House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 26, 2001, at 2 p.m.

Senate

Friday, March 23, 2001

The Senate met at 8:45 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable Craig Thomas, a Senator from the State of Wyoming.


c ci c r t t iw j d

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 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 Craig Thomas, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

Mr. THOMAS 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Acting Majority Leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Senate will immediately resume the consideration of the Helms campaign finance reform legislation with up to 15 minutes of debate with a vote to occur at approximately 9 a.m.

Additional amendments will be offered throughout the day.

Senators who have amendments are encouraged to come to the floor during today’s session to ensure consideration of their amendment.

As a reminder, the Senate will consider the Hollings joint resolution regarding a constitutional amendment on Monday. A vote on that joint resolution will occur beginning at 6 p.m.

Additional votes may occur Monday evening as well.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the Senate will now resume consideration of S. 27, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 27) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

Pending:

Specter amendment No. 140, to provide findings regarding the current state of campaign finance laws and to clarify the definition of electioneering communication.

Helms amendment No. 141, to require labor organizations to provide notice to members concerning their rights with respect to the expenditure of funds for activities unrelated to collective bargaining.

AMENDMENT NO. 141, AS MODIFIED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Senator Helms desires to modify his amendment. I send that modification to the desk.

This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment (No. 141), as modified, is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 6. DISCLOSURE OF EXPENDITURES BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act (29 U.S.C. 158) is amended by adding at the end of the section, as a new subsection:

(1) NOTICE TO MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES.—A labor organization shall, on an annual basis, provide (by mail) to each employee who, during the year involved, pays dues, initiation fees, assessments, or other payments as a condition of membership in the labor organization or as a condition of employment (as provided for in subsection (a)(3)), a notice that includes the following statement: ‘The United States Supreme Court has ruled that labor organizations cannot force fees-paying non-members to pay for activities that are unrelated to collective bargaining contract administration and grievance adjustment. You have the right to resign from the labor organization and, after such resignation, to pay reduced dues or fees in accordance with the decision of the Supreme Court.’

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Hear me, Mr. President.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will note that there are other political rights that union members have. I do not hear my colleagues suggesting that those rights ought to be enumerated and notice given about them. For example, you have a right under Federal law to register members, their families, or other employees. Why not send written notice of that right to union members?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair notify me when I have used 3 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will note that throughout the year involved, you have the right to join with other union members to register members, their families, or other employees. Why not send written notice of that right to union members?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will do so.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to Mr. Nickles.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to Senator Nickles.

Mr. President, I yield to Senator Nickles.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will vote against this amendment. I, too, thought we had finished with the antilabor amendments yesterday when we agreed to remove the codification of the Beck provision from the bill. The debate on this campaign finance reform bill is not the proper forum to address labor law issues.

I think these kinds of amendments have this purpose and distraction. Sooner or later, those who oppose this bill are going to have to quit trying to change the subject and face up to the real issue, the corrupt soft
money system that they have defended by standing in the way of reform.

Sooner or later, we are going to get to the point where people realize a majority of this body wants to pass this reform, a majority of the House wants this most importantly, the American people want this reform.

This amendment requires a notice to be posted in every workplace telling union members that they have a right to quit their union. That is not balanced and not handed. So what is next? I guess we should require all companies to send a notice to their shareholders letting each and every one of them know they have a right to sell their shares if they do not like the political spending of the corporations. That is the logical implication of this.

I think it is fitting that our last vote of this week will be to table this amendment. If we learned nothing else of this week will be to table this one of them know they have a right to motion to the amendment and ask for the yeas and nays. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the Helms amendment No. 141, as modified. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRUITI), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MILLER), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) would vote "aye."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Akaka
Baucus
Bayh
Biden
Bingaman
Breaux
Byrd
Campbell
Carnahan
Chafee
Chiles
Clinton
Cochran
Craig
Conrad
Corzine
Daschle
Dayton
Dodd

NAYS—40

Allard
Allen
Bennett
Bond
Burns
Campbell
Craig
Crafo
Domencich
Ensign
Enzi
Frist

NOT VOTING—7

Boxer
Carper
Durbin

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.
The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have agreed that this was the last vote of the day. If I may have the attention of the managers, I believe there is an understanding that we will do a couple more amendments today.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to Senator MCCONNELL.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe on this side we have an amendment from Senator HUTCHISON of Texas and Senator FITZGERALD of Illinois to be laid down NELL.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the majority leader yield?

Mr. LOTT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the majority leader. I understand the necessity, because of the weekend, that there may be two or three stacked votes on Monday. But the original agreement was we wouldn’t stack any votes. So it will be my intention to object for the rest of the week after these stacked votes. These are too critical to wait over the weekend and let them sit out there to then have everybody come running in to vote on them.

I thank Senators DODD and MCCONNELL. We have had an excellent debate and a ventilation of this issue which has been educational not only to Members but to the press. I also emphasize we need to get this done. I understand the urgency of moving to the budget the week after next, but we need to get this issue completed. I hope all Members understand that. We are still working on this until we get a final vote either up or down on the bill.

I thank the majority leader for all his help. This has been a debate that I can personally say I have enjoyed and I think other Members have as well.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, it is obvious we are probably going to have to go late Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday night to get this accomplished. We have difficulty when we have Senators seated at the Bandstand but I don’t want to offer it Thursday night or Friday or Monday, but I am available Tuesday—as is everybody else. I hope Senators, if they are serious, will take advantage of prime time on Friday morning or Monday night at 8 o’clock, which is, I believe, about 5 o’clock in California. It would be a very good time to offer a serious amendment.

I yield to Senator DASCHLE.

Mr. DASCHLE. At times in the past we have had debates of this kind—and this has been a very productive and good debate this week—we have sought unanimous consent for a finite list, and it would be something we might want to contemplate doing maybe no later than Monday evening so we can work down a list and try to find ways in which to manage the remaining amendments.

Most Members on this side would be prepared to work with the leadership to find a way to do that. That may be something we want to contemplate over the weekend.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I know the managers are trying to identify those amendments. I talked to Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD about getting that list identified clearly by Tuesday; certainly to get that done it would have to be in on Monday.

We do have pending before the country the need for action on our budget for the year, on tax relief that could be beneficial to all Americans and the economy. We have the education legislation reported out of the Health Committee ready to go as soon as we come back from the Easter recess, and we have an energy problem in this country that needs some attention, too. We have a lot of very serious work we need to do on behalf of the American people.

I hope we can complete this bill by the end of next week, and I expect that to be the case.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to the distinguished majority leader, it shouldn’t be a problem coming up with a list of amendments by sometime Monday.

I think it was George Orwell in the novel “Animal Farm,” who said all the pigs were equal but some pigs were more equal than others. All amendments are equal, but I think we have a sense of the really important amendments and those will be dealt with in the early part of the week. I think we will have a clearer sense of where we are.

I also want to agree with Senator MCCAIN. This has been a superb debate, enlightening for all the Members. A lot of Members, and hopefully members of the press, have learned a little bit more about a very complex issue which we have had out here in a freewheeling fashion for the last week. We understand the need to get to a conclusion and will work toward that on Monday.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I think there has literally only been half an hour or an hour of quorum calls all week. The Members have been engaged in the debate like the preparation of bacon and eggs. The Members are deeply committed to this issue in some ways, and we are spending the time on it.

I hope next week we can complete this. We have had wonderful debate and good amendments, by the way. We have improved this bill. I think both Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD would agree there have been improvements to the legislation as a result of the amendment process.

I know the other issues are tremendously important and all of us care about them. This issue goes to the heart of all of those questions, as well. This will be an important debate.

I thank my colleagues from Kentucky and the Members who have been on the floor during the week. They have contributed to the debate substantially.

Mr. LOTT. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Presiding Officer. I wanted to ask the distinguished
majority leader if I might make some comments, few in number, with respect to the subject of the forthcoming action on the budget that had been mentioned. My leader on the Budget Committee is not here at the moment but I simply want to say on behalf of myself and one of the Budget Committee, particularly those on my side, we do really need to have a good debate on the budget.

I will probably have a few additional comments, but for now let me just remind the Senate that according to reports, the Budget Committee will not report out a budget resolution. This will be the first time, I am told, in the history of this Budget Act that the Senate will not have the benefit of a markup in the Budget Committee. I am not saying at this point to criticize the markup in the Budget Committee. I am not saying at this point to criticize the budget resolution. We will get the budget in the recess. Monday or Tuesday in the recess. So I am, in fact, a new member of the Budget Committee. I would add to his comments. I look to for wise counsel on important subjects such as the budget. I have heard to for wise counsel on important subjects such as the budget. I have heard him as a member of the Budget Committee. He is certainly a person we count on this particular bill that is before the Senate, but we perhaps ought to object to a bipartisan document that would allow us to proceed and work together to do the country’s business.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan is on the floor. She is on that committee—a very able new member. I am a new member—not so able, but a new member. But she is a very able new member and she will join with me in calling attention to this. Not much is being written about this right now, but it is out there, it is coming, and it is probably the most important subject that this Senate will discuss this year. It involves a huge tax cut.

I was glad to see in the newspaper this morning that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. DOMENICI, is thinking of having—I don’t know how accurate this is, how accurate the story is, but he is thinking in terms of having a rebate, which I think might be a very good approach. But he is also thinking of still having a 10-year approach. I haven’t heard him say that. We will certainly be listening with great interest to what he has to say on this point.

I thank both leaders for allowing me to take these few minutes because I don’t think the time has been ill spent by my calling to the attention what lies ahead.

In closing, let me thank Mr. McCa in for his objections to stacked votes. That may be a thing we ought to do, not just with reference to this particular bill that is before the Senate, but we perhaps ought to object to stacked votes. I know how it would inconvenience Senators, but the people did not send me to this Senate for my convenience. I am here to serve them. And it is not in the best interests of the people that we stack votes, and for the very reasons that Mr. McCa in said, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore, The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator will yield?

Ms. STABENOW. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator.

Mr. BYRD. I just want to compliment the Senator from Michigan for the exemplary service she has rendered on the Budget Committee, and I thank her for her comments today. I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Michigan will yield?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the quorum call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. The Senator from Texas has an amendment to offer, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

AMENDMENT NO. 111

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I ask that amendment No. 111 be reported.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has an amendment to offer, and I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Pursuant to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt State and local political committees from duplicative notification and reporting requirements made applicable to national political committees. On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

Amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt State and local political committees from duplicative notification and reporting requirements made applicable to national political organizations by Public Law 106-230)
I submit for the RECORD a letter from the National Conference of State Legislators, which is a bipartisan organization, asking that this be fixed and stating that it has become an unreasonable burden, one that certainly does not in any way help public disclosure but, in fact, is just a duplication of public disclosure that is already required.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES,

Ms. MELISSA MEULLER,
Ways and Means Counsel, Office of Representative Lloyd Doggett, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Dear Ms. Meuller: I wanted to respond to our phone conversation of several weeks ago wherein you asked me to provide you with more information as to how the new Section 527 law (P.L. 106-230) adversely impacts state legislators, paying specific attention to the new tax code requirements.

P.L. 106-230 requires political organizations to provide notice of status to the IRS by July 31, 2000, unless an exception applies. The only exception available to a state legislative campaign is Sec. 527(i)(5)(B) ("reasoning that the legislative campaign is not anticipated to have gross receipts of $25,000 or more for any taxable year"). Given the size of Texas House districts, the cost of running a campaign will almost always be more than $25,000. Failure to file the notice of status results in a penalty in the form of a tax liability. If the political organization fails to file the notice of status by the due date, the organization must include contributions received after June 30, 2000, in taxable income.

The following represents an example of how the new law plays out in Texas:

A Texas House member heard about P.L. 106-230 in July 2000, but did not file the notice of status because he didn’t think it applied to his campaign. In his opinion, he doesn’t have an “organization,” just family and friends who help out. Political contributions to his campaign are in a non-interest bearing checking account. He was not able to reach anyone at the IRS who could tell him with certainty whether he was required to obtain an EIN and file the notice of status.

He held a fundraiser in November 2000 and raised $42,000 in political contributions. In January 2001, he learned that P.L. 106-230 did apply to his situation. He filed the 1120-POL tax return on March 15, 2001. Following the form’s instructions, he included $42,000 in total contributions and deducted $2,000. The “penalty” for his failure to file the notice of status is $14,000! If he had filed the notice of status before the due date, his tax liability would be $0.

Beginning March 2002, he must file Form 1120 if his campaign receives $25,000 in contributions, even though his campaign has no taxable income. In other words, he is required to file Form 1120-POL with all zeros. He must also file Form 990-EZ, the annual information return. According to the IRS, the estimated average time needed to complete Form 990-EZ is more than 51 hours! That includes recordkeeping, learning about the law and the form, and preparing the form.

Under Ch. 254, Tex. Elec. Code, candidates and officesholders are required to file reports with the Texas Ethics Commission, itemizing contributions, pledges, loans, expenditures, and providing...
SUSAN PARNAS FREDERICK, Committee Director, NCSL Law and Justice.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I made the argument. I hope the amendment will be accepted. I understand we will need to clear it through the Finance Committee and make sure they are also not opposed to it.

But I believe if anyone looks at the technical nature of this amendment, they will support it. It would take a terrible burden away from our State legislators and local candidates for mayor or city council. I certainly hope we can do that in an expedited way.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I wanted to speak for a few moments as if in morning business to talk about the budget and what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is proposing. I was privileged to be in a briefing to learn what the committee is looking at. It was discussed earlier on the floor that the bill is going to come straight out of committee.

I am pleased that is going to happen because I would like to have just as much say in the budget as would any Member of the Senate. We will have 50 or 50 hours of debate. We will have plenty of time to discuss our priorities. But with this evenly divided Senate, more and more, all of us are going to have the opportunity on the floor to have our input rather than not have it come to the floor and bog down the process.

I am very pleased with what we are hearing. I am very pleased that we are bringing the budget up on an expedited basis because I think we need to move swiftly. Our country is looking at an economic downturn. Many people think it is a recession; I hope not. But, nevertheless, I think action is needed. I think action on behalf of the American people is warranted at this time.

I think setting the budget and determining what our priority expenditures are going to be and looking at giving tax relief to American workers at this time is even more important than it was when we first introduced the idea because many of us believe that having this huge budget surplus sitting in Washington, DC, is certainly not good economic policy and it isn’t good fiscal policy.

It is time for us to make sure the money that is sitting in Washington, DC, in excess of what is needed for the running of our Government be put back in the pocketbooks of the people of this country.

I am very pleased we are working on an expedited basis. I am pleased we are going to take up a budget. I am pleased Senator DOMENICI, the leader of the Budget Committee, is pushing right now, right this minute, for an immediate tax relief plan—something that people will see is going to come. They will know for sure that is going to come, and that it will come, hopefully, on an expedited basis.

I am very proud the Budget Committee is moving forward in this fashion. I am so proud of our leadership. I hope we can work with the other side of the aisle so all of us will have equal input in the 50 to 50 hours of debate that will going to be our resolution so we can establish our priorities; so we can preserve Medicare; so we can have real Medicare reform to include prescription drugs; so we can have the new added expenditures that we know we are going to need to upgrade the quality of life for those serving in our military; and so we can increase spending on public education to make sure every child has a quality public education, which is the foundation for democracy.

I think we will have those added expenditures and we will have tax relief for the American people.

If we can take up this budget resolution a week from Monday, we will do it on an expedited basis.

I am proud of Senator DOMENICI and the leadership of the Budget Committee. I am proud of our leadership and their working with our President to make sure we have tax relief for hard-working Americans.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001—Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 11

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to discuss this amendment which I am sorry to oppose.

I am not opposed to the involvement of the Senator from Texas in this issue and on this particular aspect of it because it was the first major breakthrough we were able to make in the area of campaign finance reform requiring full disclosure of 527 activities.

Now that full disclosure has been obtained, we find some fascinating things have gone on in the name of campaign activities, such as buying trucks, giving people very generous salaries, renting office space—very interesting things.

Basically, as I read this amendment, it does not require the State and local political committees to notify and report the requirements imposed in 527.

As I understand the comments of the Senator from Texas, I guess somehow it gives them burdensome paperwork that would be difficult for them to achieve in the case of 527.

I am making these reports, and all they have to do is make a copy and send it to Washington. So for a 527, it seems to me, it would not be that hard to use a copying machine. In fact, you might want to even go down to Kinoko’s and get one there.

But more importantly, this is a reversal of full disclosure. Everybody, no matter which side they are on in this debate, says an integral and vital part of the problem is full disclosure. This is obviously a reversal thereof.

Also, staff informs me that this entire bill would be blue-slipped if this amendment were made part of it because it touches the Tax Code. Changes in the Tax Code originate in the House of Representatives and it would have to come out of the Ways and Means Committee.

So I will be opposing this amendment. I appreciate the involvement of the Senator from Texas. But to exempt people from making a copy of their financial disbursements in their campaign activities and sending it to Washington, where, if Senator COCHRAN’s amendment is going to be agreed to as part of this bill, it would be posted on the Internet and all would be able to see it, is obviously not something that I would really very much favor. I would want Americans to know all this information.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sessions). The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I respond to the Senator from Arizona by saying, first of all, I hope he will work with me to try to have the purpose of my amendment added to this bill. If there is a specific problem, I would like to work with the Senator because I do not think the amendment we had last year, that affected the 527
organizations, was intended to affect State and local candidates who do not participate, in any way, in Federal elections. I think it is very clear from the amendment. If it isn’t clear, I will certainly bring it up in the amendment that it would only apply to a State and local candidate who had reporting requirements and whose reporting requirements were covered under State law. Copying the report and sending it to the IRS is, unfortunately, what happens when you pass a Federal law that affects State and local candidates.

What happens, you have a form that the IRS approves, which may not be the same as is required in some States. So it is a burdensome, added requirement. Furthermore, it isn’t necessary because nothing that they do is participating in the Federal campaigns.

The second issue is an important one. It is not my purpose to blue-slip the bill or kill the bill. In fact, if the bill were to be blue-slip, I would withdraw the amendment. I do not think it is subject to being blue-slip.

In fact, the original amendment last year was offered to the Defense authorization. It was brought up at the time that this was a revenue measure and, therefore, was unconstitutional to be put on the Defense bill. In fact, we voted on that point of order, and it was determined that this is not a revenue measure.

Senator McCAIN, along with many of the other cosponsors of the bill today—Senator McCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD—agreed that this was not a revenue measure. In fact, Mr. McCAIN argued on the floor at the time:

This amendment in no way raises any revenue, nor does it change in any way the tax benefit even though they are only involved in State and local races. That is something we have to address. The other point is, as the Senator from Texas is going to argue strenuously that our legislation, which was put on the Defense bill, would not be blue-slipped by the House and should not have been. And I still believe that. I agree with the Senator from Texas that this should not be blue-slipped either.

But after we passed the bill, and they went to conference, the House was in serious upon their position that it would be blue-slipped. So it was withdrawn from the Defense bill because of that adamantly position the other body assumed.

I have been discussing this matter with our staffs, and I think there is a way to work with the Senator from Texas, we should not put additional burdens on especially a majority of these relatively small organizations that are engaging in State and local campaigns. So I rather believe we can probably get something worked out and get it modified so it is acceptable to both the Senator from Texas as well as all Senators.

I thank the Senator from Texas. We are going to work on it. I thank her for her engagement on this very important issue.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. HUTCHISON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I respond by saying, I do appreciate that Senator McCAIN will work with us. Even though Senate and local candidate does not pay taxes on the contributions he or she receives, nevertheless, this should not be a report to the IRS when the reporting is covered—a point with which I think the Senator from Arizona agrees.

Secondly, I will say right now that I would like to work with the key people in the House and the key people in the Senate to assure—before we put this amendment on the bill, or the amendment that we are going to withdraw that it will not be blue-slipped because if this is going to be a game that will be played by someone who is not for the bill, I will not be a part of it.

My views on the bill might differ—and do differ with the Senator from Arizona, and I will vote my conscience on the bill. But I am not playing a game here to try to kill the bill with a blue slip on an amendment. So I will have it cleared before we make a final determination because that is not my purpose.

My purpose is to give the relief that I think we probably all agree should be given. I think the House and Senate will unanimously want to do it.

We will clear the blue slip issue to everyone’s satisfaction before that would go on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, my colleague from Arizona has described the hesitations that those of us have about this amendment. They are mere hesitations, not opposition. It is a desire to ensure that what the Senator from Texas is trying to achieve, will in effect, be accomplished by the result and nothing more.

Certainly my colleague from Texas can appreciate that unintended consequences of our good intentions sometimes can have effects beyond our imagination.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I think that is what happened with the original section 527 and blue slip problem. I think, on the merits, this is not a blue slip issue.

Mr. DODD. Hopefully, we can narrow that.

My colleague from Kentucky may want to be heard on this, but I recognize the Senator withdraw the amendment. Obviously, as soon as she is ready to bring it back up for debate, we will accommodate her. If she wants to bring back the amendment as crafted or whatever her version will be, that will certainly be allowable. It would be a good way for us to proceed. I recommend that, if she is so inclined, and we can all work together to try to achieve the result she desires.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I am happy to withdraw the amendment. I did want to propose it and have the debate. I thought it would actually be acceptable. I think it will be in the end. I am happy to work with the House to assure that there will be no blue slip problem. I think, on the merits, this is not a blue slip issue.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I missed part of the debate. Is the Senator saying she is going to withdraw the amendment?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I was requested to withdraw the amendment so that we might move forward.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest, if it is going to be continued to be considered in the course of this debate, it might be better to simply lay it aside. That keeps it in order. If it is certain that it will not be dealt with in the context of this debate, then withdrawal will be appropriate. I missed the earlier discussion.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I say to my colleague, the problem is that if you lay an amendment aside, it does not move the Senate. It does not move the Committee. It does not move the Judiciary Committee. It does not move the Finance Committee. It does not move the Appropriations Committee. It does not move the Energy and Commerce Committee. If you lay it aside, it does not move anything.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to the Senator that we will bring it back up.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we have had a great deal of comity during...
the course of this debate. The biggest problem Senator Dodd and I are going to have is accommodating amendments that Members haven’t come over to offer. My concern is, the amendment of the Senator from Texas, having done what we asked her to do, which is come over here and others who I gather, think there might be some way to work this out. She is still in line rather than sort of getting sent back to the back of the bus. That is my advice to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DODD. I appreciate that. The problem is, we can’t control what 98 other Senators want to do.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mrs. HUTCHISON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, with the staff of the Senator from Texas and our staff, if we work it out, which I am 90 percent sure we will, then there is going to be no debate. We will bring it up and accept it. I don’t think it will be too big a problem getting back in the queue on an amendment that is going to be basically accepted. If not, then it is going to be brought up and we will have the full 3 hours of debate. I suggest the Senator from Texas go ahead and withdraw it. Then we can bring it up after we have an agreement. We can have it done in 30 seconds, since we have already debated the underlying issue.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. If I could make a parliamentary inquiry, if I withdraw the amendment—I don’t know if there has been a unanimous consent that has limited amendments—I just want to make sure I don’t lose any ability to consider the amendment. I don’t want to be in line and cause one person to hold the bill up. Again, I am not in the game. I am just trying to have this amendment be agreed to. I think it will be.

Mr. MCCONNELL. If the Senator will yield, we are in the process of working on a list of amendments which will probably be completed by sometime Monday. The amendment will certainly be on the list. What we don’t know, given the limited amount of time remaining between now and Thursday night, is whether that guarantees its consideration.

The Senator from Arizona is correct; if Senators work it out, there will be no problem. If they don’t work it out, I don’t want the Senator from Texas to think it is a certainty that we are going to be able to handle all these amendments before we get to final passage.

Mr. MCCAIN. If the Senator will yield, I wish to make it clear, if we are not done by Thursday night, it will be done on Friday; if it is not done on Friday, we will be on it Saturday; if we are not done on Saturday, Sunday; if not Sunday, Monday. We will make time for the amendment of the Senator from Texas. We will not leave this legislation as long as I have the ability to keep it there. If I don’t, then all amendments will go, and so it won’t matter whether the amendment came up or not.

AMENDMENT NO. 111, WITHDRAWN

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, based on the assertions of the Senator from Arizona and others who I gather, think there might be some way to work this out. She is still in line rather than sort of getting sent back to the back of the bus. That is my advice to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DODD. I appreciate that. The problem is, we can’t control what 98 other Senators want to do.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DODD. May I make a parliamentary inquiry. Is not the pending business the Specter amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Specter amendment was set aside by unanimous consent.

Mr. DODD. Any motion to bring up an amendment requires unanimous consent to lay that amendment aside, is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Senator from Texas. I hope she and the Senator from Arizona can work this out to their mutual satisfaction so we can accommodate what I think is a very good idea.

Mr. DODD. May I make a parliamentary inquiry. Is not the pending business the Specter amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Specter amendment was set aside by unanimous consent.

Mr. DODD. Any motion to bring up an amendment requires unanimous consent to lay that amendment aside, is that not correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I believe the Senator from Illinois is here, and he would like to offer an amendment. Building on the previous record I had had with the Chair, I say to the Senator from Illinois, the Specter amendment is the pending amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the Specter amendment be temporarily set aside in order to give the Senator from Illinois an opportunity to send his amendment to the desk.

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

The Senator from Illinois.

AMENDMENT NO. 149

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. Fitzgerald] proposes an amendment numbered 149.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide that limits on contributions to candidates be applied on an election cycle rather than election basis)

On page 37, between lines 14 and 15, insert:

SEC. 3. CONTRIBUTION LIMITS APPLIED ON ELECTION CYCLE BASIS.

(a) INDIVIDUAL LIMITS.—Section 315(a)(1)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) to any candidate and the candidate’s authorized political committee during the election cycle with respect to any Federal office which, in the aggregate, exceeds $2,000.”

(b) MULTICANDIDATE POLITICAL COMMITTEES.—Section 315(a)(2)(A) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(2)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) to any candidate and the candidate’s authorized political committees during the election cycle with respect to any Federal office which, in the aggregate, exceed $10,000.”

(c) ELECTION CYCLE DEFINED.—Section 301 of such Act (2 U.S.C. § 301), as amended by section 101, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(25) ELECTION CYCLE.—The term ‘election cycle’ means, with respect to a candidate, the period beginning on the day after the date of the previous general election for the specific office or seat that the candidate is seeking and ending on the date of the general election for that office or seat.”

(d) SPECIAL RULES.—Section 315(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) if there are more than one elections in an election cycle for a specific Federal office, the limitations under paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) shall be increased by $1,000 and $5,000, respectively, for the number of elections in excess of 2; and

“(B) if a candidate for President or Vice President is prohibited from receiving contributions with respect to the general election by reason of receiving funds under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the limitation under paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) shall be decreased by $1,000 and $5,000.”

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) The second sentence of § 315(a)(3) of such Act (2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

“Purpose: To provide that limits on contributions to candidates be applied on an election cycle rather than election basis (Purpose: To provide that limits on contributions to candidates be applied on an election cycle rather than election basis)

(2) Paragraph (6) of section 315(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. § 441a(a)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

“Purpose: To provide that limits on contributions to candidates be applied on an election cycle rather than election basis)

(3) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I have an amendment to S. 27 that was actually proposed by my own campaign treasurer and, after I started to look into it, I found out that the FEC had, in fact, made this very same recalculation to President Clinton last year and this year to President Bush. This is an amendment that will simplify the existing Federal election code
which contributions are attributable to general election contributions. The Commission recommends that limits on contributions to candidates be placed on an election cycle basis, rather than current per election basis.

Their explanation for their recommendation was as follows:

The Commission recommends that limits on contributions to candidates be placed on an election cycle basis, rather than current per election basis.

Their explanation for their recommendation was as follows:

The contribution limitations affecting contributions to candidates are structured on a "per election" basis, thus necessitating dual bookkeeping or the adoption of some other method to distinguish between primary or general election contributions. The Commission had to adopt several rules to clarify which contributions are attributable to which election and to assure that contributions are reported for the proper election. Many enforcement cases have been generated where contributors' donations are excessive, vis-a-vis the $2,000 total that could have been contributed for the cycle. Often, this is due to donors' failure to fully document which election the donation is for. Sometimes, they appear "excessive" for a particular election turn out to be simple reporting errors where the wrong box was checked on the reporting form. Yet, substantial resources must be devoted to examination of each transaction to determine which election is applicable. Further, several enforcement cases have highlighted the difficulty of determining which contributions are used for a particular election could be eliminated.

Most of these complications would be eliminated with adoption of a "per election" contribution limit. Thus, multicandidate committees could give up to $10,000 and all others could give up to $2,000 to an authorized committee at any point during the election cycle. The Commission and committees could get out of the business of determining whether contributions are properly allocated to senatorial, senatorial primary, or general election, and the difficulty of ascertaining that particular contributions are used for a particular election could be eliminated. Moreover, the per number 106-58 (the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill) amended the Federal Election Campaign Act to require authorized candidate committees to report on a campaign-to-date basis, rather than on a calendar year basis, as of the reporting period beginning January 1, 2001. Placing the limits on contributions to candidates on an election cycle basis would complement this change and streamline candidate reporting.

It would be advisable to clarify that if a candidate participates in more than two elections (e.g., in a post-primary runoff as well as a primary in a general), the campaign cycle limit would be $5,000. In addition, because Presidential candidates might opt to take public funding for the general election, but not the primary, and thereby be precluded from accepting general election contributions, $1,000/$5,000 "per election" contribution limits should be retained for Presidential candidates.

A campaign cycle contribution limit would allow contributors to give more than $1,000 toward a particular primary or general election, but this would be balanced by the tendency by candidates to delay fundraising and manage their resources so as not to be left without fundraising capability at a crucial time. Moreover, adoption of this recommendation would eliminate the current requirement that candidates who lose the primary election refund or redesignate any contributions made for the general election after the primary.

Mr. President, the FEC, in their recommendation to the President—I am going to read what they said about this. They recommended that we change this. It simply would save them a lot of time and staff resources, and it would also save our own campaigns a lot of time and bookkeeping headaches that are simply necessitated by the way the act is phrased. Instead of having a per election cycle limit, we have a per election limit, and we have to keep sending these redesignation forms to contributors.

The FEC, in their letter to the President in March of this year, this month, wrote:

The Commission recommends that limits on contributions to candidates be placed on an election cycle basis, rather than current per election basis.

Their explanation for their recommendation was as follows:

The contribution limitations affecting contributions to candidates are structured on a "per election" basis, thus necessitating dual bookkeeping or the adoption of some other method to distinguish between primary or general elections. The Commission had to adopt several rules to clarify which contributions are attributable to their campaign treasurers. This whole business of sending people letters and asking them to designate whether their contribution is for the primary or the general and if they don't return that designation, you have to refund their contribution—all of which is negotiated by the inadequate wording of the current law as it stands—is something we could avoid. It serves no public policy purpose that I can identify or that the FEC can identify. This would simply free up some of the FEC's staff to focus on more serious matters that could violate the spirit of the election laws.

Mr. President, on that basis, I thank you for this opportunity to introduce my amendment. I have shared it with both the Republican and Democratic sides. I would like to have unanimous support for this amendment. I can ask the Senator from Arizona against this amendment that their campaign treasurers will not be happy with them. This will make their lives easier. With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAiN. Mr. President, may I yield 5 minutes.

Mr. DODD. I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAiN. Mr. President, I thank Senator FITZGERALD. I wonder if the title of this is the "Fitzgerald Campaign Treasurers Protection Act."

Mr. FITZGERALD. That should be the name of this amendment.

Mr. MCCAiN. Or "The Treasurers Relief Act."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. The treasurers will love this amendment, and it would cut down on post age expenses and a whole lot of headaches. I urge its unanimous adoption.

Mr. MCCAiN. First, I thank Senator FITZGERALD because I also have heard from people who have to keep track of this network. It is difficult. It is not only an expenditure of money to make sure that all of these reports are correct, but it is an enormous expenditure of time as well.

It seems to me Senator FITZGERALD has an excellent idea. If I understood Senator FITZGERALD, there may be some technical corrections that could be added to the amendment as a result of recommendations by the FEC in order to make sure this is in keeping with the intent of the amendment, I ask my friend.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes, we have been in contact with the general counsel's office of the FEC. They just had the last few months for review. They have told me they are OK with the amendment, but I want to give them more time and have them scrub it over the weekend to make sure.

In my own mind, I do have a couple of questions on which I want to be satisfied. In particular, I have questions about how our amendment affects the requirement that you have to segregate money you have taken in the
primary and general. I want to talk to the FEC about that and see whether my amendment fully comports with their intentions. I want an opportunity to make a technical correction later if it is required.

Mr. MCCAIN. Reclaiming my time, with the agreement of the managers, I want to approve of this legislation pending technical corrections that could be made which would not, obviously, change it but would be merely technical to make sure the intent of the legislation is in keeping with the fact the FEC is the expert on this matter.

I thank the Senator from Arizona. I strongly support this amendment. I point out, it may be helpful as we conduct this debate over “hard money” because some people say you can contribute $1,000 a year; well, that really means $2,000 a cycle and the aggregates which a couple, we have already talked about.

What we are talking about is how much can you contribute to an election, which is every 2 years. It is valuable for us to have this information. I wish we were taking in those numbers now. It would be clearer to people as to exactly how much hard money could be given in the proposals I am sure inevitably we are going to engage in as to raising of hard money.

We would have a clear indication what that means to a candidate in an election. I mention to my friend from Kentucky, we also ought to take into consideration as we debate this issue of hard money—and I see my friend from New York on the floor, too—how much it costs when we are spending this money; how much it costs for a minute of prime time on New York City television on “Monday Night Football,” how much it costs for a 30-second commercial. We all know in order to legitimize a candidacy, you need to be on television.

I am going to try to inject this in this debate as we go forward, as to how much money candidates are actually spending. It is an important part; that we not only consider how much they can raise but how much it costs to run a campaign nowadays.

I thank my friend from Illinois. I strongly support the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I too, commend my colleague from Illinois. Last evening, a very diligent member of his staff caught me about 9 o’clock with this proposal. I read it going back to my office. It looked to me like a good idea then and it sounds like a good idea this morning. The suggestion that the Senator from Arizona has made and that the Senator from Illinois, in fact, has endorsed—that we take a day or so to run the trap, so to speak, on this to make sure there are not any unintended problems with this—is a wise suggestion. I endorse that.

My colleague from Kentucky can clarify this, but this may be the last amendment we consider so it could actually be the pending business when we come back in session.

This is a very sound idea. I know of a case that is related to this kind of circumstances. This goes back now more than 10 or 15 years ago, where a candidate held a series of fundraising events. The events were $100 events or $200 events. An individual actually contributed through these five or six events, without keeping a good track of how much he had actually contributed to the candidate. He proceeded the dollar amount by, I think, $50 or $75.

At any rate, the candidate then refunded the excess portion of the contributions over $1,000 limit. It might have been the individual had contributed $1,200 or $1,050. Whatever the number was, it was relatively minor. The candidate was then fined by the FEC because he accepted excessive contributions. Notwithstanding the fact that the excessive portion had been timely refunded, the fact that the candidate accepted the contributions in excess of the “per election” $1,000 limit triggered a fine.

The candidate was informed by the FEC that he had gotten a hold of the contributor and said, Didn’t you mean the extra $50 was supposed to go to the primary election, or, Didn’t you intend for your wife to contribute the $50, there would have been no fine in connection with the overage. The affirmative act of refunding the excessive portion of the contribution had no relevancy in terms of the allegation.

This amendment goes to part of that situation, and it is in everyone’s interest, including the FEC, candidate and the contributor, to allow for a more efficient and effective method of streamlining this process than lending oneself to the possibility of an added bookkeeping problem.

It seems like a very sound and commonsense amendment. I am hopeful the FEC will agree with that. We will take a look at that over the weekend and keep the Senator and his staff informed as we ask these questions. Maybe we can do it together, with the staffs, so they can be fully informed as to the FEC’s response to this.

I am very confident this amendment, or some technical modification of it, can be unanimously adopted. I hope it can be unanimously adopted by the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNEL. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Illinois for his excellent amendment. We look forward to its adoption on Monday. I am unaware of any additional amendments to be laid down on our side. Does the Senator from Connecticut have any on his side?

Mr. DODD. I have no additional amendments. My friend and colleague from New York has requested 5 minutes to speak, not on an amendment but on the bill.

Mr. McCONNEL. I suggest I put us into morning business.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business.

Mr. SCHUMER. Will the Senator yeild one of his 5 minutes at the beginning of morning business because I have to catch a plane. Otherwise, I will speak on this bill and ask for 5 minutes now, if that is OK with my colleague from West Virginia as well. He has been patiently waiting. Which is the way you want to do it is OK with me.

Mr. DODD. I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

I wish to alert my colleagues to another potential problem we face with this legislation as it evolves. I think the debate has been excellent. I compliment both the Senator from Kentucky and Senator Flingold for a great job in handling this well, as well as Senator McCain and Senator Feingold for the job they have done in moving this forward. Those of us who advocate reform are very heartened by what has happened this week. It seems no killer amendments have been adopted. Lots of changes have been made—good changes but no killer amendments.

Next week, of course, we know we face two known challenges and now there is a third one. I want to alert my colleagues. The first, of course, is severability. We know that is coming. The second is the Hagle amendment. We know that is coming. The third relates to where this debate has evolved.

Right now it seems the consensus around eliminating soft money is congealing, but, in exchange, people say we should raise the hard money limits; raise the limits an individual can give from $1,000 per election, per cycle, to $2,000 or $3,000—those were proposals from the Senator from California and the Senator from Tennessee respectively on that—but also to raise the aggregate limits, the $20,000 that somebody can give to a party, the $25,000 of hard money that can be given. I alert my colleagues to a potential problem, particularly if we raise these limits and do nothing else; and that is, what is the so-called 441a(d) money. This money, of course, that the Federal parties are allowed to give to different candidates.

Right now it is limited. It is limited based on the population and the voting population of the State. For instance, in my State of New York, I think the limit is about $1.7 million and the party can give $1.7 million. It is probably considerably less in Connecticut or West Virginia or Arizona. It is larger in California.

The exact number is 2 cents multiplied by the voting agency population of the State.

What has happened, my colleagues, is this: There is a case that has already
been argued before the United States Supreme Court. It is called FEC v. the Colorado Republican Federal Campaign Committee. I happen to be an amicus on this case, as are many of my colleagues, including Senator Feingold, among others. In the case, it has been argued that the limits on the 441(a)(d) money should be entirely lifted, that a party can give unlimited money to a Senate or a House candidate.

The argument, in itself, could obliterate the whole intent of McCain-Feingold, and it would be exacerbated dramatically if we raised the limits—not so much the $1,000 going to $2,000 but the aggregate limits: Take the proposal of my friend from Tennessee that would triple the limits, I believe. That means every year if a person gives $60,000 to a party, that party, if it so wishes, can give the $60,000 back to that person’s State directly to the Senate candidate.

We may call that hard money, but that money is as soft a hard money as there ever was because the difference between hard money and soft money, particularly now with recent Supreme Court decisions that have eliminated limits on party soft money, are now gone. So $60,000, to me, is as soft as money gets. You can call it hard because under the old law it is hard, but it is soft.

If we don’t do something to re-institute in whatever way possible the 441(a)(d) limits, and particularly, if we institute in whatever way possible the 441(a)(d) limits, and particularly, if we institute in whatever way possible the cause under the old law it is hard, but it is soft. If we don’t do something to re-institute in whatever way possible the 441(a)(d) limits, and particularly, if we raise the aggregate hard money limits— not the $1,000 but the aggregate limits—of my friend from Tennessee that would triple the limits, I believe. That means every year if a person gives $60,000 to a party, that party, if it so wishes, can give the $60,000 back to that person’s State directly to the Senate candidate.

We may call that hard money, but that money is as soft a hard money as there ever was because the difference between hard money and soft money, particularly now with recent Supreme Court decisions that have eliminated limits on party soft money, are now gone. So $60,000, to me, is as soft as money gets. You can call it hard because under the old law it is hard, but it is soft.

If we don’t do something to re-institute in whatever way possible the 441(a)(d) limits, and particularly, if we raise the aggregate hard money limits—not the $1,000 but the aggregate limits—of my friend from Tennessee that would triple the limits, I believe. That means every year if a person gives $60,000 to a party, that party, if it so wishes, can give the $60,000 back to that person’s State directly to the Senate candidate.

I mean for us that could be $600,000 to contribute $200,000. I was depriving the Senator from Connecticut who made the point extremely well. You can call this hard if you want, but it is as soft as soft money can be. Even in this Colorado case, most of the people who have watched the case have said the Supreme Court, given the past, will get rid of these limits, and then money just cascades in. There are no limits whatever.

I think if the 441(a)(d) limits are eliminated, we raise the hard money aggregate limits, there are a lot of candidates who will not bother to raise the $1,000 and $2,000 because they can do it in these big chunks. We ought to be very careful about this.

As I mentioned, I am trying to craft a language that deals with this problem, but the Senator from Connecticut makes an excellent point. Until we have that kind of language in place, to even think of raising hard money aggregate limits would be a serious mistake.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I am happy to yield. Mr. DODD. I made a miscalculation, I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases the doubles in two years it is doubling.

Mr. DODD. I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases in two years it is doubling.

As I mentioned, I am trying to craft language that deals with this problem, but the Senator from Connecticut makes an excellent point. Until we have that kind of language in place, to even think of raising hard money aggregate limits would be a serious mistake.

Mr. DODD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHUMER. I am happy to yield. Mr. DODD. I made a miscalculation, I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases in two years it is doubling.

Mr. DODD. I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases in two years it is doubling.

I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases in two years it is doubling.

I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases in two years it is doubling.

I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases in two years it is doubling.

I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases in two years it is doubling.

I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases in two years it is doubling.

I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases in two years it is doubling.

I apologize. I underestimated their generosity. I said $100,000, if you again combined a husband and wife, each with a $100,000 annual contribution cap. The new joint annual limit becomes $200,000. I forgot the limit is per calendar year here, but an election cycle increases in two years it is doubling.
happened de facto, if not de jure, is we have created a barrier for most Americans to ever think about having a seat in the House or Senate because, de facto, the cost of getting here is prohibitive. Either you have to have the money yourself, or you have to have access to the kind of dollars that would allow you to be a candidate in a statewide Senate race in the year 2001.

What Senator McCain and Senator Feingold and those of us who are supporting trying to do is see if we can’t change this assumption, this assumption that there is nothing or very little we can do about this, and we are just going to continue to raise the amount of money we can raise from individuals and groups and go to political action committees, to national parties, and state parties. Instead, we say: Enough is enough; 25 years of this exponential growth—we ought to be able to do something to slow this down. And that is exactly what S. 27 allows for increases. McCain-Feingold allows for doubling contributions, if a few instances, one being a calendar year from $5,000 to $10,000. We have the same amount as currently permitted going to national parties, and we have an aggregate limit increasing from $25,000 to $30,000 per year.

How many people in this country can write a check for $30,000 for Federal officeholders? And I am told that is too low. Too low? Too low—$30,000 a calendar year, to write checks for politicians, is too low?

You would be laughed out of my State, the most affluent State on a per capita basis, if you stood and said this is too little. And that is, in effect, what we are saying. I don’t think it is too little. We would do ourselves, this institution, and the political process a world of good by adopting the McCain-Feingold approach and living with it and learning how to live with the spirit, as well as the law, of S. 27.

The other consideration to make. Some of us Members think there are already ample limitations on contributions for individuals and ample room for people to make significant contributions in the political process.

Senator Wellstone made the point last week that it is less than one-half of 1 percent of the American public who make contributions of $1,000. Mr. President, 99 percent of the American public cannot even think about that level of contribution. I know for a fact most candidates will not bother with that 99 percent of the American public.

Senator Wellstone made the point last week that it is less than one-half of 1 percent of the American public who make contributions of $1,000. Mr. President, 99 percent of the American public cannot even think about that level of contribution. I know for a fact most candidates will not bother with that 99 percent of the American public and ask for their financial help.

If you can get the $1,000, $2,000 and $3,000 contributions, then is that the pond you are going to fish in. You are not going to go out and raise money in $50 and $200 contributions from average citizens.

I think there is something terribly dangerous about excluding average people from financially participating in the political life of America. That is what we are doing. That is the reality of it. There is not a single candidate who will bother with these people except as a political event but not as a fundraiser. You will not be raising money from average Americans. You will be going after the big-dollar givers, and there are only a handful in this country who can make those contributions. The idea that we have to double and triple the size of that contribution limit is shameful.

I look forward to the debate next week. Hopefully the majority of my colleagues will reject those unnecessary increases in hard money individual contributions.

With that, I yield the floor. I did not see my friend from West Virginia be-
the Senator from New Mexico. We happen on this question to be a little bit at loggerheads with respect to our viewpoints. But who am I to say I am all right and he is all wrong? I say the same thing with regard to my good friend Mr. CONRAD. He is the ranking member of the Budget committee. I am not. I am just one of the new members. But my interest comes from elsewhere than just the fact that I am a new member on that committee.

I am not trying to rock the boat, or get out in front of the committee. I am here because I am a U.S. Senator. I love the Senate. I have been in the Senate more than half of my life. I respect its rules, its traditions, its folklore, its history. But I am exceedingly concerned about the way we are doing things in the Senate in these times.

I am only here for a little while, as we all are. But while I am here, I want to uphold the traditions and the rules of the Senate, because men who were far greater than I am wrote this Constitution. On July 16, 1787, they reached a compromise, which is often referred to as the “Great Compromise.” It was out of that Great Compromise that this institution, the Senate, came into being. It was that compromise of July 16, 1787, that made possible my coming here as one of the two Senators who represent the State of West Virginia. It wasn’t West Virginia when those forebears wrote this Constitution that I hold in my hand. It was not a State of the Union at that time. My State, which I love and share in that love along with Senator JAY ROCKEFELLER, was borne out of the crucible of the Civil War. It became a State, and is the only State to have been born during the great war between the States.

But because those forebears, whose names were signed to this Constitution, arrived at that Great Compromise, we have this Senate. Otherwise, the Presiding Officer would not be here. He is a Senator from the State of Rhode Island. All the people who look here and our wonderful staff wouldn’t be here. This ornate Chamber probably would not be here. There wouldn’t be two Houses in the legislative branch.

So often in a while we have to stop and think about these things. How did I come to be here? What do I mean by “be here”? What is this institution? Why do we have a Senate? Why not just have a House of Representatives?

The answers to those questions go back into the centuries. Why do we have a legislative branch? Is ours a Republic? Is ours a democracy? I know that there are those who feel that there is a difference between a pure democracy and a Republic. Ours is a Republic.

What does that mean? That means that the people across the land participate in their government through elected representatives.

Think of that. In a pure democracy, the people of my hometown of Sophia could very well have a pure democracy. There are only about 1,183 people in that town. They could not all gather in one place at one time and act for themselves. So they elect us. We are the directly elected representatives of the people.

The President of the United States is not directly elected by the people. He is directly elected by the electors whose votes are chosen in each State by the people. But we Senators represent and speak for the people. And every 2 years, or every 6 years, whichever it may be, Members of the other body and Members of this body have to go home and stand for reelection.

So we represent the people. I represent, along with my colleague, JAY ROCKEFELLER, 1.8 million people. But our votes—our votes—West Virginia’s votes in this Senate are as important and are the same as the votes of the Senators from the great State of California. If it were a country by itself, California would probably be about No. 7 or No. 8 among all the countries of the world—a great State, a huge State, with a tremendous population that would dwarf the size of the population of my own mountain State of West Virginia.

But because of this Constitution, this Senate is a forum of the States, and West Virginia has just as much voice as does California, or New York, or Texas, or Florida, or Illinois, or Pennsylvania—States whose populations greatly outnumber that of West Virginia. So this institution is the forum of the States. At one time, it is made up of Members who are elected by, and who represent, the people of the United States. Now this is a long way of saying these things which are not new to any of the people who are listening. But once in a while we need to be reminded. Why do I take the floor today to talk about the budget? And what does all this that I have said got to do with the budget? What does it have to do with what we are Budget Committee? That is the problem. We do not pause and remember why we are here, and whom we represent here. We represent the people. We represent the States.

I am not the ranking member of this Budget Committee. I am not the chairman of it. But I am a member of it. I did not seek to become a member until this year. All these years since the act has been on the law books of this country, I never sought to be on the Budget Committee. But I saw that the Budget Committee, more and more and more, was becoming the major wheel in the constitutional system of this country—more and more things are being decided in that committee—and, as one who helped to write the legislation, I must say that it was not intended to become that. The Budget Committee was not intended to have all the power it has today. It never was intended to be used as it is being used today.

So I have become increasingly concerned about the fact that the Budget Committee of the Senate—this is no reflection on its members or anything of that nature, it is just a fact. What that Committee does this year, will have a major impact on the work of all the other committees, and on the work of the Senate throughout this year.

So that brings me now to what I want to say today.

I was disappointed to learn that Senator DOMENICI was not planning to have a committee markup. Now, he and I both are interested in spending, a couple of occasions. But apparently he reached that decision and so indicated during the last session the committee had, which was yesterday. He indicated that for the 113th Congress, the committee, it would not be productive—in his way of looking at things—to go through the markup process. And following the hearing yesterday, I came down to the floor to express my disapproval that the chairman was not planning a markup, and—no reflection on him, nothing personal in what I say—I spoke on the floor. He indicated to me, by written note earlier yesterday, that he would be responding to what I had to say.

And everything is just fine between the chairman and myself. I have to remember that I am 83 years of age. I do not have a long life ahead of me, and one of these days I have to meet somebody who is much younger than Senator DOMENICI or Senator LOTT or President Bush or anybody else. I will have to give an accounting for my work here, for my stewardship in this life. So I want to be able to leave this Senate with the good name of the Senator. I hope I have that. I am sure I do as far as Senator DOMENICI is concerned.

So he notified me that he would be speaking. Last evening I had to go somewhere. I do not often accept invitations to dinner. I like to have dinner with my wife, to whom I have been married almost 64 years, and with my little dog Billy when I can do so, so I do not accept many invitations.

One could spend all of his or her time in this town as a Senator by running here and there and thither and yonder and thinking, speaking, and meeting. I will try to avoid getting off on to that, but I do not think that I could not come up at that point to the floor and participate or listen to Senator DOMENICI and all he had to say.
Therefore, this morning I said to Senator DOMENICI: I haven’t seen the Record yet. I want to see what is in the Record. I understand you made a fine talk, and I heard just a little bit of it, but I couldn’t come up. So I may have something to say today after I look at the Record.

So he said: That’s fine.

And here I am.

We had many excellent, knowledgeable witnesses at our hearings, and our members engaged in spirited, incisive, and deep, probing questioning. When the Senate takes up the budget resolution, I believe the Senate should have the benefit of the committee’s views.

Now, the Senate, in 1816, began to formulate the major committees. They have not always been around. There were committees in the very first week of the Senate’s meetings. There were temporary committees, ad hoc committees, whatever, appointed to deal with legislation or something else. But in 1816, the major committees really began to take shape. Among those early committees, of course, were the committees that dealt with foreign affairs and the finances of the Government. It was not until 1867 that the Appropriations Committee came into being as a separate committee. The work of the Appropriations Committee was done by the Finance Committee. And in 1867, if I am not mistaken, the Appropriations Committee came into being.

By virtue of my seniority on that committee, I, at length—after 30 years, I believe it was, on the committee—I became, lo and behold, the chairman. So I take these things pretty seriously, having been chairman of the Appropriations Committee. And knowing what impact the Budget Committee of the Senate is having and what some of its decisions are having on the operations of the Senate, I decided I wanted to be on that committee. So again I say, here I am.

I also believe that when the Senate takes up the budget resolution, it should have the benefit of the committee’s views.

Why do we have committees? They are the little legislatures, you might say, in the institution here. The members of the committees have a very special understanding of the work over which the respective committee or committees have jurisdiction. The views of those committee members are very important. In many instances, I have been guided by my decisions on matters, on votes and so on, by what the members of the committee having jurisdiction over the subject had to say. They are the experts in that field.

As I say, I am not saying something that is teaching anybody anything, but it may be that some of our people out there who are watching through those electronic goggles up by the Presiding Officer’s desk, it may be that what I am saying will mean a little something to those people, that they will have a better sense of what we are talking about. They need to be informed.

Woodrow Wilson said the informing function of the legislative branch is as important as the legislative function. We need to be informed. It is our job to be informed on subject matters of today than it was when I came to the Congress 49 years ago this year. There are a lot more things about which to be informed. We didn’t have all the laws on the books then that we have today. We didn’t have as many agencies in Government then as we have today. We didn’t have the Interstate Highway System that we have today. We didn’t have the Appalachian Regional Commission or the Appalachian regional highways then that we have today. We didn’t have the Clean Air Act; we have it today. We didn’t have the Clean Water Act; we have it today.

We have much more today to be informed about than we had in those days. That is why I am concerned about what is happening with respect to the budget which will be coming up in the Congress shortly.

That is a good way around to tell you, but you need to know that these are important matters that affect you, you the people, we the people. It is the impact on you. It isn’t that I am a new chairman. It isn’t that I have been chairman for 49 years. I don’t have it. I thought to have all this information and I am quibbling over this and quibbling over that. No, I am not quibbling at all. This is serious business. It is your business.

I believe the public would greatly benefit by having a markup in the committee. Having been the appropriations chairman, let me say what a markup is. The chairman, with his staff, develops bills, based on the budget the President sent us. I have spent many days in meetings that have been conducted in the Appropriations Committee, and draws up an appropriations bill. It may be different from the appropriations bill that came over from the House of Representatives. Not by the Constitution but by custom, appropriations bills generally originate in the House of Representatives, unlike tax bills, which, according to the Constitution, must originate in the House of Representatives.

So I, as chairman, and my staff director, Mr. English, who has been the staff director on the Democratic side for a good many years, and others, sit down and talk about what this is. Then I always made it a point to call Senator Hatfield, whom I referred to as a member of the Senate from Oregon, who was the ranking member at that time. We said: This is the plan. We have this amount of money here, and this is the way it will be allocated.

That is the markup. Then the whole committee sits down and looks at that.

Republicans and Democrats alike sit down together and look at this bill. That is called marking up the bill. We may change it. The whole committee may not like an item. We may have to strike it, or they may want to add an item. In any event, that is the legislative process—lii, as it pertains to appropriations.

Yesterday I expressed my dismay also that the administration has delayed from April 3 to April 9 the delivery date for details of the President’s budget. The Senate is being asked to consider a $2 trillion tax cut that is estimated to consume 80 percent of the non-Social Security, non-Medicare surplus over the next 10 years. Yet the details on over $20 billion of program cuts for just one fiscal year apparently will not be available to the Senate when it is scheduled to debate the budget resolution on the week of April 2.

Last evening Senator DOMENICI sent me a letter, as I say, and came down to the floor to respond to my concerns. I thank him for responding quickly, but I am disappointed by his response. In his remarks he noted that in 1993, the first year of the Clinton administration, the details of the President’s budget were sent to the Congress on April 8 and the Democratic leadership completed the budget resolution for President Clinton’s budget prior to delivery of those details.

Senator DOMENICI said that the schedule for consideration of the budget resolution this year is in accord with the schedule in 1993 and that the schedule for consideration of the budget resolution of 1993 should serve as a role model for how to proceed this year.

Mr. President, Senator DOMENICI is absolutely correct in his description of the facts, but he misses my point. As I say, I have alerted Senator DOMENICI’s office to the fact that I am going to say these things. I am not going to say anything to hurt his feelings or anything like that. He has been around here; he is a pro. He understands. He missed my point.

We have a 50/50 Senate. The Republican leaders should not be setting up a process that rams the President’s budget through the Senate. We should be debating the budget, and we should be trying to reach an agreement on a budget, but don’t displace the business before the Senate right now to do that. But this thing is coming; it is a train that is coming right down the track. That Senate process should start in the Senate Budget Committee and not in the markup.

As I say, I am not taking myself all that seriously as somebody trying to tell the Budget Committee how to do its work. That is not it. I am not looking at that. That is not it. I am concerned that the impact this process will have on the Senate and its membership—the final outcome of this budget action—and on the country is a far-reaching impact.
As Senator DOMENICI pointed out in his remarks last night, in 1993 the Senate Budget Committee had a markup—get that—the Senate Budget Committee had a markup on March 11 and debated and approved the budget resolution, which was filed on March 12. The markup was held in 1993, just as there has been a markup in every other year since the Budget Committee was established. Yet apparently the distinguished chairman, Senator DOMENICI, does not want to have a markup this year. It is, after all, fortuitous, fortunately, and honestly said. He doesn’t make any bones about it, and I admire him for that.

In his remarks last evening, the chairman mentioned the first Clinton budget document, entitled “A Vision of Change For America.” Here it is: “A Vision of Change For America.” It is dated February 17, 1993. This morning, after briefly reviewing that document, I find that several sections have applications to us. But I was wrong. That 1993 document noted—lend me your ears, friends, “Romans”; lend me your ears. Here is what the 1993 document said:

For more than a decade, the Federal Government has been living well beyond its means—spending more than it takes in, and borrowing the difference. The annual deficits have been huge.

Deficit reduction is not an end in itself. It is a means to the end of higher productivity, rising living standards and the creation of high wage jobs. In short, it is about securing a better economic future for ourselves and, even more importantly, our children. Huge structural deficits are harmful for a simple reason: when the economy is not in recession, each dollar the Federal Government borrows to finance consumption spending absorbs private savings that would otherwise be used to increase productive capacity. Large, sustained budget deficits mean that we must either reduce our investment at home or borrow the money overseas.

This 1993 document went on to say:

The drain on our savings has caused anemic domestic investment. A comparison with most advanced industrial countries. It has retarded growth in productivity and living standards. Meanwhile, borrowing from the rest of the world to maintain investment at even today’s depressed levels has increased interest payments to foreign lenders. In effect, we have signed over some of the fruits of today’s productivity-enhancing investments to the children of Europe and Japan, rather than preserving them for our own children.

“A Vision of Change For America” laid out a plan for addressing the deficits that were created by the excessive tax cuts of 1981. It was a 5-year plan, not a 10-year plan, and it put us on a course to eliminate the colossal deficits of the 1980s and early 1990s. Page 115 of that document included the following:

The plan promises rising standards of living, productivity and national savings. It stimulates growth and provides insurance that the hoped-for slow recovery will be lasting and strong.

There are not many predictions one can believe in around here, but that was one we all saw come to fruition.

Continuing my quotation:

It invests in education, training and health of our people. It encourages the private sector to modernize and acquire the tools and technology to compete in the global economy. And it confronts our deficit head on.

That is what this book said in 1993. It confronts our deficits head on, with a serious, fair plan to bring it under control and generate economic growth.

So that plan worked. It worked. Instead of the colossal deficits which confronted the Senate at that time, today we have—according to the projections which may or may not come true—colossal surpluses. How many on the Republican side voted for that plan? Zero. Not a single vote in either body—not one. Not one. My good friend from New Mexico says that ought to be a role model—that budget—that budget plan, as outlined in the book titled “A Vision of Change For America.” Not one. Not one. Not one voted for that.

The first thing that was ever asked, I believe, in the history of mankind was, Where art thou? God walked in the Garden of Eden, when the shades of the day were falling and when the cool of the evening was on the forehead of Paradise. God walked in the garden. He asked, ‘Where art thou? Where art thou?’ And he said: Adam, where art thou? That was the first question: Adam, where art thou?

In thinking about the votes that were cast on the plan, that marvelous plan which my good friend Mr. DOMENICI, called to our attention on yesterday and which he said was a role model, one could have rightly asked from this side of the aisle: Where art thou? Where art thou? Not one of our friends over here on my right who belong to a great political party, the Republican Party—by the way, I get lots of votes from Republicans in West Virginia. I am proud of them. But not one, not one answered: Here am I. Not one.

That was not a role model, Mr. DOMENICI said. They did not follow that role model when it came to votes on that occasion.

That is why I take the time of the Senate to review these passages, because we are being asked to take up a budget resolution on April 2 without the benefit of a Budget Committee markup and without the benefit of a detailed budget from the President.

As has been pointed out, this will not be the first occasion when we did not have a detailed description of the President’s budget, the cost of the President’s budget, a $2 trillion tax cut—a trillion means a little more if I look at it in that way. What I am saying is that we are told by the Republican leaders that the core of the President’s budget, a $2 trillion tax cut—that is your money, and they say we ought to give it back. But it is your debt, it is also your schools that are falling down; the windows are broken, the plumbing out of shape; it is your schools; those crowded classrooms out there are your classrooms. It is your children. It is your parents who need health care, who need a prescription drug plan. Yes, it is your money, but in our scheme of things, we are elected by you to be the stewards of your money.

It is your highways on which you travel. It is the safety of your highways that you have to depend upon when your wives take the children to the doctor or to the child care center, or you have to go to the hospital, or We are not used to counting money in sums of that size down in West Virginia.

How much is $1 trillion? Have you ever stopped to think? We talk about it as though it were just a few dollars. I have three $1 bills.

By the way, when I married my wife 64 years ago, on the next day after we married, I gave her my pocketbook. I had been working as a meat cutter in a coal company store. My salary was $70 a month. She was a coal miner’s daughter, and I grew up in a coal miner’s home. We never had anything as far as refrigerators or vacuum cleaners. As a matter of fact, some of those inventions did not come along very much in advance of the year we married.

I said to my wife: Here’s my wallet. We were walking down the railroad tracks. That is the only place we had. We did not have any fine streets, shaded avenues, boulevards beautiful in the summer. We had to walk down the railroad tracks.

I gave her my pocketbook, and I said—now this was 64 years ago. I gave her my pocketbook. I said: You keep the money. I will work and make it—I will make you $3.75. She said, wherever I make, you will have. When I want a dollar or two, I will come to you and ask for it. And I have done that for 64 years.

This morning she said: Do you need any money?

I said: No, I have $3.75, and I am taking my lunch so I don’t have to go down to the Senators’ dining room and spend $30 or 40 minutes waiting on somebody to help me with food and then have to spend $8, $10, or $12 to pay for it. I just take my little lunch, and there is my $3 I have for the day. You can ask her; she will verify everything I have said.

Why do I say that? We are talking about a $2 trillion. How long would it take you to count $1 trillion at the rate of $1 per second? How long would it take you to count $1 trillion at the rate of $1 per second? Thirty-two thousand years. A trillion means a little more if I look at it in that way.

What I am saying is that we are told by the Republican leaders that the core of the President’s budget, a $2 trillion tax cut—that is your money, and they say we ought to give it back. But it is your debt, it is also your schools that are falling down; the windows are broken, the plumbing out of shape; it is your schools; those crowded classrooms out there are your classrooms. It is your children. It is your parents who need health care, who need a prescription drug plan. Yes, it is your money, but in our scheme of things, we are elected by you to be the stewards of your money.

It is your highways on which you travel. It is the safety of your highways that you have to depend upon when your wives take the children to the doctor or to the child care center, or you have to go to the hospital, or
you have to go to the store, or you go to church, or you have to drive to work. It is your safety on your highways for which we are responsible. You cannot build the highways yourself. West Virginia cannot build a national system of highways, but the Federal system is what the people were talking about — those framers — when they wrote this Constitution — the Federal system.

It is your money. It is a $2 trillion tax cut. What a whale of an amount of money. It may be brought to the floor, we hear, as a reconciliation bill for which debate is limited to, at most, 20 hours — 20 hours of debate, that is all. Yet it happened. It is written with its colossal $2 trillion tax cut that may return us to the deficit ditch that the 1993 plan helped us to claw our way out of after 12 years of huge deficits; that 1993 plan which my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, urged Chairman Domenici not to take over $2 trillion tax cut based on projections of surpluses 10 years away, 9 years away, 8 years, whatever, which may never — and probably won't — materialize.

That is taking a very important step, and it is going to impact on you, the people. So why shouldn't we have a debate? Why shouldn't we have a markup in this bill? We may report out a better measure than even the chairman has in mind.

May we have seen fit in our constitutional system to have committees? Why? If we are going to have committees, why don't we have markups on bills and let Republicans and Democrats hammer it out, hammer out the measure on the anvil of free debate? Why does any chairman want to say to the committee, I am not going to have a markup, period?

Some people might think that is dictatorial, tyrannical, autocratic, arbitrary. If you read the rules there is no reason why we have not had markups on the President Bush tax cut in accordance with that rule. They have answered our questions. We have had splendid hearings — you people have attended the hearings — but we are not going to have a markup in this committee.

Why? Because we are operating on a 50-50 basis. It is even-stephen in this committee. If I had a majority of one or two in the committee, yes, we would have a markup. We don't have a majority. The people have decided that. We don't have a majority. So whatever you say, I will listen, but we are not having a markup. Might as well not have meetings. A committee chairman may as well just say: We are not going to have any meetings. We will have a meeting in committee when I decide to and we won't have a meeting in committee when I decide we won't.

That is the way it used to be. Do you believe that any congressman would be that way in considerable measure?

When I came to the House of Representatives 49 years ago, committee chairmen could simply bottle up legislation in their committees and not even have a meeting. I can remember a Member of the House whom I respected, he was a former judge, was chairman of the Rules Committee. He referred to the Scriptures in his inaugural speech. He talked about Good Samaritans in that speech. I would bow and scrape to the special interest groups. He referred to the Scriptures. Thank God we have a President who referred to the Scriptures in his inaugural speech. He talked about Good Samaritans in that speech.

I would much oppose to his $1.6 trillion tax cut, which will amount to over $2 trillion. I will be very opposed to that tax cut. I may vote for a tax cut, but it won't be that one. That is not to say I am disrespectful of him. I just think he is wrong. On other occasions I may think he is right about a matter, but this, I think, is a colossal mistake.

I think we are foolish, foolish, to talk of a $2 trillion tax cut based on projections of surpluses 10 years away, 9 years away, 8 years, whatever, which may never — and probably won't — materialize.

In effect, that is what is happening here. Markup of the Budget Resolution is being "bottled up." Our cries and pleas and prayers are going to be of no avail because we are not going to have a markup in that committee. Well, why did I attend most of the hearings? Did it occur to me at the time that it is the same old thing as when those chairmen used to say, we will have a hearing or we may not have a hearing, or we won't even have a meeting, and the whole session passed and there would be no meeting of the committee on many important matters. That is the way it used to be.

So what happened? This is not National History Month but I am just repeating a little bit of history today. We have heard that history repeats itself. That is what we see in front of us. History is repeating itself.

Here is what happened in the writing of the rules around here — I am not sure I ever read much concerning the House of Representatives, but I got so much embedded in the study of them. The rules today won't allow chairmen to do that.

Let me read, as an example, from rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Here it is. I used to know the rules much better than I know them now.

Rule 26, section 10(B) — I haven't read this lately. This is a different print. This is 1999. That was the last century, 1999. I have not read this one. But this is what I think is pertinent to our discussion. "It shall be the duty of the chairman of each committee to report or cause to be reported promptly to the Senate, any measure approved by his committee and to take or cause to be taken necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote. In any event, the report of any committee to which has not been approved by a committee shall be filed within seven calendar days.

And so on and so on. I don't think that is the pertinent part.

Let me ask the Parliamentarian to give me a copy of the rules and the pertinent provision which I am talking about; 26, paragraph 3. Here it is. Each standing committee — aha, here it is.

Each standing committee (except the Committee on Appropriations) shall report regular weekly, biweekly, or monthly meeting days for the transaction of business before the committee and additional meetings may be called by the chairman when necessary. If at least three members of any such committee desire that a special meeting of the committee be called by the chairman, the members may file in the offices of the committee their written request to the chairman for that special meeting. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the clerk of the committee shall notify the chairman of the filing of the request. If, within three calendar days after the filing of the request, the chairman does not call the special meeting, he shall file in the offices of the committee his written request that the special meeting of the committee shall be held, specifying the date and the hour of that special
meeting. The committee shall meet on that day and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the clerk of the committee shall notify all members of the committee that such special meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour. If the chairman of any such committee is not present at any regular, additional, or special meeting of the committee, the proviso for members of a committee, if the majority of the members so wish, to insist upon and to require and to have a meeting of the committee.

Now, there are two problems with this provision. One is that you have to have a majority. We have a 50/50 breakdown. In other words, in the committee we have 11-11. I haven’t tested the waters to see if someone on the Republican side—with, I assume a majority, probably a group of Senators on my side—would join to insist that we have a meeting of that committee, the Budget Committee, to mark up the bill. It might very well be that we would get a majority. That is the first problem.

The second problem is as big or bigger. Once the committee meets at the request and insistence of a majority of the committee, if the chairman is not there, the ranking member—which means the member of the minority party—who has the gavel. So far, so good. But the real fly in the ointment would come in the fact that the chairman can call the meeting to order and put the committee out immediately. He has fulfilled the request of the majority of the committee. In other words, he doesn’t have to sit there and have a long hearing or meeting. He can just call it to order and adjourn.

So why do I call that to the attention of this committee? Not as a possibility—not to indicate that there is a possible avenue which would constitute a threat to the chairman. I do not do that at all. But just to remind Senators that it is there.
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It will not prohibit such groups from accepting corporate or labor funds;

It will not require such groups to create a PAC or another separate entity;

It will not bar or require disclosure of communications by print media, direct mail, or other non-broadcast media;

It will not require the invasive disclosure of all donors, and

Finally, it will not affect the ability of any organization to urge grassroots contacts with lawmakers on upcoming votes.

The last point bears repeating. The Snowe-Jeffords provisions do not stop the any organization to urge their members and the public through grassroots communications to contact their lawmakers on upcoming issues or votes. That is one of the biggest distortions of the Snowe-Jeffords provisions. Any organization can, and should be able to, use their grassroots communications to urge citizens to contact their lawmakers. Under the Snowe-Jeffords provisions any organization still can undertake this most important task.

My colleagues may wonder what led Senator SNOWE and I to work so hard for the inclusion of these provisions in the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform bill. Since the 1996 election cycle we have both seen, and experienced first hand, the explosion in the amount of money spent on these so-called issue ads. From the 133-150 million dollars spent in 1996, spending on these so-called issue ads has ballooned to over 500 million dollars during the last election cycle.

It is not the increase in the amount spent on these so-called issue ads alone that concerns us. Studies have shown that 95 percent of television issue ads mentioned a candidate, 94 percent made a case for or against a candidate, and finally 84 percent of these ads had an attack component. Does anyone think these are just coincidences? An overwhelming majority of the public recognizes this problem. They see an ad identifying, 90 percent, or showing a candidate, 83 percent, or an ad being shown in the last few weeks before an election, 66 percent, as ads that are trying to influence their vote for or against a particular candidate.

Some of my colleagues are of the opinion that this increased spending is fine. They believe that more money in the system will better inform the electorate about the candidates. Unfortunately, these same issue ads are corrupting our election system and are not better informing the voters about the candidates.

The public can differentiate between electioneering communications and other types of communications done to purely inform the public on an issue. A recent study done by the Brigham Young University Center for the Study of Elections and Democracy shows this, and the effect these ads are having on the public.

As you can plainly see from this chart, I have beside me the public views electioneering communications as trying to persuade them to vote against a candidate. These ads—80 percent—evokes as strong of a reaction in the public viewing the advertisements—81 percent—and are even stronger than the candidate’s own ads—67 percent. This chart also shows that the public knows when it is viewing a pure issue ad as compared to the other types of communications. Seventy percent of the public recognizes that.

This next chart, chart No. 2, also demonstrates how the public views these ads, again showing what is the real purpose behind these electioneering communications. Here, like the first chart, you can see that the public is able to differentiate between ads run to help or hurt a candidate versus a pure issue ad meant to influence the public.

What is intriguing, or concerning, about this chart is that the electioneering communications generate a higher response from the viewing public—86 percent—than even the candidate—82 percent—or party ads—84 percent.

My third chart shows the degree to which the public felt an ad was intended to influence their vote, with 1 being not at all and 7 being clearly intended to influence their vote.

This chart again shows that the public is able to differentiate between the communications they receive. Like before, there is a stark difference in public perception between those ads which are specifically advertising to influence a vote, election issue ads, party ads, and candidate ads, versus those seen as portraying a purely informational purpose, pure issue ads. The chart also shows that the public views the intent of these communications to be to influence their vote as strongly as a party ad—6.3 to 6.3; about even—and even more strongly—6.3 to 5.8—than the candidate’s own advertisement. The chart also shows the stark difference in the public’s mind between the intent of electioneering communications—6.3—and pure issue ads—3.7.

While the public correctly perceives that electioneering communications are viewed to influence their vote, the public is confused about the origin of these communications. As this chart shows, chart No. 4, an overwhelming majority—75 percent—of the public believe that these communications are being paid for by the party, or the candidate themselves. The voters deserve to know who is trying to influence their vote, and the Snowe-Jeffords provisions will give them that information.

My final chart, chart No. 5, shows that the public craves the information that the Snowe-Jeffords provisions would provide them. Eighty percent of the public believes that it is important to know how the money being spent by who pays for or sponsors a political ad. I ask our opponents, do they not believe that the public deserves to know who is trying to influence their vote? The public both wants and deserves that information, and Senator SNOWE and I provide it to them with our provisions.

I think this is an incredibly important part of the bill. I strongly urge all of my patriots to study the Snowe-Jeffords provisions to make sure they fully understand that all we are requiring is disclosure. We want to make sure people know from where the information to influence them is coming.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for as much time as I may consume in morning business.

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

THE ECONOMY OF OUR COUNTRY

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have listened with some interest today to some of the discussion on the floor of the Senate, first about campaign finance reform, and then to Senator Byrd, and others.

I come to the floor to talk about the economic circumstances this country finds itself in for the moment. I want to visit about a number of issues that relate to our economy.

Mr. President, I came across one of my favorite books last evening while going through a pile of old books that had been stacked for some long while. The book is written by a man named Fulghum. Most people in this country have read this book or seen the book. It is entitled “All I Really Need to Know I Learned in Kindergarten.” It is a wonderful little book.


There is a whole list of things you learned in kindergarten that represent enduring truths throughout life.

I started thinking about this in the context of the grappling that we do in this country with our economy. We forget the most basic of things—almost kindergarten-like lessons—about our economy so very quickly.

Let me describe just a few of them.

We have been blessed, of course, with a long period of economic expansion, a period in which we have seen almost unprecedented economic growth: new jobs, better income, and more opportunity for most American families. The stock market has increased in value and rolled to increasing new heights. People felt good about the stock market. They invested in the
Dow Jones, in the Nasdaq, and would see their net worth increase daily or weekly or monthly.

We saw college dropouts who were still fighting their acne problems, and hadn’t yet learned to shave, making millions in technology companies, and then selling them and starting new technology companies. It was a go-go economy with remarkable and almost unimaginable new things that were happening. We had higher economic growth and lower inflation.

Of course, the one constant in all of this was a Federal Reserve Board. The Federal Reserve Board sat down behind its thick doors, and in its concrete building, and continued to ring its bells and do its business, and almost unimaginable new things that were happening. We had higher economic growth and lower inflation.

What they did not understand—and have not understood for some long while—is the workers in this country are more productive. Productivity was on the march, on the increase. You can have lower unemployment and higher productivity if you have higher productivity.

But, nonetheless, 10 months ago, the Federal Reserve Board took its last step to increase interest rates because they felt America was growing too fast.

It was the last, I believe, in six steps over about a year to substantially increase interest rates and slow down the economy.

At the same time we have a trade deficit that is growing very dramatically. This trade deficit is the highest in history. Personal debt continues to go up in this country. As I indicated, economic growth is slowing.

Amidst all of this, we have, it seems to me, probably just forgotten some of the fundamentals. Going back to “All I Really Need To Know I Learned In Kindergarten,” some of the fundamentals we should never have forgotten. Mr. Greenspan should never have forgotten that increased productivity allows less government expenditure. Productivity allows higher growth. Don’t be afraid of the American workers being more productive and earning more money and being employed at a higher rate if their productivity is up. All we really need to know, we should have learned in the primer course on that subject. Yet the Federal Reserve Board consistently has insisted that is an equation that doesn’t work. They have forgotten the fundamentals.

In our market for securities and investors, we have forgotten the fundamentals. This is not the first time. You can go back to bubbles of speculation throughout history. One of the most interesting ones for me was to read about the bubble of speculation in “Titianmania” four or five centuries ago in which there was a time when they paid $25,000 for a tulip bulb because tulip bulbs became the subject of massive speculation. We have had a lot of speculation bubbles in recent centuries. This was just the last.

Is it surprising that it doesn’t work out when you purchase the stock at a wild- ly inflated price of a company that has never made a profit and doesn’t look as if it is going to make a profit? Is it surprising that that doesn’t work out at some point? I don’t think so. Yet many of us, probably all of us, temporarily forgot those lessons when the Nasdaq and the markets continued to go up and up.

Will Rogers once said his dad gave him some advice. He said his daddy said that he should buy stock, then hold it until it goes up, and then sell it. And if it doesn’t go up, don’t buy it. At least that is what he said his dad said. He said that doesn’t work out so well.

The lesson from all of this that we probably should have learned long ago is that some of these prices were never justifiable; that is, with respect to the market.

What about energy? Perhaps we should understand with respect to this energy crisis that it is not enough just to applaud when the price of a barrel of oil goes to $30 because there will be a consequence later. It is not enough when you find yourself short of energy to just go find new energy because that is only part of the solution.

Opening up ANWR, as some of my colleagues suggest we should do, and as I oppose, is not a substitute for an energy policy. I don’t believe we ought to open ANWR. But some say: Let’s just address this energy policy by simply finding new supplies. Well, let’s find new supplies. Let’s recognize the finding of new supplies of oil and natural gas, and let’s use clean coal technology to produce our coal in an environmentally friendly way.

Let’s also do other things. Let’s understand that conservation is very important. If you are sitting in a 6,000 pound gas hog and complaining about the price of gas, we have to be concerned about the issue of conservation in this country as well. We need to purchase new energy. We need to develop other sources of energy. We need to consume more, both with appliances and vehicles and other ways. Additionally, we need to incentivize new sources of renewable energy: wind energy, biomass, ethanol, and more. I know the oil industry doesn’t like it, but that is precisely why I do. When the oil industry believes it is in its self-interest to impede the development of other sources of energy, I say that is exactly why we ought to develop other sources of energy. Yes, we need the oil industry. We need natural gas. But we also ought to develop wind power. The new generation of wind turbines are very effective and efficient. Wind, biomass, ethanol, all can contribute to this country’s energy supply, and we ought to understand that.

Again, all we need to do is to make sensible decisions. The sensible decision is not to just rely on additional production. That was a major source of America’s energy problem. We introduced a piece of legislation yesterday—Senator Bingaman, myself, and others on the Energy Committee, along with my colleague Senator Daschle, the Demo- cratic leader, introduced a comprehensive energy policy. It moves us in the right direction in a range of areas, one that is thoughtful and will lead this country out of the dilemma that currently exists with the imbalance between supply and demand for energy. Our economy cannot survive, progress and succeed the way we want it to unless we have assured supplies of energy.
I talked about the stock market. I talked about the economy. Energy is also a very important element of these issues. We have to respond to them, and we have to deal with them.

At the same time we are confronting the other issues that are confronting us, the challenge of international trade. I mention the challenge of international trade only because, while all of the other elements of our fiscal policy seemed to have improved dramatically over the past 3 years, there is one area that continued to decline was trade. By decline, I mean our trade deficit continued to grow year after year. We have the highest deficit in human history. It is not rocket science to fix this. Again, all we really need to know is we learned in kindergarten. Everyone needs to play fair. Our current merchandise trade deficit is a huge problem at over $440 billion just this last year. The problem is that when we have trading partners, whether it is Europe, China, Japan, Mexico, or Canada, we say to them, we will open our markets to you, but in exchange, you must open your markets to us. We have never had the nerve or the will to do that.

Let me give some examples of what we have done in trade. We just negotiated a deal with China. We said to China, after a long phase-in, we will give you this deal. You have a huge surplus with us or we have a huge deficit, if after a phase-in, we will give you this deal. You have roughly 1.2 billion people who are looking for new products. However we negotiated a deal that when we sell American vehicles to China, they can impose a 25-percent tariff. But if the Chinese sell automobiles to the United States, we will impose a 2.5-percent tariff. In other words, we will make a deal with you. You can charge a tariff that is 10 times higher than the United States on automobiles. That is with a country with a population of only 120 million. That is an over $80 billion last year. I scratch my head and look at that and think, on whose side were our trade negotiators? They certainly weren’t for America. At least, they forgot for whom they were negotiating. That is one example here are a few others.

The average agricultural tariff in the United States is 12 percent. The global average is 26 percent. The average tariff in the European Union is 30 percent. We have a long series of trade agreements, and big disputes, with the European Union. How is it that our trade agreements, like with the United States but they won’t open their ranches to us? After our beef agreement, almost every pound of beef going into Japan has a huge tariff on it. Yet this country seems to lack the will, the strength, or the nerve to do much about it.

Every time we get involved in a trade negotiation, we lose in a very short period of time and agree to trade concessions that continue to ratchet up the trade deficit. I hear all my colleagues say: These trade agreements are really important so we can sell around the world. Yes, they are important. Every time we have a new trade agreement, we have a higher trade deficit. Does that add up?

We have a trade agreement with Mexico. We had a surplus; we turned it into a deficit. We have a trade agreement with Canada. We had a deficit; we nearly doubled it. We have a trade agreement with China. We didn’t have a vote on that, but we just had a bilateral agreement with China.

I will make a wager with my colleagues that in a year and a half, when we evaluate how a relationship with China, our deficit will have increased and we will be getting fewer agricultural products into China. Incidentally, after the trade agreement with China, in December last year, a load of barley was shipped to China from the U.S. and it is still waiting to enter. China stopped the shipment and apparently isn’t going to let it get in. And China will give no reason for it. It is reasonable to ask: Who is handling our interests? You could put on a blindfold and listen and you could not tell the difference between George Bush, Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, Ronald Reagan, or Richard Nixon. It is all the same mantra on trade. The country is well observed by the trade agreements we have had. I support expanded trade and expanded opportunity for American products abroad. That is not what is happening in these trade agreements.

We considered a leadership of an economy with energy issues and issues with respect to the market, trade, and other things I have discussed and we have a new President who wants to cut taxes. The new President, when he was campaigning against Mr. Forbes in the primaries, he said he wanted to cut taxes by $1.3 trillion over 10 years. That was nearly 2 years ago that he made that announcement. That $1.3 trillion is scored by the budget, not decrease. That is why a significant phase-in. That is a much more conservative and a much more thoughtful way to address these issues.

As we have had these discussions in the budget debate, and in the subsequent tax debate that will come following that, we will be able to think through exactly what kind of projections we have for the future and exactly what we think is going to happen and, as a result of that, what kind of tax cuts we should enact.

There are a number of priorities for this country. Tax cuts are one at this point, especially because, A, we have a surplus. B, we have an economy that is weakening. There are other priorities as well, one of which is to pay down the national debt. If you run it up in tough times, pay it down during better times. To those who say we are paying down the debt, I say when the budget document gets here, we will go to the page number I say and look at gross debt. It is going to increase, not decrease. Tell me why you think we are paying down the debt. I say when the budget document gets here, we will go to the page number I say and look at gross debt. It is going to increase, not decrease. Tell me why you think we are doing that. This is a significant part of the surplus that exists, in my judgment, should go to reducing the national debt.

Second, there are other things for us to do. Yes, a tax cut is a priority. So, too, is paying down the Federal debt. But there are other things we should do. We need to improve our schools in this country. That is something that is important to our future. We need to try to be helpful to senior citizens—to all Americans, but especially senior citizens. That is why we believe that lowering our prescription drugs. We ought to do that in the Medicare program and in a way that is affordable and effective.
So those are the other needs and priorities that we ought to consider. Finally, let me say that without disparaging any of the economic thinkers, either in the administration, or in Congress, or the Federal Reserve Board, no one knows what is happening in the future. We know the past, and we have a found lack of understanding. No one knows what the future holds for this economy. The most important element, by far, for this economy is the confidence of the American people. There are some who believe that the economy is going to contract and there isn’t anything anybody can do much about it. People make judgments about their future, about buying a house, buying a car, buying other things—making decisions about what affects the economy. They make decisions based on their view of what will happen in the future. If they are optimistic, they decide one thing. They may buy a new home, a second car, or a vacation home. They may make a decision to buy new clothing. That confidence creates a wave of improvement in any economy. That economy rests on a mattress of consumer confidence, and it always has.

When people are not confident about the future, they delay decisions, postpone decisions, or simply decide they will not make purchases. So they behave differently and they create a contraction in the economy. That is the important thing for all of us to understand. This is all about confidence, about the American people’s perception about the future and their confidence in the future.

I want to talk for a few more moments on the tax cut. When we look at a tax cut, as I indicated, it ought to be stimulative and fair. Let me talk about a tax cut, as I indicated, it ought to be in the future.

about the American people important thing for all of us to understand. There are some who believe that the economy is going to contract and they create a contraction in the economy. That is not very prudent, in my judgment. That is kind of a description of believing in a horse some hay and hope later the sparrows will have something to eat. It is kind of a description of believing somehow everybody will get something ultimately.

As we look at this tax issue, which I think is going to be one of the significant issues in Congress this year, we ought to be pretty hardheaded on two fronts: One, how do we do this in a way that helps this economy because this economy is in tougher shape than some know; and No. 2, how do we provide a tax cut that reflects the understanding we now have a surplus and ought to use some of it because it also saves some for debt reduction, but in a way when we give it back it is fair to all the families in this country, it is fair to everybody.

There is an old song by Ray Charles that has a lyric:

'Them that gets is them that’s got, and I ain’t got nothing lately.'

That is an apt discussion, it seems to me, of the way some people look at tax cuts. When they are proposed, they say: this and some support that; it is all the families in this country, it is fair to everybody.

It seems to me when we talk about taxes, we need to talk about the total tax burden people face, which is income taxes and payroll taxes, and give a tax cut that reflects the burden for working families. That is not the case in the proposal that has come from the President.

I think it is very unwise not to be somewhat conservative, and I am, frankly, surprised that those who call themselves the most conservative Members of Congress are often saying: Look, we are not conservative on this; what we want to do is provide a very large tax cut, and we are going to do that on surpluses that do not yet exist, but surpluses we expect we will have in 6 years, 7 years, 8 years, 9 years, 10 years.

That is not very prudent, in my judgment. It was an awful struggle to get rid of these Federal budget deficits, but they are gone. The last thing we want to do is put right back into the deficit ditch.

We have a lot of interests and a lot of opinions about all of these things. I come from a farm State, and the President’s Office is from a farm State. I think the other things we want to do: provide a tax cut, pay down the debt, and reach other priorities that are necessary, such as improving our schools.
I did not mention one that is most important to me, and that is doing what is necessary to preserve a network of family farmers in this country.

Again, there is a difference of opinion about that. Some say if farmers are worth something, then why aren't they worth more? Farmers are told: Your food is a quarter of the world is on a diet. We are struggling to hang on by our fingertips. We have family farmers put a couple tips because commodity prices have not work. We have family farmers struggling to hang on by their fingertips because commodity prices have collapsed. Our farmers put a couple hundred bushels of grain in the truck and drive to the elevator and the elevator operator says: This grain you produced doesn't have much value. Almost half the world is hungry, and probably a quarter of the world is on a diet. We have instability in places of hunger, and our farmers are told: Your grain does not have value.

What a strange set of priorities. If there is any one thing this country can do to promote a better world and promote more stability in the world it is to take that which we produce in such abundance—food—and move it to parts of the world where it is needed for survival. What a wonderful thing for us to do and do it in a way that gives those who we want to help a sense of pride, a sense of purpose.

We are able to do that with arms. It is interesting, we are the largest arms merchant in the world. The United States is the largest arms merchant in the world. We sell more weapons of war than any other country. If we can do that with armaments, we ought to be able to do that with food.

Most of us in this Chamber have been to refugee camps and places in the world where people are dying. I held a young child this morning and said I can go anywhere in the world and see this. It is happening every day.

My late friend Harry Chapin, who was killed in 1981, used to say the reason people dying from hunger is not a front-page story is because the winds of hunger blow every minute, every hour, every day; 45,000 people; 45,000 people a day, most of them children. It is not a headline story. It happens all the time, and we produce food in such wonderful quantity and are told it has no value. We can do a lot better than that.

I did not mean to speak at length—I will do so later—about agricultural policy, but in terms of our priorities as a country, as we think through all of these issues—taxes, trade, reducing the debt, and other priorities—and talk about prescription drugs and Medicare, about the energy bill and a farm policy that works for family farmers—all of these things represent values. It is about values: Who are we, what are we doing here, and what kind of future do we want?

In conclusion, when I talk about the economy, some say the economy is what it is and what it will be; the market system establishes the economy. The market system is a wonderful allocator of goods and services, but it is not perfect. In some cases it is perverted. It needs a referee, a certain structure. It needs rules and guidelines.

My thoughts are, our economy is what we decide we want to make it. If we want our economy in which family farmers can make a decent living, then that is the economy we can have. Europe has it. Good for them. I am not criticizing them. Good for them. This economy is what we make it. The tax policy is what we make it. We need to think our way through this. I do not intend to be partisan. We have a new President. I like him. I want to work with him, but I say to him: You have given us a plan—that is good—but it is not the only plan. It is not the only idea. What we ought to do is get the best of what everyone has to offer. When people write to me and say support the President, I say this is not about the President, it is not about me; it is about this country's future: What are the best ideas to ensure this country's economic future? What are the best ideas we can get from Republicans and Democrats to ensure economic growth and opportunity for all Americans?

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is permitted to dispense with the quorum call.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, let me put first of all on this floor the clerks who have been kind enough to notify me I might come over at this time. I am most appreciative of that courtesy. I will try to keep my remarks short. I recognize it is Friday afternoon and Members are anxious to be on their way.

THE ENERGY BILL

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The purpose of addressing my colleagues today is to talk about the Energy Bill. As most Members know, a bipartisan bill was introduced by Senator Breaux and myself some time ago. It was a very comprehensive energy bill. It covered all aspects of renewables, alternatives, conservation, and also went into what we think is very important, and that is the issue of supply because what we have in this country—and it is certainly the President's position that we are moving out to New York and other areas—is we have increased consumption. In other words, we increased demand but we have not increased the supply.

This particular bill attempts to not only, in the sense, encourage alternatives and conservation, but it addresses how we can go back to our conventional sources of energy and try to do a more efficient job of ensuring that they, too, continue to constitute our economic future.

That sounds simplistic in one sense, but in another it should be recognized we have not been able to build a new coal-fired plant in the United States simply because we do not have the coal or the method of transporting the coal; it is simply a matter of permitting and the difficulties associated with meeting air quality and the costs associated with the particular type of construction required to meet the new emission standards.

We have not built a new nuclear plant in this country in over 25 years. Nobody in their right mind would even approach the subject because of first, permitting, but probably even more pertinent is the difficulty of what we do with the high level radioactive wastes. We have been working out in Nevada for the last decade building a repository that is still 6 to 8 years away, even though it is basically complete today. The permitting is taking that long. It is at Yucca Mountain. We have expended over $7 billion.

My point is simply this: We do not address our conventional sources, we find we have eliminated them for one reason or another simply because we have not had the conviction to overcome the objections by some groups that do not want to see nuclear and want to see coal. It is pretty hard to identify what their contribution is to the recognition that we are short of supply.

You can go on into hydro, which is renewable, but nevertheless there are those who propose to take down hydro dams in our rivers. Out west, if you take down the dams, you close the rivers to navigation. Then where do you put the tonnage that goes on the rivers? You cannot put it on the road.

We have also seen a tremendous increase in natural gas consumption because that is the one area that our electric producing entities can permit. Nevertheless, we have seen gas prices go from $2.16 per thousand cubic feet last year to somewhere in the area of $5.40 or $8.40 or whatever—it has doubled; it has tripled. The realization now is we are pulling down our recoverable gas reserves faster than we are finding new ones.

I am not suggesting we don't have more gas in this country, but we have pretty much identified natural gas...
as the preferred fuel. Now we are finding ourselves faced with higher prices associated with that.

I have kept oil for the last provision in our dependence because I think it affects on a little different portion of energy. America moved away from oil. We do not move not necessarily on natural gas. Our industry depends on natural gas, our power generating on natural gas, our homes by natural gas, but you don’t fly out of Washington, DC, on hot air. You fly out on kerosene in your jet airplane, your bus. Unfortunately, we have little relief in sight from the standpoint of our dependence being replaced by any other technology.

We talk about fuel cells; we talk about wind, solar panels. We have expended about $6 billion over the last 5 years developing alternative energy. While that development has made some progress, the unfortunate part is it still only reflects about 4 percent of our overall general mix in energy sources.

What we have attempted to do in our bill, Senator Breaux and myself, is to concentrate to a large degree on increasing the supply by using technology to develop more efficiently, more effectively, with smaller footprints.

We have also had a bill that has been introduced. I would classify this at least initially as a partisan bill introduced by my good friend Senator BINGAMAN, with whom I share responsibility on Energy, as chairman of the committee—he is the ranking member—and Senator DASCHEL. They introduced a partisan bill. The rationale behind many of our initiatives is similar. In the area of tax initiatives, they are nearly identical. Both have marginal wells, energy efficiency, renewable, accelerating depreciation, infrastructure, other nontax provisions, electric reliability, and Price Anderson issues that address liability on nuclear plants, and alternative fuels.

However, there are some significant differences. I would like to point those out at this time. There is a little in this bill about existing older coal-fired plants that generate a significant portion of the energy in this country in the form of electricity.

There is nothing substantial for nuclear. I have indicated that nuclear energy provides about 20 percent of the power in this Nation. It is clean. It has no emissions.

As a consequence, more and more utilities are looking at American nuclear. But clearly we have to address the waste issue.

There is no expedited procedure in the Democratic bill for hydro relicensing, which we think is a necessity, because in the interest of safety and efficiency hydro dams need to be relicensed restaurant managers.

Lastly, they have not included opening up ANWR—that small sliver of Alaska that we believe has the potential to decrease, if you will, substantially our dependence on imported oil. It will not replace it. I want to make sure everybody recognizes that. It is not the answer to California’s energy problem. It never was and never will be. But certainly is it a necessary to California’s development. All oil because all the oil that is produced in Alaska is consumed in California, or the State of Washington. Oregon has no refineries. So a portion of the oil from Washington’s and California’s refineries go to Oregon.

My point is a simple one. As Alaska’s oil production declines, California, Washington, and Oregon will continue to need oil.

The question is, Where are they going to get the oil? They are going to bring it in from overseas in foreign vessels, maybe from the rain forests of Colombia or other areas where there is no environmental consideration given for the development of the field, or compatibility of the environment, or compatibility of the landmass where they develop oil, or for the technology that we mandate in developing our own oil fields.

My point is, you might not like oil fields. Prudhoe Bay is the best in the world, bar none. The combination of the environmental oversight by the Federal Government and the EPA and the State of Alaska is second to none. Any spill of an ounce or more has to be reported. Even throwing out coffee from a cup—requires reporting. That may sound landish, but that is the rule. That is the law, and that is the enforcement.

As we look at the decline in production from Alaska and recognize where it is going, and factoring in the reality that our oil under the Jones Act, which mandates that the carriage of goods between two American ports must be in U.S. flag vessels that are crewed by union members, that are in ships built in U.S. yards, which provides jobs for Americans as opposed to foreign ships that are coming in that aren’t built to U.S. standards and don’t have the same requirements of Coast Guard inspections, and so forth. There is a significant issue for Washington, Oregon, and California.

The merits of opening ANWR speak for themselves. Can you do it safely? Clearly we can. We have the experience. In the Well, those who are opposed to it would have you believe that ANWR is at risk. But they do not point out the reality that ANWR is the size of the State of South Carolina. It is roughly 19 million acres. In that 19 million acres, we have set aside 10 million acres in the wilderness in perpetuity and another 9 million acres has been set aside in the refuge, leaving up at the top for Congress and only Congress to determine what is the so-called 1002 area consisting of 1.5 million acres.

That is what is at risk—1.5 million acres out of 19 million acres. And industry says if oil is found there in the range that it believes exist—someplace between 5.6 billion barrels and 16 billion barrels—the footprint would be about 1,000, or 2,000 acres.

That is about half the size of the Dulles International Airport, to give you some idea of the magnitude. Is that permissible? We think it is. Do we have the technology? We think we do.

If the oil is there in that abundance, 10 million barrels a day—it would equal Prudhoe Bay. Prudhoe Bay has produced for 27 years about 20 to 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in the United States. Now it is beginning to decline. It has, nevertheless, exceeded its production prediction which was 10 billion barrels. It has produced over 13 billion barrels.

My point is that ANWR and that particular field that is believed to be there would be the largest oil field found in the world in 5 years. Some people say it is only a 6-month supply. That is assuming all the rest of the oil production stops. It is a ridiculous argument. It is similar to us saying that Alaska is going to tick off the development of ANWR, and therefore you are not going to have a 6-month supply of oil. It is a ridiculous argument. It needs to be tossed aside. It is amazing that the media believes it is going to take 10 years to develop. It is not going to be 10 years. We can develop that in 3 years. We already have an 800-mile pipeline. It utilizes half the capacity. We need an extension of about 26 miles of pipeline, which takes us from the field on State land on the edge of ANWR, and we can begin to produce oil.

The difficulty I have with the Democratic bill is ANWR is not in it. I think as we look at trying to find relief, we have to look at things, and we have to recognize that we can do it safely. I have already indicated prominent justification for that.

The other issue is what is going on with the economy. The economy in this country is in the dumps. How much of it is the cost, if you will, of increased energy? Look at Fortune 500 fourth-quarter earnings. They all indicate that they were substantially affected by the increased costs of energy. It affected their bottom line. It affected their employment. It affected their inventory.

Again, it is an economic factor, and it is a significant one as we look at the conclusion that this could make in our own economy. It is a significant creator of jobs.

There are virtually thousands and thousands of jobs associated with opening up this oil field. We don’t make them in the economy. We make valves. We don’t have the welders. It is estimated that about 750,000 jobs are associated with this effort.

I want to make sure everybody understands the significance of what it means to the economy.

Finally, the national security interests of this country: when do we compromise our national security? At what
point do we become so dependent on oil imports that we compromise that?

I was asked that question. I said, well, remember in 1973 and 1974 when we had the oil embargo. We had gas lines around the block. People were indignant, and there were blaming government. We said we will never approach 50-percent dependence.

So we created the Strategic Petroleum Reserve with a 90-day supply. We never reached that goal. We reached about 75 percent. When we pulled our oil out under the previous administration—about 30 million barrels—we suddenly found that we didn’t have the refining capacity to refine the oil. We had to replace what we were importing by opening SPR.

My point is we have restrictions in our energy situation. And it is not limited to supply. It is partially limited to our energy situation. And it is not limited by opening SPR.

They want to shut ANWR permanently, but, by the same token, they want to accelerate the export of Alaskan natural gas. That is kind of an interesting comparison because there is a difference of how we propose to develop Alaska’s gas. They propose a section 29 tax incentive for production of natural gas from Alaska.

It is interesting to reflect on what section 29 means. Section 29 is designed as an incentive for development of unconventional sources of energy, not conventional sources.

What am I talking about? For example, overlaying Prudhoe Bay, we have what we call the West Sack Field. It is estimated that in Prudhoe Bay the oil is immersed in the sands, and the sands are in permafrost, and the technology of recovery is simply not in existence. The oil is there.

So in our bill we have a proposed subsidy for developing that technology. We have, in our bill, under section 9, an incentive for developing biomass technology, coalbed methane technology. But surprisingly enough—and I do not mean to kick a gift horse in the mouth or the teeth or the behind or wherever—in our opinion—propose this section 29 in Alaska’s potential natural gas development.

Under our proposal, the Alaska natural gas project would not be available for any type of section 29 subsidy. There is a reason for that. In our case, the gas has been found. We found 36 trillion cubic feet of gas associated with oil development in Prudhoe Bay. The geologists will not even get a recognition for finding a gas well. The emphasis was on an oil well.

So we found this gas. We discovered it. Furthermore, we have produced it. We produced it by pulling it out and re-injecting it into the oil wells to get greater recovery. So the gas is still there. But to suggest that Exxon, British Petroleum, and Phillips are looking for an incentive—a tax incentive under section 29—I do not mean to speak out of school, but we are just amazed they would include a subsidy to big oil for a project that is already proven, already found. The technology is available. All we need is the transportation to get it out.

So, once again, we see Members of Congress trying to determine what is in the best interests of Alaska without talking to Alaskans or understanding our point of view or giving us the courtesy.

Finally, for the record, we have had long debates on this issue. You could open ANWR safely. We have had long debates on the issue of our national security interests, of the numbers of lives we have lost over oil.
I remember Mark Hatfield, a very senior Member of this body, from the State of Oregon, saying; I would vote for ANWR any day in the world if it meant not sending another American soldier overseas to fight a war in a for-
eign country.

Well, the final word—and this is from Representative RALPH HALL, a Demo-
crat from Texas, who said Tuesday in a speech before the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—and I quote:

I would drill in a cemetery if it kept my grandkids out of body bags.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RESTORING A NATIONAL COMMIT-
MENT TO MISSILE DEFENSE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in his re-
cent address to Congress, President George W. Bush made it clear that, un-
like his immediate predecessor, he strongly endorses the deployment of an
effective missile defense system capa-
ble of protecting the United States, its allies and its forward deployed forces
from the growing threat of missile at-
tack. As someone who has long viewed
the deployment of missile defense as an
urgent national priority, I look for-
ward to working with President Bush
to achieve this vital national security
goal for America.

March 23 marks the 18th anniversary
of President Ronald Reagan’s historic
speech announcing his determination
to see America build a defense against
strategic nuclear missiles. . . . as we pursue a program to begin to
build an effective theater high altitude
defense system (THAAD) and Navy Theater
West systems, in defiance of the law—
the Defense Authorization bill—requir-
ing accelerated development; annan-
counced fraudulent “3-plus-3” program
for national missile defense; three years to develop, plus three years to
deploy. (Later changed to “5 plus 3,”
then “7 plus 3,” then dropped the “plus
3”); reaffirmed ABM Treaty as the
“cornerstone of strategic stability”;
opposed and helped kill legislation
calling for NMD deployment by 2003.

1997: signed ABM Treaty agreements
with Russia which, if ratified by the
Senate, would: (1) reaffirm the validity
of the ABM Treaty banning effective
national missile defense; (2) sharply
limit the effectiveness of theater de-
fense systems; and (3) ban space-based
missile defenses.

Clinton never submitted these for
ratification, knowing they would fail to
get the needed 67 votes for ratifica-
tion.

1998: opposed and helped kill legisla-
tion calling for NMD deployment “as
soon as technologically possible;” dis-
pensed the Rumsfeld Commission’s as-
essment of the growing missile threat,
arguing that there was no need to ac-
celerate missile defense deployment;
on August 24, Joint Chiefs Chairman
Henry Shelton wrote to me affirming
his assurance that U.S. intelligence
would detect at least three years’
warning of any new rogue state ICBM
threat by testing a three-stage Taepo-Dong I
missile with intercontinental range,
demonstrating critical staging tech-
nology and rudimentary ICBM capa-
bility.

1999: delayed by at least two years
the Space Based Infrared System
(SBIRS) satellites designed to detect
targets on the move and to coordinate with any effective na-
tional missile defense system; emas-
culated the Missile Defense Act of
1999—passed by veto-proof majorities in
both houses—calling for deployment “as soon as technically possible.”

In signing the bill into law, Clinton
outrageously interpreted it to mean
that no deployment decision had been
made and that therefore he would
make no change in his go-slow missile
defense policy.

2000: cut funding for the Airborne
Laser (ABL) program by 52 percent
over 5-year period, but the cuts were
later reversed by Congress; allowed
Russia to veto U.S. missile defense
plans by making NMD dependent on
whether Russia and China signed an
ABM Defense Treaty; postponed the
(THAAD non-treaty compliant; placed
self-imposed limits on THAAD testing
to keep it “treaty-compliant.”

1994: State Department official called
the ABM treaty “sacred text,” saying
“arms control has more to offer our
national security than do more weapons
systems. We look first to arms control
and second . . . to defenses;” declared
reaffirmed commitment to ABM Treaty,
saying any defense must be
“treaty-compliant.”

1995: placed self-imposed limits on
Navy Upper Tier system to keep it
“treaty compliant,” and downgraded the
National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) to
downplay growing missile threat; ve-
tooed Defense Authorization bill requir-
ing missile defense deployment by 2003.

1996: cut funding and slowed develop-
ment of THAAD and Navy Theater
Wide systems, in defiance of the law—
the Defense Authorization bill—requir-
ing accelerated development; annan-
counced fraudulent “3-plus-3” program
for national missile defense; three years to develop, plus three years to
deploy. (Later changed to “6 plus 3,”
then “7 plus 3,” then dropped the “plus
3”); reaffirmed ABM Treaty as the
“cornerstone of strategic stability;”
opposed and helped kill legislation
calling for NMD deployment by 2000.

1997: signed ABM Treaty agreements
with Russia which, if ratified by the
Senate, would: (1) reaffirm the validity
of the ABM Treaty banning effective
national missile defense; (2) sharply
limit the effectiveness of theater de-
fense systems; and (3) ban space-based
missile defenses.

Clinton never submitted these for
ratification, knowing they would fail to
get the needed 67 votes for ratifica-
tion.

1998: opposed and helped kill legisla-
tion calling for NMD deployment “as
soon as technologically possible;” dis-
pensed the Rumsfeld Commission’s as-
essment of the growing missile threat,
arguing that there was no need to ac-
celerate missile defense deployment;
on August 24, Joint Chiefs Chairman
Henry Shelton wrote to me affirming
his assurance that U.S. intelligence
would detect at least three years’
warning of any new rogue state ICBM
threat by testing a three-stage Taepo-Dong I
missile with intercontinental range,
With a new President determined to set a new course, or rather to set us back to the course first articulated by President Reagan, there is reason for hope and optimism. I urge President Bush to move quickly in forging a new, voluntary commitment to the deployment of a robust, global missile defense system capable of defending all 50 states, our allies and our forward-deployed troops around the world. We should appropriate the necessary budgets. We should exploit all options and we should seriously consider an initial deployment at sea, using our proven Aegis ships and complementing it with important ground and spaced based systems.

In consultation with our allies, and while maintaining our nuclear deterrent, we should break free of the constraints of the outdated ABM Treaty and begin to fashion a security regime based, as Reagan said, on our ability “to save lives rather than to avenge them.” This is the legacy America deserves, consistent with Reagan’s vision of courage, morality and security—a vision I know is shared by President George W. Bush.

SCORECARD OF HATRED

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, in just the last few weeks, two California high schools a few miles apart, suffered the same fate when troubled students opened fire on both campuses and teachers. These remind of us of the many acts of gun violence committed by young people in American schools since the attack at Columbine High School almost 2 years ago. In last week’s Time magazine, an article called “Scorecard of Hatred,” lists in detail the many varied plans of copycat attacks since Columbine, including those planned by teenagers who, thankfully, failed in their attempts. Each plan involves more than 20 different attempts by young people to “pull a Columbine,” the phrase that some teenagers now use to describe these acts of violence, is disturbing in its own right. As a whole, these acts are beginning to become an epidemic.

I often wonder why these acts of school violence are so uniquely American. The warning signs most commonly associated with those who engage in school shootings—disturbing patterns of behavior, depressed and increased fascination with violence, sometimes inappropriate living conditions—are no doubt experienced by teens in other countries. Yet, even though the gun shots at Columbine were experienced by teens across the world, teens in other countries are not routinely committing terrible acts of school violence.

Last May, on the 1-year anniversary of the Columbine shootings, there was one case of copycat violence in Ontario, Canada, according to an article in the Ottawa Citizen, a 15-year-old boy, who was teased mercilessly by his classmates, became obsessed with the Columbine school massacre and the violent perpetrators of the tragic event. He posted pictures of the young men in his lockers and began counting down the days until the anniversary. But when the moment came, and the young boy in Canada attempted to repeat his Columbine copycat crime, instead of brandishing an arsenal of firearms, he brandished a kitchen knife. Instead of 15 dead and countless more injured, 5 people were stabbed, none with any life-threatening injuries.

In Littleton, CO and Ottawa, Canada, the circumstances were similar, but the outcomes were substantially different. It seems that the one crucial difference in this and other such incidences is not religion or music, entertainment, or peer influence, it is access to guns. In most of these school shootings in the United States, our young people have relatively easy access to guns. Here are some of the examples presented in a recent Time magazine article: two 8th graders in California were found with a military-sniper rifle, a handgun, and 1,500 rounds of ammunition; a 15-year-old in Georgia gained access to his stepfather’s rifle; a 7th grader from Oklahoma took his father’s semiautomatic handgun; a 6-year-old in Michigan discovered a semiautomatic handgun; a 17-year-old in California amassed an arsenal of 15 guns as well as knives and ammunition; a 13-year-old in Florida picked up a semiautomatic handgun.

Mr. President, the lists goes on and on. We must do something to limit our youth’s easy access to guns and end the epidemic of gun violence in our Nation’s schools and community places.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the Time magazine article, Scorecard of Hatred. There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Time magazine, Mar. 19, 2001]

SCORECARD OF HATRED

(By Amanda Bowen)

MAY 13, 2001—FOILED

Port Huron, Mich.

Their plan, police said, was to outdo Columbine perpetrators Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold by arming themselves, forcing the principal of Heritage Middle School to call an assembly and then killing teachers, classmates and themselves. Jedahia (David) Zinzo and Justin Schnepp, both 14, made a list of 15 targets, a building plan from the school custodian’s office and plotted to use one gun to steal more. Classmates caught wind of the plot and reported it to the assistant principal. Zinzo and Schnepp were sentenced to four years’ probation.

MAY 19, 2001—FOILED

Anaheim, Calif.

When police searched the homes of two eighth-graders at South Junior High, they found two bomb-making materials, a military-surplus rifle, a Ruger Blackhawk .45-cal. handgun, 1,500 rounds of ammunition and Nazi paraphernalia. They were tipped off by a student who heard that the boys, whose names were not released, were threatening to blow up the school.

Northeast Florida

Two teenagers were charged with conspiracy to commit second-degree murder and attempted bomb making, one of which depicted a bloody knife, a shotgun and an assault weapon. The teens allegedly described themselves as Satan worshippers and claimed they were planning to leave a deadlier trail than the one at Columbine. Charges were dropped for lack of evidence, and the boys were released from house arrest.

OCT. 28, 1999—FOILED

Cleveland, Ohio

Adam Gruber, 14, and John Borowski, Benjamin Balducci and Andy Napier, all 15, were white students planning a rampage at their mostly black school. It was to end, one of the boys’ friends said, by blowing up the school with police, with one survivor to “bask in the glory.” Officials were tipped off to the plot by another student’s mother.

OCT. 24, 2000

Glendale, Ariz.

Sean Botkin dressed in camouflage, went to his old school, entered a math class and with a 9-mm handgun held hostage 32 former classmates and a teacher, police say. After an hour, the 14-year-old was persuaded to surrender.

WARNING SIGNS.—Botkin said in a tele- view interview last month that he was picked on, hated school, had a troubled family life and couldn’t recall ever being truly happy. “Using a gun would get the attention more than just walking into school and say- ing, ‘I need help or something,’” he said.

JAN. 10, 2001

Ormond, Calif.

Richard Lopez, 17, had a history of mental illness, and police apparently believe he “had a plan made up to be killed by a po- lice officer” when he marched onto the grounds of his old school, Hueneke High, took a girl hostage and held a gun to her head. Within five minutes, when the AT officers’ arriving, he was shot dead. Lopez’s sister said her brother had wanted to commit suicide, but his Catholic faith forbade it.

WARNING SIGNS.—Family members said Lopez had been in and out of juvenile facili- ties and attempted suicide three times, “He needed help, and I cried out for it,” his grandmother said.

JAN. 20, 2001—FOILED

Cupertino, Calif.

The Columbine gunmen were “the only thing that’s real,” according to De Anza Col- lege sophomore Al Joseph DeGuzman, 19. He allegedly planned to attack the school with guns and explosive devices. The day before, however, he apparently photographed himself with his arsenal and took the film for de- veloping. The drugstore clerk alerted police.

FEB. 5, 2001—FOILED

Hoyt, Kans.

Police were alerted to Richard B. Bradley Jr., 18, Jason L. Moss, 17, and James R. Lopez, 16, by an anonymous hot-line tip. A search of their homes revealed bombmaking material, school floor plans, a rifle, ammuni- tion and white supremacist drawings, police
Children and cursing. His hellish home lifeedly made to stay after school nearly every day. There was no response. On the day of the shooting, police say they found a weapons cache, ammunition, and sketches of the school.

**FOILED**

Fort Gibson, Okla.

Seventh-grader Seth Troickey was a religious, straight-A student. But then, police say, he came to school, stood under a tree, pulled out his father’s 9-mm semiautomatic handgun and fired at least 15 rounds into a group of male classmates, all of whom were wounded.

**WARNING SIGNS**—Cordova reportedly boasted the day before the shooting that he could hold his own in battle. Meiniger, 15, and Alexander Vukodinovich, 14, were allegedly hatching an elaborate plan to make history blasting this school, “I think I might commit suicide.”

**FOILED**

Palm Harbor, Fla.

Scott McClain, a 14-year-old eighth-grader, reportedly wrote a detailed e-mail to at least one friend describing his plans to make a bomb and use it to target a teacher from his alma mater, reportedly with a .22-cal. Ruger semiautomatic and a duffel bag containing 18 bombs and a sawed-off shotgun. An additional eight bombs were allegedly found in his home.

**FOILED**

Elmvra, N.Y.

Jeremy Getman, an 18-year-old senior, passed a disturbing note to a friend, who alerted authorities. A police officer found Getman in Southside High School’s cafeteria, reportedly with a .22-cal. revolver into the cafeteria and shot Kim-berly Marchess in the shoulder.

**FOILED**

Williamsport, Pa.

Elizabeth Catherine Bush, 14, was threatened and teased mercilessly at her old school in Jersey Shore and transferred last spring to Bishop Neumann, a small Roman Catholic school. There she allegedly took her father’s revolver into the cafeteria and shot Kimberly Marchess in the shoulder.

**FOILED**

Twentynine Palms, Calif.

Cori Aragon, left, with her mother, was one of 16 students at Monument High School in the Mojave Desert to discover that their names were allegedly on the hit list of two 17-year-old boys arrested on suspicion of conspiracy to commit murder and civil rights violations. Tipped off by a female student who overheard the boys’ plans, police said they found a rifle in one home, the list in the other. The boys were not released. This was the most serious case to follow the Santee shootings. But 14 other California children were either arrested or under observation for making threats. Around the U.S., dozens more copycat threats were reported.

**ADDITIONAL STATEMENT**

**SCHOOL VIOLENCE**

- Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, tomorrow, March 24, is the third anniversary of the tragic episode of school vio-lence which occurred at Westside Middle School in Jonesboro, AR. I want the families and friends of Natalie Brooks, Paige Ann Herring, Stephanie Johnson, Britthenny Varner, and Shannon Wright to know that I will never forget their terrible loss and that my heart continues to ache for and with them. They are, and will continue to be, in my thoughts and prayers as I proceed with my efforts to make our schools the safe havens of learning that they should and must be.

- Mr. LIEBERMAN. I rise today to congratulate Godfrey “Budge” Sperring, a man who has spent the last 35 years satisfying the appetites of reporters hungry for both a good meal and a good story. On more than 3,100 mornings, Budge has invited members of the Washington press corps to join him for breakfast and conversation with political editors. He has hosted everyone from Members of Con-gress to presidential nominees to sit-ting presidents, as well as luminaries

**FOILED**

Fort Collins, Colo.

Just 66 miles from Littleton, Chad Meineger, 15, and Alexander Vukodinovich and Scott Parent, both 14, were allegedly hatching an elaborate plan to “redo Colum-bine.” Police were tipped off by two female classmates of the boys, who said they had overheard them plotting. Officers say they found a weapons cache, ammunition and sketches of the school.

**FOILED**

A 17-year-old senior at Mills High school, whose name has not been released, was arrested after a student reported being threatened with a gun. Police said they found an arsenal of 15 guns and rifles, knives and ammunition at the boy’s home, all apparently belonging to his father. In the eight months before his arrest, the boy had allegedly threatened seven other friends with guns and bragged he was going to “do a Colum-bine.” The victims told they were too scared to report the threats.

**FOILED**

Lake Worth, Fla.

Nathaniel Brazzil, 13, was sent home for throwing water balloons. Police say he returned to school, semiautomatic handgun, went into an English class and shot and killed teacher Barry Gronow, 35.
such as the Dalai Lama. Along the way, the Sperling Breakfasts have become more than an informal gathering of journalists and news makers, they have become a prominent part of Washington's political culture. In fact, they have become a brand name.

Today, I would like to take a few moments to pay tribute to this institution by sharing with my colleagues a little bit about its founder. Budge Sperling was born in Long Beach, California, in 1915, but grew up in Urbana, Illinois. In 1937 he graduated from the University of Illinois with a degree in Journalism. He continued his studies at the University of Oklahoma, receiving a law degree in 1940.

In 1946, after serving for five years in the United States Air Force during World War II, Budge joined the staff of the Christian Science Monitor, working his way through a variety of national bureaus until he and his breakfast became a brand name. Throughout a career that has spanned over 50 years, Budge has served as Chief of the Monitor's Midwest Bureau, New York Bureau, and Washington Bureau. He currently serves as the Monitor's Senior Washington Columnist.

The Sperling Breakfasts began, ironically, over lunch. On February 8, 1966, Budge decided to invite some of his colleagues to join him for a midday meal at the National Press Club with Charles H. Percy, the eventual senator from Illinois, whom he had met on the campaign trail. After the successful meeting, Budge was urged by his fellow reporters to host another gathering. Budge invited New York Mayor John Lindsay, but was unable to book a room at the National Press Club for lunch. He decided to have the meeting over breakfast instead, and a tradition was born.

Since that time, the Sperling Breakfast, or “Breakfast with Godfrey,” as it has been known, has served as the source of many news stories. One of the most well-known breakfasts occurred when Budge invited Senator Robert F. Kennedy to speak the day after the New Hampshire primary in 1968. While Kennedy was addressing the assembled reporters, news of the Tet offensive in Vietnam broke and Kennedy, who had repeatedly denied presidential aspirations, struggled visibly to reconcile this new information with his denials. As Budge recently recalled that morning had said, "we felt we’d seen history in the making."

This is only one example of the many memorable breakfasts Budge has hosted. And while not every one of the thousands of breakfasts has resulted in headlines the following day, one thing is certain: Budge has his finger on the pulse of who and what are making news in Washington.

At the beginning of each and every Sperling Breakfast, Budge begins by announcing, "The only ground rule here is that we’re on the record." With that one rule in mind, I am pleased to stand here today and state in the RECORD my congratulations and appreciation to Godfrey “Budge” Sperling for all he has done to help inform the American people about their government.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of committee were submitted:

By Mr. HELMS for the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Marc Isaiah Grossman, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be an Under Secretary of State (Political Affairs).

Richard Lee Armitage, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

(The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed subject to the nominees' commitment to respond to requests for an informal and testimony before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

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. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 603. A bill to provide for full voting representation in the Congress for the citizens of the District of Columbia to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that individuals who are residents of the District of Columbia shall be exempt from Federal income taxation until such full voting representation takes effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 604. A bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 605. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for State and local income taxes in lieu of State and local income taxes and to allow the State and local income tax deduction against the alternative minimum tax.

S. 606. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage a strong community-based banking system; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON:

S. 607. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for State and local sales taxes in lieu of State and local income taxes and ambulance providers that offer the uniformed services Survivor Benefit Plan for surviving spouses who are at least 62 years of age, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CRAGO (for himself, Mr. ALARD, and Mr. CRAGO):

S. 608. A bill to provide additional authority to the Office of Ombudsman of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ALARD (for himself and Mr. GRAMM):

S. 609. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to require partial rebates of FHA mortgage insurance premiums to certain mortgagors upon payment of their FHA-insured mortgages; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 136

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 136, a bill to amend the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 to extend trade negotiating and trade agreement implementing authority.

S. 145

At the request of Mr. THURMOND, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 145, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to increase to parity with other surviving spouses the basic annuity that is provided under the uniformed services Survivor Benefit Plan for surviving spouses who are at least 62 years of age, and for other purposes.

S. 225

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 225, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives to public elementary and secondary school teachers by providing a tax credit for teaching expenses, professional development expenses, and student education loans.

S. 236

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the medicare program of annual screening pap smear and screening pelvic exams.

S. 277

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 277, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 291

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 291, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction for State and local sales taxes in lieu of State and local income taxes and to allow the State and local income tax deduction against the alternative minimum tax.

S. 413

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 413, a bill to amend part F of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve and refocus civic education, and for other purposes.

S. 452

At the request of Mr. MURkowski, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 452, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure that the Secretary of Health and Human Services provides appropriate guidance to physicians, providers of services, and ambulance providers that are attempting to properly submit claims under the medicare program to ensure that the Secretary does not target inadvertent billing errors.
At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 549, a bill to ensure the availability of spectrum to amateur radio operators.

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to encourage the production and use of efficient energy sources, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 597, a bill to provide for a comprehensive and balanced national energy policy.

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 17, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there should continue to be parity between the adjustments in the compensation of members of the uniformed services and the adjustments in the compensation of civilian employees of the United States.

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 63, a resolution commemorating and acknowledging the dedication and sacrifice made by the men and women who have lost their lives while serving as law enforcement officers.

**STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS**

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 603. A bill to provide for full voting representation in the Congress for the citizens of the District of Columbia to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that individuals who are residents of the District of Columbia shall be exempt from Federal income taxation until such full voting representation takes effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join with my colleague Senator RUSS FEINGOLD and with my longtime friend Congresswoman ELENA HOLMES NORTON in the House of Representatives, in sending the message that, as the United States Supreme Court has said, "No right is more precious in a free country than that of having a voice in the election of those who make the laws under which, as good citizens, we must live." Here we are, in the year 2001—225 years after the birth of our nation—and the residents of the District of Columbia, despite paying their full freight of federal taxes, are still deprived of this fundamental right. The bill we introduce today, the "No Taxation Without Representation Act of 2001," drawing on the famous cry of the Boston Tea Party. Without Representation is a building block of the covenant of our democracy, a birthright of every American citizen.

The voting problems in the 2000 Presidential election make the symbolism of this bill even more powerful. Not since the civil rights struggle of the early 1960's have we been so keenly aware of the importance of a vote. All taxing citizens of the United States, except the residents of Washington, D.C., can vote for representatives to advocate for and protect the interests of their constituents in both the House and Senate. As American citizens, we do not regard this opportunity as a privilege; we regard it as a right. Many Americans are not aware of this denial. I am shocked to know that the residents of the District of Columbia have no such right. Although they regularly elect "shadow" Senators and a "shadow" Representative, these people are not recognized as members of the political class in Congress for D.C. is Delegate ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON in the House of Representatives.

Now I have known Congresswoman NORTON for many years, and I know her to be a leader. The residents of Washington, D.C. are lucky to have such a strong and talented advocate on their side. But as a delegate, she has the right to vote only in committee; she does not have the right to vote on the congressional floor. So unlike every other American, Washingtonians have no congressional representatives to call who can vote for or against pending legislation that may become the law of the land, their land.

Ever since the American Revolution, the power to tax and the right to vote have been inextricably linked. D.C. residents pay federal taxes, but have no vote in Congress. I am introducing this bill today in order to condemn this unfair situation. If enacted, this bill would exempt D.C. residents from paying federal income tax so long as they are not fully represented on Capitol Hill. There is a rationale for such an exemption from tax. Residents of places which do not have representation, such as Puerto Rico, Guam, and the United States Virgin Islands which, like D.C., have delegate representation in Congress are not required to pay any federal income tax. But let me be clear. My goal in sponsoring this legislation is not to provide a windfall to the people of Washington, D.C. Allowing the residents of D.C. to live tax-free will not solve this problem. This bill is a matter of principle, not tax policy. And the principle is the right to full franchise.

As our nation's capital, Washington, D.C. belongs to each and every American. We should all take pride in this beautiful city and show its citizens the respect they deserve. That is why I have long supported legislation providing much-needed financial and political empowerment for D.C. I was an original cosponsor of the D.C. Economic Recovery Act of 1997, which would have offered tax incentives for people to live and invest in here in D.C. We succeeded in getting two provisions of that bill enacted, a tax credit for first-time home-buyers and elimination of capital gains tax for economic development investments in D.C. I was also an original cosponsor of legislation to grant D.C. statehood both times it was introduced. And it is because I still believe that the people of Washington, D.C. deserve full participation in our democracy that I am sponsoring the No Taxation Without Representation Act of 2001 today.

My hope is that by introducing this bill, we can bring national attention to the injustice that the residents of Washington, D.C. have for too long endured. I hope it will help rally the necessary support here in Congress to grant D.C. full constitutional voting rights. All American citizens deserve the right to elect representatives to speak and to vote on their behalf in Congress. It is time that the American citizens living within the borders of Washington, D.C. are given their due. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation, and 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. 603

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 "No Taxation Without Representation Act of 2001".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

Congress finds as follows:

(1) The residents of the District of Columbia are the only Americans who pay Federal income taxes but are denied representation in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(2) The principle of one person, one vote requires that residents who have met every element of American citizenship should have every benefit of American citizenship, including voting representation in the House and Senate.

(3) The residents of the District of Columbia are twice denied equal representation, their taxpaying status as other taxpaying Americans do and are nevertheless required to pay Federal income taxes unlike the Americans who live in the territories.

(4) Despite the denial of voting representation, Americans in the Nation's capital are second among the residents of all States in per capita income taxes paid to the Federal Government.

(5) Unequal voting representation in our representative democracy is inconsistent with the founding principles of the Nation and the strongly held principles of the American people today.

**SEC. 3. REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the community of American citizens...
giving after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) Withholding.—The amendment made by subsection (b) shall apply to remuneration paid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 604. A bill to amend title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for digital education partnerships; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Ready To Learn, Ready To Teach Act. I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues, Senators KENNEDY and WARNER.

In 1992, Senator KENNEDY and I introduced the Ready To Learn Television Act. The premise was to utilize the time children spend watching television to prepare them for the first day of school. We found that nearly every preschool child in America was watching up to 30 hours of television per week. While there were some educational television shows, there was not a consistent effort to provide truly meaningful educational programming.

Ready to Learn was signed by President Bush in October, 1992. The new law supported the coordination of existing Public Broadcasting shows like Sesame Street, Stray Cats' Neighborhood. By 1994, more local public television stations began airing a consistent block of preschool educational programs and PBS began developing supplemental materials to help parents prepare their children for school.

Today, new research from the University of Alabama and the University of Kansas tells us that Ready to Learn is having a positive impact on children and their parents. The University of Alabama recently found that Ready to Learn families read books together more often and for longer periods than non-participants. And—this is a fact—Ready to Learn children watch 40 percent less television and are more likely to choose educational programs when they do watch.

Using the best research tested information available, Ready To Learn supports the development of educational, commercial-free television shows for young children. Between the Lions, is the first television series to offer educationally valid reading instruction which has been endorsed by the professional organizations that represent librarians, teachers and school principals. Its partners also include: the Center for the Book at the Library of Congress; the National Center for Family Literacy; the National Coalition for Literacy; and the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters. This broad-based support is unprecedented for a children's television show. It is well deserved affirmation of the Ready to Learn mission.

A recent study from the University of Kansas showed that children who watched Between the Lions a few hours per week, increased their knowledge of letter-sound correspondence by 64 percent compared to a 25 percent increase for peers who did not watch. Continuing research suggests that classroom teacher led use of the video and online resources will be beneficial to kindergarten and first grade students and is desired by teachers.

Thirty seven million children have played to, sung with, and learned from Ready To Learn Television shows. The parents and other care givers of more than 6 million children have participated in the local workshops and other services provided by 153 public broadcasting stations.

In my state, the Mississippi Educational Television Network Ready to Learn director, Cassandra Washington Love, has received high praise for the effective assistance provided to families. One grandfather said, "It made my grandchildren happy to know that they could get free books. My wife and I were also happy because we were able to buy our baby books. Thanks to that TV station."

The second element of the Ready To Learn, Ready To Teach Act concerns teacher professional development. MATHLINE is a proven professional development model for teachers of mathematics. In 1994, Congress authorized the "Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics," which has supported a project called MATHLINE.

MATHLINE is a blend of technology and teacher "best practices." MATHLINE demonstrations established some of the first internet-like online communications between teachers. The flexibility of video tape allows MATHLINE participants to adjust training schedules and cut out the expense and time of travel.

This bill graduates MATHLINE to TeacherLine, a more comprehensive professional development model for teachers of preschool through twelfth grade. TeacherLine will also support state of the art, digitally produced content for classroom use.

Digital broadcasting will dramatically increase the services local public broadcasting stations can offer schools. One of the most exciting is the ability to broadcast multiple video channels and data information simultaneously. This will make possible for instructional materials to be distributed on full time, continuous channels, on demand, when teachers and students need it.

In my opinion we should reauthorize these programs that are successful models and lead to educational improvement.

The Ready To Learn, Ready To Teach Act takes the best of educational technology programming; improves those proven to work, and places renewed confidence in one of education's most trusted and successful partners.
I hope Senators will support this important education legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 604

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the the “Ready to Learn, Ready to Teach Act of 2001”.

SEC. 2. REVISION OF PART C OF TITLE III.

Part C of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6902 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"PART C—READY-TO-LEARN DIGITAL TELEVISION"

"SEC. 3301. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

"(1) In 1994, Congress and the Department collaborated to make a long-term, meaningful and public investment in the principle that high quality preschool television programming will help children be ready to learn by the time the children entered first grade.

"(2) The Ready to Learn Television Program through the Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) and local public television stations has proven to be an extremely cost-effective national response to improving early childhood cognitive development and helping parents, caregivers, and professional child care providers learn how to use television as a means to help children learn and develop socially and emotionally.

"(3) Independent research shows that parents who participate in Ready to Learn workshops are more selective of the programs that they choose for their children, limit the number of hours of television viewing of their children, and use the television programs as a catalyst for learning.

"(4) The Ready to Learn (RTL) Television Program is supporting and creating commercial-free broadcast programs for young children that are the highest possible educational quality.

"(5) Through the Nation’s 350 local public television stations, these programs and other programs reach tens of millions of children, their parents, and caregivers without regard to their economic circumstances, location, or access to cable.

"(6) The Ready to Learn Television Program supports thousands of local workshops organized and run by local public television stations, child care service providers, Head Start staff, and parents of the Head Start family in child care centers and schools. These workshops have trained 630,587 parents and professionals who, in turn, serve and support over 6,312,000 children across the Nation.

"(7) The Ready to Learn Television Program has published and distributed a periodic magazine entitled “PBS Families” that contains developmentally appropriate materials to strengthen reading skills and enhance family literacy.

"(8) Ready to Learn Television stations also broadcast millions of age-appropriate books in their communities. Each station receives a minimum of 300 books each month for free local distribution. Some stations have developed and distributed more than 1,000 books per month. Nationally, more than 653,494 books have been distributed in low-income and disadvantaged neighborhoods free of charge.

"(9) Demand for Ready To Learn Television Program outreach and training has increased. Services are now being offered to 133 stations in 5 years. This growth has put a strain on available resources resulting in an inability to meet the demand for assistance to all the children who would benefit from the service.

"(10) Federal policy played a crucial role in the evolution of analog television by funding the television program entitled 'Sesame Street' in the 1960’s. Federal policy should continue to play an equally crucial role for children in the digital television age.

"SEC. 3302. REAUTHORIZATION

"(a) In General.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants to eligible entities described in section 3303(b) to develop, produce, and distribute educational and informational video programming for preschool and elementary school children and their parents in order to facilitate the achievement of the National Education Goals.

"(b) Availability.—In making such grants, the Secretary shall ensure that eligible entities make programming widely available, with support materials as appropriate, to young children, their parents, child care workers, and Head Start providers to increase the effective use of such programming.

"SEC. 3303. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING.

"(a) Awards.—The Secretary shall award grants under section 3302 to eligible entities to:

"(1) facilitate the development directly, or through contracts with producers of children and family educational television programming,

"(A) educational programming for preschool and elementary school children; and

"(B) accompanying support materials and services that promote the effective use of such programming;

"(2) facilitate the development of programming and digital content especially designed for nationwide distribution over public television stations’ digital broadcasting channels and the Internet, containing Ready to Learn-based children’s programming and resources for teachers and parents; and

"(3) enable eligible entities to contract with entities (such as public telecommunication entities) so that programs developed under this section are disseminated and distributed—

"(A) to the widest possible audience appropriate to be served by the programming; and

"(B) by the most appropriate distribution technologies.

"(b) Eligible Entities.—To be eligible to receive a grant under subsection (a), an entity shall be:

"(1) a public telecommunication entity that is able to demonstrate a capacity for the development and national distribution of educational and instructional television programming of high quality for preschool and elementary school children;

"(2) able to demonstrate a capacity to contract with the producers of children’s television programming for the purpose of developing educational television programming of high quality for preschool and elementary school children; and

"(3) able to demonstrate a capacity to localize programming and materials to meet specific State and local needs and provide educational experiences at the appropriate level.

"(c) Cultural Experiences.—Programming developed under this section shall reflect the recognition of rural/urban cultural differences and the needs of both boys and girls in preparing young children for success in school.

"SEC. 3304. DUTIES OF SECRETARY.

"(a) Annual Report to Secretary.—Each entity desiring a grant under section 3302 or 3304 shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and subject to such conditions as the Secretary may reasonably require.

"SEC. 3305. DUTIES OF SECRETARY.

"(a) Annual Report to Secretary.—An eligible entity receiving a grant under section 3302 shall prepare and submit to the Secretary an annual report which contains such..."
information as the Secretary may require. At a minimum, the report shall describe the program activities undertaken with funds received under section 3302, including—

"(1) the extent to which such materials have been developed directly or indirectly by the eligible entity, and the target population of the programs developed;

"(2) the extent to which materials that have been developed to accompany the programming, and the method by which such materials are distributed to consumers and users of the program;

"(3) the means by which programming developed under this section has been distributed, including the distance learning technologies utilized; the programming available and the geographic distribution achieved through such technologies; and

"(4) the initiatives undertaken by the eligible entity to develop public-private partnerships to secure non-Federal support for the development, distribution, and broadcast of educational and instructional programming.

"(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall prepare and submit to the relevant committees of Congress a biannual report which includes—

"(1) a summary of activities assisted under section 3303(a); and

"(2) a description of the training materials made available under section 3304(1)(D), the manner in which outreach has been conducted to inform parents and child care providers of the availability of such materials, and the manner in which such materials have been distributed in accordance with such section.

"SEC. 3308. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

"With respect to the implementation of section 3303, eligible entities receiving a grant from the Secretary may use not more than 30 percent of the amounts appropriated under such section for the normal and customary expenses of administering the grant.

"SEC. 3309. DEFINITION.

"For the purposes of this part, the term ‘distance learning’ means the transmission of educational or instructional programming to geographically dispersed individuals and groups via telecommunications.

"SEC. 3309A. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part, $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

"(b) FUNDING RULE.—Not less than 60 percent of the amounts appropriated under subsection (a) for each fiscal year shall be used to carry out section 3303.

"SEC. 3401. FINDINGS.

"Congress makes the following findings:

"(1) Since 1965, the Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics (as established under this part pursuant to the Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994) in this section referred to as ‘MATHLINE’ has allowed the Public Broadcasting Service to pioneer and refine a new model of teacher professional development for kindergarten through 12 teachers. MATHLINE uses video modeling of standards-based lessons, combined with professionally facilitated online learning communities of teachers, to help students in the classroom.

"(2) MATHLINE was developed specifically to disseminate the first national voluntary standards for teaching and learning as developed by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM). During 3 years of actual deployment, more than 5,000 teachers have participated for at least a full year in the demonstration. These teachers, in turn, have taught more than 1,500,000 students cumulatively.

"(3) Independent evaluations indicate that teaching improves and students benefit as a result of the MATHLINE program.

"(4) The MATHLINE program is ready to be expanded to reach many more teachers in more subject areas under the broader title of Teacherline. The Teacherline Program will link the digitized public broadcasting infrastructure to a wide array of educational technology networks by working with the program’s digital membership, and Federal and State agencies, to expand and build upon the successful MATHLINE model and take advantage of greatly expanded access to the Internet and technology in schools, including digital television. Tens of thousands of teachers access to the Teacherline Program to advance their teaching skills and their ability to integrate technology into their teaching and learning. The Teacherline Program also will leverage the Public Broadcasting Service’s historic relations with higher education to improve preservice teacher training.

"(5) The congressionally appointed Web-based Education Commission recently issued a comprehensive report on Internet learning that called for powerful new Internet resources, especially broadband access, to be made widely and equitably available and affordable for all learners.

"(6) The Web-based Education Commission also called for continuous and relevant training and support for educators and administrators at all levels.

"(7) The National Research Council recently issued a report entitled ‘Helping Children Learn Mathematics’ that concluded that professional development in mathematics for teachers must be sustained over years in order to be effective.

"(8) Furthermore, the Glenn Commission, appointed by the Secretary of Education to consider issues of improving and professional growth for mathematics and science teachers concluded that teacher training ‘depends upon sustained, high-quality professional development.’

"(9) The Web-based Education Commission recommended the establishment of an ongoing system to improve the quality of mathematics and science teaching in grades K-12.

"(10) Over the past several years tremendous progress has been made in wiring classrooms, equipping the classrooms with multimedia computers, and connecting the classrooms to the Internet.

"(11) There is a great need for aggregating high quality, curriculum-based digital content for teachers and students to easily access and use in order to meet State and local standards for student performance.

"(12) The congressionally appointed Web-based Education Commission called for the development of high quality public-private online educational content that meets the highest standards of educational excellence.

"(13) Digital broadcast can dramatically increase and improve the types of services with which public broadcast stations can offer kindergarten through grade 12 schools.

"(14) Digital broadcast can contribute to the improvement of schools and student performance as follows:

"(a) Broadcast of multiple video channels and data information simultaneously.

"(b) Data can be transmitted along with the video content, and interact, access additional information, communicate with featured experts, and contribute their own knowledge to the subject.

"(c) Both the video and data can be stored on servers and made available on demand to teachers and students.

"(15) Interactive digital education content will be an important component of Federal support for States in setting high standards and increasing student performance.

"SEC. 3402. PROJECT AUTHORIZED.

"(a) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to a nonprofit telecommunications entity, or partnership of such entities, for the purpose of carrying out a national telecommunications-based program to improve teaching in core curriculum areas. The program shall be designed to assist elementary school and secondary school teachers in preparing all students for achieving State and local content standards in core curriculum areas.

"(b) The Secretary is also authorized to award grants to eligible entities in section 3404(b) to develop, produce, and distribute innovative educational and instructional video programming that is designed for kindergarten through grade 12 schools and based on State and local standards. In making the grants, the Secretary shall ensure that eligible entities enter into multiyear content development collaborative arrangements with State educational agencies, local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, businesses, or other agencies and organizations.

"SEC. 3403. APPLICATION REQUIRED.

"(a) Each nonprofit telecommunications entity, or partnership of such entities, desiring a grant under section 3402(a) shall submit an application to the Secretary. Each such application shall—

"(1) demonstrate that the applicant will use the public broadcast stations or school digital networks, where available, to deliver video and data in an integrated service to train teachers in the use of stand-alone curricular materials and learning technologies;

"(2) ensure that the project for which assistance is sought will be conducted in cooperation with educational agencies, local educational agencies, national, State or local nonprofit public telecommunications entities, and national education professional associations that have developed content standards in the subject areas;

"(3) ensure that a significant portion of the benefits available for elementary schools and secondary schools from the project for which assistance is sought will be available to schools of local educational agencies which have developed content standards for the purpose of part A of title I; and

"(4) contain such additional assurances as the Secretary may reasonably require.
sponsoring the Ready to Learn, Ready to Teach Act of 2001. I commend him for his leadership in improving early learning opportunities for children and families, so that more children come to school ready to learn.

SEC. 3405. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING.

(a) AWARDS.—The Secretary shall award grants under section 3402(b) to eligible entities to—

(1) facilitate the development of educational programming that shall—

(A) include student assessment tools to give feedback on student performance;

(B) be capable of distribution through digital broadcasting and school digital networks;

(C) be created for, or adaptable to, State and local content standards; and

(D) be capable of distribution through digital broadcasting and school digital networks.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under section 3402(b), an entity shall—

(1) be a public or non-profit educational entity that shall be a local public telecommunication entity as defined by section 397(12) of the Communications Act of 1934 that is able to demonstrate a capacity for the development and distribution of educational and instructional television programming of high quality.

(c) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—Grants under section 3402(b) shall be awarded on a competitive basis as determined by the Secretary.

(d) GRANT REQUIREMENT.—Each eligible entity desiring a grant under section 3402(b) shall contribute to the activities assisted under section 3402(b) non-Federal funds equal to not less than 10 percent of the amount of the grant.

SEC. 3406. MATCHING REQUIREMENT.

(a) ALLOWABLE COSTS.—In administering the grant program under this part, the Secretary shall—

(1) enter into an annual report with each grantee that contains such information as the Secretary may require.

(b) REPORTS.—Each eligible entity receiving a grant under section 3402(a) shall prepare and submit to the Secretary an annual report which contains such information as the Secretary may require at a minimum of 200 books each month for free local distribution. More than 300,000 books are distributed each year. Twelve of the 15 television programs named "best for classroom use" by librarians are PBS educational programming. A 1997 study by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting estimated that turn TV time into learning time. It created the Reading Rainbow, and Where in the World is Carmen Sandiego, which are leaders in educational programming across the country.

SEC. 3407. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part, $45,000,000 for the fiscal year 2002, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years. However, for any fiscal year in which appropriation under section 3402 exceeds the amount appropriated under such section for the preceding fiscal year, the Secretary shall only award the amount of such excess minus at least $500,000 to applicants under section 3402(b).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join Senator COCHRAN in

Ready to Learn workshops are more critical consumers of television and their children are more active viewers. Children watch 40 percent less television, overall, and they watch more education-oriented programming. Parents did more hands-on the activities and read more minutes with their children than non-attendees. They read less for entertainment and more for education. They took their children to libraries and bookstores more than non-attendees. Ready to Learn workshops are beyond the individual and the family. A 1997 study by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting estimated that turn TV time into learning time. It created the Reading Rainbow, and Where in the World is Carmen Sandiego, which are leaders in educational programming across the country.

In addition, Ready to Learn stations have won 37 Emmys for their children's programming. Many of the innovations under Ready to Learn have come from local stations. WGBH in Boston is one of the nation's leaders in public broadcasting. It created the Reading Rainbow, and Where in the World is Carmen Sandiego, which are leaders in educational programming across the country.

Last year, WGBH hosted 34 Ready to Learn workshops in Massachusetts. 1,100 parents and 265 child-care providers and teachers attended. These parents and providers in turn worked with 3,400 children, who are now better prepared to succeed in their schools. WGBH of Springfield is the mainstay of literacy services for Western Massachusetts. This station trained 250 home care providers, who serve 2,500 children. A video lending library makes PBS materials available to teachers to use in their classroom.

Workshop participants receive training on using children's programs as the starting point for educational activities. Participants receive free books. For some, these are the only books they have ever owned. They receive the PBS Families magazine, in English or Spanish, and they also receive the broadcasting schedules. Each of these developments builds on the learning that begins with viewing the PBS programs.

Through partnerships with the Massachusetts Office of Child Care Services
and community-based organizations such as Head Start, Even Start, and the Reach Out & Read Program at Boston Medical Center, Ready to Learn trainers are reaching many low-income families with media and literacy information.

In Worcester, the Clark Street Developmental Learning School offers a family literacy program that uses Reading Rainbow or Arthur in every session with families. In addition, the school has now expanded its efforts to create an adult literacy center in the school. Many of the parents involved in the Ready to Learn project now attend the adult education program there.

Similar successes are happening across the nation. Since 1994, the sponsors of Ready to Learn workshops have given away 1.5 million books. Their program has grown from 10 television stations in 1994 to 130 television stations today. They have conducted over 5,000 workshops reaching 180,000 parents who have in turn affected the lives of over four million children.

The Ready to Learn, Ready to Teach Act of 2001 that we are introducing today will continue this high-quality child development programming. Equally important, it will take this valuable service into the next century through digital television, a powerful resource for delivering additional information through television programs.

The Ready to Learn, Ready to Teach Act will also increase the authorization of funds for Ready to Learn programs from $30 million to $50 million a year, enabling these programs to reach even more families and children with these needed services.

The Act also authorizes $20 million for high-quality teacher professional development. Building on the success of the MathLine program, the bill will expand the program to include materials for helping teachers to teach to high state standards in core subject areas.

Participating stations make the teachers workshops available through districts, schools, and even on the teachers’ own television sets. In this way, at their own pace, and in their own time, teachers can review the materials, observe other teachers at work, and reflect on their own practices. They can consider ways to improve their teaching, make adjustments to their own practices. Teachers will also receive essential help in integrating technology into their teaching.

Teachers themselves are very supportive of the contribution that television can make to their classrooms. Eighty-eight percent of teachers surveyed in 1997 by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting said that quality television used in the classroom helped them be more creative. Ninety percent said that it helped them be more effective in the classroom.

Again, I commend Senator Cochran for his leadership, and I urge my colleagues to join us in support of this important legislation, so that many more children can come to school ready to learn.

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

S. 606. A bill to provide additional authority to the Office of Ombudsman of the Environmental Protection Agency; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Ombudsman Reauthorization Act of 2001 in partnership with the Senator from Colorado, Senator ALLARD, and my colleague from Idaho, Senator CRAIG.

We all expect our federal agencies to operate professionally, efficiently, and with the interests of the American people at the forefront. To help ensure this commitment, several officials are charged with the responsibility of internally auditing and monitoring the operations and expenses of agency and department programs. These individuals are sometimes known as “watchdogs” for their role in alerting the public and Congress to questionable activities.

Within the Environmental Protection Agency’s, EPA, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, OSWER, this duty is held by the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman is ultimately responsible for responding to public inquiries into the activities of OSWER and investigating those matters that warrant closer scrutiny.

Originally established in 1984, the Ombudsman provides the public and Congress with an added measure of confidence that controversial waste control and emergency response actions by the EPA are being properly overseen and investigated where appropriate. Communities in Idaho, for their part, have twice welcomed the Ombudsman and his staff to our state to look into questionable decisions made by the EPA under the Superfund statute. In both cases, the Ombudsman has made extraordinary efforts to keep the public informed on the issues and a part of the investigations. Each time, the people of Idaho have shown collective relief that someone of the Ombudsman’s stature and expertise has become involved in cleanup decisions in our state. In both cases, the Ombudsman has also demonstrated the ability to understand the will of the community and, despite strong agency resistance, to point out policy decisions for cleanups that were not justified or in the public interest.

In 1988, the standing authority of the Ombudsman expired, leaving the office and investigations in a precarious position. In essence, while the Ombudsman endured as an “at will” employee of the EPA, the Office’s independence and authority have continuously been eroded. As a result, the Ombudsman must get approval for new investigation and budgetary needs from the very people he and his staff must monitor. With these restrictions on the Ombudsman’s functions, the public has become increasingly alarmed by the loss of a true internal watch-dog of EPA activities.

The Ombudsman Reauthorization Act of 2001 would restore public confidence. First and foremost, it would reestablish the statutory recognition of the Office of Ombudsman within the OSWER function of the EPA. Second, it would clarify the operational guidelines of the Ombudsman to collect information on matters requested by the public and investigate questionable agency activities. Finally, the measure would create a separate budget authority, free from the possible influence of those that may be subject to investigations.

This legislation is a careful balance between the need to restore public confidence in the independence of the Ombudsman and the need to ensure discretion and accountability in investigations conducted by the Ombudsman. I invite the Administration to engage us in an effort to recreate the Ombudsman in the model originally envisioned by Congress in the 1980s when the office was established. Our work together will help ensure the American people that EPA OSWER programs are chosen based on merits, functioning well, and are conducted in the interests of the public health and the environment.

I would like to take a moment to congratulate my colleague, Senator ALLARD, for his partnership in this effort. His leadership on this issue has helped raise public and congressional attention when few others recognized the importance of this cause. I salute him for his diligence in advancing this debate, and I have welcomed the opportunity to work with him on this legislation.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise today to say a few words about an issue near and dear to all of us. The Ombudsman and the need to ensure discretion and accountability and public safety. Today, my colleague from Idaho, Senator CRAPO and I are introducing the Ombudsman Reauthorization Act of 2001. The bill’s goal is to reauthorize the Ombudsman’s Office within the Environmental Protection Agency’s Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, (OSWER).

I’d like to keep my remarks brief, but I want to share my reasoning and interest in this issue. Last year, I introduced legislation to establish a separate Ombudsman Office. That legislation was an ongoing battle between the citizens of a Denver neighborhood and the EPA concerning the Shattuck Superfund site. Only through the work of the Ombudsman’s office, did the truth finally become known.

The story surrounding the Shattuck site in the Overland Park neighborhood in southwest Denver and what the EPA did to this community will have a lasting impact not only on the residents of the Overland Park neighborhood, but on every one of us who looks to the EPA to be the guardian of our nation’s environmental health and safety. In 1997, after several years of
With Senator CRAPO there to serve the needs of the people.

The Office of Ombudsman was afforded the opportunity to uncover the facts and provide assurance to the public that their health was protected. The Ombudsman's investigation revealed that EPA officials had failed to properly oversee the Shattuck issue. In early 1999, the Ombudsman's office began an investigation into EPA's oversight of the Shattuck case. The Shattuck case is not unique. Many EPA officials have been unable to properly oversee the multiple Superfund sites in their home states. Senator CRAPO knows firsthand the need for this independent and trustworthy office. As a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, his assistance is greatly appreciated.

After I introduced legislation last year, Senator CRAPO joined me in my legislative endeavors and has been a great asset. In experiencing a similar Superfund problem in his home state of Idaho, Senator CRAPO knows firsthand the need for this independent and trustworthy office. As a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee, his assistance is greatly appreciated. I believe that in the future, my colleagues may find themselves in a similar situation and I want to make sure that they have every assurance that the public’s health is protected, that its voice is heard, and that its questions are addressed.

I look forward to working with new EPA Administrator Whitman to address these concerns and I’m sure she will agree with me on the need for government accountability and public confidence.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to reinstate distributive shares or rebates of FHA insurance premiums. This rebate program was suspended at the direction of Congress in 1990 when the MMI fund was in economic scenarios. However, GAO also found that the fund could not be used as a tool to change the value of the fund and the conditions can quickly change, thus changing the value of the fund and the legal reserve.

I believe that the most prudent court of action is for the Congress to increase the reserve requirement to either 2.5 percent or 3 percent of the insurance in force, and then direct the Department to reinstate distributive shares whenever the reserve fund becomes excessive. Therefore, I am reintroducing legislation that would require partial rebates of FHA mortgage insurance premiums to certain mortgagors upon payment of their FHA-insured mortgage. I believe that in the future, my colleagues may find themselves in a similar situation and I want to make sure that they have every assurance that the public’s health is protected, that its voice is heard, and that its questions are addressed.

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. 607

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 “Homeowners Rebate Act of 2001.”

SEC. 2. PAYMENT OF DISTRIBUTIVE SHARES FROM MUTUAL MORTGAGE INSURANCE FUND RESERVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 255(c) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1711(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) DISTRIBUTION OF RESERVES.—Upon termination of an insurance obligation of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund by payment of the mortgage insured thereunder, if the Secretary determines (in accordance
with subsection (e) that there is a surplus for distribution under this section to mortgagors, the Participating Reserve Account shall be subject to distribution as follows:

"(1) Required Distribution.—In the case of a mortgage paid after November 5, 1990, and insured for 7 years or more before such termination, the Secretary shall distribute to the mortgagor a share of such Account in such manner and amount as the Secretary shall determine to be equitable and in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practice, subject to paragraphs (3) and (4).

"(2) Discretionary Distribution.—In the case of a mortgage not described in paragraph (1), the Secretary is authorized to distribute to the mortgagor a share of such Account in such manner and amount as the Secretary shall determine to be equitable and in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practice, subject to paragraphs (3) and (4).

"(3) Limitation on Amount.—In no event shall the amount any such distributable share exceed the aggregate scheduled annual premiums of the mortgagor to the year of termination of the insurance.

"(4) Conformity Requirement.—The Secretary shall not distribute any share to an eligible mortgagor under this subsection beginning on the date which is 8 years after the date of the first transmission written notification of eligibility to the last known address of the mortgagor, unless the mortgagor has applied in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary for payment of the share within 6-year period. The Secretary shall transfer from the Participating Reserve Account to the General Surplus Reserve Account the amounts that, pursuant to the preceding sentence, are no longer eligible for distribution.

"(b) Determination of Surplus.—Section 205(e) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1711(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"The term ‘election cycle,’ means, with respect to a candidate, the period beginning on the day after the date of the previous general election, for the office specified in the specific office or seat that the candidate is seeking and ending on the date of the general election for that office or seat.

"(c) Election Cycle Defined.—Section 301 of such Act (2 U.S.C. 431), as amended by section 101, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(25) Election Cycle.—The term ‘election cycle’ means, with respect to a candidate, the period beginning on the day after the date of the previous general election, for the office specified in the specific office or seat that the candidate is seeking and ending on the date of the general election for that office or seat.

"(d) Special Rule.—Section 315(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 41a(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(9) For purposes of this subsection:

"(A) if there are more than 2 elections in an election cycle for a specific Federal office, the limitations under paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) shall be increased by $1,000 and $5,000, respectively, for the number of elections in excess of 2; and

"(B) if a candidate for President or Vice President is prohibited from receiving contribution with respect to the general election by reason of receiving funds under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the limitations under paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) shall be increased by $1,000 and $5,000.

"(e) Conforming Amendments.—

"(1) The second sentence of 315(a)(3) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 41a(a)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"For purposes of this paragraph, if any contribution is made to a candidate for Federal office during a calendar year in the election cycle for the office and no election is held during that calendar year, the contribution shall be treated as made in the first succeeding calendar year in the cycle in which an election for the office is held.

"(2) Paragraph (6) of section 315(a) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 41a(a)(6)) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) For purposes of paragraph (9), all elections held in any calendar year for the office of President of the United States (except a general election for such office) shall be considered to be one election.

"(f) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made after the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 144. Mr. FITZGERALD proposed an amendment to the bill S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mark Peters, a legislative fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges during this debate.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations reported by the Foreign Relations Committee today: Executive Calendar Nos. 21 and 22, Marc Grossman and Richard Armitage.

I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed on bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s actions, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

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

The nominations were considered and confirmed as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Marc Isaiah Grossman, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be an Under Secretary of State.

Richard Lee Armitage, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

This resolution will be in front of us shortly, either later this afternoon or next week. I thank my friend and my colleague from the State of Ohio, Congressman STEVE CHABOT, as well as Representative NICK LAMJSON from the State of Texas, for introducing and gaining approval of this resolution in the House of Representatives.

It is unfortunate, however, that we need to be here today taking up this resolution. It is unfortunate because that fact acknowledges that we have made little progress in getting the return of American children who have been abducted and taken abroad, usually by a parent.

This resolution addresses the serious issue of international child abduction and the importance of The Hague Special Review Commission on International Child Abduction which formally began its work yesterday and will continue meeting until March 28.

This commission is raising the importance and the necessity of compliance with The Hague Convention on the International Aspects of Child Abduction. The Hague convention is in
place to facilitate the return of internationally abducted children to their countries of “habitual residence” for custody determination. This means, according to the Hague convention many countries have signed, when there is a dispute about the custody of a child, the child’s place of “habitual residence” is the country where that determination should be made.

Sadly, it has been clear for some time that all countries that have signed the convention do not take their obligation seriously. Certain countries in particular—allies of ours such as Germany, Austria, Sweden—have performed especially poorly in returning children and allowing family visitation options.

What are we talking about? What is the situation that brings about this international parental kidnapping? Usually it is a case such as this: An American citizen falls in love, marries someone from another country, they decide to establish a family. A child is born. Then one day the spouse who is the American citizen, the spouse who was one of the two parties to this union, wakes up and finds the other spouse gone and the child gone. That other father, takes that child back to where that mother or dad came from originally, and now the parent in the United States is looking for their child.

This is a human tragedy, a tragedy that is repeated in this country many times every year.

As many of my colleagues know, this is not the first time I have come to the Senate floor to talk about this issue and to raise the tragic problem of international child abduction. In fact, exactly 1 year ago today, I came to the Senate floor to discuss this issue. I came to the floor and a year ago introduced a similar resolution urging compliance with the Hague convention. While I am glad the Senate both passed that resolution, regrettably I have to be back here again this afternoon because, tragically, we have seen very little, if any, progress in gaining signatory compliance and ultimately in getting our children back.

Specifically, the resolution before us today identifies key problems with the current Hague convention. What are these problems?

No. 1, a lack of awareness about international parental kidnappings among policymakers and the general public in the signatory nations. This is just not an issue that people really understand, and it is not an issue to which the governments of the signatory countries are paying any attention.

No. 2, a lack of awareness and training of judges who hear these cases, who hear these international abduction cases, training that would enable them to interpret and rule on these cases fairly and would enable them to appreciate the importance of these cases.

No. 3, different interpretations of the Hague convention by signatory nations. We see that all the time. There is no uniformity or consistency.

No. 4, one of the problems with the Hague convention is that it is the failed enforcement of parental access rights and a lack of enforcement of court orders for the return of children.

Finally, we see a narrow exception to the requirement of returning children, which prevents them from being returned if they are perceived to be, upon return—and this is the language that is in the Hague convention—in grave risk of being exposed to, or having their physical or psychological well-being damaged or physically harmful situations.

Instead of being the exception, this loophole has really become the rule. It has become standard procedure and is frequently used as a justification for not returning children at all. Basically, all the court has to do is to make a determination that if the child were returned to his or her parent in the country where the child was originally born, it would place the child in grave risk of being exposed to a psychologically damaging or physically harmful situation, the court does not have to abide by the Hague convention. There is no determination of whether it is abundantly clear that this language is being used as a loophole, particularly in the area of finding a grave risk of psychological damage being done. These are some of the problems.

Additionally, our resolution calls on this special session of The Hague that is now meeting to determine practice guidelines, practice guidelines that would build on expert opinions and research-based practices in handling international child custody disputes and kidnappings.

Why do we need these guidelines? We need these guidelines because currently set standards are not in place telling signatory nations what to do when a court rules that a child should be returned. By implementing these guidelines, we would be telling nations that they could no longer hide behind the vagueness of the Hague convention articles anymore. They would not be able to use a lack of guidelines as a reason to keep children from a parent and from their homeland.

The reality is, we cannot understand nor can we ignore the importance of getting these children returned to their homes in the United States. Sadly, our previous administration, the Clinton administration, did not put these children at the top of its priority list. As a result, the number of international abductions has continued to increase.

In 1997, 280 abducted American children were living in foreign countries. That is the official number. I happen to believe, based upon anecdotal evidence, based upon conversations I have had with my colleagues and with other individuals, that the number in 1997 was much higher than that.

The official number is 280 in 1997 who were abducted children who were living in foreign countries. In 1998, that number increased to 398. And in 1999, the official number was 441. Last year, it was a staggering 775.

Quite candidly, our inability to resolve these cases has been due to, in part at least, our Government’s lack of attention to this issue.

According to the State Department, each year the United States sends an estimated 90 percent of kidnapped children back to foreign countries. In other words, this country, the United States, that has signed the Hague convention, complies in 90 percent of the cases. We must determine that certain courts that in 90 percent of the cases these children should in fact be returned to the place they were resident when they were abducted and taken from these countries. So the United States is in compliance.

We are following The Hague convention.

As the lawyers would say, we come to this issue with clean hands. The sad fact is, though, that even though we do it 90 percent of the time, and even though we are in compliance with the Hague convention, the rate of return of American children by other nations belonging to the Hague is much lower. A State Department report singles out several countries for their noncompliance with the accord, including Mauritius, Austria, Honduras, Mexico, and Sweden.

Notably absent from this report, however, was Germany, which, as I have already mentioned, has also established a disturbing pattern of noncompliance. Because of Germany’s noncompliance, an American/German working group on child custody issues has been established to help encourage Germany to return abducted children. However, essentially no progress has been made regarding open cases—either in the return of children to the United States or in allowing left-behind parents adequate visits with their children in Germany.

To that end, we must not allow Germany—or any other signatory nation—to ignore their convention obligations and turn blindly against the parents who have suffered unbelievable heartache due to the loss of their children.

What we have to remember when a parent abducts a child is that each abduction involves the destruction of a family. Yes, it is unfair for the mother or father who is left behind, but much more importantly, it is unfair for that child. A good illustration of this is what happened to Tom Sylvester of Cincinnati, OH. I have talked to Mr. Sylvester about his case, about his child, who have seen the desperation on his face. Tom is the father of a little girl named Carina, whom he has seen for a total of only about 18 days since his ex-wife abducted her from Michigan, where they lived, in 1996. The ex-wife took this little girl to Austria. She filed after the Sylvester filed a complaint with the State Department and started legal proceedings under the Hague convention.
An Austrian court heard his complaint, and the court ordered the return of Carina to Mr. Sylvester. However, this court order was never enforced, and Carina’s mother took the child into hiding. Eventually, though, when Carina’s mother surfaced with the child, the Austrian courts reversed their decision on returning her to the father, finding that she “resettled into her new environment”—a decision clearly contrary to the terms of the Hague convention.

Sadly, Mr. Sylvester is still waiting to get his little girl back.

The bottom line is this, Mr. President: We must make the return of America’s children a top priority with our State Department, a top priority with our Justice Department. Governance and policymaking are clearly about setting priorities. It is my hope that the new leadership in our State Department and the new leadership in the Justice Department will make that issue a top priority and will start trying to get these kids back.

I raised this issue with Attorney General Ashcroft during his Senate confirmation hearings, and I have written to the Secretary of State as well about the urgency of this issue. Today, I again say to our Justice Department and to our State Department: We must begin to prioritize these cases. Yes, it is important to worry about trade issues. Yes, there are many other issues on the desks of the State Department and our embassies. But what could be more important than a child? If we can say that foreign trade is important, we should also say that our children are important as well.

It is a question of setting priorities, and we must begin to prioritize these cases, and our State Department and our Justice Department must do this. No excuses should be accepted by the parents of these children, nor by the Senate, nor by the House of Representatives, nor by the American people. This must be a priority. These kids must be a priority.

As a parent and a grandparent, I cannot begin to imagine the nightmare so many American parents face when their children are kidnapped by a current or former spouse and taken abroad. It is hard to imagine. But, tragically, this is a very real and daily nightmare for hundreds of parents right here in this country. That is why the resolution we have introduced is critical to encouraging the safe return of children to the United States. It gives us an opportunity to help make a positive difference in the lives of children and their families.

In the end, if we are to succeed in bringing parentally abducted children back to their homes in the United States, the Federal Government must take an active role in their return. Ultimately, our Government has an obligation to these parents, but much more importantly, to these children. We must place our children first. They must become our priority.

I urge my colleagues to join in support and passage of this very important resolution.

THE HAGUE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION

Mr. DeWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. No. 69, which is now at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 69) expressing the sense of the Congress that the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction and urging all Contracting States to the Convention to recommend the production of practice guides.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. DeWINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to this resolution be printed in the Record.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 69) was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 26, 2001

Mr. DeWINE. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 69) was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 26, 2001

Mr. DeWINE. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 10 A.M. on Monday, March 26. I further ask that on Monday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then proceed to a period for morning business not to extend beyond 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes, with the following exceptions: Senator Byrd, or his designee, controlling the time between 10 A.M. and 11 A.M., and Senator Thomas, or his designee, controlling time between 11 A.M. and 12 noon.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon the Senate resume consideration of S. 27 and that Senator Wellstone be recognized for an amendment.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. DeWINE, Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will resume consideration of the campaign finance reform bill at noon this coming Monday. Senator Wellstone will be recognized to offer an amendment during Monday’s session. Debate on S.J. Res. 4, the Hollings constitutional amendment, will begin at 2 p.m. by previous consent. Debate will continue on that issue until 6 p.m., with a vote scheduled on passage of S.J. Res. 4 at 6 p.m.

Any votes ordered with respect to amendments to the campaign finance legislation will be stacked to follow the 6 p.m. vote. Therefore, several votes will occur in a stacked sequence beginning at 6 p.m. on Monday.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 26, 2001, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. DeWINE, Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:59 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 26, 2001, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 23, 2001:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARK ISAIAH GROSSMAN, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR POLITICAL AFFAIRS.

RICHARD LEE ARMITAGE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE.

The above nominations were approved subject to the nominee’s commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.
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Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2795–S2833

Measures Introduced: Six bills were introduced, as follows: S. 603–608.

Page S2823

Measures Passed:

Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 69, expressing the sense of the Congress on the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction and urging all Contracting States to the Convention to recommend the production of practice guides.

Page S2833

Campaign Finance Reform: Senate continued consideration of S. 27, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: Pages S2795–S2807

Rejected:

Helms Modified Amendment No. 141, to require labor organizations to provide notice to members concerning their rights with respect to the expenditure of funds for activities unrelated to collective bargaining. (By 53 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 46), Senate tabled the amendment.) Pages S2795–98

Withdrawn:

Hutchison Amendment No. 111, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt State and local political committees from duplicative notification and reporting requirements made applicable to political organizations by Public Law 106–230.

Pages S2799–S2803

Pending:

Specter Amendment No. 140, to provide findings regarding the current state of campaign finance laws and to clarify the definition of electioneering communication.

Page S2795

Fitzgerald Amendment No. 144, to provide that limits on contributions to candidates be applied on an election cycle rather than election basis.

Pages S2803–07

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at 12 noon, on Monday, March 26, 2001.

Page S2833

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Marc Isaiah Grossman, of Virginia, to be an Under Secretary of State (Political Affairs), vice Thomas R. Pickering.

Richard Lee Armitage, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

Pages S2831, S2833

Executive Reports of Committees:

Pages S2823

Statements on Introduced Bills:

Pages S2824–31

Additional Cosponsors:

Pages S2823–24

Amendments Submitted:

Page S2831

Additional Statements:

Pages S2822–23

Privileges of the Floor:

Page S2831

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—46) Pages S2797

Adjournment: Senate met at 8:45 a.m., and adjourned at 1:59 p.m., until 10 a.m., on Monday, March 26, 2001. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S2833.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Richard Lee Armitage, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary, and Marc Isaiah Grossman, of Virginia, to be an Under Secretary for Political Affairs, both of the Department of State.
House of Representatives

Chamber Action
The House was not in session. It will next meet on Monday, March 26 at 2 p.m.

Committee Meetings
No committee meetings were held.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD
Week of March 26 through March 31, 2001

Senate Chamber
On Monday, Senate will resume consideration of S. 27, Campaign Finance Reform. Also, at 2 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of S.J. Res. 4, Hollings Constitutional Amendment, with a vote on final passage to occur at 6 p.m.

During the remainder of the week, Senate will continue consideration of S. 27, Campaign Finance Reform, and any other cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees
(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: March 27, to hold hearings to review the Research, Extension and Education title of the Farm Bill, 9 a.m., SR–328A.

March 29, Full Committee, to hold hearings to review environmental trading opportunities for agriculture, 9 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Appropriations: March 27, Subcommittee on Interior, to hold oversight hearings to examine trust reform issues, 10 a.m., SD–138.

March 28, Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings to examine certain Pacific issues, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: March 27, to resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on military strategy and operational requirements; to be followed by closed hearings (in Room SH–219), 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

March 27, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold a closed briefing on information warfare and other threats to critical U.S. information systems, 2:30 p.m., S–407, Capitol.

March 28, Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings to examine Department of Defense policies pertaining to the Armed Forces Retirement Home, 9:30 a.m., SR–222.

March 28, Subcommittee on Strategic, to hold hearings to examine the Report of the Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization, 2:30 p.m., SR–232A.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: March 29, Subcommittee on Securities and Investment, to hold hearings on S. 206, to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: March 28, to hold hearings to examine the Secretary of Commerce proposals concerning adjustments of Census data, 9 a.m., SR–253.

March 29, Subcommittee on Aviation, to hold hearings to examine aviation delay prevention legislation, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: March 29, Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation, to hold oversight hearings to review the National Park Service’s implementation of management policies and procedures to comply with the provisions of Titles I, II, III, V, VI, VII, and VIII of the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998, 10 a.m., SD–628.

March 29, Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, to hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Administration’s National Fire Plan, 2:30 p.m., SD–628.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: March 27, Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Water, to hold hearings to examine water and wastewater infrastructure needs, 9:30 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: March 27, to hold hearings to examine the affordability of long term care, 10 a.m., SD–215.

March 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings on issues relating to preserving and protecting Main Street USA, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: March 27, business meeting to consider the nomination of Grant S. Green, Jr., of Virginia, to be Secretary of State for Management, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

March 27, Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of William Howard Taft, IV, of Virginia, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State, 11 a.m., SD–419.

March 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the Department of Energy’s nonproliferation programs with Russia, 10 a.m., SD–419.

March 29, Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of John Robert Bolton, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: March 29, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia, to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Government Reform’s Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization to examine the recently issued final report of the U.S. Commission on National Security in the 21st Century, focusing on the national security implications of the human capital crisis, 10 a.m., SD–342.
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: March 27, to hold hearings to examine early education and care programs in the United States, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

March 28, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine health information for consumers, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

Committee on Indian Affairs: March 28, to hold hearings on S. 210, to authorize the integration and consolidation of alcohol and substance abuse programs and services provided by Indian tribal governments; S. 214, to elevate the position of Director of the Indian Health Service within the Department of Health and Human Services to Assistant Secretary for Indian Health; and S. 535, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify that Indian women with breast or cervical cancer who are eligible for health services provided under a medical care program of the Indian Health Service or of a tribal organization are included in the optional medicaid eligibility category of breast or cervical cancer patients added by the Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention and Treatment Act of 2000, 10:30 a.m., SR–485.

Select Committee on Intelligence: March 28, to hold closed hearings on intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH–219.

Committee on the Judiciary: March 27, Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information, to hold hearings to examine domestic response capabilities for terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction, 2 p.m., SD–226.

House Committees

Monday, pro forma session.

Tuesday, Consideration of suspensions (list to be announced on Monday, March 26;

Consideration of H. Res. 84, Omnibus Committee Funding Resolution (privileged); and

Consideration of H. Con. Res. 83, Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2002 (debate only, pursuant to previous unanimous consent agreement).

(No recorded votes are expected before 6:00 p.m.)

Wednesday and the Balance of the Week, Consideration of H. Con. Res. 83, Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2002 (Subject to a Rule); and

Consideration of H. R. 6, Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001 (Subject to a Rule).

Committee on Agriculture, March 28, Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight Nutrition and Forestry, hearing on National Fire Plan Implementation, 2 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

March 29, full Committee, to continue hearings on Federal Farm Commodity Programs, 9:30 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, March 27, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, on Members of Congress, 10 a.m., and 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Defense, on Members of Congress and public witnesses, 9:30 a.m., and 1:30 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

March 28, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, on Members of Congress and public witnesses, 12:30 p.m., H–144 Capitol.

March 28, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, on NIH Theme hearing, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Military Construction, on Pacific Military Construction, 2 p.m., B–300 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Transportation, on FAA, 10 a.m., and 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Veterans’ Affairs, House and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, on Member of Congress, 10 a.m., and 1 p.m., H–143 Capitol.

March 29, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary, on the Supreme Court, 10 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

March 29, Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, on Public Schools and Public Charter Schools, 9:30 a.m., 2362 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies, on Energy (National Energy Strategy), 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Military Construction, on Quality of Life, 9:30 a.m, B–300 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Transportation, on Federal Transit Administration, 11 a.m., and on Federal Transit Capital Projects, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, on Custom Service Counter drug-oversight, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, March 28 and 29, hearings on the posture of U.S. military forces, 10 a.m., on March 28, and 9:30 a.m., on March 29, 2118 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Military Procurement, hearing on military transformation and its impact on the equipment modernization programs of the military services, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 29, Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare and Recreation, hearing on commissaries and exchange programs, 2 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, March 28, hearing on No Child Left Behind, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.


Committee on Energy and Commerce, March 27 and 30, Subcommittee on Energy and Air Quality, oversight hearings on National Energy Policy, 1 p.m. on March 27 and 10 a.m. on March 30, 2123 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Environment and Hazardous Materials, hearing on Drinking Water Needs and Infrastructure, 2 p.m., 2322 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Issues Raised by Human Cloning Research, 12 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.
March 29, Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet, hearing on “FCC Chairman Michael K. Powell: Agenda and Plans for Reform,” 10 a.m., 2125 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, March 27, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing on the agreement by Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to voluntarily enhance capital strength, disclosure, and market discipline, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 28, full Committee, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 974, Small Business Interest Checking Act of 2001; and H.R. 1088, Investor and Capital Markets Fee Relief Act, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Domestic Monetary Policy, Technology and Economic Growth, hearing on Beyond the Tax Cut: Unleashing the Economy, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, March 27, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, hearing on “Medical” Marijuana, Federal Drug Law and the Constitution’s Supremacy Clause, 2:30 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 27, Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs, hearing on “A Rush to Regulate—the Congressional Review Act and Recent Federal Regulations,” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 27, Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans’ Affairs and International Relations, hearing on Combating Terrorism: In Search of a National Strategy, 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.


Committee on International Relations, March 28, to mark up the following measures: H. Res. 91, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the human rights situation in Cuba; H.R. 428, concerning the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization; H. Res. 56, urging the appropriate representative of the United States to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to introduce at the annual meeting of the Commission a resolution calling upon the People’s Republic of China to end its human rights violations in China and Tibet; and H. Con. Res. Expressing the sense of Congress that the 2008 Olympic Games should not be held in Beijing unless the Government of the People’s Republic of China releases all political prisoners, ratifies the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and observes internationally recognized human rights, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Africa and the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, joint hearing on America’s Sudan Policy: A New Direction? 2:30 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia, hearing on Developments in the Middle East, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, March 28, to consider Subcommittee Rules of Procedure for private immigration bills and private claims bills and to mark up the following measures: H.R. 768, Need-Based Educational Aid Act of 2001; H.R. 503, Unborn Victims of Violence Act of 2001; H.R. 863, Consequences for Juvenile Offenders Act of 2001; and a private claims bill, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Crime, oversight hearing on Drug Trafficking on the Southwest Border, 10 a.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, March 27, Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands, oversight hearing on the Yosemite Valley Plan, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

March 27, Subcommittee on Water and Power, oversight hearing on the Status of Federal Western Water Resources, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 28, full Committee, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 146, Great Falls Historic District Study Act of 2001; H.R. 182, Eight Mile River Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2001; H.R. 309, Guam Foreign Investment Equity Act; H.R. 581, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to use funds appropriated for wildland fire management in the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2001, to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Services and the National Marine Fisheries Services to facilitate the interagency cooperation required under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 in connection with wildland fire management; H.R. 601, to ensure the continued access of hunters to those Federal lands included within the boundaries of the Craters of the Moon National Monument in the State of Idaho pursuant to Presidential Proclamation 7373 of November 9, 2000, and to continue the applicability of the Taylor Grazing Act to the disposition of grazing fees arising from the use of such lands; and 642, to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 29, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing on the Effect of Mining Claim Fees on Domestic Exploration: Are They Worth It? 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.


March 29, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, hearing on the Effective Community Involvement in National Forest Restoration and Recreation Efforts: Obstacles and Solutions, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, March 27, to consider the following: Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2002; and H.R. 6, Marriage Penalty and Family Tax Relief Act of 2001, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.
Committee on Science, March 29, Subcommittee on Environment, Technology, and Standards, hearing on H.R. 64, to provide for the establishment of the position of Deputy Administrator for Science and Technology of the Environmental Protection Agency, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, March 28, hearing on H.R. 10, Comprehensive Retirement Security and Pension Reform Act, focusing on small business implications, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, March 28, Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, to mark up the following: H.R. 495, to designate the Federal building in Charlotte Amalie, St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands as the “Ron de Lugo Federal Building;” H.R. 819, to designate the Federal building located at 143 West Liberty Street, Medina, Ohio, as the “Donald J. Pease Federal Building;” H. Con. Res. 74, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 20th Annual National Peace Officers Memorial Service; H. Con. Res. 76, authorizing the use of the East Front of the Capitol Grounds for performances sponsored by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; H. Con. Res. 79, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; 2 11 (b) Project Building Survey Resolutions; and other pending business, 2 p.m., 2253 Rayburn.

March 28, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, hearing on Water Infrastructure Needs, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

March 29, Subcommittee on Railroads, hearing on Railroad Track Safety Issues, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, March 27, Subcommittee on Health, to continue hearings on Medicare Reform: Laying the Groundwork for a Rx Drug Benefit, 2 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

March 29, Subcommittee on Trade, hearing on Free Trade Deals: Is the United States Losing Ground As Its Trading Partners Move Ahead? 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, March 27, Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, executive, hearing on NSA Issues, 12 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

March 27, Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence and the Subcommittee on Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, executive, joint hearing on Information Operations, 3 p.m., H–405 Capitol.


March 29, Subcommittee on International Policy and National Security, executive, briefing on Covert Action Case Study, 2 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

March 29, Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, executive, hearing on NRO Issues, 10 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Joint Meetings: March 29, Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia, to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Government Reform’s Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization to examine the recently issued final report of the U.S. Commission on National Security in the 21st Century, focusing on the national security implications of the human capital crisis, 10 a.m., SD–342.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Monday, March 26

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: After the recognition of two Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 12 noon), Senate will continue consideration of S. 27, Campaign Finance Reform.

Also, at 2 p.m., Senate will consider S.J. Res. 4, Hollings Constitutional Amendment, with a vote on final passage to occur at 6 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2 p.m., Monday, March 26

House Chamber

Program for Monday: Pro Forma Session.