By Mr. HAGEL:

S. 229. A bill to amend Federal banking law to permit the payment of interest on business checking accounts in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ENSIGN (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. 230. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a former Bureau of Land Management administrative site to the City of Carson City, Nevada, for use as a senior center; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

S. 231. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that seniors are given an opportunity to serve as mentors, tutors, and volunteers for certain programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CLELAND (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HAGEL, Mr . CORZINE, and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 232. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude United States savings bond income from gross income if it is used to pay long-term care expenses; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FEINGOLD (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. WELLSTONE, and Mr. CORZINE):

S. 233. A bill to place a moratorium on executions by the Federal Government and urge the States to do the same, while a National Commission on the Death Penalty reviews the fairness of the imposition of the death penalty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S.J. Res. 3. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which requires (except during time of war and subject to suspension by the Congress) that the total amount of money expended by the United States during any fiscal year not exceed the amount of certain revenue received by the United States during such fiscal year and not exceed 20 per centum of the gross national product of the United States during the previous calendar year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. Res. 16. A resolution designating August 16, 2001, as ''National Airborne Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 222. A bill to provide tax incentives for the construction of seagoing cruise ships in United States shipyards, and to facilitate the development of a United States-flag, United States-built cruise industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation designed to promote growth in the domestic cruise ship industry and at the same time enable U.S. shipyards to compete for cruise ship orders. The legislation would provide tax incentives for U.S. cruise ship construction and operation.

Current law prohibits non-U.S. vessels from carrying passengers between U.S. ports. As such, today's domestic cruise market is very limited. The cruise industry consists predominantly of foreign vessels which must sail to and from foreign ports. The vast majority of cruise passengers are Americans, but most of the revenues now go to foreign destinations. That is because the high cost of building and operating U.S.-flag cruise ships and competition from modern, foreign-flag cruise ships have deterred growth in the domestic cruise ship trade.

By some estimates, a single port call by a cruise vessel generates between $300,000 and $500,000 in economic benefits. This is a very lucrative market, and I would like to see U.S. companies and American workers benefit from this untapped potential. However, domestic ship builders and cruise operations face a very difficult, up-hill battle against unfair competition from foreign cruise lines and foreign shipyards. Foreign cruise lines, for example, pay no corporate income tax. Nor are they held to the same demanding ship construction and operating standards imposed on U.S.-flag vessel operators. Foreign cruise lines are also free from the need to comply with many U.S. labor and environmental protection laws, and U.S. health, safety, and sanitation laws do not apply to the foreign ships.

The legislation I am introducing today is designed to level the playing field between the U.S. cruise industry and the international cruise industry. For example, it provides that a shipyard will pay taxes on the construction or overhaul of a cruise ship of 20,000 gross tons or greater only after the delivery of the ship.

Under my bill, a U.S. company operating a cruise ship of 20,000 grt and greater may depreciate that vessel over a five-year period rather than the current 10-year depreciation period. The bill would also repeal the $2,500 business tax deduction limit for a convention on a cruise ship to provide a tax deduction limit equal to that provided to conventions held at shore-side hotels. The measure would authorize a 20 percent tax credit for fuel operating costs associated with environmentally clean gas turbine engines manufactured in the U.S., and also allows use of investment of Capital Construction Funds to include not only the non-contiguous trades, but also the domestic point-to-point trades and ''cruises to nowhere''.

Mr. President, I truly believe that this legislation would help jumpstart the domestic cruise trade, benefit U.S. workers and companies, and promote economic growth in our ports. I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in a strong show of support for this effort.

By Mr. DOMENICI:

S. 223. A bill to terminate the effectiveness of certain drinking water regulations; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, ''Just as houses are made of stones, so is science made of facts; but a pile of stones is not a house and a collection of facts is not necessarily science.''

For the past 8 years I have questioned numerous collections of facts put out by the Environmental Protection Agency in the name of science and I have found sound science has been left out of the regulation equation too often. A prime example is the new arsenic standards in drinking water proposed last week. This new standard dramatically reduces the arsenic level allowable in drinking water from 50 parts per billion (ppb) to 10 ppb, a reduction of 80 percent.

I believe it is essential to protect and ensure the safety of our nation's water supply and to uphold the principles and goals set forth in the Safe Drinking Water Act, but these standards were not based on sound science and there is no proof that they will increase health benefits. They were put into effect because it was the politically expedient thing to do.

That is why at this time I am introducing this bill which would terminate the effectiveness of these new drinking water standards.

The amendments to the Safe Drinking Water Act required the standards for arsenic in drinking water be changed by January 1st of this year. Because the proposed rule was issued late, I cosponsored an amendment to the VA HUD appropriations bill giving EPA a 6-month extension. This amendment was later signed into law, but was ignored by the agency.

There was much controversy and debate surrounding the appropriate level for the new standard. The EPA's Science Advisory Board expressed unanimous support for reducing the current standard, but varied considerably on the appropriate level. Both the EPA and the National Academy of Sciences National Research Council acknowledged more health studies were needed to evaluate what potential health benefits, if any, would likely result from this lower standard.

Arsenic is naturally occurring in my home state. In fact, New Mexico has some of the highest levels of arsenic in the nation, yet has a lower than average incidence of the diseases associated with arsenic. I have not seen any reasonable data in support of increased health benefits from these lower standards. I have only seen a collection of facts from studies conducted outside of the United States.

Under these new standards states such as New Mexico, are going to be required to revise water treatment facilities at a significant cost to the general public. Such costs should not be incurred unless sufficient scientific information exists in support of the new standard.

The New Mexico Environment Department estimates this new standard will affect approximately 25 percent of New Mexico's water systems, with the price for compliance between $400,000,000 and $500,000,000 in initial