled from the list of materials that would qualify for the credit.

I believe this bill provides a common sense combination of current and new technologies to help maintain the economic, environmental and waste management benefits derived from biomass power. The current electricity shortage in California and the soaring prices of home heating fuel and natural gas this winter are reasons enough to support and accelerate this renewable energy.

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. 756

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 “Growing Renewable Energy for Emerging Needs [GREEN] Act.”

SEC. 2. CREDIT FOR ELECTRICITY PRODUCED FROM BIOMASS.

(a) EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF PLACED-IN-SERVICE RULES.—Paragraph (3) of section 45(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(i) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

“(B) CLOSED-LOOP BIOMASS FACILITY.—In the case of a facility using closed-loop biomass to produce electricity, the term ‘qualified facility’ means any facility—

(i) owned by the taxpayer which is originally placed in service after December 31, 1996, and

(ii) of the taxpayer which is originally placed in service before December 31, 1992, and modified to use closed-loop biomass to co-fire with coal before January 1, 2007.”

(ii) by striking “2002” in subparagraph (C) and inserting “2007”, and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) BIOMASS FACILITIES.—In the case of a facility using biomass (other than closed-loop biomass) to produce electricity, the term ‘qualified facility’ means any facility owned by the taxpayer which is originally placed in service before January 1, 2007.

(E) SPECIAL RULES.—In the case of a qualified facility described in subparagraph (B)(ii) or (D)—

(i) the 18-year period referred to in subparagraph (a) shall be treated as beginning no earlier than the date of the enactment of this paragraph, and

(ii) subsection (b)(3) shall not apply to any such facility originally placed in service before January 1, 1997.

(b) BIOMASS FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 45(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 defining qualified energy resource is amended—

(A) by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (B),

(B) by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting “; and”, and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) biomass (other than closed-loop biomass).

(2) BIOMASS DEFINED.—Section 45(c) of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) BIOMASS.—The term ‘biomass’ means any solid, nonhazardous, cellulosic waste material which is segregated from other waste materials and which—

(A) any of the following forest-related resources: mill residues, precommercial thinnings, slash, and brush, but not including old-growth timber;

(B) solid wood waste materials, including waste pallets, crates, dunnage, manufacturing and construction wood wastes (other than pressure-treated, chemically-treated, or painted wood wastes), and landscape or right-of-way tree trimmings, but not including municipal solid waste (garbage), gas derived from the biodegradation of solid waste, or paper that is commonly recycled, or

(C) agriculture sources, including orchard tree crops, vineyard, grain, legumes, sugar, and other crop by-products.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to electricity produced after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 757. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 504 West Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the “Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse”; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to name the Federal building and courthouse in Allentown, Pennsylvania for retired Judge Edward N. Cahn. Judge Cahn, a native Pennsylvanian and resident of the Lehigh Valley, served with distinction on the Federal bench for 23 years, including 5 years as chief judge.

Judge Cahn attended school at Lehigh University and graduated magna cum laude in 1955. He went on to receive a law degree from Yale University in 1958 and began practicing law in Allentown in 1959. His accomplishments on the basketball court as a 1,000 point scorer for Lehigh University translated into his later success in another court, when President Ford nominated him to be a federal judge in 1974.

Judge Cahn was instrumental in helping build Allentown’s new courthouse, which opened in 1989. His accomplishments on the basketball court and the bench are well recognized throughout Pennsylvania, and it is my hope that future jurists who serve in this courthouse will uphold those ideals.
On February 28, 2001, the House unanimously passed an identical measure, H.R. 558, introduced by my colleague, Congressmen PATRICK TOWNS and TIM HOLDEN. I am hopeful that the Senate will also see fit to pass my bill, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Judge Edward N. Cahn.

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:

SEC. 1. DESIGNATION OF EDWARD N. CAHN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 504 West Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, pursuant to Public Law 94-118, reappoints the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2001

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 24. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business, equally divided, with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VOINOVICH. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. VOINOVICH. For the information of all senators, it is hoped that the Senate can begin consideration of S. 1, the education bill, tomorrow morning. Negotiations have been ongoing during the day today. It may be possible to begin consideration of the education legislation shortly after convening on Tuesday. Any Senator who desires to speak on the issue of education is encouraged to come to the floor tomorrow to participate in the debate. Votes are therefore possible during tomorrow afternoon's session.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VOINOVICH. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator NELSON of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VOINOVICH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OIL DRILLING

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to discuss a matter of critical importance to the State of Florida: that is, the prospect that soon, under the new administration, we might have the sale-for-lease tracts for offshore oil drilling off the coast of the State of Florida.

There has been in place presently a moratorium in one form or another since 1989 regarding drilling off the coast of the State of Florida. And there is presently offered, through this new administration, through the Department of the Interior, a proposed lease sale called "lease sale 181," which comes within 30 miles of Perdido Key, which is in northwest Florida. It is explained by the new administration that most of the tract for lease is 100 miles off the coast. But there is indeed a part that comes to within a few miles of the coast of Alabama and close to the State of Florida-Alabama line. This lease tract would come within some 20 to 30 miles of the pristine white beaches of the State of Florida.

I can tell you that 16 million Americans residing in the State of Florida do not want drilling off the coast of our State and have spoken vigorously against it, which is why we have had a moratorium off the State of Florida. Yet, the administration continues to persist.

Now let me read for you a statement that was made by candidate George W. Bush in the past campaign. He made this statement at West Port Richey, north of Tampa, Mr. President. He said at the time in the campaign, when asked about offshore oil drilling in Florida:

I'm going to work with your Governor about offshore drilling here in Florida. We are both against it. Twice he said he was against it. But it is now his position to offer it. Just last week the Tampa Tribune, a very conservative editorial newspaper—in an editorial last Thursday, said:

Had George W. Bush openly supported the sale of these leases before they he would have lost Florida and the Presidency.

Now that is the truth. And promises are being broken. The fact is that they don't need to be because we could address our energy problem if we would be wise by increasing our R&D on alternative fuels, on increased conservation. You don't have to produce your way out of the energy crisis. You can be a lot wiser with using alternative fuels.

In the discussion of the budget, we saw some dramatic testimony showing that the consumption of energy in the United States, in large part, is allocated to transportation. Why should we not use research and development to build a new automobile that in fact can get 60 to 80 miles per gallon? That would cause a tremendous conservation of energy in this country. That is just one alternative, but it is an alternative we ought to explore and keep the promises that were made in the election.

This whole matter of offshore oil drilling suddenly caught my attention back in the early 1980s, when, as a junior Congressman representing a congressional district off the east coast of Florida, suddenly I was confronted with the Reagan administration, through the person of the former Secretary of the Interior, James Watt, offering leases for oil drilling off the east coast of the United States. For as far north as Cape Hatteras, all the way as far south as Fort Pierce, FL. As a junior Congressman, I went to work with the Appropriations Committee in the House to get them to insert language that would say in the Department of the Interior appropriations bill: No money may be used under this appropriations act for the purpose of offering oil and gas leases in tracts such-and-such—and then we described all of the tracts that were being offered.

We won in that year in the Appropriations Committee because of bringing to that committee dramatic testimony from Florida: that there would be the environmental and economic damage to our State if waves of oil were lapping up onto the beaches of Florida—not only environmental damage, but economic damage as well, particularly considering Florida's tremendous tourism industry.

Well, I thought my fight was over. But sure enough, after a year's lapse,
the Reagan administration came back under a new Secretary of the Interior and proposed to lease oil again. We had to go work even harder. This time it escalated all the way up to not just the appropriations subcommittee on the Department of the Interior, but to the full Appropriations Committee, where we finally won the vote by pointing to NASA and the Department of Defense. To defend the fact that you can't be dropping solid rocket boosters from the space shuttle and the first stages from expendable booster rockets being launched from the Kennedy Space Center and the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station if you have oil rigs down below. So we won that vote after a hard fight.

I thought our fight was over on being able to protect Florida's shores from the threat of environmental and economic damage as a result of oil drilling. But my hope back there in the early 1980s was for naught because in the year 2000, despite a promise that was made last fall, in the year 2000, by candidate for President George W. Bush, one of the first acts of the new Bush administration is to offer for sale lease tract 181 off the coast of the State of Florida for oil and gas drilling.

Well, 16 million Floridians will not stand for this. Senator Bob Graham and I will not stand for this. Statewide elected officials expressed many times over, including this Senator who used to be an elected member of the State Cabinet of Florida, will not stand for it. The legislature of the State of Florida will not stand for it. Most of the congressional delegation from the State of Florida will not stand for it. Yet the administration persists. It looks as if we are in for a donnybrook where we will crash our swords and so on. For the sake of all the desire of 16 million Floridians will prevail.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:20 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, April 24, 2001, at 9:30 a.m.
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Executive nominations received by the Senate April 23, 2001:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

EDWARD C. ALDRIDGE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE JAMES P. GILLESPIE, RANKING MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE DOUGLAS H. FEHR, RANKING MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.
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THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PROBES OF THE AGENCIES INDICATED FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF THE CLASS INDICATED, AND ALSO FOR THE OTHER APPOINTMENTS INDICATED HEREBY:
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JAMES P. BUTTERWORTH, OF CALIFORNIA
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RAYMOND M. WHITE, OF MARYLAND
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DOROTHY L. LUTTER, OF MASSACHUSETTS

THOMAS E. MOORE, OF TEXAS

DOROTHY L. LUTTER, OF MASSACHUSETTS
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OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

WILLIAM E. WYATT, OF VIRGINIA
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RAYMOND M. WHITE, OF MARYLAND
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### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

#### APRIL 25

**9 a.m.**
- Appropriations
- Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
  - To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Health and Human Services.
  - SD–124

**9:30 a.m.**
- Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
  - To hold hearings on agricultural trade issues.
  - SR–323A

**2 p.m.**
- Foreign Relations
  - To hold hearings on the nomination of Andrew S. Natsof, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.
  - SD–138

**10:30 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
  - To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Agriculture.
  - SD–226

**10 a.m.**
- Foreign Relations
  - To hold hearings on the nomination of Andrew S. Natsof, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.
  - SD–138

**3:30 p.m.**
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
  - Consumer Affairs, Foreign Commerce, and Tourism Subcommittee
  - To hold hearings on west coast natural gas prices in comparison to other parts of the country.
  - SR–253

**9 a.m.**
- Finance
  - To hold hearings on Medicare and social security benefits relative to prisoners, fugitives, the deceased and other ineligibles.
  - SD–215

**3:30 p.m.**
- Commerce, Science, and Transportation
  - Egyptian-American Affairs Subcommittee
  - To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2002 for the National Nuclear Security Administration.
  - SR–232A

#### APRIL 26

**9:30 a.m.**
- Energy and Natural Resources
  - To hold oversight hearings to consider national energy policy with respect to fuel specifications and infrastructure constraints and their impacts on energy supply and price.
  - SD–366

**10 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
  - To hold hearings on certain ergonomic issues.
  - SD–538

**10 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Subcommittee
  - To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
  - SD–215

**10 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Environment and Public Works
  - Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee
  - To hold hearings to examine the budget oversight on the Army Corps of Engineers program for fiscal year 2002.
  - SD–428

**10 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Commerce, Science, and Transportation
  - To hold hearings on the nomination of Theodore William Kassinger, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.
  - SD–253

**10 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
  - To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
  - SD–538

**10 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Commerce, Science, and Transportation
  - To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Commerce.
  - SD–428

**10 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
  - To hold hearings on the nomination of Theodore William Kassinger, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.
  - SD–253

**10 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Commerce, Science, and Transportation
  - To hold hearings on the nomination of Theodore William Kassinger, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.
  - SD–253

**10 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Commerce, Science, and Transportation
  - To hold hearings on the nomination of Theodore William Kassinger, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.
  - SD–253

**10 a.m.**
- Appropriations
  - Commerce, Science, and Transportation
  - To hold hearings on the nomination of Theodore William Kassinger, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs.
  - SD–253
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

**April 23, 2001**

2 p.m.
Armed Services
SeaPower Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on strategic airlift and sealift imperatives for the 21st Century.

Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine energy implications of the Forest Service's Roadless Area Rulemaking.

Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy.

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the problem of unsolicited commercial email (spam) and possible legislative options to deter it.

Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider the nomination of John Robert Bolton, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, and other pending calendar business.

**MAY 1**

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the report of the panel to review the V-22 Program.

Small Business
To hold hearings to examine the Small Business Administration’s funding priorities for fiscal year 2002.

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Energy and Water Development Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for certain Department of Energy programs relating to Energy Efficiency Renewable Energy, science, and nuclear issues.

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

10 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine high technology patents, relating to genetics and biotechnology.

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Energy.

10 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Veterans’ Affairs.

**MAY 2**

10 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy.

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

**MAY 3**

10 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on assistance to producers and the farm economy.

**MAY 8**

10 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine the United States military's capabilities to respond to domestic terrorist attacks involving the use of weapons of mass destruction.

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**MAY 9**

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.

**MAY 10**

10 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine high technology patents, relating to business methods and the internet.

**JUNE 6**

10 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

**JUNE 13**

10 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the National Science Foundation and the Office of Science Technology Policy.

**JUNE 20**

10 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council of Environmental Quality.

**POSTPONEMENTS**

**APRIL 26**

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To continue hearings on agricultural trade issues.