

short statement. Whenever Senator THURMOND is not present and I am, I make that statement to the nominees.

During the first 4 years of my term here, Senator Howard Baker, the majority leader, used to keep us all night, and on many occasions I would join STROM for a bowl of soup for about an hour, and I have listened to some of the most fabulous stories because Senator THURMOND is a legend, having been here when John Kennedy was a Senator, when Lyndon Johnson was a Senator.

I shall tell one very brief story. After Senator THURMOND ran on the Dixiecrat ticket in 1948, in the Presidential motorcade Inauguration Day in 1949 Senator THURMOND rode in an open car with his wife. Senator THURMOND tells a story of when he passed by the reviewing stand of President Truman and Vice President Barkley. Senator THURMOND stood up, took his hat off and bowed. And Vice President Barkley started to wave to Governor THURMOND. And I shall not tell the whole story, but President Truman pulled down Vice President Barkley's hand with a comment, which is a remarkable story.

I asked STROM on a number of occasions if I could be his biographer. He should have a biographer, if he does not take the time to write his own. It is too bad, on this very busy occasion of the Senate, that there are not more Senators on the floor to hear the remarkable accolades presented by our noted historian and conscience of the Senate, Senator BYRD, and by the senior junior Senator, Senator HOLLINGS, but I wanted to have my words of admiration for Senator THURMOND on this very auspicious occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I planned to speak about 10 minutes on defense, but I did not know that these wonderful accolades were going to come up at this time. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the able Senator from West Virginia, who has been minority leader, majority leader, and every position the Senate had to offer. I guess no man in the history of this country has filled more important positions in the U.S. Senate than Senator BYRD of West Virginia, and he has filled them well. Everything he has undertaken he has done it well. I deeply appreciate the kind words he said today.

I wish to thank my able colleague, Senator HOLLINGS. Senator HOLLINGS and I are different parties but we have been here a long time together. We respect each other. And I have had the opportunity to work with him on many matters of various kinds and it has been a pleasure to do that. We have never had an argument that I recall. Although we do not always vote alike, we hold each other in respect. I wish to thank him for his kind remarks. He is, as someone stated, the longest-serving

junior Senator in the United States, but after this term, if he is still here, maybe he will get to be the senior Senator. Again, I wish to express to Senator HOLLINGS my appreciation for serving with him and working with him. It has been a pleasure to do so, FRITZ, and I thank you.

I wish to thank the able Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER. When I came to the Senate I watched different Senators come and go. When Senator SPECTER came I soon recognized that here was a man of unusual talent, a man of great ability. It has been a pleasure to serve with him. He is a great historian. He can tell many stories about different people on different things and amuse you to the fullest. I deeply appreciate his fine friendship and thank him for his kind remarks here today.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this budget resolution represents a historic endeavor by the Congress and the administration. For the first time in 28 years, we have agreed on a path designed to balance the Federal budget by the year 2002. The fiscal irresponsibility that drove us into a national debt of more than \$5 trillion, with interest payments amounting to 15 percent of our annual Federal budgets, was surely leading this Nation toward a day of economic reckoning with severe consequences. I am delighted that, aided by a strong economy, we seem to be moving toward setting our fiscal house in order.

Despite my enthusiastic support for a balanced budget, I must admit that I remain deeply concerned about the state of our national security and plans for funding our defense establishment in this post-cold-war era.

When the Clinton administration took office in 1993, it immediately began to cut defense spending. Within the context of the bottom-up review, they cut over \$120 billion out of the Future Years Defense Program. Despite this severe underfunding of our military forces, the administration has shown no reluctance to use them. Multilateral peacekeeping operations under the United Nations became the vogue during the early years of the Clinton administration. The debacle in Somalia, where 18 American soldiers were killed in the streets of Mogadishu, awakened the Congress and the American people to the folly of these policies. Despite this concern, less than 2 years later the administration was dispatching U.S. troops to Haiti and then to peacekeeping operations in Bosnia. During the first 4 years of the Clinton administration, our military forces were dispatched on more separate deployments than at any other time in our history.

The tempo of these operations has put tremendous strain on our dimin-

ished force structure and its aging equipment. Indeed, the administration's willingness to employ our military forces in peacekeeping operations without regard to the adverse effects of these deployments has further eroded our capability to execute two overlapping major regional contingencies. Defense funds authorized and appropriated for military readiness, personnel and equipment have been depleted to pay for unbudgeted operations that have exceeded \$15 billion since 1993. Furthermore, the unprecedented personnel tempo from these operations has dramatically stressed our military personnel and their families.

The administration's proposed budgets have neglected the necessary immediate investment in force modernization, and justified this by projecting significant funding increases in the outyears, when the administration promised to recapitalize our military forces. Unfortunately, these outyears never arrived. For 6 straight years, the administration's projected increases in the modernization accounts did not materialize. In fact, the amounts requested for the modernization accounts were lower each year than projected by the administration in the previous year.

In 1995, Republicans gain control of Congress and passed a budget resolution intended to alleviate at least some of the problems caused by the underfunding of the defense budget. Over \$18 billion was added to the defense budgets of the 104th Congress. Most of these funds were directed into the modernization accounts which had been so drastically neglected by this administration.

During negotiations on the recent budget agreement, I urged our budget negotiators to adopt the congressional budget resolution for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, since those numbers were above the administration's request. I also urged that we accept the administration's request for fiscal years 2000 through 2002, when the projected spending targets were above those in our congressional budget resolution. By agreeing to the administration's spending targets in the outyears, we would, in effect, capture in the budget agreement the elusive recapitalization funds for modernization.

This agreement before us today protects our military forces from unrealistic and unwise cuts in defense. I was encouraged that Secretary Cohen has also supported these more favorable, higher numbers for defense. We do not yet know the full impact on the defense budget resulting from the budget agreement and possible effects of outlay shortfalls in the later years of this agreement. However, I remain concerned that even the highest levels for defense considered in this agreement may not provide sufficient funds to adequately sustain over time the personnel, quality of life, readiness and modernization programs critical to our military services, especially if we continue to use funds from the defense

budget to pay for unbudgeted peace-keeping operations.

Preliminary results emerging from the QDR indicate that the two MRC strategy will remain essentially unchanged. However, even using the administration's higher funding in the outyears, the QDR recommends force structure reductions of up to 130,000 personnel to free minimal funds for essential modernization. Key force modernization programs will also have to be significantly reduced in order to remain within the funding limits of the administration's defense program.

I hope that, within the balanced budget agreement, we will provide adequately for our men and women in uniform to defend our Nation. It is clear that we must continue now and in the future to examine the adequacy of the funds we allocate to our national security. At the same time, we must continue to search for ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our defense establishment—especially in the support structure—so that we can achieve savings to devote to the cutting edge of our military combat forces.

It is gratifying to me, after almost 42 years in the Senate, to see the possibility of a balanced budget with adequate funds also provided for our national security. It has been worth fighting for. I pledge to continue the fight.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Thank you, Mr. President.

AMENDMENT NO. 336

(Purpose: To provide \$5 billion to create a partnership among all levels of government to help states and school districts meet their school repair, renovation, modernization, and construction priorities, offset by closing tax loopholes; to improve the educational environment for the 14 million children who attend severely dilapidated schools, the millions of children in overcrowded classrooms, and the 19 million children who are denied access to modern computers because their schools lack basic electrical wiring; and to generally help states and school districts bring their school buildings into the 21st century)

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN], for herself, and Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GLENN, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KERRY, Mr. REED, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. KERREY, Mr. DODD, Mr. CONRAD, and Ms. MIKULSKI, proposes an amendment numbered 336.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 3, line 4, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 3, line 5, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 21, line 18, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 22, line 1, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 22, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 22, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,250,000,000.

On page 40, line 17, reduce the amount by \$5,000,000,000.

On page 41, line 8, reduce the amount by \$5,000,000,000.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, this amendment provides \$5 billion to create a partnership among all levels of government to help States and school districts meet their school repair, renovation, modernization and construction priorities.

The point of this amendment is to focus Federal resources, and to focus our support as a national community for rebuilding the schools in our country. Every day, 14 million American children attend schools that are in such dilapidated condition, and present such an unsuitable environment for learning, that their ability to access educational opportunity is impaired and impeded and diminished.

So this amendment seeks to address the budget resolution that has been agreed upon by allocating \$5 billion to the Labor Committee to help school districts meet their most urgent school repair, renovation, and modernization and construction needs. It would allow us to create a partnership among the national, State, and local governments to repair our crumbling schools and help prepare our children for the 21st Century.

This amendment is not specific to any school construction plan. It is an up-or-down vote on whether or not the Senate believes school construction ought to be a priority.

I want to take a moment to talk about school construction and why it is important for us to be engaged as a national community in support of the en-

vironment in which we expect our children to learn. At no point in our history has education been more important to individual achievement and to our national well-being.

According to a just-published Hudson Institute study of the changing American work force, "The crucial factor accounting for long-term success in the work force is a basic education provided at the primary and secondary levels."

The Wall Street Journal recently quoted a leading U.S. economist who said, "One of the few things that economists will agree upon is the fact that economic growth is very strongly dependent on our own abilities."

Mr. President, that is true.

We are putting our Nation's economic future at risk by shortchanging our kids at schools that are literally falling down around them. Unfortunately—and it is an unfortunate fact—many of our schools are not in adequate physical condition to meet the educational needs of our children. Many of our children attend schools that are literally falling down around them.

The U.S. General Accounting Office, at our request, completed an exhaustive study of the condition of America's schools. They found that 14 million children every day attend schools in such poor condition that major renovation or outright replacement of the schools is needed. Twelve million children every day attend schools with leaky roofs. Seven million children every day attend schools with life-threatening safety code violations.

In this, the greatest country in the world, educational environments are in such bad condition that our children's performance is degraded by them. Our parents' generation did better by our generation than we are doing for our children. And that is why I have submitted this amendment. It is a tragedy for American children who have to attend schools in these conditions. None of us certainly would consider working in conditions this bad.

The problem of crumbling schools is one that is not isolated nor limited to inner cities, nor to isolated pockets of rural poverty. The General Accounting Office, in one of its studies, found that 38 percent of urban schools, 30 percent of rural schools, and 29 percent of suburban schools are falling down around our children.

In my State of Illinois alone, it is estimated to cost some \$13 million to meet the school repair needs. Nationally, the GAO has documented \$112 billion of renovation needs.

Clearly this is not a challenge that the local government and the States can do by themselves by relying on local property taxes.

I am going to inject a little humor because this is a very sobering story. This ought to be a very sobering situation. But I want to inject a little humor in the debate.

A couple of weeks ago Charles Schulz had a series of Peanuts cartoons featuring Peppermint Patty's crumbling

school. The problem of crumbling schools has become so widespread that even Peppermint Patty's school has a leaky school roof. That is what this cartoon is about.

In this series of Peanuts cartoons, Peppermint Patty and her friend, Marcie, express their frustration over the fact they can't get anyone to repair the leaking roof. But the most important one, I thought, was this last one here when Marcie says to Peppermint Patty, "This is how it is, Mr. Principal. Half the kids in our class can't read and half can't multiply 6 by 8. None of the them ever heard of Bosnia and couldn't tell you who wrote Hamlet."

Peppermint Patty says, "I talked to the principal."

So Marcie says, "What did he say about the roof leaking?"

She said, "I forgot to mention it."

Mr. President, unfortunately, that has been the case all along. We have been talking about education and educational achievement. We have been talking about standards for our kids. We talk about excellence for our children. We talk about education making our Nation competitive in the global economy. But we forgot to mention that they have to go to school to learn it. They have to have an environment that is suitable for learning. We have so far and for so long turned our backs on this problem that, again, according to the GAO, is going to require \$112 billion nationwide to address. That is just to provide the basics. That is just to make up for the years and years of neglect.

The GAO also found that many of our schools are not ready for the 21st century. Again, there is a lot of discussion on this floor about the information superhighway, the information age, and the advent of computers and technology. Fifteen million children every day attend schools that lack enough electrical power to fully use computers or telecommunications technology in their classrooms. Fifty percent of the schools in our country lack the necessary electrical wiring to deploy computers to the classrooms.

You can't very well use these technologies if there is not the basic infrastructure to allow them to be used. You can't use a computer if you can't plug it into an outlet that works. Unfortunately, it is the case at this time in our country that many of our classrooms are inadequate to meet the technological challenges of our time.

So we have two different issues that we have to begin to face up to. One is the decades of neglect and the fact that many of our young people are going to schools that our generation attended. And they have not had the continuing maintenance over time to keep them in decent shape or to keep them from crumbling.

Then we have the secondary challenge of getting these old buildings retrofitted, or new ones built sufficient to meet the technological changes of the information age that this generation is

going to have to take up, and the technologies that ought to be tools for them to succeed in this global economy.

I point out that for this generation, computers are in many instances the functional equivalent of textbooks. We used books. They ought to be able to use the Net, and they ought to be able to use the computer technology for their education. And, yet, we are denying them even the basic opportunity to do so by putting them in situations in the crumbling schools that we see.

I found it very interesting. Today in the New York Times on the front page there is an article about tax breaks for schools. This was an article on an entirely different subject—not entirely, but a part of the problem of how it is that we got to the point of having our schools literally falling down around us. Interestingly, the little boy in this picture is going to a school of the arts. There is a huge hole in the wall in the school at the stairs that he is going up. You can see it right here, a huge hole in the wall of the school that he's attending. Mr. President, I would like to think that this would be the exception to the rule. Unfortunately, according to the General Accounting Office, it is not the exception. It is, more often than not, the rule.

Here is another picture that is not quite as graphic. You can see the peeling paint. Our children are attending schools with asbestos, they are attending schools with lead paint, they are attending schools where the roofs are leaking, where the windows are broken, where the heating is not adequate, where the sewage is not working. In short, the infrastructure consigns our children to an environment for learning that is not suitable and ought to be an embarrassment to all of us in this country.

Added to that problem is the fact that too many of our schools are so overcrowded that teaching and education are difficult. Again, according to the Department of Education, public high school enrollment is expected to increase some 15 percent by the year 2006. So, just to maintain current class sizes, we will need to build some 6,000 new schools by that time.

So the question is, how did we get to this point? How did we let it get this bad? And it is bad. Crumbling schools are not accidents. Crumbling schools happen because of some policy decisions that we have made here in the Congress and in our Nation. That is why this debate, I think, goes to the heart of the future of elementary and secondary education.

At the outset, I would like to share with whoever is watching, listening to this debate, some pictures that I have brought out before but I think they are graphic reminders of what we are up against. This would have been a chemistry lab, I guess, if you could use it, in a school. As you can see, there is no way a student can learn chemistry in circumstances like this. More often

than not it would probably affect performance, and that student will not be able to be competitive in this global marketplace, in this global economy.

Desks, these are desks sitting against walls that are literally cracking and falling in.

A set of lockers in a high school: Torn in, broken down, dilapidated. That neglect, that kind of disrepair, did not happen overnight. It happens because over a period of many, many years, in some cases decades, these schools have not had maintenance because the maintenance was deferred. Senator PATTY MURRAY addressed this issue. As school districts have struggled to make ends meet, have struggled to provide for the educational demands of the system, they have neglected the infrastructure. And the result is the crumbling school phenomenon and crisis that we see today.

This is another school lab.

I point out, Mr. President, this is not just confined to one part of our country. It is a nationwide problem. In fact, interestingly, according to the General Accounting Office reports, it happens more often in the Western States than any other, but all regions of the country have crumbling schools. But it also happens in every kind of community in America. It happens in urban school districts. The central city school districts experience a 38-percent rate of crumbling schools. The rural districts, a 30-percent rate. The suburban districts, suburbia, which every one thinks of as being so well off, in suburbia 29 percent of the school systems in suburbia have at least one inadequate building. So this is a problem that we have to face up to as a national community. That is why this amendment has been offered.

I said earlier, crumbling schools are not just accidents. They are a predictable result of the way we fund education. Overcrowding and deterioration in the schools will persist as long as we continue to rely exclusively on the efforts at the local property tax level to fund school infrastructure improvements. The local property tax is simply an inadequate way to pay for the school infrastructure improvements of the magnitude that our country is facing right now.

Poor- and middle-class districts especially cannot raise enough revenue to meet their needs. In fact, another one of the General Accounting Office studies pointed out a perversity that everyone should become aware of, and that is that the middle class and poorer schools tax themselves harder, do more to raise the funds to provide for their education systems, than the schools in the wealthier districts. So what you have is the whole notion of ability to pay for schools turned on its head by tying educational funding to the local property tax—for, in some instances, laudable reasons. But by not allowing for any flexibility in that arrangement, what we essentially do is consign middle-class districts, poor districts, to a

greater effort in terms of raising the money to rebuild their schools and provide for educational services for their community. And we do not offset that in any way.

In 35 States, some poor districts have higher tax rates than wealthier districts, but they raise less revenue because there is less property wealth to tax. It stands to reason. If you have a poor district with less property tax wealth, the rate has to be higher in order to reach the same result as a more well off area that has the capacity and has the property level to begin with. So, for the most part, these districts across the country have to look elsewhere, above and beyond their own property tax base, to help fund educational improvements such as repairing the crumbling schools. Unfortunately the General Accounting Office found that they do not get a whole lot of help from State governments. In fact, in fiscal year 1994, State governments contributed only \$3.5 billion to the school infrastructure crisis, in other words about 3 percent of the total needed. So this model, this school funding model, does not work for infrastructure, just as it was recognized some 50 years ago in this country, that it would not work for highways and other infrastructure.

Imagine for a moment if we based our system of road funding on the same funding model that we use for education funding. Imagine if every community by itself, without any outside help, were responsible for construction and maintenance of the roads within its borders. In all likelihood, with that kind of model, we would have smooth good roads in the wealthy towns, we would have a patchwork of mediocre roads in middle-income towns, and we would have very few roads if any at all in the poorer towns. Transportation, then, would become hostage to the vagaries of wealth and geography, commerce and travel would be difficult, and navigation of such a system would not serve the interests of our whole country.

That hypothetical, however, unfortunately, describes precisely the state of our school funding model. That is how we fund schools. We rely on local property taxes to find the money and then the States chip in some. And, at the national level, we say it is not our problem, it is not our responsibility, it is a State and local responsibility. I submit it is time for us to rethink that model and develop a new partnership, a partnership among all levels of government, that will allow us to rebuild and modernize our schools for the 21st century. Just as the national community through the Federal Government supports the highway system, but the State and local officials decide which roads are to be built and where they should go, I believe that we can, at the national level, help finance school infrastructure improvements while preserving local control of education. Those two concepts do not have to be

tied to each other at the hip. If anything, we can look to local governments to do what they do best, which is to deal with where the school shall be and what the schools will teach and those kinds of issues at the local level; but at the same time, engage support from the national community, where we can perform best. We can access money easier. We can make it cheaper, we can make it available to the States so the States can help local school districts make those decisions.

So, we can address this issue. This amendment will engage the local, State and national resources in ways that preserve local control but at the same time maximize cooperation. At the national level, we will help to supply the funding. At the State and local levels, discussions will be had as to what schools and what features to address. Local control, I believe, will be enhanced by deemphasizing reliance on the local property tax to help solve a \$112 billion national challenge.

I want, also, to share with the Members here this evening some of the comments from some of the endorsers of this legislation, because I think it is important to take a look at how it is that others who are concerned with education see this problem. I have to tell you, I was struck on my travels around Illinois, examining the crumbling school phenomenon in my State, how many instances I found the teachers and principals in classrooms, people in the school systems, just making do. If anything, the teachers and the school administrators, the people who have been involved with education and providing educational opportunity to our children, have had to make do over the last several decades, precisely because they did not have any options.

I saw schools with children learning, not in a classroom, huddling in the hallway. I saw schools in which the basements had been reconverted and cardboard, temporary walls put up to separate one class from another. I saw schools in which the computers were as old, almost, as Senator LAUTENBERG's computer system. They clearly were so outmoded and outdated that they were meaningless for the youngsters who were trying to use them; one school in which the youngsters could not use the computers because you had to turn the lights off in the entire building to keep from blowing a fuse when you plugged it in. We have computers here at the desk. We use computers in our work. Why can't we provide at least as much for our children?

I have to tell you also, some of the situations are almost—border on the tragic, with the condition of America's schools. There is a school in a part of my State, and I do not want to embarrass anybody by telling the story, but it is a fact, where the youngsters on the track team, instead of practicing at the track, because of the dilapidated and deteriorated condition of the gymnasium, had to go down the road to practice at the local prison. The prison

had more modern track facilities. The youngsters on the track team had to go there for their practice because the school building was not adequate. Mr. President, as Americans, I know we can do better and we absolutely have to do better if we are going to preserve our Nation's competitiveness and preserve the quality of life that, as Americans, we have come to enjoy.

More to the point, if we are in any way going to meet the challenge of providing to the next generation of Americans at least as much as what our parents provided to our generation, I believe we have an absolute obligation to step up to the plate and help support State and local governments in meeting this \$112 billion challenge that the GAO has documented.

The Children's Defense Fund writes a letter in support. I would like this letter to be printed in the RECORD.

We simply cannot ignore the environment where nearly 52 million children spend so many crucial hours every weekday.

Again, recognizing this is a widespread phenomenon that affects all children.

As much to the point, in terms of not just affecting their ability to learn, what do we communicate to our children about the value of education? We preach, "stay in school." We preach, "It is important to get an education." Then we send them here. What do we tell them? What are we telling our children, when we consign them to environments in which no one can be expected to function—with leaky roofs and broken windows and floors that are rotting out from underneath them? I think we send them the absolute wrong message. We, in this Congress have, I believe, an absolute obligation to do something about it.

I have another letter here, which is interesting, from the Council of the Great City Schools. It says:

The infrastructure needs of America's schools are complex and varied. Your bill does an excellent job in balancing these needs, in being flexible in how they are met, and leveraging other funds to expand the bill's impact.

Again, we are not looking to meet the entirety of the \$112 billion challenge here. We are just taking a first step with the \$5 billion of assistance which, going to States and local governments, can give leverage additional funds. It is estimated that this legislation will allow for States and local governments to leverage 20 billion dollars worth of funding to address this crumbling schools phenomenon.

This is from the National Association of State Boards of Education. They say, among other things:

While our schools are literally falling down, they are also filling up. Total school enrollment, already at a record high, continues to increase. The student population in elementary and secondary schools is expected to rise 20 percent over the next decade, due to the demographic phenomenon known as the "baby-boom echo." Overcrowding and the use of temporary portable classrooms have become commonplace across the country. New schools need to be built to accommodate this growing demand.

And then they say:

School construction is a State and local responsibility and should remain so, but their combined resources have been overwhelmed by the estimated \$110 billion required to repair existing school facilities. Clearly, this is a national problem that deserves national attention. Federal involvement is consistent with the Government's historical role in promoting educational equity.

Again, I would point out this legislation will allow for the kind of flexibility to allow school districts with State and local governments to work with the national Government on behalf of this initiative.

The American Institute of Architects in their letter say:

By instituting a cooperative partnership between the Federal Government and local school districts, the school construction initiative provides Federal support for local oversight of school repair projects. The return on investment for improving the condition of our schools has many positive dividends as well.

By upgrading public school facilities in urban and rural areas alike, this nation can renew its commitment not only to a sound public infrastructure but can also ensure that succeeding generations will grow and prosper from an academic environment that is second to none.

Mr. President, there was a time when we made the investment in our schools. But we have forgotten about them. We forgot about them. Just as Marcie pointed out to Peppermint Patty, the roof leaking was something they forgot to mention to the school board.

So among the variety of issues in education that we face, I submit that the crisis of our crumbling schools is second to none. Our schoolchildren cannot be expected to learn if their schools are literally falling down around them. And only by addressing the repair of these schools, only by providing the kind of assistance that the State and local governments so clearly need in this instance will we be able to meet the challenge and really remedy the effects of decades of neglect.

The Associated General Contractors statement of policy says, and I would like to raise this as an issue also:

As a nation, we have invested \$422 billion in our public schools. Now 74 percent of those schools are more than 25 years old and nearly one-third are more than 50 years old; 14 million children attend schools that need extensive repair or replacement. The General Accounting Office estimates that 112 billion dollars' is needed to refurbish our nation's schools. The Federal Government does not currently fund school construction. However, in light of the staggering needs and the importance of education to future generations, improving the quality of our schools should be a national priority.

Mr. President, that is what this amendment calls on the Members of this Senate to do, to make a statement that education, repairing our crumbling schools, is a national priority, that it is something we put value on and that we are prepared to step up to the plate and meet the challenge of the \$112 billion worth of need that the General Accounting Office has already documented. In so doing, as we do so, we

will provide our youngsters with an environment in which they can learn. We will provide them with an environment that says we value education. By sending our youngsters to these crumbling schools, schools that are falling down around them, we send a message to our children that education is not important to us, this is not something that is valuable to us.

In fact—and I do not mean to be critical—there was a cartoon, another cartoon today by Herblock, who is a famous cartoonist, which says, "I hear President Clinton wants to spend money to send more people to college—What is College?" And then in the back it says "City School." The doors are falling; the bricks are falling; it is in general disrepair.

This is the situation we see all over this country. Obviously, while we support it, and higher education is important, it is not inappropriate for us to recognize that we have the capacity to engage in a partnership with State and local governments to give them the help they need.

Flexibility is a very important buzzword around these parts these days. Everybody wants arrangements to be flexible. Everybody wants the Federal Government to turn things over to the States. I think that is wonderful, and I have supported that. But at the same time flexibility has to be a two-way street, one in which the State and local governments can come to us for help and as a national community we engage in behalf of our national priorities. Clearly, giving our children an environment that is suitable for learning ought to be a national priority, and that is why this amendment seeks to start us on a path toward providing this opportunity.

Winston Churchill once said, "We shape our buildings; thereafter, they shape us."

Well, Mr. President, nowhere is that more important than in the schools. The poor condition of America's schools has a direct effect on the ability of our students to learn the kinds of skills they will need to compete in the 21st century, global economy. Our children cannot compete if they cannot learn, and they cannot learn if their schools are crumbling down around them. So this amendment would ensure that school districts around the Nation are provided some assistance—some assistance, not a lot; \$5 billion out of a \$112 billion starting price tag is not a lot of money, but it certainly is money well spent and will give us the ability to begin to address this problem that has crept up on us.

So, Mr. President, I encourage support of the amendment. Again, it should not conflict with the objectives of this balanced budget agreement. If anything, as the Chair may know, I am a supporter of the balanced budget. I supported the balanced budget amendment. I very much applaud the negotiators for reaching an agreement that reaches balance. I think it makes sense

to do it. But as we do so, it is important that we not also throw the baby out with the bath water, as it were, that we also not forget that our priorities ought to start with providing our youngsters with the opportunity and the environment they need in which to learn.

I ask unanimous consent that the series of letters and statements I referenced earlier be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CHILDREN'S DEFENSE FUND,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1997.

Hon. CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN,
Senate Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOSELEY-BRAUN: I commend you on your initiative to restore funding to the budget agreement for school construction and renovation.

It is clear that the physical condition of many of our nation's public elementary and secondary schools is deteriorating. Over 14 million students attend schools that need major renovation or outright replacement. Some 7 million children attend schools with life safety code violations. About 12 million children attend schools with leaky roofs. In communities in every state, schools are crumbling and children struggle to learn in unsafe conditions. At the same time, schools are not equipped to use modern technology. The General Accounting Office (GAO) has estimated that it would cost more than \$112 billion to renovate and upgrade our children's schools.

While in the past school construction and renovation have been state and local responsibilities, given the magnitude of the challenge that states and localities face, I believe that we need a new partnership. Certainly the federal government is not the sole answer. However, a federal role in partnership with states and localities as proposed in your amendment makes sense. We simply cannot ignore the environment where nearly 52 million children spend so many crucial hours every weekday.

Children need your amendment. If I can provide any assistance to you, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,
MARIAN WRIGHT EDELMAN.

COUNCIL OF THE
GREAT CITY SCHOOLS,
Washington, DC, April 7, 1997.

Hon. CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOSELEY-BRAUN: On behalf of the Council of the Great City Schools, a coalition of the nation's largest urban public school systems, I am writing to give our enthusiastic endorsement for your new school infrastructure initiative, "The Partnership to Rebuild America's Schools Act".

The infrastructure needs of America's schools are complex and varied. Your bill does an excellent job in balancing those needs, in being flexible in how they are met, and in leveraging other funds to expand the bill's impact. The measure is also strong in allowing construction, repair and upgrading. Finally, the bill does a particularly good job at targeting scarce federal money to where the needs are greatest, the nation's poorest communities.

This proposal, first outlined last summer, is one of the boldest and most helpful initiatives ever introduced in the U.S. Senate. It addresses one of America's most severe domestic needs and does so in a way that has real promise for success. Thank you for your leadership both in calling attention to the needs in school repair and renovation and in shaping a program to meet them.

America's Great City Schools are resolute in our support of your proposal. And we will strongly encourage Congress to support it. Our children deserve what this bill proposes.

Again, thank you for your leadership and advocacy. Please let us know if we can be helpful to you in this critical effort.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL CASSERLY,
Executive Director.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE
OF ARCHITECTS,
Washington, DC, May 7, 1997.

Hon. CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOSELEY-BRAUN: The American Institute of Architects (AIA) wishes to commend the sponsors of S. 456, "The Partnership to Rebuild America's Schools Act of 1997." In order to adequately meet the challenges of the 21st Century, America's elementary and high school students need a modern and safe environment.

As the saying goes, "a picture says a thousand words." Hopefully, the photographs received from various school districts around the country will convey the urgency for repairing and modernizing the physical structure of our public schools. By initiating a cooperative partnership between the federal government and local school districts, the school construction initiative provides federal support for local oversight of school repair projects. The return investment for improving the condition of our schools has many positive dividends as well. By upgrading public school facilities in urban and rural areas alike, this nation can renew its commitment not only to a sound public infrastructure, but can also ensure that succeeding generations will grow and prosper from an academic environment that is second to none.

The AIA looks forward to working with Congress and other organizations in the months ahead so that America's schools have the resources necessary to provide the quality education our students so richly deserve.

Sincerely,

RAJ BARR-KUMAR,
1997 AIA President.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION,
Alexandria, VA, April 10, 1997.

Hon. CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR MOSELEY-BRAUN: The National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) is a private nonprofit association representing state and territorial boards of education. Our principal objectives are to strengthen state leadership in education policymaking, promote excellence in the education of all students, advocate equality of access to educational opportunity, and assure responsible governance of public education.

We are writing to express our support for federal assistance in the area of school construction. As you are no doubt aware, the deterioration of America's school infrastructure has reached crisis proportions. A Government Accounting Office report found that one-third of all U.S. schools are in need of

extensive repairs or replacement and 60% have at least one major building deficiency such as cracked foundations, leaky roofs, or crumbling walls. We cannot expect our children to learn much less excel in such decrepit and unsafe environments.

NASBE has been concerned about the issue of school construction for some time. In the fall of 1995 we began a one-year study of the condition of school infrastructure. The result was a comprehensive report which I have enclosed entitled, *Building Our Future: Making School Facilities Ready for the 21st Century*. I commend it for your review.

While our schools are literally falling down, they are also filling up. Total school enrollment, already at a record high, continues to increase. The student population in elementary and secondary schools is expected to rise twenty percent over the next decade due to the demographic phenomena known as the "baby boom echo." Overcrowding and the use of temporary, "portable" classrooms have become commonplace across the country. New schools need to be built to accommodate this growing demand.

School construction is a state and local responsibility, and should remain so, but their combined resources have been overwhelmed by the estimated \$110 billion required to repair existing school facilities. Clearly, this national problem deserves national attention. Federal involvement is consistent with the government's historical role in promoting educational equity.

We applaud both you and President Clinton for your efforts to address this critical situation by proposing a \$5 billion federal investment to spur school construction, recently introduced as legislation in the Senate and House as S. 456 and H.R. 1104 respectively. NASBE is encouraged by this action and we look forward to working with congressional leaders like yourself and Administration officials in fostering a partnership between federal, state and local entities to improve the learning conditions of American children.

Sincerely,

BRENDA L. WELBURN,
Executive Director.

[Excerpt from Associated General
Contractors Statement of Policy]

INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Invest in safe schools for our children—As a nation, we have invested \$422 billion in our public schools. Now, 74% of those schools are more than 25 years old and nearly one-third are more than 50 years old. 14 million students attend schools that need extensive repairs or replacement. The General Accounting Office (GAO) estimates that \$112 billion is needed to refurbish our nation's schools. The federal government does not currently fund school construction. However, in light of the staggering needs and the importance of education to future generations, improving the quality of our schools should be a national priority.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield. I would not like to lose any of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may reserve her time.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Florida has the next amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Is the Senator finished?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Reserving my time, I will yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, with great reluctance I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do so only because, with the necessities of education, we have to establish certain priorities. There is no question but that rebuilding the infrastructure is an important priority. But there are others that at this particular time I think have to take priority.

I do appreciate, for instance, in the city of Washington this body, Congress, has a certain obligation to restore the schools. That is about \$2 billion that we are going to have to find a way to fund in order to bring this city back to where it ought to be.

On the other hand, there is somewhere around \$120 billion in infrastructure repairs necessary in this country. How we get that I do not know. I do know that \$5 billion would start it, but there are other priorities—and I will tick off a number of those priorities—for which we could use these resources better.

First of all, as the body probably knows, I voted in favor of expanding the amount of money that will be available by supporting the Hatch-Kennedy bill. If that money were available, it might tend to change my position. But when I look out there right now, our most immediate needs are trying to get the educational system in order to provide the kind of skilled labor we need in this Nation. That means we have to change the K through 12 programs by professional development in order to give us the math standards we need in order to provide the skilled labor force. This is going to take a considerable amount of immediate resources.

In addition to that, getting our schools up to speed with respect to the technical aspects of computers and other means of being able to improve access to modern technology, to improve the schools, would take about \$16 billion. In addition to that, it would take about \$8 billion a year to keep them up to snuff.

Another area we have to deal with is higher ed as well. We already know that we have incredible problems in that respect. Most importantly are worker training areas. Right now, in order to provide the work force for the future, we have to find ways to, first of all, provide sufficient additional remedial help so that our young people who graduate will be ready to go to work in skilled labor. We do not have those resources yet.

We will be passing out a worker training bill, and we will be needing resources in order to do that. We have created another huge priority in this Nation, and that is taking the welfare people who are involved in receiving benefits, to train them and retrain them in order to have jobs. That is incredibly important, and it has to be done. That is going to take other billions of resources.

So although I sympathize with the amendment, I strongly believe the resources at this time that we do have available would have to be placed in slightly different order than would enable us to try to take care of the huge backlog and which has traditionally been accepted as the responsibility by the State and local governments. For those reasons, Mr. President, I oppose the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN's amendment to the Budget Resolution that would provide \$5 billion for a national school construction initiative. I would like to commend Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN for her leadership on this issue, and I would also like to thank Senators KENNEDY and HARKIN for their fine efforts to address this critical problem.

Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this amendment. Crumbling schools are not just an urban problem. They are a nationwide problem, and rural areas are no exception. In fact, 30 percent of schools in rural areas report at least one inadequate building feature.

A 1996 report by the General Accounting Office found that in my home state of South Dakota, 25 percent of schools have inadequate plumbing, 21 percent of schools have roof problems, 29 percent have ventilation problems, and 21 percent of schools are not meeting safety codes.

We have adopted a nationwide goal of trying to connect every school building in the country to the internet. Teaching our children to use new technology is critical for preparing them for the 21st century. Yet, in my home state, 22 percent of schools have inadequate electrical wiring. In their present condition, these schools cannot accommodate computers in the classroom.

South Dakota's tribal schools also face very serious facilities problems and major construction backlogs. There are nine federally recognized tribes in South Dakota. At the same time, my State has 3 of the 10 poorest counties in the nation, all of which are within reservation boundaries.

With 56 percent of its people under the age of 24, the native American population in this country is disproportionately young when compared to the American population overall. This population strains existing school facilities. The BIA estimates that there is a construction backlog of \$680 million in its 185 elementary, secondary and boarding schools serving Indian children on 63 reservations in 23 States. Of these schools, 63 percent are over 30 years old; 26 percent are over 50 years old. Annual appropriations for BIA education facilities improvement and repair have averaged \$37 million annually, which unfortunately meets only 5 percent of total need.

Nationwide, the statistics are similarly ominous. Crumbling schools are a problem of enormous magnitude. Four-

teen million children attend classes in buildings that need major repair or renovation. Seven million children go to school in buildings that have safety code violations. Sixteen million children study in classrooms without proper heating, ventilation, or air conditioning.

It is nearly impossible to measure the impact that these conditions have on students' ability to learn, but there is no doubt that the impact is severe.

Clearly, there is much we can do to improve our existing school building infrastructure. But that is only part of the problem. Our Nation is experiencing significant growth in school enrollment. Estimates are that we will need to build 6,000 new schools by the year 2006 if we want to keep class sizes the same as they are presently.

This amendment would allocate \$5 billion to the House and Senate committees of jurisdiction to devise a school construction and renovation initiative. We are not mandating a specific approach in this amendment. Rather, we hope that this \$5 billion Federal contribution can be used in partnership with State and local efforts to leverage over \$20 billion of dollars of construction activity nationwide. An effort of this magnitude would benefit our students for generations, and I am proud to support this amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise as a cosponsor and strong supporter of Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN's school infrastructure amendment.

One of the major problems facing elementary and secondary education today is the poor condition of our school buildings. In my home state of Rhode Island, many schools are in need of extensive repairs and upgrades.

I have visited several of these schools, including the Harris Elementary School in Woonsocket which was built in 1876. To put this in perspective, in 1876 the nation celebrated the centennial of the United States; Rutherford B. Hayes was elected President by one vote; Custer confronted the Sioux at Little Big Horn; Alexander Graham Bell transmitted the first complete sentence by voice over wire; Henry Heinz put ketchup in a bottle; and Colorado became the 38th State.

Sadly, the Harris Elementary School's library is a small trailer parked in the school's playground. In addition, I have received compelling footage of the condition of the schools in North Providence, including the Stephen Olney School, which has asbestos in the floors and water damaged classrooms, and the Centredale School, which has leaking classroom ceilings.

These examples and numerous others across my State and the Nation show the urgent and real need for a school construction initiative. A problem of this magnitude demands a Federal response.

Indeed, a recent General Accounting Office (GAO) report found that in Rhode Island 29 percent of schools re-

port at least one inadequate building of any type; 61 percent have at least one inadequate building feature; 75 percent have at least one unsatisfactory environmental factor, such as heating and ventilation; and 37 percent have insufficient capability for computers.

Nationally, the statistics are equally compelling. Fourteen million children, in one-third of the Nation's schools, are learning in buildings that need major renovations or should be replaced outright. Seven million students attend schools with safety code violations, such as the presence of lead paint, asbestos, or radon in the walls, floors, or ceilings. One-third of students study in classrooms without electrical wiring and power outlets to accommodate computers and multimedia equipment.

We should not pass up this opportunity to repair our Nation's schools.

While the budget resolution before us does include some increases in education funding and provides protection for important education initiatives, the agreement's caps on discretionary funding do not guarantee room for the school construction initiative. The same may also be the case for school reform and efforts to improve the recruitment, education, and mentoring of teachers, for which the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future report, *What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*, suggests almost \$5 billion is needed.

I urge my colleagues to support the Moseley-Braun amendment, which seeks to make \$5 billion available for school repair, renovation, and construction. Indeed, this must be a top priority as we work to provide students a quality education and prepare them for the future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. LAUTENBERG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I find myself in a very difficult position.

First, I commend the Senator from Illinois for her interest not only in school construction, the infrastructure for schools, but her view about investments in children, about what it is going to take to help our society stabilize, about what it is going to take to avoid criminality and violence that we see so freely around our country. She has been a leader on those issues for children. She is always discussing what it is that we have to do to make certain that children will grow up as contributing adults with a prospect for their own successes.

It is consistent with her views on what we ought to be doing for the children in our country to be concerned about the schoolhouses they attend.

Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN has made too many speeches, written so much about what the alternative to incarceration and prosecution is, and it is investment in our kids. If there is not a

particularly identifying view of what we ought to be doing for our children than a bunch of broken down school-houses, then I would tell you there is nothing else.

I am a member of the Budget Committee, the senior Democrat on the Budget Committee, and as I said, this is a painful point at which I find myself. We have a consensus budget resolution. It took a lot of work. I was surprised, I must say, when I saw the agreement in its final form because I was expecting that there would be some funds reserved for improvement of the school facilities around the country. I did not think at the time that the original \$5 billion request was held, but I thought it might be somewhere in the vicinity of \$3 billion, certainly not enough to make a dent when we consider that the GAO estimate, as the Senator from Illinois mentioned, is that there is \$112 billion needed to bring our schools up to date.

Now, I happen to come from a highly urbanized State, a State in which we have more than a fair share of poverty.

Our cities, and we have many of them, are among the poorest in the country—Newark, Camden, Paterson, my birthplace, I think is the fifth poorest city in America. I visit my old hometown, if I can call it that, on a fairly regular basis. It is often said here that we do these things, but I happen to go to the same barbershop that I have been going to since I was in college—and that was some years ago—and the barber is still cutting. Even if he misses a few hairs here and there, I don't care, but it takes me back to the city of my birth.

I have a lot of sentiment attached to that city because they were hard-working people, people who were determined to have their children succeed and invest whatever they could in terms of personal involvement in the development of those kids. School was the No. 1 thing. That was always the concern of the parents.

I can tell you, I don't like to admit this publicly, but I was a truant one day, and it was just my luck my father found out. I was never truant again. I visited that school just last week because I was helping them establish the connections they needed to get ultimately into the Internet, the schools being wired. My old company paid for the wiring of the schools in Paterson where our company started because my partners, like I, came from poor working-class families. I remember what it was like living that way, not particularly enjoying anything but the memory of good family life. So we helped to get the schools wired in the city.

When I was there, I was struck by the horrific condition of not that school-house, not that school building in particular, but others in the city, with signs of almost war-type devastation, with broken windows and things of that nature.

I am also, since I was very active on the environment committee, conscious

about the hazards to the health of the children. Forget about the disruptions to learning, for the moment—asbestos, lead paint, things that you would not permit your children to be near, to fiddle with if you had any way around it.

So when I think of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois, I say, yes, it is difficult for me. I am going to support the amendment that the Senator is offering in hopes that we can find some way to finance it. The amendment, I understand, includes a source for the funding coming from where, may I ask, reduction of tax cuts?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. That is correct. It is not specific. It raises the revenue floor by \$5 billion.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. The Senator is on the Finance Committee.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. That is correct.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. She will have the task of having to find a way to do it, because I think that it is probably not going to be allowable in the budget resolution.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Will the Senator from New Jersey yield? This is the book, "Reducing the Deficit: Spending and Revenue Options." It is kind of a loophole cookbook, and I am certain that in the course of the Finance Committee's deliberations that we can find \$5 billion here that will make up for the difference, so that will provide the funding stream for this.

I very much appreciate the Senator from New Jersey. You have seen the realities, you have seen what these children have to live through and live with. You know that they cannot go into the information age based on the kind of environment we are providing them.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. They cannot even go sometimes to the age of civilization in some of these facilities.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. That is correct.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. They are fire-traps. They are insecure at a time when security is high in the consciousness list. So I hope a source can be found that doesn't violate the basic construction we put into this budget resolution.

I commend the Senator from Illinois for her dedication, for her determination to bring this problem foursquare in front of us and try and solve it.

The statistics are so terrible that if you look at them, they begin to lose their significance: 30 percent of the children not having adequate heating and ventilating; 24 percent—other schools without adequate plumbing. The list goes on. That is just the physical eyesore that is out there that you would expect to be something resembling a decaying factory and not a facility that is being used by youngsters who are trying, with the help of often inadequate supervision, to try and find some life for themselves that they can follow and get through. If you walk into a place that is a dump, it is not

going to lift your spirits to start your day.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor and just remind everybody that we now have other amendments in order and that this amendment will be voted upon. As I understand it, there is a UC that allots the remaining time for use in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The Senator is correct. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Madam President, that is correct, and we will take this up, again, in the morning as part of the vote.

I just want to say in closing, it is a funny thing, reality really does have a ring about it that is unavoidable, and I don't think there is anyone in this Chamber or anyone who is a Member of this Senate who, if they spent the time to go around in their own States and visit the schools there, elementary and secondary schools, will deny the validity of what the GAO has told us is true.

Everyone knows about the crumbling school problem, and if you talk to your constituents or visit schools in your area, you will find it there. That is what is so stunning about this issue. It is not an inner-city issue, it is not a Midwestern issue, it is an American issue, and it affects every kind of community and every kind of child. If, indeed, we are going to turn our back and say we have other things to do, we are too busy to get around fixing the window but we want you to meet these standards, we are not going to help these States meet this \$112 billion burden, but we are going to give them all the flexibility in the world, or we are not going to give the local governments—the local communities that are taxing themselves the most and are having the hardest time repairing these crumbling schools.

That is what is so compelling to me in engaging this new partnership in which we don't take over Federal educational content. No one is looking to do that. It is appropriate that local governments deal with what kind of schools they have and what the children learn, the conditions and the teachers and the curriculum and those kinds of things. I think that is appropriate. So we are not talking about the Federal Government taking over anything, but rather, in this air of flexibility, saying we are prepared to be responsible and give the flexibility and help States and local governments meet this \$112 billion challenge, because, indeed, our very national security is at risk. We will not be able to stay the greatest country in the world if we send our children to schools where even Peppermint Patty gets rained on in the classroom.

I thank very much the Senator from New Jersey. I thank my colleagues.

Madam President, I inquire, how much time is remaining on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 27 minutes; the

Senator from New Mexico has 56 minutes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Will it come from my time?

Mr. NICKLES. It will come from our time.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Certainly.

Mr. NICKLES. Does the current law, Davis-Bacon, apply as well? You mentioned flexibility, but would the schools who do the building or do the maintenance also have to comply with Davis-Bacon regulations?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. That is not addressed specifically in this amendment. However, Federal contracting rules would apply, but the States and local governments would have to come forward with their own contracting rules. The question has been raised about Davis-Bacon, to be honest. We don't yet have, since the funding formula has not been worked out in terms of Federal funding of infrastructure and State and local funding of infrastructure—

Mr. NICKLES. But there is no exemption from Davis-Bacon?

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. No, there is not.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. I control the time still.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois controls the floor.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. My understanding is the Senator wanted to ask a question.

Mr. NICKLES. No, I want to speak on the amendment.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Let me say this, the amendment does not go to those contracting rules, and, again, I think the issue of Davis-Bacon and those arguments which would take up all the time in connection with Federal highway projects is not a relevant issue with regard to this effort in behalf of rebuilding crumbling schools.

Mr. NICKLES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and in answer to the question, obviously Davis-Bacon applies, because all Federal contracting dealing with Federal money would apply. We would have the Federal Government setting wage determination rates. So I object to this amendment for that reason, but also for other reasons. The Federal Government does not have a primary responsibility of trying to build new schools or to rebuild schools. That is not a Federal responsibility.

Some people say, "Well, we need more education money, we need more education programs." We have 788 education programs spending \$98 billion a year spread all throughout the Government. One that we don't have, if we

adopted the Senator's amendment, would be a \$5 billion school building program. That is one program we do not need, and we cannot afford.

Schools are the primary function of State and local government, and to build or rebuild or to figure out which schools should be rehabbed, that really should be decided by local and State government. That should not be decided by Washington, DC. Contingent with that money comes Federal strings, regulations, such as Davis-Bacon. The Federal Government would be determining what the wage rates would be to comply, to rehab the school building. Some of those wage rates are outlandish in comparison to what is normally paid for schools or for other buildings and projects in those areas.

With greatest respect for my colleague from Illinois, I know her intentions are very sincere and I know a lot of schools need to be rehabbed, I know a lot of schools need to be replaced, I know a lot of schools are in pathetic shape, but it is not the function or responsibility of the Federal Government to try and solve all the problems and certainly not the construction of local schools or the rehab of local schools, which, I might mention, \$5 billion would hardly scratch the surface. Then we would have to have the Federal Government determine if the needs in the hundreds of billions of dollars—how is the Federal Government going to determine who wins and who loses? I imagine you could spend \$5 billion for school renovation in the State of Texas alone. Quite possibly, I imagine the State of Illinois alone.

So you have all this competition amongst the various schools and States for who is going to get this money. This is not a function for the Federal Government. The 10th amendment to the Constitution says all other rights and powers are reserved to the States. We should certainly leave this one, school construction and renovation, to the States and to the localities, not to the Federal Government.

I yield the floor.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. MOSELEY-BRAUN. Thank you, Madam President. In the first place, what we are talking about fixing are our Nation's schools.

I think we can have a separate debate, a separate vote on the merits of paying workers prevailing wages. But I would point out to my colleague that some 32 States, many cities and townships, already have their own prevailing wage laws affecting school construction. And frankly, any school district that is receiving Federal Impact Aid funding today is already subject to Davis-Bacon.

Now, the truth is that Davis-Bacon applies to Federal highway construction, and few people argue that the Federal Government has no role in highway construction.

I ask my colleague, what is the difference? If the highways were in this kind of condition, clearly there would be a rush to create a partnership so that we can provide support in order to support transportation in our Nation. But the schools are in this condition. And the Senator is suggesting that we turn our backs and say it is up to the States and local governments to do it by themselves.

I think the pictures and the debate about this issue demonstrate very clearly that they have not been able to do it by themselves, and it has not been through want of trying. It is not as though school districts have deliberately set out to put children in classrooms that look like this. It is not as though local school boards have not wanted to vote the money to provide for the schools.

The Senator from Vermont knows full well that with the District of Columbia schools you see the condition. And it is not as though the people here in D.C. did not want to make certain the windows were fixed, but they had other emergencies. That is the exigencies of education they had to meet first: classrooms, textbooks, lighting, the basics, teacher salaries. So the funds have gone to that. And maintenance has been deferred time and time again.

Again, of the 50 percent of the schools in this country that are over 50 years old, in all too many instances those schools have suffered just about that same amount of neglect and deferred maintenance. Well, as with maintenance of anything else, it just gets worse as the problem gets older.

This problem is going to get worse and worse over time. And school districts have been trying. In fact, one of the reports by the General Accounting Office talked about the fact that school districts that have the least try the hardest and that they have been trying to meet these infrastructure needs, but all too often have not been able to. They cannot go into the capital markets to borrow money at favorable rates because they do not have the bond rating. So the result is classrooms that look like this.

So I will just suggest to my colleagues that this is not in any way about Washington telling school districts what classrooms to fix or what schools to rebuild or where to put the construction effort. In fact, the whole idea is to have that kind of decision-making start at the local level and start and stay at the local and State level. That is the point of their decisionmaking. All we would do as a national community is to give financial assistance in ways that will allow these local districts to leverage additional money to meet what is clearly their local need on the one hand but, in the final analysis, is our entire need.

If one community or another cannot afford to provide their youngsters with laboratories in which their youngsters

can learn chemistry, how can we expect to be competitive in a global economy, in global competition? If a community cannot afford it and is being taxed to the maximum extent, and they just do not have the money to address the basics of the rain coming through the window or the roof leaking, how can we expect these youngsters to learn, even assuming for a moment there are other program priorities that the Federal Government has traditionally taken up with regard to elementary and secondary education?

Of course, our role has always, as a national community, been limited in elementary and secondary education. But even assuming for a moment that there are other priorities, I daresay, it should go without argument that ought to be a priority also. Our kids cannot learn, they cannot take advantage of whatever those other priorities are in schools that are literally falling down around them.

We are going to take a vote on this tomorrow morning. There will be some further debate about it tomorrow morning. I encourage my colleagues to take a close look, to call home, to check out what is going on in your own States, because this is a problem that, again, is national in scope, but it particularly goes to the well-being and the access to educational opportunity for every child in this country.

I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, I would point out that the primary responsibility for this construction lies with the States, and that if we were to go on in a new venture to pick up the responsibility of reconstructing the schools in this country of about \$115 to \$120 billion, that obviously would create a huge change in our priorities.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, I understand that under the unanimous-consent order, the Moseley-Braun amendment is now set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be set aside.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, I have a motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order agreed to was to recognize the Senator from Florida at this time.

Mr. MACK. Madam President, I have no objection to allowing the Senator from Vermont to proceed at this point.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. I will be very brief. I thank my good friend from Florida for allowing me to do this.

AMENDMENT NO. 337

Mr. JEFFORDS. I have a motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS] for himself and Mr. COATS, moves to recommend S. Con. Res. 27 to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report the same

back to the Senate forthwith with the following amendments:

Strike the reconciliation instruction for the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

Adjust the reconciliation instructions for the Committee on Finance to reflect an increase in revenues of \$1,057,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 and \$1,792,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 1998 through 2002.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Madam President, so I do not sound totally inconsistent with the arguments I just made, I would let it be known that I intend to withdraw my amendment at the conclusion of my statement.

I rise today with my good friend from Indiana, Senator COATS, to offer this motion. What this does is to remove the reconciliation instructions from the budget bill, the reconciliation instructions of my own committee. The reason for that is that this would require us to reduce the aid for our higher ed students.

I would remind everyone that last year this body greatly reduced the instructions then of some many billions of dollars and sent it over to the House. They came back and refused to go along. And this body voted 99 to 0 to insist upon the Senate's position. That resulted in restoring almost all of the money to the higher ed area.

The only area that my committee, the Labor and Human Resources Committee, has any money that is in the reconciliation area is with respect to the higher ed funding of our student loans. The budget agreement as recently written cuts the student financial aid account by \$1.8 billion over 5 years. I would note that that is substantially lower than last year. We end up, even after all the reductions from about \$19 billion down, we still ended up with \$4 billion. So I commend the Budget Committee for coming back with half of what was required last year.

Our motion would restore these funds however and remain budget neutral by providing for adjustment on the revenue side of the agreement. I think it is important to remind my colleagues of the central importance that student aid plays in our children's future.

The balanced budget agreement is dependent upon increases in working productivity and in future economic growth. This growth in turn is dependent upon the quality and availability of a well-educated work force.

Let us take a minute to reflect on the facts regarding the economic impact, the higher education impact upon Federal aid to student participation. Participation in higher education is one of the most dramatic predictors of economic success.

As you can see from this chart—the chart I would have had but do not have—that shows dramatically that the more education you have, the more economic availability you have.

With a high school degree, your high range is at \$43,000. If you have a bachelor's degree, it is \$73,000. And if you have a doctorate, it goes well above that.

In the past years, only those that had postsecondary education have been able to stay even with the cost of living. And only those with doctorates and masters degrees have improved their standard of living.

So it is incredibly important we provide the access of our young people to go to higher education. The postsecondary, as I referred to it now—we have given much emphasis on the higher education without keeping in mind the postsecondary training education that is available.

Federal financial aid plays an essential role in allowing students from low and middle income families to attend community colleges and universities. Thirty-six percent of all students receive some form of Federal financial aid in order to allow them to attend college. This Federal investment is returned many times over in increased economic productivity and income in Federal taxes. Without this aid, however, many of the students would not be able to fulfill their dreams to attend college.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, education is, for many of us, a top priority. S. 1, the first bill introduced in the 105th Congress evidenced that fact. The rhetoric from our President would seem to indicate that education was also his top priority, yet at this very moment he is supporting a budget which will result in a decrease of \$1.8 billion to student aid programs. I rise today to support the Jeffords motion which ensures access to educational opportunities for all Americans.

Since the early 1980's, the price of going to college has increased at more than twice the rate of inflation; growing even more rapidly than the cost of health care. This is the chief reason that a college education is unaffordable for American families.

Initiatives, such as those included in S. 1, provide tax relief for families, encourage planning for the future through the use of college savings accounts, and build on already successful programs, such as Federal student loans and work study. These initiatives deserve our support. Unfortunately, the budget that we are considering today will make it virtually impossible to adequately provide these critically important programs to students and their families.

I encourage my colleagues to join Senator JEFFORDS and I in this firm resolve to protect higher education programs, thereby ensuring that all students have access to post-secondary educational opportunities. Access to higher education is critical and should not be compromised in this budget resolution.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I would again ask Members to keep in mind the 99 to 0 vote which occurred last year that said we should not do anything that impacts in the ability of our students to attend higher education. So I will ensure that the reconciliation that we send, if anything, will make sure that

it does not in any way hinder the ability of students to attend higher education.

I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion at this time.

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

The amendment (No. 337) was withdrawn.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 315

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the Federal commitment to biomedical research should be doubled over the next 5 years)

Mr. MACK. Madam President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. FRIST, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DEWINE, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REID, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DORGAN, proposes an amendment numbered 315.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) heart disease was the leading cause of death for both men and women in every year from 1970 to 1993;

(2) mortality rates for individuals suffering from prostate cancer, skin cancer, and kidney cancer continue to rise;

(3) the mortality rate for African American women suffering from diabetes is 134 percent higher than the mortality rate of Caucasian women suffering from diabetes;

(4) asthma rates for children increased 58 percent from 1982 to 1992;

(5) nearly half of all American women between the ages of 65 and 75 reported having arthritis;

(6) AIDS is the leading cause of death for Americans between the ages of 24 and 44;

(7) the Institute of Medicine has described United States clinical research to be "in a state of crisis" and the National Academy of Sciences concluded in 1994 that "the present cohort of clinical investigators in not adequate";

(8) biomedical research has been shown to be effective in saving lives and reducing health care expenditures;

(9) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has contributed significantly to the first overall reduction in cancer death rates since recordkeeping was instituted;

(10) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has resulted in the identification of genetic mutations for osteoporosis; Lou Gehrig's Disease, cystic fibrosis, and Huntington's Disease; breast, skin and prostate cancer; and a variety of other illnesses;

(11) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has been key to the development of Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) and Positron Emission Tomography (PET) scanning technologies;

(12) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has developed effective

treatments for Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia (ALL). Today, 80 percent of children diagnosed with Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia are alive and free of the disease after 5 years; and

(13) research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health contributed to the development of a new, cost-saving cure for peptic ulcers.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that this Resolution assumes that—

(1) appropriations for the National Institutes of Health should be increased by 100 percent over the next 5 fiscal years; and

(2) appropriations for the National Institutes of Health should be increased by \$2,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 over the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997.

Mr. MACK. I ask unanimous consent that no second-degree amendments to this amendment be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MACK. Madam President, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself and the following Senators: Senators FEINSTEIN, KENNEDY, FRIST, SPECTER, HARKIN, D'AMATO, DEWINE, BOXER, COLLINS, DURBIN, REID, BREAUX, and DORGAN.

Madam President, let me quickly state the amendment is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. Let me just say to my colleagues that I recognize that what we are doing here is merely making a statement. But I think it is an important statement to be made.

This has to do with a sense of the Senate about doubling the investment in the National Institutes of Health over the next 5 years.

It further States that it is our intent that the investments of the National Institutes of Health be increased by \$2 billion in this next fiscal year.

I begin my remarks, as I do often about this issue, by speaking about my own personal experiences, in essence, what motivates me to offer this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

Before I get into those kinds of personal feelings, maybe I ought to share with my colleagues an experience that I had just a few months ago, the last hearing that the Senate—at least I believe it was—the last hearing that the Senate held in the 104th Congress. It was a hearing that was chaired by Senator Hatfield and Senator Cohen, and it was a hearing to raise the awareness of the American people about the advantages and the needs of more research dollars.

General Schwarzkopf was one of those individuals who testified. He, in essence, said that one of these days the American people are going to realize how little we have invested in basic research in health care, in health care research, health research in this country, how little we have done. He said, in essence, when they find that out, they are going to be mad as hell and they are going to want something done about it.

I have spent many years now here in the Senate trying to raise the voices of concern, and the time has now come,

frankly, that another year cannot pass without this Congress and this Senate making a commitment to doubling the investment at the National Institutes of Health.

And I say so in recognizing I do this from an emotional perspective because I, like so many others, represent families that have been devastated by disease. In my particular case, I am talking about cancer. Since the last time I spoke on the floor of the Senate about this issue I lost another member of my family to the disease. I lost my father, who died at the age of 83 with esophageal cancer.

I remember at a particular moment as he was fighting the disease, and I guess this moment comes for most of us, dad realized regardless of all the advantages and all the breakthroughs that have taken place with research, that frankly nothing more could be done for him. One of the doctors suggested what they needed to do next was to insert a feeding tube into his stomach. Dad's reaction to the doctor was, "That's not going to happen to me. I have lived a pretty good life. I have raised eight children," and he said with a little grin, "They have all done pretty well. So I look upon my life as one that has been pretty successful." He said, "It's time for me to die. I'm going back home. I'm not going to stay in the hospital. I'm not going to eat anything else. I'm not going to drink anything else. It is time for me to die. I accept that."

That was totally different than the experience that I had with my younger brother who died of melanoma at the age of 35. At that age, I guess it is almost impossible to give up. You have a sense that you have got to fight every step of the way. Maybe there will be a discovery made is the sense of what people feel. I can tell you as a member of the family, I sure was hopeful, each day, maybe a new procedure, maybe a new experimental drug would come along and save my brother Michael's life, who for 12 years, from the age of 23, on knew that each year could be the year in which he would lose his life.

So I say today, Madam President, I can no longer be kind of quiet about this issue. I realize I am here today speaking about my own personal experiences, but in essence I represent every family in America. Why are we taking this? Why have we, as a Nation, said over and over and over again we do not have the money to invest in this kind of research? We are talking about \$2 billion more in this next fiscal year—\$2 billion more, and we are told we do not have the money. Now I know how difficult it is going to be to find it. I do not mean to be underestimating that. But if our Nation made the commitment to do it we could find the resources to invest \$2 billion more at the National Institutes of Health.

As I say, my story is a story about cancer. I was diagnosed with the same cancer that killed my brother, within months after I came to the U.S. Senate. And I would say this, if it had not

have been for Michael's death, I probably would have been the one who died because I would not have been sensitive to the information on the early warning signs of the disease. I would have ignored the mole on my side until maybe it was too late. All I am saying is I do not think we as a Nation should ignore the warning signs.

You can talk about Parkinson's disease, and many of us have had the opportunity to talk with Morton Kondracke or with Joan Samuelson. In my case, a dear friend, Bob Finkernagle, another dear friend, Pat Hucker, whose wife is suffering with the disease. There have been tremendous breakthroughs with respect to Parkinson's disease but there is a lot more out there that can be discovered, a lot more that can be done.

During these past several years I have had the opportunity to speak with Dr. Varma, Dr. Klausner, Francis Collins, all out at the National Institutes of Health, and as you listen to them talk about breakthrough after breakthrough after breakthrough you cannot help but be excited about what the opportunities are for further investments in medical research.

There is a gene known at the P-53 gene with respect to cancer. Interestingly enough, this gene, when it malfunctions, when it is mutated, has been found in somewhere between 50 percent and 80 percent of all cancers. It is a tumor suppressor gene and research scientists all across America and around the world are, in fact, trying to figure out the mechanism. They have indicated that in their tests in the laboratory that when a P-53 gene that is not mutated is placed in with other cells it, in fact, stops the growth of those cells. More money needs to be invested to find out whether P-53 holds a key for a cure.

What can be the benefits from more research? One of the things that would happen is that we would see that the number of people that participate in clinical trials would go from 2 percent to 20 percent. What does that mean to the average person? Well, it means that some mother or some father or some brother, some sister, might have an opportunity to have drugs that are available on the market but only through a clinical trial. We would increase from 2 percent to 20 percent if we were to double the investment at NIH.

The number of grants that would be approved would jump from 25 percent to 40 percent. More access to state-of-the-art care, ability for the research centers to attract new talent. I could go on and on.

The point here is this, and I will close my comments at this time, with another story from that same hearing that I referred to a little bit earlier. There was an individual on that panel with General Schwarzkopf by the name of Travis Roy. Travis Roy is a young man whose dream it was to play ice hockey in Boston, and he succeeded. Unfortunately, in the first 11 seconds

of a game he was hit in such a manner that he is paralyzed from the neck down. He said to the Members at that hearing, to the panel, that his dream was to be able to hug his mother again someday. You know something, if we had listened to that 15 years ago, our reaction, sure, we would have had the compassion and the concern for that young man, but in the back of our mind we would have said, but you know there is nothing we can do about it. Well, something dramatically has changed in America. We no longer believe that there is nothing we can do about it. We have seen so much happen in the field of research that we now believe there are opportunities all across the board in all different kinds of diseases for breakthroughs that will save lives.

Today, I had the opportunity to listen to a physician by the name of LaSalle LaFalle, a former President of the American Cancer Society. He said, "When I was trained, I was told that there was no cure for leukemia, that everyone died from leukemia. Hodgkin's disease, everyone died from Hodgkin's disease." We know now the cure rate of leukemia is around 60 percent, and Hodgkin's disease is 80 percent. That is a result of the investments we made in basic research. I ask my colleagues to support this sense-of-the-Senate resolution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask my distinguished colleague, Senator MACK, who controls the time, for an allocation of 10 minutes.

Mr. MACK. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to support this sense-of-the-Senate resolution because the results of the National Institute of Health have been dramatic, really stunning. We have seen dramatic breakthroughs in heart disease, in breast cancer, in prostate cancer, in ovarian cancer, Alzheimer's disease, cystic fibrosis, new generations of AIDS drugs are reducing the presence of the AIDS virus in HIV-infected persons to nearly undetectable levels. With respect to the variety of cancers, the death rates have begun a very, very steady decline. Most recently we have made enormous progress as well in schizophrenia.

The accounts on the National Institutes of Health have risen consistently over the past decade and a half. Regardless of whether the chairman of the subcommittee was Senator Weicker, Senator Chiles, Senator HARKIN, or myself, a position which I now hold, we have found the money for very, very substantial increases in the funding for NIH. Last year we had an increase of some 6.9 percent for a total of \$820 million. The year before, \$643 million. I commend my colleague, Senator MACK, for his leadership in first

offering a resolution early on to double NIH funding over the next 5 years, and the resolution tonight, to add \$2 billion to NIH funding.

I suggest that we need to go a step beyond the sense-of-the-Senate Resolution, and if I might attract the attention of the distinguished manager of this bill, Senator DOMENICI, in supporting this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, I wish to point out that the figures, while well intended, to express the views of the Senate, are not binding in terms of what will occur. The reality is, of course, that nothing is binding. The whole budget resolution is, in a sense, the sense of the Senate. Now there are some parts which are protected, as Senator DOMENICI has explained, under an agreement between the congressional leadership and the President. Those, however, require the confirming by the entire body, and that may not happen and they are subject to a veto if that does not happen, but in the very broad sense we express in this budget resolution what we would like to see done.

Now, at a later point in the budget resolution I will call upon my distinguished colleague from New Mexico to support an amendment which I will offer which will add \$1.1 billion to the 550 function, which surprisingly has been reduced in the resolution now before the Senate. Under a freeze, that figure is set at \$25 billion and in the budget resolution it is at \$24.9 billion.

So, notwithstanding the very impressive presentation made by my colleague from Florida, he is talking about Confederate money. If we are to have real money in order to present this to the Appropriations Committee, in a discussion I have had with the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Senator STEVENS, we are going to have to have real dollars put in an offset. As much as I would like to see \$2 billion as suggested by Senator MACK I do not know quite how to get there with an offset, but I think this is admirable.

I suggest to my colleagues that if we take four-tenths of 1 percent from discretionary nondefense, a total of some \$258 billion, we will have \$1.1 billion. That sum of money would enable us to have an increase in the NIH budget, something in the neighborhood of \$950 million, which would be hard cash and something which is really very, very, badly needed.

When we talk about the number of grants provided through NIH, we currently have some 27,000 research project grants, 878 center grants, nearly 15,000 training grants. But even at that, only one in four approved grants are funded.

Now, beyond NIH, we will face in this subcommittee LIHEAP, Low-Income Energy Assistance. I know my distinguished colleague from New Mexico has been a leader on mental illness, and he will be coming to the markup and will be making a very valid, very impassioned plea, as he has done each year. If I could continue to have the attention of my colleague from New Mexico,

each time he as come to me as chairman—and we have had rotations as to who is the chairman of which subcommittee—and each time Senator DOMENICI has come to me, I have said, “Yes. Pete. Yes, sir.” He is right. But if I am to be able to say that as chairman of the committee, we are going to have to have some hard dollars. For Senator DOMENICI’s recommendation, I had a discussion with Senator STEVENS, and he said, “I will follow PETE’s lead, but we are going to have to have more than a sense-of-the-Senate resolution.”

I know my distinguished colleague from New York is standing beside me. I want to yield the remainder of my time because I think there is going to be a very persuasive argument offered by my colleague, Senator D’AMATO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York?

Who yields time?

Mr. MACK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, let me say to my friend and colleague from New York that Senator FRIST was—2 minutes?

All right.

Mr. D’AMATO. I will not take a long time.

Mr. President, let me just simply say this: I support the efforts of my distinguished colleague from Florida. He has been instrumental in helping to lead the way. I remember when we first appropriated money from the defense account for breast cancer research. Were it not for his persuasiveness on the floor, I do not know if we would have ever made that historic breakthrough. That was an amendment offered by Senator HARKIN and myself. It was really Senator MACK who made a difference in this presentation with his efforts.

Let me say this: We are missing the boat. We are just dreadfully missing the boat. Where is our sense of priority in terms of how we do the business of the people?

I have to tell you something. We should take money from any one of a number of sources to see to it that the NIH is properly funded. What we are doing today—making scavengers and beggars of the best in biomedical research—is just simply wrong, whether it is for AIDS, whether it is pediatric work, cancer research, breast cancer, or prostate cancer. Virtually every male in this Chamber is going to get prostate cancer if they live long enough.

What are we doing to ourselves and to future generations? I suggest that we are mortgaging it by not coming forward and allocating resources. I don’t care if it comes from the gasoline tax, the cigarette tax, or from cutting expenditures in other areas. We couldn’t invest money more prudently than in this kind of medical research.

We shouldn’t be juggling funds and saying take it from diabetic research

and put it into some other area. Every one of these areas under NIH needs more money.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we not only pass this resolution but then do the business of the people, and that we stand up and say, “Yes, we are going to allocate the necessary resources.” There was a 4.3-cent-per-gallon raise in the gas tax to help bring the deficit down. You ask the American people if they wouldn’t take one penny of that—which is a lot of money on an annual basis, well over \$1 billion—and use that for medical research. You ask them whether or not they would be willing to see to it that expenditures that we are making today should not be diverted to this area. And they would tell you to spend the money for the research so we don’t have to go begging and turning down worthy applications because we are talking about the lives of our children and future generations.

I yield the floor. I thank my colleagues for their patience.

Mr. MACK. I say to the Chair that I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania has three amendments.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I seek recognition simply to send forward to the desk three amendments in accordance with the pending rule.

I thank my colleague from Florida.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MACK. I now yield 5 minutes to Senator FRIST of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise in support of the amendment before us just introduced by the Senator from Florida which expresses the sense of the Senate that the Federal commitment to biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health is one of the highest priorities in this year’s budget resolution. This amendment very simply states that Congress should double the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health over the next 5 years and, in the fiscal year 1998, increase NIH funding by \$2 billion.

I would like to commend my colleague, the Senator from Florida, Senator MACK, for his leadership in bringing this amendment forward today to ensure our commitment short term and long term to biomedical research. I was an original cosponsor with Senator MACK of similar legislation, Senate Resolution 15, introduced on the first day of the 105th Congress, the Biomedical Research Commitment Resolution of 1997, which demonstrated collectively our commitment to increasing biomedical research substantially over the next 5 years.

I rise as a member of the Senate Budget Committee who has struggled with the effort to balance the budget which we will achieve by the year 2002 and at the same time preserve a strong role, a vital role, a critical role, in biomedical research during the times of obvious fiscal restraint. Historically, Congress has in many ways over the

years demonstrated a continued strong support of increased funding for the important work that we all know occurs at the National Institutes of Health.

The scientific and medical breakthroughs supported by the NIH in the last 50 years have vastly improved our capacity to prevent disease, to diagnose disease, and treat human disease. I contrast my status as a heart and lung transplant surgeon to my father, a family physician who practiced medicine for 50 years, when he started, he carried around most of the knowledge that he needed at that time to treat somebody in his head and most of his tools in a simple black bag. How far we have come because of our commitment to invest in biomedical research.

As a heart and lung transplant surgeon, I have had the opportunity to see firsthand the great advances which have revolutionized the way we think about disease. As Americans, we benefit every day from the highest quality of health care in the world. And it is vital—it is vital—that we continue to invest for the long term as well as the short term in our research efforts to maintain this high quality.

The research supported by the NIH has resulted in numerous medical advances. A whole new industry in the postwar period has sprung up that supports and encourages research. For the first time in this postwar period we have had mortality rates more affected by chronic disease than infectious disease.

I want to speak, as I see the Senator from New Mexico here on the floor, about the Human Genome Project and what we have seen. We are poised today to move into a whole new era that we couldn’t have imagined 10 years ago where it is critical that we continue to maintain that investment to see these potential cures, these new ways to make a diagnosis come to fruition.

The Human Genome Project is an international effort, historic effort, with the goal of understanding and deciphering the human genetic code. The project has achieved already hugely important milestones in our understanding of the molecular basis of disease and the crucial role that our genes play in how we function and how disease is caused. This past year we have witnessed the mapping of chromosomal locations for genes related to, as referred to earlier, an inherited aspect of Parkinson’s disease as well as a hereditary form of prostate cancer, which was just mentioned by the Senator from New York. The tools of this Human Genome Project have led to the isolation of a gene responsible for hereditary hemochromatosis, an iron in our metabolism disorder which causes multiple organ failure which we didn’t understand historically.

These advances in genetics research are opening the door to our understanding of the causes of disease and giving hope to millions of Americans suffering from genetic disorders. We

will see these treatments and we will see these cures for some of the most devastating diseases.

Again, I have to recognize the Senator from New Mexico, because it is he who deservedly has the title of the father of the Human Genome Project, for his wisdom in launching this project in the United States of America—the very person who has spent all day today and yesterday and will be tomorrow leading us into a balanced budget by the year 2002. The Human Genome Project is a success story for Federal investment in biomedical research.

In closing, the Human Genome Project is just one example of the many success stories from the National Institutes of Health. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety, as a scientist, as someone who has seen, firsthand at the bedside, people die, and who has sat at the bedside of those whom we can have a cure for if we make that investment today, I stress the importance of our continued commitment to this investment so that we can reap these benefits.

In this spirit, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support passage of this amendment in recognition that the future of our Nation's health and the future of the health of our children is dependent upon our strong investment in biomedical research today.

Mr. President, I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from California, Senator FEINSTEIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair, and I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for this opportunity.

One of my great pleasures in the Senate has been to chair the Senate Cancer Coalition with Senator MACK, and in that capacity, we have had four hearings. We have listened and heard a great deal about cancer.

I think, Mr. President, if you ask the American people two questions about Federal spending, in two areas, and if you asked, "How much do we spend as a portion of our budget on foreign operations?" the American people would think it is very high. If you ask them, "What do you think we spend on research for health?" I think they would say it is a great deal. In fact, it is less than one percent of our budget.

Today, at the NIH only 28 percent of the grant applications are funded. That is down from 30 percent in 1992. We are doing less. Only 20 percent of new grants are funded.

How would NIH use more funds? They would use the funds in areas that show scientific promise:

Brain disorders: areas such as neural development, neural degeneration, with emphasis on Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease.

New Therapies: drugs to combat cancer and AIDS; bioengineering to repair damaged tissues; treatments to improve care at the end of life.

Genetics: better identification of inherited mutations which contribute to cancer risk; better identification of environmental impact of genetic mutations.

Now let's turn to the National Cancer Institute.

The National Cancer Institute in fiscal year 1997 can only fund 26 percent of grant applications. NCI funded 32 percent in 1992. They are down in 4 years from funding 32 percent to 26 percent of grant applications.

General Norman Schwarzkopf, a prostate cancer patient, said: "During the past decade, Federal funding for cancer research has, after adjusting for inflation, increased only one percent."

Mr. President, 7.4 million Americans have a history of cancer; 1.3 million cases will be diagnosed this year and 560,000 Americans will die. But we spend one tenth of one cent of every Federal dollar on cancer research.

On May 7, NCI Director Dr. Klausner said NCI could use double its current funding. How would NCI use additional funds? First, experts say they could increase the testing and search for causes of cancer. Second, more people could participate in cancer trials. We could increase access of eligible adult cancer patients participating in clinical trials. Today, only 2 percent of eligible cancer patients can participate and we could increase that to 20 percent. NIH could increase the number of cancer centers from 55 to 75. Cancer researchers could improve earlier detection of cancer and expand studies of environmental risk factors for cancer, as was urged by experts at a recent hearing of our Senate Cancer Coalition. NCI could monitor more people to better understand the impact of treatment on cancer patients. Today, NCI can monitor only 10 percent of the American population with cancer, a sample that is too small. More monitoring can yield more information about the outcome of treatments.

Mr. President, NCI has identified five important new research areas that could realize the large dividends that are described in NCI's "bypass budget." What is the bypass budget? The Congress requested the National Cancer Institute to annually identify, in their professional judgment, their promising scientific unmet needs.

Here is what they are: First, Cancer genetics: Within 5 years, the goal is to identify every major human gene predisposing to cancer. Second, NCI could increase animal models of human cancers that would allow testing in animals of early detection, prevention, and treatment strategies. Third, NCI could improve detection technologies, to sharpen the sensitivity of technologies and smaller numbers of tumor cells. Fourth, NCI could improve developmental diagnostics to better understand the difference in and the properties of tumors, how they change, how they respond to treatment and thereby improve the treatments. And fifth, NCI could increase what is called investi-

gator-initiated research by 30 percent, to capitalize on new ideas and talent all across the country. This would increase research conducted in universities and labs.

With our aging population growing, our research needs will grow. People are living longer. By the year 2000, the number of people aged 75 to 84 will increase by one-third, to 12.3 million people. People over 85, the fastest growing segment of our population, will grow 70 percent, to 4.9 million. One-third of U.S. health care spending today goes to people over age 65. These costs, left unabated, will grow exponentially. The rising aged population will tax Medicare, Medicaid and the health system overall.

NIH is working on research to delay the diseases and disabilities of aging. Let me give some examples. Mr. President, 4 million Americans today have Alzheimer's disease, a degenerative disorder that can leave people unable to function on their own. By delaying the onset of Alzheimer's for 5 years, we can save \$50 billion annually.

Half of all people over age 65 have symptoms of arthritis. Osteoarthritis costs \$8 billion annually. By delaying the onset by 5 years, we can save \$4 billion.

Hearing loss: 30 percent of adults age 65 to 75, and 40 percent of those over 75, have some degree of hearing impairment. Delaying the onset by just 5 years could save \$15 billion annually. What is my point? Research is cost effective.

We need more health research because we have diseases and disorders for which there is no cure.

AIDS has surpassed accidents as the leading killer of young adults. It is now the leading cause of death among Americans age 25 to 44.

The prevalence of diabetes has steadily increased over the past 35 years.

Just pick up Time magazine and you see that asthma rates jumped 58 percent, from 1982 to 1992 for children, and asthma is the leading cause of school absences from chronic conditions.

40,000 infants die each year from devastating diseases, and 20 million Americans have rare diseases for which there are few effective treatments. Seven to ten percent of children are learning disabled.

The rate of low birth-weight among African-American children is 13 percent, compared to 6.2 percent for white Americans. One condition that increases the risk of premature delivery is bacterial vaginosis, and African Americans have a higher rate.

So we can alleviate suffering, find treatments, cure diseases, if we have the research, if we devote the resources to it. The irony is that most people, 75 percent of the people in America, would pay higher taxes for this kind of research.

I contend that increased research will reduce health care costs. Let me

give some examples of annual economic costs. Cancer, \$104 billion annually; heart disease, \$128 billion; Alzheimer's, \$100 billion; diabetes, \$138 billion; mental disorders, \$148 billion; stroke, \$30 billion. A 5-year delay in Alzheimer's—again, \$50 million savings. Savings in delaying the onset of stroke would be \$15 billion. And a delay in the onset of Parkinson's disease would save \$3 billion annually.

For every \$1 spent on measles/mumps/rubella vaccine, \$21 is saved. For diphtheria/tetanus/pertussis vaccine, \$29 is saved. This is prevention. And research can bring us prevention.

Hip fractures, common among the elderly, are a leading cause of nursing home admissions. They account for one in every 5 admissions. NIH research found that estrogen therapy reduces osteoporosis and hip fractures. In 1991, 1 year alone, the reduction in fractures in women taking estrogen replacement saved \$333 million in these nursing home admission costs.

Medicaid and Medicare: 56 percent of nursing home costs are paid by these programs. They total over \$44 billion annually. These costs are rising. We all know this from our budget deficit debate. By delaying the onset of chronic aging-related illnesses, spending for nursing home care could be cut by \$35 billion.

What is my point? My point is health research makes sense for many reasons, but we are not doing as well as we could. The scientific community has repeatedly pointed out that we are neglecting research. The Institute of Medicine has described U.S. clinical health research as, "in a state of crisis." Without adequate support, we will see a serious deficiency of clinical expertise, a reduction in effective clinical interventions, increases in human suffering and disability, and increases in the costs of health care.

A June 1995 national survey by Research America found, as I said, that 75 percent of the public would pay more for medical research. This is one of the reasons why Senator MACK, Senator D'AMATO, Senator REID, Senator JOHNSON and I will be proposing a tax checkoff for the IRS form, giving Americans the opportunity to use a checkoff to contribute to cancer research. This could be an effective public-private partnership. It is one of the reasons why we are also for a breast cancer stamp, which would have 1 additional cent, and that 1 cent would go to breast cancer research.

Mr. President, 94 percent of Americans believe it is important for the United States to maintain its role as a world leader in medical research. We cannot do it if health research is less than 1 percent of our budget. We cannot do it when good grants are turned down because the funding isn't there. Only 3 cents of every health care dollar spent in this country is used for research—3 cents. NIH's budget is less than 1 percent.

I made my case. Medical science is on the cutting edge of many important

discoveries. It is a time when we should be nourishing research. This is not the time to backslide. I urge my colleagues to support the Mack-Feinstein amendment. I yield the floor and I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. I yield 5 minutes to Senator COLLINS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the sense-of-the-Senate resolution offered by my colleague from Florida, calling for a doubling of our investment in biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health over the next 5 years. Now, some may question why we are calling for such a significant increase in spending as part of a balanced budget agreement. However, I believe that our sense-of-the-Senate resolution is entirely consistent with the goal of a balanced budget, because there is no investment that would yield greater returns for the American taxpayer than an investment in biomedical research.

Our nation currently spends billions of dollars each year, both directly and indirectly, to treat and care for chronic diseases. For example, cardiovascular disease costs us \$138 billion each year. Alzheimer's disease costs about \$100 billion each year, primarily in nursing home and other long-term care costs. Strokes result in health care costs of almost \$30 billion annually. And Parkinson's disease costs our society about \$6 billion annually. We basically have two choices. We can sit back and continue to pay the bills and endure the suffering, or we can aggressively pursue a national strategy aimed at preventing, delaying, and even curing these devastating and debilitating diseases and conditions.

While we are spending billions of dollars each year on patient care, as the Senator from California has pointed out, only 3 cents—3 cents of each health care dollar are currently invested in medical research. Opportunities for progress in biomedical and related health science research have never been better, but currently, we are only funding a fraction of the promising grant applications submitted to NIH. Moreover, not only are the investments in research disproportionately low compared to the cost of patient care, but the potential of research to reduce health care costs is vastly under realized.

The work of Dr. Jonas Salk and his colleagues to produce a vaccine for polio serves as a dramatic example of research as a high-yield investment. The lifetime costs of maintaining just two children stricken with polio is greater than all of the money—all of the money—ever spent on the research that virtually eliminated the disease.

The potential for achieving even greater savings from health care research is enormous. For example, the

Alliance for Aging Research has estimated that a 5-year delay in the onset of Alzheimer's disease could cut health care spending by much as \$50 billion annually and that a 5-year delay in the onset of stroke could save our Nation \$15 billion a year.

This is no time to put the brakes on research spending. Rather, we should accelerate our efforts and increase our commitment to medical research that can cure, prevent or delay disease. This strategy is especially important as we move into the next century when our public health and disability programs will be increasingly strained by the aging of our population.

Finally, the cost of disease and disability cannot be measured in dollars alone. Only those who have had to care for a father or a husband whose quality of life has been cut short by a stroke can appreciate how devastating it can be. Or think of the family whose mother or grandmother no longer recognizes her own children or grandchildren because of Alzheimer's disease.

These diseases take their toll emotionally as well as financially. They can dramatically and irretrievably alter the lives of the affected individuals and their families, as Senator MACK has so eloquently testified. Therefore, I am very pleased to be joining Senator MACK in offering this sense-of-the-Senate amendment, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us in passing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair. I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding.

I am honored to be a cosponsor on this resolution. There are so many things that we vote for in the Chambers of the Senate and House, and I often wonder what the average person in the street would do if they were faced with casting a yes-or-no vote on issues we face in the Chamber.

I think I know what they would do when it comes to this resolution. If we are talking about a substantial increase in medical research as a major budget priority, I think I know where the American people would end up on that. They would be supportive. They understand, as we do, what is at stake.

There have been a lot of things said in the Chamber, and I stand behind the statement of the Senator from California, the Senator from Maine and others, and they have recounted the work that has been done by NIH. I will not go on to repeat all those things, the breakthroughs that the National Institutes of Health has initiated. There are so many in the area of hip fractures, as the Senator from California said, breast cancer. The No. 1 leading cancer cause of death among women is lung cancer from smoking, but No. 2 and very serious is breast cancer.

What is happening at the National Institutes of Health in breakthrough research on bone marrow transplant is giving new hope to women who have learned that they have been diagnosed with breast cancer. That is something that every single husband, every father, everyone can identify with in a family as an important breakthrough.

Diabetes, heart disease, stroke, the list goes on and on. But I would like to ask my colleagues to think about this in a different and more personal context. I would daresay that in the next 12 months some Member of this Senate, someone sitting in the gallery, or someone listening to this debate will be seated in a doctor's office or a hospital when a doctor walks in the room and says that either myself or you or a loved one has been diagnosed with a serious illness. It takes your breath away to even think that it might happen, and yet we know it happens every day. You and I and everyone listening pray to God that the next words out of the doctor's mouth are, "But I have good news. There is a promising new therapy. There is a new surgery. There is a new medicine. We think that we can conquer this." And your heart starts beating and you realize you have hope.

That is what this is all about. This is not about a budget resolution. This is not about numbers on a page. It is about the hope that every family wants to have when faced with this threat of a serious illness. This investment in the National Institutes of Health is money well spent, not just because it can lead to new cures and lead to people having longer lives and less suffering, but let me mention one other element that I do not know has been spotlighted.

Across America today young men and women are deciding what to do with their lives. We hope that a substantial number of them will dedicate their lives to science, to medical science, and to research. But if they fear that their education is not going to lead to a position where they can get involved in research, they are less likely to do so. When we make a commitment to medical research at the National Institutes of Health, we say to that class of young scientists, men and women, we have a job waiting for you. We need you and we need your talent and we need you to stick with it so that you can live through the satisfaction of finding a breakthrough in the field of medicine and in science.

So it is not just a matter of saving those who are ill. It is a matter of encouraging young people to dedicate their lives to medical research. And that is why the sense-of-the-Senate resolution offered by the Senator from Florida is so critically important.

The National Institutes of Health in 1995 funded approximately 2,140 research institutions and over 18,000 investigators. And yet, if I am not mistaken—and I stand to be corrected by my colleagues here—we are funding about one out of four or one out of five

eligible research grants. In other words, there are three or four grants there that are very promising in medical research that we cannot fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DURBIN. This resolution offered by the Senator from Florida, which I am happy to cosponsor, will provide the resources for that absolutely essential research.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mrs. BOXER. I rise to support the Mack amendment which recognizes the importance of funds for the National Institutes of Health [NIH] research programs.

The investment that the American public has made in medical research funded by the NIH has been the foundation of this Nation's medical research enterprise—one of the leading sectors of our economy.

The NIH supports research at 2,000 colleges, universities, and other scientific institutions, including the efforts of more than 50,000 researchers and their staff throughout the country.

An NIH appropriations increase of 100 percent over the next 5 fiscal years and a \$2 billion increase by 1998 will save millions of lives.

In 1991, NIH launched the Women's Health Initiative, a 15-year study to examine hormone replacement therapy and its impact on cardiovascular disease—the leading cause of death in the U.S.; dietary intervention in the prevention of breast and colorectal cancer; and vitamin D and calcium in the prevention of osteoporosis and colorectal cancer.

Breast Cancer—the most commonly diagnosed cancer and the second leading cancer killer of American women—affects one in eight women in their lifetimes. Federal funding for breast cancer research and programs has continued to increase, but this year alone over 180,000 American women will be diagnosed with breast cancer.

I want to see the death rate from more diseases drop. I want to see a commitment in research funds for ovarian cancer—the silent killer—about which there is so little known.

I want to see eradication of diseases like Scleroderma, a disease most can't pronounce—but there are more cases of scleroderma than multiple sclerosis or muscular dystrophy.

In the 25 years since the National Cancer Act was signed into law, the toll taken by cancer continues to rise. In 1996, over 1.5 million Americans were diagnosed with some form of cancer and over 550,000 people lost their lives to cancer. This year, the numbers will continue to climb.

In 1997, approximately 131,920 Californians will be diagnosed as having cancer. This is the equivalent of almost 15 new cases every hour of every day. Approximately, 53,610 Californians will die from cancer.

Prostate cancer is the most common cancer in American men and has be-

come the most common cancer in California. (American Cancer Society, 1997 California Cancer Facts and Figures). Based on current U.S. rates, about 19 of every 100 men born today will be diagnosed with prostate cancer during their lifetime, while approximately 4 of every 100 men will die from this disease.

In 1997, approximately 24,000 Californians will be diagnosed with prostate cancer and an estimated 3,500 deaths will occur.

More funding for cancer research will make a difference. While there is no shortage of good research ideas in the cancer field overall, the chances for funding these research opportunities keeps getting worse.

The overall percentage of approved but unfunded investigator-initiated grants steadily increased from 40 percent in the 1970's to 85 percent in 1995. This trend needs to be reversed.

This amendment is a step in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and make sure that appropriate levels of funding are invested in research which saves lives.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GORTON and Senator HUTCHISON of Texas be added as cosponsors.

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

Mr. MACK. If I could just make a couple of brief comments and then we will be through.

Mr. DOMENICI. Sure.

Mr. MACK. As I listened to the discussion, and most of you heard me go through some of my experiences, I will never forget the moment that my wife told me she had discovered a lump in her breast and the doctor had told her that she had cancer. The sense of terror that gripped both of us, the sense of fear that we experienced—and I must say to you, there were a lot of selfish feelings going on inside me. I thought that I was going to lose my wife, that she would die of cancer. That is the reaction most people have when they are told they have cancer. I thought I was going to lose her. And so I wonder to myself, knowing what we know today, the breakthroughs that have already taken place in research, what keeps us from doubling the investment at NIH? Why will people accept the notion that we cannot do more?

I just cannot comprehend that. And so I would ask my colleagues tonight to support this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, recognizing that it is only the first step in a long, hard fight to find the dollars to double the investment in the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, do I understand we are finished with the debate except Senator KENNEDY?

Mr. MACK. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend Senator MACK for introducing this amendment. He has consistently fought for the increases at NIH over a long period of time. This makes eminent sense for the reasons he and others have outlined. I hope that his amendment will be accepted and that we could move ahead on this extraordinary opportunity to support breakthroughs in health care, in so many different areas affecting so many different families in America. He deserves great credit, and I am proud and privileged to cosponsor the amendment.

Our amendment expresses the sense of the Senate that the Federal commitment to the National Institutes of Health should be doubled over the next 5 years, increasing the current NIH budget of \$13 billion to \$26 billion by the year 2002.

This increase is critical to fulfilling our hope for healthy lives for all Americans. Every family is touched by the scourge of disease. This amendment will be a step toward reducing that burden. It is vital to maintaining the investment we've already made and to moving forward to improve the health of the American people. It can also be a key strategy in our efforts to save Medicare.

NIH began in 1887 as a one-room Laboratory of Hygiene. It has grown in the past century into the premier biomedical research facility in the world, for the benefit of literally billions of citizens in this country and of many other lands.

In the 1950's, NIH research found that fluoridated drinking water could prevent dental cavities in children. In the 1960's, NIH scientists helped crack the genetic code, beginning the studies that would lead to recombinant DNA technology and gene therapy. In the 1970's, NIH-sponsored research began to unravel the mysteries of the genetic origin of cancer.

The promise of new medical research is boundless. As impressive as the progress of the past has been, it pales in comparison to the opportunities for the future. We stand on the threshold of stunning advances in medicine through deeper understanding of the fundamental mechanisms of the cell, through mapping of human genes, through biotechnology, and through a host of advances that are already on the horizon.

But instead of moving toward that horizon, we are in danger of standing still. The proportion of worthwhile projects that NIH is able to fund has declined steadily over the past 15 years. Today, they can fund only about one in four such projects. That means, for example, that in 1996 the NIH had to turn away about 18,000 applications.

Every unfunded application represents a missed opportunity. As funding sources dry up, the best young minds are discouraged from entering the field of biomedical research. The situation is growing dire. In 1994, the

National Academy of Sciences warned that we have too few clinical investigators to conduct the research that is most needed.

In recent years, medical research has changed the world we live in, revising much of what we know about life, about diseases afflicting citizens of all ages. It has led to a breathtaking array of new technologies and therapies which have improved the health of Americans of all ages and walks of life.

From vaccines against childhood diseases, to treatments for spinal cord injury, from chemotherapy for cancer to medication for mental illness, medical research is improving the lives, and health of people everywhere.

Since we began to immunize small children with the Hib vaccine, which was developed by NIH scientists in the 1970's and 1980's, cases of deadly spinal meningitis have dropped by more than 98 percent. Diseases like mumps, whooping cough, and chickenpox, all common in the past, have dropped to their lowest levels in history. We are on the verge of eradicating polio from the world.

Spinal cord injury affects thousands of Americans, often striking in the prime of active lives. A recent NIH study found that a new drug, given within 8 hours of the injury, improves recovery by 20 percent, and gives patients greater independence and better health.

Chemotherapy for testicular cancer, the most common form of cancer in men aged 15 to 35, can bring a cure rate of 60 to 65 percent.

Researchers have identified genes linked to certain forms of breast cancer, and have developed new treatments for colon cancer. Improved detection and treatment methods like these have increased the 5-year survival rate for cancer victims to 52 percent. The gain since the 1960's represents over 80,000 additional cancer survivors each year.

For the first time, we have effective prescription drug treatments for serious mental health conditions, such as major depression, bipolar disorder, and schizophrenia. Many of these medications were developed by NIH-supported research.

We are also making progress against other intractable and debilitating diseases. Diabetes affects more than 16 million Americans. Recent research has improved treatment and offers the possibility of a cure.

Research on heart disease has made important advances. Since 1971, deaths from heart disease have dropped by 41 percent. NIH-funded research showed that one aspirin a day can reduce early mortality from heart attacks by 23 percent, and reduce subsequent nonfatal heart attacks by almost 50 percent.

Estrogen therapy in women has been shown to have a wide range of benefits, including reduced heart disease, osteoporosis, and Alzheimer's disease.

Dramatic progress is taking place in the treatment of stroke, which affects

3 million Americans each year. Victims who receive a new clot-dissolving drug in the first hours after a stroke recover more fully and more quickly than other patients. Half of the patients receiving this treatment recover completely. Other advances have reduced death from stroke by 59 percent since 1971.

Parkinson's disease affects more than half a million Americans. Doctors can now identify the area of the brain causing the tremor, and destroy it with a procedure that has been successful in over a thousand patients. Patients require fewer physician visits and less medication. The treatment reduces the number of falls leading to hip fracture and the need for hospitalization, nursing homes, and physical therapy.

Recent research on Alzheimer's disease suggests that preventing small, silent strokes can help those at risk delay the onset of the disease.

Research on the cutting edge of molecular biology, immunology, and neuroscience are making advances. In the early 1980's, AIDS was virtually untreatable. Today, new drugs are maintaining health in people with HIV for longer and longer periods.

Biomedical research is cost-effective. Research costs for the Hib vaccine were about \$30 million. Today, the vaccine saves \$70 to \$150 million a year in direct medical costs. The spinal cord injury study cost very little. If the medication comes into widespread use, the potential savings are in the billions of dollars. Estrogen therapy costs less than a dollar a day; cost savings in money and human suffering are huge.

We all know that Medicare is one of the most successful social programs ever enacted, but it is threatened today by demographic changes and the retirement of the baby boomers that lie ahead. Rather than saving the program by raised premiums of cutting reimbursements, there may be a better way.

A Duke University study earlier this year suggests that a small improvement in the disability rate among older Americans can bring large cost savings for Medicare. The decline in disability that is already occurring is attributable to research on the diseases of aging. If we take sensible steps to fix Medicare for the short-term, the most effective way to keep it solvent for the long term may well be to maintain and strengthen the existing trend toward better health for older Americans. The key step in that strategy is support for medical research.

Continued and expanding investment in such research will also provide benefits to the larger economy. As advances move from the laboratory into the commercial sector, new businesses and jobs will follow.

A recent study at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology found that the licensing of university inventions—including biomedical technologies—adds \$21 billion to the economy and supports 200,000 jobs each year.

Doubling the NIH budget will build on this progress and help to ensure

that its potential is achieved. It will provide funds to strengthen the research community, encouraging the best, and brightest of America's college graduates to make their careers in scientific research. This increased support will be tangible evidence of Congress' commitment to the health of all Americans.

Some will ask if we can afford to double the NIH budget. I would turn the question around to ask if we can afford not to do so. President Charles Vest, of M.I.T. has written, "Modern medicine is born of scientific research and delivered by advanced technology. Its human benefits can be realized only through the wise and caring public policy of a nation willing to invest in the future." If we can't afford to do this, we can't afford the future. The fundamental issue is priorities, and I urge the Senate to give its strong support to this bipartisan proposal.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise in support of Senator MACK's amendment to double the research budget of the National Institutes of Health over the next 5 years and to add \$2 billion to NIH funding now for fiscal year 1998. I want to thank the Senator for bringing this amendment to the floor today and this issue to the attention of our colleagues.

This level of funding is critical. It's clearly needed if we're going to tackle the serious medical problems that America faces—including cancer, diabetes, asthma, arthritis, AIDS, and the need for additional information about the special medical needs of children.

Research sponsored by the National Institutes of Health has a proven track record that has touched the lives of many Americans. The broad scope of its achievements is truly impressive. It includes the development of new treatments for disease; identification of genetic mutations for a varied set of diseases; identification of genetic mutations for a varied set of diseases; and contributions to the development of new scanning technologies. These spectacular advances in health could not have been achieved but for the commitment of Federal dollars we make to the NIH.

And let us be clear on this. The returns on the public investment in biomedical research have been impressive. Not only have we won Nobel prizes and built on decades of basic research, we have contributed to our national economic growth. Our investments have given life to America's biotechnology industry. Some have estimated that revenues in this industry will approach \$50 billion annually by the year 2000 and create as many as 500,000 new jobs.

I am supporting this effort because I believe it reflects a commitment to substantially strengthen our priorities toward biomedical research. We cannot rest on our laurels. We must work to improve the health of our citizens. I also want to make a personal commitment to work with my colleagues there in Congress and with the NIH to make

advantage of the important opportunity this amendment presents to advance research that benefits all of us—and especially, all of our children.

Let me highlight just one example of the type of activity that additional NIH research could support. Children under the age of 21 represent 30 percent of the population—and yet the NIH devotes only somewhere between 5 and 14 percent of its budget to their needs. Just as there has been a recognition in recent years that women and minorities have been neglected in research efforts nationwide, there's a growing consensus that children deserve more attention than they are getting.

Children are not small adults. They go through different developmental stages, they metabolize drugs differently, and they respond to illnesses and treatments differently. Children's health needs are not only different—they're often ignored by the private sector.

Federal funding for research—especially medical research—is a fundamental responsibility of Government. Today, the Senate must acknowledge that responsibility and act to enhance the ability of NIH to improve the health of all Americans.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add Senator DOMENICI, Senator GRAMM, and Senator THURMOND as cosponsors.

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

Does the Senator yield back his time?

Mr. MACK. Yes, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wanted to just alert the Senate, we were not quite sure when this vote was going to occur, and I have just spoken to our leadership office and they would like to give Senators a little bit of time to get in here. So I wonder if we could start this vote at a quarter of.

Mr. President, I think what we will do, I have a couple of comments, and then I think what we will do is go ahead and have the up-or-down vote and just keep it open for 20 minutes or more, and that will give Senators who are en route a chance to get here. I think that will be all right.

Mr. President, I compliment Senator MACK on the sense-of-the-Senate resolution, but I would be remiss if I did not congratulate the Congress on what it has already done for the National Institutes of Health.

Yes, we should do more. But last year we gave the National Institutes of Health a 7 percent increase. This year, if all goes as planned, they will get a 3½ percent increase.

Now, the National Institutes of Health this year under the new plan will be a \$13.1 billion enterprise, so it is not like we are not doing something significant. And while I believe that a sense-of-the-Senate saying we should do more, if we can, makes good sense, let me suggest that the greatest health science in the world is going on at the

National Institutes Of health of the United States, the biggest breakthroughs are being made there along with the business investment, pharmaceutical investment in America. We are truly at the cutting edge of some very significant wellness events.

Sometime when I have time in the Chamber, we will talk a little more about how the Human Genome Project got started, for it is an interesting kind of story. I do not intend to do it tonight. It is one of the greatest programs we have going, and I thank Senator FRIST for mentioning my name in conjunction with its inception. I had a bit to do with that.

Now, if we had any time in opposition, we yield it back.

Has the Senator asked for the yeas and nays? The yeas and nays have been requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. There was a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 315 offered by the Senator from Florida. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GREGG] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] would each vote "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Akaka	Feingold	Mack
Allard	Feinstein	McCain
Ashcroft	Ford	McConnell
Baucus	Frist	Mikulski
Bennett	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Biden	Gorton	Moynihan
Bingaman	Graham	Murkowski
Bond	Gramm	Murray
Boxer	Grams	Nickles
Breaux	Grassley	Reed
Brownback	Hagel	Reid
Bryan	Harkin	Robb
Bumpers	Hatch	Roberts
Burns	Hollings	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hutchinson	Roth
Campbell	Hutchison	Santorum
Chafee	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Cleland	Inouye	Sessions
Coats	Jeffords	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kennedy	Snowe
Coverdell	Kerrey	Specter
Craig	Kerry	Stevens
D'Amato	Kohl	Thomas
Daschle	Kyl	Thompson
DeWine	Landrieu	Thurmond
Dodd	Lautenberg	Torricelli
Domenici	Leahy	Warner
Dorgan	Levin	Wellstone
Durbin	Lieberman	Wyden
Enzi	Lott	

NOT VOTING—2

Gregg Helms

The amendment (No. 315) was agreed to.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am sorry that I have to inconvenience a couple of people that are waiting around, particularly my good friend, the chairman, but I have to get a little business done, if I can.

I have some amendments that have been cleared on both sides. I would like to send them to the desk with the attendant statements, whatever they are.

AMENDMENT NO. 341

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that certain elderly legal aliens should continue to receive benefits during a redetermination transition period)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of Senator FEINSTEIN, and others. I believe the amendment is a good amendment. It is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment regarding the elderly disabled and the SSI program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] for Mrs. FEINSTEIN, for herself, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. D'AMATO, Mr. DEWINE and Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 341.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CERTAIN ELDERLY LEGAL ALIENS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of this resolution assume that:

(1) the Committee on Finance will include in its recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate changes in laws within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance that allow certain elderly, legal immigrants who will cease to receive benefits under the supplemental security income program as a result of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-193; 110 stat. 2105) to continue to receive benefits during a redetermination or reapplication period to determine if such aliens would qualify for such benefits on the basis of being disabled.

(2) the Committee on Finance in developing these recommendations should offset the additional cost of this proposal out of other programs within the jurisdiction of Committee on Finance.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I, along with Senators DOMENICI, LAUTENBERG, BOXER, CHAFEE, DEWINE, D'AMATO, and KENNEDY am offering the sense of the Senate that would require the Finance Committee to allow elderly legal immigrants to continue receiving

SSI during their redetermination period. Under the current budget agreement, all elderly would be cut off of SSI as of October 1, 1997.

I want to acknowledge the leadership of the bill managers on both sides for their recognition of the devastating impact this budget agreement has on over 400,000 elderly legal immigrants, and encouraging the Senate to provide an important interim provision.

While I support the budget resolution's broad budget balancing framework, I have expressed over and over again, my deep concerns over its failure to restore SSI for over 400,000 elderly legal immigrants, 30 percent of which are over the age of 75 and who will be cut off from SSI as of October 1, 1997.

The current budget agreement, falls short of what is needed to keep the elderly immigrants from losing their life supporting benefits.

The Budget Agreement provides:

SSI benefits for disabled legal immigrants who are disabled and were in the country as of August 22, 1996.

SSI benefits for those who became disabled and got on the rolls between August 22, 1996 to June 1, 1997.

The budget agreement bans:

SSI for most elderly legal immigrants, even those elderly immigrants who rely on SSI for survival.

Food Stamps for most legal immigrants.

Although restoring SSI for the disabled is an important first step to a major flaw in the Welfare Reform bill passed by Congress last year, the elderly legal immigrants who depend on SSI will still lose their benefits under the agreement.

Under the current agreement, an 83-year-old woman with no family, who speaks little or no English, will be just as homeless as one who is disabled when she loses her SSI benefits. What is she supposed to do, get a job?

Under Welfare Reform, approximately 725,000 elderly, blind, and disabled legal immigrants could lose SSI benefits on August 22 of this year. Under the budget agreement: 42.5 percent or 307,630 disabled legal immigrants who were receiving SSI as of the date of enactment of the Welfare Bill would continue receiving SSI. However, for 417,360 or 57.5 percent of elderly legal immigrants who are currently receiving SSI would be cut off as of October 1, 1997.

The President estimates that 66 percent of the elderly legal immigrants who will be cut off from SSI initially could be recertified under the disabled category.

However, due to what I believe is an unintended mistake, even those elderly legal immigrants who are also disabled would be cut off from SSI on October 1, 1997. The elderly would become eligible for SSI only if they requalify after the cutoff.

CBO estimates that it would take 6 months or longer to rectify all the elderly legal immigrants currently on

the rolls. During the recertification period, no elderly legal immigrant would be receiving SSI. How will they survive for 6 months? They will mostly become homeless or fall onto County General Assistance rolls.

The impact of the SSI ban for elderly legal immigrants will be devastating and immediate, especially in the high immigrant States.

In California, 163,900 elderly legal immigrants may lose their SSI.

In New York, 65,340 elderly legal immigrants may lose their SSI.

In Texas, 32,640 elderly legal immigrants may lose their SSI.

In Florida, 44,310 elderly legal immigrants may lose their SSI.

In Illinois, 13,360 elderly legal immigrants may lose their SSI.

In Massachusetts, 13,410 elderly legal immigrants may lose their SSI.

Come October 1, 1997, we will see hundreds of thousands of elderly legal immigrants, of which 30 percent are over 75 years old, and who may also be disabled, thrown out into the streets and homeless.

Under the Budget Agreement, 137,728 or 34 percent of elderly legal immigrants nationwide will lose their SSI permanently because they will not be able to qualify as disabled; 55,726 elderly legal immigrants in California will lose their SSI; 22,215 elderly legal immigrants in New York will lose their SSI; 11,076 elderly legal immigrants in Texas will lose their SSI; 15,065 elderly legal immigrants in Florida will lose their SSI; 4,542 elderly legal immigrants in Illinois will lose their SSI; and 4,425 elderly legal immigrants in Massachusetts will lose their SSI.

The alternatives for these elderly legal immigrants are bleak—if they do not have family who can care for them, they either end up in a homeless shelter or end up on County General Assistance rolls.

Senator JOHN CHAFEE and I have previously introduced a bill that would restore SSI benefits to all elderly, blind or disabled legal immigrants who were receiving SSI prior to the passage of the welfare reform bill. We propose that no current recipient should be thrown off from their SSI benefits. We agree that for those coming into the country after the enactment date, we ban SSI and require instead, the sponsors to be responsible for their family members.

I believe that this is a responsible action that must be taken by Congress to correct a serious flaw in the welfare bill.

Allowing the elderly to continue receiving their SSI until they can be recertified is the first step but not the final solution. The final solution is to provide for all elderly and disabled legal immigrants who were on SSI as of August 22, 1996, to continue receiving their SSI.

As we go forward in the budget reconciliation process and final passage of the fiscal year 1998 budget, I urge my

colleagues to support the Chafee-Feinstein provision that protects the elderly legal immigrants who were getting SSI at the date of enactment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an SSA table be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 3.—NUMBER OF ALIENS RECEIVING SSI PAYMENTS BY ELIGIBILITY CATEGORY AND STATE, DECEMBER 1996

State	Total	Aged	Disabled
Total	724,990	417,360	307,630
Alabama	480	370	110
Alaska	750	390	360
Arizona	7,650	3,900	3,750
Arkansas	340	190	150
California	293,180	163,900	129,280
Colorado	5,140	2,740	2,400
Connecticut	4,370	2,700	1,670
Delaware	330	200	130
District of Columbia	860	530	330
Florida	69,710	44,310	25,400
Georgia	4,570	3,930	1,640
Hawaii	3,770	2,850	920
Idaho	410	220	190
Illinois	23,980	13,360	9,620
Indiana	1,080	730	350
Iowa	1,170	600	570
Kansas	1,500	700	800
Kentucky	720	380	340
Louisiana	2,500	1,430	1070
Maine	540	200	340
Maryland	7,800	5,970	1,830
Massachusetts	23,980	13,410	10,570
Michigan	7,350	4,060	3,290
Minnesota	6,640	2,340	4,300
Mississippi	440	230	220
Missouri	1,900	1,030	770
Montana	150	(¹)	(¹)
Nebraska	720	340	380
Nevada	2,370	1,590	780
New Hampshire	350	200	150
New Jersey	22,140	14,580	7,560
New Mexico	3,350	1,530	1,820
New York	113,900	65,340	48,560
North Carolina	2,600	1,590	1,010
North Dakota	180	(¹)	(¹)
Ohio	5,340	3,380	1,960
Oklahoma	1,340	880	460
Oregon	4,260	2,200	2,060
Pennsylvania	11,340	6,470	4,870
Rhode Island	3,440	1,700	1,740
South Carolina	580	420	160
South Dakota	200	(¹)	(¹)
Tennessee	1,380	850	530
Texas	54,760	32,640	22,120
Utah	1,420	700	720
Vermont	150	(¹)	(¹)
Virginia	6,780	5,150	1,630
Washington	13,160	5,920	7,240
West Virginia	190	(¹)	(¹)
Wisconsin	4,790	1,800	2,990
Wyoming	(¹)	(¹)	(¹)

¹ Relative sampling error too large for presentation of estimates.

Source: SSI 10-Percent Sample File, December 1996.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee for their help on this amendment.

The amendment before the Senate addresses the treatment of poor, elderly legal immigrants who are dependent on SSI benefits. SSI is a Federal program that provides cash assistance to those who are either elderly or disabled, and of very low income.

Pursuant to last year's welfare law, legal immigrants may no longer receive SSI on the date the law was enacted therefore are scheduled to lose that assistance beginning on August 1 of this year, although thanks to an amendment I offered with Senator D'AMATO and others to the disaster relief bill, that cutoff date likely will be pushed back to October 1.

In my view, the welfare law's SSI restrictions were not only harsh, but un-

fair, particularly to those elderly or disabled legal immigrants who were relying on those critical benefits at the time. It seems an increasing number of Senators and Representatives agree. Therefore, this year Congress is considering proposals to revise the legal immigrant SSI restrictions.

The particular proposal suggested by the budget resolution addresses immigrants' plight by exempting from the SSI ban those who are disabled and who were in the country when the bill was signed. While that is an important step toward fairness, it would mean that legal immigrants who are elderly, but not disabled, would be left out, and would lose their SSI benefits.

If this proposal were enacted, the Social Security Administration would need to re-evaluate all the elderly SSI recipients to determine how many would requalify as disabled. That process would take perhaps 6 months. The question then would become the fate of these elderly recipients during the re-determination time. Would they be dropped from the program during those six months, and then be reinstated later if they requalified? Or would they be allowed to continue on the program until it was clear whether or not they would requalify?

Senators FEINSTEIN, D'AMATO, DEWINE, and I believe that in that situation, it makes absolutely no sense to kick elderly recipients off of SSI during the redetermination period, only to reinstate many of them at a later date. However, as written, the budget resolution is silent on this point. Therefore, we worked with Senator DOMENICI to clarify this issue. The amendment before us would ensure that elderly recipients would be allowed to continue to receive this critical SSI assistance during the time it would take to re-determine their status.

This clarification makes sure that should the proposal in the budget resolution be enacted, elderly legal immigrants will be treated with compassion and not subjected to the sudden and perhaps unwarranted loss of basic assistance.

Mr. President, I want to point out that the proposal suggested by the budget resolution is an important one, but it is just one of the many that the Finance Committee may consider during the upcoming reconciliation process. As I mentioned, I believe that the budget resolution approach, as clarified by our amendment, goes a long way toward restoring fairness for vulnerable legal immigrants who were in the country and playing by the rules when the welfare law was enacted. But I must say that I am sorely disappointed that the budget resolution proposal leaves elderly legal immigrants—those who by definition have no other source of income and are too old and frail to work—out in the cold. To my view, then, the budget resolution proposal therefore addresses only part of the problem, and I intend to work with my colleagues here and in

the Finance Committee toward a more comprehensive solution.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor this amendment and commend my colleagues for bringing this important issue before the Senate.

We have discovered an unintended gap in the budget agreement with regard to SSI coverage for disabled immigrants. If this budget agreement is adopted, elderly immigrants dependent on SSI assistance who are also disabled will continue to receive that assistance. However, the Social Security Administration states that it may take 6 months for the agency to review the current SSI caseload and make that determination. In the meantime, many elderly immigrants will lose their assistance, only to requalify later on the basis of their disability.

Clearly, this was not intended under the budget agreement, and I commend Senator DOMENICI, Senator LAUTENBERG, Senator CHAFEE, Senator FEINSTEIN, and my other colleagues for their commitment to resolve this problem and cover this gap.

I also join many of my colleagues in expressing my hope that more can be done. As we proceed with legislation to implement this agreement, I hope that we can find ways to ensure that immigrants who fall on hard times and have no sponsors to fall back on can still get help. I am particularly concerned about elderly immigrants and immigrant children.

So I commend my colleagues for their leadership in bringing this amendment before the Senate. We have made progress in restoring assistance to immigrants under this budget agreement, and I look forward to working with them on this important issue in the days ahead.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We have no objection here, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 341) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 342

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding retroactive taxes)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator COVERDELL, I send to the desk an unprinted amendment which has been cleared on both sides regarding retroactive taxes, a sense of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] for Mr. COVERDELL, proposes an amendment numbered 342.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING RETROACTIVE TAXES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in general, the practice of increasing a tax retroactively is fundamentally unfair to taxpayers;

(2) retroactive taxation is disruptive to families and small business in their ability to plan and budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this budget resolution assume that—

(1) except for closing tax loopholes, no revenues should be generated from any retroactively increased tax; and

(2) the Congress and the President should work together to ensure that any revenue generating proposal contained within reconciliation legislation pursuant to this concurrent resolution proposal, except those proposals closing tax loopholes, should take effect prospectively.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, today I rise to offer a sense of the Senate amendment to the concurrent budget resolution before us that sets our nation on the path to budgetary balance. This amendment addresses a practice that I believe is one of the most reprehensible burdens government can place on its taxpayers, retroactive taxation.

My conviction for putting a stop to retroactive taxation dates back to just months after I began my service representing Georgia in the United States Senate and occurred as a result of one of the most egregious examples of retroactive taxation in our history. I am speaking of the retroactive tax rate increases enacted as part of the Administration's 1993 tax package whose passage in the Senate required the Vice President to cast the deciding vote.

At the time, estimates of the price tag to taxpayers of these retroactive tax increases were over \$10 billion! In other words, with more than two-thirds of the year having been gone, the federal government effectively told the American people, "All your planning was for naught, and we don't care."

To bring an end to this practice, I introduced legislation in the 103rd Congress, the 104th Congress, and now in the 105th Congress. This is not an issue which I intend to drop, and I'll tell my colleagues why.

Mr. President, let me take this opportunity to share with you the story of Mrs. Joanne Dixon, a retired farmer from Girard, Georgia, who suffered personally from the 1993 retroactive tax increases. In her testimony before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights, she described herself and her family as a simple farming family that, like many of their neighbors, farmed their land, attended church, contributed to their community and paid their taxes. They were proud to be farmers and still believe it to be a good life.

Tragically, in February of 1993, her husband suffered a life-threatening illness brought on by the rigors of running a farm, which they had done together for 38 years. In light of the circumstances, it soon became clear they would have to leave farming and auction off everything they had worked for all their lives. In her testimony Mrs. Dixon said, "I could never put our feelings into words to adequately express what we went through. I will never forget the day of the auction itself. Looking back, I don't know how we stood it, but we managed."

After living with a very painful decision, the Dixons dutifully paid their taxes. Imagine if you would, Mr. President, their surprise when they learned they owed still more in federal taxes because of the 1993 retroactive increases.

Let me again refer to Mrs. Dixon's own words, "The amount of money itself was not a large amount, but we still had to pay the retroactive tax out of funds we had planned for retirement. However, for me that is not the issue. After what we had been through to know that the federal government can tax you simply because it chooses was a real shock. Furthermore, our situation also left us with no way to recover the money we had to pay in this additional retroactive tax. We were out of business. The retroactive tax was a shameful tax."

Mr. President, it was clear to Thomas Jefferson that the only way to preserve freedom was to protect its citizen from oppressive taxation. I believe he would agree that the retroactive imposition of massive taxes is the ultimate slap in the face of the American citizen. Even the Russian Constitution does not allow you to tax retroactively.

American families, businesses, and communities must know what the rules of the road are and that those rules will not change. They have to be able to plan their lives, plan for their families, and plan their tax burdens in advance.

We have before us an historic opportunity to bring the Federal budget into balance. This is a goal I have worked long and hard to achieve since coming to the Senate. In the march to a balanced Federal budget, I believe we need to do so in a way that is fair to American families and small businesses.

Mr. DOMENICI. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No objection here, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 342) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 343

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on Social Security and balancing the budget)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have an amendment on behalf of Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. HOLLINGS. It is a sense of the Senate regarding long-term balancing of Social Security accounts. We have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] for Mr. DORGAN, for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, and Mr. HOLLINGS proposes an amendment numbered 343.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place in the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON SOCIAL SECURITY AND BALANCING THE BUDGET.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) This budget resolution is projected to balance the unified budget of the United States in fiscal year 2002;

(2) Section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 requires that the deficit be computed without counting the annual surpluses of the Social Security trust funds; and

(3) If the deficit were calculated according to the requirements of Section 13301, this budget resolution would be projected to result in a deficit of \$108.7 billion in fiscal year 2002.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying this budget resolution assume that after balancing the unified federal budget, the Congress should continue efforts to reduce the on-budget deficit, so that the federal budget will be balanced without counting Social Security surpluses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 343) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 344

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate supporting sufficient funding for veterans programs and benefits)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I send a sense-of-the-Senate resolution regarding veterans' programs on behalf of Senator DASCHLE, myself, and Senator ROCKEFELLER, an unprinted amendment, regarding supporting sufficient funding for defense programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for Mr. DASCHLE, for himself and Mr. ROCKEFELLER, proposes an amendment numbered 344.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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:

Insert at the appropriate place the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING SUFFICIENT FUNDING FOR VETERANS PROGRAMS AND BENEFITS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) veterans and their families represent approximately 27 percent of the United States population;

(2) more than 20 million of our 26 million living veterans served during wartime, sacrificing their freedom so that we may have ours; and

(3) veterans have earned the benefits promised to them.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the assumptions underlying this Budget Resolution assume that the 602(b) allocation to the Department of Veterans Affairs will be sufficient in FY98 to fully fund all discretionary veterans programs, including medical care; and

(2) funds collected from legislation to improve the Department of Veterans Affairs' ability to collect and retain reimbursement from third-party payers ought to be used to supplement, not supplant, an adequate appropriation for medical care.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 344) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 345

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Congress concerning domestic violence)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MURRAY I offer a sense of the Senate regarding family violence option clarifying amendment. This was accepted by the U.S. House in their budget resolution. I see no reason why we should not accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] for Mrs. MURRAY proposes an amendment numbered 345.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS ON FAMILY VIOLENCE OPTION CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Domestic violence is the leading cause of physical injury to women. The Department of Justice estimates that over 1,000,000 violent crimes against women are committed by intimate partners annually.

(2) Domestic violence dramatically affects the victim's ability to participate in the workforce. A University of Minnesota survey reported that ¼ of battered women surveyed had lost a job partly because of being abused

and that over ½ of these women had been harassed by their abuser at work.

(3) Domestic violence is often intensified as women seek to gain economic independence through attending school or training programs. Batterers have been reported to prevent women from attending these programs or sabotage their efforts at self-improvement.

(4) Nationwide surveys of service providers prepared by the Taylor Institute of Chicago, Illinois, document, for the first time, the interrelationship between domestic violence and welfare by showing that from 34 percent to 65 percent of AFDC recipients are current or past victims of domestic violence.

(5) Over ½ of the women surveyed stayed with their batterers because they lacked the resources to support themselves and their children. The surveys also found that the availability of economic support is a critical factor in poor women's ability to leave abusive situations that threaten them and their children.

(6) The restructuring of the welfare programs may impact the availability of the economic support and the safety net necessary to enable poor women to flee abuse without risking homelessness and starvation for their families.

(7) In recognition of this finding, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate in considering the 1997 Resolution on the budget of the United States unanimously adopted a sense of the Congress amendment concerning domestic violence and Federal assistance. Subsequently, Congress adopted the family violence option amendment as part of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996.

(8) The family violence option gives States the flexibility to grant temporary waivers from time limits and work requirements for domestic violence victims who would suffer extreme hardship from the application of these provisions. These waivers were not intended to be included as part of the permanent 20 percent hardship exemption.

(9) The Department of Health and Human Services has been slow to issue regulations regarding the provision. As a result, States are hesitant to fully implement the family violence option fearing that it will interfere with the 20 percent hardship exemption.

(10) Currently 15 States have opted to include the family violence option in their welfare plans, and 13 other States have included some type of domestic violence provisions in their plans.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this Resolution assume that—

(1) States should not be subject to any numerical limits in granting domestic violence good cause waivers under section 402(a)(7)(A)(iii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 602(a)(7)(A)(iii)) to individuals receiving assistance, for all requirements where compliance with such requirements would make it more difficult for individuals receiving assistance to escape domestic violence; and

(2) any individual who is granted a domestic violence good cause waiver by a State shall not be included in the States' 20 percent hardship exemption under section 408(a)(7) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 608(a)(7)).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 345) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I move to lay it on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 346, 347, AND 348

Mr. DOMENICI. We can save a little bit of time because we have a number of amendments that are going to qualify and Senators do not have to stand up and go through all of that maneuvering. I ask unanimous consent the amendments that I send to the desk be considered as having been offered by their appropriate sponsor and thus qualified as under the previous order, and further they be considered as having been set aside. I do this en bloc for the Senators enumerated on the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] proposes amendment numbers 346, 347, and 348.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 346

(Purpose: to require that the \$225 billion CBO revenue receipt windfall be used for deficit reduction and tax relief, and that non-defense discretionary spending be kept at a freeze baseline level)

On page 3, line 3, decrease the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 3, line 4, decrease the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 3, line 5, decrease the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 3, line 6, decrease the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 3, line 7, decrease the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 4, line 4, decrease the amount by \$13.7 billion.

On page 4, line 5, decrease the amount by \$23.4 billion.

On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by \$33.2 billion.

On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by \$42.9 billion.

On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by \$52.7 billion.

On page 4, line 12, decrease the amount by \$6.3 billion.

On page 4, line 13, decrease the amount by \$16.9 billion.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by \$26.7 billion.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by \$36.6 billion.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by \$46.8 billion.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 4, line 22, decrease the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by \$22.5 billion.

On page 35, line 9, decrease the amount by \$13.7 billion.

On page 35, line 10, decrease the amount by \$6.3 billion.

On page 35, line 15, decrease the amount by \$23.4 billion.

On page 35, line 16, decrease the amount by \$16.9 billion.

On page 35, line 21, decrease the amount by \$33.2 billion.

On page 35, line 22, decrease the amount by \$26.7 billion.

On page 36, line 2, decrease the amount by \$42.9 billion.

On page 36, line 3, decrease the amount by \$36.6 billion.

On page 36, line 8, decrease the amount by \$52.7 billion.

On page 36, line 9, decrease the amount by \$46.8 billion.

AMENDMENT NO. 347

(Purpose: To provide for parental involvement in prevention of drug use by children)

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN PREVENTION OF DRUG USE BY CHILDREN.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) 2,000,000 more children are using drugs in 1997 than were doing so in 1993. For the first time in the 1990's, over half of our Nation's graduating high school seniors have experimented with drugs and approximately 1 out of every 4 of the students have used drugs in the past month.

(2) After 11 years of declining marijuana use among children aged 12 to 17, such use doubled between 1992 and 1995. The number of 8th graders who have used marijuana in the past month has more than tripled since 1991.

(3) More of our Nation's school children are becoming involved with hard core drugs at earlier ages, as use of heroin and cocaine by 8th graders has more than doubled since 1991.

(4) Substance abuse is at the core of other problems, such as rising violent teenage and violent gang crime, increasing health care costs, HIV infections, teenage pregnancy, high school dropouts, and lower economic productivity.

(5) Increases in substance abuse among youth are due in large part to an erosion of understanding by youth of the high risks associated with substance abuse, and to the softening of peer norms against use.

(6) Nearly 1 in every 10 students who received a diploma last June is a daily user of illicit drugs.

(7) A 1995-96 school year survey of drug usage by students revealed that 25 percent of children using drugs are doing so at home or at the home of a friend. Despite these alarming statistics, less than 30 percent of students stated that their parents talked to them about the problem of alcohol and drugs.

(8) In the 1990-91 school year survey, over 40 percent of the students reported that their parent regularly talked to them about drugs. The 1995-96 survey reported an 11 percent decrease in parental involvement and a corresponding 10 percent increase in the number of students in the 6th through 8th grades, who use drugs, and a 17 percent increase in the number of students in the 9th through 12th grades who use drugs.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the provisions of this resolution assume that, from resources available in this budget resolution, a portion should be set aside for a national grassroots volunteer effort to encourage parental education and involvement in youth drug prevention and to

create a drug-intolerant culture for our children.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, recently the Senate has made strong statements promoting efforts to fight against teenage drug use. Programs to mobilize America's parents are desperately needed in these efforts as we struggle to deal with a rising epidemic of teenage drug use.

Survey after survey has shown a shocking rise in teenage drug use. Since 1992, drug use among teens has more than doubled. We recently learned that for the first time since the 1980's over half of all graduating high school seniors will have been involved with illegal drugs and the use of heroine and marijuana by high schoolers has reached levels unprecedented in the 1990's. The number of 8th graders who have used marijuana in the past month has exploded since 1991, growing by over 350%, and heroine use in our high schools has doubled. The fact that 35.8% (or more than one out of every three high school seniors) used marijuana in the past year should be a wake up call to us all, as marijuana serves as a gateway to the use of cocaine, LSD, heroin and other highly addictive drugs. Overall, this is a complete reversal from the previous 12 years when teen drug use was cut in half between 1980 and 1992. A decade of progress has been destroyed.

Yet in spite of these alarming statistics, research conducted by the National Parents' Resource Institute for Drug Education [PRIDE] shows that 7 out of 10 American parents are not talking to their children about the dangers of drug use. These numbers are especially alarming in light of the fact that PRIDE's research indicates that mobilizing parents is one of our most effective ways of fighting this rising epidemic. For example, among students who said they never hear from their parents on the subject of drugs, 35.5% reported using illicit drugs in the last year. Yet this number falls to 26.6%—a relative decrease of 25% for students whose parent often discuss this issue with them. In response to the rise of teenage drug use in the 1980's, parents across the country became active in the anti-drug movement. Their efforts played a key role in reducing drug use by teenagers from the all-time high of 54 percent in 1979 to just 27 percent by 1992.

Over the past several years, PRIDE has devoted a great deal of attention to the question of how we, as a nation, can again capture the level of parental involvement that helped drive down teen drug use in the previous two decades. PRIDE has proposed a grassroots plan focused on a renewed parent movement in the fight against illegal drug use. The goal of this initiative is to educate parents and involve them in programs that will prevent and reduce drug abuse by their children. This volunteer-based approach will allow parents to create a drug prevention program most suitable to their community.

My experience with PRIDE has convinced me that grassroots efforts by America's parents are essential in order to reverse the skyrocketing rates of teenage drug use. I hope that the Senate will build on the amendment I have offered today and fully support programs such as PRIDE which enlist our parents in the war on drugs.

AMENDMENT NO. 348

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the budget resolution agreement does not foreclose the possibility of Congress adopting additional tax cuts in the future, so long as they are paid for)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ADDITIONAL TAX CUTS.

It is the sense of the Senate that nothing in this resolution shall be construed as prohibiting Congress from providing additional tax relief in future years if the cost of such tax relief is offset by reductions in discretionary or mandatory spending, or increases in revenue from alternative sources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, amendments Nos. 346, 347, and 348 are now set aside.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and this has been cleared but I want to read it—I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of the legislation and any conference report thereon pursuant to the reconciliation instructions set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1998, for the purposes of section 313(b)(1)(E) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, legislation which reduces revenues pursuant to reconciliation instruction contained in the fiscal year 1998 resolution, the second reconciliation bill, shall be taken together with all other legislation passed in the Senate pursuant to the reconciliation instructions contained in that resolution, the first reconciliation bill, when determining whether any provision of the second reconciliation bill is extraneous; further, it is clearly understood that the unanimous consent is contingent upon the Senate considering two reconciliation bills pursuant to this budget resolution.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 349

(Purpose: Expressing the sense of the Senate that higher education tax cuts should encourage parents and students to save for the costs of a higher education, and to provide relief from the debt burden associated with borrowing to pay for a post-secondary education)

Mr. DOMENICI. When I was sending amendments to the desk that had been approved on both sides we failed to introduce one on behalf of Senator SNOWE. This is another sense of the Senate regarding education, tax deductions, and credits. It has been accepted on both sides. This is being sent to the desk on behalf of Senator SNOWE to qualify under the requirement that it be in by closing time tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] for Ms. SNOWE, for herself and Mr. COVERDELL, proposes an amendment numbered 349.

Mr. DOMENICI. 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:

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the budget agreement reached between Congressional leaders and President Clinton provides for \$85 billion in net tax relief over five years.

(2) in a May 15, 1997, letter to President Clinton, the Speaker of the House and the Senate Majority Leader agreed that the tax package must include tax relief of roughly \$35 billion over five years for post-secondary education, including a deduction and a tax credit.

(3) the letter further stipulated that the education tax package should be consistent with the objectives put forward in the HOPE Scholarship and tuition tax proposals contained in the Administration's FY 1998 budget proposal.

(4) as outlined in the Administration's FY 1998 budget summary, the objective of the education tax credits and deductions is to ensure that financial barriers to higher education continue to fall for all Americans, and to encourage Americans to pursue higher education and to promote lifelong learning.

(5) students at the undergraduate level have seen tuition increases outpace inflation for more than a decade, which has led to an increased demand for student aid, including student loans.

(6) the typical student loan borrower—including undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral students—now accumulates more than \$10,000 in educational debt. This rising debt burden poses a serious threat to students and may lead to some students no longer pursuing a higher education.

(7) post-secondary education tax cuts that encourage savings and that address this rising debt burden would encourage Americans to pursue a higher education and promote lifelong learning, and would, therefore, be consistent with the objectives sought by President Clinton in his budget proposal.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels of this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume—

(1) that higher education tax relief should encourage Americans to pursue a post-secondary education and promote lifelong learning.

(2) tax incentives that encourage parents and students to save for higher education expenses, and that provide relief from the debt burden associated with borrowing to pay for a post-secondary education, are consistent with the objectives set forth in this resolution, and should be included in any post-secondary education tax cut package.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, AND 355

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I have a group of amendments that will be sent to the desk to be considered, and I ask unanimous consent they be considered as offered by the appropriate sponsor and qualify under the previous order, and further they be considered as having been set aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments by numbers.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] proposes amendments numbered 350, 351, 352, 253, 354, and 355.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 350

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate supporting an increase in funding for defense 050 account funds dedicated for medical research)

At the appropriate place in the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MEDICAL RESEARCH.

It is the sense of the Senate that the funds in the defense 050 account that are assumed to be dedicated for medical research should be increased by \$900,000,000 for fiscal year 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 351

(Purpose: To reduce the incentives to use tax gimmicks that artificially increase revenues in 2002 in ways that make balancing the deficit more difficult after 2002)

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. . ANTIGIMMICK TAX SCORING.

For purposes of scoring any revenue provision of a reconciliation bill enacted pursuant to this resolution, a provision that increases revenue in fiscal year 2002 by an amount \$1,000,000,000 or more in excess of the amount that the provision increases revenue in either fiscal year 2001 or 2003 shall be scored by—

(1) subtracting the amount of the excess from the revenue amount for fiscal year 2002; and

(2) dividing the amount of excess by 4 and adding the quotient to the revenue score for the provision for each of the fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

AMENDMENT NO. 352

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on early childhood education)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds the following:

(1) Scientific research on the development of the brain has confirmed that the early childhood years, particularly from birth to the age of 3, are critical to children's development.

(2) Studies repeatedly have shown that good quality child care helps children develop well, enter school ready to succeed, improve their skills, cognitive abilities and socioemotional development, improve classroom learning behavior, and stay safe while their parents work. Further, quality early childhood programs can positively affect children's long-term success in school achievement, higher earnings as adults, decrease reliance on public assistance and decrease involvement with the criminal justice system.

(3) The first of the National Education Goals, endorsed by the Nation's governors, passed by Congress and signed into law by President Bush, stated that by the year 2000, every child should enter school ready to learn and that access to a high quality early childhood education program was integral to meeting this goal.

(4) According to data compiled by the RAND Corporation, while 90 percent of human brain growth occurs by the age of 3, public spending on children in that age range equals only 8 percent of spending on all children. A vast majority of public spending on children occurs after the brain has gone

through its most dramatic changes, often to correct problems that should have been addressed during early childhood development.

(5) According to the Department of Education, of \$29,400,000,000 in current estimated education expenditures, only \$1,500,000,000, or 5 percent, is spent on children from birth to age 5. The vast majority is spent on children over age 5.

(6) A new commitment to quality child care and early childhood education is a necessary response to the fact that children from birth to the age of 3 are spending more time in care away from their homes. Almost 60 percent of women in the workforce have children under the age of 3 requiring care.

(7) Many States and communities are currently experimenting with innovative programs directed at early childhood care and education in a variety of care settings, including the home. States and local communities are best able to deliver efficient, cost-effective services, but while such programs are long on demand, they are short on resources. Additional Federal resources should not create new bureaucracy, but build on successful locally driven efforts.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budget totals and levels in this resolution assume that funds ought to be directed toward increasing the supply of quality child care, early childhood education, and teacher and parent training for children from birth through age 3.

AMENDMENT NO. 353

(Purpose: To expand opportunities to access funding in the Highway Reserve fund)

On page 56, line 7, strike the word "enacted" and insert: "reported or an amendment is adopted".

On page 56, line 15, strike the words "enactment of legislation" and insert: "reporting of legislation or upon the adoption of an amendment".

AMENDMENT NO. 354

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate regarding the extension of the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund through fiscal year 2002)

At the end of title II, add the following:

SEC. . SUPPORT FOR FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Our Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers provide essential services that preserve and protect our freedoms and security, and with the support of Federal assistance, State and local law enforcement officers have succeeded in reducing the national scourge of violent crime, as illustrated by a murder rate in 1996 that is projected to be the lowest since 1971 and a violent crime total in 1996 that is the lowest since 1990.

(2) Through a comprehensive effort to attack violence against women mounted by State and local law enforcement, and dedicated volunteers and professionals who provide victim services, shelter, counseling, and advocacy to battered women and their children, important strides have been made against the national scourge of violence against women, illustrated by the decline in the murder rate for wives, ex-wives, and girlfriends at the hands of their "intimates" fell to a 19-year low in 1995.

(3) Federal, State, and local law enforcement efforts need continued financial commitment from the Federal Government for

funding and financial assistance to continue their efforts to combat violent crime and violence against women.

(4) Federal, state and local law enforcement also face other challenges which require continued financial commitment from the Federal Government, including regaining control over the Southwest Border, where drug trafficking and illegal immigration continue to threaten public safety and menace residents on the border and throughout the nation.

(5) The Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund established in section 310001 the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14211) fully funds the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, including the Violence Against Women Act, without adding to the Federal budget deficit.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions and the functional totals underlying this resolution assume that—

(1) the Federal Government's commitment to fund Federal law enforcement programs and programs to assist State and local efforts to combat violent crime, including violence against women, will be maintained; and

(2) funding for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund will continue in its current form at least through fiscal year 2002.

AMENDMENT NO. 355

At the appropriate place, add the following new section:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TAX CUTS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget assumes that—

(1) A substantial majority of the tax cut benefits provided in the tax reconciliation bill will go to middle class working families earning less than approximately \$100,000 per year; and

(2) The tax cuts in the tax reconciliation bill will not cause revenue losses to increase significantly in years after 2007.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendments numbered 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, and 355 will now be set aside.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday I voted for an amendment offered by Senator HOLLINGS. I would like to take a brief moment to explain my vote.

Senator HOLLINGS is absolutely right in his contention about this budget agreement. The so-called balanced budget agreement that has been hammered out by the White House and the Congress does not, in fact, balance the budget.

While the agreement purports to balance the budget, I would urge my colleagues to look at page 4 of the budget resolution, which will put the agreement into effect. It says, in section 101(4) of the resolution, that the budget will be \$108 billion in deficit in the year 2002. Why is that the case? Because they are claiming a balanced budget using a "unified budget," which means they can count the Social Security surplus to offset other deficits.

However, as I have said in previous debates, using the Social Security surplus creates a deficit for our future. The surplus that is accrued in the year 2002 in the Social Security accounts is

needed in the following decades to fund the retirement needs of the baby boom generation. If that money is now used as an offset against other spending to balance the budget, it will not be there when it is needed to meet Social Security needs in future years.

The way to balance the budget in a real and honest way is to do as Senator HOLLINGS suggests. We must make spending cuts that are necessary and delay both the tax cuts and the spending increases in specific accounts until there is room in the budget to accomplish them while still balancing the budget in a real way.

Robust economic growth is driving the budget deficit down substantially. I think there will ultimately be room for some tax cuts and for some targeted investment increases in certain areas, such as education, health care and the environment. But the priority ought to be to balance the budget first and do it fully and completely by reaching a budget deficit of zero in 2002 without using the Social Security trust funds. Then, as the economy continues to grow, added revenue will allow us to both provide needed tax cuts as well as targeted investments in critical accounts. Not many Members of the Senate voted for the Hollings amendment, because most want to rush to provide tax cuts now and to provide spending increases in certain accounts now. But if we do that there is no guarantee that we will truly reach an honest balanced budget in the near term.

Unfortunately, the Hollings amendment failed. It failed by a large margin. However, as the budget process continues, I intend to work as best I can to advance deficit reduction. The resolution we are debating does move in the right direction. While it is not a balanced budget plan, it is a deficit reduction plan. It does achieve \$204 billion of deficit reduction. And for that reason, I think it's better to support this negotiated agreement. At least this agreement makes some progress.

To sum up, I would have felt better if this agreement had delayed both the tax cuts and spending increases until the budget is truly balanced. While this agreement provides hope for those of us who want the deficit cut, and who want the budget balanced, it also serves up the dessert before the main course. It requires less discipline than we need. I still believe that we should continue to work to do more than just balance the unified budget. Balancing the unified budget will still leave this country with a budget deficit.

NUCLEAR WASTE FUND

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I would like to inquire of the managers regarding the impact of the resolution now being considered by the Senate.

My question relates to the legislative intent of the resolution as it relates to the nuclear waste fund and specifically regarding its impact on S. 104 passed by the Senate on April 15, 1997. What is the impact of the budget resolution on the provisions of S. 104 and the Nuclear Waste Fund?

Mr. DOMENICI. The budget resolution does not prejudice the outcome of the debate concerning the nuclear waste issue. However, S. 104, as passed by the Senate, does not violate the Budget Act. If S. 104 is enacted into law, there is sufficient funding in the offsetting collections and the budget could accommodate full funding of both the permanent repository and the interim storage at Yucca Mountain within the statutory schedules mandated.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his response.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent when the Senate resumes Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 on Thursday, there be 13 hours remaining to be equally divided under the Budget Act.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent when the Senate resumes Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 on Thursday, that time remaining on the amendment numbered 336 be limited to 50 minutes under the control of Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, 10 minutes under the control of Senator DOMENICI, and following the conclusion or yielding back, Senator DOMENICI be recognized to move to table the amendment.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I further ask that no other amendments be in order prior to the motion to table the amendment of Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. From what I understand, Senator BOXER wants to speak for 3 minutes and then I want to put the Senate into morning business with speeches up to 10 minutes. I am assuming you will be recognized at that point and Senator STEVENS will be here to wrap up.

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

Mr. CONRAD. Senator STEVENS has 5 minutes. It is fine if he goes before me.

Mr. STEVENS. I have a series of matters for the leader to perform before that time.

Mr. CONRAD. And I have 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California for up to 3 minutes.

AMENDMENT NO. 355

Mrs. BOXER. I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member. I understand that after our brief conversation they will accept an amendment that Senator DURBIN and I will be introducing tomorrow that has already been sent to the desk.

Mr. President, because the economy is so strong and the Clinton budget plan in 1993 was so right, we can now finish the job of balancing the budget in a fair and responsible way. The plan before us, for the most part, I believe is fair and reasonable. No more destruction of Medicare and Medicaid, gone are the \$270 billion cuts proposed by

Republicans last year, gone are the \$88 billion cuts they wanted to do to Medicaid, no more talk about doing away with the Department of Education, the Department of Commerce, no more suggestion that the Environmental Protection Agency should be stripped of its power and its funds.

Now, I believe this radical revolution is over with this budget deal. Could this budget deal be better? Yes, of course, it could. One way, Mr. President, it could be better is if we kept our tax cuts moderate and targeted them to the middle-class. We could reach balance sooner. We would still have resources left to do more for our children and our communities.

What Senator DURBIN and I—and it is cosponsored by Senators DASCHLE, HARKIN, and BUMPERS—what we say in our amendment, and I am very pleased it will be accepted, is that a substantial majority of the tax cut benefits provided in the reconciliation bill will go to middle-class working families earning less than approximately \$100,000 per year and that the tax cuts in the reconciliation bill will not cause revenue losses to increase significantly in the years after 2007.

In other words, we have two points to our amendment. One is tax cut benefits go to the middle-class; and two, we do not want to see an explosion of deficits in the outyears.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the chairman is accepting this. I am pleased we are walking down this path together. I really will watch this because we have no assurance that this amendment will be kept in the conference, but we will keep our eye on it because I suspect if we insisted on a vote we would get a near unanimous vote.

I am hopeful we can keep this language in the bill itself. If it is stripped out, Mr. President, I will be back once we get to the reconciliation bill, to make sure that tax cuts are not going to the people who are earning \$1 million but are, in fact, going to our hard-working families who earn approximately \$100,000 a year.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Again, my thanks to the Members of the Budget Committee. This has been a long time in coming. It is not the perfect budget but I think it puts an end to the radical revolution that was threatened a couple years ago and it will bring us to balance. It is good for our children, and overall I am pleased with it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alaska.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. STEVENS. I ask unanimous consent there now be a period for the transaction of morning business.

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

U.S. FOREIGN OIL CONSUMPTION FOR WEEK ENDING MAY 16

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, the American Petroleum Institute reports that for the week ending May 16, the U.S. imported 7,834,000 barrels of oil each day, 52,000 barrels more than the 7,782,000 imported each day during the same week a year ago.

Americans relied on foreign oil for 54.8 percent of their needs last week, and there are no signs that the upward spiral will abate. Before the Persian Gulf War, the United States obtained approximately 45 percent of its oil supply from foreign countries. During the Arab oil embargo in the 1970s, foreign oil accounted for only 35 percent of America's oil supply.

Anybody else interested in restoring domestic production of oil—by U.S. producers using American workers? Politicians had better ponder the economic calamity sure to occur in America if and when foreign producers shut off our supply—or double the already enormous cost of imported oil flowing into the United States—now 7,834,000 barrels a day.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Tuesday, May 20, 1997, the federal debt stood at \$5,346,367,814,885.12. (Five trillion, three hundred forty-six billion, three hundred sixty-seven million, eight hundred fourteen thousand, eight hundred eighty-five dollars and twelve cents)

One year ago, May 20, 1996, the federal debt stood at \$5,114,233,000,000. (Five trillion, one hundred fourteen billion, two hundred thirty-three million)

Five years ago, May 20, 1992, the federal debt stood at \$3,921,030,000,000. (Three trillion, nine hundred twenty-one billion, thirty million)

Ten years ago, May 20, 1987, the federal debt stood at \$2,291,944,000,000. (Two trillion, two hundred ninety-one billion, nine hundred forty-four million)

Fifteen years ago, May 20, 1982, the federal debt stood at \$1,068,510,000,000 (One trillion, sixty-eight billion, five hundred ten million) which reflects a debt increase of more than \$4 trillion—\$4,277,857,814,885.12 (Four trillion, two hundred seventy-seven billion, eight hundred fifty-seven million, eight hundred fourteen thousand, eight hundred eighty-five dollars and twelve cents) during the past 15 years.

INTERNATIONAL PRINCIPLES OF ASYLUM ERODING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, every year the respected U.S. Committee for Refugees issues a review of the state of the world's refugees. This yearly review has earned worldwide respect as the most authoritative compilation of analyses, data, and thought-provoking information on refugees. The 1997

World Refugee Survey, released yesterday is especially troubling. The Committee finds that many countries which were once considered safe havens for refugees and asylum seekers are beginning to turn their backs on persons fleeing persecution.

The report estimates that the number of refugees and asylum-seekers decreased last year to about 14.5 million worldwide. But this apparent decrease is misleading. The Committee attributes it in part to the higher barriers to asylum erected in many countries last year, including the United States. In addition, some countries have begun to forcibly repatriate refugees back to their home countries, even if conditions in those countries have not improved. For example, Thailand has recently begun to forcibly return Burmese refugees to their persecutors in Burma.

There is some good news. Several countries, including Guatemala, Haiti, Mozambique, and Cambodia, have improved their human rights situations, so that some refugees have been able to return to their homes.

Sadly, the overall message of the report is that basic long-standing international principles of asylum and refugee protection are in trouble. As this report points out, the United States bears a share of responsibility for this problem. The summary exclusion provisions of last year's immigration law, and the continued detention of asylum-seekers sets a poor example for other countries which look to the United States for guidance on asylum and refugee protection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a U.S. Committee for Refugees press release be printed in the RECORD.

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

ASYLUM ERODING IN MORE COUNTRIES, REPORT FINDS; REFUGEES' LIVES, PROTECTION PRINCIPLES ENDANGERED

WASHINGTON, DC.—Asylum for refugees around the world is eroding in more countries than ever before, as governments, including those traditionally friendly to refugees, either close their borders completely or offer "pseudo-asylum" that lacks adequate protection, the U.S. Committee for Refugees (USCR) said today.

"We are seeing a continuing deterioration in the quality of protection and assistance countries are willing to offer to those fleeing persecution and violence," said USCR Director Roger Winter in releasing USCR's 1997 World Refugee Survey. "This pseudo-asylum not only endangers the lives and well-being of refugees, but threatens to kill the principle of asylum itself," Winter said.

USCR's World Refugee Survey is considered the preeminent source for information on the worldwide refugee situation, and this year's Survey includes 120 detailed country reports, 12 statistical tables, and essays on deteriorating asylum standards.

The 1997 World Refugee Survey provides examples of countries either shutting their doors to asylum seekers or offering pseudo-asylum in the past year:

The international community deprived Rwandan refugees of true asylum by ignoring serious protection problems in refugee