

trillions of dollars. It paid off: 250 years later, communism is virtually wiped off the map and these countries, the Balkans and eastern European countries, now enjoy democracy and freedom.

There was only one country in the world that could do that, and that was the United States. We have military skill, the great men and women in uniform, and we have a reputation of involving ourselves in foreign policy—not to come away with any property or treasure; we are there to try to promote the ideals and values of our country.

So when Governor Bush suggests withdrawing troops in some parts of the world, you have to wonder, has he really reflected on this? Has he taken the time to try to measure why he would change policies that even his father supported, perhaps President Reagan supported, and now he wants to change these policies and approaches?

This is an important element. Thank goodness we live in a world that is generally at peace, but it is a dangerous world that at any moment can flare up. We need leadership in the White House that understands the consequences of its actions.

I salute the Senator from California. What we are seeing happen today in North Korea—where they are finally talking to us; they are finally agreeing to perhaps end the missile testing—is a very positive development. It is only because the United States made a commitment in South Korea with the lives of our service men and women and then kept troops there to protect it that we have reached that point today.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator DURBIN be given 5 minutes following the completion of my time.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask that Senator DURBIN be given 5 minutes when I conclude my time.

Mr. KYL. I object, Mr. President, on the ground that I was going to speak at a quarter till.

Mr. DURBIN. May I make an inquiry of the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to be fair to my colleagues. It was my understanding that the Democratic side would have the first 25 minutes in morning business and then the Republican side. But in the interest of my colleagues who have given up their own time, I am happy to work out an arrangement with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the objection over adding 5 minutes or taking the 5 minutes?

Mr. KYL. Let me withdraw the objection.

Mrs. BOXER. I was just making sure that Senator DURBIN would be recognized for the next 5 minutes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I withdraw my objection. I did not un-

derstand the Senator's request. My understanding was that the minority time would have expired about now. I understand that is not the case. Therefore, I do not object to the request of the Senator from California to have Senator DURBIN speak next. I was hoping to be able to speak before noon, but that may not be possible.

Mr. DURBIN. May I ask for clarification? How much time does the Democratic side have remaining in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic side has a little over 24 minutes. The Republican side has 20 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Chair make an inquiry of my two Republican colleagues as to how long they would like to speak.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, if I could clarify, it is no big deal. What we had was the morning business time divided between Republicans and Democrats. The leader's time took some of that, so we didn't have enough. We ought to share equally what remains. Whatever that division is, it ought to be divided between the two of us.

Mrs. BOXER. If I may restate my unanimous consent request, understanding that we have 24 minutes remaining, I would appreciate it if Senator DURBIN could follow my remarks so we have some train of thought. Then we can take the next 10 minutes from the Republican time, if they would like to use it. I don't think Senator DURBIN has a problem; I don't have a problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. If we would determine exactly the time that is remaining and then maybe add to that my opportunity to speak after Senator DURBIN.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to.

Mr. KYL. If we could suspend one moment.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to do that.

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

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I ask if we could suspend the request for one moment. Senator THOMAS is technically in control of the time on our side. He should be the one who understands this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the Senator from California finishes, the Senator from Illinois will speak for 5 minutes, followed by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. I thank the Chair.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Out of the 10 minutes I originally had, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used her time.

Mrs. BOXER. I ask unanimous consent for 60 seconds to recap what I said before the time goes to Senator DURBIN.

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

Mrs. BOXER. We have taken longer deciding who is going to talk than we

have on what we really want to say. I will sum up my points today.

I think two issues are coming to the floor in this election. Education is one of them. We have the Governor of Texas saying his kids in Texas are doing great. We learned today that was based on a State test, not a national test. So that is something we have to look at. We have a new study showing that Texas is one of the worst places to raise a child. That is from another objective, nonpartisan study.

Now we have a hearing going on in Foreign Relations beating up on Vice President GORE for something that happened in 1995, when not one Republican ever complained about it until 2 weeks before the election, when Governor Bush has now made a proposal that in essence threw a bomb into NATO—figuratively, not literally—and our NATO allies are worried and concerned that suddenly we have on the table a proposal—not very well thought out, in my view—that would drastically change NATO and would say, in essence, that the United States will be the fighters, someone else will be the peacekeepers.

I think it is more dangerous for our people to take that on alone. It is a big worry I have. It shows in this sensitive time why we need proven, effective, experienced leadership in the White House. We don't want to have someone coming in and throwing this kind of proposal into NATO. We need our NATO allies now more than ever. We have great opportunities for peace in the world. We are not going to make them come true if we dissect NATO and destroy it.

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

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for the sake of my colleagues on the floor, Senator THOMAS and others, it is my understanding that I am to speak for 10 minutes, and then the Republican side will be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request was made for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Five minutes, fine. I will confine my remarks to 5 minutes in the interest of my patient colleagues. After Senator THOMAS and Senator KYL, I would like to reclaim the Democratic time under morning business.

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

MAKING TOUGH CHOICES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in 2 weeks the American people are going to face one of the toughest choices they have had perhaps in modern memory.

This Presidential race is not just a choice between two individuals and whether, frankly, one has a better image on television, or more experience, or a better speaking voice. It comes down to basic questions of values envisioned for this country. There

are two contrasting views to be chosen. I can recall 4 years ago coming to the Senate when the Republicans all lined up and said that our economy was in such terrible shape, and the Federal budget was in such bad shape, we would have to amend the Constitution with a balanced budget amendment because of our deficits. They were so desperate they wanted to give the power to the Federal courts to stop Congress from spending.

Four years later, look at the difference. We are not talking about deficits; we are talking about how to spend the surplus, and we are talking about an economy which, for 8 years, has been cooking, creating 22 million new jobs. There is more home ownership than at any time in our history. Welfare rolls are coming down and crime rates are coming down. Opportunities for businesses, for minorities, for women are unparalleled in our history. When you look at advanced placement courses in schools, we have more Hispanics and African Americans enrolling in them than ever before in our history.

America is moving forward, and I am glad to say we have been part of it in Congress. We can't take credit for it anymore than the President can or Alan Greenspan can. It is a joint effort of families and businesses across America. But make no mistake, the right policy in Washington set the stage for this to happen. When President Clinton said, "I am going to make a meaningful effort to reduce the national deficits," frankly, we didn't get a single Republican vote to support us. Not one. Vice President GORE came to the floor of the Senate and cast the tie-breaking vote, and we started on a path in 1993 that led to where we are today. There are some people who think this is automatic in America, that prosperity is a matter of standing aside and watching it happen.

I know better. I have been in the Congress long enough to know that the wrong policies in the White House can jeopardize economic prosperity. Do you remember the early days of the Reagan years when they came up with an idea called "supply side economics" and the appropriately named "Laffer curve"? We followed that crazy notion long enough to find ourselves deep in red ink, with the biggest deficits in history, the largest national debt and America on the ropes. Thank goodness we have broken away from that.

Should we experiment again? George W. Bush suggests he wants a \$1.6 trillion tax cut going primarily to wealthy people in America. Can we run that risk? The highest 1 percent of wage earners who will see over 40 percent of the George W. Bush tax cut are people who are making more than \$300,000 a year. I can't understand why a person who has an income of \$25,000 a month needs a \$2,000 a month tax cut. But that is what Governor Bush has proposed. He says it is only fair and right; these are taxpayers, too. Think of Bill

Gates. He has been very successful with Microsoft. He is worth billions of dollars. According to George W. Bush, he needs a tax cut. I don't think so.

George W. Bush should take into consideration that the net worth of Bill Gates is greater than the combined net worth of 106 million Americans. He doesn't need our help. The people who need our help, frankly, are families struggling to pay for college expenses. We on the Democratic side believe that we need tax cuts targeted to help families in a real way so they can deduct college tuition and fees up to \$12,000 a year to help kids get through college and have a better life.

We also believe we ought to help families who are going to work trying to find something to do with their children. Day care is an important issue for so many families. We want to increase the tax credit for day care and also give a tax credit for stay-at-home moms who are willing to make the economic sacrifice for their children.

Finally, when it comes to long-term care, so many of us have seen aging parents and grandparents who need a helping hand. I have seen families making extra sacrifices for those parents. Our tax program would give a targeted tax cut to help those families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

CAMPAIGNING ON THE SENATE FLOOR

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I think it is somewhat unseemly to use the Senate floor for campaign purposes with respect to attacking the qualifications of one of the two candidates for President of the United States. I would like to do some business here and suggest that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who use their time to engage in campaign tactics really ought to be helping us take care of a bit of business that I think ought to move to the top of the agenda, such as fighting terrorism in the aftermath of the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*.

ENHANCING THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, we now have more reports of specific credible evidence of planned attacks against the United States—terrorism that must be prevented. We have not done everything we can do to prevent terrorism. According to a Commission that has reported to the Congress, there is more to be done. I have incorporated that Commission's recommendations into a bill. We are trying to get the bill passed. It runs into objections from the other side. Today, I am going to lay it out because there isn't much time left.

Earlier this month, I introduced the Counterterrorism Act of 2000, cosponsored by my friend and colleague, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN. This should have bipartisan support. As the chairman and ranking member of the Judi-

ciary Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information, I have held hearings, along with Senator FEINSTEIN, on steps that would better prepare this country to thwart and defend against and prevent and respond to terrorist attacks. Our legislation will do that by capturing many of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorism.

The Commission was mandated by the Congress, and it released its report earlier this year. It is bipartisan, led by Ambassador Paul Bremer and Maurice Sonnenberg. They have a long record—both of them—of experience and expertise in this matter. The Commission, with 10 members in all, came to unanimous conclusions on the gaps in America's counterterrorism efforts and made extensive recommendations in their report.

In addition to Ambassador Bremer, who formerly served as Ambassador-at-Large for Counterterrorism and Mr. Sonnenberg, who serves on the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board, the Commission included eight other outstanding experts in the field: former CIA Director, James Woolsey; former Assistant Director-in-Charge of the FBI's National Security Division, John Lewis; former Congresswoman Jane Harman, who served on the House Armed Services and Intelligence Committees; former Under Secretary of Defense, Fred Ikle; former Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Special Operations Command, Gen. Wayne Downing; Director of National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, Richard Betts; former foreign policy adviser to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, Gardner Peckham; Harvard professor Juliette Kayyem, who formerly served as legal advisor to the U.S. Attorney General.

In June, the members of this Commission testified before the Intelligence Committee, of which I am a member, with their findings and recommendations. A week later, the Commission's report was the subject of a Foreign Relations Committee hearing. At the end of June, Senator FEINSTEIN and I invited the Commissioners to testify at a hearing of the Judiciary subcommittee which I chair. The purpose of our hearing was to explore the findings of the Commission and clarify some recommendations that have been mischaracterized. So the Senate thought that this Commission report was important enough to hold three specific hearings on its findings and recommendations.

Senator FEINSTEIN and I then decided to take action on the recommendations by drafting the Counterterrorism Act of 2000. We believe this is an important first step in addressing shortfalls in America's fight against the growing threat of terrorism.

In summary, this is what the bill would do:

First, it expresses the sense of Congress that the United States Government should take immediate actions to