

from 1995 to 1998 the new Internet economy grew 174 percent, compared to the 3.8 percent growth in the world economy as a whole. The Internet economy alone ranked among the top 20 economies worldwide. More importantly, this awe-inspiring growth, packed into just a few short years, stands almost toe to toe with the economic horsepower generated by the Industrial Revolution.

The onslaught of e-commerce and the Internet puts us in the same position as the snail who was run over by a turtle. When interviewed about it, he said: It all happened so fast I never saw it coming.

We are working hard to see if we can work with small businesses to help them see it coming. E-commerce is leading a new business revolution, from Wall Street to Main Street. In my view, there simply is no more potent force at work in the economy with the equal potential to propel nearly every business into the 21st century.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business, it is my pleasure to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to take care of and to be concerned about whether small, independent, family-owned, and home-based businesses are adequately prepared to be full partners in the remarkable growth potential that the Internet economy holds.

Some folks may assume that the rapid development of new technologies has given Main Street America the tools to compete more effectively, but the unanswered question is whether the technologies readily available to small businesses are truly up to the challenge.

Yesterday, in the Senate Committee on Small Business, we held a forum entitled "e-commerce: Barriers and Opportunities for Small Business." We had a blue-chip panel of experts in high-tech computer and software companies and business leaders representing over 20 trade groups to identify and target barriers keeping Main Street businesses from expanding into e-commerce.

We were joined by several of the companies that are leading the charge in pushing back the rise of the Internet economy, including an Internet service provider from my home State of Missouri, Primary Network of St. Louis.

It was an exciting and informative session considering the potential growth e-commerce will undoubtedly spark for many years to come. One of the participating companies, CyberCash, unveiled new research specifically for yesterday's forum projecting e-commerce business will generate another million jobs over the next 2 years. Those are conservative estimates.

Another study from the firm, Cyber Dialogue, shows that many small businesses are already taking advantage of e-commerce-based markets. That study says over 427,000 small businesses added web sites and sold \$19 billion worth of

products and services over the Internet in the last 12 months, a 67-percent increase since early 1998.

Unfortunately, not all the news was good. According to the American City Business Journals and the Network of City Business Journals, only 10 percent of small businesses have a web site today and only 32 percent have access to the Internet. That suggests both a disconnect and, at the same time, an incredible opportunity for Main Street America and for the suppliers of the equipment and services.

What is more, we were reminded that for many small businesses you have to be prepared to deal with a 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week business. Some small businesses have difficulty raising the capital and acquiring the knowledge to survive in such a dynamic business area. Research has shown that even major companies have been slow to realize the potential, and many are now working hard to regain market shares they lost.

Today, thanks to the cutting-edge expertise and the information provided at yesterday's forum, we are a little wiser about the Internet economy. We know that e-commerce can be economic TNT. I think Congress has a duty to make sure that as many independent, family-owned and home-based businesses as possible are not at risk of being left behind in this worldwide business revolution.

I am deeply grateful to the occupant of the Chair. His subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations has approved a \$1 million earmark we asked for to allow the Small Business Administration's Office of Advocacy to begin a study of the potential of e-commerce for small business. We are going to ask the Office of Advocacy to develop a web site to help small businesses who want to do business with the Federal Government.

Make no mistake, the Internet economy is a train that has already left the station and it is picking up speed by the minute. I look forward to working with my colleagues, both in the committee and in this broader body, to help Main Street America climb on board.

I look forward to pursuing this effort. We are outlining just a few steps we will take on the Senate Committee on Small Business. We welcome ideas, participation and suggestions from other colleagues. We invite all Members of the Senate to join in making sure that the smallest businesses in the United States have access to this tremendous engine of economic growth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### ELECTRONIC COMMERCE

MR. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Missouri for his excellent work on the Small Business Committee in a very important area—the dramatic growth in

electronic commerce and the ability of small businesses to participate in that. We hear so much about the family farm and the small business community being in jeopardy. As we transition in this economy, to have a chairman of the Small Business Committee who is on top of that and working to integrate the advances in electronic commerce with our small business community, and to make those advances available to them is very important. I congratulate him on that, and Senator MACK and Senator BENNETT of the Joint Economic Committee for a series of hearings this week in the area of technology and its impact and continued potential impact on our country and on our economy and the world economy.

These are the things, frankly, we do not do enough of around here, looking at the future to see how we can adjust our public policy to alleviate not just what the problems are or what the problems were that have been with us but how, through innovation, we can form the future to alleviate those problems.

So I am very pleased we are focusing in on the future as opposed to just dealing with the current important problems; not looking through the rear-view mirror instead of looking in front at the opportunities ahead us.

#### THE ENERGY AND WATER APPROPRIATIONS BILL

MR. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to thank the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee on Appropriations, Senator DOMENICI, for agreeing to an amendment I offered to restore \$25 million of money for the Lackawanna River levee raising project in Lackawanna County, near Scranton, PA. That is a critical project to the people in Greenridge and the Albright Avenue sections of Scranton, who have suffered immeasurable loss in prior floods, which is a chronic problem in the Lackawanna River area. All of Lackawanna and the counties in northeastern Pennsylvania have had terrible problems with flooding. This is a critical project and one I have to commend Congressman Joseph McDade for his work, before he left here, in getting that money.

I just cannot tell you how much I appreciate Senator DOMENICI's willingness to restore that money into this bill so we can tell the people up in Scranton that money will be there, that money is there to raise the levee, to prevent the damage that could be caused by future high waters on the Lackawanna River.

I know it was a very difficult thing for Senator DOMENICI to do. I again want to tell him how much I appreciate his willingness to do that. I know Senator SPECTER was on the floor here a couple of days ago expressing a similar concern, so I think I can speak for Senator SPECTER. We are both very grateful the Senator has agreed to restore that money so we can tell the people

up in Scranton that money will be there, the levee will be built, and there will be money in the pipeline and it will be available whenever that money is needed to raise that levee.

#### THE SOCIAL SECURITY LOCKBOX

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, finally I want to comment on the vote we just had on the lockbox. I have to say I am puzzled and disappointed at the unanimous opposition by Senate Democrats to a proposal that passed with 416 votes in the House. Obviously, almost every House Democrat—all but 12—voted in favor of this measure, a measure which obviously has broad bipartisan support and, as many have stated in the House and the Senate, one that is a first step toward dealing with the long-term problems of Social Security.

The first step is very simple. We have a surplus. Do not spend it on things other than Social Security; save it for Social Security. We are eventually going to have to do Social Security reform. We are going to have to strengthen it and save it for future generations. It runs out of money in the next 15 years, so we are going to have to do something. We have surpluses building up which are now just being borrowed by the Government and spent on other things. We have had that happen for the past 20 years.

We are now in a unique position. We are close to an on-budget surplus. We are not quite there, but we are very close to an on-budget surplus, non-Social Security surplus. So we have the Social Security money which will go to save Social Security by reducing the Federal debt unless we spend it. In a sense, all this lockbox does is say: Don't spend the money. Don't come up with new ideas and new ways to spend Social Security.

We are not asking anybody to cut anything. That is one of the most remarkable things about it. We are not asking the other side to cut money to make sure the money is there for Social Security. All we are saying is don't spend more. That is why it received bipartisan support in the House.

We hear so much talk on both sides of the aisle about how we have to save Social Security first, how Social Security is the highest priority, how we have to make sure money is there for future generations. In fact, in the budget vote just a couple of months ago, we had a 100-to-nothing or 99-to-nothing vote that we need to save Social Security; we are not going to spend that money in the trust fund. That was just a sense of the Senate. In other words, the first had no binding effect in law.

Now the mechanism comes along that says if we are going to pass a bill that is going to spend Social Security surpluses, we have to have a separate vote where we have to stand up before the clerk and say: Yes, I will spend the Social Security surplus on this.

There is no such vote that has to be cast right now. This will set up a point of order where every Member of the Senate has to say to the people back home: I want to spend Social Security money on this, because I think it is more important than Social Security. That is all this point of order does.

There are points of order out there on spending, but there is nothing clear. There are points of order whereby you can challenge something if it breaks the budget point of order or this and that, and people run out and say it is really not Social Security. You can dance around it. You can spin it back home. There are lots of folks very good at spinning. The wonderful thing about this provision is you cannot spin it. It is what it is. It is a vote that says we will spend the Social Security surplus on this. That will have, I believe, the greatest impact—in this body and the other body, and in particular the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, the President—on controlling our willingness to raid the Social Security trust fund for the demands of spending today. Or, for that matter, the demands of tax cuts today. I want to add, it is not just a governor on those, principally on the other side, who want to spend more. It is also a governor on those on this side who want to cut more taxes.

As I said before, there is no tax cut I will not vote for, just about. But I am not going to do it out of the Social Security surplus. We will do it out of the general fund where the taxes are paid in. If people are paying in too much in the general fund, give them a tax cut, if we can. I will vote for it. If we can cut spending in the general fund to pay for a tax cut, I will vote for it. But I will not fund a tax cut out of Social Security funds, and that is what this says.

While on the first vote on cloture many Democrats will vote no as a matter of principle, I am hopeful they will understand this is a bill that has consensus, that can be signed, that can put real restraints on our ability and the President's ability to spend the Social Security surplus and, hopefully, we will reach a point where we can have bipartisan consensus on this, because Social Security is simply too important to continue to play political games.

I think what we have seen here is all the rhetoric says: Yes, we agree; yes, we agree. But when it comes down to casting the vote, what we have is this spurious argument, "You are not letting us amend it," which I find is quite remarkable because, if you look at the amendments, they have virtually nothing to do with Social Security.

In fact, I have not seen all the amendments, but those I have been made aware of have absolutely nothing to do with Social Security. They all have to do with what we do with the general fund surplus, and that is the non-Social Security, non-Medicare surplus.

We have on a bill, which is focused on Social Security, on how we save Social

Security, an attempt to bring in a whole lot of other issues to clog up this issue, to bog it down, and, in my mind, to try to destroy any chance of this ever becoming law.

Mr. DORGAN. I wonder if the Senator will yield for a question.

Mr. SANTORUM. I will be happy to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I was listening to the Senator from Pennsylvania as I was coming through the Chamber. I want to propound a question.

I do not think there is much disagreement in this Chamber as to whether anybody ought to put their mitts on the Social Security funds. Those are dedicated taxes that go into a trust fund and should only be used for Social Security. I must say, several years ago, we had an incredible debate in this Chamber on amending the Constitution. It was the case that those who wanted to amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget were saying, put in the Constitution a provision that puts the Social Security funds, along with all other operating revenues of the Federal Government, into the same pot. Many of us were very upset about that and stood on the floor day after day saying that was the wrong thing to do; you ought not put them in the same pot.

Mr. SANTORUM. I will respond to that. It is a far different thing to put a Government program—and I do not know of any Government program that exists, with maybe the exception of defense, but defense has changed over time—in the Constitution of the United States and say we are going to set up this Federal program that must be, in a sense, left alone when future Congresses, as I certainly hope will occur, will be making adjustments to that program.

In fact, 200 years from now, who knows what this country is going to look like. It may, in fact, want to do something completely different than what we have in mind today. I think that was the concern of a lot of us. If we were going to start enshrining Government programs in the Constitution, that is a fairly dangerous precedent, and I think a lot of us had real concerns about that.

At the same time, there was broad sympathy that we do need during this time of surplus, because it is not going to be forever that the Social Security surpluses will be there, as the Senator knows because, again, things change—for this time period, we can lock this away and do it by legislation, in this case a point of order.

As the Senator knows, 15 years from now, that provision in the Constitution would work almost in some respects against Social Security because they would be running a deficit. As the economics of Social Security change, enshrining that in the Constitution I do not think is in the best interest of Social Security. Here we can react to