

proposal. I think the refineries will keep it and they won't pass it on. There are a whole host of reasons. The main point that is worth considering is that we labored mightily in this body and in the other body a couple years ago to pass a very significant highway program; we called it TEA 21. Was that significant? It said that for the first time all of the Federal gas taxes were going to the highway trust fund, and the highway trust fund would be used only for highways. It was a commitment: People who drive cars and trucks in our country and pay the Federal gas tax or diesel tax will know that tax is going to the highway trust fund and it should stay in the trust fund, with the trust fund dollars to be allocated among the States to build and repair our highways. That was it. It was that simple.

So if the bill that may come before this body, which the Senator was addressing, were to be enacted, it would break that trust, break that commitment. It would open up the highway trust fund to potentially any purpose. It would just be the camel's nose under the tent. It would be the first step down the slippery slope of taking trust fund money and using it for other purposes. Why do I say that? Because part of the amendment is to say, OK, let's replenish it with general revenue. We all know "general revenue" is a slippery slope around here. We don't know how much general revenue there is going to be; therefore, the solidarity of the dollars going into the trust fund and dollars coming out of the trust fund to pay for highway modernization and new highways has to be kept sacrosanct. I hope the Senate rejects the position to repeal the 4.3-cent gas tax. It is a bad idea.

LAUNCHING OUR COMMUNITIES' ACCESS TO LOCAL TELEVISION ACT OF 2000—Continued

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I will address the pending subject, local-into-local broadcasting. At the end of the last session of Congress, there was some talk that in this session of Congress, this year, we would take up financing to help guarantee local-into-local television coverage in rural areas. Frankly, I wasn't happy with the way we were about to leave the last session of Congress, so I stood up on the floor and tossed a little bit of obstruction around until we got a firmer commitment that by a certain date we would bring up legislation in this body directed toward financing satellites or other entities so that we could provide local-into-local coverage throughout our country. I am very happy now that this bill is before us. As a consequence of the deference of myself and others, we are now here.

Very simply, the need for this is extremely important. This chart shows markets that aren't now covered and will be covered under the basic bill to be passed. There aren't very many of

them. The red dots depict areas where people can get local-into-local coverage. There are 210 TV markets in our country. You can tell that the red dots don't number 210. In fact, they number something much less than that. I might say that number 210 happens to be right up here—Glasgow, MT. Butte, I think, is 167, and there is Billings. We have a bunch of TV markets in our State, but they are nowhere near where the red dots are.

With the passage of last year's bill, 67 markets will have coverage. Only 67 of the 210 markets will eventually get coverage and have local-into-local television coverage. Thirty-five percent of the homes in my State would receive video programming through satellite. Our State flower is the bitterroot, but we have a new State flower now, the satellite dish, because we in Montana have the highest per capita utilization of satellite dishes—more than any other State in the Nation. Montanans per capita have more satellite dishes. It is because Montana is so big. We are a rural State. There are only about 900,000 people in our State, with about 147,000 square miles. You can see why satellite dishes are so important. But because we are so rural and because so many other States are so rural, we are not getting local satellite coverage. It stands to reason because the satellite companies are going to give the coverage to the greatest markets where they will make the most money, as well they should. Companies are there to get the highest rate of return. So they are going to go where they can make the greater returns, and that is going to be the cities.

It is only fair that the rest of America also be wired in. That is why I think this bill is so important. It will take a few years to accomplish it, but at least we will get there.

What are the reasons for having it? One is to find out what your local team is doing.

Here is a chart. This is the University of Montana Grizzlies. Most folks like to know how the home team did. If you don't get local-to-local satellite coverage, it is pretty hard to know. You might be able to find out for New York, Denver, or Florida. But when you are from a smaller community and a smaller town, you only care about the local team. You can't get it now with satellite coverage in my State of Montana and in most places.

Maybe it is not the local team. Maybe it is weather conditions. Is a storm coming? What is the weather report? Our State sometimes has blizzards. Sometimes it snows—not very often. Most people think Montana is awfully cold; that we have a lot of snow. Montana is really not very cold. It doesn't snow that much. But every once in a while it snows. We kind of like to know every once in a while when it is going to happen. So we need local notice. Local-to-local is critical throughout our country.

The final point I will make is demonstrated by this chart. This shows

how well the Rural Utilities Service, a branch of USDA, is already serving America—the telephone cooperatives, and with the power cooperatives around the State. RUS is a loan guarantor. It guarantees loans for wastewater proposals, for electric distribution, transportation, telecommunications, telephone, and distance learning. It guarantees loans to finance operations to build these infrastructures all over the country.

The basic point is a very simple one. We have an organization in place. It is serving America well. Why not allow the Rural Utilities Service to, essentially, be the agency that provides the additional loan guarantees for satellites and to give assistance to rural areas?

The underlying bill before us sets up a board to do all of this. I submit that another board and another level of bureaucracy does not make sense. We already have an organization that is doing it. Also, this RUS organization has a very good record. In fact, in the last 50 years, the Rural Utilities Service has not had one loan loss in its telecommunications program—not one. That is indicated by the green dots scattered throughout the country.

When we finally pass this legislation, remember that we already have an agency doing a good job.

I also urge adoption of the pending amendment offered by Senator JOHNSON, which adds the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation as another lender in addition to FDIC-insured banks. I think it is helpful to have that availability. We are more likely to get the financing.

I must also say that I hope we include in the underlying legislation a provision which encourages the loan guarantors at the lending institutions to finance new satellite operations not only for local-to-local coverage but also to help in the availability of broader bandwidth and higher-speed Internet connections because we have the opportunity now while we are providing satellite service for local use to also say: OK, maybe we should also give some consideration to wireless, broad bandwidth, and higher-speed access to the Internet because clearly that is the way of the future. Many of the urban parts of our country have broad bandwidths. It is 10 times more expensive, but they have it.

In addition, many companies are competing vigorously to provide this service all across the country. They are doing it the good old American way—based on a profit motive. That is great. That is what built America. But a consequence is that rural America often doesn't get near the same coverage as urban America for the same reason, that satellite companies are not providing local-to-local to America; namely, because it doesn't pay nearly as well in rural America as it does in urban America.

I am saying that whoever makes the decision, I hope it is not the board. But

if it is the board, give them incentives to provide financing and guarantee financing for satellite companies. It could be perhaps a cable company. It might even be a telephone company that would provide local-to-local cable service. But also they would be in a position to more quickly provide broad bandwidth to the same area.

That is the sum and substance of what I hope we do. I think it makes a lot of sense.

For those Senators who have some questions about some of these points, I am more than willing to sit down and try to work out some of the details. Some of the details can be worked out in conference as well. But let us not let perfection be the enemy of good.

I think these are pretty good ideas. They are not perfect, but they are good. I urge my colleagues to work together to try to incorporate these provisions.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak in morning business for a time not to exceed 10 minutes.

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

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I thank the Chair. (The remarks of Mrs. FEINSTEIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2328 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. I ask consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

MEDICARE REFORM

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, over the last 3 months I have come to the floor of the Senate on more than 20 occasions to talk about the need to assist the Nation's senior citizens and families under Medicare with help with the extraordinary costs so many of them are experiencing for prescription medicine. I am very pleased to report some very exciting, positive developments that have taken place in the last few hours on this issue as a result of the bipartisan effort in the Budget Committee.

I particularly want to commend my colleagues Senators SNOWE and SMITH. Senators SNOWE and SMITH have teamed up with me on a bipartisan basis for more than 15 months to address this enormous need of the Nation's older people.

Today in the Budget Committee we took a concrete, tangible step to set in place the kind of program that really will provide meaningful relief for the Nation's older people. We did it in a way that will be consistent with long-term Medicare reform, a view that is a view shared by Members on both sides of the aisle. It allows for universal coverage and a program that is voluntary. That is to ensure that older people can make the choices that are good for them.

Specifically, what the Budget Committee did is provide legislation that would allocate \$20 billion during the next 3 years to put in place a prescription drug program, and then make it possible to add another \$20 billion in the next fiscal year, which would be fiscal year 2004-2005, as part of an effort to ensure solvency, long-term Medicare reform, and to do it in a way that would not cause an on-budget deficit in those later years.

I have believed for a long time that at a time when more than 20 percent of our Nation's older people are spending over \$1,000 a year out of pocket on their prescription medicine, when we have millions of seniors with an average of 18 prescriptions a year, that it is important we put in place, on a bipartisan basis, meaningful relief for the Nation's older people.

Today, on a bipartisan basis, the Budget Committee said the Finance Committee should report a plan on or before September 1 of this year to help older people with their prescription drug medicine to ensure that \$20 billion would be available for fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003, and, accompanied by real reform of the Medicare Program, there could be \$20 billion for fiscal years 2004 and 2005.

This required, frankly, compromise on both sides. For example, one of the stipulations in what was done by the Budget Committee today was a stipulation that there could not be transfers of new subsidies from the general fund to extend solvency. Frankly, some of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle had supported those kinds of transfers in the past.

I think after many months of debate, and certainly a lot of prognosticators saying it was not possible in this session of Congress to make real headway on the prescription drug issue, and, in fact, to get the job done, what the Senate Budget Committee showed this morning in a very significant breakthrough is that we are now on our way to address the needs of older people. In fact, this language would be binding. The language adopted by the Budget Committee, setting out the parameters for the adoption of a prescription drug program for the Nation's elderly under Medicare, would be binding.

In addition to my two colleagues Senators SNOWE and SMITH, I would like to single out a number of others on a bipartisan basis who helped us. Chairman DOMENICI, for example, was one who, in many conversations with me on this issue, talked about the need to make this program consistent with long-term Medicare reform and to make Medicare more solvent in the future. That is an issue that has been highlighted by Senators DASCHLE, LAUTENBERG, and CONRAD as well. But the fact that Senator DOMENICI emphasized that in the last couple of days helped us find common ground this morning.

This is a vast improvement on what the House has thus far been able to accomplish on this issue of prescription drugs. Specifically, the Senate made it clear we could launch a prescription drug program that would offer \$40 billion of assistance to the Nation's older people, a program that would assist all senior citizens. So the Senate was able, this morning, in the Budget Committee, on a bipartisan basis, to add a significant amount of additional relief. That was important.

The House did not address the solvency issue and that is what, in fact, the Senate did. In that sense it is a dramatic improvement. What we did, in terms of the dollars on a bipartisan basis, is today we raised the amount the Senate would make available for the program to \$40 billion. Originally that amount was \$20 billion.

The fundamental point remains. We addressed this issue by adding more money than was originally envisaged in the mark that came out from the Senate. We were able to do it in a way that addressed the Medicare solvency question. The House did not really touch the Medicare solvency question, and we think, on a bipartisan basis in the Senate this morning, that was important.

Finally, we know the revolution in American health care has essentially bypassed the Medicare Program. A lot of these medicines today help older people to stay well. They help to lower blood pressure. They help to lower cholesterol. They are medicines that promote wellness. They do not just take care of folks when they are sick. As a result of the work done today, we made a major step forward in modernizing this program and bringing it in line with the rest of the American health care system.

I reported on the floor of the Senate recently a case of an older person in Hillsboro, OR, who had to be hospitalized for 6 weeks because Part A of Medicare would pay his prescription drug bill and he could not afford his medicine on an outpatient basis. Today, as a result of what the Senate Budget Committee did, that person will be in a position to get his medicine on an outpatient basis.

They will be able to get help because the Senate improved on what the House has been talking about by putting more of a focus on solvency, and