

Huskymania, we have come to learn, is an equal opportunity experience. In the town of Storrs, the picturesque, wooded hamlet that the University of Connecticut students, faculty, and administrators call home, more than 5,000 people turned out Monday for a midday pep rally of appreciation at the Gampel Pavilion, where sellout crowds watched this great team work their magic all year long. As the celebration grew more and more boisterous and enthusiastic, it seemed hard to believe that this was the same part of our State that used to be called "The Forgotten Corner," because these days, if you follow college basketball, it is an awfully hard place to forget.

The fact is, thanks to the Huskies, Storrs is home to the stars now. We like to think of it as the "College Hoops Capital of America."

Last year, when we came to the floor to celebrate the men's victory, I closed with an impersonation of a University of Connecticut cheerleader. I was advised by many people, including my dear friend and senior colleague, not to repeat this performance. But you know that I feel it would be unfair. So very briefly, U-C-O-N-N, UConn.

Thank you. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the last time I saw something like that was when Senator D'Amato did a tune.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. The Senator, let it be known, was one of my role models. I compliment him.

FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET—
Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 2926

(Purpose: To redirect \$28.133 billion of risky tax schemes toward key education programs proven to increase student performance, including programs that ensure qualified teachers in every classroom; small classes where every child receives the attention needed; safe, modern schools; extra resources for schools with large numbers of poor children and resources to turn around failing schools and implement tough accountability systems; research-based early literacy programs; public school choice programs; and increased Pell grant funds for students needing financial assistance for college education)

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN) for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. DODD, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. WELLSTONE, proposes an amendment numbered 2926.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$1,930,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$6,230,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$5,480,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$5,810,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$6,940,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$1,930,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$6,230,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$5,480,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,810,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$6,940,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$5,640,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by \$7,120,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by \$6,470,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$7,080,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$8,420,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,930,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$6,230,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$5,480,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$5,810,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$6,940,000,000.

On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by \$5,640,000,000.

On page 18, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,930,000,000.

On page 18, line 11, increase the amount by \$7,120,000,000.

On page 18, line 12, increase the amount by \$6,230,000,000.

On page 18, line 15, increase the amount by \$6,470,000,000.

On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by \$5,480,000,000.

On page 18, line 19, increase the amount by \$7,080,000,000.

On page 18, line 20, increase the amount by \$5,810,000,000.

On page 18, line 23, increase the amount by \$8,420,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by \$6,940,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, decrease the amount by \$1,949,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, decrease the amount by \$28,133,000,000.

Add new Section 105, as follows:
SEC. 105. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE SENATE.

Not later than September 29, 2000, the Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than \$19,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and \$1,743,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico 15 minutes off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have to leave the floor for a while. I wanted to indicate that one-half hour of our hour in opposition is going to be yielded to the Senator from Texas. He will have half an hour.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I am offering the amendment on behalf of myself, Senator KENNEDY, Senator MURRAY, Senator DODD, Senator KERRY, Senator DASCHLE, and Senator WELLSTONE, several of whom will speak.

It would increase the national investment in education over the committee's mark by \$5.6 billion in budget authority in fiscal year 2001.

Let me put up a chart that shows the difference between our proposed amendment and the budget resolution. You can see that the budget resolution is \$75 billion in 2001. Our amendment will raise that up to \$80.64 billion.

It also would increase over a 5-year period the total amount devoted to education by \$34.7 billion.

This second chart shows the comparison between the budget resolution that came to the floor and what this amendment would do.

In our view, this increase is essential if we are going to reflect the priorities of the American people. All of us know that the top priority of the people we represent is to see improvements in education and to see every child in this country given the opportunity to get a good education. Clearly, the decisions we make in this budget resolution will go a long way to determining whether that is possible or not.

The amendment I sent to the desk would use about 15 percent of the proposed Republican tax cut. It would reduce the tax cut by that 15 percent in order to guarantee sufficient funding for programs that have been proven to improve student performance in our public schools and to assist students seeking a postsecondary education.

What are those programs? That is the subject of our amendment. The amendment that we are proposing would seek to protect many such programs.

First, it seeks to protect a program to increase safety and decrease overcrowding in our schools by providing \$1.3 billion in grants and loans for urgent repair of 5,000 public elementary and secondary schools in high-need areas and by leveraging \$25 billion in interest-free bonds to help build and modernize 6,000 schools.

The amendment also demonstrates a national commitment to building and renovating our schools to make sure all children are able to study in safe, modern environments by setting aside \$3.7 billion of the proposed tax cut, which is just 1.8 percent of the total tax cut, to back those interest-free bonds for school construction costs.

These programs I estimate would provide about \$200 million in my home State of New Mexico where current estimates are that school repair and modernization needs exceed \$1.8 billion. Many schools are overcrowded. Over 69 percent of our schools in my State report plumbing and electrical problems; 75 percent have problems with environmental factors such as lighting and heating.

Another program we guarantee funding in what we believe is a reasonable

level is the afterschool programs. We expand existing afterschool programs so approximately 1.6 million more school-age children in over 6,000 new 21st century community learning centers have access to afterschool programs in safe and drug-free environments.

The amendment seeks to ensure an increase of \$547 million in these programs. The estimate for my State would be about \$5.3 million of the total amount. Also, in this amendment we support tough accountability standards for increasing the funding for title I accountability grants by \$116 million over last year's level, to the level of \$250 million. This is essential to accelerate efforts to turn around failing schools and to implement tough accountability systems.

Under current law, States in districts receiving funding under the title I program, which is every State and most school districts in the country, are required to monitor student and school performance on State assessments based on State standards. States and districts are required to take action if schools are failing. In committee, we strengthened the accountability system, but we did not strengthen it enough.

During the debate on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I hope to offer an amendment that strengthens it further. Nevertheless, no accountability system is going to prove effective without the resources to implement. Although most States have adopted statewide standards, they have not directed adequate resources to schools that are failing in order to meet those standards. Dedicated funds are necessary to develop improvement strategies which create rewards and penalties holding schools accountable for continuous improvement in their student performance.

The Federal Government directs over \$8 billion in Federal funding to provide critical support programs for disadvantaged students under title I. However, the accountability provisions in title I have not been adequately implemented due to insufficient resources. The amendment we are offering today provides for this critical assistance and the strict accountability measures for improvement in student performance to turn around so-called failing schools.

My colleagues and I believe this amendment is necessary because the proposed budget we are now considering, if implemented, will make adequate increases in education spending virtually impossible. Several of my colleagues have already pointed out the proposed budget calls for at least \$168 billion in tax cuts over 5 years; that is the largest tax cut ever proposed. These tax cuts, at a minimum, leave nothing in the budget surplus for education or for the other priorities so important to the American people.

Without cutting other programs or dipping into Social Security, this bud-

et resolution causes Members to choose between tax cuts and education. Unless unrealistic cuts are made to noneducation programs, the Republican budget resolution disregards these and other national priorities and exhausts 98 percent of the total non-Social Security surplus on tax cuts over the next 5 years. The budget resolution only covers the next 5 years; over 10 years the tax cuts would cost substantially more than the projected non-Social Security surplus projected by the CBO.

While the Budget Committee's resolution provides increases for discretionary spending for defense, it cuts nondefense discretionary funds by \$105 billion, or 6.5 percent over the next 5 years below the amount the Congressional Budget Office indicates is necessary to maintain current funding.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I say to the Senator from New Mexico, I am proud to be a sponsor of his amendment. The Senator goes to the heart of what our country's priority ought to be—frankly, what all of the Republicans and Democrats alike say our priority ought to be. When we look at numbers, we realize the Republican budget is going to be devastating to education.

I engage my friend in a question about afterschool programs. The Senator and I have worked hard in getting more funding for afterschool. Thanks to a lot of hard work in this Congress and with the Vice President's leadership, we have seen spending on afterschool programs go up to about \$453 million in the year 2000. By the way, a few years ago it was \$1 million; then it was \$40 million. The need is tremendous.

The President is asking in his budget to accommodate the waiting list of children, which is more than one million children. He envisions spending \$1 billion on afterschool programs to accommodate that wait. In the Republican budget, that number is cut by \$547 million; it freezes the amount for afterschool.

I ask my friend, because he works so hard on the issue of school dropout rates and helping kids who need a hand, and he does so much work on gang violence prevention, does the Senator think this Republican budget is going to harm these million children? If we go with the President's numbers, they will be included in his programs.

Mr. BINGAMAN. I thank the Senator from California for the question.

My own view is there are a great many young people out there who want to be in these programs. There are a great many parents who want to have their children in these programs. Our estimate is that 1.6 million more of the students nationwide would be able to participate if we are able to succeed with this amendment and add the \$547 million of additional funds that the President has requested. That is what we are trying to do. Clearly, it is a

question of priorities. Where do people think this money should be spent?

My own view is these programs are extremely effective not only in improving children's performance but in keeping kids out of trouble. The drug problem is real. We all talk about the need to fight the drug problem. We are having a great discussion now in the newspapers about how much should be spent to deal with the drug problem by assisting the country of Colombia. I support doing something significant there.

Clearly, reducing demand through more attention to young people through afterschool programs is part of the solution.

Mrs. BOXER. I know the Senator is aware, but I want to underscore the incredible support afterschool programs have with the American people. Ask the American people, and 90 percent of them support safe afterschool programs for our children.

In addition, is the Senator aware that this is a top priority for law enforcement? Look at the FBI statistics. Juvenile crime occurs from the hour of 3 p.m., and it starts to go down around 6 o'clock or 7 p.m.

If my friend could answer that question, is he aware that this is a priority with the American people?

Again, I do agree with the Senator from California that this is a top priority with the American people and with much of law enforcement. I have had law enforcement officers in my State, police from local and State Police organizations, tell me they wish we would do more to deal with juvenile crime in these types of programs so they would not have to do so much afterwards, when crimes have been committed.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Let me go ahead and complete the summary of this amendment, if I could.

First, I do recognize the Republican resolution, which we have on the floor, asserts a commitment to increase spending for a few important education programs. We support the committee's decision to commit to increased funding for IDEA and for Pell grants and some other elementary and secondary education programs. But we do not support pitting these programs against other critical programs. We believe the more prudent course would be to guarantee the level of funding required to protect the programs that have proven themselves in our efforts to reform schools and bring improvements in student performance.

Let me just go through this chart to try to clarify my understanding at least of the Republican budget resolution that is before us. The resolution asserts a \$4.5 billion increase for mandatory and discretionary Department of Education programs. But when you try to figure out how that \$4.5 billion is arrived at, the specific elements that are discussed at different parts of the budget add up to more than \$4.5 billion. For example, there is \$2.3 billion set

aside for a new, mandatory performance bonus fund which is established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask for an additional 8 minutes.

Mr. REID. I yield 8 minutes off the resolution.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. When you look at this \$2.3 billion the Budget Committee report sets aside for this new, mandatory performance bonus fund, that, of course, presumably, should come out of the total amount for education. I believe it does very explicitly. Therefore, when you subtract that, the resolution asserts a \$2.2 billion increase for discretionary education programs. Given the size of the tax cut in relation to the non-Social Security surplus, this increase does not seem possible, as I mentioned before. But if we assume it is, it still falls short of covering the priorities specified in their own resolution.

The resolution earmarks, out of the \$2.2 billion that remains after you subtract the \$2.3 billion down here—\$1 billion for IDEA, it sets aside \$1.6 billion for increases in other elementary and secondary education programs, and it sets aside \$700 million for the increase to raise the maximum Pell grant by \$200. If you add the \$700 million, the \$1.6 billion, the \$1 billion, and the \$2.3 billion, you get \$5.6 billion.

So the unfortunate reality is that there is no way to get it all done in the \$4.5 billion that is permitted in the way of increases for education. Therefore, the \$1.1 billion difference between the \$5.6 billion and the \$4.5 billion needs to be cut from other education programs in order to reach the specified increases.

Based on what is outlined in the committee-reported budget, Non-elementary and Secondary Education Act or IDEA education programs would have to be cut about 22 percent to meet the assumptions for education spending.

The funding for fiscal year 2001 for discretionary programs under the Republican proposal is \$2.3 billion below what the President requested. If all discretionary education, training, and social programs in function 500 of the budget are considered, the resolution is \$4.7 billion below the President's budget.

Our amendment would guarantee real dollars for targeted efforts, for programs that are known to improve student performance. The program would provide increases in funding that would allow for this \$1 billion increase in IDEA. As I said before, we compliment the committee for agreeing to that. I believe that is very important.

Our amendment would also sustain our commitment to the student loan program and to the impact aid programs. The amendment would provide for a \$400 increase in the maximum Pell grant rather than the \$200 increase

proposed by the President and contained in the committee report.

In addition, the amendment would guarantee increased investments in programs that we know are essential to educational reform, including those I mentioned before. Let me mention just a few more of those. There is a \$1.5 billion increase in our proposed amendment for teacher quality programs. This is \$1 billion over the President's proposal, so we can ensure every child is taught by a qualified instructor. Research shows that high-quality teachers are the single most important determinant of student learning.

This amendment increases resources for schools with high concentrations of poverty. Here we are talking about the title I program. We would propose to increase funding there by \$1 billion, which, frankly, is not enough. During the Elementary and Secondary Education Act markup, which we concluded in the Health and Education Committee just the other day, our committee voted unanimously—all Democrats and all Republicans voted unanimously to increase the authorization for title I to \$15 billion. I would like to work with my Republican colleagues to ensure we are at least on the path to meeting that goal. At the very least, we need to commit to make a substantial increase next year. All of us know the importance of title I funding. All of us give speeches about how important it is to adequately fund title I. Here is a chance to actually vote to do that.

The amendment we are offering continues our commitment to smaller classes, providing \$1.75 billion to hire 100,000 teachers to reduce class size in the early grades. In addition, the amendment expands support for creating smaller learning communities in large schools.

This amendment makes college more affordable for many of our young people. As I mentioned before, we are increasing the maximum Pell grant by \$400—we are proposing to do that. That would make postsecondary education accessible to 96,000 more recipients than currently have access. The amendment increases the GEAR UP program and the TRIO Program so more disadvantaged children can be given the support they need to attend college. Under the amendment, students in my State would receive an additional \$5 million in aid under the Pell Grant Program.

Let me just conclude by saying the public does want its schools fixed, even if that means somewhat less in the way of a tax cut. That is the issue before us. Should there be something in the range of a 15-percent reduction in the tax cut in order to adequately fund education in this budget? The budget resolution before us does not reflect the priorities of the American public. It flies in the face of what Americans say their priorities are in this robust economy. In survey after survey, American voters have not only told us education is the

most important issue nationally, but they support action at the national level to improve our country's schools. This sentiment extends to the funding of education, just as it extends to other changes in our education.

So I believe this is very important. I believe this amendment will improve this budget resolution dramatically and will put it much more in line with the interests and priorities of the American people. I hope very much it will be agreed to by my colleagues.

I yield the floor and yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I am sure that anybody following this debate might get confused as to what the Democrats are for, but there is not any way on Earth they can fail to figure out what they are against. They are against a tax cut.

They are against eliminating the marriage penalty. They are perfectly willing to allow the Tax Code, which penalizes people who fall in love and get married, to stand.

They are opposed to repealing the death tax. They are perfectly willing to leave in place a Tax Code that says: You work your whole life to build up a family business or a family farm, you pay taxes on every dollar you earn, and when you die, your children still may be forced to sell off the business or sell off the farm to give the Federal Government another 55 percent of your life's work.

They are against those things, and in trying to kill the tax cut, they are for many other things.

As to education, there are a lot of reasons for which one can criticize this budget, but not spending enough money on education is simply not one of them. This budget provides \$47.9 billion for the Department of Education, which is \$600 million more than the President proposed. In fact, last year in our budget and in the appropriations process, we spent more money on education than the President proposed.

Unless we get carried away with euphoria and believe that spending a whole bunch of money on education is somehow going to change anything, that somehow having a smaller class size is going to improve performance—we have been lowering class size since 1965 and performance has been declining.

The real debate about education is about whether or not we ought to be the national school board in Congress or whether we ought to let the States decide how to spend this money. That is the real debate between Democrats and Republicans. Democrats believe we ought to have Congress say how the money is going to be spent, and Republicans believe we ought to let the States say how the money is going to be spent.

Mr. President, Senator DOMENICI yielded me 30 minutes to speak. I ask

unanimous consent that the 30 minutes come off the resolution.

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

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I want to talk about the evolution of this budget. I want to talk about the last 8 years of the Clinton administration and how we came to be where we are today with a balanced budget.

The one thing about history is everybody wants to rewrite it to suit themselves, but facts are persistent things.

What I want to do today is begin with the first budget President Clinton ever submitted to the Congress. I want to trace his budgets through Congress until we get to the last budget he will ever submit to Congress, which is the one we are considering today.

The objective is to basically try to get a clear picture of what has been proposed and what has been done.

When President Clinton took office, he sent to the Congress on February 17 of 1993 a budget entitled "A Vision of Change for America."

I have the budget in my hand today. Many people have made a great point about the fact that the President did impose the largest tax increase in American history, but the result of it was a balanced budget.

I begin by noting that on page 22 of the first budget President Clinton ever submitted to Congress, the deficit he started with was \$319 billion. His first act as President, in addition to proposing the largest tax increase in American history, was to raise that deficit in 1993 from \$319 billion to \$332 billion. He did that by proposing that spending actually go up by more than his tax increase in the first year and, in fact, he proposed a stimulus package of \$16.262 billion of brand new spending.

Some of my colleagues will remember the proposal was to spend this out of a projects book. We were able to defeat this proposal on the floor of the Senate, after it passed the House, by pointing out that in this projects book were such proposals as an ice skating warming hut in Connecticut and an alpine slide in Puerto Rico.

In the last budget that was adopted when the Democrats had a majority in Congress—and I have the conference report from that fiscal year 1995 budget, which was adopted on May 4 of 1994—that budget has on page 4 their deficit for fiscal year 1995 which, not counting the money that was being plundered from Social Security, was \$239.5 billion. It was projected to rise in 1996 to \$253 billion, in 1997 to \$278 billion, in 1998 to \$281 billion, and finally, the fiscal year 1999 deficit they were projecting in the last budget when the Democrats controlled Congress was going to be \$300.7 billion.

When the American people looked at those numbers and looked at the Clinton health care bill which proposed having the Government take over and run the health care system, they elected a Republican majority.

When the Republican majority showed up in January of 1995, it was

greeted by the President's fiscal year 1996 budget. This was a budget that Bill Clinton sent to the Republican Congress in February 1995. Actually he began to write it in large part before he knew there would be a Republican Congress. That budget proposed in January of 1995 that we adopt a budget that had a deficit of \$203 billion, and it proposed in the year 2000 that the deficit would be \$194.4 billion. This was the budget that Bill Clinton submitted to the new Republican Congress.

In 1995, Bill Clinton was asked on many occasions, because the Republican Congress started talking about balancing the budget, when he thought we could balance the budget. He had many different answers. This is what he said in 1995: How many years will it take to balance the budget? He said: Nine years.

Then he was asked the question again, and he said: Well, 10 years.

Then he said 8 years.

Then he said 9 years.

Then he said 7 years.

Then he said 7 to 9 years.

Then he said 7 years.

Then he said 9 years.

And then he said 10 years.

These are all statements that President Clinton made in 1995 when Republicans on the floor of the House and on the floor of the Senate, for the first time in the modern era, were talking about balancing the Federal budget.

He was saying: Yes, we might balance the budget. We could balance it 4 years after I leave office; 5 years after I leave office; 3 years after I leave office. But he never, ever proposed that we balance the budget while he was President. Nor did he ever submit any budgets that would require it, until it had already been accomplished.

What happened to the deficit? When Congress arrived in January of 1995, this was the Clinton budget proposal as it related to the deficit: Basically, it was a \$200 billion deficit that went on forever. The American people in 1994 elected a Republican majority in Congress, and it took office in 1995. I ask the people to look at what happened to the deficit under a Republican Congress. The deficit fell very rapidly, and by 1998 we had a balanced Federal budget.

Let me, if I might, make the following point, and do it in taking the President's new budget. First of all, there is one thing that is totally consistent in every Clinton budget. For 8 years, he has submitted budgets, and in every year they have had one thing in common: massive increases in non-defense discretionary spending.

Mr. REID. I apologize to my friend from Texas, but I want to say this. I stepped off the floor to take a phone call. In my absence, there was a request to take 30 minutes off the resolution. I am very upset about that. There was an agreement made, before we left, with the manager of the bill, that 30 minutes would be taken from your side. I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. DOMENICI. Taken from the amendment.

Mr. REID. That is right. I ask unanimous consent that the original unanimous consent agreement be reestablished.

Mr. GRAMM. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object. I was passed a note saying, given the makeup of time, that it would be helpful if I would ask for 30 minutes off the resolution. I made that request. If the Senator objects to it, I will be glad to withdraw it.

Mr. REID. I will just say this. I appreciate very much the Senator from Texas.

I also say this, I am not going to leave the floor anymore. I will be here all day.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, might I suggest, I think this is the right decision. We had an agreement. I left the floor and he left the floor. This time should come off the amendment.

Mr. GRAMM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. I was not a party to the agreement. I really did not know the details of the agreement. I was simply trying to accommodate other people who wanted to debate the amendment. I did not get an opportunity yesterday, because I was working on a lot of other things, to talk about the budget itself. Normally I resent deals that I am not part of, but in this case I would be happy to try to comply with it.

The point I wish to make, in concluding, in looking at the 8 years of the Clinton budget, is that on one point they are totally consistent; and that point is, they always proposed dramatic increases in nondefense discretionary spending. It is an interesting paradox that in the first budget that President Clinton ever proposed, his first proposal was to increase nondefense discretionary by 12.5 percent. We rejected it when we rejected his stimulus package. In the last budget that he will ever propose, remarkably, he proposes to increase nondefense discretionary by 12.5 percent, which brings me to my final point on the budget.

Increasingly, we are hearing from our Democrat colleagues, and we are hearing, in fact, from the President and from the Vice President, that somehow our effort to let working people keep more of what they earn is risky, that somehow repealing the marriage penalty is risky, that somehow repealing the death tax is risky. I guess they say it is risky because that is money that we are giving back to the American people.

But I would ask my colleagues to understand and remember that if you take last year's budget, and you take President Clinton's proposal for this year's budget, he is proposing an increase in spending over the 5 years—from 2002 to 2006—he is proposing new

spending of \$494 billion. That is brand new spending in this budget. Some 80 new programs in this budget would be funded at a level of \$494 billion above the level we are spending now.

So what President Clinton is saying, what Vice President GORE is saying, what our Democrat colleagues are saying, is, let us start 80 new programs and let us spend \$494 billion.

It is interesting. My Governor, who has been criticized by the President and the Vice President, and many of our Democrat colleagues, said: No. Let's take \$483 billion and give it back to working Americans by repealing things such as the marriage penalty and by repealing things such as the death tax.

Here is what I do not understand. Why is it risky to give \$483 billion of non-Social Security surplus back to working families but it is not risky to spend \$494 billion on some 80 new programs? Why is it risky to let the American families spend the money and why is it not risky to let the Government spend the money? Do our Democrat colleagues believe that the Government can spend this money better than the family can spend it? Does anybody believe that if we have a crisis that we will really go back and eliminate these 80 programs and get the \$494 billion back? If we did, it would make history because we have not done it. There have been numerous occasions that Congress has raised taxes after giving a tax cut.

I simply repeat the point that gets lost in all this political rhetoric, with all the talk about debt reduction: You have to go back to when Jimmy Carter was President to find a budget that spends as much money as does the new Clinton budget. It spends \$494 billion on new programs over the next 5 years. That is more money than anyone has talked about in terms of tax cuts. Why is it risky to give the money back to working people and not risky to have Government spend it? That is the unanswered question in this whole debate.

Let me conclude by making two additional points. We have had a lot of amendments on Medicare. The President is talking about Medicare. I want to remind my colleagues that five Members of the Senate and 12 other Americans who had some knowledge of Medicare and health care in general were appointed to a bipartisan commission where President Clinton appointed four of the members; the leadership of both Houses appointed six members each; and they jointly appointed a Chairman, Senator JOHN BREAUX.

With all this talk about Medicare, we had an emerging consensus in the Breaux commission that would have reformed Medicare and would have provided prescription drugs to Americans who had a modest income and had a difficult time paying for their pharmaceutical benefits.

We would have done it in the context of reform, where we did not jeopardize

other Medicare benefits, where we did not jeopardize the pharmaceutical coverage that other Americans had who had the ability to pay for it; but we had a responsible, bipartisan reform program, and we provided pharmaceuticals for seniors who needed the help. Help those who need the help; do not destroy the coverage of those who already have it—roughly 65 percent of all seniors—and do not jeopardize the future of Medicare. It was a pretty good proposal.

What happened to the Breaux commission report? It failed by one vote because every single appointee of President Clinton voted no. So while we have all this rhetoric today about Medicare, I think it is important to remember that the Medicare commission failed by one vote to reach a consensus, and four of the "no" votes were by the four people the President appointed. At some point, I would like to get that commission back together to try again to come up with a bipartisan solution.

A final point, and then I will yield the floor.

What we have shown on this chart is the history of spending on nondefense discretionary spending. This is money that we are not required by law to spend on things such as Medicare and Social Security. These are discretionary programs. And we are not talking about defense. We are talking about nondefense programs.

What this shows is, over the last 5 years we have done a relatively good job of controlling spending.

The President has consistently urged us to start massive new spending sprees, but we have refused to do that over the 5-year period.

One of the reasons this budget has been difficult to write is that in looking at the last 5 years individually, in 1996, when we had just elected a Republican majority, we actually were able to reduce spending in real terms by 4.1 percent. Then real spending grew by 1.8 in 1997; 0.8 in 1998; 3.6 percent in 1999; and then by a whopping real 4.7 percent in the year 2000.

The point is, there is a real danger that this surplus is going to burn a hole in our pocket. There is a real danger that in the midst of this great opportunity to rebuild the base of Social Security, to reform Medicare and provide prescription benefits to people who cannot afford the benefits themselves, with an opportunity to let working Americans who face the highest tax rates ever in American history keep more of what they earn, unless we are careful, we are going to end up spending this non-Social Security surplus.

We will have some votes later today or tomorrow where there will be efforts to strike points of order in the budget which represent our discipline in trying to stay with the budget we have adopted. Despite all the rhetoric about cuts, there are no cuts in this budget. Defense spending grows by almost 5 percent, and nondefense spending

grows faster than inflation. How many families in America would say they have a lower family budget if their income grew by more than inflation did this year? Nobody would say that. But then we are not constrained to logic or reason or fact when we are talking about these budgets.

I urge my colleagues, in this golden moment of economic prosperity, when revenues are gushing into the Treasury, when Americans are working and prospering and rejoicing in it, we have an opportunity to fix Social Security forever with an investment-based system so that we don't have to cut benefits of people who are retired today and so that young people will own their own investments to pay for their retirement. We have an opportunity to fix Medicare with reasonable reforms that promote economy and efficiency and that help people who cannot afford pharmaceuticals to get them without destroying the coverage that 65 percent of our citizens have. And we have a chance to do things that need to be done—repeal the marriage penalty, repeal the death tax.

If we keep this spending spree underway, if we keep spending more and more money, in the end those things are not going to get done. What we need to do is to try to exercise the kind of responsibility that American families exercise when they look further than just the moment, when they look at their future and look at the problems they face and opportunities they have.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts to offer a resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, what is the matter that is before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment numbered 2926 offered by the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, to get back to the Bingaman amendment, I will take a few moments of the Senate's time to spell out where we are today in the area of education. I think most Americans believe there ought to be a partnership between the Federal Government, the States, and local communities. Most parents want to make sure their children are advanced in terms of academic achievement and accomplishment. Most Americans want to see opportunities for continued education available to their children. Most Americans understand and support programs that will assist gifted and talented needy children who want to continue their education by getting some help to further their education.

It is important, as we are considering the budget amendment of Senator BINGAMAN, that we look over exactly where we are and examine what has been the record of the Republican leadership on the help and assistance to education in recent years.

The 2001 GOP budget resolution, I believe, deserves a failing grade on education. It is anti-education, it is anti-children, and it is anti-family. The Republicans claim their budget makes a substantial investment in education, but, as we have had to do every year since the GOP took the majority in Congress in 1995, we must be equally vigilant of Republicans when it comes to education funding. Over and over, we have heard their rhetoric, but the reality is just the opposite. They say they want to invest in education, but their record shows they won't and don't. Year after year it is the same story.

If we look back at the contrast between 1980 and 1999, the Federal share of education funding has declined. This demonstrates what percent of the Federal budget was going for elementary and secondary education: 11.9 percent in 1980; 7.7 percent in 1999. In higher education, it was 15.4 percent, and now we are down to 10.7 percent. This is what we have had over the last few years: a major withdrawal of Federal participation in the area of aid to both elementary-secondary as well as higher education.

Having seen the percentage of our budget allocated to education, look at what has happened to the enrollment in K through 12. In 1990, 46.4 million students were enrolled in school. We are up to 54.4 million and continuing to rise. We have seen this incredible expansion of the number of children attending K through 12, increasing pressures on local communities, increasing pressures on the State, and increasing pressures, obviously, if we are going to meet our responsibility. The total number of enrollment has been growing steadily—every community in this country can tell us that. Talk to the school boards, talk to the parents, talk to the teachers. However, our percent of GNP is decreasing in education.

Look what is happening in higher education, the millions of Americans who are attending colleges and universities across this country. It has gone from 12.2 million in 1985 up to an estimated 15.6 million in 2005. An increase in the total number of K through 12 students, an increase in the number of students attending higher education, and what has been the corresponding Federal response? A decline in terms of helping and assisting families across the country.

Let's look at the record of the Republican history of cutting education funding in appropriations bills.

In 1995, when the Republican leadership took control of the House and the Senate, we had a rescission. The money had already been appropriated. The President signed it. We had a request to cut back, but of all the different areas of the Federal Government, we only cut funding in the area of education. This is about the same time the Republican leadership wanted to abolish the Department of Education. Their 1996 budget would have reduced the

Federal investment in education by one-third over 7 years, forcing deep cuts in Head Start and aid to elementary and secondary education, freezing funding for Pell grants, and slashing \$10 billion from student loans.

Their 1997 budget would have slashed education by 20 percent over six years, causing 1.3 million students to lose Pell grants, and 344,000 children to lose Title I support.

Their 1999 and 2000 budgets were no different. They claimed to invest in education, but the numbers always added up to a loss for students, families, schools, and colleges across the country.

This is the fact, Mr. President. We can go through all kinds of shenanigans and gimmicks, but these are the facts. They are printed in the RECORD. The current Republican budget will cut education by \$4.7 billion below President Clinton's level. It is no surprise that they refuse to address basic education priorities. Once again, the GOP budget fails to meet the obvious need. Parents want the help today. Parents want to improve the quality of education now.

The Republican budget claims a \$4.5 billion increase in Department of Education programs in fiscal year 2001. But, \$2.3 billion of that amount is for a new mandatory program that is not contained in current law, and if it were, it would not direct funding to states until at least 2005.

That leaves an increase of \$2.2 billion for discretionary education programs in the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. But, the Republican budget also assumes a \$700 million increase in Pell grants, to increase the maximum grant by \$200 to \$3,500—bringing it to the President's level. In addition, it claims a \$2.6 billion increase for elementary and secondary education programs. That's a total increase of \$3.3 billion specified for K-12 education programs and Pell grants. But, the Republican resolution only allows for a \$2.2 billion increase.

That means the Republican budget robs Peter's education to pay for Paul's education. It would force \$1.1 billion in cuts, below last year for higher education.

Now, the Budget Committee will say: Well, we have \$2.3 billion that we may appropriate, and it will be mandatory spending to try to help schools improve themselves. We want to try to help improve the schools today. That is what the President wants—that is what this amendment is about. It is about today and trying to get sufficient resources to try to help families across the country.

So that is the spread, Mr. President. Look at what happens when we look at the particular expenditures in the areas of higher education, as well as in K through 12. With the President's request, we have a \$500 million increase in the fiscal year 2001. This includes all higher education funding, except Pell grants. The President's would be \$500 million.

The Republican's 2001 budget resolution forces \$1.1 billion in cuts, below last year for higher education. Do we understand that? That is the reality. We are talking now about higher education funding, except for Pell grants. Where are these cuts? I haven't heard a great deal of talk from those on the Budget Committee.

The College Work-Study program would be cut by \$282 million below the President's request, reducing the ability of 286,000 students to work their way through college. Massachusetts students would lose \$14 million in funding for college work study opportunities.

TRIO would be cut by \$222 million below the President's request, denying an additional 195,000 disadvantaged students the opportunity to prepare for college and attend college. This is a reduction in the TRIO Program, which is the program to try to help gifted and talented, first generation college students go on to college.

Under the Republican budget, GEAR UP would be cut by \$169 million below the President's request, denying 810,000 low-income middle and high school students access to academic and support services needed to increase their academic achievement and to prepare them to pursue a college education. With the money appropriated last year, 80 percent of the seventh graders in the city of Boston will have a chance to move on to graduate together and hopefully will be guaranteed, when they do graduate, that they will be qualified and able to go to college.

Colleges and middle schools are working together to provide additional help and assistance to students by educating their families about the importance of a college degree. They are getting whole school communities to think that college is a reality for their children. The TRIO Programs have been an excellent model for building cohorts of young people from different schools. GEAR UP's objective is to build the capacity of under-achieving schools by getting all of their students to think about college early, prepare for college, and move on to achieve the highest education level possible. We have seen extraordinary success in different parts of the country where this program has been implemented. These important programs would be significantly cut back by the budget resolution.

The Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants program would also be cut by \$199 million below the President's request, reducing support for 346,000 needy undergraduate students. Massachusetts would lose \$9 million that helps its colleges and universities provide needy undergraduate students with additional financial aid. That adds up to a \$1.1 billion cut.

Make no mistake about the great importance of this amendment. If you are concerned about the higher education cuts, now look what happened here on K through 12 education programs.

The Republican budget cuts K through 12 education programs by \$1.4 billion below the President's request. The other side can say they put on an additional \$1 billion in special education. We agree on increasing funding for IDEA—our amendment will match that level. But, it's still not enough. All we are trying to do is make sure these other programs are getting adequate funding. The Republican budget does nothing to ensure the pressing education needs of families and communities across the country will be met, and ensure new, substantial investments in what works.

But I remind our friends that when we had the opportunity, even a year ago, when the Republicans had their \$780 billion tax cut and a number of us offered an amendment to try to provide full funding for special education needs and reduce the tax cut for wealthy individuals, virtually every Member of this side voted in favor of it and there was Republican opposition to it. We are glad we have an additional billion dollars. But if we are going to compare apples to apples and oranges to oranges, we can say this is an increase of \$2.6 billion, and that would be \$4 billion, but you still have the dramatic spread in the area of K through 12.

The Bingaman/Kennedy/Murray Education amendment would reverse these unacceptable cuts in the GOP budget and increase the national investment in education by \$5.6 billion in FY2001 and \$34.7 billion over 5 years. It will give parents and communities the support they need to provide every child with a good public school education, and to send every qualified student to college. It would reduce the tax cut by 15% in the first year, and 18% over 5 years. It would use 14% of the on-budget surplus over 5 years.

The Republican budget cuts \$450 million from the President's request for the bipartisan class size reduction program, preventing the hiring of 20,000 additional qualified teachers to reduce class size in grades 1-3. Massachusetts communities would lose \$7.3 million to help them further reduce class size next year.

Our amendment continues the national commitment to smaller classes by providing \$1.75 billion to continue the effort to hire 100,000 teachers to reduce class size in the early grades. The funding will bring the total number of qualified teachers hired to 49,000.

Research has documented what parents and teachers have always known—smaller classes improve student achievement. In small classes, students receive more individual attention and instruction. Students with learning disabilities are identified earlier, and their needs can be met without placing them in costly special education. In small classes, teachers are better able to maintain discipline. Parents and teachers can work together more effectively to support children's education. We also know that overcrowded classrooms undermine discipline and decrease student morale.

Project STAR studied 7,000 students in 80 schools in Tennessee. Students in small classes performed better than students in large classes in each grade from kindergarten through third grade. Follow-up studies show that the gains lasted through at least eighth grade, and the gains were larger for minority students.

STAR students were less likely to drop out of high school, and more likely to graduate in the top 25% of their classes. STAR students in smaller classes in grades K-3 were between 6 and 13 months ahead of their regular-class peers in math, reading, and science in grades 4, 6, and 8. Michigan, California, Nevada, Florida, Texas, Utah, Illinois, Indiana, New York, Oklahoma, Iowa, Minnesota, Massachusetts, South Carolina, and Wisconsin have initiated or considered STAR-like class size reduction efforts.

Our amendment helps communities modernize their schools by providing \$1.3 billion in grants and loans for the urgent repair of 5,000 public elementary and secondary schools in high-need areas. States will be able to issue \$25 billion in interest-free bonds to help build and modernize 6,000 schools.

Nearly one third of all public schools are more than 50 years old. 14 million children in a third of the nation's schools are learning in substandard buildings. Half of all schools have at least one unsatisfactory environmental condition. The problems with ailing school buildings are not the problems of the inner city alone. They exist in almost every community—urban, rural, or suburban.

In addition to modernizing and renovating dilapidated schools, communities need to build new schools in order to keep pace with rising enrollments and to reduce class sizes. Elementary and secondary school enrollment has reached an all-time high this year of 53.4 million students, and will continue to grow. The number will rise by 324,000 in 2000, by 282,000 in 2001, and by 250,000 in 2002. It will continue on this upward trend in the following years.

According to a report this year, total unmet school modernization needs, including technology and infrastructure, totals \$307 billion—almost three times the amount estimated in 1995.

This amendment expands after-school opportunities for children by increasing funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers from \$453 million to \$1 billion for FY2001.

Each day, 5 million children, many as young as 8 or 9 years old, are home alone after school. Juvenile crime peaks in the hours between 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. Children unsupervised are more likely to be involved in anti-social activities and destructive patterns of behavior.

Children who attend quality after-school programs while their parents work have better peer relations, better emotional adjustments, better grades, and better conduct in schools. They

have more learning opportunities and more enrichment activities. Research also shows that students participating in after-school programs have higher achievement in reading and math, are more interested in learning, are more likely to stay in school, and are less likely to be involved in crime.

Our amendment supports tough accountability for results, by increasing funding for Title I Accountability grants by \$116 million to \$250 million, to accelerate efforts by states and school districts to turn around failing schools.

Stronger accountability in education is imperative. Effective accountability steps—what business leaders call quality control measures—can make sure that public tax dollars are used wisely and produce better results for children.

Despite concerted efforts by states, school districts, and schools, the accountability provisions in Title I have not been adequately implemented due to insufficient resources. In 1998, only 8 states reported that their support teams have been able to serve the majority of schools in need of improvement. Less than half of the schools in need of improvement reported that they received additional professional development or technical assistance.

We must make all our schools accountable for good teaching and improved student achievement. We cannot turn our backs on low-performing schools. We must do all we can to improve them. Schools, school districts, and states need additional support and resources to address weaknesses soon after they are identified.

The amendment increases support for Title I by \$1 billion to ensure that the neediest students get the extra help they need to succeed in school. Disadvantaged communities need more help to ensure that all public schools give children a good education. Title I is working in many schools across the country. We should help bring that success to every community.

Ninety-nine percent of Title I funds go to local school districts. In addition, Title I and other federal programs are much more targeted to high-poverty districts than state and local funds.

More than 80 percent of poor school districts, and almost half of all districts nationwide, report that Title I is "driving standards-based reform in the district as a whole." In addition, Title I funds, as well as other federal education funds, are more targeted to high-poverty districts than state and local funds. Title I now supports 95% of the highest-poverty schools and is helping these schools to dramatically improve student performance.

As I mentioned, in the higher education, we are talking about the GEAR UP program, which reaches out to low- and middle-income high school students to help them so they can continue on to higher education. The amendment increases funding for GEAR UP by \$125 million to \$325 million, to put more low-income middle

and high school students on the path to college. This increase will support at least one state or local partnership in every eligible state. It will also leverage the resources of more than 2,400 community organizations and businesses as partners, and provide services to 1.4 million low-income students.

Our amendment would also increase funding for TRIO by \$80 million to \$725 million, to expand and improve post-secondary outreach and student support programs for 760,000 minority and disadvantaged students.

Our amendment increases the maximum Pell Grant by a total of \$400—from the current maximum of \$3,300 to \$3,700.

Pell Grants are the most effective way to make college a reality for the nation's neediest students. Yet, today, the maximum grant is worth only 86% of its 1980 value in constant dollars. Clearly, we have fallen behind. We are failing to maintain our commitment to make college accessible to the neediest students.

I am pleased that the Committee accepted the Feingold-Smith amendment to increase the maximum Pell grant by \$200 to \$3,500. But it's not enough.

The average family income of Pell recipients is \$14,500. In 1997-98, approximately 87% of all Pell Grant recipients had incomes less than or equal to \$30,000. These students come from working families who sacrifice to make sure that their children can go to college. These parents understand the importance of education, and they want to make sure that their children have every advantage.

Opening the doors of college to more students should be a high priority for Congress. Nearly 4 million students received Pell Grants in 1999. Our \$400 increase translates into 96,000 new Pell grant recipients. In Massachusetts, 4,000 additional students would receive Pell Grants.

Our amendment also increases funding for College Work-Study by \$77 million to \$1 billion, which will give 1 million students the opportunities to work their way through college.

Now, Mr. President, finally, I want to mention an extraordinary factor in higher education. Mr. President, we know that 89% of children who come from families with incomes over \$74,000 attend college, but only 40% of children from families with incomes below \$25,000 attend college and only 1 in 4 attend a 4-year college. May I have 5 more minutes on the resolution?

Mr. REID. I yield 5 more minutes on the resolution to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you. Family income should not determine whether a child goes to college—their academic achievement should be the only factor to consider. Let's promise kids a level playing field for college. Let's make sure that if a student is qualified to attend college, the money will be there so that they have the credentials that they need to more fully participate in

our economy than their parents were able to participate.

That is a family value, Mr. President. We hear many around here talk about family values. Minimum wage is a family value—about respect for work and people having an opportunity to live with dignity. A family value is the quality to be able to succeed and continue their education at a time when it is essential if they are going to have any economic opportunities. Every year, we cut back on that opportunity and reduce and fly-specking this particular budget, and we diminish this country and the promise it has for the children of this Nation. That is what this amendment is about. The Democrats believe we ought to invest in the young people of this country. We believe that is a higher priority than tax breaks for the wealthy individuals.

We will have an opportunity to call the roll on that. We hope we are not going to be denied that chance by our good Republican friends. Let's have a vote on this particular measure. I stand with those who say if you deny us an opportunity with a second-degree amendment, we are coming back again and again on this budget resolution until we get a vote.

What are they going to be frightened of in terms of this particular amendment? We are either going to stand for working families, the children of working families, and for talented young people to be able to have their dream and be part of the American dream, or we want to nickel and dime them in order to have a tax break for wealthy individuals in this society. You couldn't have a clearer opportunity on the issue of priorities: Who is going to stand with the young people in this country today, and who is going to stand for a tax cut?

I hope when the time comes, this body will support the Bingaman amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I extend to the senior Senator from Massachusetts 15 minutes off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I thank the Senator from Nevada. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts, whose passion and understanding of this issue provide the most important leadership in the country with respect to the question of education.

I join him on the floor of the Senate in an absolute state of incredulity that the Republicans can turn their backs so brazenly and so overtly on the educational opportunities that are needed for young people in our country.

We just had a conference in Massachusetts last Saturday with many leaders of what is called the "new economy." I think we are getting lost in all of this talk about a new economy and an old economy. What we are seeing is an economy in transition. It is in tran-

sition because we are moving into a very different world—a world where skills are more needed than ever before. Every single day, we talk about the economy and its changes—about the knowledge-based economy. The presumption is that people are able to get the knowledge on which that economy is based, that they are able to get the skills.

But at this conference in Boston, which is one of the leading cities in the Nation experiencing the changes in the economy today, we had leader after leader after leader of new technologies, not just the Internet—everybody talks about the Internet and the Internet companies, but there are a host of companies on which this new opportunity is based—but companies in biotechnology, artificial intelligence, robotics, advanced materials. You could run down a long list of critical technologies where the United States of America is in the lead today.

But guess what. We have a bill before the Senate to raise the number of visas which permit people to come into the country to fill technical slots. They are called H-1Bs. The level of H-1Bs was at 65,000. It was as high as 115,000 for a year or so. Several pieces of legislation are now seeking to enable up to 200,000 people to come in. But the leaders of the new revolution in our economy tell us that we are anywhere from 400,000 to 1 million people behind where we need to be in terms of hiring.

Here we are with a bill that might let in several hundred thousand at the end of this year or next year when the demand is 400,000 to a million, and when countless numbers of our citizens are facing a transition in their life—movement from the old kind of job to the new kind of job or the hope that they are going to be able to find some kind of job in the new economy where they can share the higher salaries that so many Americans are beginning to experience.

What do the business titans tell us? What are those leaders and entrepreneurs who are breaking the ground of the new economy—who, I might add, are in a voracious race with other countries for the market share. We are not the only people experiencing this. You go to Europe; you have all kinds of companies racing to try to grab their share of the markets. You go to Asia; the one thing leaders in Asia will tell you today is that they are focused on education. The one thing leaders of Europe will tell you they are focused on—and also in Latin America—is education because only by educating Americans ultimately are we not only going to provide the labor pool to be able to fill the jobs of this new economy, but, quite frankly, only by educating Americans are we going to have a citizenry that is capable of managing our own democracy and making the difficult kinds of decisions we will face in the future.

So one would think the Senate in facing this reality—it is not a partisan reality. Most of these leaders of industry

who are telling us in the Senate to wake up and pay attention to education are Republicans. They will tell us it is long since overdue that the United States make a more pronounced commitment to the education system of the country.

I know we don't run the education system at the Federal level, and none of us is advocating that we should. I understand that. I know no one wants Washington telling the local community what to do. I understand that. I don't want to tell them what to do. I would like to empower them to be able to do what they know they want to do but can't do because they don't have the resources.

All over this country, there are communities in rural areas and urban centers of the Nation where they don't have the tax base. In the United States of America, for some reason that is beyond me, we still base our school systems on the property tax, which is part of the old agrarian structure we had when we first founded our public school system. And yet, in the urban centers and in many rural centers where they don't yet share in the kinds of salaries or the kinds of opportunities as do other parts of the country, they don't have a property tax capacity to pay the teachers more money, put the equipment into the school, have an extended schoolday, have the kind of laboratories for language that they need, do the kinds of remedial work with students who are troubled, have dance, arts, music, sports, and the kinds of things that are the real stuff of a complete education.

What do these districts do? In some cases, they have received help from States because the States have engaged in education reform, and there is a State revenue sharing process. But where is the Federal Government? Where is the great equalizer which, as a matter of national priority, is supposed to help provide the kinds of empowerments to communities that federalism embraces? That is the whole notion of a national government. It is the whole notion of a Federal system of sharing so that all parts of the country are uplifted simultaneously.

We have some great public schools in Massachusetts. We have some great public schools in some urban centers where mayors have paid particular attention to help scrounge up enough money. But even in those areas, they are desperate for additional Federal assistance and for more capacity to do the things they know they need to do. Yet here we are with a budget resolution on the floor of the Senate which gives a very meager increase to the special needs side of the ledger. We are happy for some increase on the special needs side, but we fundamentally reduce the capacity of our schools to face this most important mission.

It ought to be an acceptable national priority that our citizens are well educated. It may be a responsibility of the local level to actually do it, but it is

certainly a Federal priority that it is done. If we have the capacity by leveraging resources to the local communities to empower those local communities to be able to achieve that national priority, we ought to do it.

Americans may not be aware that in the budget we are about to spend \$1.8 trillion of collected taxpayers' money. People ask, My God, out of \$1.8 trillion we cannot find \$5 billion additional for education?

A lot of that budget obviously goes to pay for the entitlement programs, including Social Security, Medicare, military retirement, and Federal and civilian disability benefits. We will spend over \$1 trillion of the \$1.8 trillion on all of the entitlement programs, which no one has suggested we will suddenly cut or stop. Then we have the defense spending as well as everything else the Government does that will come out of the remaining \$600 or \$700 billion. Out of that \$600 billion, we have to make interest payments on the national debt, pay for our defense, build our highways, channel our harbors, finance mass transit, pay for housing assistance, nutrition programs, finance health research, public health programs, fund crime control, drug trafficking, and foreign aid, which is minuscule compared to the total budget. All of these are by choice of our majority, and when measured against other significant choices, it leaves precious little money for education.

Why? Because they want to give a \$150 billion, 5-year tax break to the wealthiest people in America. Every single tax break they have ever brought to the floor of the Senate has been with 60 percent or more going to the top 20 percent of income earners of America. I have gladly voted for many of the tax cuts we have given over the last years I have been in the Senate. In the year 2000, we are looking at about a 1-million-person gap in the high-skilled labor needs of this country.

Kids in our schools test ahead only of Cyprus and South Africa in math and science. Kids in our country are reading at a 1988 level that hasn't progressed since then. Because of the property tax revolution in California, Massachusetts, and a lot of other States, we saw the schools decimated over the last 10 years. Programs were cut, libraries were shut, and teachers' pay was not raised. We now need 2 million additional teachers in the course of the next 10 years. We need 1 million of those teachers over the course of the next 5 years.

It is precious hard to find a kid out of most colleges who says, I want to teach, when teaching means starting anywhere from \$22,000 though \$27,000, and after 15 years of teaching and getting a master's degree you can get into the thirties and the forties, depending on the system in which you are working in this country. Their colleagues from college will be earning \$40,000 and \$50,000 a year within a couple of years

of getting out of college. College graduates today have \$50,000 or \$100,000 in loans and have to begin paying back those loans immediately.

What kid at the top percentile of their class, with \$100,000 in loans, will say, yes, I will go into an urban center at \$20,000-plus a year, so I never have a chance to send my kids to college unless they get a scholarship or I somehow qualify for assistance? If that isn't a national emergency, I don't know what is a national emergency.

Yet this budget does nothing to address the question of how the Federal Government is going to assist these revenue-starved communities to be able to deal with the problem of education in this country. It does nothing to answer the question of executives across the Nation about how they will have a skilled labor pool in the future that will be able to address the question of education. It goes backwards. Under their proposal, there will be a cut.

The President has proposed a hiring of teachers to reduce class sizes so we get a nationwide average of 18 students per class. But what happens? Under their proposal, 20,000 new teachers could not be hired in order to do that. It cuts \$540 million from the President's request for 21st century community learning centers where approximately 1.6 million school-age children in over 6,000 new centers would have access to before- and afterschool programs. Again, it defies common sense to believe we are going to continue to turn our backs.

I do understand some of it. I understand some of our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle don't want to put money into the Federal education system unless it is done in one way—maybe a big block grant that has no targeting whatever with respect to any of the priorities we might embrace as a Federal Government.

For instance, if we happen to believe it is important in certain States that Head Start be a priority or that afterschool programs be a priority or early childhood intervention be a priority, and we think as a matter of Federal priorities it is very important that at least the Federal Government say, hey, you go decide how you want to spend the money—if you want to put it into this kind of child care or that kind of child care, that is your business; we just want to make sure some of it goes to child care; that is all we are looking for—we cannot even get that kind of an agreement.

The great divide in the Senate is over putting some money into a grant where there is so much discretion that States that have never chosen to do any of these things could continue to choose not to do any of these things. Is that a smart expenditure of Federal dollars? I don't think so.

We are not even going to have an opportunity in this budget resolution to guarantee that the kind of dollars that ought to be part of that will be part of

it. So we will see reductions in the total amount of expenditure in order to have some huge tax cut as a matter of priority at a time when the Federal component of taxation is at its lowest level since I have been in the Senate. It seems to me we ought to be measuring our priorities a little bit more carefully.

I know my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to come to the floor and say: We put additional money into the special needs sector, into IDEA. They have about \$1 billion that goes into IDEA.

All the other priorities, the real stuff of educating in America today, are in the cities and the rural areas that do not have the tax base. No matter what they say about money that will go into education spending, there is nothing in this budget that will guarantee those communities most in need are going to find the additional funding they need to address the needs of education in the country.

We should be talking about putting somewhere between \$40 billion to \$50 billion over the next 10 years in additional funding for education. We should probably have a significant separate trust fund that guarantees education is going to be the kind of top priority it needs to be, so every school in America has the ability to keep its doors open into the evening so parents—who are working extra hours, many of them single parents who have their kids in child care during the day and would like to have ongoing education—can participate in the new economy and have the ability to use school facilities well into the evening, even while their children may be there also getting their homework done in a secure environment so they can go to school the next day ready to learn.

In community after community in the United States, there are kids on waiting lists for Head Start, early childhood intervention—for all those programs that bring a child to the first grade ready to learn. I have talked to so many first grade teachers who tell me they have kids coming into a classroom with 25 kids in a class, 30 kids in a class, and the kids cannot even do the elementary things kids coming to first grade ought to be able to do such as early numbers or recognizing shapes and forms and colors. So they have to step aside and they have to deal with the problem of that child, magnified five, six, seven, eight times over, and try to deal with the mainstreaming of a full class of 25 kids at the same time.

We believe the standard of education that requires you have 18 kids and no more in a class is appropriate. These are the kinds of priorities left out of this budget. I regret that enormously. I regret this budget is a negative against even the rate of growth of inflation. I hope we will have a chance to rectify that in the days ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time do I have in opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 36 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield up to 20 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico. I congratulate him on putting together this budget resolution, which was a very difficult task in the present climate. It is ironic; when we are running surpluses, it is almost more difficult to put together a budget than when we are running deficits. But through the adept and able leadership of the Senator from New Mexico, this budget has come forward. It is an excellent effort to address the issues which are critical to our country, especially the issue of protecting Social Security, as he does in this budget, so no Social Security funds are spent for anything other than Social Security, and the effort to protect some of the on-budget surplus so it will be available for debt reduction but also for reducing taxes for hard-working Americans who pay that extra money in that is no longer needed by the Government.

The effort we are talking about today is in a number of categorical areas, but specifically today we are mentioning the area of education. I wanted to speak to the Bingaman amendment and some of the comments that were made, especially by the Senator from Massachusetts, first to their inaccuracy and second their inconsistency as to how we address quality education in this country. In fact, I can speak to the remarks of both Senators from Massachusetts who have spoken on this topic because I tend to disagree rather pointedly with both of them.

Let me begin with Senator BINGAMAN's amendment. He held up a chart. It has been referred to by a number of Senators on the other side. The chart showed how much of an increase the Democratic leadership proposed in spending, and then they showed the Republican budget on the same account, same chart. They showed our budget being about \$5 billion below what they were. What they failed to put up on the chart—which I found ironic and sort of misleading, relative to the way the debate was going—is the President's number.

What did the President ask for in education? What the President asked for in education, if they had put it on the chart, would look something like this: The President asked for the greenish-blue line here. I am not sure what color you would call that—aqua, I guess. The aqua line here, that represents the President's request in education. Our request, what we put in the budget for education, is the red line. In each of the years of the budget, the Republican budget exceeds what the

President of the United States asked for in education.

This yellow insert here—which we had to jury-rig because we did not actually have the chart of the Senator from New Mexico—would be the Senate Democratic proposal. It is a dramatic increase over what the President requested and what we have put in our budget, which is an increase over what the President requested.

So there is a bit of inconsistency for the Members of the other side of the aisle to come to the floor and savage the Republicans in this House, and the Republican budget, on the issue of education and not mention the fact we exceeded the President's request. Why didn't they savage the President's budget, too? Why didn't the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER—she said we did not care about kids—say the President didn't care about kids? Maybe she just forgot. The President's budget was actually less—less than what we have put in our budget for education.

I think what we have is a classic attempt at grandstanding, trying to throw more money at an issue and trying to address a problem, not by addressing it substantively but simply by saying: We outspent you on that issue, so you don't do as well as we do on education.

Actually, we do very well on education. As I mentioned, we exceed the President's number in each year. It is not the dollars so much; it is the way we spend the dollars that I think is important to note. This is where I have disagreements with both Senators from Massachusetts who recently spoke on this matter, because there is a fundamental disagreement of philosophy on how we should address education. It is not a difference over money, really. As I said, our dollars exceed what the President requested for education. It is a difference of philosophy.

Stated very simply, there are two philosophical differences. The first is that on the Republican side of the aisle, we think when the Federal Government says to the local school districts, you must spend a certain amount of money on education and we, the Federal Government, will help you by paying a percentage of the cost of that spending, when the Federal Government puts that type of mandate on local school districts, the Federal Government ought to live up to its obligation. It ought to pay the money it says it is going to pay. Before it starts new educational programs, it ought to pay for the ones it already requires from the States.

What am I talking about here? Special education, IDEA. It has been alluded to by the other side of the aisle. It is almost a throwaway line there, at least from the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. KERRY: Oh, sure, the Republicans will talk about IDEA, but we have done more about education; we don't have to worry about IDEA.

IDEA is probably the most significant area you could find where the

Federal Government has failed to fulfill its obligations to the school districts of this country. It is the largest unfunded mandate which the Federal Government puts on the States and the school districts, and which therefore causes the States and school districts to have to pay for the Federal share and, as a result, take local resources and reallocate them to pay the Federal obligation and, as a result, skew the local budgets.

Local school districts, which would probably want to have better language courses, better computers, maybe more teachers, better trained teachers, smaller classes, can't do any of these things, in many instances, because they are having to take a large amount of their local dollars to pay for the Federal share of special education.

On this side of the aisle, we have said that is wrong. We have said it is wrong now for 4 years. Every one of the President's budgets that has come up here over the last 4 years has had virtually no increase in special education funding, even though the Federal Government, when we arrived as a Republican Senate, was only paying 6 percent of the costs of special ed funding in this country when it originally said it was going to pay 40 percent of the costs. Even though the Federal Government was paying such a minimal part of the cost of special education, this administration has never sent us a budget that has significantly increased special education dollars.

They have always taken the attitude, and it has been supported by the other side of the aisle: What the heck, let the local school districts pick up the Federal share. We are going to start a new categorical program that says to the local school districts you must, in order to get the Federal dollars, start this new program, too, rather than funding the special ed dollars which were originally owed.

The practical effect of that, as I have said, is to skew the local budgets, and too many local school districts have been unable to do things they might have wanted to do because they have had to cover the Federal share of special education dollars.

So what did we as a Republican Senate do? We changed that paradigm. In the last 4 years, we have more than doubled the funding for special education. We have gone from 6 percent up to almost 13 percent of the special ed dollars. In this budget, we increase it significantly again. It is our No. 1 priority. Yes, it is our No. 1 priority as a Congress, as a Republican Congress: Fund special education because that is our obligation. We said we would do that back in 1976, when Public Law 94-142 was passed.

So it is not a throwaway line for us. It is something we should do. Yes, that is where some of our dollars are flowing. When we exceed the President's budget in education spending, which we do, some of that excess spending in education goes into special ed, a sig-

nificant amount more than what the President requested. He requested virtually none, no increase.

So that is the first fundamental difference. We believe the special ed student deserves to get the funds, the funding support to which the Federal Government originally committed.

(Mr. HAGEL assumed the chair.)

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, why do we believe that? We believe it, first, because it is an unfunded mandate, but more important, because in our school districts across this country, that special-needs child and his or her parents are being put in the impossible position of going into school meeting after school meeting and being told that resources are being used to pay for their child that should be used to pay for other children in the school district.

As a result, the special-needs children and their parents are being put in an untenable position. They did nothing wrong. The people who did things wrong were the President and this administration for failing to fund special ed.

We are saying let's give the special-needs children in this country a little relief, and let's fund special ed.

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

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

Mr. SANTORUM. The Senator from Massachusetts, who just spoke, talked about how their legislation targets those schools in inner cities and poor areas that are most in need of this help and that our increase in spending will not do that. Can the Senator from New Hampshire tell me where the highest percentage of populations of IDEA students are located?

Mr. GREGG. Ironically, in Massachusetts, from where the Senator who was just speaking comes, 30 percent of their students are coded as special needs. If one looks at it across the country, most special-needs children, regrettably, do come from lower income school districts. They tend to have a higher percentage of kids in special needs.

Mr. SANTORUM. I guess my question is, by putting more money into IDEA, are we actually sending more money into the schools on which he believes we need to be focusing?

Mr. GREGG. There is no question about that. As we increase special education funding, the Senator from Pennsylvania is absolutely right, more of that funding will be flowing to schools in lower income districts and also in rural districts.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GREGG. The second philosophical difference we have with the other side of the aisle is, again, highlighted by the discussion of the Senator from Massachusetts who said essentially there are a lot of States that do not know what they are doing in the area of education and we, the Federal Government, do know what we are doing; therefore, the programs from

the Federal Government should be categorical so that States live up to their obligations to do what we in the Federal Government tell them they should do in education.

It is essentially the attitude of "we know best" in Washington how to run the school districts across this country; that the people who run the school districts—the local school boards that are usually elected, the local legislatures that are always elected, and the Governors of States who are elected—that these individuals, for whom education is usually their No. 1 priority because it is their No. 1 spending issue, as compared with the Federal Government which has other priorities like national defense, Medicare and Social Security, these individuals who are almost all elected are not capable of doing their job.

That is essentially the attitude taken on the other side of the aisle when they say we in the Federal Government know best how to run education and States do not know what they are doing in education; therefore, our programs must be categorical. They must tell the States exactly what they must do with dollars coming to them from Washington.

It is a little bit of a disconnect, of course, because the dollars coming from Washington did not start in Washington. They started in the States. They came to Washington. Then we took 15 to 20 percent off the top and sent it back to the States. Maybe they got 80 percent back, but certainly not 100 percent. In any event, it is not our money in Washington.

As a practical matter, we do not know more about running a school than the local school districts. I, for example, do not contend I know more about the Epping School District than the people in Epping or the people on the school board in Epping. When they look at their elementary school, they know whether they need another teacher or another classroom, whether they need computers or whether they happen to need a new baseball field or language course. I do not know that. It is not my purpose to tell them how to run their school district. So our philosophy of education on this side is a little different.

They say it is a block grant; just send the money. No, that is not it at all. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which we passed in the HELP Committee a couple of weeks ago, will be before the Senate in a few weeks. That bill has a brandnew approach to education. The theme is not that we are going to send the money back in a great big huge block grant and the States can do whatever they want. It is not we are going to send it back with a targeted proposal and tell people what they must do with it. It is a different approach.

The theme is, first, that funds should be spent for purposes of the child. The child is the center of our attention.

Second, we will look for achievement on the part of the child to be sure they are actually learning.

Third, there is flexibility.

And fourth, there is accountability.

We have reoriented these programs so that we send the money back, yes. For example, in our Teacher Empowerment Act, we send the money back in a rather large lump sum. We take the Eisenhower grants and the class size money and put it together. Then we say: You can use this money, local school districts. You do not have to hire a new teacher if you do not need a new teacher. You can use it to hire new teachers if you want to reduce class size. You can use it to improve the ability of your teachers to teach. You can use it to give teachers more support. You can even use it to pay teachers. They cannot keep the really good teachers in the classrooms because they are being hired by the private sector. This is especially true of our science and math teachers who are leaving because the opportunities are so lucrative outside education.

You can pay teachers more to keep them by using bonus payments. You can use it for any of those things, but you have to produce results. We are not going to tell you how to produce results. We are not going to tell you that you must have 17 kids to every teacher. We are not going to tell you that you must have a computer in every classroom. We are not going to tell you that you must have a classroom that is 6 feet by 25 feet or 12 feet by 13 feet. We are not going to tell you how many books you must have in your library.

No, we say: You can get the money and use it for these defined areas, and you have flexibility to use it in those areas, but you have to show us that the academic achievement of the low-income child—because that is where ESEA is basically aimed in the title I funds—is improving in relation to the other kids in the school. You have to have tests—not designed by the Federal Government; we are not out to design tests because that means we end up designing curriculum—tests that are designed by the local school districts and the States. Those tests have to ascertain annually whether or not the children in the low-income categories are improving academically.

What a radical idea—we expect kids to learn. We are not going to tell schools how to teach. We are not going to tell schools the ratio of their classes. We are not going to tell schools the size of their classes. What we say is take this money and show us that kids are learning something and that they are improving in their academic achievement.

That is a very radical idea. It is the idea we are pushing forward as an approach to education. It is not a block grant. It is not: Here is all the money and you can do whatever you want with it. It is: Here are the dollars, but we are not smart enough to tell you, the local school district, how to im-

prove your children's education and what you need because we cannot look into every classroom and guide every classroom, even though they would like to do that on the other side of the aisle.

On the other side of the aisle, they want to have a string running from every desk out to every classroom in America; 30,000 strings running off the desks, and pull a string here and there so every classroom in America has to fall into exactly what we outline in Congress. That is not the approach we suggest.

The approach we suggest is, take the money and use it in a variety of different areas; have flexibility, but then show us, prove to us, that achievement is improving amongst those children who are targeted with the dollars. That is our approach to education. That is what is funded in this bill.

Let me remind you, one more time, what the Bingaman amendment fails to mention: Our funding in this bill exceeds the President's funding in his budget. Therefore, our proposals in this bill make a lot of sense. They address the IDEA issue; they address special ed; they address the need to fund children in schools at a level that is appropriate and actually exceeds the President's level, and, more importantly than that, they expect the kids to achieve. As a result of achieving, we are going to get a much better return for the dollars we spend.

Mr. KERRY. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. Sure.

Mr. KERRY. It is my understanding, reading the Republican budget, that \$2.3 billion of the money that the Senator claims is for an increase—

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I will have to reserve my time. If the Senator wants to use his time to ask a question, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. REID. We yield, off the resolution, 3 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. My understanding is, \$2.3 billion is for a new mandatory program that will not even be spent until the year 2005. That leaves an immediate increase of \$2.2 billion. But the Republican budget resolution also assumes the \$700 million increase in Pell grants. That brings it up to the President's level. It claims the \$2.6 billion increase for elementary and secondary education programs alone, of which \$1 billion is reserved for the IDEA. That means you have supposedly a total of \$3.3 billion specified for K through 12. But the resolution only allows for a \$2.2 billion increase because you do not even have an expenditure permission until 2005 for \$2.3 billion. So there is a lot of "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

Is that not true?

Mr. GREGG. Well, obviously it is not true. As the Senator knows, this is budget authority. Maybe the Senator skipped over that point or maybe he did not understand it. It is possible either way. But in either case, the Senator is wrong.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, that is not an answer to simply say it is wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I would like to make a comment, if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. REID. The Senator from Massachusetts is yielded 3 minutes.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, that is a classic response to simply say the Senator is wrong. But there is no showing to the contrary. The language of the budget is absolutely clear. There is no question it forces \$1.1 billion in cuts. But the way to have a debate is—to simply say it is wrong, and question whether the Senator's facts or capacity to even understand the facts are correct, I mean, we could talk about rule XIX here, but I am not going to do that. But I would suggest, we deserve a better debate than that.

I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished manager.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is yielded 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have come to the floor today to offer my support and thanks to Senators BINGAMAN and KENNEDY for offering this extremely important amendment.

Senator KERRY is exactly correct. The budget proposal before us is a sleight of hand. We should not be duped by that. It is very clear, in looking at the budget, that it shortchanges America's students.

The Republican budget proposal says tax cuts for a few are more important than a first-rate education for all of our children. Their budget tells students across America a tax cut is more important than their future.

We think that is wrong. We think that is incredibly wrong. We do not think America's students should only get the spare change left over after the Republican tax cut. America's students should not be the last in line in this budget. That is why we are offering this amendment today, to make sure all students get the resources they need to reach their full potential.

The Republican budget that is before us is very crafty because at first glance it looks as if education funding has been increased. But when you look closely at the numbers, it is really an empty promise. Senator KERRY of Massachusetts pointed that out. The rhetoric of this budget does not meet its reality.

I do want to acknowledge one thing. This underlying budget does one thing right. It does fund special education programs that the Senator from New Hampshire talked so eloquently about a few moments ago. That is important. We agree with that. Unfortunately,

that is the only thing this budget does well.

But every other education investment—whether it is reducing class size or improving teacher quality or modernizing our schools—is not treated as a priority in this budget. There are no guarantees in this budget that those other vital education programs will get the investments they need to continue to help America's students.

This budget funds one program and leaves the other programs hanging. It does not have to be this way. That is why I am supporting the Bingaman amendment.

This amendment says we can support special education. In fact, we support the same level as the Senator from New Hampshire. We are not disagreeing with that. But it says we can fund that and other key education investments at the same time. We should not have to choose which students get served. We should be serving every student. This amendment shows us how we can do that.

This budget's misplaced priorities will be felt in classrooms across the country. I am very concerned that this budget does not provide the resources to help our public schools move forward. I am concerned that this budget abandons the programs we know are working for students across this country.

Parents are asking us—pleading with us—to become partners with their local districts to help them with overcrowded classrooms. This Republican budget fails to make a commitment to reduce class size.

Teachers are asking us for more help in mastering the best ways to teach our children the basics. The Republican budget fails to make a commitment to teacher quality.

Students are asking us for schools where they can feel safe and secure when they get off that schoolbus or walk to school every day. This Republican budget fails to make a commitment to school safety.

Parents are asking—and pleading—for afterschool programs so their children will not get into trouble or become victims of violence after school. This Republican budget fails to make a commitment to afterschool programs.

Teachers and students are asking for school buildings that are modern. This Republican budget fails to make a commitment to modernizing our aging schools.

The American people are asking for a stronger commitment to the programs that make a difference in their child's education. But the Republicans are too focused on their exploding tax cut to meet these needs of America's students.

This budget freezes our progress. That is why our amendment would put the resources where parents and teachers and students need them the most.

The amendment before us will ensure adequate funding for a number of key educational priorities. To reduce over-

crowded classrooms, this amendment will provide \$1.75 billion to continue our Class Size Reduction Program. Any Senator here can go home to their State, to their local schools that have taken advantage of the class size money we have passed over the last 2 years, and talk to teachers, and hear them say the same things I hear; which is, it has made an incredible difference.

I have teachers tell me every time I visit one of these classrooms that, where 5 years ago, 3 years ago, they had 24, 25, 30 kids in a classroom, that today, where they have 16, 17, 18 kids in a classroom, the difference is remarkable.

Teachers tell me in the small classes we have provided dollars for, in the first, second, and third grades, that those students—every one of them—will be able to read at the end of this year because of that reduced class size. This is making a difference. We have to keep that obligation going. We need to keep that partnership going.

Schools tell me every day they could not have done it without the commitment and the partnership of the Federal Government. The underlying budget fails to meet that. With this amendment, we on our Democratic side meet that obligation.

Our amendment modernizes school buildings by providing \$1.3 billion. I was in a school a week ago where kids were in portables with no running water. In order to go to the bathroom they had to go outside in the rain, which is not uncommon in my State, go to another building and come back soaked. I saw kids in coats in classrooms because there was not enough heat in the school buildings.

We recognize we have an obligation, a partnership that we need to provide at the Federal level to meet these basic needs. Our amendment does that. This amendment looks at improving teacher quality. It provides \$2 billion for professional development to recruit new educators and reward excellent teachers. We all understand that we need to make sure we have young people today committed to becoming teachers for our students tomorrow. We need to provide the dollars to partner with our local schools to make sure that they can recruit those best and brightest among our young students to be the teachers for our classrooms tomorrow.

This amendment ensures that students have safe educational activities at the end of the school day. It ensures adequate funding for afterschool programs. I commend Senator BOXER for her tremendous work on this initiative. We address that in this amendment.

To make sure that disadvantaged students have the extra classroom attention they need, this amendment will increase funding for title I programs by \$1 billion. I have heard a lot of rhetoric in the HELP Committee and on the floor about local control and sending money to the States and that this is somehow miraculously going to happen. Talk to your local schools, as I

have; talk to your title I schools. They will tell you this program has changed dramatically since its inception. They will tell you they have much more flexibility and local control. They fear us sending a block grant to the State will mean they lose the access and the ability to ensure that the money will be there for disadvantaged students in the future.

This amendment recognizes how important title I funding is to ensure that the kids at the bottom get the opportunity to learn as well. We increase title I funding by \$1 billion to address the incredible needs out there.

Finally, this amendment will increase funding for Pell grants, grants that help disadvantaged students go to college, by \$400 per year for each student. I would guess that my colleagues hear the same thing I hear when I talk to young people about the incredible amount of debt they accrue when they go to college, debt they have to pay off. We have to make sure we allow the kids at the bottom to have access to higher education. We recognize this in the amendment by increasing the Pell grants for students so we can assure that more young people can go on to college and our best and brightest will be encouraged to go on to college no matter what their income is.

These are the types of investments we should be making in America's young people. Unfortunately, the Republicans have the wrong priorities in their budget. They are putting their tax cut ahead of the needs of America's students. We know they are wrong, and we have introduced this amendment to make sure our students don't lose out.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. For those members of the majority who are inclined to oppose it, I want them to know this amendment would take only 15 percent of the tax cut and put it towards education. I can't think of a better priority for this Senate to support. I don't think it is too much to ask for America's students. By voting for this amendment, we will be saying that the young people of our country are a priority. They deserve a budget that treats them as a priority.

I thank the Chair and yield my time back to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. DODD, is yielded 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, before my colleague from Washington leaves the floor, let me commend her for a very fine and eloquent statement. She brings to this debate not only an intellectual commitment to the issue but hands-on experience from her previous life directly involved in the education of young children.

I think it is valuable for us to pay attention to our colleagues who bring their life experiences to this Chamber and can help us be better enlightened

about what is needed. We certainly listen to our fellow colleague from Tennessee, a good doctor, when he talks about health care issues. We listen to other Members who were part of the private sector and add a significant contribution to the debate. It is a fortunate moment, indeed, that we have an educator, an elementary and secondary schoolteacher who was involved in early education, in our midst. I thank her for her efforts not only today but over the years on education issues.

I also commend the author of this amendment, our colleague from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, and the other cosponsors of this proposal.

It has already been pointed out but it is worth repeating: There are roughly 55 million children, from Maine to California, every day getting up to go to school. Of that 55 million who went off to school today, 50 million of them walked through the doors of a public school.

Our primary obligation is, obviously, to these students in public schools. That is not to say we are uninterested or not involved with the 5 million who go to private or parochial schools or a home school. But our fundamental, basic obligation goes to the public institutions that serve all children no matter their means, needs or backgrounds. That is primarily where our tax dollars flow.

Now, the federal investment in schools overall is small, shockingly small. Seven cents on every dollar that is contributed to the educational needs of children comes from the Federal Government; 93 cents of every dollar comes from State and local taxes. The lion's share of the cost of education is borne at the local and State level.

Historically, we have contributed as much as 12 percent. Today, we are down to 7. Although that is better than some recent years when it was even lower. This debate about what we do with our 7 cents may not seem like much, but to local communities, to parent-teacher associations, to school boards, to teachers, to superintendents, to principals at the local level, this 7 cents is important. It helps direct scarce and valuable resources towards those elements of national educational need that are most pronounced, most in demand, or should be.

For those who argue a block grant approach to the States, we do a great disservice to our local communities, where the bulk of the education costs are borne. We do a great disservice to them to deprive them of the direct funding in the areas they are crying out for help. To merely send a check back to the States, knowing full well that so many of these local communities lack the kinds of clout and influence at the State level, particularly those communities, rural and urban, that are most in need, is to do a great disservice to the parents and educators, to the citizens of those communities.

Outside of the dollar amounts, block grants also are a step backward in time as well as policy. We tried a block grant approach in the past. Basically, it was revenue sharing. I think the American public wants more than that. They want us to offer a sense of national purpose, what ought to be our goals, how best to achieve them, and support the efforts of local schools, local communities in meeting these.

Our goal is to get the dollars back to the community and the schools as fast and in the most direct, targeted way we can and not allow it to be interrupted. I hope as we go through the process this year of talking about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, we will keep in mind that it is our relationship with our parents, students and local communities, not with the States, on which we ought to focus.

Beyond these policy differences, this budget highlights our differences with the funding approach of the majority. When it comes to resource allocation, the majority claims that they have, in fact, increased spending on our schools, but the numbers just don't add up. I will explain why.

The No. 1 priority in this budget is a major tax cut. Again, I think the American public has spoken rather clearly on this issue. This budget provides for \$150 billion of tax cuts, at a minimum, over 5 years. Paying down the debt, dealing with Medicare, Social Security, and improving the quality of education in this country are a distant second, if even that, to that primary goal—A tax cut. Even though these other needs hold a far greater sense of priority for most Americans than a large tax cut which most people think is not warranted in this kind of an economy, the best economy we have had in the history of our country. To fund this tax cut, the budget cuts overall nondefense discretionary programs by 6.2 percent.

On education, this budget claims a \$4.5 billion increase in spending. Keep these numbers in mind. They say \$4.5 billion; \$2.3 billion of that is for a new mandatory program, a new program—it is hard enough to get funding for existing ones—a new mandatory program that won't be spent until the year 2005, 5 years from now. That leaves an increase of \$2.2 billion of the \$4.5 billion.

The Republican budget resolution also assumes a \$700 million increase in Pell grants to increase the maximum grant by \$200 to \$3,500, and a \$2.6 billion increase for elementary and secondary education programs alone, of which \$1 billion of that \$2.6 billion is for special education. If you have had your pencils out and added this up, all of these good sounding programs add up to \$3.3 billion.

That means to simply provide funding for these stated commitments, and level fund other programs, this budget should provide \$3.3 billion more than what our colleagues said, but this budget only provides for the additional \$2.2 billion in spending.

This gap can only be filled by cutting other education programs—core national efforts, such as college work-study, campus-based child care, TRIO, and GEAR UP would have to be cut by 22 percent to meet these goals.

There is no great new deal for education in America in this proposal. This is just another in the string of Republican budgets that undercut, undermine, and underfund education. The math is not complicated here. They say \$4.5 billion, but this isn't adequate to meet their commitments. So to make up the difference within the Department of Education, you would have to cut at least amount—22 percent—in the areas I have described.

We have and will continue to take a different approach on education funding. This is a key national priority. In the amendment, we are offering we make a simple proposition—a little bit less in tax cuts, 10 percent, in the first year, and 16 percent over 5 years, for an additional \$4.5 billion in education. That means cutting the \$150 billion tax cut by about \$15 billion—a tax cut nobody wants—and applying it to education to make all the difference in the world for children, families, and educators across this country.

Let it be clear, the choice is simple here. This amendment would support our efforts to accelerate change and improvement in our schools. The status quo is unacceptable. Our schools are improving. Children are doing better in many areas. Reading and math scores are up—not as high as they should be, but they are up—in nearly every age group and all the different groups of students across the country, particularly in our poorest schools.

Mr. President, but that is not good enough. We need to accelerate the pace of this change, and change doesn't come inexpensively. Someone once said, "If you think education is expensive, try ignorance as a cost." That is what we are going to get if we don't make intelligent investments in these programs.

What we propose is more resources, with more accountability and higher expectation for success. The budget by the majority, which is in front of us, of less funding for education goes right along with their proposals for education—block granting programs currently focused on areas of national need and concern, and transforming targeted, successful programs into vouchers for private schools. Remember, 50 million of the 55 million students are going in the door of public schools. This is a recipe for failure in our public educational system—dollars frittered away on the status quo, less targeting, less funding, less accountability.

If you want no accountability, put dollars into in a block grant. How do you follow that or find out where the dollars have gone if it ends up in one big, large block of money that goes back to the States? How do you track that and keep account of it? For those

of us who care about accountability, one sure way to get less of it is to have a block grant approach.

So we want to see less of the status quo approach. Their policies and funding for them are tired, timid, and dangerous for our schools. Block grants and vouchers are proven failures; why would we waste more dollars on them in the beginning of the 21st century?

Instead, our amendment proposes to reinvigorate our investments in our public schools—as I said a moment ago—which serve 90 percent of the America's 55 million students.

It would provide the needed resources to train teachers across the country in reading and literacy. It would support local afterschool programs for an additional 1.6 million students. It would assist local communities as they work to transform school facilities into safe, modern, learning environments for all students. It would ensure smaller class sizes in the early grades, when students are most in need of attention as they learn to read. Mr. President, it would support tough accountability and results in targeting resources to the schools that are most in need. It would also shore up our national commitment to support students as they move on to postsecondary education.

This is no litany of Federal programs. These are real initiatives we can afford to do with the 7 cents—our 7 cents on the dollar spent for elementary and secondary education—to assist local communities, to see that our towns and counties across this country get the backing and support they need in the Federal Government.

Ask any parent about class size; ask them about afterschool programs and about school safety; they are crying out for this help. That is what they want, and that is what this amendment offered by our colleagues as an alternative to what is in this budget would do.

The choice is very clear. Can we afford to take about \$10 billion or \$15 billion over 5 years out of this tax cut proposal and put it into the one area, Education, that Americans all across the economic, racial, ethnic, gender spectrum, say they want to see this Congress spend time and effort on? They have never spoken more loudly or clearly on an issue.

In light of that, we think this amendment is a responsible, prudent, and efficient way to continue to get the accountability and resources necessary to improve the quality of the education of our children as we sit on the cusp of the 21st century. With all of the challenges we will have, we should offer nothing less than the very best we can to see that local communities will have the tools to succeed in what will be the most competitive environment any generation of Americans has ever had to face in our 210-year history. For those reasons, I strongly urge adoption of this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the manager of the bill is on the floor. I ask to be yielded some time, if he would.

Mr. DOMENICI. If the Senator will be patient a moment, how much time does the Senator want?

Mr. GORTON. Ten minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I have listened with great care to the Senator from Connecticut paradoxically claiming that to create a half dozen new categorical education aid programs and keeping control over all of them, to enable the U.S. Department of Education to write a few hundred pages more of rules and regulations, somehow or another enhances local control.

Mr. President, that is an Alice in Wonderland argument. A debate that will be at the heart of education will take place in this body next month when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act comes to the floor. By a regrettable partisan vote, that committee has proposed an Elementary and Secondary Education Act renewal that gives more promise to increase the academic performance of our students than has any other educational debate in this body for a decade or more.

On one side, including the chairman of the committee whose bill that is before us, are those who believe in true education reform and the kind of innovation that focuses not on how well teachers and superintendents and principals fill out Federal forms but on how well our students actually do. On the other side is the attitude that the Federal Government knows best and that somehow or other men and women all across the United States of America—parents and teachers and principals and superintendents and elected school board members, most of them working without compensation—somehow or other don't know or don't care what is best for their kids and we have to provide them with guidance.

Recently on this issue, one of my colleagues said that if we give these local communities the right to set their own education priorities, they will likely use the money for "building a new locker room or redecorating office space."

On hearing this charge, one of my superintendents, the superintendent of the Oak Harbor School District, had this to say:

School boards are very close to their constituencies. Probably more than any other type of governing body, they are sensitive to the needs and demands of their communities. After all, they see their constituents on a daily basis at grocery stores, soccer fields and dance concerts. A parent can easily influence all five of our board members. Ten parents can move mountains locally. By contrast, what influence would these same people have on the education department, or even Congress? The best opportunity to avoid wasteful expenditures of education funds is at the local level where individual citizens have the greatest power and influence.

Yet what do we have from the minority party in the health committee on this request? Twenty new Federal education programs. We already have teacher training programs, to early childhood programs, to programs for delinquent and at-risk youths. They offered these new programs in that committee even though the General Accounting Office finds that we already fund 127 at-risk and delinquent youth programs in 15 Federal agencies and departments, 86 teacher training programs in 9 Federal agencies and departments, and more than 90 early childhood programs in 11 Federal agencies and departments. But, according to them, we need 20 more to be added to all of these.

Our view, to the contrary, is just this. We should allow our States and local education agencies to make the determinations of how best to use this money, and we should hold them accountable in only one way so the students actually do better.

We have offered three alternatives. One is that any State that likes the present system, that believes it is perfectly all right to fill out these forms, that doesn't mind a bureaucracy with hundreds of different education programs, can continue to do it the way they do it today. Any State that likes the present system can continue it.

Fifteen States will be allowed the opportunity under Straight A's simply to take all of the money, give 95 percent of it to the school districts in the same proportion they get it today, and be accountable only for the performance of their students. And all of the other States will be allowed the program proposed by the National Governors' Association, both Democrats and Republicans, that would require title I money at least to go directly down to the school district in exactly the amounts that it does today.

For 35 years under title I, we have attempted to reduce the disparity between title I-eligible students and the more privileged students who are not eligible for title I. That disparity has not increased. For the first time in these programs, we are actually offering an incentive—more money to those States that work to decrease the disparity and show they have actually been successful.

There is, unfortunately, a great gulf between the two sides on this issue. The one side likes the present system and, in fact, apparently believes we need more than 127 programs for at-risk and delinquent youths, more than 90 early childhood programs, more than 86 different and distinct teacher training programs, more forms from the Federal Government and from the bureaucracy, and less trust in the ability and interest of either State officials or local school officials in making the determination as to what our children need to succeed.

That is simply wrong. The men and women who know our children's names know best what they need to succeed in

education. The accountability we set out for them in our proposal is the most fundamental accountability of all. It is: To see to it that your students do better, come up with a system of tests that show whether or not they are succeeding in their academic subjects, and if they do succeed, you will go forward with this flexibility; you will in fact get more money.

The difference is striking. It is a great contrast. But those who believe in local control will allow the people in our States and communities to have that control, and we will not tell them they have to spend their time filling out forms and following hundreds of pages of Federal regulations.

There is a great gulf between the two sides in this debate. But our side is the one that believes in the future of our children and believes the future can best be determined by their parents, by their teachers, and by their elected school board members at home.

To go down the road putting more money into a failed system is to put new wine in old bottles. The bottles will simply burst and the wine be wasted.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank Senator GORTON for the remarks he made. I don't think people remember that when we first started this movement toward more flexibility and control by local government and accountability, SLADE GORTON offered the first amendment. And there has been a constant evolution in that direction. I personally thank him for it.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Bingaman amendment. The single most important thing we do as a government is educate our young people. What we should be doing and talking about today in this debate is making this decade "the education decade."

We have in the United States the best roads, the best technology, and the best economy. But we don't have the best schools. We should be working toward making our schools the envy of the world.

I intend to submit a sense-of-the-Senate amendment later during the course of this debate which provides that 10 percent of the non-Social Security surplus will be devoted to education. I think it is the kind of statement that we as a body need to make to show the American people we are committed to providing the resources that are necessary to educate our young people.

If I can make just one comment in response to the Senator's remarks, what we are talking about in this debate is simply providing the resources for the programs that are so desperately needed, which I will talk about in just a minute. We are not talking about placing bureaucratic restrictions on State and local school

districts. I believe very strongly that we don't want our school systems run out of Washington. In fact, we need our school systems to be run at the State and local level. We need to be sure they have the flexibility to make the decisions about what is best for their schools. I support that. We support that.

The issue we are debating today is whether we are going to provide in this budget process the resources that are so desperately needed in our public schools today. If we don't provide these resources, it is going to be impossible for our children to compete in the world. There is no doubt that they will be required to compete in a global economy. Our responsibility is to give them the tools to compete. They will not have the tools to compete unless we provide the resources that are so desperately needed by our public schools.

I would like to talk briefly about four areas.

First, afterschool programs: We have thousands and thousands of children all over this country who are on the waiting list to get into afterschool programs.

I actually have some firsthand experience with afterschool programs because my wife and I helped start an afterschool program in Raleigh, NC.

We have computers, we have technology, and volunteer tutors help children to learn technology, help them with their homework, help them prepare for tests. I have been able to see firsthand what happens when kids are put on a level playing field and they are all given a chance.

We know the time kids are most likely to get in trouble is between the time they get out of school and the time their parents get home from work. It is nobody's fault their parents have to work. We ought to give the kids a safe place to go, a safe environment where they can continue to learn and continue to be productive; equally important, give them a sense of self-esteem and make them believe they have an equal opportunity to compete against all the students around them. I have seen firsthand what happens. Their self-esteem grows, their self-image grows; as a result, their engagement grows and their grades improve. It happens over and over and over.

That is why afterschool programs are so important. This is not about a line item on a budget, this is about the lives of our children.

Class size: Every teacher I encounter tells me they feel as if they are babysitting. It is impossible for them to teach when they have 30, 32, 33 children in a classroom. We have to do something about that.

We have trouble attracting good teachers. We have trouble retaining good teachers. Our responsibility is to give teachers the tools they need to do the job they want to do. They are professionals. They are professionals who are in this business because they want

to educate kids. We have to give them an environment that allows them to be effective. That is what reducing class size is about. Making our kids effective, allowing kids to have access to the teachers they say they so desperately want to have access to so they can learn—that is what this debate is about.

School construction and modernization: Just a few weeks ago, I was at Wayside Elementary School in Statesville, NC, a small, overcrowded, school built more than 50 years ago. They have literally put pieces of carpet all over the floor to cover asbestos tiles. The roof is leaking. The children have to go outside in order to go to the bathrooms. There are trailers, mobile homes, everywhere. The teachers who teach in that school a couple years ago got an incentive bonus. These are already underpaid teachers, but instead of keeping the bonus money for themselves and their families, they turned their bonuses back in to be used at the school. It is obvious these teachers are committed to the young people whom they are trying to educate. These kids cannot learn in a school that is falling apart. They cannot learn when they are sitting on top of each other in classrooms.

What kind of message does it send to the American people when these kids go to the local mall, all the stores are beautiful and shiny and new and well built, and then they go to Wayside Elementary School, the building is falling apart, patches of carpet are everywhere, the roof is leaking, and in order to go to the bathroom they have to go outside?

We need to do something about this. We need to put our kids in good quality buildings. We need to modernize the schools. We need to do it in a fiscally responsible and sound way. It is critically important we put our kids and our teachers in an environment where they can learn—the teachers can teach and the kids can learn.

Finally, Title I: Visit the schools in North Carolina, and the one thing you learn immediately is, we don't have a level playing field. There are some schools in Wake County and Mecklenburg County, Raleigh, and Charlotte that are beautiful and new with lots of technology. Go out into the rural areas of North Carolina, and we find schools that are falling apart, where they can't keep teachers. These are the schools at which Title I is aimed.

Title I has not been as successful as we would like in some areas. Although it has done very good things, there is more that needs to be done. We need to make sure a child living in the country in North Carolina has just as good an opportunity to learn as a child who lives in Raleigh or Charlotte. There is absolutely no reason that a child who is born in Raleigh, NC, should have an opportunity for a better education than a child who is born in rural North Carolina. That is what Title I is about. It is about leveling the playing field.

There is nothing more important we can do in the Senate this year than focus on education. We must send a clear and unmistakable message to the American people that we are willing to do whatever is necessary, financially and otherwise, to support our public school system, to educate our children, to give our children a chance to compete against every other child in this global economy. That is what we should be talking about today. That is what we should be debating. More importantly, that is what we should be committing to do in this budget process.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I thank our Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Massachusetts and so many others who have put together this outstanding amendment. This amendment is one of the most important amendments we will vote on this entire year.

We have moved into an economy where ideas matter. As Alan Greenspan puts it: High value is added no longer by moving things but, rather, by thinking things. We cannot afford an educational system that the OECD—the 22 developed nations in North America, Europe, and Japan—ranks, in America, 15th, 16th, or 17th.

I think Americans have come together on two types of issues: One, that we are willing to spend more money on education. We have to. When a starting salary for a teacher is \$24,000, when we have such shortages of classrooms, when we don't have the kinds of things we need for afterschool and computers and all the things that make a modern education worthwhile, there is only one answer. It is money.

We all know the local property taxpayer who from the beginning has funded education in this country is up to here in property taxes. The choices are simple: Let education stagnate or let the Federal Government play a more significant role. Most Americans want us to do that. It is unfortunate the budget that is put before the Senate does not do that.

The second issue I think we all embrace in general is that we must have standards in education. A student who is not reading at a third-grade level should not be promoted from the fourth to the fifth grade. A teacher who is not certified in a subject should not be teaching it. We need real standards and real accountability. Put that together and I think we can come up with a significant education program that can bring Americans together and do the job our country needs.

Mark my words, if our educational system stays at the present level, we will not be the leading economy in the world in the year 2025 or 2050. This is a crisis that demands some dramatic urgency.

The amendment put forward by the Senator from New Mexico and others, including myself, makes a difference. Let me go over again what it does. First, it puts a qualified teacher in every classroom. There is \$2 billion for recruitment, mentoring, and professional development of qualified teachers. Many of the things I have been working on, a Marshall Plan for teachers, are included in this amendment. We desperately need it in New York. Nationally, for instance, we face a teacher shortage of 2.2 million over the next decade. New York faces a teacher shortage of 80,000 men and women over the next 5 years. How are we going to get qualified teachers? Currently, only 10 States require and fund programs for new teachers, 12 pay veteran teachers to be mentors. This amendment provides those kinds of resources.

Second, it helps communities modernize our schools. My children attend the public schools in New York City. I will never forget the day I went to open school day for my little one, Alison's kindergarten class, a few years back. There were two classes in that one kindergarten room. You could not hear above the voice of the teacher of the other class in the other corner of the room; you could not hear what Alison's teacher was saying to her students.

Left alone to the localities, left with the tremendous burden the property tax puts on so many Americans, we will not modernize our schools. But our amendment comes to the rescue. It provides \$1.3 billion in grants and loans for the much needed repair of 5,000 public elementary and secondary schools in high-need areas. It leverages an additional \$25 billion in interest-free bonds to help build schools.

New York currently has an unmet funding need for school construction of \$50.7 billion, one-sixth the national need of \$307 billion. We desperately need this part of the amendment.

The amendment supports tough accountability for results. To put money into a program without having it be accountable, as it would be in the private sector, has been one of our failures in education—lack of accountability.

I disagree with some of my friends on the left who say that accountability is wrong or unmeetable. I plead with my colleagues to do two things. First, keep the bar high. That is the only way we are going to stay a leading country. But help provide the resources to let those get over that bar. The other two choices are unacceptable: to lower the bar or to not help people get over it. Neither is good. The tough accountability for results in this amendment—\$116 million over last year to \$250 million for accountability—is vital.

This amendment rejects the cuts that have been proposed in impact aid. We have, in New York State, districts such as Indian River near Fort Drum and Highland Falls near West Point which would be devastated by the cut actually in the President's budget because he eliminates \$94 million in im-

impact aid. This amendment restores that.

Not least important, this supports a commitment to smaller classes; \$1.75 billion to hire 100,000 new teachers and reduce class size in the early grades. My daughter has seen class size grow in her public school, P.S. 230. She is one of millions of American children who see that.

We expand afterschool opportunities for children. I participated in afterschool programs and played basketball. It kept me in good shape. Many students do not have that opportunity. We increase it.

We increase support for children with disabilities, and we make college more affordable by increasing the individual Pell grant by \$400.

These are all important things to do. Compare this with the budget that has been proposed by my friends. The problem is twofold. No. 1, it does not provide those resources. We can talk and talk and talk about education, but, unless we provide resources, we are not going to achieve our goal.

Most Americans support that wish. I think the other side is being pennywise and pound foolish to not support increasing aid for education. Ask Americans what is their No. 1 priority, above any other spending program, above tax cuts and above retiring the deficits. It is education. The budget proposed by my friends on the other side of the aisle does not recognize that need. It is woefully inadequate. It actually cuts, by \$1.4 billion, from what the President did. I am the first to say what the President did in his budget was not enough in this important area. It is the spending area where we most need an increase.

No. 2, the budget envisions this block grant procedure, which I know my colleagues on the other side want to move forward, in the ESEA bill on which we will vote. In their budget, under function 500, it says:

This bill will give States greater flexibility in delivering hundreds of elementary and secondary education programs and will place more decisionmaking in the hands of States, localities and families.

It is good rhetoric, but I will tell you I don't think we should take the Federal taxpayer dollars and let it be frittered away in the same way we have seen money wasted in the past. We in this Congress should set our priorities for education. We should certainly not mandate on the locality that they have to take our priorities. But if they want some money, they better improve and reform their systems.

Crime is the area in which I have the most expertise. I remember when we had a crimefighting block grant very similar to this proposal. One locality bought a tank. Another State bought an airplane so the Governor could fly from Washington to Indianapolis—it was the Governor of Indiana—all under the block grant process.

I do not get the logic. Our friends on the other side say the system is not

working well enough. I agree. Then they give money to the same exact people to spend in the same exact way. What sense does that make? We are trying to get the localities to reach to a higher goal: Lower class size and we will give you some dollars; increase accountability and we will give you some dollars; make better classrooms and we will give you some dollars. But we are not going to give dollars—I ask the Senator from Nevada, may I have an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. REID. The Senator from New York is yielded 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, we set out goals. A block grant is a continuation of mediocrity. A block grant does not give families the power to spend the money. It gives money so the same local institutions, many that have been mired in mediocrity, can do the same thing as they have been doing before. Sure as we are sitting here, if we have a block grant, do you know where it is going to end up? Administrators' folderol.

The programs in the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico are designed to do specific things that all Americans support and, more importantly, even that our educational experts tell us are needed to improve education. So the fact that the budget is pusillanimous, is stingy in the area where we most need help—education—and the fact is, instead of laying out a specific guidepost based on careful analysis and what the experts say is needed, it just takes a ball of money and throws it to a locality or throws it to a State, separating the taxing authority from the spending authority. That is probably the greatest problem in block grants because when you separate the taxing authority from the spending authority, you almost always get wasted money. It is free money to others. Those are the two great problems in education, our most important priority with the budget that is put before us.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to look at that budget; when they go home and make speeches about how important education is, to then ask themselves how they can vote for a budget that actually cuts from the President's budget by approximately \$1.4 billion, not including IDEA.

I ask my colleagues on the other side who criticize the present system, why just give, in a mass block grant, money to the same States and same localities that have not measured up now? Why not increase the amount of dollars but only allow them to go into the classroom, whether it be teachers or new classrooms or standards for those classrooms that everyone, when they go back home to give speeches, seems to say we need?

I salute the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Massachusetts,

the Senator from Washington, and all the others who have put together this amendment. It is a marvelous blueprint, a well-thought-out blueprint of where we need to go in education. Let us stop simply giving the American people rhetoric. Let us put together a concrete plan that makes a difference in the areas where we need to make a difference, such as reducing class size, modernizing and building more classrooms, improving the quality of teachers, and improving accountability.

This amendment does it. I urge my colleagues to support it and reject the present budget. The budget before us is a pusillanimous and unfocused approach towards education.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I want to reserve 2 minutes. I will speak for 4 minutes.

Mr. President, this request has been worked out with the minority. I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur in relation to the Bingaman amendment at 5:30 p.m. in a stacked sequence, with no amendment in order to the Bingaman amendment prior to the vote and, further, that there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote for explanation. I further ask unanimous consent that following the use or yielding back of time on the Bingaman first-degree amendment, the amendment be laid aside, and Senator ALLARD be recognized to offer a first-degree amendment relative to debt reduction. I further ask unanimous consent that following the use of or yielding back of time, Senator CONRAD be recognized to offer a second-degree amendment relative to debt reduction, and that following the use or yielding back of time, those votes occur in a stacked sequence.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that all votes in the voting sequence after the first vote be limited to 10 minutes in duration.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. In light of this agreement, the next votes will occur today starting at 5:30 p.m. I thank all Members for their cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, to alert all Members, especially on the minority side, we have been told the majority leader expects to spend a lot of time here tonight, and the minority will offer amendments throughout the evening.

It is my understanding the majority leader wants to get the time left on this resolution down to single digits. We are now in high double digits. We will have to work into the evening tonight to eat up some of that time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself 4 minutes, reserving 2 minutes.

First, wherever the distinguished Senator from New York referred to the Senator from New Mexico, it is more fair he say the Senator from New Mexico, Mr. BINGAMAN, because I do not want credit for something of which I am not in favor.

I want to make three quick arguments: First, for those who are listening and those in American education who think we are going to decide in detail how the money in this budget is going to be used for education, I assure them the appropriations subcommittee headed by Senator SPECTER and the Senate is going to determine how the money in this budget resolution is spent in education.

We can come to the floor and talk about all the problems in education and say the Bingaman amendment takes care of these things. The truth of the matter is that is a wish list. That is what somebody hopes will happen. What will happen is what the appropriators decide. Anybody who has a wish for education can come down here today and say the Senate budget resolution is going to take care of this problem in education, and if those listening believe it, then wait around for 3 months and see what the appropriators do.

My second point is that there is a lot of talk about whether or not we cut the President's budget. I have a Congressional Budget Office analysis of our education numbers. This is what they say: The Senate's budget is \$47.877 billion in budget authority, program authority; the President's is \$47.228 billion, a difference of \$600 million more in the pending resolution than that for which the President provided.

The baseline from which we start this year is \$43.3 billion. Everybody can do the arithmetic. We have added more than the President to this function. Where it goes will be determined by the appropriators.

My other observation is that while in office, this President has called himself the education President. He has bragged that he has gotten Congress to go along with him on education. There are Members coming to the floor saying these are Republican education numbers while, as a matter of fact, the President is bragging they are his over the last 5 years. I do not know whom to believe, but I think we have increased education significantly over the last 6 years while we have been in power in the Senate.

My last observation has to do with whether or not the new bill that is going to be reported out of committee and come to the floor is going to do away with categorical programs. To those who love the 300 or 400 categorical programs we have and think they must be helping education, I say that is why it has not gotten any better in the last 10 years. If they think that is what the bill says, let me tell them it

is going to have three menu items. One is if schools like what we have now, they can keep it. They can keep that program everybody thinks is so great or they can opt to take a lump sum with strings attached that mean performance and accountability. If they take that, they have to account for it; they have to be accountable, and they receive a bonus if their accountability is on the plus side. If not, they do not get a bonus.

Actually, we are going to let the schools decide which way they want to go. Republicans are already in the field trying out this idea. To the amazement of some Democrats, school leaders, school boards, superintendents, and principals are opting our way, saying: Give us a chance instead of putting all these strings on our education money.

We have done enough. We do not need the Bingham amendment. I hope it is tabled later in the day. I commend my colleague for his interest in education. We have done enough when we do more than the President this year.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina, and this will be off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, upon taking office, President Ronald Reagan appointed a commission to root out government waste, fraud and abuse. Headed by Peter Grace, the Grace Commission reviewed the numerous Federal departments and agencies, and called for the elimination of tremendous waste. The commission also called for an annual report on the implementation of its recommendations. Eighty-five percent of the Grace Commission's recommendations were implemented by 1989, but today not only has Congress abandoned the Grace Commission's initiative but is racing in the other direction.

Section 201 of the Social Security Act requires that Social Security surpluses be invested in Treasury bills so that the trust fund can reap interest and grow. Paradoxically, section 201 requires that the trust fund be spent or eliminated. When you buy Treasury bills you give the Government the money and the Government, in turn, gives you a note or bond which amounts to an IOU. The only way to have the trust fund reflect a surplus instead of a deficit is to require the Secretary of the Treasury to maintain in the trust fund cash in an amount equal to the total redemption value of its Treasury bills. Today, instead of trust fund surpluses of \$1,099 billion, the Social Security "lockbox" is \$1,009 billion in IOUs.

The policy of investing in U.S. Government instruments is sound. Some think that the fund could make more money by investing in the stock market, but this involves risk that the Congress is determined not to take.

Fifteen years ago we only owed Social Security \$50 billion. We were not worried because we were taking in surpluses each year. In 1990, we amended the Budget Act prohibiting the President and/or Congress from reporting a budget offset by Social Security surpluses. We wanted the people to know the true condition of the Social Security trust fund and the growth of the national debt. Nevertheless, surpluses continued to be applied against the national debt obscuring its elephantine growth. As the debt grows, carrying charges or interest costs grow. Come the year 2013, there will be a day of reckoning. In 2013, there will not be enough revenue from payroll taxes to pay the Social Security benefits. Congress, for the first time, will look to the trust fund which was supposed to have been saved to take care of the baby boomers. Instead, the Social Security trust fund is projected to be in the red \$4 trillion. Congress will have two options: cut the benefits or raise the taxes. Looking at the increasing need and already short \$4 trillion, Congress will no doubt cut benefits. In the meantime, interests costs on the national debt, the waste that the Grace Commission intended to eliminate, grows like "gangbusters."

When President Lyndon Johnson balanced the budget last in 1968 the annual interest cost on the national debt was only \$16 billion. Today, the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, estimates it will be \$362 billion—almost a billion dollars a day for nothing. No one thinks we should accumulate \$4 trillion in the Social Security trust fund by repealing section 201. Yet, the people should be awakened to the fact that Congress hasn't paid for the Government it has been providing for 31 years. CBO estimated in February that we will spend \$58.9 billion more this year than we take in. Looking at the votes in Congress since that time, the deficit will exceed \$100 billion. Talk of a surplus is a total farce. Talk of not spending Social Security is a total farce. Talk of a Social Security lockbox is a total farce. And any proposal for a tax cut is no more than an increase in the debt, an increase in interest costs, an increase in waste.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator and yield the floor.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. I yield the Senator from Minnesota 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

AMENDMENT NO. 2926

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada. I especially thank my colleague, Senator BINGAMAN from New Mexico, not only for his amendment but for his work in education and for children.

Quite often, we will come out here on the floor and talk about how great Senator "so and so" is. I am not saying it is not meant because I think quite

often it is meant. But from my point of view, at least, I think Senator BINGAMAN's methodology as a Senator is interesting. He never seems to try to claim credit for what he does. He is extremely thoughtful. He is very substantive. I believe he is one of the best Senators in the Senate. I am proud to support this amendment.

Really, what this amendment says, as we look at this overall budget—after all, our budget speaks to our priorities—is that there is a difference between the Democrats and Republicans. It is a difference that makes a difference.

Republicans, in their budget proposal, have provided much more funding for IDEA. I thank the Presiding Officer, the Senator from New Hampshire, for his strong voice on this. Ever since he came here to the Senate, he has been talking about the need to live up to what is an unfunded mandate and to provide for more resources in this area. I think that is extremely important.

I also hear from people at our school district levels: Look, if you would do the job of providing the funding here, that would help us in many important ways. Above and beyond that, what we have done is said yes to that. We provide for the same funding, but we go further. We say that we think there is an important choice we need to make as Senators, and there is an important choice and decision the country needs to make: Whether we go down the path of the tax cuts—many of them disproportionately flowing to high-income people, to more affluent citizens—or whether, as we look over the next 5 years, we could, in fact, do better by our children and do better by education with close to an additional \$35 billion.

I think I heard my colleague, my friend from New Mexico, whom I work with a lot in the mental health area, say: Look, we have done enough. Basically, we believe there is enough in this budget.

I do not agree. I am in profound disagreement. I am in a school every 2 weeks, most of the time in Minnesota, although sometimes in other States, as well. I was a college teacher for 20 years. I love to be in schools. I love to teach. I love to meet with students.

I will tell you right now, in Minnesota, and all across the country, we have a lot of crumbling schools. I think in Minnesota we have well over a \$1 billion challenge ahead of us.

I will tell you this: It is very difficult to tell students and young people we value them and then not invest in these schools to the point where the infrastructure is crumbling. What we say to students when we do not even invest in the physical infrastructure is: We do not value you.

We have the task of rebuilding crumbling schools. But don't stop there, I say to Senators. We need to do more. I do not think this budget that our Republican colleagues have presented does near enough. I am in profound disagreement.

You ask the students—talk to them; in many ways, they are the experts on education—what works and what doesn't? They will all tell you that one of the keys to a good education is good teachers.

In the budget proposal that the Democrats have brought to the floor, Senator BINGAMAN taking the lead, we talk about the need to get more resources to the school district level so that we can hire more good teachers and we can have smaller class size.

I would argue today and tomorrow and for the rest of this year and for the next 10 years, that is one of the best things we can do.

One of the things we do not include in this budget proposal but Democrats have talked about—I wish we would back it more with investment—is what we should be doing prekindergarten.

But let me go on about what we can do and what is in this proposal.

In addition, we are talking about afterschool programs. I have not found any issue where there is a greater community consensus—from law enforcement to teachers, to parents, to social workers, to youth workers—that we have to give our children and our young people positive alternatives after school: places to go, places to be. We include that in this proposal. That makes a whole lot of sense.

We had a debate—sort of a debate—on the Ed-Flex bill. I will admit, I was in a minority of one on that. I think the final vote was 99-1. But one of the arguments I made—which I believe most Senators agree with, I hope—and which is certainly a part of this proposal, is that we are talking about flexibility at the same time we are providing title I money, which goes to those students who are disadvantaged, those students who need additional support. We are funding it at about a 30-percent level.

In my State of Minnesota—I am in inner-city schools all the time—in the city of St. Paul, after you go below the threshold of 65 percent of your students coming from homes which make them qualified for the free or reduced school lunch program, we do not have any funding. Once you have 60 percent of your students low income, you do not qualify. We are out of money. We can do much better.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle say we have done enough. No, we have not done enough. It is not enough to give speeches. It is not enough to have photo opportunities next to children. It is not enough to say we are all for education. It is not enough to say we are for young people because they are our future. It is not enough until we back it up by digging into our pockets and, yes, spending more money and making the investment.

I think this amendment that we bring to the floor is a "divide" amendment. This is a divide amendment between Republicans and their priorities—more tax cuts; more tax cuts dis-

proportionately going to wealthy, high-income people, versus more investment in children and more investment in education.

Frankly, I would be willing to debate any colleague who says we have done enough, that we should not be making this additional investment.

Of course, we should be making this additional investment. We are not going to provide the best education for every child on a "tin cup" budget. This additional \$35 billion can make a difference.

Let me also point out, since we have this debate on the floor of the Senate—and we will have much more of this debate when we get to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—that I am deeply troubled by all of the Senators—I hope not a majority—who want to talk about high stakes standardized tests and want to say we are for rigor and want to say we are for accountability and want to even say that, by gosh, if a third grader, age 8, does not pass this test, then she is going to be held back, but we are unwilling to make the investment and get the resources to the local school district level so that every one of these children have the same opportunity to pass these tests. We hold children responsible for our failure to invest in their achievement and their future. We can't have it this way. We ought to be talking about high standards. We ought to be telling our children we expect the very best of them, but we also need to have the policy integrity, as Senators, to provide the resources to our local communities so we can make sure that, as a Nation and as a Senate, we have met the opportunity-to-learn standard, that every child in the United States of America, regardless of color of skin, rich or poor, low income or high income, rural or urban, or boy or girl, will have the same chance to reach his or her full potential.

This \$35 billion is not Heaven on Earth. It doesn't make it perfect, but it makes it a better Earth on Earth for our children. I believe we should support it, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending Bingaman amendment to increase funding for education programs in the FY2001 budget resolution—programs that have been proven to increase student performance. Few of the problems facing us today are as important as the challenge of educating our children to meet the demands of the future. Yet, the budget resolution put forward by the Majority does nothing for key priorities like funding for high-quality teachers, smaller class sizes, modern and accountable schools, and expanded and improved technology in the classroom. In fact, total discretionary spending for education, training and social services programs in the Republican budget plan before us is \$4.7 billion below the President's budget re-

quest, reducing discretionary education funding to below FY2000 levels.

I strongly supported an amendment offered during the Budget Committee markup to provide increased funding for smaller class sizes, school construction and renovation, and teacher quality—initiatives that are critical to ensuring an educated citizenry. I regret that Republican members of the Committee opposed this amendment, resulting in its defeat, and I would strongly urge my colleagues to support the pending amendment.

Mr. President, the quality of teachers and principals is essential to student achievement. Research indicates that high-quality teachers are the single most important determinant in how well students learn. Likewise, research has shown that students attending small classes with qualified teachers in early grades make more rapid educational progress than students in larger classes. This amendment would increase funding in these critical areas, as well as in other areas such as afterschool programs and school modernization, offset by reducing the irresponsible tax cuts included in the Majority's proposal. It would also make higher education more affordable and accessible by increasing the maximum Pell Grant, and increasing funding for the TRIO and GEAR-UP programs.

Throughout my service in the United States Senate, I have been committed to the goal of ensuring a quality education for all our Nation's citizens. This amendment would move us in the direction of that important goal and I again urge my colleagues to support it.

AMENDMENT NO. 2928

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wonder if Senator REID will agree that I may offer the Johnson amendment—he asked that it be offered on his behalf—and a second-degree from me, and we vote on both of them by voice vote.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. No objection, Mr. President.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator JOHNSON, I send a first-degree amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent this be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] for Mr. JOHNSON, for himself and Mr. ABRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 2928.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . RESERVE FUND FOR MILITARY RETIREE HEALTH CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, aggregates, allocations, functional totals, and other budgetary levels and limits may be revised for legislation to fund improvements to

health care programs for military retirees and their dependents in order to fulfill the promises made to them, provided that the enactment of that legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 2001; or

(2) the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

(b) REVISED LEVELS.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 2929 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2928

(Purpose: To limit the amount of the reserve)

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time on this amendment be yielded back and that I may send a second-degree amendment on behalf of myself to the desk, that all time be yielded back and the second-degree amendment be agreed to, that the first-degree amendment, as amended, be agreed to, and that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, reserving right to object—I don't know whether I will—could I ask the Senator to again summarize the second-degree amendment. I couldn't hear him.

Mr. REID. If I could say to my friend from Minnesota, Senator JOHNSON, the sponsor of the amendment, has worked with the majority. They have worked something out that is to the satisfaction of Senator JOHNSON. This was his amendment. He believes the second-degree strengthens the amendment and that it should be accepted. I personally don't know the subject matter of the amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thought the Senator had just summarized it.

Mr. DOMENICI. All it does is, it makes it clear that the bill we are relating to is to be reported out by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is the second-degree amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is the second-degree amendment. It makes it clear.

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

The amendment (No. 2929) was agreed to, as follows:

In subsection (a), after the words "may be revised for" insert the words "Department of Defense authorization", and after the word "legislation" insert the words "reported by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate".

The amendment (No. 2928), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on the pending amendments—the amendments we have been working on most of the day—the minority has no more speak-

ers. We yield back the time we have on that subject under the unanimous consent agreement. I understand the Senator from Colorado will now offer his amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield back the 2 minutes I have on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2906

(Purpose: To protect social security and provide for repayment of the Federal debt)

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk numbered 2906.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. GRAMS, proposes an amendment numbered 2906.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

TITLE —SOCIAL SECURITY PROTECTION AND DEBT REPAYMENT

SEC. 1. BALANCED BUDGET REQUIREMENT.

Beginning with fiscal year 2001 and for every fiscal year thereafter, budgeted outlays shall not exceed budgeted revenues.

SEC. 2. REDUCTION OF NATIONAL DEBT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with fiscal year 2001 and for every fiscal year thereafter, actual revenues shall exceed actual outlays in order to provide for the reduction of the Federal debt held by the public as provided in subsections (b) and (c).

(b) AMOUNT.—The on budget surplus shall be large enough so that debt held by the public will be reduced each year beginning in fiscal year 2001. The amount of reduction required by this subsection shall be \$15,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and shall increase by an additional \$15,000,000,000 every fiscal year until the entire debt owed to the public has been paid.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS AND DEBT REPAYMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Until such time as Congress enacts major social security reform legislation, the surplus funds each year in the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund shall be used to reduce the debt owed to the public. This section shall not apply beginning on the fiscal year after social security reform legislation is enacted by Congress.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term "social security reform legislation" means legislation that—

(A) insures the long-term financial solvency of the social security system; and

(B) includes an option for private investment of social security funds by beneficiaries.

SEC. 3. POINT OF ORDER AND WAIVER.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget that does not comply with this title.

(b) WAIVER.—Congress may waive the provisions of this title for any fiscal year in which a declaration of war is in effect.

SEC. 4. MAJORITY REQUIREMENT FOR REVENUE INCREASE.

No bill to increase revenues shall be deemed to have passed the House of Rep-

resentatives or the Senate unless approved by a majority of the total membership of each House of Congress by a rollcall vote.

SEC. 5. REVIEW OF REVENUES.

Congress shall review actual revenues on a quarterly basis and adjust outlays to assure compliance with this title.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) OUTLAYS.—The term "outlays" shall include all outlays of the United States excluding repayment of debt principal.

(2) REVENUES.—The term "revenues" shall include all revenues of the United States excluding borrowing.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I rise today on behalf of myself, Senator ENZI, and Senator GRAMS, to offer this very important amendment to the budget resolution. Our amendment concerns the repayment of the \$3.6 trillion debt owed to the American public. I am eager to join my colleagues in this important discussion about the Federal budget, the budget surplus, and the American Government's economic future.

When I was first elected to Congress in 1990, the discussion was radically different. The concept of a budget surplus, let alone long-term projections for a surplus, was foreign. The notion that a national debt measured in trillions could ever be paid off was practically science fiction. While 1990 was only 10 years ago, we stand on the floor of the Senate today a million miles from the bleak fiscal outlook of those times.

We must be careful. While our present fiscal condition may be rose colored, fiscal irresponsibility and a refusal to wisely use the budget surplus can not only lead us back to our deficit spending ways of the past, in my view, it will threaten the fiscal health of our Nation for yet another generation of Americans.

I am here today to urge my colleagues to address the responsibility that comes with the \$5.7 trillion debt. During the 105th Congress, I introduced the American Debt Repayment Act. This legislation provided an amortization schedule for the repayment of the national debt.

The largest purchase an American family will ever make is the purchase of their home, and this expenditure is made possible because they laid down a plan on how to pay off this mortgage. It is a set schedule of payments. When I was crafting the American Debt Repayment Act, I studied this traditional form of payment and said, why doesn't this apply to our enormous Federal debt?

Now, 2 short years later, the outlook has changed somewhat, as the Federal Government has run and is estimated to continue to run an on-budget surplus. During the previous two budget cycles, we have witnessed an eagerness to spend more and more money. On-budget surplus dollars have become lumped into the appropriations process to allow for increased spending.

One result yielded by our time of prosperity has been the use of surplus

money to raise the discretionary spending levels, allowing Congress to shy away from making some hard choices. The willingness to spend surplus dollars is so strong, in fact, that when Congress adjourned last fall, there was no real certainty as to whether we would spend all of the on-budget surplus dipping into the Social Security trust fund. This, quite simply, is no way to run an enterprise—any enterprise. Plowing surplus money back into discretionary spending to the extent that Social Security money would be jeopardized is bad policy.

Today, I rise to offer an amendment that would not only provide an opportunity to control the impulse to spend surplus dollars but would eliminate the entire \$3.6 trillion debt owed to the public, save over \$3 trillion in interest, and protect the Social Security program from annual discretionary appropriation raids. It is simple legislation in the model of the American Debt Repayment Act, providing dedicated debt repayment over a 20-year period.

Beginning with the fiscal year of 2001 and for every year thereafter, this amendment requires that the Federal Government maintain a balanced budget. As most families and business owners know, you must live within your means. It provides this payment schedule I have described—I have it on this chart—so that, by 2021, we have paid down the debt using the on-budget surplus dollars. The on-budget surplus dollars have become lumped into the appropriations process to allow for increased spending. And if you can live within your means, then you are assured better prosperity in the future because it is going to carry you through the ups and downs of our economy.

It is fair and equitable that the Federal Government, I believe, live under the same parameters. I believe this is the first and most essential step in Federal budget accountability and payment.

My amendment further provides that Congress must budget for a surplus that must be dedicated to the repayment of the publicly held portion of the debt. Specifically, again, in fiscal year 2001, Congress will be using \$15 billion of on-budget receipts to pay down this debt. Every succeeding year, the amount of debt repayment must increase by \$15 billion. So that in 2001 there is \$15 billion toward debt repayment, the next year it goes to \$30 billion, and then \$45 billion. It increases in increments of \$15 billion our obligation to pay off that debt, which is looking basically at the surpluses we anticipate over the years in our budgeting as we move forward. Every succeeding year, the amount of debt, again, is increased by \$15 billion, so the amount Congress must budget for and pay toward the debt in fiscal year 2002 will be \$30 billion, and then \$45 billion, and so on. In this system, if it is adopted, by year 2021, the entire debt owed to the public will be zero.

We must have a plan to repay the debt, and we must have a repayment schedule, the same as you have on your home mortgage, and we will have the ability to cut taxes. A plan provides certainty and structure. I believe that anyone concerned with the national debt or tax cuts will understand the need for a responsible repayment schedule on the national debt.

In addition to the on-budget surplus payment required by this amendment, I have added language to require that until such time as serious Social Security reform is implemented, Social Security surplus dollars must also be dedicated to the repayment of the debt owed to the public. Every Member of this body is aware of the enormous obligation this country has made to present and future Social Security recipients. I believe the policymakers must address the future solvency of Social Security.

I am not here today, and my amendment is not drafted, to address the vital issue of Social Security solvency in the long term. What this amendment will do, however, is dedicate a surplus in Social Security dollars to debt repayment until the Congress can generate an appropriate long-term fix to the obstacles that stand in the way of this program.

I note that the 20-year schedule I have introduced does not account for the inclusion of Social Security surplus money to repay the debt owed to the public. I believe the only sensible use for these funds, until such time as they may be used to reform Social Security, is again reducing the debt owed to the public. Directing these surplus funds to debt repayment will only accomplish total repayment at an earlier date.

I must stress today, I offer a dedicated repayment schedule to eliminate the entire debt owed to the public in 20 years, without using Social Security surplus money. The use of Social Security surplus dollars will only serve to pay the debt down more quickly, removing the burden of the publicly held debt from Social Security in the annual budget process.

In recent weeks, the distinguished Speaker of the House and the President have talked a great deal publicly about seizing this unprecedented opportunity that lies before us, and that is to pay down the Nation's debt. Testifying before the Senate Banking Committee in January, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan strongly urged Congress to use surplus dollars to pay down the debt. Chairman Greenspan stated:

My first priority would be to allow as much of the surplus to flow through into a reduction of debt to the public. If that proves politically infeasible, I would opt for cutting taxes. And under no conditions do I see any room in the long-term outlook for major changes in expenditures.

I think that very succinctly spells out where we should be. This dialog has been tremendously helpful in further drawing the attention of the public and

elected officials to the importance of debt repayment.

As many of my colleagues can attest, and as I have experienced in my numerous town meetings around my home State of Colorado, this is an issue that the public understands. It is an issue of basic common sense, equity, and responsibility. This amendment is a call to action and accountability. It demands that this country and this Congress recognize the debt it has created. It structures a disciplined, fiscally responsible schedule for the repayment of our debt. In the process, it is my view that this legislation will serve to generate greater fiscal responsibility with every appropriation cycle, prevent future deficit spending, and save the taxpayer more than \$3 trillion in interest payments. Now, that is \$3 trillion that would be better spent on necessary expenditures, the strengthening of Social Security, and tax cuts.

I wish to compliment Senator DOMENICI, and the Budget Committee under his leadership, for working to pay down the debt. I recognize their sincere efforts in that regard. But during a time of unprecedented growth in our country, I think we need to seize the opportunity to make a firm commitment to pay down the debt. I am asking that the Senate take us a little step further in that process, and this American Social Security protection and draft repayment amendment—I haven't introduced it as a bill but as an amendment on this Budget Act—deals with several issues in order to further our commitment to paying down the debt.

First of all, it says we are going to have to balance our budget; that is, we are not going to spend more than what comes in in revenues. We are proposing a plan to reduce the national debt. The amendment I have before you talks about a \$15 billion commitment every year in additional obligations to paying down the debt. We have a provision in there to preserve the Social Security surplus and to state, as Senators, that we are serious about saving Social Security, and that we are going to work hard for the long-term fiscal soundness of a very important program for our elderly in America, and that we are going to have an option to allow individuals to play a role in their Social Security accounts.

Then, we also have a very important provision that says, look, if the revenue projections don't hold up as anticipated, there is a means where the Congress will come back on a quarterly review of these revenues. If they don't hold up, we are going to have to cut spending. It is going to help ensure that when we make decisions as we did last year in the budgeting process, where we got to the end of the appropriations process last year and we weren't entirely sure whether we would have spent Social Security or not until our final figures would have come before us in February of this year—now, fortunately, those revenue figures held

up—we do not spend Social Security dollars.

I have a mechanism in place which protects our position so that when we say we are not spending Social Security dollars, we will have an opportunity to make sure we are protecting the Social Security surplus; that we are staying to our schedule to paying down the debt because we in Congress are going to go back and review it on a quarterly basis and then help assure the American people that we will stay on schedule.

We are moving into somewhat turbulent times. If you watched the stock market yesterday and the amount of oscillation it went through, it reminds us of how the economy is changing.

I am concerned that at some point in time we will be overly optimistic about our revenue, and if we don't have this particular plan in place we will find ourselves in trouble and back into deficit spending, which I think we need to avoid. We need to utilize this prosperous time in our country to pay down the debt, which I think is extremely important.

I think the Congress can do all of those things. We can have a schedule to pay down the debt. We can save Social Security. We can also have some provisions for tax cuts.

With a three-pronged approach, the American people will understand our commitment to their future.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I extend 15 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, now the gamesmanship is revealed.

Look at this amendment. It says let's spend Social Security.

Let me read that to you.

Until such time as Congress enacts major Social Security reform legislation, the surplus funds each year of the Old Age and Survivors Insurance trust funds shall be reused to reduce the debt owed by the public. This section shall not apply beginning the fiscal year.

They say reduce the debt owed by the public. You are back to playing the game of taking one credit card and paying off the other credit card and owing the same amount. It is as if I have a MasterCard and a Visa card. I want to pay off the Visa card with the MasterCard. I say the Visa card is the public debt. And I paid it off—\$3.6 trillion—never mentioning that my MasterCard bill went up by the same amount.

My distinguished colleague from Wyoming is a cosponsor. He smiles because he is a CPA. He knows what we're talking about.

As the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, Dr. Rivlin, says, you are just taking the debt from one pocket and putting it in another.

I want the distinguished Chair and the Parliamentarian to pay close at-

tention because a point of order will be made later.

In other words, over on the third page of the particular amendment, it reads: No bill to increase revenues shall be deemed to have passed the House of Representatives or the Senate unless approved by a majority of the total membership of each House of Congress by a rollcall vote.

That is in violation of Section 305 of the Budget Act. It has not been considered and referred to the Budget Committee. That point of order can be made in due time.

I refer to what the law says about the public debt, and not what Alan Greenspan says. I worked with Alan Greenspan 20 years ago when I was the chairman of the Budget Committee. I have tremendous respect and affection for him. But he represents Wall Street. As long as we can borrow from ourselves; namely, as long as we can spend surpluses on government programs, then we stay out of the stock market. Mr. Greenspan doesn't want us coming in with the sharp elbows of Government driving out private capital and running up interest rates.

As long as we play the game for Wall Street, Mr. Greenspan is happy. We have had a wonderful economy. Rather than raise interest rates, we ought to put in a value-added tax allocated to reducing the deficit and the debt. Then we could save trillions of dollars not only in principal but in interest costs. That bill is in the Finance Committee. I introduced it. I had a hearing when Senator Bentsen was the chairman. But I have not been able to get a hearing on it since then. I would be glad to start this afternoon with a hearing on that initiative.

I think that is what we have to do. This debt goes up, up, and away, as shown by the numbers published by the Secretary of Treasury.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the public debt issued by the Secretary of the Treasury.

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

Current month:	Amount
04/03/2000	\$5,750,620,100,381.36
Prior months:	
03/31/2000	5,773,391,634,682.91
02/29/2000	5,735,333,348,132.58
01/31/2000	5,711,285,168,951.46
12/31/1999	5,776,091,314,225.33
11/30/1999	5,693,600,157,029.08
10/29/1999	5,679,726,662,904.06
Prior fiscal years:	
09/30/1999	5,656,270,901,615.43
09/30/1998	5,526,193,008,897.62
09/30/1997	5,413,146,011,397.34
09/30/1996	5,224,810,939,135.73
09/29/1995	4,973,982,900,709.39
09/30/1994	4,692,749,910,013.32
09/30/1993	4,411,488,883,139.38
09/30/1992	4,064,620,655,521.66
09/30/1991	3,665,303,351,697.03
09/28/1990	3,233,313,451,777.25
09/29/1989	2,857,430,960,187.32

THE PUBLIC DEBT TO THE PENNY—Continued

[Current 04/04/2000—\$5,758,854,640,223.41]	
09/30/1988	2,602,337,712,041.16
09/30/1987	2,350,276,890,953.00

Source: Bureau of the Public Debt.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, you will see that when we started the fiscal year the debt was \$5.656 trillion. It has gone up to \$5.750 trillion.

We have increased the debt. Everyone is talking about "surplus." What are we going to do with all of these great surpluses?

We do not have a surplus. We had a deficit last year of \$127 billion.

As the debt goes up, I am trying to clear up the confusion in this particular body rather than engaging in this charade.

When the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee keeps talking about how he paid down the public debt by \$1.1 trillion, here is the actual record as provided in the Budget Committee of the non-Social Security surplus:

In the year 2001, \$11.1 billion; 2002, \$3.2 billion; 2003, \$6.5 billion; 2004, \$8.7 billion; 2005, \$12.7 billion, for a total of \$42.2 billion.

The distinguished chairman says he pays down the debt \$1.1 trillion. It is actually \$42 billion in non-Social Security surpluses. And, of course, the rest of it—over \$1 trillion—is Social Security. Yet, in the same breath, he maintains that we are saving Social Security with a lockbox.

I pointed out a second ago that we have nothing but IOUs in the lockbox.

Let me refer to the most recent Congressional Budget Office figures on the Social Security surplus. As of last year, 1999, we had a surplus of \$125 billion. In this past fiscal year, we expect a surplus of \$154 billion; 2001, \$166 billion; 2002, \$183 billion; 2003, \$196 billion; 2004, \$209 billion; and 2005, \$225 billion.

That is how you may be able to use the expression "pay down the debt." They say pay down the public debt because they don't want to say they are separating, in their minds, the public debt from the government debt. You simply can't do that. There is just one debt. We owe it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the trust funds that have been looted already to balance the budget.

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

	1999	2000	2001
Social Security	855	1,009	1,175
Medicare:			
HI	154	176	198
SMI	27	34	35
Military Retirement	141	149	153
Civilian Retirement	492	522	553
Unemployment	77	85	94
Highway	28	31	34
Airport	12	13	14
Railroad Retirement	24	25	26
Other	59	62	64
Total	1,869	2,106	2,350

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this particular chart shows that in 1999 we

looted \$1.869 trillion from all of the trust funds. This year, we are on course to loot \$2.106 trillion. We have \$78 billion in non-Social Security surpluses. That is tied up in Medicare, military retirement, civilian retirement, the unemployment compensation fund, the highway-airport trust fund, railroad retirement, etc.

We are beginning to make the record and have it understood.

If there is any doubt with respect to the public debt, I refer to the particular budget that is now under consideration on page 5, "Public Debt."

"The appropriate levels of public debt . . ."—I am referring to the budget; it will get a majority vote. We are going through a little exercise. I say "a little exercise"; it is actually a charade. We worked 2 days and nights, and we produced the budget. Upon completion of a budget resolution in committee, the chairman is allowed to make technical adjustments through a unanimous consent. This year the technical adjustment was \$60 billion. Imagine that. Tell the appropriators they have to cut some \$60 billion in order to fall within the caps.

The instrument itself, I refer to S. Con. Res. 101, page 5:

(5) Public debt.—

The appropriate levels of the public debt are . . .

And then they list the levels for 2000 through 2005 going from \$5.625 trillion to \$5.923 trillion. That is without that \$60 billion technical adjustment. But even there, they list the debt going up \$297 billion.

This is the overall debt, which is not going down. When they say "paying down the debt," they are instead referring to the public debt.

With the course we are on, by the year 2013 there will not be any surpluses of payroll tax revenues sufficiently large to make the payments due on that particular year. So we are going to be running into a wall, and we will have to either cut the benefits or raise the taxes.

I ran over what we had done on the Grace Commission about cutting spending, but each year the spending goes up because health costs are going up, the military costs are going up. We have to live in the real world. Everybody understands that. Here is the first frontal assault according to the Allard amendment: You shall spend the Social Security surpluses. Until such time as Congress enacts major Social Security reform legislation, the surplus funds of Social Security shall be used to reduce the debt.

What you are doing is using Social Security moneys to make it appear that the debt is less and some kind of interest cost is saved. The truth is, you have gone from one credit card to the other. That is the sort of game we have played each year, making the debt increase from less than \$1 trillion under President Johnson, when he balanced the budget back in 1968 and 1969, to almost \$5.7 trillion now. Interests costs

of only \$16 billion back then are now \$362 billion, or \$1 billion a day.

That is a waste. If we had that \$200-some billion we are paying in interest costs, I could almost double the defense budget, give you all the research for health, build all the highways, bridges, the libraries, courthouses. We could do everything anybody wanted to do. I could give Gov. George W. Bush's tax cut and Vice President GORE's program of spending.

We are spending the money for nothing. When are we going to get hold of ourselves and sober up and cut out this political campaign? The worst campaign finance abuse is us. We are using our payroll to run around here and give a lark and a story to the American people that we are going to save Social Security; no, we are going to pay down the debt, pay down the public debt.

I retain the remainder of our time.

Mr. ALLARD. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 45 minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment offered by my friend from Colorado, Senator ALLARD. This is an amendment that will keep our budget balanced. It will protect the Social Security surplus by preventing these revenues from being used for additional spending, and—this is the important part—it establishes a concrete schedule for paying off the publicly held debt payments with non-Social Security surplus. This is a true payday of the debt.

I am pleased we had the comments from the Senator from South Carolina to whom I have been paying attention since I got to this body. I am pleased to say I think this is a bill he could sign onto when we have an opportunity to explain all the ramifications.

The first year Senator ALLARD and I were in the Senate, we talked about balancing the budget. It seemed a dream at that time, but it happened. Everybody in this body listened to constituents at home and said, by golly, they want the budget balanced. And we balanced it.

Now, a little fluke in that was that we were partly balancing it with Social Security surplus. The difference between what people paid into Social Security and the amount paid out was a positive revenue; it was extra money. And we were spending it.

We said: That is not honest. The people of America listened, and they said: We want some honesty with our Social Security money. Quit spending the Social Security surplus. We have done that. Everybody paid attention last year. We will have an honest surplus, not counting Social Security surplus for the first time in decades.

Now what we are talking about is debt accountability. Honesty with the trust funds is where we are headed. Debt accountability is what we need to get there.

There is a fellow in Gillette, WY, who calls me regularly. Steve Tarver is a fellow accountant, retired now. He says: Congress keeps talking about the debt being paid down, but I call the Treasury regularly and I say: How much is the national debt?

The debt keeps going up, in spite of the Social Security surplus, which is supposed to be used to be paying down the public debt already. We are taking the money out of one pocket and putting it in the other pocket. Debt to the public becomes debt to the Social Security trust fund. But it is IOUs. That debt as of 11:51 this morning: \$5 trillion, 730 billion and some-odd change.

The U.S. population as of 11:51 this morning was 274,548,318 people. A little simple division demonstrates that every man, woman, and child in this Nation right now owes, in national debt, each of us, \$20,873. I love to go to school classrooms and say: Did you know you already owe a tremendous debt? That amount is over \$20,000. That is pretty staggering to a kid in sixth or seventh grade. He or she doesn't just owe that \$20,000; every single person in each family owes that \$20,000. That is how big the debt is for the Nation.

We have gotten some benefits as we have run up the till. But it is a debt. I can say as I have traveled across Wyoming, the people understand that debt. They don't like the Federal Government being in debt any more than they like being in debt. They recognize the debt is something you have to pay off sometime. They don't think it is fair that we make our kids and our grandkids pay off our debt.

Maybe the portion that attributes down to them, they could; OK, but \$5.7 trillion is one heck of a package to pay off. It is a staggering package.

So how do we do it? We do it by starting sensibly. We start with a plan. We put this country on a mortgage program. The mortgage program is outlined in the bill. It starts with a payment of \$15 billion. It sounds like a lot of money. Around here it is not much money—\$15 billion. Essentially, the money then that you save in interest, you do not run out and spend; you add that to the principal. And the next year you pay down the \$15 billion. We are adding a little bit to it because those surpluses are going up, and it has been predicted, if we pay down the national debt, if we honestly pay down the national debt—and that is what we are talking about, debt honesty—there will be an increase in the national economy. That is the biggest factor that can increase the national economy. That means we will have a little additional revenue we can add to the \$15 billion plus the interest we save. Each year we will escalate that payment so in 20 years we pay off the national debt, not using the Social Security surplus.

This is honesty in paying down the national debt. We have to do something about these trust funds that are IOUs. People keep talking about it. This one

does not add a dime to the IOUs. This one pays down the national debt in a very calculated, fashioned program.

I do not think we are tied to 20 years on this. I do not think we are tied to \$15 billion the first year. I do not think we are tied to the same additions each year. It is time this country got on a plan to pay that debt down. You want to make the loan longer? You want to have some years when you have a little flex in it? It does not matter to me. We just have to be honest on paying down the national debt. This is one that forces honesty. This is a plan that pays off the national debt honestly over a 20-year period.

This amendment makes good economic sense, and it is good for America's future. It fulfills our promise to America's seniors without savaging our grandchildren's future. For too long, Congress has followed the path of reckless abandon in spending money we didn't have for programs with short-term benefits and long-term burdens. We have left our children and grandchildren holding the mortgage on this \$5.7 trillion Government mansion that they may not even be able to visit. That is right. If we fail to rise to the challenge of eliminating the Federal debt, we leave our children shackled to the high interest payments that were mentioned earlier, and the looming debt created by the last 40 years of big Government programs, while the benefits of that spending fade into the sunset of history.

This Congress is in the best position of any Congress in a generation to eliminate the debt held by the public—honestly. In 1999, after only 4 years of a Republican Congress, we were able to balance the budget. We have now projected budgeted surpluses beyond the next 10 years, and every year those are recalculated and become considerably greater.

Given this unique opportunity made possible by the ingenuity of the American people and the hard work of a Republican Congress willing to control Government spending to reduce it from an annual growth of about 20 percent a year, down to about 2 percent a year—it is still growing—we should get our financial house in order by setting up a definite repayment plan to eliminate the \$3.6 trillion of publicly held debt, while ensuring Social Security remains strong for future retirees.

This amendment contains three main provisions that have been outlined, three main ones that start out easy and build as we go and then continue to pay down the debt, even if Congress enacts meaningful Social Security reform next year. It creates a responsible, concrete method of paying off the debt while ensuring the future solvency of Social Security.

I have been listening to the budget debate. I found it interesting to hear the number of people on the Democratic side of the aisle talk about the budget resolution before us being irresponsible because it allows for a mod-

est tax cut over 5 years. They argue we could be using that money to pay down the debt.

This is not the first time I have heard this argument. In fact, I have heard a lot of these same claims as we debated the Taxpayer Refund and Relief Act of 1999, which is the best policy discussion and only policy discussion we have had on taxes since I have been in the Senate. I think it helped people understand how we could make a more fair, more simple Tax Code. It passed. It was vetoed. During that time, I heard a lot of rhetoric about how the most important thing was paying down the national debt.

I do not think the people using the rhetoric necessarily believe the national debt would be something we would put up as a project, that it could actually be done. That is what we are doing here. We are giving everyone a chance to back up their rhetoric with real action, by voting in favor of debt reduction by voting for this amendment.

This amendment contains three main provisions. First, it requires Congress to continue passing balanced budgets for each and every year. Second, this amendment requires yearly repayments to be made from the non-social security surplus. This schedule would begin a payment of \$15 billion in the coming fiscal year, and this amount would increase in each succeeding year by \$15 billion per-year. Third, this amendment requires that the entire social security surplus would be used for debt reduction until Congress enacts social security reform legislation. These last two provisions are essential, because they ensure that we will continue to pay down the debt even if Congress enacts meaningful social security reform next year. This amendment creates a responsible, concrete method of paying off the publicly-held debt while ensuring the future solvency of social security.

As the only accountant is the Senate, I spent a great deal of time listening to last year's discussion on tax relief. I was amazed at the number of my Democratic colleagues who opposed the tax relief bill because they said the money should be used for debt reduction. This was the same reason the president gave for vetoing our tax cut. When the president submitted his budget to Congress this year, he made clear that his rhetoric on debt reduction was a fleeting facade, behind which he could hide his real desire for countless new government programs, each one requiring substantial new government spending which would further threaten our children's economic future. As soon as the threat of a tax cut disappeared, so did President Clinton's commitment to debt reduction. This amendment challenges my Democratic colleagues to choose between a plan that offers real debt reduction or the hollow promises of President Clinton which are nothing more than a smokescreen for huge new Government spending.

I urge my colleagues to join me in rebuilding a financial house of responsibility where our parents and grandparents can retire in peace and where our children and grandchildren will be welcomed for years to come. We should join together in laying an important cornerstone in that foundation today by supporting Senator ALLARD's amendment to this budget resolution.

I want to mention a few of the things my colleagues have said. The Senator from North Dakota said:

The first choice, it seems to me, ought to be, during good economic times you pay down part of the Federal debt. That is the best gift we can give the children of this country, and that would also stimulate lower interest rates and more economic growth.

The Senator from Virginia—this is the Democratic Senator from Virginia—said:

I would rather have nothing, notwithstanding some of the good things upon which both sides agree, and simply begin to pay down the debt.

The Senator from the other side of the aisle from Michigan said:

That would be the greatest gift of all that we could make for the American people, the reduction on that debt, because that would be a reduction in the interest rates which people pay on their mortgages and cars and credit cards, and that would truly be a contribution to the well-being of our constituents.

And the Senator on the other side of the aisle from Vermont said:

I believe Congress should follow three basic principles to continue our strong economy and provide targeted tax relief. First, we must continue to keep our fiscal house in order and pay down the national debt. The national public debt stands at \$3.6 trillion. That's a lot of zeros. Like someone who has finally paid off his or her credit card balance but still has a home mortgage, the Federal Government has finally balanced its annual budget but we still have a national debt to pay down. Indeed, the Federal Government pays almost \$1 billion in interest every working day on the national debt.

The Senator from California said:

Debt reduction is the external debt, the debt that is owed to private people, Americans and those around the world who picked up our bonds. We owe them debt. I see my friend from South Carolina has pointed this out. Because of that debt, we are paying over \$300 billion a year in interest payments which, as my friend said, is bad for the economy, it's wasteful, it does no good to anyone.

And finally the Senator from the other side of the aisle from Washington said:

We will not be able to pay off our debt, a very important issue that is facing us, which we have not left ourselves room for with a massive cut of this size.

That is a lot of people encouraging us, giving us an indication that they would like to see the debt paid down. I hope they will follow through on that and help us do it.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. ENZI. I am on a limited time.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I will do it on our time. It is not a question of time. I wanted to ask a question because I am referring, on page 2, to line 12:

Until such time as Congress enacts Social Security reform legislation, these surplus funds of Social Security shall be used to reduce the debt.

So you are using Social Security trust funds to pay down the national debt? And yet you are saying we are saving Social Security.

So if I increase the debt for Kosovo or for regular defense or for food stamps or for foreign aid or for your pay and my pay, or whatever, that is the debt of the Government. That is the national debt and you use Social Security to pay it?

Mr. ENZI. If I can answer the question, in the State of the Union speech, the President said we are going to use the Social Security surplus to pay off the national debt. Over a 10-year period, we are going to have \$1.8 trillion in money we can use to pay off the national debt. And I said the same thing you did, that is, moving the money from one pocket to the other. That is not honest. But we have made a commitment that we will protect that Social Security surplus.

The one thing that is allowed by law to be done with that is to pay off bonds in the public debt. The only investment we are allowed to have at the present time for Social Security is bonds.

Mr. HOLLINGS. That is right. Bonds are IOUs, so you just increase the IOUs.

Mr. ENZI. No, it keeps the IOUs the same. The Social Security surplus will grow; the debt stays the same. Then the interest gets added to the public debt because, again, it cannot be taken

out. It has to be invested in more bonds.

That is part of the problem with Social Security; the only thing that can be done with the Social Security funds is buy U.S. bonds.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Right.

Mr. ENZI. So there are the public bonds out there and the private bonds out there. If we wind up with more private ones, we have to buy out some of the public ones. It can be done a number of ways. They are all exactly the same. They are transferring money from one pocket to another, as the Senator says.

Paying down the national debt is a commitment this Congress has made. We are not changing that commitment. We put that in the bill, and we are not changing Congress' commitment. We would like to change Congress' commitment. If Congress changes Congress' commitment, they can do that. That is what that says.

In addition, there is an honest debt repayment in the amendment. The Senator is choosing to overlook the honest portion of the debt repayment, which is the focus of this bill. It is the focus of the bill that Senator ALLARD and I introduced the first year we were here: Paying down, with true surplus, the public part of the debt. We are going to do that part and another part.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 15 minutes have expired.

Mr. ALLARD. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator does not have any time.

Mr. ALLARD. Our time has expired. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, has the Senator used the full hour? He had a full hour.

Mr. ALLARD. I am sorry, the time I yielded to the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment, so I control the time. Does the Senator from South Carolina want some additional time?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Two minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield as much time as the Senator wants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming talked about the commitment to pay down the national debt, but on page 5, the national debt is listed beginning on line 20, fiscal year 2000, as \$5.625 trillion going up to, on page 6, \$5.923 trillion. It's an increase in the debt of \$297,712,000. Here is the Senator's commitment to reducing the national debt.

There is no commitment that I have seen. I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a listing of the national debt as it has gone up since the days of President Truman.

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

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES

[In billions of dollars]

President and year	U.S. budget (outlays)	Borrowed trust funds	Unified deficit with trust funds	Actual deficit without trust funds	National debt	Annual increases in spending for interest
Truman:						
1946	55.2	-5.0	-15.9	-10.9	271.0	
1947	34.5	-9.9	4.0	+13.9	257.1	
1948	29.8	6.7	11.8	+5.1	252.0	
1949	38.8	1.2	0.6	-0.6	252.6	
1950	42.6	1.2	-3.1	-4.3	256.9	
1951	45.5	4.5	6.1	+1.6	255.3	
1952	67.7	2.3	-1.5	-3.8	259.1	
1953	76.1	0.4	-6.5	-6.9	266.0	
Eisenhower:						
1954	70.9	3.6	-1.2	-4.8	270.8	
1955	68.4	0.6	-3.0	-3.6	274.4	
1956	70.6	2.2	3.9	+1.7	272.7	
1957	76.6	3.0	3.4	+0.4	272.3	
1958	82.4	4.6	-2.8	-7.4	279.7	
1959	92.1	-5.0	-12.8	-7.8	287.5	
1960	92.2	3.3	0.3	-3.0	290.5	
1961	97.7	-1.2	-3.3	-2.1	292.6	
Kennedy:						
1962	106.8	3.2	-7.1	-10.3	302.9	9.1
1963	111.3	2.6	-4.8	-7.4	310.3	9.9
Johnson:						
1964	118.5	-0.1	-5.9	-5.8	316.1	10.7
1965	118.2	4.8	-1.4	-6.2	322.3	11.3
1966	134.5	2.5	-3.7	-6.2	328.5	12.0
1967	157.5	3.3	-8.6	-11.9	340.4	13.4
1968	178.1	3.1	-25.2	-28.3	368.7	14.6
1969	183.6	0.3	3.2	+2.9	365.8	16.6
Nixon:						
1970	195.6	12.3	-2.8	-15.1	380.9	19.3
1971	210.2	4.3	-23.0	-27.3	408.2	21.0
1972	230.7	4.3	-23.4	-27.7	435.9	21.8
1973	245.7	15.5	-14.9	-30.4	466.3	24.2
1974	269.4	11.5	-6.1	-17.6	483.9	29.3
Ford:						
1975	332.3	4.8	-53.2	-58.0	541.9	32.7
1976	371.8	13.4	-73.7	-87.1	629.0	37.1
Carter:						
1977	409.2	23.7	-53.7	-77.4	706.4	41.9
1978	458.7	11.0	-59.2	-70.2	776.6	48.7
1979	504.0	12.2	-40.7	-52.9	829.5	59.9
1980	590.9	5.8	-73.8	-79.6	909.1	74.8
Reagan:						
1981	678.2	6.7	-79.0	-85.7	994.8	95.5
1982	745.8	14.5	-128.0	-142.5	1,137.3	117.2
1983	808.4	26.6	-207.8	-234.4	1,371.7	128.7

HOLLINGS' BUDGET REALITIES—Continued
 [In billions of dollars]

President and year	U.S. budget (outlays)	Borrowed trust funds	Unified deficit with trust funds	Actual deficit without trust funds	National debt	Annual increases in spending for interest
1984	851.9	7.6	-185.4	-193.0	1,564.7	153.9
1985	946.4	40.5	-212.3	-252.8	1,817.5	178.9
1986	990.5	81.9	-221.2	-303.1	2,120.6	190.3
1987	1,004.1	75.7	-149.8	-225.5	2,346.1	195.3
1988	1,064.5	100.0	-155.2	-255.2	2,601.3	214.1
Bush:						
1989	1,143.7	114.2	-152.5	-266.7	2,868.3	240.9
1990	1,253.2	117.4	-221.2	-338.6	3,206.6	264.7
1991	1,324.4	122.5	-269.4	-391.9	3,598.5	285.5
1992	1,381.7	113.2	-290.4	-403.6	4,002.1	292.3
Clinton:						
1993	1,409.5	94.2	-255.1	-349.3	4,351.4	292.5
1994	1,461.9	89.0	-203.3	-292.3	4,643.7	296.3
1995	1,515.8	113.3	-164.0	-277.3	4,921.0	332.4
1996	1,560.6	153.4	-107.5	-260.9	5,181.9	344.0
1997	1,601.3	165.8	-22.0	-187.8	5,369.7	355.8
1998	1,652.6	178.2	69.2	-109.0	5,478.7	363.8
1999	1,703.0	251.8	124.4	-127.4	5,606.1	353.5
2000	1,769.0	234.9	176.0	-58.9	5,665.0	362.0
2001	1,839.0	262.0	177.0	-85.0	5,750.0	371.0

*Historical Tables, Budget of the US Government FY 1998; Beginning in 1962 CBO's 2001 Economic and Budget Outlook, Feb. 16, 2000.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, one can see how that debt has gone up. One can see we were doing pretty good under the Budget Act, which was the solution we had in 1993 under President Clinton. We came from a \$403.6 billion deficit. We were spending over \$400 billion more than we took in, until 1993 when we reduced it to \$349.3 billion. And in 1994, it went down to \$292.3 billion. Then in 1995, it went down to \$277 billion. In 1996, it went down to \$260.9 billion. In 1997, it was \$187.8 billion. In 1998, it was \$109 billion. In 1999, it was \$127 billion. It went back up last year.

Under this chart, it shows we are going back down. These are CBO figures.

As I related a minute ago, with the votes we have had, it is going to be over \$100 billion. I am always trying to jump off the Capitol dome to emphasize a point. I make that offer again to my distinguished chairman—I will jump off the Capitol dome if we balance the budget. Watch. Come October, when we adjourn for the year and start the new fiscal year, we will be running a deficit again. I yield the floor and retain the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues know, earlier I offered an amendment to provide for a tax reduction. At this time, I speak on behalf of the Allard-Enzi-Grams amendment because I believe it is a responsible way in which to deal with the problem of reducing the national debt.

First, we need to pay down our national debt so we can decrease our interest payments on that debt, a debt which stands at \$5.7 trillion. The way I calculate it, the interest we'll pay this year comes out to over \$224 billion. We pay about \$600 million a day on interest costs alone. Out of every Federal dollar we spend, 13 cents goes to pay interest on the national debt compared, for example, with 16 cents for

national defense and 18 cents for non-defense discretionary spending. We will spend more money on interest this year than we do on Medicare.

These numbers make me determined to do all I can to decrease our debt even further. I believe every fiscal decision we make in Congress should be measured against the backdrop of how it will decrease our national debt. And I am not the only one who believes that. In fact, in Congressional testimony in January of this year, CBO Director Dan Crippen stated:

Most economists agree that saving the surpluses, paying down the debt held by the public, is probably the best thing we can do relative to the economy.

On that same day, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said:

My first priority would be to allow as much of the surplus to flow through into a reduction in debt to the public. From an economic point of view, that would be, by far, the best means of employing it.

Lowering the debt sends a positive signal to Wall Street and Main Street and encourages more savings—and we need more savings in this country—and investment which, in turn, fuels productivity and continued economic growth. It also lowers interest rates which, in my view, is a real tax reduction for the American people.

Furthermore, devoting on-budget surpluses to debt reduction is the only way we can ensure our Nation will not return to the days of deficit spending should the economy take a sharp turn for the worse or a national emergency arise. As Alan Greenspan has testified before Congress:

A substantial part of the surplus . . . should be allowed to reduce the debt, because you can always increase debt later if you wish to, but it's effectively putting away the surplus for use at a later time if you so choose.

Many in the Senate have argued that putting the Social Security surplus in the lockbox will be enough to pay down the debt. I remind my colleagues, we will have to use some of the surplus everybody is talking about for paying down the national debt in order to fund reform of the Social Security system,

if we are going to solve the problems of Social Security.

We cannot keep putting off our responsibilities. If we have the ability, as we do now, we have a moral obligation to pay down the debt.

When I go back to Ohio, people say: we're not asking for more tax cuts; I want you to do something about Social Security, Medicare, health care, and if you have some money, for goodness sake, pay down the debt.

That is what we do in our own families. If we get a little extra money and we are in debt, we pay down the debt. That is what the people want this Government to do. That is the message I am getting from the people in the State of Ohio. I am sure my colleagues who are supporting this amendment are hearing from the people in their states.

Last but not least, I agree with GAO Comptroller General David Walker. In testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee last year, he said something that is really very important to those of us who have children and grandchildren, as most of us in this body do, about our obligation to future generations. David Walker said:

This generation has a stewardship responsibility to future generations to reduce the debt burden they inherit, to provide a strong foundation for future economic growth, and to ensure that future commitments are both adequate and affordable. Prudence requires making the tough choices today—

We have to make the tough choices today—

while the economy is healthy and the workforce is relatively large—before we are hit by the baby boom's demographic tidal wave.

We should support this amendment. It makes sense. It is good for America, and it is good for fiscal responsibility.

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

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time does Senator ALLARD have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator ALLARD has 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield myself 5 minutes. Let's make it 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have the greatest respect for Senator ALLARD and all those who are supporting him on this amendment. But I surely did not want the debate to end today without talking about what we have already done and what this budget resolution does.

In the last 2 years, we have reduced the debt held by the public. I hear people talking about both kinds of debt on the floor. But did I hear Senator VOINOVICH say he was quoting from somebody who stated the best thing we can do is reduce the debt held by the public when we have a surplus? We have already reduced it by \$355 billion. This budget resolution—so everyone will know—will reduce the debt by an additional \$1.1 trillion.

Frankly, I am going to give an estimate, but I think I will be close. If we stay on this path, the interest on the national debt will have been reduced between \$100 billion and \$130 billion.

I ask, how much is enough?

There is an argument being made that since this money is Social Security trust fund money, it does not really reduce the debt because we may have to use it someday. Right now, as we sit in this Senate, and as I stand and talk, there is less interest being paid because the Social Security trust fund money is not being spent; it is being saved, which means we have that much less IOUs to the public.

We are going to have \$1.1 trillion more over the next 5 years, making the total, in a period of about 7 years, of almost \$1.5 trillion.

I think that on my side of the aisle, the same Senators who are concerned about whether this is real, because someday we have to fix Social Security, in my mind's eye I think they are all for personal accounts as a solution to the Social Security problem. I suggest that if we do personal accounts, then we will not spend this money. In fact, it will turn up on the side of the ledger as having been saved rather than having been spent. So it is too early to predict what kind of reform will occur, and when it will occur, if it occurs, on Social Security.

What we have to look at is right now and the next 5 years in this budget resolution. Some would make it sound as if \$1.1 trillion applied to the debt—a portion of which is from the on-budget surplus—isn't enough, that we ought to do more.

Let me suggest, what is left over after doing that, over the next 5 years, is about \$390 billion. That is what is left over in new money, off a freeze.

You have to take care of defense with that, which I think a fair guess would be that by itself it is going to grow at \$20 billion a year at a minimum. What about all the rest of Government? Are we literally going to say we are not going to have a single increase in the

rest of Government? Of course, we are going to have some.

What about a tax bill of some type? Sooner or later both sides of the aisle—and we are going to get a new President, but we are going to have some tax relief. That all has to come out of the remaining money, some portion of which they keep saying: Put more on the debt. They can argue whichever way they want. Part of it will come out of the tax relief in the future; part of it will come out of spending in the future; maybe part of it will come out of defense in the future.

But I do not believe this Budget Committee did anything but the right thing in assuming that about \$1.1 trillion out of a surplus that is probably totally, for both kinds of surplus, about \$1.5 trillion, is put on the debt.

Everybody claims they want to do more. Everybody quotes Alan Greenspan. My friend, Senator GRAMM, once said: Quoting Alan Greenspan is sort of like quoting the Bible. It depends on whether you are reading John or Matthew; you can get a quote in one of them that faith alone gets you to Heaven, and you can quote the other one that faith and a little work gets you to Heaven. Choose whichever you like. But you can quote either one.

I am going to say—to quote Alan Greenspan to my way of thinking—the best thing you can do is put a surplus on the debt that you owe to the public. But then he says, if the next choice is between spending it and tax relief, unequivocally, tax relief; and, third, the worst for the economy is to spend more.

Frankly, I am amazed that we have Republicans complaining about not having enough on the debt when all we have left over is used for two things: \$150 billion, spread over 5 years, in tax relief, unless we do not do it. If we do not have tax relief at all, it all goes on the debt. That is right in the budget resolution. That is binding. So if you do not do tax relief, it goes on the debt. The rest goes to contemplated increases in defense and a very small amount for the myriad domestic programs that we have in our Government.

We have to be both realists and theorists. We have to be philosophical and we have to apply it with some benchmarks to reality.

To tell you the honest truth, and to share with my fellow Senators, never in my life—25 years of which was spent with great deficits—did I ever assume we would be applying as much as this budget resolution contemplates against the debt. Our interest is going to decline—I am corrected here—from about \$224 billion a year to about \$166 billion by the year 2005. That is with the tax relief we have and with the defense increases we have. Then, if you want to go out the next 5 years, it comes down precipitously thereafter.

Frankly, this generation of Americans, and those working and trying to make a living, are all out there saying:

We are putting part of our taxes into debt relief. They are asking: How much is enough? Are you going to have any left over to give us a little tax relief? Are you going to have any left over so we can have an adequate Defense Department? Or are you really going to put it all on the debt?

I understand I am exaggerating when I say "all," but how much more can we do?

I do not believe we ought to go beyond what we have in this budget resolution. Democrats will claim maybe \$75 billion more ought to go on the debt. Senator ALLARD has it in some formula by the year we ought to have more. I think they both ought to lose. I hope, before we are finished, they will both lose because the right thing to do is just about what the Budget Committee agreed to: about \$10 billion, or so, a year out of the on-budget surplus; and the entire Social Security surplus going unused, staying in the fund.

When I ask, How much is enough? I suggest that the most significant fiscal policy change made to this point—to the benefit of Americans of the future—is something that came from our side of the aisle, and in particular that I thought up one day; and that most significant fiscal change of events is that all the Social Security surplus stays in the Social Security fund.

Ask Dr. Greenspan, looking over the last decade, and from what he can see in the future: What is the most significant fiscal policy change to the betterment of America? He will say that one, if you live by it. We are living by it right here in this budget resolution, and somebody is suggesting that isn't enough. Somebody such as Dr. Greenspan thinks it is a whopping amount. I imagine if he could write it down on a piece of paper, he would say: I really never thought Congress would ever do that. If they do it for another 5 or 10 years, what a plus will occur, what a positive thing to happen for American consumers, the American worker, and America's future.

I will just summarize by stating a rather unbelievable fact: By the year 2005, interest expenses will have decreased from 13 percent to 8 percent of the Federal budget. That is the only significant portion of the budget that has declined, from 13 percent of the budget down to 8 percent by 2005. Pretty good work, Congress, pretty good work.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield for a minute?

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield whatever time the Senator would like.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to strike section 208 and section 210, and I ask unanimous consent that they be qualified and temporarily set aside to be called up later. We will have a third amendment pertaining to section 211 to be offered later.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, what was the request?

Mr. STEVENS. That these amendments be qualified and put in line.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I will take the opportunity to respond to some of the comments of the Senator from South Carolina and also to some of the comments from the chairman of the Budget Committee.

We all appreciate the effort the chairman of the Budget Committee has put forth in paying down the public debt. I think he is to be commended for his commitment. We have talked about the need to pay down the public debt.

What I am saying with this particular amendment is that we need to go beyond 5 years. We need to look at 20 years and put a plan in place. This is a minimal plan. We have over a \$1.6 trillion budget. We are just taking \$15 billion of it and saying let's commit each year an additional \$15 billion to paying down the debt and that we ought to be able to do that. I don't care whether it is 15 or 10 or 7. Senator ENZI from Wyoming made the same comment. The important thing is that we have a plan to pay it down.

This is a legitimate plan. This is not just a paper transfer. The Senator from South Carolina implied that this is just a transfer on paper. It isn't. It is taking the on-budget surplus and using that towards paying down the debt as a minimal plan. If the Budget Committee comes up with more dollars they want to put aside for debt reduction, God bless them. Let's do it. I am all for that. But this doesn't prevent them from doing more if they want to do it.

In addition to that, we say, instead of taking the Social Security surplus and transferring it over to the general fund where it gets spent, hold it in a fund very much like the Domenici lockbox. We put it there, and we don't spend it. It stays in that fund until we have serious Social Security reform. Then, when we have changed Social Security, when we have saved Social Security, then we can relook at changing the law, where we have an automatic transfer of surplus and Social Security that goes to the general fund to be spent. We can look at the implications on our total debt figure.

What you have here is a minimal plan. If you start including the off-budget surpluses in the year 2001, you have a total debt payment of around \$152.4 billion because there is \$137.4 billion that comes in on top of the \$15 billion we have in the minimal plan. Then in the next year, in 2002, we go up to \$30 billion that we are using in on-budget surplus to pay down the debt. That is a minimal plan to pay it down by 2021. We add on top of that another \$143.6 billion to bring it up to \$173.6 billion at the end of the 2002 budget year. That is assuming we don't do anything to reform or change Social Security.

I think most of us agree that Social Security is going to have to be

changed. We will have to do something to save it. I am saying, in the meantime, instead of leaving the money out there, leaving it vulnerable, let's use the money to pay down the public debt an additional amount so it doesn't get built into the spending patterns of the Congress and obligate us to programs we may not be able to afford if we go into a time period where our economy is going to turn down.

I believe our economy is cyclical. Right now, we are going through unprecedented growth. At some point in time, it is going to turn around. We are going to regret the day we didn't do more to pay down the debt to get us in a position to ride through those economic downturns when they occur.

I think this is an important provision. It is in no way intended to be critical of the efforts of the Budget Committee to date. It says we can do just a little bit more; instead of looking at 5-year increments, let's look at a 20-year increment for paying down the debt. We can do that in 20 years, by 2021. It says that in the process of doing that, at a minimum, we will save ourselves \$3 trillion in interest payments.

It is a concrete plan. It doesn't eliminate the opportunity, if Members of the Senate want to have reduced taxes. It does not eliminate that. It has an enforcement mechanism.

Last fall, we got into a discussion in the Senate as to whether or not we were spending Social Security dollars because there was a disagreement on what the revenues were going to be at the first of the year, and we moved into February. We have provided that if our projected revenues don't hold up, we can go in and make adjustments on spending so that when we tell the American people we are not going to spend Social Security dollars and the revenues don't hold up, we won't spend Social Security dollars. We will have saved Social Security. I think it is straightforward budgeting. It is accountable. I think it is a step in the right direction.

I reserve the remainder of my time. I wonder if we have anyone further who wants to speak on the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

If neither side yields time, the time will be subtracted equally against both sides.

Mr. ALLARD. Does the other side have anybody who cares to speak? If not, I can yield on this side.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We do, Mr. President. If, however, the proponent of the amendment wishes to continue addressing the Senate, we have no objection. We are waiting for people to come by.

Mr. ALLARD. I think Senator ENZI may want to make a point or two in the debate. I will yield some time to him, unless the Senator has somebody in line to speak.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. That would be fine.

Mr. ALLARD. I call on the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI, and yield him 5 minutes.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, we have been hearing about the Social Security surplus, and I hate for the debate to really revolve around the Social Security surplus. The Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, did come up with a marvelous plan last year—the lockbox for Social Security—which has been adopted as one of our budget principles now; we lock up the Social Security surplus. I can't give enough credit to him for his effort, along with those of us who joined him to make that preservation of Social Security. It is extremely important. That continues under this bill.

The focus of the bill should be a plan to pay down the rest of the national debt over a specified period of time, just as you do a house payment. Why is this important? Every family in America will understand why that is important.

I hear some words around here occasionally that if you have extra money after you do these other things, then you understand you are supposed to pay down your debt. No, that is not how it works, and the American people understand that. If you have a debt, you have a payment you have to make, and you allocate that payment before you do anything else.

That is what we are talking about here—responsibility, just as you have in a family, for paying down the national debt. It would come first. It would have to be the first thing we did. We would still find the money to do the other things we thought were important, but we would first pay down this national debt we have accumulated on behalf of our kids and grandkids.

We have talked about the debt being reduced by \$1.1 trillion over the next 5 years. That is marvelous. That is taking the Social Security surplus and locking it up. It is a very important concept. But that does not pay down the national debt so there is money left with which to eventually do additional things.

There was a comment that there is \$130 billion in interest savings by paying that down. Not if we are being honest about Social Security. If Social Security has bonds, Social Security should earn interest. If Social Security earns interest, that also has to go into the account because we can't spend it. We don't want to spend it, we are not supposed to spend it, and we have made it a principle not to spend it. But we should still pay the interest to Social Security. It will increase the debt reduction on this changing from one pocket to another. But it is still interest that has to be paid.

We are talking about a billion dollars a day of interest on the national debt—borrowing from what the Senator from South Carolina used as a figure. But I have to tell you, that billion dollars a day is not free to be spent until all of the national debt is paid off—all of it.

When you pay down a house mortgage, you pay it down a little bit and it saves you some interest, but you actually apply that interest to your payment because the payment stays constant on a house payment. So you can't spend the interest you save on a house payment. We are suggesting you can't spend the interest you save on a debt reduction payment.

As the only accountant in the Senate, I spent a great deal of time listening to last year's discussion on tax relief. I was amazed at the number of my Democrat colleagues who opposed that bill because they said the money should be used for debt reduction. This is the same reason the President gave for vetoing our tax cut. When he submitted his budget to Congress this year, he made clear his rhetoric on debt reduction was a fleeting facade behind which he could hide his real desire for countless new Government programs, each one requiring substantial new Government spending, which would further threaten our children's economic future. As soon as the threat of the tax cut disappeared, so did the President's determination and commitment to debt reduction—other than moving it from one pocket to the other on Social Security.

This amendment challenges all of my colleagues to choose between a plan that offers a real debt reduction or the hollow promises which were nothing more than a smokescreen for huge Government spending.

I urge colleagues to join me in rebuilding the financial house of responsibility where our parents and grandparents can retire in peace and where our children and grandchildren will be welcome for years to come. We should join together in laying an important cornerstone in that foundation today by supporting Senator ALLARD's amendment to this budget resolution.

I reserve the remainder of my time and I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of our time on this side.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. 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. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLARD. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation regarding the time for any opposition to the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, there are 41 minutes remaining in opposition.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I will speak off the budget resolution itself. I have listened with interest to the comments of the Senator from Colorado. I salute what he says he wants to do to get the debt reduced more than anybody else: Get it lower, bring it down. It doesn't matter how we get it there, if we have to burn the house down to get it.

There isn't anybody here who doesn't know we are terribly short of funding for programs we need to have in place, that even the Republican budget resolution—and I serve on the Budget Committee—was passed by the majority without any support from the minority. None of the Democrats voted for this resolution.

I think it is fair to say the principle of paying down the debt was established by President Clinton and his administration when they said, "Save Social Security, pay down the debt." They were almost simultaneous acts. Some disagree and say it is another IOU from the Government. But it is an IOU from a much stronger balance sheet. I come from the business world, and that is the way I look at things.

I ask the Senator from Colorado, if he will indulge me, what is the total savings he hopes to have or the total debt reduction he plans to have over the 5-year period?

Mr. ALLARD. If we look at it overall, we plan on saving, in interest over the 20 year period, \$3.2 trillion. Now, if we look at our debt payment over 5 years in surplus, then we are going to be paying down our trust fund. In 2006, we are going to be looking at—let me get the figure out here—a total of having paid down the surplus in 5 years of \$982.7 billion and a savings of the interest, which would be that much less since we have to pay interest on it.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator be kind enough to tell me what the formula says in direct debt repayment over the 5-year period? I understand that it is in increments.

Mr. ALLARD. Fifteen billion dollars.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Then \$30 billion.

Mr. ALLARD. Then \$45 billion. Yes. So when we get down here to the year 2006, we would be making a \$90 billion payment for the debt payment. But \$15 billion of that comes out of the spending for that year as new revenues come in. So we are establishing a program.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I appreciate the Senator's response. I am trying to get it nailed down to a figure so we can discuss it with a degree of understanding.

If it was \$15 billion, \$30 billion, \$45 billion, \$60 billion, and \$75 billion, it comes to about \$255 billion in 5 years.

Mr. ALLARD. The program amount paying down the debt would be \$90 billion in the year 2006.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. But we are talking about starting in 2001. It comes to \$255 billion. We don't have to take this

much longer. I was surprised to see the Senator introduce a 20-year forecast. Am I correct? Was that on the chart?

Mr. ALLARD. It is not a forecast. It is a plan to pay down the debt so we will have completely paid off the debt by the year 2021.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. It is a mandatory retirement of debt each year regardless of the financial condition in this country.

Mr. ALLARD. It includes the Social Security surplus. The bill sets the Social Security surplus over here, and says it will not spend the Social Security surplus unless we do Social Security reform. On top of that, you have the Social Security surplus. If we took 2001 and 2002, for example, when you include a Social Security surplus, it is more than \$15 billion. It is \$152.4 billion in 2001, and \$173.6 billion paying down the debt in both those years. It is pretty similar to what the Budget Committee is doing right now.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. To be clear, because I think there is perhaps some misinterpretation of what the Senator is looking for, that is pay down the debt as a mandate of the budget process—pay down the debt, and that is regardless of where those payments come from. I understand the Senator wants to get the debt paid down. But I just want to be sure I am correct in what I understand his intention is, once again to pay down the debt. Regardless, we are going to take \$15 billion out next year, and the next year it is \$30 billion, and then \$45 billion, et cetera, among the first things. That is a mandate.

Mr. ALLARD. That is a priority.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the Senator. I hope it is clear to everybody who is listening that this is a cut taken without regard for the consequences. It doesn't matter where it comes from. It can come out of Medicare, based on what we are hearing. It could come out of education. It could come out of COPS. Pull in the FBI, cut the number of FBI agents, cut safety programs, cut Coast Guard—cut, cut. It is like the harvest at the end of the growing season—just cut it. The only problem is we have other obligations.

Maybe the Senator from Colorado thinks the principal obligation is similar to running an accounting office such as H&R Block, or something such as that. We cut regardless of the consequences. Take down the respirators. Take down the blood transfusions. If the patient dies, the patient dies.

We can't have that. Forgive me, but everybody knows that this is a political idea whose time should never come. We cannot plan on eliminating the debt without establishing where it is that the funds are going to come from to pay down that debt. I did not hear the Senator say "only if there is a surplus." He didn't allocate the resource to the surplus. Even if we are in debt because of an economic downturn of some significance, we will just pay down the debt. We will take it out of programs that are life-sustaining programs in some cases—or increasing

taxes. That is where we have to go if there is no accounting. I know the Senator, in addition to being a professional, is also, if I may say, a businessman. He knows what balance sheets and P&L statements look like. We are going to just pay down the debt regardless of where it comes from.

I know the distinguished chairman of the committee on which I serve, the Budget Committee, has a word or two he wants to pass along. I must say that this proposal, unless we know where and how the funds are going to be generated to pay down that debt, you will forgive me, borders on the reckless.

I ask the Senator to answer in short form, because it is on opposition time, where does the Senator plan to get the funds to pay down this debt?

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, my response is, we have 4-percent growth in outlays projected into the schedule that we have laid out. In reality, there are no program cuts. We make provisions for 4-percent increases. There is just a plan. It is similar to an amortization schedule for your home. If the family runs into problems, they can redo that plan to pay down the debt. But the key is that we have a plan to pay down the debt. We have allowed 4-percent growth in spending in that plan. I think that is reasonable.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am sure the Senator considers it reasonable.

I point out that this cut would be to reduce the Republican budget resolution plan for spending by \$205 billion.

I ask the chairman of the Budget Committee what kind of effect this might have if your budget plan for discretionary spending and nondefense was cut, and maybe even throw defense in the \$205 billion.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that all good intentions are attributable to this amendment. But this amendment prejudices everything that we need for the next 5 years, and perhaps 5 years after that. Assuming we know right now about everything we need—and we ought to use his number, which is 4 percent for defense and everything else—and decide all the rest goes on the debt, then budget committees will start with those ground rules in the future. Pretty soon, we will just write a budget right here on the floor like this. We don't have to meet. Nothing happens any differently every year. We just determine this is exactly how much will be left over, and all the rest goes to the debt.

I am already against the amendment. I don't think it is the right thing to do. I didn't yield time off my amendment, but I would have if I had been here.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I could see a hefty tax raise coming to pay off the debt.

Mr. DOMENICI. It could, and it could be tax cuts in the future, which is not what Republicans have been thinking either. The Senator from Colorado says he doesn't intend to affect them. But the truth is we don't know that.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I have finished with my remarks.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I regret I will be unable to support the amendment offered by Senator ALLARD to provide for budget procedures designed to reduce our national debt. While I strongly agree with the goal of debt reduction, I cannot support the amendment because of several important flaws.

First, the amendment calls for at least partially privatizing Social Security as part of an overall reform plan for that program. While I believe we need to pursue modest reforms to Social Security, I strongly oppose efforts to privatize that program. For the past seven decades, Social Security has worked to keep retirees out of poverty. Roughly half of seniors would in live poverty were it not for Social Security. It would be a great mistake to eliminate the fundamental shared security that program provides by moving to a privatized system.

Second, while a policy of planned debt reduction may be meritorious, there are clearly times when it would be wise to temporarily suspend such plans. The amendment provides for one exception, namely a declaration of war. However, there are other circumstances under which an exception may be needed, in particular, when there is a severe economic recession. At such a time, debt reduction may aggravate an economic slump. At the very least, the amendment should provide some flexibility with respect to the level of debt reduction. Unfortunately, it does not.

Finally, the amendment may be unconstitutional, as it attempts to constrain the power of the Vice President, provided in the Constitution, to break tie votes in the Senate. It is ironic that perhaps the most critical vote of the past decade in the cause of a lower national debt, the vote to pass the 1993 deficit reduction package, was decided by the tie-breaking vote of the Vice President and would have been precluded had this provision been in effect at the time. That single vote may be more responsible for the record-breaking economic growth we have experienced than any other over the past seven years. More importantly, this provision is almost certainly unconstitutional, and on that basis alone, warrants opposition.

This budget resolution would certainly look a lot better were it to incorporate the levels of debt reduction contemplated by this amendment, and it is regretful that, thanks in large part to the fiscally irresponsible tax cuts in it, the underlying budget resolution could not sustain the level of debt reduction that Senator ALLARD proposes. While I cannot vote for his amendment, I congratulate Senator ALLARD on his effort, for he has certainly helped to raise the critical issue of debt reduction, and given it the priority it deserves.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise to strongly support Senator ALLARD's amendment, which would protect So-

cial Security and eliminate the federal debt held by the public. I believe this is a fiscally responsible amendment and it will help us to maintain fiscal discipline in an era of budget surplus.

If enacted, this amendment would stop Washington's spending spree and eliminate the entire \$3.6 trillion debt owed to the public, save over \$3 trillion in interest, and protect the Social Security program from annual discretionary appropriations raids.

Mr. President, thanks to our strong economy, we will have a \$1.9 trillion non-Social Security surplus and a \$2.3 trillion Social Security surplus over the next 10 years.

Yet there are many proposals to spend this surplus. If we spend it, rather than save it, we will confirm the public's worst fears about the irresponsibility of their elected leaders.

This budget surplus didn't just fall from the sky. It is working Americans who generated the surplus—not Congress, not the President, but Americans' hard work. And it should be returned to taxpayers in the form of debt reduction, tax relief, and Social Security reform.

If we don't lock in the budget surplus and return it to the taxpayers in these ways, Washington will spend it all. Last year's appropriations spending has proven that my fears are well founded.

Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan has repeatedly advised the Congress and the administration that we should use the surplus for debt reduction or tax relief, rather than increasing government spending. Here is what he said:

Saving the surpluses—if politically feasible—is, in my judgment, the most important fiscal measure we can take at this time to foster continued improvements in productivity.

The Allard amendment would achieve this goal by dedicating some of the non-Social Security surplus to retire the debt. It also locks up the entire Social Security surplus for debt reduction, so we can have more cash reserves to save and reform Social Security, and to ensure Social Security will be there for our seniors, baby boomers, and future generations.

I am pleased that under this budget resolution, we dedicate the \$1.1 trillion budget surplus to reduce the debt. This is a move in the right direction. We should now accelerate and continue the debt repayments.

The Allard amendment will just do that. Starting in fiscal year 2001, this amendment requires Congress to use \$15 billion of non-Social Security surplus receipts to pay down the debt. Thereafter, in every succeeding year, the amount of debt payment must increase by \$15 billion. Under this amendment, we will do more to pay down the debt.

Furthermore, the Allard amendment leaves plenty of room to provide tax relief for working Americans, while protecting the Social Security surplus.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about debt reduction, but what they really want is to use debt reduction as an excuse to deny working Americans tax relief and to increase government spending. When I offered an amendment in the Budget Committee to dedicate this fiscal year's \$26 billion on-budget surplus to retire the national debt, all of the Minority party members voted against my amendment, claiming that it would cut government spending too much.

Mr. President, our economy has greatly improved our short-term fiscal situation, and we will have a significant budget surplus over the next 10 years. However, our long-term fiscal condition, such as the insolvency of Social Security, still constitutes the primary threat to the health of our future economy.

We must seize the opportunity presented by this budget surplus to address our long-term fiscal imbalances caused by the astronomical unfunded liability of Social Security. Without reform, the long-term financial imbalances will crowd out all of our discretionary spending. It will create fiscal hardship for millions of baby boomers and impose a heavy burden on future generations.

The Allard amendment offers us the opportunity to fix the problem.

The Allard amendment maintains the fiscal discipline we need in an era of budget surplus. It requires Congress to budget for a surplus that will be dedicated to the repayment of the publicly held portion of the debt, while maintaining a balanced budget.

As I have repeatedly warned, without returning this budget surplus to the taxpayers in the form of debt reduction and tax relief, Washington will spend all of it. Let's pass the Allard amendment to stop that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, while the manager of the bill has been talking on this most important issue, I have been meeting with staff and some others to try to get the remaining time lined up before 5:30.

I say to the manager of the bill on the majority side that Senator CONRAD is here and would like to offer an amendment. He can either do it when time runs out or he could do it now.

If the Senator from Colorado wishes to offer an amendment, we could take 5 minutes before 5:30.

Senator KENNEDY and Senator BINGAMAN would also like 5 minutes to speak before the vote takes place. The Senator from North Dakota, who is going to offer the amendment, needs about 12 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. We have been working very well together on this but I don't want to agree to that. That means on your side you have 10 minutes to speak on the education matter and you have not yielded anything to us in opposition.

Mr. REID. I have no problem with you having whatever time. I am trying

to protect Senators BINGAMAN and KENNEDY because they requested time a long time ago.

Mr. DOMENICI. The unanimous consent said each of them can speak 2 minutes before the vote. That is agreed to in the unanimous consent; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOMENICI. So they have 2 minutes each.

Mr. REID. If they are here and I get the floor I will yield them some time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I am ready to let the Senator proceed with his amendment although there is time remaining. I want to yield my time. If the Senator will yield his time, he will not have time left except the 2 minutes for each side.

Mr. REID. I think the two leaders would not agree to that because they have alerted everybody the vote is going to take place at 5:30.

Mr. DOMENICI. Under my proposal, we yield back our time on Allard, he yields back his time, and we are finished with Allard except for the 2 minutes.

Mr. REID. And then the rest of the time we talk on debt reduction.

Mr. DOMENICI. Up until the time we allow 2 minutes for each amendment.

Mr. ALLARD. I want 2 or 3 minutes to summarize. I can do that and then yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. Wouldn't you rather speak before your amendment is voted on?

Mr. ALLARD. Yes.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator has 2 minutes under the unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. ALLARD. That is fine.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back the time and assume the time has been consumed on the Allard amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 2935 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2906
(Purpose: To increase the amount of debt reduction contained in the resolution by \$75 billion over 5 years)

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering is simple. It reduces the proposed \$150 billion tax cut in the Republican plan. It cuts it in half and dedicates the savings to debt reduction.

The U.S. economy is stronger than it has ever been. We have now had the longest economic expansion in our history. The question before the Senate is: What is the best strategy for keeping this extraordinary economic expansion underway? That is the question before the Senate.

Virtually every economist who came before the Budget Committee, virtually every economist who came before the Finance Committee on which I also serve, has said the highest priority ought to be the further paying down of the national debt. That is what my amendment addresses.

I believe rather than some ambitious, new spending scheme or some ambi-

tious, new tax scheme that our priority ought to be paying down the national debt. Why? Because that is what has triggered this enormous economic expansion, getting our fiscal policy in order.

In 1993, we had a \$290 billion deficit, a deficit as far as the eye could see. We were running up the national debt. In fact, we quadrupled the national debt in about a 10-year timeframe. That would put this economy in the tank. In 1993, when we passed a plan to bring down the deficit, a 5-year plan that brought down the deficit each and every year, that put us on a course to lower interest rates and of higher rates of economic growth, to get the crowding-out factor removed from the marketplace so the Federal Government wasn't in competition with the private sector for scarce resources.

The result has been reduced interest rates. The result has been more money available for productive investment in this economy. The result has been the lowest unemployment in 30 years, the lowest rates of inflation in more than 30 years, and the longest economic expansion in our history. Those are the facts. The critical component, according to every economist that has come before us, is to continue that strategy, continue to pay down the debt, lift this debt burden off of the economy, pay off this publicly held debt by the year 2013 or before so that we have as big an economy as we can possibly grow before the baby boomers start to retire. That is the wisest course.

It is not just the opinion of the Senator from North Dakota; that is also the opinion of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, who says: Pay down the debt first. The best use of the surplus is to reduce red ink.

Chairman Greenspan said on debt reduction: Saving the surpluses, if politically feasible, is, in my judgment, the most important fiscal measure we can take at this time to foster continued improvements in productivity.

Listen to Mr. Greenspan on this question:

... there are limited fiscal resources in this country and until we have strong evidence that there is a major structural increase in the surplus, that trying to commit it to various different programs or even tax cuts, I think, is unwise.

The alternative budget we are offering on our side dedicates 82 percent of the projected surpluses to debt reduction. This is what we are proposing over 10 years; 82 percent of all of the surpluses dedicated to paying down the debt. We leave 14 percent for tax cuts and other high priority domestic needs such as prescription drug benefits.

The vast majority of what we are proposing in our substitute is to pay down the debt. This includes every penny of the Social Security surplus, and it includes the biggest percentage of the non-Social Security surplus for paying down the debt.

I know this is a conservative approach and some are surprised we are

advocating it, but this is our position. We believe it is the best strategy for the economy. We believe it is the best strategy for the country, and it is the strategy we are strongly supporting.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle primarily advocate tax cuts. Virtually all of the non-Social Security surplus in the plan on the other side of the aisle goes for tax cuts. Our alternative is to say, yes, there is room for tax cuts, but it ought not to be the first priority out of the non-Social Security surplus. The first priority ought to be further debt reduction. We dedicate 36 percent of the non-Social Security surplus in addition to 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. In addition, we advocate 36 percent of the non-Social Security surplus to debt reduction, the biggest percentage.

The next biggest percentage is for tax cuts. Yes, tax cuts are called for with this prosperity. Yes, we ought to address the marriage penalty; we ought to solve it. Yes, we ought to deal with some of the other things in the Tax Code that are unfair. For example, I believe 39 years of depreciation for leasehold improvements makes no sense when the economic life of those improvements is 10 to 15 years. We ought to change that, too. We ought to change the estate tax. The current unified credit is out of date. We ought to update that. We ought to dramatically increase what we are doing in terms of relief for people with an estate tax problem.

The top priority ought to be debt reduction. That is what we have made the top priority in our proposal. Mr. President, 36 percent of the non-Social Security surplus is for debt reduction; 29 percent for tax cuts; 23 percent for prescription drugs and other initiatives, and, of course, 11 percent for interest costs.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. REID. Would a debt reduction be a tax decrease for everybody in America?

Mr. CONRAD. Absolutely. That would reduce interest costs over time. Of course, we are burning up a lot of money in the Federal budget in interest costs.

The other thing I think is often missed in this whole question of debt reduction, Lloyd Bentsen when he was Secretary of the Treasury came to a meeting of the Finance Committee and said the best bang for the buck, the biggest bang for the buck is to take measures that reduce debt, that reduce deficits, that as a result take pressure off of interest rates.

For every 1 percent we save on interest rates, we lift a \$128 billion debt burden off this economy, every year—every year. That is bigger than any tax cut anybody has come up with, in terms of relief to our economy, by lifting the debt burden on this economy.

The proof is in the pudding. What happened in 1993, when we cut spending

and, yes, raised income taxes on the wealthiest 1 percent so we could reduce the deficits, balance the budget, and get us on a course that could be sustained financially? We triggered reduced interest rates, increased rates of savings, societal savings that made more money available for productive investment that kicked off the longest economic expansion in our history. That is what is working. We ought to continue that course.

We ought to stay the effort, continue the effort to pay down this debt, relieve the debt burden on the economy, take Government out of competition for scarce resources so the private sector has more money to invest, so we are better able to grow the economy, so we have a bigger economy when the bills of the baby boom generation start to come due. That is what every economist has told the Finance Committee. It is what they have told the Budget Committee. We have the Chairman of the Federal Reserve telling us that is the wisest course. Let's do it. Let's take some of this tax cut, half of it, and use it to reduce the debt. That is the wisest course.

We know there are things that need to be done on tax relief. I mentioned the marriage tax penalty. We ought to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. We ought to eliminate that. We have enough money in our proposed tax cuts to take care of that problem and also to address other serious needs in the tax arena. But when I talk to my constituents, they say to me: Senator, pay down the debt. That is really the crying need in this economy.

We know; we have seen the reports in the Washington Post, that individuals' taxes have gone down. That is the finding of the Congressional Budget Office. That is the finding of the Tax Foundation, that taxes on individuals have gone down because we have expanded the earned-income tax credit; we provide the \$500 tax credit for children. As a result, we have provided tax relief, very meaningful tax relief. That is one reason people are not clamoring for the additional tax relief.

What they are clamoring for is a continuation of the economic strategy that has made us the wonder of the world. It has created the longest economic expansion in our history. Whatever we do, we should not put that economic expansion at risk. And the best way to foster a continuation of this economic expansion is to continue the strategy of paying down debt.

Might I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has not sent up his amendment, so the time has not begun to run on his amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD], for himself, Mr. KOHL, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. HARKIN and Mr. ROBB, proposes an amendment numbered 2935 to amendment 2906.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment strike all after the first word and add the following:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this resolution the following numbers shall apply:

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$6,579,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$12,427,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$15,376,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$18,775,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$21,724,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$6,579,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$12,427,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$15,376,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$18,775,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$21,724,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$6,579,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$12,427,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$15,376,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$18,775,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$21,724,000,000.

On page 5, line 23, decrease the amount by \$6,579,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, decrease the amount by \$12,427,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, decrease the amount by \$15,376,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, decrease the amount by \$18,775,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, decrease the amount by \$21,724,000,000.

On page 6, line 6, decrease the amount by \$6,579,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, decrease the amount by \$12,427,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, decrease the amount by \$15,376,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, decrease the amount by \$18,775,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, decrease the amount by \$21,724,000,000.

On page 29, line 3, decrease the amount by \$6,579,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, decrease the amount by \$74,881,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thought we had an implicit understanding when I yielded back all my time on the amendment that Senator CONRAD would offer his amendment, it would be a half-hour on his side on his amendment and a half-hour on our side. That is what second-degree amendments carry.

Mr. CONRAD. I thought we had 12 minutes on our side.

Mr. DOMENICI. Twelve only? Whatever anyone wants to do, we have to leave some time.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield? I say to the Senator from North Dakota, I offered a unanimous consent agreement to give him 12 minutes. He thought that had been agreed to. It had not been. That is why he asked the Chair how much time he had left. He offered his amendment. I guess the time will just be split now; is that right?

Mr. DOMENICI. He has used 12 minutes. How much time has he used on his amendment?

Mr. REID. How much time has the Senator used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator spoke for 11 minutes off the resolution.

Mr. REID. So, 45 minutes, approximately, would be remaining?

Mr. DOMENICI. At what time are we supposed to vote?

Mr. REID. We are to vote at 5:30; there are 35 minutes left.

Mr. DOMENICI. We need 2 minutes to talk about the amendment that is up, that is going to be called up. Why don't we split the remaining time.

Mr. REID. That will be fine.

Mr. DOMENICI. So we need 4 minutes before we vote at 5:30, and the rest of the time will be divided equally, which is giving him a very big break, but I am glad to do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, first let me thank my colleagues. We are glad to split the remaining time.

I think the point has been made and hopefully clearly made. I am offering a second-degree amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. Let me just speak, if I may for a moment, about the amendment of the Senator from Colorado because there is something in his amendment that also should concern my colleagues.

Right at the beginning of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, he defines a balanced budget as one that includes all budgeted outlays and budgeted revenues. He says, "budgeted outlays shall not exceed budget revenues." That sounds like a balanced budget but, unfortunately, under the legal terms to which we have to hold, that is a definition of a balanced budget that includes the Social Security surpluses.

We have all pledged here not to do this. We have all pledged not to use Social Security surpluses to balance the budget. Now the Senator from Colorado comes in here and defines a balanced budget as one that uses Social Security revenues to balance. That is precisely—

Mr. ALLARD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONRAD. No, I will not. That is precisely what we should not do. That is going back to the bad old days around here of using Social Security money to balance the budget. That is going back to the bad old days of raiding Social Security, of looting Social Security to make it look as if we have balanced the budget.

Why ever would we want to go back to that approach? We have just spent years convincing our colleagues and the American people that we should not count Social Security surpluses to balance the operating budget of the United States. Now we have an amendment from a colleague that suggests we ought to go back to the bad old days and we ought to raid Social Security to balance the budget.

I hope we will not go in that direction. I hope we will continue on the path of reserving every penny of Social Security for Social Security. Let's not, please, colleagues, go back to defining a balanced budget as one that raids the Social Security surpluses in order to achieve balance. That would be a profound mistake.

Instead, I hope we take the second-degree amendment I have offered that says let's make the top priority debt reduction, let's take every penny of the Social Security surplus and dedicate it to Social Security, and let's take the biggest chunk of the non-Social Security surplus and use it to pay down debt. That is the best game plan for maintaining economic prosperity in the country, for extending this remarkable period of economic expansion, for broadening and deepening economic opportunity in this country.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time does Senator CONRAD have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I do not want to provoke a long argument about who did the most to cause America to have these years of prosperity. I will summarize what I think.

Frankly, I do not believe it is rational to say the Clinton tax increase of \$290 billion is what caused this American economy to go buoyant and produce strong growth rates for the last 7 years. Essentially, that is what happened in that first year. Some say it added some credibility. To the extent it added credibility, it probably should have been taken off after the next year we had credibility.

In any event, I want to talk about what we are doing here. I do not know why it is, with the surpluses we have, that we cannot get to the point where those on the other side of the aisle—at least almost all of them. They really do not want to have very much tax relief, if any, for the American people. When we boil it right down, the difference is not paying off the debt—there is a slight difference there—but

the difference is spending, and that is it. They want to spend more, and we say let's give back more to the American people in tax relief.

This is about as dramatic as I can give it, and it is a pretty honest interpretation of the Democrats' budget—that is what the Senator alludes to—versus our budget.

The committee's resolution has 11 percent of the surplus going to tax reductions. They have 4 percent. In the committee's resolution, spending gets 17 percent of the surplus—this is the total surplus—and we put 72 percent of that surplus on the debt. The Democratic plan says let's do 4 percent in tax relief and 22 percent in spending.

If one wants to quote Alan Greenspan correctly—as I said, it is like the Bible: It depends on how one wants to read him. But Alan Greenspan would say: Do not spend any of it; put it all on the surplus. And if you cannot put it all on the surplus, do not spend it; put it on tax relief. That is what we did.

Essentially, when the argument is finished, for some reason, even though we get our tax relief down to a small amount—\$1 in tax relief for \$13 in debt reduction in the first year; over 5 years it is \$1 in tax relief for \$8 in deficit reduction—that is not good enough. We cannot even give back to the taxpayers \$1 out of \$9—8 plus 1; \$8 in reduction of the debt. Here is the difference: We would spend 17 percent; they would spend 22 percent. It seems to me we are following the admonition of the distinguished Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board and they are not.

On the other hand, we can argue all day who is closest to what he says. The Republicans are being realistic. Out of these huge surpluses, we ought to give a little back to the American people sooner or later, and if we spend it, we do not have it to give back. That is just the way it is. That is the difference between the two.

I do not believe I will need all of my half hour. I assume I have used 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me? Will the Senator from New Mexico give me some time to respond to the comments of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, on the Senator's amendment or in opposition to the Conrad amendment?

Mr. ALLARD. In opposition to his amendment. He made some comments I want to clarify for the record.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will give the Senator from Colorado 3 minutes.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota indicated that we include Social Security in our provision when we say we have to balance the budget. That is correct. But he did not read the whole bill because if he had read another section of the bill, it shows we set aside the Social Security surplus and do not spend it. We do treat Social Security as an off-budget item, and we keep it there. It stays there until there is Social Security reform or we do something to save

Social Security. We all agree Social Security is headed for trouble. I wanted to clarify for the record that we do protect Social Security.

I point out in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota that my amendment does more than what he is proposing. We have a plan in place that specifically saves Social Security, and we have an enforcement mechanism in there.

I plan to vote against the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota because I believe that unless we have the enforcement mechanism, all of this is a sham. We need to have the enforcement mechanism that says if our revenues do not measure up, we do not spend Social Security.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico for yielding to me so that I could clarify the record. I yield back any remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, with the 10 minutes we have remaining, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota, 2 minutes to the junior Senator from North Dakota, and 4 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts. Senator BINGAMAN will use our 2 minutes in wrapup.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Colorado, I read his amendment. His amendment defines a balanced budget as one that includes all receipts and all outlays. That includes the Social Security surplus funds as a definition of a balanced budget. That, in my judgment, is not a balanced budget. It is exactly the mistake we made around here for 30 years. Defining a balanced budget as one that includes Social Security surpluses is to set up the circumstance in which we could go back to the bad old days of raiding and looting Social Security for operating expenses, and that is something we have all pledged not to do.

Maybe the intention of the Senator from Colorado is to protect Social Security, but when he defines a balanced budget in the amendment he has offered as one that raids Social Security surpluses to accomplish balance, he has turned back the clock to the bad old days. That is a mistake. That should not happen. We should not vote for it.

Instead, I say to my colleagues, we should vote for the second-degree amendment I have offered that says let's put debt reduction as the first priority of this Government; that says we are going to reserve every penny of the Social Security surplus for Social Security; and that says of the non-Social Security surplus, instead of making a tax reduction, a tax-cut scheme virtually the only priority of the non-Social Security surplus, we ought to adopt a plan that says, no, we ought to make the top priority of the non-Social Security surplus debt reduction.

That is the proposal before the Senate: to cut in half the proposed tax cut

and dedicate the money to debt reduction. That is what the economists have told us should be the highest priority for these funds. I believe that is the case. I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I have been listening to this debate, and it is fascinating. Some things that are debated in the Senate are complicated. This is not.

The question proposed by Senator CONRAD is: Will we devote more money to reducing the debt? If during good economic times we have a surplus and we cannot reduce the debt we have accumulated during tough economic times, when are we going to see real debt reduction? I do not think there is any Senator who ought to be voting against Senator CONRAD's second-degree amendment.

With respect to the point he made about the use of Social Security funds, he and I, the Senator from Nevada, and others have been on this floor for, I guess, 5 or 6 years talking about this very issue. We cannot use these funds as offsets for something else and then say: No, we didn't use them; in fact, we created a lockbox. Some lockbox. Somebody got away with the key in the middle of the night, apparently.

Back to the point. The issue here, offered in the second-degree amendment, is, if during tough economic times we ran up this Federal debt to \$5.7 trillion, will we, during good economic times, when we have a surplus, begin to make significant payments to reduce that debt?

Is there any greater gift we can give to America's children to reduce that burden on their shoulders of this Federal debt? The answer is no.

This second-degree amendment is an amendment every single Senator ought to be supporting if they believe in basic conservative principles of, during good times, paying back what you had to borrow during tough times. That is what this second-degree amendment is all about. It is very simple. As I said when I started, there are a lot of things that are frightfully complicated on which we vote on the floor of the Senate. This is not. This is incredibly simple. We ought to support the second-degree amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. I ask the Senator, do you want to use some of your time? We only have 4 minutes left. You have 15 minutes or thereabouts.

Mr. DOMENICI. Do we have anybody else here?

Mr. President, I said about as much as I can say about the difference between the budget resolution and Senator CONRAD's approach. I think it is shown right behind me on this chart. Essentially, it does not have very much to do with who brings the debt down quicker. It has more to do with who wants more money for spending?

I want to repeat that I am firmly convinced that, for some reason or an-

other, the other side is not frightened by the idea of spending the surplus but somehow they are very frightened about giving some of it back to the citizens of the United States. I know Senator CONRAD has a tax plan also. He is on the Finance Committee.

But I submit, if we were to adopt his amendment, any realistic change in the marriage tax penalty over the next 5 years to make it more fair, so millions of newlyweds will not come into April finding out they are paying an average of \$1,400 a year more in taxes because they are married than they would if they were single, filing separately—we think that will cost, over 5 years, somewhere between \$60 billion and \$65 billion.

There is some education tax relief that has passed with rather substantial margins. That is about \$8 billion. There is health care tax relief that is about \$13 billion.

That leaves small business provisions for which both sides have voted. They are very good provisions for small businessmen, such as one that says anyone who works for an employer that does not have insurance, if they buy their insurance as an employee, they can deduct it. Isn't that something? I assume Americans thought that was the case already. But unless your employer deducts it, employees cannot. So two people working for different employers, neither of whom has health care, if they pool their resources and buy a health care plan for themselves and one child, they cannot deduct a nickel of it.

But there is some relief we propose here on the floor of the Senate that ought to get done, and a number of small business provisions.

The minimum for those kinds of reforms is somewhere between \$100 billion and \$130 billion. We are led to believe we are going to grant all kinds of tax relief to the rich people of America, when the plan encompasses these ideas because that is what we have been talking about. That is what the Finance Committee is going to consider.

If you take that much of the surplus and say, we are going to put that much more on debt, you cannot accommodate these kinds of tax relief measures.

Last but not least, I repeat, how much debt reduction is enough?

Frankly, I would like to get rid of the whole debt. But we accumulated it over 30 years. How in the world we expect one generation of Americans to pay that whole debt down is beyond me. I think the \$400 billion we have already done plus the \$1.1 trillion in this budget resolution in the reduction of debt is pretty good.

As a matter of fact, I think we will substantially reduce interest payments. That ought to permit lower interest rates in this country. Although Dr. Alan Greenspan insists on raising interest rates to solve other problems, maybe it will not have an impact for some time.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Senator KENNEDY is now recognized for 4 minutes, with the Chair's permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3½ minutes of the 4 minutes.

I think this chart really tells what is happening in the area of the Federal share of education funding. It demonstrates the very significant decline from 1980 to 1999.

The blue on the chart indicates what was being spent in elementary and secondary education in 1980. Here we see it was 11.9 percent in elementary and secondary education and 15.4 percent in higher education. Now we are at 7.7 percent in elementary and secondary

education and 10.7 percent in the area of higher education. There has been a significant decline in terms of the money that is being spent in education.

Look at what has happened in the area of higher education, where you see a continuing expansion of enrollment in terms of higher education. And it is going to continue. There is an important need in the area of higher education, as there is in K through 12. This chart shows the enormous rise in the total enrollment in schools all across this country. Every parent, every school board, every local group can tell you that.

It is against that background that we find in the President's budget there would be \$6.9 billion. This increases \$2.2 billion. That reflects the difference in the Bingaman amendment. We say al-

locate that money before we are going to have a tax break.

There was a question raised earlier about whether this was an accurate portrayal. I will put in the RECORD the CBO figures, as prepared by OMB, that give the whole function that lists education, training, and the Head Start programs. The bottom line shows there is \$4.7 billion less, according to CBO, than the President's budget. Those are the figures. Those are the figures in the Bingaman amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that table printed in the RECORD.

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

FY 2001 SENATE BUDGET RESOLUTION

[Budget authority in billions of dollars]

	CBO WODI	Inflated base	CBO president	SBC	SBC res minus CBO			Percent change		
					WODI	Inflated base	President	WODI	Inflated base	President
500: Education, Training, Employment, & Social Services:										
Impact Aid	906	921	770	906	0	-15	138	0	-2	18
Special Education	6,036	6,076	6,369	8,236	2,200	2,160	1,867	36	36	29
Other Elem and Second Education	16,478	16,615	19,678	16,878	400	263	2,800	2	2	-14
Pell Grants	7,640	7,770	8,356	7,828	188	58	-528	2	1	-6
Head Start	3,867	3,933	4,867	4,122	255	189	-745	7	5	-15
All other programs:										
Other higher education	3,687	3,750	4,136	3,521	-166	-229	-615	-5	-6	-15
Training and employment	7,248	7,334	7,851	6,921	-327	-413	-930	-5	-6	-12
Remaining programs	8,784	8,965	9,517	8,388	-296	-577	-1,129	-5	-6	-12
Subtotal, all other programs	19,719	20,049	21,504	18,830	-889	-1,219	-2,674	-5	-6	-12
Total	54,646	55,364	61,544	56,800	2,154	1,436	-4,744	4	3	-8
Memo: Department of Education										
	35,498	35,900	39,983	39,998	4,500	4,098	15	13	11	0
550: Health:										
NIH	17,814	18,169	18,813	18,914	1,100	745	101	6	4	1
Indian Health Service	2,391	2,457	2,620	2,620	229	163	0	10	7	0
All other programs:										
CDC	2,892	2,962	3,239	2,745	-147	-217	-494	-5	-7	-15
HRSA	4,564	4,648	4,386	4,333	-231	-315	-53	-5	-7	-1
Substance abuse & med health serv	2,652	2,699	2,823	2,518	-134	-181	-305	-5	-7	-11
Remaining programs	3,445	3,562	3,421	3,270	-175	-292	-151	-5	-8	-4
Subtotal, all other programs	13,553	13,871	13,869	12,866	-687	-1,005	-1,003	-5	-7	-7
Total	33,758	34,497	35,302	34,400	642	-97	-902	2	-0	-3
570: Medicare:										
Medicare Provider Fees	0	0	-220	0	0	0	220	NA	NA	-100
All other	3,067	3,175	3,197	3,100	33	-75	-97	1	-2	-3
Total	3,067	3,175	2,977	3,100	33	-75	123	1	-2	4

Based on CBO estimates. The Republican Budget Resolution is \$4.7 billion below the President's budget.

Mr. KENNEDY. We believe we ought to accept the Bingaman amendment if we believe education is the first priority. This is supported by every single parent group. It is supported by all of the student associations across the country, the NEA, the AFT, the national school boards, the Council of Great City Schools, and the American Council on Education that represents all of the various universities in this country.

This makes sense. Which is important for the American people? Putting education ahead of tax breaks. That is what the Bingaman amendment does. We need that in order to meet our responsibility to the children in this country. I hope the Senate will accept the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 5 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me use 3 minutes of it.

I say to Senator KENNEDY, I am not arguing with your CBO or OMB numbers. I could not tell which it was. You said CBO and then said OMB. I do not know which it is.

Look, I am not arguing about that because that is a total function. That is not education. There are other things than education in that function.

Here is the education part. I will put in the RECORD what is in this budget resolution because it is supported by the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that table printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—SBC 2000 MARK VS. CBO
WODI 2000 VS. PRES REEST 2000
[In millions of dollars]

Summary	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
REPORT TOTAL						
Resolution: BA	34,935	47,877	48,043	48,138	48,423	49,321
MARK:						
OP	24,075	23,191
OT	35,988	41,117	44,506	47,001	47,622	48,367
Mar 2000: BA	34,934	43,384	43,550	43,186	42,776	43,041
WODI:						
OP	24,075	23,191
OT	35,987	41,050	42,791	43,243	42,804	42,848
President: BA	34,444	47,228	47,434	47,668	48,188	49,099
REEST:						
OP	24,075	23,191
OT	35,532	40,840	44,955	46,475	47,134	47,957
Group 1: BA	1	4,493	4,493	4,952	5,647	6,280
Group 2:						
OP	0	0
OT	1	67	1,715	3,758	4,818	5,519

Mr. DOMENICI. If we are speaking about education—not AmeriCorps; that is not part of education; some might think it is, but it isn't—according to the CBO, our budget resolution provides \$47.877 billion for education. The President had \$47.228—slightly less, \$600 million less. What we are spending this year is 43.3.

To get up and say all these groups support this—of course, if we ask them, do you want more money, they will say, of course, we want more money. Right? I don't think anybody in the education field, whether it is at the State level, the district level, or the national level will not affirmatively answer a questionnaire, will you support more money for education?

The question is, Are we treating it with the priority that it deserves in this budget? There are two parts to ours. One is the sense-of-the-Senate language that says we need reform in education, not only more money. We don't need to try the same old things we have been trying, the so-called status quo, more targeted programs telling them precisely what to do, such as we did with special education. Then we didn't even fund special education to the amount we promised them, and they had to take it out of their regular budgets. We set the standard and we told them how to do it. I guarantee you, they would say, give us more funding in that program. They would answer yes across America. And we do provide more funding. In fact, since the Republicans have been in leadership, we have been trying to play some catchup on special education funding for the schools across America.

Everyone should know our history has been for many decades, the cities, the States, and the counties pay for education essentially, not the Federal Government. So to make this out as a debate on what happens to public education in America is to ignore the fact that for most of our history we have paid between 6.5 and 8 percent of the total cost of kindergarten through 12, somewhere between 6.5 and maybe 8.5 percent. The rest is paid by whom? The taxpayers of the sovereign States of America.

We are suggesting that a new program ought to come into being where they have more say-so, rather than less, about how our money is used, more flexibility and accountability. We have both suggestions in our budget resolution.

I will take 1 additional minute. In every function in this Government, even the Economic Development Administration, where we understand there are 334 different activities in the Federal Government, they want more, not less. In a buoyant economy, growing with less than 5-percent unemployment, America putting money into economic development so people can run around acting as if they are creating jobs, of course they want more money. But the point is, don't the American taxpayers in a surplus of this size de-

serve some consideration? Shouldn't they be given an opportunity to say maybe we ought to get a little tax relief such as the marriage tax penalty.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I will respond briefly to my colleague from New Mexico on the question of our plan and what it can accommodate and what it can't. I start by saying I have great respect for the chairman of the Budget Committee.

With respect to the marriage tax penalty, we do have sufficient resources to address the marriage tax penalty. The tax cuts we have provided out of the non-Social Security surplus are net tax reductions of \$265 billion over 10 years. The plan we offered to address the marriage tax penalty in the Senate Finance Committee costs \$150 billion. It is a very simple plan. It says we are going to give people the choice of filing as a married couple or filing separately. They can file and pay whichever is less.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts has 1 minute.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I say to my friend and colleague, who is chairman of the Budget Committee, money may not be the answer to all of the problems. Just throwing money at a particular problem isn't going to be all of the answer. But we do know that in the budget, this allocation is a clear indication of what a nation's priorities are going to be. That is the decision we are making. We say we ought to give a higher priority in the area of education than we should in tax cuts. That is what the Bingaman amendment is doing, and that is why I believe we should support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from New Mexico has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is very interesting; the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts says this is going to show our priorities. We have more than the President of the United States in education. So one would think that he would have more money available for tax reduction. But guess what. He found there are a lot of other priorities. So he has a 14-percent increase in domestic programs, all with high priorities equivalent to education—increase them all. Actually, in truth, the difference is, do you want to spend more money on the domestic programs of America, even though we are increasing education more than the President, do you want to spend more and not even give the taxpayers a shot as to whether or not they should get some tax relief via the marriage tax penalty, some small business help and those kinds of things?

That is essentially the difference in priorities. We think ours are very good priorities. There is a lot of money in here for education. To the extent the

Federal Government can be helpful, I believe we will be helpful.

AMENDMENT NO. 2926

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on this amendment has expired. There are 4 minutes evenly divided on the Bingaman amendment. Who yields time?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will use the 2 minutes we have to summarize the amendment.

I agree with Senator KENNEDY from Massachusetts that this is a simple choice we have to make. Is there going to be a reduction in the amount of the tax cut? The proposed tax cut is the largest on the Senate floor with which I am familiar. And the proposal is to reduce that tax cut by about 15 percent and commit 15 percent of those revenues to improvements in education.

The argument is that the underlying budget resolution has \$1 billion for IDEA, which we support. Our amendment has that, too. There is no difference on that issue.

The argument is that their budget resolution asks for more than the President's proposal. The truth is, their budget resolution says that of the increase in education, \$2.3 billion of it needs to be spent on a so-called performance bonus fund. It is committed to that. It is dedicated to that. It can't be spent for 5 years. So no school is going to see any benefit from that. If you take that out, there is a cut in education in the budget resolution on which we are voting.

Our amendment tries to restore those funds and get the funds up to the level in the programs that have been proven to work, programs that matter to people all over this country. We believe those programs should be adequately funded: programs to improve the quality of teachers in the classroom, programs to modernize our schools, programs to increase accountability for the expenditure of funds, particularly title I funds, programs for after school. Those are the types of programs we are trying to see are adequately funded.

We do not believe those programs should suffer in order that we create a new mandatory performance bonus. That is the issue before us today.

I hope Members will support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, it is not often that we are on the floor in this mode, where I am opposing my junior Senator's request. On this one, I am in opposition and will shortly move to table.

I suggest the Congress of the United States is going to have an opportunity before the year is out to vote on a new Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That act, as passed, plus the appropriations decisions made by Senator SPECTER and his Democratic minority member, approved by the appropriations in the Senate, will determine

where the specific money goes—not what we are saying on the floor that we assume is in our number.

I believe we are going to reform the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and it is not going to be filled with targeted programs as it is now, or at least the States will have an option to do otherwise, to approach this from “we will receive the money, we will sign an accountability agreement, and let us decide where our priorities are.”

One shoe doesn't fit every school district in America in terms of aid. In fact, sometimes we tell them to do the things they don't want to do.

I don't believe this is a debate over the enumerated tools Senator Bingaman says he is adding. The issue is, are we adding as much as the President to a budget of last year, which was \$43 billion. The answer is, yes, we are. We are going to decide, as the Senate and House, how it is spent. We are not deciding that tonight, whether the Bingaman amendment is adopted or not; It is going to be up to another series of votes.

I don't know whether we are going to fund the programs that he thinks are great programs. Somebody else is going to decide that. We are doing as much as the President in program authority; of that, I am confident.

With that, I move to table the Bingaman amendment and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Abraham	Frist	McConnell
Allard	Gorton	Murkowski
Ashcroft	Gramm	Nickles
Bennett	Grams	Roberts
Bond	Grassley	Roth
Brownback	Gregg	Santorum
Bunning	Hagel	Sessions
Burns	Hatch	Shelby
Campbell	Helms	Smith (NH)
Cochran	Hutchinson	Smith (OR)
Collins	Hutchison	Snowe
Coverdell	Inhofe	Specter
Craig	Jeffords	Stevens
Crapo	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lott	Thompson
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Enzi	Mack	Voinovich
Fitzgerald	McCain	Warner

NAYS—46

Akaka	Daschle	Kennedy
Baucus	Dodd	Kerrey
Bayh	Dorgan	Kerry
Biden	Durbin	Kohl
Bingaman	Edwards	Landrieu
Boxer	Feingold	Lautenberg
Breaux	Feinstein	Leahy
Bryan	Graham	Levin
Byrd	Harkin	Lieberman
Chafee, L.	Hollings	Lincoln
Cleland	Inouye	Mikulski
Conrad	Johnson	Moynihan

Murray	Rockefeller	Wellstone
Reed	Sarbanes	Wyden
Reid	Schumer	
Robb	Torrice	

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that the next two votes be 10-minute rollcall votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 2935 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2906

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time on the Conrad amendment?

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, my second-degree amendment is very simple. Instead of using \$150 billion for a tax cut over the next 5 years, we take half of that money and dedicate it to further debt reduction. Every economist who has come before the Finance Committee and the Budget Committee has said the highest priority is to pay down the debt.

The question is, What do we do to best secure a continuing economic expansion in our country? Every economist who has come before the Budget Committee and the Finance Committee, as well as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, has said the highest priority is to continue to pay down this debt. We take half of the proposed tax cut and use it for further debt reduction. That ought to be our priority. That is what this amendment does.

I hope my colleagues will support the second-degree amendment and oppose the underlying Allard amendment which defines a balanced budget as one that raids Social Security. Let's not go back to the bad old days. Let's pay down the debt.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I will shortly move to table the amendment. I want to show you a chart that simply depicts the difference in priorities between the two sides. Alan Greenspan suggested we should put our surplus against the debt, unless we intend to spend it, in which event we should reduce or reform or give relief to the taxpayer. A big difference between the two is exemplified by this. They would give 4 percent of the surplus to the taxpayers.

The difference is very easily depicted. They give 4 percent of the surplus to tax relief for the American taxpayer; we would give 11 percent. They would spend 22 percent of the surplus; we would spend 17 percent.

That explains it. Alan Greenspan suggests instead of spending money, we ought to give it back to the taxpayers. That is what we are doing—but a very small amount. As a matter of fact, \$150 billion over 5 years, if we pass it, means \$13 goes to debt reduction for \$1 in tax relief in the first year; 8-1 over the 5 years.

How much is enough? It seems to me the taxpayer deserves a little bit of it.

We shouldn't be spending it. We should give it back to them.

I move to table the amendment. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 2935. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Abraham	Gorton	Nickles
Allard	Gramm	Roberts
Ashcroft	Grams	Roth
Bennett	Grassley	Santorum
Bond	Gregg	Sessions
Brownback	Hagel	Shelby
Bunning	Hatch	Smith (NH)
Burns	Helms	Smith (OR)
Campbell	Hutchinson	Snowe
Cochran	Hutchison	Stevens
Coverdell	Inhofe	Thomas
Craig	Jeffords	Thompson
Crapo	Kyl	Thurmond
DeWine	Lott	Torrice
Domenici	Lugar	Voinovich
Enzi	Mack	Warner
Fitzgerald	McConnell	
Frist	Murkowski	

NAYS—48

Akaka	Durbin	Levin
Baucus	Edwards	Lieberman
Bayh	Feingold	Lincoln
Biden	Feinstein	McCain
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Boxer	Harkin	Moynihan
Breaux	Hollings	Murray
Bryan	Inouye	Reed
Byrd	Johnson	Reid
Chafee, L.	Kennedy	Robb
Cleland	Kerrey	Rockefeller
Collins	Kerry	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kohl	Schumer
Daschle	Landrieu	Specter
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wellstone
Dorgan	Leahy	Wyden

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2906

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes debate evenly divided preceding the vote on the Allard amendment.

Who yields time? The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I speak in behalf of the amendment. We are going through unprecedented good times. We ought to take advantage of this time and put in place a plan to pay down the debt. We do not have a plan to pay down the debt, and my amendment lays in place a 20-year plan to completely eliminate the debt.

By doing that, we save over \$3 trillion in interest payments, and we also do not eliminate the opportunity to reduce taxes. In fact, I believe repaying the debt is the first step necessary in providing the structure to make further tax cuts. Repayment of the debt

owed to the public by requiring all Social Security surpluses be applied to the debt until we have Social Security reform is the proper approach. This is a minimal plan in paying down the debt. It will probably do more because the Social Security surplus will also go towards paying down the public debt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. First of all, Mr. President, I am sure this amendment violates the Budget Act because it is not germane. I will make that point of order shortly.

But I am afraid that if we adopted this amendment, it could, over time, preclude the kind of defense spending we need and the kind of tax relief in which we might be interested. I believe we are doing plenty to reduce the debt in this budget resolution: \$177 billion in the first year, \$1.1 trillion over 5 years. The ratio of tax relief to debt reduction, over 5 years, is 8 to 1. In the first year, it is 13 to 1. That is a pretty good game plan.

Mr. President, I make a point of order that this is not germane to the provisions of the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Budget Act, I move to waive section 305 of the Budget Act for the consideration of Allard amendment No. 2906 and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to waive the Budget Act in relation to Allard amendment No. 2906. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 16, nays 84, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 56 Leg.]

YEAS—16

Allard	Enzi	McCain
Ashcroft	Fitzgerald	Smith (NH)
Campbell	Grams	Thomas
Collins	Hutchinson	Voinovich
Craig	Hutchison	
Crapo	Inhofe	

NAYS—84

Abraham	DeWine	Johnson
Akaka	Dodd	Kennedy
Baucus	Domenici	Kerrey
Bayh	Dorgan	Kerry
Bennett	Durbin	Kohl
Biden	Edwards	Kyl
Bingaman	Feingold	Landrieu
Bond	Feinstein	Lautenberg
Boxer	Frist	Leahy
Breaux	Gorton	Levin
Brownback	Graham	Lieberman
Bryan	Gramm	Lincoln
Bunning	Grassley	Lott
Burns	Gregg	Lugar
Byrd	Hagel	Mack
Chafee, Lincoln	Harkin	McConnell
Cleland	Hatch	Mikulski
Cochran	Helms	Moynihan
Conrad	Hollings	Murkowski
Coverdell	Inouye	Murray
Daschle	Jeffords	Nickles

Reed	Sarbanes	Stevens
Reid	Schumer	Thompson
Robb	Sessions	Thurmond
Roberts	Shelby	Torricelli
Rockefeller	Smith (OR)	Warner
Roth	Snowe	Wellstone
Santorum	Specter	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 16, the nays are 84. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Byrd-Warner amendment regarding gas tax, all debate time be consumed this evening and there be no amendment in order to the amendment prior to the vote. I further ask unanimous consent that the vote occur on the Byrd-Warner amendment first in any series of votes scheduled by the majority leader, after consultation with the minority leader, on Thursday. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that prior to the vote, there be 2 minutes equally divided for closing remarks.

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

The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will shortly be speaking on an amendment which I will offer on behalf of myself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BOND, and Mr. REID.

Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Maine would like to be recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. COLLINS. Yes, for 5 minutes as in morning business to put in a bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Maine, Ms. COLLINS, for not to exceed 5 minutes, after which I will regain the floor.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, and I won't object, but I want everybody to know that there will be no more unanimous consents for morning business today or tomorrow as long as I am on the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. We don't need to have morning business. Let's let her speak and count it against the bill. That is what you would like, and I would like that also.

Mr. REID. That will be better.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS and Mr. ABRAHAM pertaining to the introduction of S. 2365 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from West Virginia will add me as a cosponsor.

Mr. BYRD. I would be happy and most honored.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of Mr. DOMENICI be added to the list of cosponsors of this amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2943

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. BOND, Mr. REID, and Mr. DOMENICI, proposes an amendment numbered 2943.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CONTINUED USE OF FEDERAL FUEL TAXES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION OF OUR NATION'S HIGHWAYS, BRIDGES, AND TRANSIT SYSTEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) current law, as stipulated in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), requires all federal gasoline taxes be deposited into the Highway Trust Fund;

(2) current law, as stipulated in TEA-21, guarantees that all such deposits to the Highway Trust Fund are spend in full on the construction and rehabilitation of our nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems;

(3) the funding guarantees contained in TEA-21 are essential to the ability of the nation's governors, highway commissioners, and transit providers to address the growing backlog of critical transportation investments in order to stem the deterioration of our road and transit systems, improve the safety of our highways, and reduce the growth of congestion that is choking off economic growth in communities across the nation;

(4) any effort to reduce the federal gasoline tax or de-link the relationship between highway user fees and highway spending pose a great danger to the integrity of the Highway Trust Fund and the ability of the states to invest adequately in our transportation infrastructure; and

(5) proposals to reduce the federal gasoline tax threaten to endanger the spending levels guaranteed in TEA-21 while providing no guarantee that consumers will experience any reduction in price at the gas pump.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this budget resolution do not assume the reduction of any federal gasoline taxes on either a temporary or permanent basis.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment that the functional totals in this budget resolution do not assume the reduction of any Federal gasoline taxes on either a temporary or permanent basis.

Mr. President, in 1996, just four years ago, the Senate considered a proposal to repeal the 4.3 cent per gallon federal excise tax on gasoline. As I recall, the issue was debated in the midst of the 1996 presidential election, as gasoline

prices were on the rise. Today, we are considering a similar proposal under almost identical circumstances. American consumers are understandably upset about the rise of gasoline prices over the last year. In February 1999, average U.S. prices were under a dollar per gallon. Since then, the average price for gasoline in the United States has increased by about 55 cents per gallon. To make matters worse, the U.S. government has had to go hat-in-hand to the Gulf nations to beg them to produce more oil. Let us all remember that these are the very same Gulf states that the U.S. defended during Operation Desert Storm in 1991. In answer to the outrage of the American people over this latest hike in gas prices, we see, yet again, a proposal for a reduction in the federal excise tax on gasoline.

The repeal of any tax, particularly a tax on gasoline, is always politically popular, and quite a temptation for politicians, especially in the midst of a campaign season. Additionally, the temptation to remind the electorate of a tax increase approved by a political opponent is close to irresistible in an election year. However, in our rush to craft a pseudo-solution to a real concern in this election year, I hope that the Senate will carefully consider the long-term implications of its actions. To suggest that the 4.3 cent per gallon gasoline tax enacted in 1993 is the precursor of all this pain at the gas pump, and that the cure for that pain is a simple repeal of that tax, is pure and utter folly.

A look at the markets over recent months shows that gasoline prices have risen because of the basic economic forces of supply and demand. First, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) successfully agreed last year to curb crude-oil production in order to raise exceptionally low per-barrel prices—such low per-barrel prices that U.S. producers were in danger of being put out of business. Second, U.S. crude-oil inventories were allowed to fall to dangerously low levels in 1999. Because there was no cushion from U.S. inventories to respond to the cuts in oil production, gasoline prices, naturally, increased. What we are seeing is classic supply and demand at work.

OPEC agreed last week to increase oil production, but that oil will not arrive from the Gulf states for at least another one to two months. In the meantime, there is a more or less fixed supply of oil available for U.S. consumption. This short-supply scenario means that even if the excise tax were repealed, gasoline prices would likely increase again, reflecting, guess what, the classic lack of equilibrium between supply and demand. In other words, there is no getting around the basic tenets of the problem, which are OPEC's cutbacks on production and low U.S. crude-oil inventories.

Yet, some of my colleagues would have the American consumer believe

that this tax cut proposal will effect a miracle cure. Faith in snake oil never seems to diminish in the Halls of Congress. They argue that we can get around the laws of supply and demand altogether by simply reducing the gas tax. I, for one, am doubtful that consumers would significantly benefit from this latest attempt to treat a serious malady with a political placebo.

As I have said, over the past few months, gasoline prices on average have risen by about 55 cents per gallon across the nation. S. 2285, would roll back the price of gasoline to the American consumer by only 4 cents, and only until the end of this calendar year. If average U.S. prices increase to two dollars per gallon, this proposal would repeal the entire excise tax for this calendar year, which is still a reduction of only 18 cents per gallon. Assuming that these prices actually filter down to the consumer—a rather large leap of faith—how significant a difference will a 4 cent decrease be compared to a 55 cent increase in gasoline prices? Likewise, if prices reach as high as two dollars per gallon, will 18 cents make a noticeable difference in the average consumer's weekly expenses?

As I mentioned before, supporters of the proposal to repeal a portion of the gas tax assume that the tax decrease would filter down to the consumer. But there is no guarantee that any savings whatsoever will be passed on to the consumer. Since this proposal does not address the low supply of oil in the United States, the benefits of the tax cut are likely to flow to the coffers of the domestic oil-refinery industry, not to the pockets of the consumer. As I mentioned before, even though refineries would be paying less in taxes to the federal government, lower prices at the pump would drive up demand for gas, further reducing supply and increasing the price for the remaining scarce gasoline. Until oil supplies in the United States increase, gasoline will continue to be scarce and prices at the pump will continue to climb, regardless of whether or not the federal excise tax is reduced.

OPEC is also more likely to benefit from this proposal than the American consumer. Let us consider this proposal from OPEC's point of view for a moment. Gasoline prices can only rise so high before American demand begins to wane. Decreased demand means lower profits for OPEC, which is why OPEC agreed to increase oil production last week in Vienna. Stable prices are in the long-term interest of OPEC. This tax repeal proposal, however, would remove the incentive for OPEC to maintain stable oil prices. If the Congress chooses to cut the gasoline tax to reduce gasoline prices, it would effectively allow OPEC to maintain artificially low production quotas, and thus support artificially high prices, without suffering from the decrease in oil demand that the free market would otherwise dictate. A reduction in the gas tax removes the economic incen-

tive for OPEC to keep oil production in equilibrium with demand.

Mr. President, the economics of this proposal notwithstanding, it is also important to consider the impact it would have on transportation spending, since the excise tax revenues are intended to be reserved for maintaining and improving the Nation's highways. Spring is here, and on highways and roadways across the Nation, spring is an event marked by the thump and rumble of tires hitting potholes and crumbling medians.

Mr. President, just three years ago, the Senate considered the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, or TEA-21. At that time, the Senate debated at length the appropriate mechanism to finance the needs of our Nation's infrastructure. I, along with many of my colleagues, was determined to reverse the trend begun in the early 1980's of federal disinvestment in our Nation's infrastructure. During the debate on TEA-21, I, along with my colleagues Senator GRAMM, Senator BAUCUS, and Senator WARNER, championed an amendment that would allow the revenue from the 4.3 cent gas tax imposed in 1993 to be used for highway construction. Just the year before, Senator GRAMM had succeeded in seeing to it that the 4.3 cent tax was deposited into the Highway Trust Fund. The Byrd-Gramm-Baucus-Warner amendment during TEA-21 was to ensure that the new revenue to the Trust Fund would, indeed, be spent on highways as it was intended, and as we informed the American people it would be.

Mr. President, our amendment gathered no fewer than 54 cosponsors on a broad bipartisan basis—29 Democrats and 25 Republicans. The entire debate on the highway bill was characterized by bipartisanship. Back then, we heard talk about all the highway needs that were going unmet across our Nation and how the revenue of the 4.3 cent gas tax could help address those needs.

Indeed, during the debate on TEA-21, an amendment was offered to repeal the 4.3 cent gas tax. By a vote of 80 to 18, the Senate refused—refused!—to waive the Budget Act to consider that amendment. Senator MACK's proposal was appropriately rejected by the overwhelming majority of Republicans and the overwhelming majority of Democrats. On that day, March 11, 1998, the 4.3 cent tax was the difference between a highway bill that continued the status quo of disinvestment and a highway bill that made real progress in repairing our deteriorated highways. With the adoption of the Byrd-Gramm-Baucus-Warner amendment, the final highway bill that passed the Senate two days later was almost \$26 billion larger than the bill reported by the Environment and Public Works Committee. And that \$26 billion figure was derived directly from the Congressional Budget Office's estimate at that time of the expected revenue of the 4.3 cent gas tax.

Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the budget resolution, on behalf of several of my colleagues whose names I mentioned earlier, which states that it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal gas tax should not be repealed on either a temporary or a permanent basis. I am pleased to be joined in that amendment by five distinguished members of the Committee on Environment and Public Works; namely, Senators WARNER, BAUCUS, VOINOVICH, LAUTENBERG, and BOND; and, in addition, Senators REID and DOMENICI.

This amendment provides the Senate an opportunity to vote, up or down, on the continued integrity of the Highway Trust Fund and the relative importance of infrastructure investment versus a short-term tax cut that may never be felt by the consumer.

The recent effort to repeal a portion of the gas tax attempts to create a political issue where there really should be none. Thankfully, Republican Senators like JOHN WARNER, GEORGE VOINOVICH, KIT BOND, and PETE DOMENICI are not being baited by the hook of this foray into election year politics. Nor are senior House Members, including members of the House Republican Leadership, such as RICHARD ARMEY, J.C. WATTS, and House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman BUD SHUSTER. The nation's governors, the nation's mayors, the state legislatures, and the nation's county executives are not going for the bait either. The national associations representing all those elected officials, both Democrats and Republicans, are all opposed to efforts to repeal the gas tax. So is the "Triple A" whose sole responsibility is to the driving public that is paying the higher gas prices at the pump every day. So is the Association of General Contractors, the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, the American Public Transit Association, and scores of other groups.

For those of my colleagues who wish to portray this issue as a political one, let me remind them that less than a decade ago, a bill to raise gas taxes for deficit reduction was signed into law by George Bush—that is, with George Herbert Walker Bush. I was there at Andrews Air Force Base, across the table from OMB Director Richard Darman and White House Chief of Staff John Sununu. It was at that summit where a 5-cent gas tax increase was first discussed. I did not participate in the final negotiations over the revenue measures in that agreement since they were handled by the Chairmen of the Finance and Ways and Means Committees and their Ranking Members. At the end of those negotiations, the Bush Administration was supportive of raising the gas tax by 5 cents—with 2½ cents being deposited into the Highway Trust Fund and 2½ cents going to deficit reduction. So it was the Bush/Quayle Administration that first laid the groundwork for using gas taxes for

deficit reduction in 1990. Thankfully, today, every penny of the federal gas tax is deposited in the Highway Trust Fund and spent on transportation investments across the nation.

Mr. President, S. 2285, as introduced by the Majority Leader, proposes to repeal 4.3 cents of the 18.4-cent federal gasoline tax. Since every penny of the gas tax is now distributed to the states in the form of annual obligations from the Highway Trust Fund, that repeal will put at risk more than \$7.1 billion in transportation funding beginning in 2002. Now, \$7.1 billion will fill a lot of potholes and fix a lot of crumbling roadways. Under this bill, if the average price of gasoline reaches \$2 or higher, then the entire 18.4-cent federal gas tax will be repealed, putting more than \$30 billion in transportation funding at risk.

Additionally, there is some very unique language in S. 2285 that seeks to mandate that spending from the Highway Trust Fund be maintained at the levels authorized in TEA-21, notwithstanding the fact that this bill will keep revenue from coming into the Trust Fund. Does anyone truly believe that this is a workable approach? The Chairman of Surface Transportation Subcommittee, Senator VOINOVICH, clearly does not. Senator WARNER and Senator BAUCUS, who joined me in restoring the "trust" to the Highway Trust Fund, certainly do not. I implore all Members on both sides of the aisle to join us in rejecting a plan which will compromise that trust which would take the "trust" out of the Highway Trust Fund.

Mr. President, our highway and transit infrastructure can ill afford to forego several billion dollars in annual investment. Let me remind my colleagues that we have no reason to be proud of the current condition of our highways. According to the Department of Transportation's most recent figures, the condition of our nation's highways and bridges continues to deteriorate by many measures. Daily usage of our highway system has continued to grow each and every year, such that more than half of our nation's urban interstate miles are now perpetually congested—more than half! Less than half of our rural highway miles and less than half of our urban highway miles are considered to be in good or very good condition. That means that more than half of our nation's highway miles are considered to be at some level of disrepair. So when you look at the condition of our nation's highway bridges, the situation is no better. Roughly one-third of our urban highway bridges are either structurally or functionally deficient. The same is true for roughly one-quarter of our rural highway bridges. This is not just a matter of insufficient capacity. This is a matter of safety. The Senate must not turn its back to these troubling facts.

It is quite appropriate that we are debating this issue as part of the budget

resolution. Indeed, the Committee report accompanying the budget resolution parrots the assumptions contained in S. 2285. The report states that "as part of a five year, \$150 billion tax reduction package, the Committee-reported resolution could accommodate a suspension or repeal of the Clinton/Gore 4.3 cent tax increase on fuel." Mr. President, I believe we have reached the point where we must ask the Senate where it stands on just this question. This amendment provides that opportunity.

This is an election year. I understand that this proposal is being presented to the Congress for reasons which just might have very little to do with sound fiscal policy. The American people are not foolish. They will realize that this bill would have an unfortunate effect on transportation spending. They will not thank us for handing them more of the congested, crumbling commuter routes they must already deal with every day. Likewise, they will realize that such a short-term fix does nothing to address the underlying problem of high gas prices—namely OPEC and the lack of a national energy policy to protect the United States against the roller coaster ride of gasoline price adjustments. I urge my colleagues to reject this voodoo chant remedy. We might as well hire a witch doctor to shake a tambourine over the heads of the OPEC states as adopt this approach. Our energy problems demand serious remedies, not pseudo-solutions. Vote against this bill for the people, the commuters, the truck drivers and the ambulance and bus drivers, of America. We need a serious look at the totality of our national energy policy, not a quick fix non-remedy that will only result in more broken promises and broken pavement for the American driving public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in support of this amendment from the following organizations be printed in the RECORD: The Associated General Contractors of America, the National Association of Counties, the National Asphalt Pavement Association, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, the American Public Transportation Association, the National Association of Regional Councils, the American Consulting Engineers Council, and the American Portland Cement Alliance.

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

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL
CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Alexandria, VA, April 5, 2000.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The Associated General Contractors of America (AGC) strongly urges you to support the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Lautenberg-Bond Sense of the

Senate Amendment to the Budget Resolution. The amendment emphasizes the importance of maintaining the link between highway user fees and highway spending, and opposes any reduction of any federal gasoline taxes on either a temporary or permanent basis.

Any reduction or suspension of the federal gasoline tax threatens to erode the spending levels guaranteed in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). Moreover, the reduction in gasoline taxes provides no guarantee that consumers will experience any reduction in the price at the pump.

The United States Senate has consistently opposed repealing the 4.3-cent gas tax. In 1998, 72 sitting Senators voted against repeal of the 4.3-cent gas tax. The next day, the entire Senate voted to spend the 4.3 cents for highway and transit improvements. AGC urges you to keep your promises—don't flip-flop on this highway user fee.

AGC urges you to vote for the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Lautenberg-Bond Sense of the Senate Amendment to the Budget Resolution.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. SHOAF,
*Executive Director,
Congressional Relations.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES,

Washington DC, April 5, 2000.

Re 4.3 cents Federal fuel tax/FY 2001 budget resolution

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing on behalf of the National Association of Counties (NACo) to urge that you support the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Lautenberg-Bond Sense of the Senate Resolution for the continued use of federal fuel taxes for the construction and rehabilitation of our nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems which is being offered as an amendment to the FY 2001 Budget Resolution. This resolution conforms with NACo's opposition to any legislative proposals that would interfere or interrupt the current level of transportation user fees being collected which provide dedicated federal funding for transportation programs.

At our recent Legislative Conference, NACo adopted a resolution that opposes any legislation that reduces monies coming into the Highway Trust Fund. County governments, which have substantial responsibility for highways, bridges, transit systems, and airports, cannot afford cuts in federal transportation infrastructure funding such as the 4.3 cents reduction proposed in the Budget Resolution. The 4.3 cents tax on gasoline and diesel brings in \$7.2 billion annually to the Highway Trust Fund—\$5.8 billion for highways and \$1.4 billion for transit. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, if the 4.3 cents were repealed, the highway program would be cut by \$20.5 billion through FY 2003, the final year of TEA-21. The Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund would go broke in 2003. The aviation program, just reauthorized by Congress, would lose \$700 million a year, or \$2.1 billion through FY 2003.

On behalf of the nation's 3066 counties, I urge you to support the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Lautenberg-Bond Resolution. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. If you have any questions concerning our views on this issue, please contact Bob Fogel of the NACo staff.

Sincerely,

C. VERNON GRAY,
President.

NATIONAL ASPHALT
PAVEMENT ASSOCIATION,
Lanham, MD, April 5, 2000.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,

*U.S. Senator,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: The National Asphalt Pavement Association (NAPA) strongly supports the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Bond amendment to the FY 2001 budget resolution clarifying that Federal fuel taxes are intended to be used for construction of our nation's highways, bridges. Furthermore, the amendment clarifies that the FY 2001 budget resolution does not assume the reduction of federal gasoline taxes on a temporary or permanent basis.

Repeal of the 4.3¢ would have a catastrophic impact on the highway construction industry including the members of NAPA, and delay—perhaps for years—badly needed highway infrastructure improvement projects that save lives, reduce congestion and improve fuel economy.

There is a direct correlation between pavement smoothness and fuel economy according to research recently completed at WestTrack for the Federal Highway Administration under the auspices of the National Cooperative Highway Research Program. According to the study, a vehicle's average fuel economy improved 4.5% after the pavement was rehabilitated. In addition, the study found that an increase in pavement roughness increased the frequency of fatigue failures in the vehicles tested at the track.

If a cut in the fuel tax by 4.3¢ was enacted, revenues in the Highway Trust Fund would be reduced by \$7 billion annually and delay by one or more construction seasons highway projects that result in smoother pavements. The short term gain in reducing the excise tax on motor fuel by 4.3¢ is offset by the additional 6.8¢ in additional costs a typical motorist pays on average to operate their vehicles on rough pavements that are not rehabilitated.

While the motoring public might experience a short-term benefit with a 4.3¢ reduction in the price of their fuel, the cost in terms of increased fuel consumption, congestion and safety to the motoring public will quickly erase any benefit and set the highway pavement improvement program back by years.

NAPA strongly supports the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Bond amendment and strongly opposes a reduction in the federal fuel tax.

Sincerely,

MIKE ACOTT,
President.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE
HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION
OFFICIALS, AMERICAN PUBLIC
TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RE-
GIONAL COUNCILS,

April 4, 2000.

Hon. SPENCER ABRAHAM,
*U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR ABRAHAM: We are writing on behalf of the members of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, the American Public Transportation Association, and the National Association of Regional Councils to express our opposition to a temporary suspension or permanent repeal of a portion of, or all of, the federal motor fuel tax. Therefore, we respectfully urge you to support an amendment to the budget resolution that will be offered by Senator Robert Byrd and others to express the sense of the Senate that the budget resolution not assume the reduction of fuel taxes on either a permanent or temporary basis.

The Highway Trust Fund is the primary funding source for highway, transit, bike-way, pedestrian, and other surface transportation programs authorized under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21). Proposals to temporarily repeal 4.3 cents of the federal motor fuel tax would result in a \$4.5 billion loss in revenue to the Highway Trust Fund and yet offer no guarantee that the repeal would result in actual cost savings to the motoring public. The net effect of this action would be to seriously jeopardize the continued stability and reliability of the federal surface transportation program while providing no meaningful solution to the effects of the present oil shortage.

A 4.3-cent per gallon reduction in the federal motor fuel tax, if passed on to the consumer, would result in about a \$13 savings this year, but would at the cost of more substantial tax reductions or of reductions in other domestic programs. Given the intense competition for use of the budgetary surplus, we believe that, absent an ironclad guarantee, it is unrealistic to assume that any portion of the budget surplus to offset the loss to the Highway Trust Fund would necessarily materialize.

We respectfully urge you to continue to support TEA 21's reliable and stable funding mechanism, and to oppose proposed legislation that would jeopardize the surface transportation program while failing to offer a meaningful solution to impacts resulting from the current oil shortage.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN HORSLEY,
*Executive Director,
American Association
of State-Highway
and Transportation
Officials.*

WILLIAM MILLAR,
*President, American
Public Transportation
Association.*

WILLIAM DODGE,
*Executive Director,
National Association
of Regional Councils.*

AMERICAN CONSULTING
ENGINEERS COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, April 5, 2000.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the American Consulting Engineers Council (ACEC), I urge you to support the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Lautenberg-Bond amendment to the FY 2000 Budget Resolution. The amendment could come to the floor as early as April 5.

The Byrd amendment would establish the Sense of the Senate that federal fuel taxes should continue to be used for the construction and rehabilitation of our nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems. Congress took the proper step in the 1997 Taxpayer Relief Act by moving the last 4.3 cents of the federal gas tax into the Highway Trust Fund and away from general deficit reduction. The following year, Congress passed TEA-21, which guaranteed that all deposits into the Highway Trust Fund will be spent each year for their intended purpose.

In response to the recent surge in gasoline prices, however, legislation has appeared on Capitol Hill to repeal or suspend some or all of the federal gas tax and thus de-link the relationship between highway user fees and transportation spending. While the repeal legislation is well intentioned, we believe it will not offer any real consumer relief from high gas prices, and it could devastate transportation improvements and safety programs in every state.

Even temporarily eliminating the Highway Trust Fund structure is very dangerous because it would become too easy for Congress to eliminate or reduce the proposed transfer from the general fund "surplus" in the future. CBO has re-estimated the FY 2000 surplus to be \$15 billion. Repealing the gas tax from April 15 to September 30 (as S. 2285 could do) would cost states \$15 billion. It is highly unlikely that Congress could spend the entire budget surplus on highways and transit in the face of such competing priorities as general tax cuts, education, and emergency supplemental appropriations.

Congress is to be applauded for its efforts to bolster investment in infrastructure and for recognizing that the Highway Trust Fund provides an effective and appropriate stream of revenue for transportation improvements. We urge you to reaffirm these priorities by voting for the Byrd Amendment to the Budget Resolution. Thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Sincerely,

LEO F. PETERS, *P.E. FACEC,*
President.

AMERICAN PORTLAND CEMENT ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, April 5, 2000.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: On behalf of the American Portland Cement Alliance (APCA), a trade association representing virtually all domestic portland cement manufacturers, I urge you to support the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Lautenberg-Bond Sense of the Senate amendments to the budget resolution.

The amendment expresses that the budget resolution should not assume a permanent or temporary reduction in the federal gasoline tax. The amendment may be considered as early as today.

APCA is deeply concerned that any reduction in the federal gasoline tax would undermine TEA-21 and the funding commitment that legislation made to the states for highway and mass transit programs. Any reduction in federal gasoline tax would jeopardize the funding guarantee under TEA-21 and introduce uncertainty for state highway and transit improvement programs, and the construction and material supply industries, such as the cement manufacturers.

Again, I urge you to support the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Lautenberg-Bond Sense of the Senate amendment.

Sincerely,

RICHARD C. CREIGHTON,
President.

Mr. BYRD. As I close, I again thank Messrs. WARNER, BAUCUS, VOINOVICH, LAUTENBERG, BOND, REID of Nevada, and DOMENICI.

Let me thank also Mr. Jim English and Peter Rogoff, fine staffpersons who have been so helpful in the work on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield off his hour, 1 minute to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BYRD. I will.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to explain to the Senate why I am supporting this. The actual sense of this resolution says:

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in the budget resolution do not assume the reduction of any Federal gasoline tax on either a temporary or permanent basis.

I might say to the Senate, that is already true. The Senate budget resolu-

tion does not—does not, in the functional totals. So I am delighted to support it. There is some language saying: Within the tax provisions. The tax committee can do a lot of different things. One thing suggested was temporary repeal of the gasoline tax. I am pleased to have an opportunity to vote on whether or not the Senate would like that to remain even contemplated. Whether they will be precluded because of a vote, I do not know, but I think we ought to vote tomorrow on this issue. I support the sense of the Senate that is proposed.

I ask Senators how many more want to speak on this resolution because we have two others?

Mr. WARNER. I would like to have 7 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much would the Senator like?

Mr. VOINOVICH. About 4 or 5 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator BOND, on this subject?

Mr. BOND. I would like 3 minutes.

Mr. BAUCUS. I would like about 5 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if we could agree, would the Senator object if that be the unanimous consent, those Senators in that order?

Mr. BYRD. Very well.

Mr. BAUCUS. Might I ask, what is the order?

Mr. DOMENICI. It is the order you arrived on the floor: Senator WARNER and then the Senator from Ohio, Senator BOND and—

Mr. HARKIN. I have been on the floor since the last vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let the Senator decide.

Mr. BYRD. Very well. We can do Mr. WARNER and Mr. BOND—Mr. BOND talked with me several minutes ago. He has to go somewhere. Then Mr. BAUCUS and then Mr. VOINOVICH, if that is all right.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is fair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, first I commend the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia. I was the chairman of the subcommittee that worked on ISTEA—we called it TEA-21. How well I remember that he, together with the Senator from Texas, fought the battle to take the 4.3-cent tax out of the general revenues and put it into the highway trust fund. Now our distinguished colleague and former majority leader is once again showing that leadership to keep those funds flowing to support America's highway infrastructure.

The economy of this Nation is dependent upon the efficient use of its transportation for people to get to and from their places of work, to carry our goods to the ports and terminals, to get them throughout the world. Now we are faced with this situation. I, from the first day, have resisted—even though I am in opposition to my distin-

guished leadership—the repeal of this 4.3 cents. It was a commitment made by the Senate by a vote, if I recall, I say to the senior Senator from West Virginia, which was in the 80s of Senators who approved the transfer of these funds from general revenue to the highway trust fund.

Every Senator understands the highway programs in his or her State. I recognize that. But stability is the key word, stability in funding.

We have the former distinguished Governor of Missouri and the former distinguished Governor of Ohio who will address those points. But as they set down their programs for highway improvement, safety and construction, they needed to have some certainty in the funding. It took almost a decade for the Senate to finally come to the recognition we ought to stop this donor-donee situation, one of the most controversial things I ever witnessed in my 20-plus years in the Senate. We got rid of that.

We also, in that bill, made a specific law whereby, when you go to the gas pump in your State and pump that gas, those taxes go to Washington and make a U-turn and go back to the State. No State got less than 90 percent of the return of those taxes.

That is what we are here for, continuity of action and decisionmaking by this body, continuity and stability in planning these programs to improve our roads, our infrastructure. There are contracts that reach out a year or more, 2 years or more. People have to order materials. They have to do design work. They have to engage labor. That is being done. We see the slow, steady improvement of our infrastructure. Now we are challenged by the 4.3 cents. As the distinguished Senator from West Virginia said, it could have a triggering mechanism where 4.3 cents goes to over 18 cents. As he pointed out, there is no certainty these funds will get back to the pockets of those who put the gas in their car—no certainty. There are many, many levels where various purposes could take off these funds.

My distinguished colleague from West Virginia talked about the groups. He put their letters in the RECORD. This is a group of organizations all across this country that support the highway construction program, whose efforts led to the passage of the ISTEA legislation in this Senate and eventually had it enacted into law.

The distinguished Governor from Ohio, who will soon speak, was very active in the National Governors' Association and the Association of Highway Administrators, which had given sound support through that legislation. He did not come by it by accident. It took absolutely years to build up to get this done.

The National Governors' Association, National Conference of State Legislatures, Council of State Governments, U.S. Conference of Mayors, National League of Cities, National Association

of Counties—these are groups that visit us every day on various issues. They write:

Proposals that would interfere with or reduce revenues coming to either trust fund by suspending or repealing any portion of Federal transportation taxes would undercut critical commitments to the nation's public infrastructure and potentially threaten the credit quality of state and local bonds already issued to finance highway, bridge and airport construction and repair.

Already the contracts are out. The revenue bonds are out. Even the American Automobile Association, one of the most valued organizations in the history of this country, stated as follows:

AAA has serious concerns about efforts to suspend or repeal any portion of the federal gas tax. While attractive at first glance, this course of action will do little to address the root cause of our gasoline price problem today, which is a shortage of supply caused by curtailed production of crude oil by [primarily the] OPEC states.

Our distinguished senior colleague covered that.

To reiterate, this Sense of the Senate amendment is critically important because of legislation that is pending before the Senate to suspend 4.3 cents of the federal gas tax until next January, and because of the instructions this resolution gives to the Finance Committee to report legislation to repeal the 4.3 cents tax.

The budget resolution before the Senate indicates that the reconciliation instructions to the Finance Committee provide \$150 billion over 5 years in tax cuts that "could accommodate" the repeal of 4.3 cents of the federal gas tax.

It is unsound budget policy for this budget resolution to assume that a portion of the gas tax will be repealed.

It is unsound for several reasons, and today I will share with my colleagues the reasons for my concerns.

I join with my colleagues in their frustration with the rising price of gasoline. It is too high and threatens the continuation of our robust economy.

In our efforts to respond to OPEC's choking off of supply and the absence of leadership by this administration, we must not promise American's tax relief that they may not get. The entire proposal to repeal or suspend the 4.3 cents gas tax and replenish the Highway Trust Fund with general revenues is fraught with uncertainty.

I ask the question, is the repeal, or temporary suspension of 4.3 cents of the federal gasoline tax going into the pockets of American drivers? What is the guarantee that this tax cut will be passed on to consumers at the pump?

How are they protected from the oil refiners and wholesalers chipping off their share? Will the free marketplace enable them to charge the same price at the gas pump?

Just last week the Congressional Research Service issued a new analysis entitled "Transportation Fuel Taxes: Impacts of a Repeal or Moratorium," which stated:

Current market conditions and the small amount of tax relief incorporated into most

proposals, however, raise uncertainty as to whether prices to individuals and businesses would fall and whether any price decline would be meaningful to consumers.

If it is not passed on to consumers, and the high prices continue, Americans will feel betrayed.

The impact of a repeal on the 4.3 cents is significant on our budget surplus. According to the Department of Transportation, this repeal will result in a loss of \$20.5 billion to the Highway Trust Fund for the remaining years of TEA-21—until 2003.

Efforts to repeal or suspend the 4.3 cents gas tax has generated strong opposition from the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Council of State governments, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of Counties. They write:

Proposals that would interfere with or reduce revenues coming into either trust fund by suspending or repealing any portion of federal transportation taxes would undercut critical commitments to the nation's public infrastructure and potentially threaten the credit quality of state and local bonds already issued to finance highway, bridge and airport construction and repair.

Even the American Automobile Association with millions of members dedicated to highway maintenance and safety write:

AAA has serious concerns about efforts to suspend or repeal any portion of the federal gas tax. While attractive at first glance, this course of action will do little to address the root cause of our gasoline price problem today, which is shortage of supply caused by curtailed production of crude oil by OPEC states.

The Small Business Legislative Council joins those views with the following:

While small businesses are clearly suffering as a result of the high gasoline prices, we are long time staunch supporters of preserving the integrity of the highway trust fund and making sure that we have the proper infrastructure to deliver our goods and services.

My colleagues who support this repeal will tell you that the Highway Trust Fund will not be harmed—that general fund monies will be used to replace lost revenue to the Highway Trust Fund. This replacement, if it actually occurs, will be \$20.5 billion.

And, where will this \$20.5 billion come from? It will come from our limited budget surplus—and it will drain the limited dollars available for lasting tax cuts to Americans.

This budget resolution provides for \$150 billion for tax cuts to be defined through the reconciliation process by the Finance Committee. I support this level of funding to relieve the tax burden on Americans. But, do we want to use the on-budget surplus to give a tax cut to gasoline wholesalers? Or, do we want to use the funds in the budget resolution for other, more certain, tax legislation providing real and lasting tax relief.

That is the course I want to take.

The budget resolution assumption that the Congress will repeal 4.3 cents

of the gas tax comes to pass, it will have a lasting, negative impact on the Highway Trust Fund. The Highway Trust Fund is the sole source of revenue available to maintain and upgrade our nation's highways, transit systems and highway safety programs.

We are in only the second year of the 6-year TEA-21 legislation. Now is not the time to take a step backward on the important investments we are making in our nation's transportation infrastructure.

For over a decade in the Senate, I, along and many others, worked to restore faith with drivers who were promised that gas taxes they pay when buying gasoline would be used to maintain and modernize our highways and transit systems.

Finally, in 1997, with the steadfast leadership of Senator BYRD, Senator BAUCUS, Senator BOND, and others, we achieved success. TEA-21 guarantees that all of the gas taxes motorists pay at the pump will be placed in the Highway Trust Fund and spent—100 percent—on highways, transit, and highway safety.

Before TEA-21, the gas tax was increased by 4.3 cents in 1993 to pay for spending on many programs other than transportation or deficit reduction. I opposed this tax increase, but it passed.

Later, while debating TEA-21, this body voted 80 to 18 not to repeal this tax, now that it was going to the Highway Trust Fund.

As our nation's transportation infrastructure aged and crumbled, it was imperative we transfer the 4.3-cents tax from general revenues to the Highway Trust Fund in 1997.

The TEA-21 spending guarantee reforms resulted in a 40 percent increase in transportation spending for each of the next 6 years. We are only in the second year of TEA-21, yet we can see in every state the transportation construction that is moving forward. We are just beginning to see the benefits of TEA-21 with more projects under construction, jobs being created, products moving more efficiently across the country, and most importantly, improvements in highway safety.

Do we want to turn back the clock and inject uncertainty again into our nation's highway program.

We are being asked to rely on future legislation that will have an untested triggering mechanism to restore general revenues to the Highway Trust Fund. What happens if it doesn't work.

Again, this uncertainty will jeopardize the safety of the driving public and the thousands of jobs that are now at work under TEA-21.

We all know that it takes years—far too long—for highway and transit projects to make it from the drawing board to construction. Severe swings, or even the uncertainty as to the availability of funds, in transportation spending will make it nearly impossible for states to effectively manage their highway programs.

Consistent funding levels are critical to the seamless steps of planning, design, engineering, permitting, contract selection, materials orders, and construction. A stable program, where states, local governments, and contractors have the benefits of a long-term funding cycle ensures a reliable supply of materials and an experienced, ready workforce.

Do we want to stop the modernization of our nation's transportation system to give the gas middle-man a few more pennies in his pocket? Or, do we keep on course to improve transportation and highway safety for all Americans?

Lets use wisely our limited budget surplus for meaningful and lasting tax relief—not on promises that Americans may never see.

I ask unanimous consent the letters to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION,
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES, COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS, THE U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES, INTERNATIONAL CITY/COUNTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION,

April 5, 2000.

TO ALL SENATORS: We are writing on behalf of the elected leaders of the nation's state and local governments to urge support for the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Lautenberg-Bond Sense of the Senate Resolution for the continued use of federal fuel taxes for the construction and rehabilitation of our nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems, which is being offered as an amendment to the FY 2001 Budget Resolution.

This resolution conforms to state and local leaders' strong opposition to any legislative proposals that would interfere or interrupt the current level of transportation user fees being collected that provide dedicated federal funding for transportation programs. It supports the critical commitment to transportation infrastructure, and the funding mechanism to support that commitment, made in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21).

Our state and local government members are responsible for almost all the nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems. We cannot afford cuts in federal transportation infrastructure funding such as the 4.3 cents reduction proposed in the Budget Resolution. The 4.3 cents tax on gasoline and diesel brings in \$7.2 billion annual to the Highway Trust Fund—\$5.8 billion for highways and \$1.4 billion for transit. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, if the 4.3 cents were repealed, the highway program would be cut by \$20.5 billion through FY 2003, the final year of TEA-21. The Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund would go broke in 2003.

Again, we urge your support of the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Lautenberg-Bond Resolution.

Sincerely,

RAYMOND C. SCHEPPACH,
Executive Director,
National Governors
Association.

WILLIAM T. POUND,
Executive Director, National

Conference of State
Legislatures.
DANIEL M. SPRAGUE,
Executive Director,
Council of State
Governments.

J. THOMAS COCHRAN,
Executive Director,
The U.S. Conference
of Mayors.

DONALD J. BORUT,
Executive Director,
National League of
Cities.

LARRY B. NAAKE,
Executive Director,
National Association
of Counties.

WILLIAM H. HANSELL, Jr.,
Executive Director,
International City/
County Management
Association.

AAA, WASHINGTON OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2000.

Hon. JOHN W. WARNER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: AAA encourages you to cosponsor and support an amendment to the Senate budget resolution being offered by Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV). The "Sense of the Senate" amendment will put the Senate on record in opposition to any repeal or suspension of the federal gasoline excise tax.

AAA has serious concerns about efforts to suspend or repeal any portion of the federal gas tax. While attractive at first glance, this course of action will do little to address the root cause of our gasoline price problem today, which is a shortage of supply caused by curtailed production of crude oil by OPEC states.

The benefits to motorists from reducing the gas tax are, at best, minimal—repealing 4.3 cents would amount to about \$1/week for the average consumer. However, the resulting loss of revenue to the Highway Trust Fund would be disastrous to the important work of fixing the nation's highways and bridges and improving safety.

It is highway and traffic safety that is of most concern to AAA. Lower receipts to the Highway Trust Fund compromise the safety of the traveling public. We take these roads back and forth to work and on vacations, our children take these roads to school, and our public safety officials use these arteries to respond to emergencies.

Asking Americans to choose between a gas tax reduction and safety is posing the wrong question. The right question is: How should Congress and the Administration manage an energy strategy that reduces dependence upon a foreign cartel? That way motorists would have the safe highways they've paid for through their gas taxes and an oil supply they can rely on. Short-term fixes, while politically popular, are not in the best interests of highway safety and the overall economic well being of the nation.

Congress made a very important decision by creating the Highway Trust Fund and establishing the direct link between user fees paid by motorists and trust fund monies being dedicated to improving the nation's surface transportation infrastructure. Because of TEA-21, the trust fund is now dedicated to providing Americans the safe and efficient transportation system for which they have paid and on which they rely.

AAA urges the Senate to recognize that a gas tax reduction—though well-meaning—will (1) provide little, if any, actual relief to motorists; (2) not solve the real problem, which is supply; and (3) cause real problems as our highways and bridges continue to de-

teriorate and with that, the safety of the motoring public.

Sincerely,

SUSAN G. PIKRALLIDAS,
Vice President,
Public & Government Relations.

SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, March 29, 2000.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MAJORITY LEADER: On behalf of the Small Business Legislative Council (SBLC), I want to indicate that we must object to the initiative to temporarily roll back the Federal gas tax. While small businesses are clearly suffering as a result of the high gasoline prices, we are long time staunch supporters of preserving the integrity of the highway trust fund and making sure that we have the proper infrastructure to deliver our goods and services.

We understand that you intend to pay for this roll back using the "surplus." Right now we have many priorities for the use of that surplus. Repeal of the death tax, increasing direct expensing, full deductibility for the self-employed's health care costs, FUTA tax relief, repeal of the installment sales repeal and national debt reduction to name just a few.

As you know, the SBLC is a permanent, independent coalition of nearly 80 trade and professional associations that share a common commitment to the future of small business. Our members represent the interests of small businesses in such diverse economic sectors as manufacturing, retailing, distribution, professional and technical services, construction, transportation, tourism and agriculture. Our policies are developed through a consensus among our membership. Individual associations may express their own views. For your information, a list of our members is enclosed.

We appreciate your outstanding leadership on behalf of small business. We believe there must be a better way to provide relief for small business from rising gasoline prices without jeopardizing other small business priorities.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. SATAGAJ,
President and General Counsel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia. It is an honor to be on the floor to join with him and Senator from Virginia to make the point very strongly that suspension or repeal of the gas tax would be a grave error. Although all of us, as Senators, are aware of consumer complaints about the high gasoline prices we are facing in our States, we also should keep in mind that this is due primarily to factors other than the level of the gas tax, as the Senator from West Virginia has pointed out.

Our declining production of petroleum and the constriction by OPEC of the supply of gasoline on the world markets is the most significant factor in determining the price at the pump. Cutting the tax would merely reduce the revenues available for improving highway safety without producing real savings that would be passed on to the consumers. Because of the imposition of tax at the refinery level, there is no

assurance it would come to the gasoline purchaser, the automobile owner, or the truck or bus driver.

The CRS has issued a report saying there might not be any appreciable evidence of a reduction in tax. The consumers would never see it. Who would see it would be those people who are committed to repairing and rebuilding our inadequate roads, bridges, and highways.

In 1998, I worked hard with our friend and dear colleague, the late Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. John Chafee, on the Bond-Chafee guarantee that was incorporated into TEA-21 with the help of the Senators who spoke before me—Senator DOMENICI, Senator BYRD, and Senator WARNER. That provision created for the first time a real guarantee that revenues collected and earmarked for the highway trust fund would, in fact, be used for transportation purposes. If we collect a dollar gas tax, that dollar must be credited to the highway trust fund. This guarantees that for the first time highway users will get the transportation benefits in return for the user fee they pay through the gas tax.

We cannot have a guarantee if we continue to change the way the program is funded. To hold the trust fund harmless, supposedly by having money come from general revenue and projected surpluses, will put us back in the same sinking boat—more appropriately, crumbling highway—that we were in before. That position was one where off-budget or turnbacks were advocated. This amendment makes clear the budget resolution does not assume the reductions of any Federal gasoline tax.

We need a Department of Energy that makes energy policy, not the EPA. The administration policy has been no policy. We can stop the raid on the highway funds, and we must not repeal or roll back the gasoline tax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, what is at issue is very clear. I hope my colleagues pay attention. The issue is whether this Congress is going to break the trust the American people have in the highway trust fund. That is the issue.

Dollars going into the Federal highway trust fund are locked in. There is a trust that those dollars are then distributed back to the States. The revenue in the trust fund goes back to the States. It is a trust, an understanding. That is why we have a highway trust fund.

We cannot go down the slippery slope of opening up the trust fund and replenishing it with general revenue or using general revenue to pay for highway allocations because once we start down that slippery slope, we will then have broken the trust. We will have sprung a leak, which will grow into perhaps a creek or a river, and will drain the highway trust fund, as the trust is broken. It is that simple.

I very much thank the Senator from West Virginia for drawing this to the Senate's attention. Not only is it the resolution before us, but it is also any potential revenue matters that might come up in this body. The essential point is the linkage.

I strongly urge my colleagues to continue the trust this Congress made with the American people when it passed the last highway bill, TEA-21. That bill was heralded as a landmark piece of legislation, overwhelmingly passed by both bodies. We all touted it, not only because of the revenues and dedication to the infrastructure so desperately needed but also because of the trust; that is, the assurance that the gasoline tax and the diesel fuel tax people pay at the pump will come back to the States; that it will not be tampered with by the Congress; it will not be changed by the Congress. That is something on which the people could count, of which they could be assured. It is something that is certain, something they can trust.

I very much hope we resist the temptation, we resist the siren song for a short-term political change, to jigger around with the 4.3 cents, repealing it and adding the difference to the surplus or revenue. It is an exercise that is not only futile; it is an exercise that is a misrepresentation of what we did in TEA-21, and it will be an exercise which begins to break the trust.

Either we keep the trust or we do not. There is no halfway here. There is no little breaking of the trust. Either we keep it or we do not. I submit the American people want us to keep the trust. They will be very upset if we break it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print a letter in the RECORD from various organizations—the National Governors' Association, the National Conference of State Legislatures, the Council of State Governments, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, National League of Cities, National Association of Counties, International City/County Management Association, all in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

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

NATIONAL GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION,
NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE
LEGISLATURES, COUNCIL OF STATE
GOVERNMENTS, THE U.S. CON-
FERENCE OF MAYORS, NATIONAL
LEAGUE OF CITIES, NATIONAL AS-
SOCIATION OF COUNTIES, INTER-
NATIONAL CITY/COUNTY MANAGE-
MENT ASSOCIATION,

April 5, 2000.

DEAR SENATOR: We are writing on behalf of the elected leaders of the nation's state and local governments to urge support of the Byrd-Warner-Baucus-Voinovich-Lautenberg-Bond Sense of the Senate Resolution for the continued use of federal fuel taxes for the construction and rehabilitation of our nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems which is being offered as an amendment to the FY 2001 Budget Resolution.

This resolution conforms to the strong opposition that state and local leaders have to

any legislative proposals that would interfere or interrupt the current level of transportation user fees being collected that provide dedicated federal funding for transportation programs. It supports the critical commitment to transportation infrastructure, and the funding mechanism to support that commitment, made in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21).

Our state and local government members are responsible for almost all the nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems. We cannot afford cuts in federal transportation infrastructure funding such as the 4.3 cents reduction proposed in the Budget Resolution. The 4.3 cents tax on gasoline and diesel brings in \$7.2 billion annually to the Highway Trust Fund—\$5.8 billion for highways and \$1.4 billion for transit. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, if the 4.3 cents were repealed, the highway program would be cut by \$20.5 billion through FY 2003, the final year of TEA-21. The Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund would go broke in 2003.

The nation's state and local leaders look forward to working with you on this very important issue.

Sincerely,

Raymond C. Scheppach, Executive Director, National Governors' Association; Daniel M. Sprague, Executive Director, Council of State Governments; Donald J. Borut, Executive Director, National League of Cities; William H. Hansell, Jr., Executive Director, International City/County Management Association; William T. Pound, Executive Director, National Conference of State Legislatures; J. Thomas Cochran, Executive Director, The U.S. Conference of Mayors; Larry E. Naake, Executive Director, National Association of Counties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia for offering this amendment. He knows and the rest of us know that repeal of the 4.3-cent gas tax is not going to solve the problem of high gasoline prices which today confronts this country. In my opinion, the administration's lack of an energy policy and total inability to react to OPEC's production cut has pushed gasoline prices to \$2 per gallon in some places in the nation.

The fact of the matter is, the American people are angry, and I share their frustration. The real problem we have today is that we do not have an energy policy in this country.

Two weeks ago, when Department of Energy officials testified before the Governmental Affairs committee, I asked them whether or not they had an energy policy. I asked them if we were too reliant upon foreign oil. Their answer to that was yes we are too reliant on foreign oil.

I said: Your department is predicting that in the next 10 years we are going to be 65-percent reliant on foreign oil. How reliant should we be? Is it 45, 50 percent?

They had no answer.

I said: As a former Governor, if I had a problem, I would set a number and say it is going to be 45 or 50 and then put a plan together and move forward and get it done.

I hope in this debate over whether or not we ought to reduce the gas tax, the administration and Members of Congress take advantage of this wonderful opportunity to come together to look at the environmental concerns, look at the issue of exploration, look at the problems of the stripper well producers in this country who are out of business because the cost of a barrel of oil has been too low. We need to get it all on the table so that we do not have a repeat performance, and so that we are not at the mercy of foreign oil producing nations, some of whom are actually avowed enemies of the United States of America.

I've said many times the price is going to go down because the administration is going to put the pressure on these nations. But what I would like to know is, what are the promises they are going to be making in order to get the price down? We ought not to be in this position.

I happen to have been chairman of the National Governors' Association when Congress did TEA-21. Most Governors were opposed to the 4.3-cent gas tax in 1993 but we came back and said: If you move that from deficit reduction to the highway trust fund, we will support it.

I want everyone to understand that for the donor States—and Ohio is a donor State—without that 4.3 cents, we would not have a guarantee of 90.5 percent of the money we are sending to Washington. This is the way we helped get some of our money back into our State.

I think if you ask most of the highway directors of the States in this country, they will tell you that without that 4.3-cent gas tax, they are not going to have any new construction programs. All of the rest of our gas tax money goes for the maintenance and repair of our highways. The new construction is being paid for by that 4.3-cent gas tax.

There are some people who say: Don't worry about it because the money will come from the on-budget surplus or from someplace else. My answer to that is, we have a users' tax. The people who use the highways pay the tax for the highways. I do not think it is fair that we should say to the people of the country what we are going to do is reduce the highway users' tax and we are going to make everyone else pay to make up for the tax reduction.

I would like to say I am just prayerful that this amendment passes, that it passes overwhelmingly, that we send the message that we are not for repealing the 4.3-cent gas tax and that we take advantage of this wonderful opportunity to come together and develop an energy policy for this great Nation of ours.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. I wonder if Senator BYRD could yield me 3 minutes off his time?

Mr. BYRD. Yes. I yield whatever time the Senator wishes to consume.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to argue in two parts.

My first part has to do with the highways and byways and freeways of America and our home cities across this land. I think there is no one in this Chamber who has not been home to their State and found that people somewhere in their State are frustrated because we do not have adequate roads to handle the traffic.

No, I am not suggesting I know how to do that in terms of these very heavily congested areas. But there is no doubt, we are way behind the curve in terms of supplying highways, freeways, and arteries in our cities.

You are not going to tell the American people they can't have their dream. I mean, their dream is to own a house and own a car or cars. One of their big dreams is to have that place where they want it. We are just never going to succeed in telling the American people: You cannot live 5 miles from your employment, as they did in Russia. They had it all figured out: They all worked; they all got on one train; and they all went to work. In fact, they told them in high school what they were going to be.

That is not America. So we are behind. In fact, I am not sure in most places we are gaining on the congestion and traffic. Frankly, I could come down here and say I am pretty satisfied that repeal of the 4.3-cent tax would not hurt next year, but in 7 years actually it would hurt.

The truth of the matter is, we should not deceive anybody. The problem we have is the problem that America uses more crude oil and crude-oil products than we are now producing.

Frankly, we have an American policy, I regret to say—especially since President Bill Clinton has been in office and Vice President GORE—of taking more and more of America, the public lands, out of production that you cannot use; you cannot get on it to find oil, even if it is there, all under some mystique that on "public domain" we should not be looking for oil, that we ought to be saving it for something.

Then tonight we are going to have a debate, I say to the Senator. I am not sure where everyone is going to be on it. But actually one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the Arctic wilderness, called ANWR, one one-hundredth of 1 percent is a little strip of land that they are trying to say: Why don't we try to find out if there is oil there?

You know what they think might be there? Sixteen billion barrels of oil. Pretty much. It is as much as we will import from Saudi Arabia over the next 5, 6, 7 years. That would be the amount. That is pretty good. That is a pretty large amount of oil. All of it would be owned by Americans. All of it would be drilled by Americans. Americans would have jobs.

Instead, we say it is just going to ruin that wilderness. Somebody who is neutral ought to pass on that, not

somebody who wants to save this wilderness, including one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the land surface.

If I had my notes from my desk, I would tell you how much we have taken out of production in America. We have taken lands on which people could find oil, and we have said: You cannot get on it to find oil.

We have regulations, through the Department of the Interior, that instead of saying, hey, get out here and find your oil, they make it tough. It is sort of like: Boy, do we have to put up with you? It is not like: Boy, I hope you find oil.

It is American oil. It is sort of like: Maybe it is OK, but it is just too bad that we have to do this. What is too bad about it? We are going to buy this oil someplace. We have less American oil, fewer rigs producing oil, and we are getting more dependent.

The last point is, according to the independent institute within the Department of Energy, the one that is supposed to do analysis of supply, they tell us—I hope they are wrong—they cannot find out how much the production of the world is. That sounds incredible. If they cannot, somebody in our Government should. We should not be surprised all of a sudden if somebody says: You know, they are producing 4 million barrels less. We are hurting.

We ought to know; there is no way to keep this a real secret. If we set out to find it, I am sure we could. In fact, I think there are probably some parts of the American Government we do not know about that might already know that. But that is very important.

To summarize, my last point is, we need to build more roads for America's congestion, not less. Secondly, we need to take a positive approach. If the President does not want to, we will not get it done for a while. But we have to decide what are our goals as Americans in terms of producing energy? How much should we be conserving? Let's get serious about it.

This will not happen with a bunch of Government regs. This will happen when the marketplace of America is opened up to oil and gas production. I am even wondering whether the largest supply of natural gas is offshore in some parts of America. We have said: No more offshore drilling.

It isn't environmentally dangerous. In fact, I submit to the Senate, it is more dangerous to increase our reliance and thus bring more tankers into American ports than it would be to seriously consider doing more offshore drilling.

But, of course, for some people what I am speaking about is kind of radical. I think it is really kind of common sense about America's growing dependence. I am not ashamed or embarrassed about saying I would change it drastically. I would recommend that somebody change it dramatically. Tell the world we are going to try. We are not going to give in.

We currently think it is an American energy policy to send the Secretary of

Energy—one of New Mexico's sons; my friend—around to make a deal. That is America's energy policy? Have you ever heard of anything like that being the policy of America? What if they said no?

In this case, they started asking a few questions and said: Maybe we don't want to hurt your economy. Kuwait does not know what we want of them. We saved them from the invasion. They do not know whether we want to dance on a barrel of oil or what we want. They already said: Look, America, you send us so many signals, we don't know what to do. But we are on your side.

I think we ought to be very clear, it is not this 4.3-cent tax. What it is, we do not have a policy to produce more and tell the world we are growing more independent rather than dependent.

Whatever time I have, if I have any, I yield back.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his very enlightening statement. I have listened to him on this floor many times over the years. I do not think I have enjoyed more any statement of his than I have this evening.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BINGAMAN, Senator ROBB, and Senator LINCOLN be added as cosponsors of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I see no other Senator asking for time on this side.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, under terms of the unanimous consent agreement on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, the agreement said we would use all time tonight on this amendment. Is Senator LAUTENBERG wishing to speak on the amendment of Senator BYRD dealing with gas tax repeal?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. While I wasn't present to hear Senator BYRD's presentation, there is no doubt in my mind that the Byrd proposal is one we have to support. The last thing we want to do now is to reduce that tax in order that we might give OPEC or the distributors, whomever, a chance to boost the price for the difference.

One of the toughest things we have to do is to try to meet our obligations with the resources we have available. The American people know very well that one of the most important things we do is to maintain our transportation infrastructure. I plan to do whatever I can to see that that is done.

My remarks are short, but they are very supportive. I congratulate Senator BYRD for his usual wisdom in presenting something that we have to think seriously about and, frankly, I support fully. I thank him for that.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator for his kind and supportive statement. I thank all

Senators who have spoken on this subject for their remarks. I thank them for their support, and I hope all of our colleagues tomorrow will vote in favor of the amendment I have offered on behalf of myself and the other Senators named thereon.

Mr. REID. It is my understanding that the next amendment in order will be offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. DOMENICI. That is my understanding. Senator ROTH is on the floor, I believe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMENDMENT NO. 2955

(Purpose: To strike the revenue assumption for ANWR receipts in fiscal year 2005)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself and Senators BOXER, BAUCUS, JEFFORDS, SCHUMER, DODD, FEINGOLD, LIEBERMAN, MURRAY, CHAFEE, ROBB, and TORRICELLI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the pending amendment is set aside. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. DODD, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. TORRICELLI, proposes an amendment numbered 2955.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 27, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, increase the amount by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 28, line 20, decrease the amount by \$1,200,000,000.

On page 28, line 21, decrease the amount by \$1,200,000,000.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the gentleman from Delaware consent to the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, being added as cosponsors of the amendment?

Mr. ROTH. I am happy to have them join as cosponsors.

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I commend my colleague, the Senator from New Mexico, for what I consider to be an excellent budget resolution. Over the next 5 years, the Budget Committee chairman has protected Social Security, funded our priorities such as defense and education, and provided for a \$150 billion tax cut—something I look forward to crafting in the Finance Committee.

However, there is one point at which I respectfully disagree with my distinguished colleague's work. It is in the assumptions of allowing leasing for oil exploration and production in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. This budget resolution assumes that \$1.2 billion would become available in fiscal year 2005 from the bids for such leases.

My amendment would simply remove that assumed revenue from the budget resolution and thereby protect this wilderness area.

My reason for offering this amendment is based on beauty, not on budgets. I do not want to see us make an irreparable mistake in one of America's remaining natural treasures. We can afford to forgo this momentary revenue, but we can't afford not to protect this Arctic Eden.

Mr. President, in 1960 President Dwight Eisenhower had the wisdom to set aside a portion of America's Arctic for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations. His Arctic Range protected the highest peaks and glaciers of the Brooks Range, North America's two largest and most northerly alpine lakes, and nearly 200 different wildlife species, including polar bears, grizzlies, wolves, caribou and millions of migratory birds.

Eisenhower's Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, called the new Arctic Range, "one of the most magnificent wildlife and wilderness areas in North America . . . a wilderness experience not duplicated elsewhere."

The Alaskan wilderness area is not only a critical part of our Earth's ecosystem—the last remaining region where the complete spectrum of arctic and subarctic ecosystems comes together—but it is a vital part of our national consciousness.

The Alaskan wilderness is a place of outstanding wildlife, wilderness and recreation, a land dotted by beautiful forests, dramatic peaks and glaciers, gentle foothills and undulating tundra. It is untamed—rich with caribou, polar bear, grizzly, wolves, musk oxen, Dall sheep, moose, and hundreds of thousands of birds—snow geese, tundra swans, black brant, and more. Birds from the Arctic Refuge fly to or through every state in the continental U.S. In all, Mr. President, about 200 species use the coastal plain.

Mr. President, there are parts of this Earth where it is good that man can come only as a visitor. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is one of those places. These are pristine lands that belong to all of us. And perhaps most importantly, these are the lands that belong to our future.

In essence what I am asking my colleagues to support is an environmental stewardship that protects our important wilderness areas and precious resources, while carefully and judiciously weighing the short-term desires or our country against its long-term needs.

Considering the many reasons why protecting this area is so important, I came across the words of the great Western writer, Wallace Stegner. Referring to the land we seek to protect, he wrote that it is "the most splendid part of the American habitat; it is also the most fragile." We cannot enter this land "carrying habits that [are] inappropriate and expectations that [are] surely excessive."

An industrial zone and wilderness cannot occupy the same space. The

simple fact is that no matter how well done, oil exploration and development would have significant and lasting impacts on this environment.

In closing, I want to remind my colleagues that when the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was formally created under the 1980 Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, it was to conserve fish and wildlife populations in their natural diversity. Oil development on the coastal plain of the refuge is prohibited without the enactment of legislation authorizing development.

I urge my colleagues, to support my amendment and reject the budget resolution's assumptions on oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Let us reconfirm to protect today what can never be regained tomorrow if we make the wrong decision now.

I hope that we can forever protect the coastal plain from development. It is certainly premature at this time to assume revenue from oil development there.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise to support the Roth amendment, which expresses the sense of the Senate that we should maintain the longstanding ban on oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

We have heard a lot of concern lately about the cost of gas at the pump.

I share that concern. I represent Montana. The Big Sky State. Vast open spaces. We often drive long distances just to get to the grocery store.

Prices at the pump in Billings have gone from \$1.18 in April of 1999 to \$1.59 today. We need to get the price down. The administration has made some progress, with the OPEC countries. We may need to do more. For example, we may need to use the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. But we should not respond to high gas prices by opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. That would be shortsighted, ineffective, and environmentally harmful.

Proponents of oil drilling make three main arguments. They imply it will lower the price at the pump. They argue that it will enhance our energy security. And they argue that it won't really pose a significant environmental risk to the refuge.

I disagree. Let me take the arguments in turn.

First, the cost at the pump. Opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will have absolutely no impact on gas prices, now or in the foreseeable future. Think about it. Assume that we pass a law authorizing drilling. Assume the President signs it. First, companies will need to conduct exploration to determine where to drill. Next they will have to build the infrastructure, the roads, drill pads, drill rigs, pipelines, gravel pits, waste pits, and living and working quarters. This could include

hundreds of miles of roads and pipelines, production facilities, increased traffic at loading ports, and housing and services for thousands of people.

This work will take years and years. Senator MURKOWSKI himself said, in 1998, that "a future decision on ANWR is one which will take about 10 years to produce any results in the way of any increased production contribution to our current flow of domestic oil." Ten years, before we see any impact on the price at the pump.

Let me turn to the longer term issue. Energy security. Let's look at what the potential oil of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge means in the big picture. At best, the economically recoverable oil would represent 2 percent of our daily needs. As a result, oil drilling in the Arctic Wildlife Refuge has little, if anything, to do with long-term energy security.

Another point. It does not make good strategic sense to use our reserves, which account for only 12 percent of the crude oil available in the world, while we have access to other sources. After all, once our reserves are used up, we will be totally at the mercy of OPEC.

Instead of continuing our unhealthy dependence on OPEC, we should develop a comprehensive energy strategy. We should improve energy efficiency. We should diversify our energy sources.

What are we doing here in Congress? Virtually nothing.

We continue to prevent an increase in corporate average fuel economy. We routinely underfund the development of solar and renewable energy. And we fail to seriously consider tax legislation that rewards efficiency and increases our energy security.

In the absence of a comprehensive national energy strategy, drilling the refuge is just a band-aid. A quick fix. It's no substitute for a real, comprehensive, strategy.

Putting this all together, drilling in the Arctic Refuge will not reduce prices at the pump anytime soon, if at all. And it will not significantly enhance our energy security.

Now consider the environmental impact. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is truly unique. It is the only refuge of its type in the world. I've been there. It has been referred to, for good reason, as "America's Serengeti." It's the nation's largest and most northerly wildlife refuge. It includes a full range of arctic and subarctic habitats. Vast herds of caribou migrate to the refuge, bearing their young on the coastal plain. Muskox use the area year-round. The refuge is the most important polar bear land denning area in Alaska. One hundred eighty bird species migrate there, from throughout the hemisphere. Eighteen major rivers contain 36 species of fish.

Let's look at what development might do. What happens when the construction of, say, a pipeline and road forces wildlife away? Take the caribou hers. Female caribou seek out the best

foraging areas as calving areas. These areas change each year. If, in any given year, the best foraging and calving area is a site for development, the caribou won't use it and fewer calves will survive. Development can also force females into areas where there are more predators, or block them from climbing onto ridge tops to avoid swarms of insects. Again, fewer calves will survive.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has concluded that the cumulative impacts of these effects could significantly reduce the size of the caribou hers. The Service has expressed similar concerns about muskoxen.

What about disturbances from road building? There is not enough water to build only ice roads. You'd have to build gravel roads, even for exploration. Gravel roads will alter the natural flow of water during spring breakup, will melt permafrost, and will otherwise damage the environment. Taken together, this could harm the habitat for more than 100 species of birds. This, in turn, will have effects way beyond the refuge itself. All of these birds are migratory. They nest and rear their young in the Refuge in the summer, then migrate throughout the entire hemisphere, including virtually every state.

Now, the proponents of drilling say that the environmental impacts have been exaggerated. They say that the "footprint" of development is no larger than Dulles Airport. In fact, the development will *not* be concentrated in a small area.

This map, based on projections by the Fish and Wildlife Service, shows potential pipelines, drilling pads, roads, and other facilities. As you can see, the roads and pipelines stretch across the entire coastal plain, bisecting migration paths and stream channels. What's more, recent reports by the U.S. Geological Service show that the oil reserves in the Refuge are smaller and more widely dispersed than previously thought. As a result, oil development will require more, and more widely dispersed, roads, pipelines, and other infrastructure. Finally, accidents.

If the *Exxon Valdez* taught us anything, it is that humans working in a cold, harsh environment can make mistakes, and that the environmental costs in a fragile ecosystem can be extraordinarily high. Our experience elsewhere on the North Slope confirms this. There has been a general increase in the number of spills. At least two well-blowouts have occurred. At least 76 areas have been contaminated by oil development from the Prudhoe Field. Things usually don't go as smoothly as we plan.

That brings me to my final point. It may be that, someday, the need will be so great, and the technology so sophisticated, that we decide that the benefits of exploration and development of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge are worth it. But we should only make that decision after careful deliberation,

after exhausting all reasonable alternatives, and after assuring that this fragile ecosystem will, in fact, be protected. Because there's no margin for error. If we make a mistake, and allow development that destroys the unique character of this special place, the mistake will be permanent and, perhaps, unforgivable.

Mr. President, pulling all of this together, the benefits of drilling simply are not worth it. They are not worth the environmental risks.

Therefore, I urge Members to vote to maintain the longstanding ban on drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, by voting for the Roth amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. L. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Senator ROTH's amendment to the budget resolution, and I thank the Senator for his leadership on matters relating to the future of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, or ANWR. The purpose and rationale behind the Roth amendment is simple: We should not include revenue assumptions in the budget based on oil development that will not, and should not, occur. Such faulty assumptions make poor fiscal policy and poor environmental policy. The Arctic Refuge is a national treasure. I support Senator ROTH's efforts to designate the area as wilderness, and I am pleased to add my name as a cosponsor to the Roth wilderness bill.

The crux of this debate is on our values, our legacy, and what we want to pass on to future generations. Senator BAUCUS mentioned the Serengeti National Park in Africa, an area immortalized in the human imagination for its beauty and majesty. This amazing park exists because previous generations had the foresight to preserve and protect this area from development. As Senator BAUCUS said, the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is referred to as the "American Serengeti." And like its counterpart in Africa, this area deserves to be protected for us, our children, and our grandchildren.

In 1980, in recognition of the area's immense environmental value, as Senator ROTH said, Congress formally established the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. At that time, and after much debate and deliberation, Congress made the wise decision to prohibit drilling in the Coastal Plain pending further review.

Now, only a short 20 years later, efforts are underway to open this area to development.

I urge my colleagues to resist these efforts, to look past our short term needs, and designate the area as wilderness for future generations. The very definition of a "refuge" means an area of sanctuary, shelter and protection. In the case of our wildlife refuges, this

means protecting nature from drilling, road construction, combustion engines and all of the other harmful effects of human beings and their machines. A large portion of the Alaskan North Slope is already open to oil exploration or drilling; we should not subject ANWR to the same fate.

Some have voiced concern at our increasing dependence on foreign oil, and our lack of a coherent national energy policy. I share these concerns, and agree completely that our country must take steps to improve our energy security. But the solution to our energy problems does not lie underneath the coastal plain of ANWR, and drilling there cannot become our energy policy. Remember, by definition, a refuge is a place providing protection or shelter—it is a haven, a sanctuary—we must make sure that ANWR remains a haven, a sanctuary.

I thank my colleagues for their consideration, and I respectfully urge them to support the Roth amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator for yielding. I stand in complete support of his amendment, an amendment very similar to the one offered by my colleague, the Senator from California, in the Budget Committee.

It should be kept in context that this budget resolution, without the Roth amendment, assumes \$1.2 billion in royalties from the sale of oil from drilling in the Arctic Wildlife National Refuge.

I want to say to Members of the Senate that the reason we are debating this is because the price of gasoline is increasing in the United States. People are more sensitized to the cost of fuel and energy and the impact it has on businesses, families, and individuals.

Those who have been salivating for decades for an opportunity to drill in this wildlife refuge in Alaska have jumped at the chance to assume that we are so consumed by the increase in energy prices that we will cast aside any concern for the environment and the legacy which we should leave to future generations.

Senator ROTH is right. We should not be drilling in ANWR. We have to consider the fact that on the North Slope, 95 percent is already open to exploration. The 5 percent on the Coastal Plain that we have set aside is to protect what we have identified as a legitimate, important wildlife refuge.

Oil companies and their supporters can't wait to drill in that wildlife refuge. I think it is wrong. I think Senator ROTH is right, as Senator BOXER was in committee.

We should say unequivocally in a bipartisan fashion on the floor of the Senate that we need an energy policy, but we do not need to walk in and desecrate a wildlife refuge designed to be preserved for future generations.

This last Saturday in Belleville, IL, I paid \$1.39 a gallon for regular gasoline. I then drove 100 miles to Springfield, IL, and paid \$1.49. Yes, prices have increased. Yes, I am sure for families of limited means and some businesses there is sacrifice attached to it. But we shouldn't use this as a catalyst or a reason to run headlong into this effort to desecrate this important environmental refuge.

We need to face the reality that America needs an energy policy, and we shouldn't wait for a gasoline price crisis to drive us to the point to develop one. Such an energy policy is going to include a lot of things, such as looking for responsible areas for oil exploration and development; also, of course, energy efficiency not only in our automobiles but in virtually everything that we use involving energy. Of course, it will lessen our dependence on foreign oil sources. We need to look for alternative fuels.

This is an important, complicated but a necessary national debate.

This quick fix of drilling in ANWR in the belief that it is going to bring down gasoline prices is wrong on two counts.

First, it is not likely to bring them down, if at all, until years from now.

Second, it really avoids the obvious responsibility we have to preserve this important refuge.

Senator ROTH is offering an amendment which is consistent with a member of his party who served in the United States as President many years ago by the name of Theodore Roosevelt, who said in his efforts to preserve the environment:

We must ask ourselves if we are leaving for future generations an environment that is as good or better than what we found.

Senator ROTH's amendment says this Senate will go on record leaving a legacy for future generations in the name and in the memory of Theodore Roosevelt, "as good or better than what we found," that we will not allow this exploitation and exploration of this valuable and fragile natural resource.

I stand in complete support of this amendment.

I yield the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank Senator ROTH for offering this amendment. I offered almost an identical amendment in the Budget Committee, and it failed on a tie vote. I am very hopeful that we will do better on the floor of the Senate. We were able to pick up one Republican in the committee. We had all the Democrats. I think we have a good chance of picking up, with the help of Senator ROTH and Senator CHAFEE, some more on their side of the aisle.

This amendment would strike from the budget \$1.2 billion in receipts that

the budget resolution assumed would be received from oil exploration or drilling operations in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

I stand with those who have spoken very eloquently tonight, and say that we cannot allow that beautiful, pristine sanctuary—one of the most remarkable wildlife habitats in the world—to be spoiled.

We have a beautiful picture, with which I am sure Senator MURKOWSKI is familiar.

The wildlife refuge was established in 1960 by a Republican President, President Dwight D. Eisenhower. And it was for the benefit of his generation and future generations; that is, all of us. I think we have an obligation to keep that going, just as he kept it going for us.

From the very beginning, support for this refuge has been bipartisan. Thank goodness we see evidence of that on the Senate floor. Too few times, I am sad to say, do we see such bipartisanship. That is why I am delighted to work with Senator ROTH on this.

This land that President Eisenhower set aside in the Arctic wilderness is ecologically unique. It is the last remaining region where the complete spectrum of Arctic and sub-Arctic ecosystems can be found. It includes the highest peaks and glaciers of the Brooks Range.

President Eisenhower's Secretary of the Interior, Fred Seaton, called the new Arctic Refuge "one of the most magnificent wildlife and wilderness areas in North America . . . a wilderness experience not duplicated anywhere else."

Nothing has changed since then. It is still there. But we can destroy it here.

I am stunned that the Budget Committee let this go. I am stunned the majority on the Budget Committee put in \$1.2 billion as if we were going to allow this to happen next year. We are not going to allow this to happen.

I would like to say tonight to my good friend from Alaska, whom I respect—we have some good arguments now and then, and we probably will have them again—that we are going to fight this out. To put \$1.2 billion in as if we were going to start getting receipts from this next year makes no sense at all.

I can guarantee—I shouldn't say that because you never can guarantee anything around here, but I believe we will have more than 41 people who will stand on their feet as long as it takes to stop that from happening.

To put it in the budget resolution, No. 1, is wrong because it is presuming the Senate is going to approve this when I don't believe it will happen.

This area is tremendously rich with nearly 200 different wildlife species including polar bears, grizzlies, wolves, caribou, and a whole list of others, including millions of migratory birds. Amazingly, birds from the Arctic Refuge fly to or through every State in the continental United States of Amer-

ica. This is not only an Alaska issue. We all benefit from this refuge. I cannot reconcile the concept of drilling with a wildlife refuge. It seems to me they don't go together. If you are going to set aside a wildlife refuge, you should not allow drilling there at all. Drilling will raise disturbing questions about what our refuges are for. If wildlife are not guaranteed protection from oil drilling, where are they safe?

My colleague, Senator ROTH, has introduced legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, which would forever safeguard this great national treasure by designating it wilderness area. This permanently protects it from oil exploration and development. That protection is warranted and reasonable. As Senator DURBIN has pointed out, nearly 95 percent of the arctic slope is available to industry for oil and gas development. It makes sense to shield this last remaining piece. I hope Chairman ROTH's wilderness proposal will get full consideration.

Instead, what are we seeing? Instead of moving forward with that wonderful piece of legislation that has bipartisan support, we have a budget resolution that essentially slaps its hand at Senator ROTH's legislation and includes \$1.2 billion, as if we will open it up without a fight.

It isn't going to happen. It is not realistic. It is funny numbers. It isn't going to happen. We are not going to let it happen. What we should be doing is passing Senator ROTH's legislation for our wilderness instead of plugging in a number.

It reminds me of the fight over the Presidio. Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska helped me save the Presidio. One year, I say to Senator MURKOWSKI, there was a plug put in the budget of \$1 billion for selling the Presidio. As I explained to my friends, that will never happen; the city and county of San Francisco would not allow this magnificent former military base to become anything other than a park; you are not going to get \$1 billion there. Finally, I prevailed on my colleagues. They backed off and we never put the plug in.

And we are prevailing tonight. Don't put that \$1.2 billion plug in because it is not real. It is wrong. It goes against what we ought to be doing.

I understand the rising gas price phenomenon because I am in a State that has some of the highest gas prices. Believe me, it hurts at the pump. We are looking at \$2 a gallon where I come from.

My constituency wants me to do something about it, and I have come up with a plan. The plan is pretty straightforward. No. 1, why are we exporting gas from Alaska to other countries when we need to use it here? That is 68,000 barrels a day. Second, why don't we increase the energy efficiency of SUVs and light trucks? That will bring 1 million barrels a day. We can do that to get them up to 27 miles per gallon. That can be done.

Why don't we say there should be a moratorium on the oil company mergers? We know less competition brings higher prices. It is the rule of a capitalist system. We need more competition. That is what we ought to be doing. We ought not be drilling in a wildlife refuge on the coast of California or any of our magnificent offshore areas.

The American people realize this. I have letters favoring Senator ROTH's bill. Tonight I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters from several environmental organizations, including the League of Conservation Voters, that will use this as a scored vote.

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

LEAGUE OF
CONSERVATION VOTERS,

April 4, 2000.

Re Protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—Vote "YES" on the Roth Arctic Wilderness Amendment to the 2001 Budget Resolution

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) is the bipartisan political voice of the national environmental community. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the press.

The League of Conservation Voters urges you to protect the biological heart of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge by supporting an amendment offered by Senator Roth (R-DE) to the 2001 Budget Resolution that opposes opening the Refuge to oil drilling. Currently the budget resolution assumes revenues from drilling in the Refuge.

Some members of Congress are using the current high price of gasoline as a pretext to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling. The current price of gasoline in no way justifies destroying this national treasure. Development of the Refuge's coastal plain will not impact oil supplies until far into the future, and the amount of oil that lies beneath it is minimal compared to our national energy needs.

The Arctic Refuge is home to wolves, polar bears, caribou and millions of migratory birds. It is also the last 5% of Alaska's vast north coastline that remains off-limits to the oil companies. And the Refuge plays an integral part in the lives of the Gwich'in people who depend on the seasonal migrations of the caribou for both survival and cultural identity.

Protecting the wilderness values of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is one of the top priorities of the national environmental community. LCV urges you to vote "YES" on Senator Roth's amendment to protect the Arctic Refuge.

LCV's Political Advisory Committee will consider including votes on this issue in compiling LCV's 2000 Scorecard. If you need more information, please call Betsy Loyless in my office at (202) 785-8683.

Sincerely,

DEB CALLAHAN,
President.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL,
April 4, 2000.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing on behalf of the more than 400,000 Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) members from across the country to respectfully urge you to oppose any legislative provisions that would open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to oil exploration. As you know, the FY 2001 Budget Resolution that the Senate Budget Committee reported to floor includes damaging language that assumes revenues from oil drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

Under the guise of combating high gas prices, some legislators are pressing to open the Arctic Refuge's 1.5 million-acre coastal plain to oil exploitation. The coastal plain is often called, "America's Serengeti" because of its abundant caribou, polar bear, grizzly, wolf and other wildlife populations, and represents the last five-percent of Alaska's Arctic Slope not already open to development. It would be ill-advised to open up our nation's Arctic wilderness for a questionable, short-term supply of oil.

We respectfully encourage you to oppose any bill or resolution that would open up the last pristine wilderness in the Arctic to oil and gas development, and urge you to support Senator Roth's amendment to the 2001 Budget Resolution to strike Arctic Refuge drilling revenues from the federal budget.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. ADAMS,
President.

NATIONAL PARKS
CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
April 4, 2000.

Re Oppose degradation of the Arctic Coastal Plain

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of our 400,000, the National Parks Conservation Association strongly urges you to oppose efforts to include projected revenues from oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge's coastal plain in the pending Budget Reconciliation bill.

The Arctic coastal plain has long been recognized as a spectacular national gem because of its spectacular scenery and diverse and abundant wildlife. The coastal plain richly deserves its tag of "America's Serengeti," as over 130,000 caribou of the Porcupine herd migrate there every spring to their calving grounds, and more than 300,000 snow geese are found there in the fall.

Attempts to open the coastal plain for drilling for oil have reared their head in Congress over the past three decades. Recent increases in gasoline prices have renewed the call to open the plain for oil production, resulting in an "assumption" of revenue from drilling in the Arctic Refuge in the Budget Reconciliation bill.

Opening up the coastal plain would not be a solution to the short-term increases in gasoline prices, nor would it address the nation's long-term energy strategy. In fact, the United States Geological Service estimates that even if oil were found in the coastal plain, production would never meet more than two percent of our nation's oil needs at any given time. This supply would hardly justify the production facilities and related infrastructure that would destroy the unique character of the coastal plain.

Your support in opposing efforts to promote oil development and drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is critical. Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Sincerely,

TOM KIERNAN,
President.

U.S. PUBLIC INTEREST RESEARCH
GROUP, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
STATE PIRGS,

Washington, DC, April 4, 2000.

DEAR SENATOR: The United States Public Interest Research Group (U.S. PIRG) urges you to support an amendment to the Budget Bill to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Senator Roth, the sponsor of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge wilderness bill, will offer an amendment today to strip language from the Senate Budget bill that would allow leasing and drilling on the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge.

The coastal plain is one of the last unspoiled areas left in the United States. Caribou, muskoxen, wolves, polar, black and brown bears, and thousands of migratory birds rely on the pristine habitat the Refuge provides. The annual migration of the 129,000 member Porcupine river caribou herd evokes images of the long-gone buffalo herds of the Great Plains. Most states, and a number of nations in South America, throughout the Pacific Rim and beyond are visited each year by birds from the Arctic coastal plain.

The Arctic Refuge is also home to the Gwich'in, the people of the caribou. The Gwich'in have lived in and around the Refuge for thousands of years. To them the coastal plain is sacred. Oil drilling will damage the coastal plain's environment and therefore jeopardize one of the last native subsistence cultures in North America.

Allowing oil drilling and development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would destroy the wilderness, yet would do virtually nothing to ease our energy problems or lower gas prices. A national energy policy that emphasizes energy efficiency, increases auto fuel efficiency standards, and promotes renewable energy would save more oil than thought to be in the coastal plain, preserve sensitive areas like the Arctic Refuge, and reduce pollution.

U.S. PIRG urges you to support the Roth Arctic amendment to the Budget bill and to Save America's Arctic.

ATHAN MANUEL,
Director, Arctic Wilderness Campaign.

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH,
1025 VERMONT AVE., NW,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2000.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the thousands of members of Friends of the Earth, we urge you to support efforts by Senator ROTH (R-DE) to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) from being opened for oil exploration. Currently, the FY 2001 Budget Resolution (S. Con. Res. 101) includes language that assumes receipts from the sale of oil leases in ANWR. Seismic exploration and oil drilling in a national refuge is an unacceptable short-term approach to the problems associated with the current oil crisis, and one which would have long-term devastating consequences.

ANWR encompasses 19 million acres of pristine wilderness. Created by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1960, ANWR is sanctuary for nearly 200 species of wildlife including polar bears, grizzlies, wolves, caribou and millions of birds. The area under consideration for oil exploration—a 1.5 million-acre coastal plain—is referred to by many scientists as the "biological heart" of the Arctic Refuge and represents the last five percent of Alaska's Arctic slope not already open to drilling. Though some maintain that modern technology allows clean exploration, many scientists have noted that today's seismic oil exploration, consisting of large crews with bulldozers, "thumper" trucks, fuel supply vehicles and a variety of other tracked vehicles, is even more damaging to the landscape than it has been in the past.

Drilling in ANWR would do little to reduce U.S. dependency on foreign oil. In fact, the U.S. Geological Survey has found that

ANWR would provide us with less than six months worth of oil. A more responsible solution to the problem is to develop and promote sustainable forms of clean energy.

We should not sell off this priceless wildlife refuge for a short-term energy fix. Support Senator ROTH in his efforts to defend the one of the few remaining natural treasures in the United States.

Sincerely,

COURTNEY CURF,
Legislative Director.

THE IZAAK WALTON
LEAGUE OF AMERICA,

April 4, 2000.

DEAR SENATOR: At the IWLA convention in 19u8, IWLA members from all over the United States passed a resolution in favor of Wilderness protection for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. In June of 1978, I visited Anchorage, Valdez and Prudhoe Bay with seven IWLA board members, as guests of Arctic Power and the State of Alaska—who wanted us to change our policy.

After a grueling four-day schedule, during which our members interviewed hundreds of Alaskans, we sat together quietly together and unanimously agreed that our policy should remain unchanged. Our decision was reaffirmed by our 1998 convention. While we did not presume to know what the future might bring, and did not go so far as to say that the Refuge should never be opened to oil development, we were certain that it should not be developed today.

Any oil from the Refuge will have an imperceptible impact on our nation's dependence on foreign oil. Almost any adjustment in CAFE standards would do more. As time passes and technology improves, more oil can be recovered at significantly less impact to the environment if it is indeed needed for national security.

The 45,000 members of the Izaak Walton League of America support full Wilderness protection for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and oppose any oil development in the Refuge at this time.

Sincerely,

PAUL W. HANSEN,
Executive Director.

SIERRA CLUB,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2000.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: Oil prices are arising because OPEC—the cartel of oil exporting countries—is manipulating the market to drive up petroleum prices. Many in Congress are seeking legislative redress for Americans who face higher prices at the pump. But some in Congress are using the oil price hike to renew their call to open the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas development. Consumers are seeking answers, but drilling the Arctic Refuge is not the solution.

America cannot drill its way to energy independence. We import more than half of our oil, 56% at present, and the United States contains less than 3% of the world's known oil reserves. Any way you look at it, increased domestic production does not add up to energy independence. Though some say the answer to our nation's energy needs lie below the surface of the coastal plain, the Sierra Club believes that this spectacular landscape should not be sacrificed.

No one knows how much, if any, oil lies beneath the coastal plain. In 1998, the United States Geological Service (USGS) published a determination of the mean estimate of economically recoverable oil as 3.2 billion barrels of oil. That's less than a six-month supply at current consumption rates and even at peak production, arctic oil would represent only 2% of total U.S. daily demand.

95% of Alaska's vast North Slope is already available for oil and gas exploration and leasing. The coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge represents the last 5% that remains off-limits to drilling.

The coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is America's serengeti. Nestled between the towering mountains of the Brooks Range and the Beaufort Sea in northeast Alaska, the narrow 1.5 million acre coastal plain in the biological heart of this untamed wilderness. It is home to unique and abundant wildlife: wolves, polar bear, musk ox and wolverine. A myriad of bird species rely on the coastal plain for breeding, nesting and migratory stopovers on trips as far away as the Baja peninsula, the Chesapeake Bay, and even Antarctica. The coastal plain is also the calving grounds for the 129,000 member Porcupine River Caribou herd, which migrates over 400 miles each year to this same place to give birth to their young. It is a migration reminiscent of the buffalo that once roamed the great plains.

It doesn't matter how much or how little oil may lie underneath the coastal plain. Drilling in the Arctic Refuge would be as short-sighted as damming the Grand Canyon or tapping Old Faithful. More drilling isn't the answer—reducing our dependency on oil is the solution. America needs a long-term energy strategy that is based on conservation and renewables, alternative energy sources, and raising the Corporate Average Fuel Economy standards for automobiles and light trucks. Such a long-term strategy will help America ultimately decrease its dependency on oil and allow us to protect our national treasures like the Arctic Refuge for future generations.

We urge you to oppose legislative attempts to open the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge to oil and gas development. The Sierra Club opposes S. 2214, Senator Frank Murkowski's development bill, and will strenuously oppose attempts to insert arctic drilling revenue assumptions in the Budget Resolution.

Instead, we urge you to support a bill, S. 867, authored by Senator William Roth of Delaware and cosponsored by 24 other Senators, that would grant permanent protection to the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. OPEC's manipulation of oil prices is no excuse to drill in our last great wilderness. Thank you for your consideration of this very important issue.

Sincerely,

CARL POPE,
Executive Director.

Mrs. BOXER. I also have a letter written by the Ambassador from Canada saying that it is very important we support Senator ROTH's legislation. I ask unanimous consent to have that printed in the RECORD.

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

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
AMBASSADOR DU CANADA,
Washington, DC, April 3, 2000.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER, I am writing to express Canada's concern with the proposal in the budget under consideration by the Senate to seek revenues from prospective lease sales in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Any decision to proceed with oil and gas development in the Arctic Refuge will have serious implications for Canada.

Canada joins with many Americans in the belief that opening up the Arctic Refuge to hydrocarbon development will cause major

disruptions in the sensitive calving grounds and will affect migratory patterns of the Porcupine Caribou Herd on which thousands of Canadian and American native peoples depend.

In signing the 1987 Canada-United States Agreement on the Conservation of the Porcupine Caribou Herd, both governments recognized the transboundary nature of these wildlife resources and our joint responsibility for protecting them.

In 1984, Canada gave permanent wilderness protection to its portion of the caribou calving grounds by creating the Ivvavik National Park. The critical calving grounds in the United States, however, do not have formal protection and remain vulnerable to development, as evidenced by the recent budgetary proposal.

Canada has consistently stated that the best way to ensure the future of the shared wildlife populations of the Arctic Coastal Plain is to designate the "1002 Lands" as wilderness, thereby providing permanent, equal protection on both sides of the border to these irreplaceable living resources.

I very much appreciate your support for wilderness protection for all of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I hope that you find Canadian views helpful in your deliberations with your colleagues on this matter.

Yours sincerely,

RAYMOND CHRETIEN,
Ambassador.

Mrs. BOXER. They say we need to do this in order to uphold our agreement with Canada to protect the Porcupine caribou herd which depends upon the refuge for its survival.

In closing, I am very pleased to join with Senator ROTH. I thank my ranking member, Senator LAUTENBERG, for being so supportive of this amendment when I offered it in the committee. We delivered every single Democrat for the environment. I was proud of that. I was very pleased we had an additional vote in the committee from the Republican side, Senator SNOWE. I thank her from the bottom of my heart.

Again, this is a bipartisan issue. It dates back to the Eisenhower administration. Let us stand together across party lines. Let us get rid of this \$1.2 billion revenue. It is wrong to put it in there because it is wrong to drill in this refuge. It is wrong to put it in there because it, frankly, isn't going to happen.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Will the Senator from California yield?

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. I am happy to yield on your time.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I note that the picture my friend from California identified—and that is an extraordinary picture of the Brooks Range, as she may not know—is nowhere near the Coastal Plain, the 1002 area about which we are talking. It is probably somewhere between 80 and 100 miles away. That is the wilderness we are committed to support and does not represent at all the Coastal Plain which is the issue before us.

Mrs. BOXER. We were given it from people in your State supporting it.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. It is a beautiful picture of Brooks Range, but it is not the 1002 area.

Mrs. BOXER. They sent it directly from your State.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I wouldn't want the Senate to be misled.

Mrs. BOXER. It comes from your people from your State. If they were misleading, I am surprised about that.

Mr. ROTH. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the budget resolution assumes revenues from leasing the lands in the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for oil drilling.

I, too, support the efforts of the senior Senator from Delaware to ensure that drilling in the Arctic Refuge is not used as a revenue assumption. I have also long been a cosponsor of his bill to designate the Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge as a wilderness area.

Not only do I support this amendment along with many Members of this body, but also I support this amendment along with Members of the other body who have worked so hard on this issue. I particularly recognize the efforts of my colleague in the other body, Mr. VENTO, who so long and so well has led the fight to designate the refuge as wilderness.

I am concerned this assumption obligates Congress to decide whether or not to drill on the Coastal Plain refuge before we decide whether or not it should be designated as wilderness. Drilling on the Coastal Plain allows an activity that is generally considered to be incompatible with designated wilderness areas.

In addition, I am concerned about the potential impact drilling would have upon the existing wilderness, the area that was just being discussed, existing wilderness in the Arctic Refuge. Eight million acres south of the Coastal Plain are already designated as wilderness. I want my colleagues to be aware the drilling question does not only impact our ability to make future wilderness designations in the refuge but also may impact areas that we have already protected in the public trust.

I suggest even if the previous portrayal by the Senator from California was of an area that is already protected, that is part of the point. Drilling in this area could have an impact on the already-protected area. I want to speak to my colleagues who may be considering allowing drilling in the refuge in light of current high oil prices. Supporters of drilling argue that the Arctic Refuge has the potential of yielding 16 billion barrels of oil. That figure, I am afraid, represents the outside limit of probabilities for an assessment area that includes the Arctic Refuge, Coastal Plain, plus adjacent areas where exploration has already taken place. When you look at just the Coastal Plain, the correct low-probability estimate of oil is 11.8 billion barrels of undiscovered oil; 25 percent less than the 16-billion-barrel figure. Moreover,

USGS assigns a probability of 5 percent, or 1 chance in 20, to the possibility that a field of that magnitude will be discovered. The mean estimate for technically recoverable oil is considerably lower, and the figure for oil that is economically recoverable is lower still. In fact, USGS concluded that the refuge is capable of producing, altogether, approximately 3.2 billion barrels of oil. That is only one-fifth the amount of oil we have heard might be available.

If including this assumption in the budget resolution may impair our ability to make a decision about the wilderness qualities of the refuge in the future, and if the refuge does not contain as much oil as we thought, why are we considering drilling? Consider this: Oil companies with an interest in drilling in the refuge poured millions of dollars of soft money into the coffers of the political parties in 1999; millions of dollars in just 1 year, and it was an off-year election at that. I would like to briefly call the bankroll on just a few of the oil companies that would profit from opening the refuge to drilling so my colleagues and the public can have a fuller picture of what is at stake.

Last year, giant political donor Atlantic Richfield, its executives and subsidiaries, gave more than \$880,000 in soft money to the parties. The recently merged Exxon-Mobil, its executives and subsidiaries, gave more than \$340,000 in soft money in 1999. And in 1999, BP Amoco, the result of another oil megamerger, gave over \$361,000 in soft money, along with its executives and subsidiaries.

This is quite an influx of cash. In a day and age where wealthy interests drop \$100,000 checks to the parties on a regular basis, the huge donations of the oil and gas industry are still remarkable. As we examine this issue closely, I think we have to keep the industry's donations and the resulting political clout in mind as we debate this legislation.

As I have said, the facts do not point toward drilling in the refuge. The refuge does not contain as much oil as we thought. What is more, including this in the budget resolution may cause problems down the road as we decide about the wilderness qualities of the refuge in the future.

For these reasons, I support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Roth amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield to me for 1 minute?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I am happy to yield.

Mrs. BOXER. If the Senator will yield, I just got a call from the Alaska Wilderness League. I want to tell Senator MURKOWSKI what they said. They said that photograph was taken by a

biologist from the Alaska Fish and Game Department, and it is from the 1002 area in the Coastal Plain. So that biologist was contacted. I just wanted to correct the RECORD. If Senator MURKOWSKI wants to call that biologist, I will get his name, but it is, in fact, a photo—

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I would appreciate it if the Senator will get his name so we can contact him.

Mrs. BOXER. Adam Kolton is the individual who just talked to the biologist. I will get the phone number.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. He is a photographer for the Alaska Wilderness—

Mrs. BOXER. No, he got the picture I showed from the area you disputed from a biologist from the Alaska Fish and Game, and he can provide you the name of that individual.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The photograph was provided by whom?

Mrs. BOXER. A biologist from the Alaska Fish and Game Department.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. They gave it to you?

Mrs. BOXER. They gave it to your people in Alaska, the Alaska Wilderness League.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

Mr. ROTH. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I thank the chairman of the Finance Committee. I congratulate Senator ROTH for this amendment because this is not an easy one for him to do. The fact of the matter is, there is an assumption that there would be \$1.2 billion in revenues resulting from this. But the question is, What is the appropriate thing to do? Again, Senator ROTH, chairman of the Finance Committee, knows only too well how difficult it is to raise revenues, but I wanted to make sure we do the right thing.

So I am pleased to support Senator ROTH's amendment. It expresses very clearly the sense of the Senate that these provisions, those that allow drilling in the ANWR, are not to be included in this resolution.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the second largest wildlife refuge in the United States. It takes in a lot of territory, 19 million acres of mountains, forests, wetlands, wild rivers, tundra. It is home to a spectacular variety of plants and animals—caribou and polar bears, grizzly bears, wolves, quantities of migratory birds, the things that everyone of us would like our children and grandchildren to be able to see, to be able to believe that the animals that were here when their father or grandfathers or great grandfathers came on this Earth—that they will be able to see them as well; not just in picture books, but in real life—grizzly bears and polar bears, wonderful things.

A legacy is more important, frankly, than some of the money we are talking about to fund programs. The most important legacy we can leave our chil-

dren and our grandchildren is a natural condition that enables them to see the animals, see the forests, go fishing in the streams, drink the water. That is the issue. The presence of these migratory birds, and grizzly bears, so many other species, in a nearly undisturbed state, have led some to call the area America's Serengeti.

I have been to the Serengeti and I have been to the ANWR. I flew up there right after the *Exxon Valdez* ran aground. I was up there within 2 days of the time the *Exxon Valdez* ran aground. I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, which had the Coast Guard as one of its responsibilities. The Coast Guard airplane picked me up and flew me up there immediately. I wanted to see what was happening.

I will never forget the sight of that oil sheen floating across Prince William Sound. By then, very good people in our Government, the Forest Service and others, were up there picking up birds, seals—oil covered, couldn't breathe—on these tiny little islands, put there by helicopters. It looked like a dangerous assignment. But you could see the reach of the oil just fingering out all across Prince William Sound. It was a devastating thing to see.

I was an environmentalist before I came here and I still am. By environmentalist I don't mean I just contribute to the environmental organizations or anything like that. I genuinely love the environment. It is the one thing that gives continuity through the ages that perhaps we can protect.

The nearby Continental Shelf provides the coastal waters with a rich nutrient base, allowing the region high productivity which in turn supports an unusually wide variety of marine mammal diversity—ANWR.

I flew across the ANWR in a single-engine airplane when I was up on my visit to Prince William Sound because I wanted to see what the area was like. What I saw were abandoned oil rigs in an area called Dead Horse, the Prudhoe Bay area.

I saw rusting derricks and abandoned junk lying there. It was a pitiful blight on that beautiful expanse of nature.

I then flew over the ANWR, this snow desert. I saw signs of some animals. It was a breathtaking sight. I then made a pledge to myself that I would do whatever I could to protect this pristine area. I owed it to my children who may never get up there to see it, but they have a relationship with that area that is inexplicable but nevertheless real.

I returned from the South Pole in January. I am not an adventurer, but I am interested in what happens in our world. I went down there to see what was happening with climate change and the National Science Foundation. I went there to see whether or not there were things we could discover about our climate change and our environment about which we could do something.

Scientists are still trying to search out what it is that is causing the ice melts in the South Pole that causes—I address myself to Senator ROTH—a piece of the ice continent to break up, as they described it, twice the size of the State of Delaware and before that a piece the size of the State of Rhode Island. The next thing we know, we are going to see a piece floating out there the size of Texas, and then we will hear a squawk in here because that ice is melting rapidly. Seventy percent of the world's fresh water is stored in the South Pole.

I relate the North and South Poles to our existence, and that environmental paradise called ANWR is part of that.

Arctic ecosystems are delicately balanced and are some of the most ecologically sensitive ecosystems in the world. The harsh climate and short growing season leave very little time for species that have been harmed to adequately recover. The system's short food chains make a loss of a portion of the chain even more significant. This delicate balance can easily be disrupted by human intrusion.

Oil exploration threatens the ecosystems that surround it through noise pollution, air pollution, on and offshore oil spills, and the destruction of the natural habitat. We all remember the horror of the *Exxon Valdez* spill—the images of the birds and seals and other animals covered in oil, their life literally being choked out of them. We remember the wide eyes on our children's faces as they watched the natural beauty of Alaska being destroyed. We saw it on television.

According to the *Exxon Valdez* Trustee Council, many of the natural resources injured in that spill still show little, if any, sign of recovery. The danger is real. The *Exxon Valdez* spill took place in 1989. There was a lawsuit against Exxon. It was resolved in a damage suit which awarded \$5.3 billion. Of that, \$300 million has been paid—\$300 million in a \$5.3 billion award. That was over 10 years ago.

What restitution was given to the fishermen and those who depend on the area for their livelihood? What restitution was made to those species that were endangered, whether it was eagles, seals, ducks, you name it? Some of them suffocated because of the film of oil that covered their natural structure.

Here we are. That is what happens when the environment is damaged.

We are all aware of the problems this country is facing from higher oil prices, and our people should not have to pay for profiteering by OPEC, especially those people in the modest income category who depend on oil to heat their homes.

Prices at the pump have risen dramatically in the last year. My own State of New Jersey was hit hard by extremely high prices for home heating oil during a surprisingly cold winter, as it was throughout the Northeast. The occupant of the Chair who is from the

State of Rhode Island knows about what we are talking.

We should use this wake-up call to increase our efforts in conservation. I have not heard two words about conservation.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes from the resolution.

We have to talk about energy conservation. We have to work at it, and we need the cooperation of everybody—citizens, automobile manufacturers, all of us. We need to be energy efficient and explore the use of alternative sources of energy, instead of just falling to: Well, let's drill in the ANWR.

We should also strongly encourage our friends in OPEC, as President Clinton has, to significantly increase production. I will tell my colleagues straight out, I believe they owe it to us. Although I think the increase that was just enacted should have been larger, I was slightly encouraged by OPEC's decision to increase production which will help to stabilize our prices.

It is essential we continue our efforts on this front, and I look forward to another OPEC production increase at their June meeting. We have to remind the oil-producing nations in the Middle East that when they dialed 911, we answered the phone with over 400,000 of our young people put on their soil to defend Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and the surrounding area. We placed our young people in harm's way to protect what was interpreted to be a global interest.

We sent our young people far from home, into danger, causing a lot of disruption in their lives. We are still not sure of the consequences of exposure to a polluted environment. Our citizens are suffering, and it is time for them to return the favor. Friendship is a two-way street. We have to ask for favors as easily as we dole them out.

I am pleased to tell the American people that some relief is in sight. I look forward to more positive news in June. What we cannot do is use this situation as an excuse to endanger even more of our dwindling natural resources.

I speak as the ranking member of the Budget Committee. While I disagreed with the outcome of the budget resolution, the fact of the matter is, we worked diligently to fashion a budget resolution on which we could agree.

One of the things that passed with a majority vote was to gain \$1.2 billion in revenues from drilling in ANWR. Senator BOXER, so eloquent in her response, reminds us that even in the Budget Committee there was doubt about whether or not this source of revenue ought to be allowed. It was an 11-11 tie. It took a bipartisan effort, even though there was only one Republican. It is significant that this Republican Senator was voting with the Democrats because that is almost a no, as we say, but it happened.

Senator ROTH is making an earnest appeal to save a wildlife preserve, nature's bounty, for all of us. It is not simply an Alaskan problem, it is a national problem. It is a global problem, and we must not allow that drilling to take place.

I commend the Senator from Delaware for his amendment. I hope my colleagues will support it. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. I ask my colleague from Alaska to yield me up to 15 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I am happy to yield my friend from Oklahoma 15 minutes.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first, I want, one, to compliment my colleague from Alaska for his statement on this amendment.

I would like to make a couple comments in general about our energy policies. There has been somewhat of an oil shortage, so there has been an increase in gasoline prices. A lot of Americans, a lot of our constituents, have said: Well, what are you going to do about it?

Gasoline prices are going up. OPEC is strengthening their hand. The administration has sent Secretary Richardson to go over and beg OPEC countries to please increase their production.

Some of us on this side have complained about the administration not having an energy policy. I have tried to correct them. I think the administration has an energy policy. I have looked at and reviewed the Clinton-Gore administration's energy policy for the last 7 years. It is fairly consistent.

In 1993, they came up with a Btu tax. They were going to have a tax surcharge on Btu's. In 1993 the Democrats controlled both the House and the Senate, but that did not pass anyway. We defeated it.

They did pass a gasoline tax increase. As a matter of fact, Vice President GORE broke the tie. They increased gasoline taxes. You might think that was for roads and highways and infrastructure. No. It was for general revenues. So they could spend more money and it passed by one vote, the Vice President's vote. In addition, the administration has done nothing to increase domestic oil production. So our reliance on imports has grown significantly. It has grown very dramatically.

They did sign the Kyoto accord. Though it is truly a treaty, they will not call it a treaty and they have not sent it to the Senate for ratification. One of the reasons is, in the Senate we had a vote of 95-5 that said we would not ratify a treaty that was particularly punitive to this country and did not apply to many countries, "little" countries like China, Mexico, and India. It is a very poorly thought out agreement that Vice President GORE is very proud of and that this administration wants us to comply with, but they will not send it to us for ratification. It

is the equivalent of increasing costs on all fuels, particularly oil-related fuels.

The administration, likewise, has had the policy of restricting access to public lands as far as drilling. They want to expand the moratorium on offshore drilling. That is the administration's position.

Vice President GORE, in a political speech in New Hampshire, said he wanted to ban offshore drilling. I guess that sells well in New Hampshire. But that would mean our reliance on imported oil would grow even more.

They have a policy, but their policy has been a disaster. As a result of that policy we are much more dependent on foreign sources.

What has happened? I mentioned the administration and the Secretary running around begging OPEC countries to produce more oil.

Frankly, one of the biggest increases in oil production of any country worldwide is Iraq. What has the administration done with Iraqi oil? We have had an embargo on Iraqi oil production since the war in 1991 where we lost about 147 American lives, where we spent billions of dollars, where we had 550,000 troops in Iraq. We fought a war to get Iraq out of Kuwait, to stop their aggression, and their efforts to take over not only Kuwait but probably to expand throughout the Persian Gulf region. We stopped that.

We also wanted to stop their aggression in building weapons of mass destruction. So we set up a compliance regime that said: We are going to have onsite inspectors to make sure Iraqis were not building nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, or biological weapons. We are going to enforce that. Those inspectors are going to make sure they are not building those weapons so they could not continue to threaten their neighbors.

Saddam Hussein threatened to burn Israel with the use of chemical and biological weapons.

We had arms control inspectors, and said: We are going to keep the strangle hold on their exports, including oil, unless they allow an arms control regime. We had arms control inspectors for years in Iraq.

What has this administration done? Year after year, the administration allowed the Iraqis to produce more with less access for inspectors.

Today, Iraq can produce all the oil it wants, thanks to support from the Clinton-Gore administration. And there are no arms control inspectors—none, zero—in Iraq today. None.

We have not had an arms control inspector in Iraq for over a year. Keep in mind that we have bombed them. This administration has bombed Iraq time and time again. Yet, we have no arms control inspectors there.

The real leverage, aside from bombing, was the fuel export valves. The administration just said: Open up. As a matter of fact, they just supported a resolution that said: We want to assist them in making their production fa-

cilities grow even more. So now they are producing 700,000 barrels of oil and we are going to help them produce a lot more, but we still do not have one arms control inspector in Iraq.

I think the administration's policy dealing with energy, dealing with Iraq, has been a disaster.

What can we do? One of the things the administration is supposed to be doing is opening up ANWR.

I saw this beautiful picture shown by my colleague from California of this pristine area of the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. I do not doubt that it is absolutely gorgeous. I have been there where they are going to drill, hopefully, eventually, in the ANWR area, and it is not that picture, unless it has changed dramatically—and I do not see how it could in the area I saw. Don't get me wrong, I think Alaska is one of the most beautiful States anywhere in the country. It is one of the most beautiful places anywhere in the world. It is beautiful, gorgeous. But Alaska is a great, big State.

ANWR covers a lot of land. ANWR, is approximately 19 million acres, about the size of South Carolina, a little less than about half the size of my State of Oklahoma. That is ANWR, the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. That is a big area: 19 million acres. That is a lot of land. That is a big refuge. I am sure it has some beautiful areas in it.

Where they are proposing to drill comprises about 2,000 acres; and that area is not at all like the picture just shown. While most of Alaska is gorgeous, this area is not the most pristine.

Drilling can be accommodated there without hurting the environment. There are people who say: Wait a minute. Drilling in Prudhoe Bay, that has been disastrous for the environment. Drilling in Endicott Field, which is not too far away from there, has been disastrous for the environment.

I disagree. That is not the case.

They say: Drilling in that area would be bad for the caribou. That is not factually borne out. The caribou around the Alaska oil pipeline has been a very big plus. The only place we really have not seen a lot of caribou is in the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge; they are all over by the Alaska oil pipeline. There are a lot of caribou.

I am all for the caribou. I am strongly in favor of wildlife development. We have more visitors in the Oklahoma Wildlife Refuge than any other wildlife refuge in the country. We are proud of it. It is a beautiful area and a treasure in our state. I want to encourage that. I want to encourage it in Alaska. But you can do this in a sound, environmental way, and also reduce our dependence on foreign oil sources. We can do this and increase production domestically so we will not be so dependent, so our Energy Secretary will not have to have to hold a tin cup saying: Please give us more.

We can do so much more. We can do so much better. We can do it in an en-

vironmentally sensitive manner. We can do it in a way that is compatible with the caribou, compatible with wildlife, compatible with all the beautiful scenery that we have in Alaska, and not do any damage whatsoever to the environment.

We can have a more sensible, sane energy policy where we are not just spending billions and billions of dollars overseas. Our dependence on foreign sources has grown so dramatically that we are a lot more vulnerable than anyone realizes.

We had shortages in 1973 and 1979. We were importing something like 36 percent in 1973. Today we are importing 56 percent. That number is growing every year. We will be at two-thirds probably in another 10 or 15 years.

We had shortages in 1973 when we imported 36 percent. Today we are importing 56 percent.

In 1979, we had a shortage, and the shortage was significant. That meant we had brownouts. That meant factories had to close. That meant there were gas lines galore. People were lined up. Their biggest problem was getting through gas lines in their cars so they could get to work, if their factories were opened because there was an energy shortage.

We do not want to replay that. We do not want to become that dependent. Yet we are marching on a dependency line that is unbelievable. We can do things to prevent it.

One of things we could do is supplement Alaska production, which has been declining dramatically. I am sure every person who has been speaking about how bad it would be to drill in ANWR would also be opposed to Prudhoe Bay.

Prudhoe Bay was at one time producing 2 million barrels of oil at its peak. Today, it is declining. Now it is down to about 1.2 million barrels of oil a day and continues to decline. We need to supplement that or else we will have an even greater dependency. As Alaska pipeline Prudhoe Bay production continues to decline, our dependency will only rise.

We can open up ANWR to help prevent this. I urge my colleagues to think about the future. It is going to take years to get this on line, to alleviate some of the shortages and curtailments and dependency we will have 5 years from now, 10 years from now, 15 years from now. If we stay on this present course, we will be importing 60 percent or 70 percent of our oil needs and be very dependent, frankly, in some cases on unreliable, unstable sources such as Iraq, such as Iran, some of the other Middle East countries that may get mad at us for whatever reason.

Again, I compliment my colleague from Alaska. I urge our colleagues to vote no on the underlying amendment, the ROTH amendment, tomorrow.

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

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

Mr. ROTH. I say to the majority whip, we have others waiting to offer amendments. Have you completed your time on this amendment? I ask the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask how much time remains on the other side as controlled by Senator ROTH?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes under the control of Senator ROTH.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. And I believe there is an unlimited time, for all practical purposes, on the underlying amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time remaining on the resolution is 10 hours 58 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The division of that time, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all under the control of the minority.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. And the remaining time on this side relative to the ROTH amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I think that may clarify the time. I am sorry, but I did not hear the question posed by the minority whip.

Mr. ROTH. I say to my friend from Alaska, the majority whip put in a quorum call. I was just saying that if you have completed your discussion on this amendment offered by Senator ROTH, then we would go ahead and offer another amendment. The majority leader has told us to stay around until we are down to about 8½ hours. So that is going to be another couple of hours.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I don't intend to yield back. Mr. President, I have not addressed this matter yet. I yielded to my colleagues on the other side, so I am prepared to talk at some length. But out of courtesy, if they want to proceed, I will wait.

Mr. ROTH. We are anxious to hear the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is always amusing to me to learn the facts about my State, things I didn't know. I was 6 or 7 years old when my family moved to Alaska, and I have lived extensively throughout the State and believe I have some knowledge of facts and some knowledge of fiction.

I again refer to the picture my good friend from California portrayed. Those mountains are the Brooks Range. As this will show you clearly, the Brooks Range is an area we are committed to protect. As a matter of fact, it is the wilderness. The wilderness is not in jeopardy, in spite of what we have been led to believe by most of the speakers who have never been to Alaska in spite of the invitations extended over the years.

There are 19 million acres, as my friend from Oklahoma accurately pointed out. What we have done with this, the vision of Congress, was to establish both a wilderness and a refuge. The wilderness is approximately 8 million acres. The refuge is 9.5 million

acres, leaving this 1002 area, the Coastal Plain area, which has been referred to as the Serengeti of North America.

Let me tell you what is in it because no one has attempted to describe that. I find that extraordinary. It is treeless. It has no mountain. I think the hills are 1,100, 1,200 elevation. But those are found 20 to 30 miles from this coast. In this area, there are 92,000 acres of private native land. In the area of Kaktovik, Kaktovik is a native village. It has 223 residents and their attendant housing, their schools, their stores, their boats, their airstrips, their power lines, a variety of other modern-day facilities. The military's Barter Island DEW Line radar station is also nearby. It is hardly accurate to portray this unique area as the Serengeti of North America. It is unique, there is no question about it.

Now there have been many statements, and unfortunately there is just not enough time to respond to all of them. I think we should be sensitive to recognizing the reality that OPEC is watching this debate tonight. Saddam Hussein is watching this debate tonight. This debate addresses whether we are committed to reduce our dependence on imported oil or increase it.

The administration, when it made its profound announcement that they had been successful in convincing OPEC to increase its production by 1.7 million barrels, really left out a few interesting facts. It wasn't a net of 1.7 million barrels. It was actually a net of 500,000 barrels. We know that because OPEC had been committed to a production level of 23 million barrels a day in March 1999, but they had been cheating. They had been producing 24.2 million barrels a day. So the acknowledged difference between the announced 1.7 increase and the 1.2 cheating is only a 500,000 increase. To suggest that is all going to the United States is a fallacy. We get about 16 percent of it. As a matter of fact, the arithmetic suggests it is somewhere in the area of 121,000 barrels of oil, which is the amount, interestingly enough, that is consumed in the greater Washington metropolitan area every day. The percentage the United States would get out of that 500,000 barrels is somewhere in the area of 78,000 barrels per day. So we don't even stand still, if you consider our increasing demand. It is little or nothing in comparison to what our needs are.

Consider some of the facts associated with the lack of an energy policy in this administration. You can't help but be overcome by the reality that we have learned little from history. We were 37-percent dependent in 1973.

We are 56-percent dependent on foreign oil. The administration acknowledges that we are going to be about 64-percent dependent on foreign oil by the year 2015 to 2020. What does that mean to the coastline of California, New Jersey, or other areas where these tankers are going to come? The oil is going to come in, Mr. President. Well, it is esti-

mated that that will mean about 30 giant—foreign, I might add—super-tankers, each loaded with about 500,000 barrels of crude oil, will have to dock at U.S. ports every single day of the year. That is about 10,000 ships—as I have indicated, most are foreign flag—unloading in our harbors each year. I think this indeed creates a substantial environmental risk because you are not going to have many of these companies having the deep pockets of Exxon.

You speak of environmental issues. Isn't it better to promote development domestically when we know the global environment is going to be protected than to encourage development from Iraq or the Russian Arctic, where development is done without regard to the environment? Think about that, Mr. President. Think about the environmental community's attitude. They don't care where the oil comes from, as long as it doesn't come from up here in Alaska. If it comes from the Colombian rain forest, that is OK. If it comes from the dilapidated infrastructure of Russia, where there are leaks all over, no environmental enforcement, that is OK with them. It can come from Iraq, and that is OK.

I find that very ironic. We lost 147 American lives over in Iraq in 1991. We had nearly 300 wounded and 23 taken prisoner. The American taxpayers paid \$10 billion to keep Saddam Hussein fenced in; that is enforcing the no-fly zone. We have military people stationed over there to ensure that he doesn't break out and invade Kuwait or threaten Israel. Yet our newest and fastest growing source of oil imports is Iraq. It was 300,000 barrels last year; it is 700,000 barrels this year.

I could go on and on, but clearly Saddam Hussein takes this revenue—and to suggest that he somehow uses it for the benefit of his people is obviously misleading. He uses it to keep the Republican Guard, which, in turn, keeps him in office—maybe keeps him alive, for all we know. Do you know what else he is doing, Mr. President? He is working with the North Koreans to build missile technology. What kind of a threat is that to Israel, or the United States, or the free world, for that matter? We are rebuilding Iraq's cash-flow, which sustains their economy.

I happen to believe charity begins at home when it comes to our energy security. We have the technology. We can do it right. Let's look a little bit at a map of Alaska. Before we do, I see I have a chart here that reflects Iraq's oil exports to the United States. The exports were virtually nothing in 1997, and now it is 700,000 barrels a day. What the administration did the other day regarding Iraq is, they had the Department of Commerce lift the export ban on technology, which will allow Saddam Hussein and Iraq to increase their production capacity. So the answer of this administration to address our energy needs is simply to import

more oil. Don't worry about any domestic development, we will get our oil from overseas.

There are a lot of politics in this issue, the issue of the 1002 Area of the Arctic Coastal Plain. The politics of America's extreme environmental community is evidence on this floor; it is evidence with the pictures and with the dialog and with the Members. I wish to God the environmental community would come to grips with reality and recognize the dependence we have on imports and what it is doing to our national energy security—come to grips with it and help us develop domestic energy sources with their recommendations, with attention to their environmental concerns, and help us to do it right.

So we attempted to do it right in Alaska. The Congress has attempted to do it right. We have 56 million acres of wilderness in my State. As I have said, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is an area the size of the State of South Carolina; it is 19 million acres. We have set aside, as I have indicated, 9 million acres in refuge, 8.5 million acres in a wilderness. But Congress, in its wisdom, left this area aside to determine its management status at a later time, with the belief that the national energy security of the country might necessitate its development.

Let's look at some factual pictures of what is going on in the real Alaska. Here is the real Alaska. Clearly, this is not in the 1002 area because there is no exploration activity allowed there. But I defy you, Mr. President, or any Member in this body, to look at this area and see any difference—you can see the ocean out here—but any difference with the general area of the Coastal Plain in the wintertime. This is a tough area, with winter 8 months of the year.

We have heard a lot about pipelines and a lot about gravel roads. This is the technology that is used in Alaska today. That is an ice road there. It is built up with ice and snow, and sometimes water is added. This is a drill pad. That is a factual picture of the technology used today. Let me show you what it looks like in the summertime on the tundra with that same well capped. That is it. That technology is utilized in Alaska today because it is the right thing to do. It is the environmentally compatible thing to do. You will not see that in any other oil field in the world. It is a long winter up there, Mr. President.

We have capabilities, obviously, to address some of the wildlife concerns we have heard so much about tonight. Well, you have seen this before. This is a picture in Prudhoe Bay, but you would never know the area from the Coastal Plain, with the exception of the pipelines in Prudhoe Bay. Here are three bears going for a walk, walking on the pipeline where it is warm. It sure beats walking on the snow. Nobody is shooting those bears; nobody is running them down.

We have a picture of some caribou. We have heard a lot about them from our experts who have never been to this area. This is in Prudhoe Bay. This is an oil field, and this is 35-year-old technology. These are some live caribou. I can assure you that those are not stuffed, like some of the conversation we have heard tonight. This is factual.

We have a herd of Caribou called the Porcupine herd and a legitimate concern about that herd because the Gwich'in people are dependent on it. It is kind of interesting to look at the history of this because as you look at Alaska, you also have to look at Canada because we abut. We have an interesting issue here. The Canadians, about 20 years ago, were very interested in drilling in the Mackenzie Delta, thought there was a great opportunity for oil and gas. So they drilled some 89 holes here in this area on the Mackenzie Delta, and they also built a highway called the Dempster Highway. The interesting thing is that this line on the map represents the path of the Porcupine caribou herd. Not only has it maintained its general stability during the time these areas were drilled extensively by the Canadians, but the caribou cross the highway. Now, it is not the beltway—I grant you that—but it is a highway that goes up into the Canadian Arctic. They wander into Alaska and go into the Yukon, where the Gwich'ins make a substantial take for subsistence purposes.

It is significant that these animals are adaptable; if you don't shoot them or run them down with a snowmachine, they can flourish. Now we have heard from the Senator from California, mentioning a letter from the Canadian Ambassador opposing development of the 1002 area. Yet they thought it was OK to drill their area. Maybe they are in a little competition between Canada and the United States for energy. We buy a lot of energy from them—a lot of electrical energy—particularly in the Northeast corridor. They are happy to do that; Alberta is happy to sell us gas. Maybe they don't want us to compete. I wonder if that could be the motivation of the Canadian Ambassador.

As we look at our concern over the Porcupine caribou herd, it is legitimate and the people associated in these areas are legitimately concerned. But we have been able to protect the caribou in Prudhoe Bay with 30-year-old technology. The herd has grown from 3,000 when development began to over 18,000 caribou. You can't take a gun in. You can't shoot them.

It is the technology that we have going for us now that offers us such a tremendous opportunity to develop this resource. If we were back before this body some 30 years earlier, we would have heard the debate on the appropriateness of opening up Prudhoe Bay. Prudhoe Bay was the largest oil discovery in North America, and it still is. There was a great deal of debate over how to develop it, and what the

impact would be, because to get this oil out, we had to build an 800-mile pipeline across the length of Alaska.

We have a chart for those of you who wonder where that might be. It runs from the Arctic Ocean clear down through Fairbanks on to Valdez, where the oil is then shipped down to the west coast where it is primarily processed.

We had a terrible accident. The Senator from New Jersey was there. He knows that tanker ran aground in a 10½ mile wide channel with absolutely no excuse. But the accident happened. But that wasn't the fault of the pipeline. That wasn't the fault of the oil field. It was a human error involving a supertanker, and it was inexcusable.

But the reality is we have been able to build this pipeline. It has withstood earthquakes. It has been shot at. It has been dynamited. It is one of the wonders of the world.

But 35 years ago or so, when we were arguing about this issue, we had the same arguments we have today. The doomsayers were saying: You are going to build a pipeline, a hot pipeline. It is going to take hot oil and pump it through a permafrost area; because that is what the Arctic is—permafrost, frozen ice and ground. That hot pipeline is going to melt the ground. You are going to lose the foundation. Your pipeline is going to break.

It didn't happen.

They said this 800-mile pipeline is going to be a fence across your State, an 800-mile fence. Your moose, your caribou, your animals are not going to be able to cross. It is going to be a calamity. It didn't happen.

There is nearly 1,000 miles of Arctic coastline. It is all unique and very much all similar. You look for oil. You find it where you are most likely to find it. The geologists simply tell us that the 1002 Area of the Coastal Plain is the area where we are most likely to make a major discovery; The USGS says 16 billion barrels.

Let me tell you something to factor in because we have heard so much rhetoric around here tonight.

For Prudhoe Bay, the recovery estimates were 9 billion to 10 billion barrels. Prudhoe Bay has been producing some 23 years. We have produced over 12 billion barrels, and we are still producing. It is estimated that we will probably produce for another decade, or maybe two, because the technology is such that we can get greater recovery.

When you talk about estimates, you had better be realistic. If there is no oil up here, nothing is going to happen, except you might have a lease sale. You might get a substantial payment from the oil companies that are prepared to bid on it. That is the risk they take.

We don't know what is up there. But the geologists say it is the most likely area for a major discovery. That is why Congress, in its wisdom, set this area aside for Congress to address and resolve at a later time. That is why we are here.

The Budget Committee took action because we have a crisis in this country. If you do not believe it, ask the Secretary of Energy. He went over to the OPEC countries. He said: We have an emergency. You know what they said: We are having a meeting on March 27. He said: No. You don't understand, it's an emergency. We sent 35,000 troops over here. We fought a war to keep Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait. We lost American lives. We need help now. We need more oil production in those countries. You know what they told him: We are having a meeting on March 27. They stiffed him.

He went to Mexico. He told the Mexicans: We need more production. Mexico said: Fine. But where were you when oil was \$11, \$12, and \$13 a barrel, and our economy was in the sack?

We have an emergency. If we don't take steps now to recognize our increased dependence on imported oil, one wonders when we will. What is going to happen to the security of this Nation from the standpoint of energy as we become more dependent on imports, more dependent on Iraq, and more dependent on OPEC?

Those are the realities we face today.

Let's take a look at something that is very unpleasant. I hate to show you this. But this is a terrible picture that ran all over America when Saddam Hussein was defeated and when he set the oil fields of Kuwait on fire.

You talk about environmental degradation. That is it. Here you see Americans over there trying to put out the fires and stop the environmental damage. You can see the burning wells behind him. This is reality. This is the kind of individual and the type of country and leadership on which we are now depending for our energy security.

I find it outrageous and inexcusable. I am very critical of the environmental community that condones oil coming from a tyrant, one who left an environmental scar of the magnitude that Saddam Hussein left in Kuwait.

Let's look at a couple of others because they are all bad. The only problem is that they get worse. How we can continue to be misled, if you will, through complacency associated with our dependence on Iraq is beyond me. Here we see the burning wells and the terrible mess that was left. Look at the Americans working in those conditions.

This Senator is not going to stand by and support increased dependency on Iraq when we clearly have an administration whose only policy is more imports. Give us more; give us more. It is like an addiction. It is pathetic.

You almost forget. And you can very easily forget that we are dependent on oil for transportation. Our truckers came to Washington, DC, and expressed themselves. They can't pass on the price. Look at your airline tickets. You pay a surcharge now. The consumer—the mom taking the kids down to the soccer game—is facing nearly \$1.85 or \$2 a gallon. It shoots a pretty big hole

in a hundred dollar bill if she has a sports utility vehicle, and many of those aren't paid for.

But go a little further. Our farmers are getting geared up for planting season. What is the cost of that going to be relative to their productivity? Can they pass it on?

It multiplies. What do the farmers use? They use fertilizer. What is fertilizer made of—urea. It comes from gas and oil. The multiplier is there.

Look at our balance of payments. One-third of the \$300 billion is the cost of imported oil.

Every time oil goes up \$10, inflation goes up half of 1 percent. There are a lot of uneasy people out there.

This single issue today is going to send a signal about whether we are serious about alleviating our dependence on imported oil and are going to do something about it.

I have heard statements that it will take a while. Yes, it will take a while. President Clinton vetoed ANWR the last time it went down to the White House. That was in 1995. We would know today if we had oil there. We would be on our way to production.

One of the things that bothers me about the environmental community is they sell American technology and ingenuity short. We can do it better. We can make a smaller footprint, given the opportunity. And we have that opportunity before the Senate today.

We have heard conversations about oil exports. There has been oil exported because there has been excess capacity on the west coast up until a short time ago. Those who don't recognize and understand oil, unfortunately, don't know that oil used to move through the Panama pipeline, and prior to that in smaller ships through Panama, and to the gulf coast to be refined there. That changed when Venezuela came on production. So we had an excess on the west coast, a modest excess.

Now with the takeover of Arco by BP Amoco and the divestiture of the Arco Alaska properties to Phillips, which has refineries, there will not be a surplus. There will not be a surplus because BP will now have refineries on the West Coast. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from BP indicating they have no plans to export oil, once the contracts for the current month expire.

As I understand, Phillips has no intention of exporting oil. That is a bogus argument.

How much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remains 17 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. If the Senator from New Mexico desires some time, I will yield.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. From the first knowledge we had that the OPEC cartel plus their friends had dramatically decreased production, thus having this terrible impact on American energy costs, Sen-

ator MURKOWSKI has been trying every day, every time he could, to tell us we are doing things exactly the opposite of what we ought to be doing for America's future. I compliment him. He has a lot of people wondering about what we are up to. Frankly, I would like to add a little bit to that.

While the United States grows more dependent upon foreign crude oil, we have an administration that, from the first day they went in office until today, has been engaged in seeing to it that the United States produces less oil—not more—from our own lands by overt, conscious acts of withdrawing real estate that we own as a nation on which to explore for oil and gas, to a constant insistence that we cannot solve the little, tiny problem of what do we do with nuclear waste, which every country in the world except America has solved. They have solved it at least for 50 to 100 years.

We sit around acting as if we can continue to be dependent upon the very limited sources of energy for this great country's future. I will give a couple of facts about what has happened to the American energy economy, the production of oil in America, by Americans for Americans. In 1990, there were 405,000 jobs in America in the exploration and production of oil and gas. As of last year, there were 293,000, a 27-percent decline in people employed in the exploration and production of oil and gas in America. When you reduce the number of people involved in oil and gas exploration by 27 percent, there has been something consciously happening that says we will produce less in America.

Ten years ago, there were 657 rigs working on oil exploration in the United States. Everybody understands what that is. Now there are fewer than 175. We did something wrong. Somebody would stand up from the administration and say: The cartel had something to do with that; they lowered the price of oil. But we didn't have a policy that said to our companies, in spite of that, we will help you explore for more. As a matter of fact, we had the opposite policy.

New refineries in the United States: It used to be, if you could have an oil refinery and attach to it all the refined products that go with it, you would be delighted. It would employ your people. They are high-paying jobs. Guess what. In the United States, while we grow dependent, here we are with not a single new refinery built in the United States since 1976. That means we have decided other countries ought to produce the refined products we need and we ought to have such strict requirements that it is impossible for Americans to build them with American money and American workers to produce more refined products in our country—the opposite policy we ought to have.

If we had another time and another day, we could discuss why Americans will not invest in oil refineries in the United States. I can tell you one of

them, and I will use three initials for starters—the Environmental Protection Agency of the United States. Unreasonable restrictions, costing billions of dollars, that any neutral party would say are unreasonable, we impose them. When they can pay for them, they do; when they cannot pay any longer, they say: We will not refine anymore; we will do it somewhere else.

There are Federal lands available for exploration. I suggest we have done it exactly the wrong way since this President has been in office. We have taken lands out of production because we have this kind of whimsical idea, if they are public lands, we sure don't want to find an oil rig out there. In fact, it is an attitude. We have to put up with oil rigs, but we really don't want them, even though it is "black" money for American workers. It is oil for American cars. It is America's investment. But it is like public domain. Man, we ought to just save that and forget about this dirty business of producing oil. That is America's policy today.

I wish I could share with you, although I don't have the notes, how many thousands and thousands of acres we have taken out of production, out of development, because of what I have been explaining for the last 3 or 4 minutes.

That leads us to tonight. In the past, I have heard Senators on the floor of the Senate talking about their States with great enthusiasm, great concern about what is happening to their States. I will tell you why FRANK MURKOWSKI and Senator TED STEVENS are concerned. If we were to produce oil in ANWR on one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the land, 2,200 acres is what we would need to explore for oil in a modern way and produce it in ANWR.

That would produce 16 billion barrels of oil, produced by Americans, American workers, American oil for Americans. What does that mean in dollars? It means one-half trillion. Think of that, I say to the Senator from Wyoming. In the State of Wyoming, we have oil locked up. It is worth half a trillion for your workers, for your companies, for your businesses, and we are locking it up for the reasons Senator MURKOWSKI stated, that we wanted to lock up Prudhoe Bay.

We found none of the predictions about Prudhoe Bay were true, and none of them will be true about this one either. But it is as if we are kind of economically arrogant. We are so powerful and so strong that we do not have to worry about American oil for American people, produced by Americans, used for American cars. We just have to say this little tiny piece of property, just a strip of ANWR that you could go and explore to find out if it is there and then insist they advise the Congress if there is any environmental damage—they will not let us do that.

I submit we ought to vote on this. I also submit anyone who votes no on this ought to be asked: What do you

think America's future is? More oil from the cartel or less?

With that, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I thank him.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield myself whatever time is remaining because I believe we will have some time tomorrow. Might I ask how much time remains on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I will yield to the other side at this time, if they care to continue the debate.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, if I might have a parliamentary review for just a moment, I heard the distinguished Senator from Alaska ask if this debate could not be continued tomorrow. It is my understanding that, once the time is used on both sides, the proponent's and opponent's, that time is exhausted and there will not be further opportunity to discuss this tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That was true for the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia. But there have been no subsequent agreements.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We are talking now about the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been no agreement in regard to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. So, as it presently stands, the time once used tonight, unless agreed to by unanimous consent for an extension, will not be available?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no such agreement on this particular amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. There is no agreement. May I be precise? We are talking about 2 hours that was available for the delivery of the amendment, and an hour—and time for opposition, equally divided; is that right? Two hours?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 hours on this amendment.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Right. And the time used by the proponents and opponents as described by the Parliamentarian—there is some 7 or 10 minutes for each side? What is the present situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 8 minutes, the Senator from Delaware has 11 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. So once those 19 minutes are consumed, this discussion is over and cannot be brought tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If they are consumed tonight, that is correct.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I just wanted to let the Senator know.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask the President, if they are not consumed tonight, what is the disposition of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For them not to be consumed tonight would take unanimous consent.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Unanimous consent to—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Have them over until tomorrow.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Is there any reason why it would not be consumed tonight?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I indicated my interest in reserving the remainder of my time until tomorrow. I would propose that at this time.

Mr. REID. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Therefore, it is the ruling of the Chair, as I understand it, the time in opposition to the Roth amendment must be fully utilized tonight or given up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. We have a little more time, I believe. I defer to the other side prior to taking up more of my time.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. If I may, I ask the Senator from Delaware if I can have 5 minutes of the time?

Mr. ROTH. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. DOMENICI. Could I say to the distinguished Senator from Alaska, there are only two ways I can think of that he could save his time: We could close up shop right now, and we are not going to do that, so there is an hour on each side. You could get consent, and you tried and haven't gotten that. So anybody offering an amendment tonight has an hour on each side if they want to use it. If they want to yield it back, they can yield back. Any amendment to an amendment has a half-hour, and we go that way until we finish tonight.

I can tell you, I think you made as good an argument tonight as you can make. I don't think there are many votes going to be changed. I already complimented you immensely. I do it again.

There will be 2 minutes before the vote. They will be in your control.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I yield. If the Senator from New Jersey has been recognized, I will keep my remaining time and use it tonight.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I have asked for 5 minutes from the Senator from Delaware, which has been yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I have listened carefully to the debate presented by my distinguished colleagues on the other side who are for drilling in ANWR: Don't worry about it. After all, look at what happened in these other places. They are drilling foreign oil for consumption by Americans. We have lost so many jobs in the oil fields.

I will tell you about those jobs in the oil fields. You tell me where there is a shortage of jobs in this country, and I will tell you where they can get employed immediately. Tell me where there are people looking for work, I

will tell you where they can get employed immediately.

The fact is, yes, we are importing more oil. We ought not to be. I am no different than anybody else when we talk about those who owe us a responsibility to make sure we have the products that we helped save when we sent our young people to war in 1990 and 1991. We cannot disagree about that. One is not less patriotic than the other. This is not a question of loyalty. This is a question of how the world functions.

Right now, those of us in the environmental community say we ought to be cautious about the use of our precious, pristine wildlife areas. I heard the Senator from Oklahoma say—I do not want to mimic what he said, but he did say: Well, that area that is reserved for drilling, some 2,000 acres, is not so pretty anyway.

It was hard for me to believe my ears. What do you mean it is not so pretty anyway? We have some areas in our country that are not so pretty that attach to areas that are beautiful. It is the not-so-pretty areas that help keep the pretty areas, and those that are essential for our existence as a species, the human species, to function. So we cannot dismiss it like that.

With all of the best intentions of managing the way we transport our oil and we explore for it, it is all subject to human frailties. If we have had a pipeline that has worked well for lots of years, I salute it. But, remember this, in 1989 when the Exxon Valdez ran aground—and it was human error, there is no doubt about that but you cannot remove it. We lost a spaceship with our precious astronauts aboard because of some human error. These things do not happen without human intervention. We cannot dismiss this and say: Don't worry about it; everything will be all right. We will take care of it.

I say that is not so.

I wish we could get all our Senators to do a flyover of the ANWR. I guarantee there would be a majority voting the other way, saying do not drill there unless there is no other way in the world for us to survive.

We have other sources of oil, other sources of energy being considered and developed. There is work going on in Azerbaijan. You know, when it is said we should only consume American oil to the extent we need oil, I do not believe that is necessarily so.

I would rather save that reserve. Heaven forbid if we need it some day in the future. I would like to bring it in from other sources. There are minerals in this country which we do not mine anymore because it is cheaper and better on the environment to import some of those minerals. That is the way things go.

We have become a profligate society in our use of energy. We have SUVs popping up everywhere. The automobile companies do not mind making them. The workers of those automobile

companies do not mind working there. The guys who work in the gas stations—whether the oil comes from Saudi Arabia or from Oklahoma or Texas—do not mind their jobs. They have businesses that are based on supplying that energy.

We are a society that is overblown with riches, and we are using whatever energy we want. We consume fresh air with congestion. There are more cars out there than we know what to do with, but that does not stop us from using our cars.

We are saying, as long as we are profligate, just wasting it, let's get it; let's go up to the ANWR and drill in that pristine area described in different fashions as beautiful or not so beautiful or the home for some of the animals; they will survive anyway.

I say do not take the risk. I would rather see us practice conservation, which we have not done in this society of ours. I have not heard anybody—I am talking about either from the administration presently in power or any of us—talk about conservation programs: Save it, don't just use it; save it if you are concerned about it. But no, look at the traffic lines. Nobody wants to save oil.

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

Mr. LAUTENBERG. I take 5 minutes off the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, as to this debate about whether or not it is American jobs, Americans, thank goodness, are working at jobs that are productive and have given us the strongest economy ever seen in the history of mankind. We ought to reduce our dependence. I agree with my friends on the other side, but that does not mean we have to go to a source that raises questions about our ability to preserve the environment.

I said it before, when I think of my children, one of the most important assets I see in this country is a good environment, good natural resources. Even if they never get to visit Alaska, I have done it. I do not want to be a "Johnny's been all over the place," but I was also in Kuwait. I saw the situation the Senator from Alaska described. I was in an airplane several thousand feet in the air. The windshield was covered with soot from the burning oil fields. It was a terrible waste of lives and energy, but it happened.

What we have to do is make sure our allies, the people whom we worked to save, understand what we mean when we call on them to help us through a crisis. I could not agree more with my friends on that score. I believe we should have gotten much tougher than we did.

I had an occasion to speak to a diplomat from one of the Mideast countries. I said: Do you know what you are doing? You may make a better profit

right now, but you are alienating the American people, and you are not going to recover from that so easily. Do not depend on us when you issue an alarm—"help save our skins; help save us." Some of them went to other countries to enjoy themselves when we did the fighting. That is not going to happen easily again.

The Senator from Delaware, the chairman of the Finance Committee, and some of the friends on the Republican side, including Senator SNOWE, who voted with Senator BOXER on protecting the ANWR—there was a commentary in the Washington Post from someone who cannot be declared a cockeyed liberal or crazy environmentalist. I will read the quote before I identify who it is:

I totally agree that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is a truly unique pristine ecosystem, and I believe we should not damage it. It should be set aside in wilderness designation in perpetuity, Smith wrote to the New Hampshire Citizens for Arctic Wilderness.

That is Senator BOB SMITH, someone we know well, who is chairman of the environment committee, and we are hearing from the chairman of the Finance Committee that we ought not to do this. These are people who deserve to be heard, and we know there are other people in the Republican Party who agree with us. We are going to find out when we put this to a vote. The vote will come sometime tomorrow.

I hope we will close this debate at this point. While everything to be said has been said, not everybody has said everything. I yield back any time I requested from the resolution which I did not use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may use.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD letters I have received from many organizations which are concerned about the environment and support my amendment. These include the Wilderness Society, Republicans for Environmental Protection, the National Parks Conservation Association, Friends of the Earth, the League of Conservation Voters, and the National Resources Defense Council.

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

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2000.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the thousands of members of Friends of the Earth, we urge you to support efforts by Senator Roth (R-DE) to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) from being opened for oil exploration. Currently, the FY 2001 Budget Resolution (S. Con. Res. 101) includes language that assumes receipts from the sale of oil leases in ANWR. Seismic exploration and oil drilling in a national refuge is an unacceptable short-term approach to the problems associated with the current oil crisis, and one which would have long-term devastating consequences.

ANWR encompasses 19 million acres of pristine wilderness. Created by President

Dwight Eisenhower in 1960, ANWR is a sanctuary for nearly 200 species of wildlife, including polar bears, grizzlies, wolves, caribou and millions of birds. The area under consideration for oil exploration—a 1.5 million-acre coastal plain—is referred to by many scientists as the “biological heart” of the Arctic Refuge and represents the last five percent of Alaska’s Arctic slope not already open to drilling. Though some maintain that modern technology allows clean exploration, many scientists have noted that today’s seismic oil exploration, consisting of large crews with bulldozers, “thumper” trucks, fuel supply vehicles and a variety of other tracked vehicles, is even more damaging to the landscape than it has been in the past.

Drilling in ANWR would do little to reduce U.S. dependency on foreign oil. In fact, the U.S. Geological Survey has found that ANWR would provide us with less than six months worth of oil. A more responsible solution to the problem is to develop and promote sustainable forms of clean energy.

We should not sell off this priceless wildlife refuge for a short-term energy fix. Support Senator Roth in his efforts to defend the one of the few remaining natural treasures in the United States.

Sincerely,

COURTNEY CURF,
Legislative Director.

NATURAL RESOURCES
DEFENSE COUNCIL,
New York, NY, April 4, 2000.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing on behalf of the more than 400,000 Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) members from across the country to respectfully urge you to oppose any legislative provisions that would open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) to oil exploration. As you know, the FY 2001 Budget Resolution that the Senate Budget Committee reported to floor includes damaging language that assumes revenues from oil drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

Under the guise of combating high gas prices, some legislators are pressing to open the Arctic Refuge’s 1.5 million-acre coastal plain to oil exploitation. The coastal plain is often called “America’s Serengeti” because of its abundant caribou, polar bear, grizzly, wolf and other wildlife populations, and represents the last five-percent of Alaska’s Arctic Slope not already open to development. It would be ill-advised to open up our nation’s Arctic wilderness for a questionable, short-term supply of oil.

We respectfully encourage you to oppose any bill or resolution that would open up the last pristine wilderness in the Arctic to oil and gas development, and urge you to support Senator Roth’s amendment to the 2001 Budget Resolution to strike Arctic Refuge drilling revenues from the federal budget.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. ADAMS,
President.

REP AMERICA,
Deerfield, IL, April 4, 2000.

Hon. TRENT LOTT,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

DEAR SENATOR LOTT AND SPEAKER HASTERT: This week, Congress takes up the issue of whether potential oil revenue from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge should be included in the congressional budget. REP America, the national grassroots organization of Republicans for Environmental Protection, opposes this kind of sleight-of-hand accounting as well as development in the Refuge.

A strong national bipartisan consensus exists for continued protection of the ANWR. The estimates of finding commercially valuable quantities of oil there are actually quite small. But even if such quantities were found, the oil would not appreciably increase our nation’s known reserves or lower gasoline prices. At present, over 90% of America’s portion of the Arctic is open to oil and gas exploration and development. Further development within the Refuge is not necessary for the security of our nation, and we should not count unearned and unanticipated revenues stemming from oil that might not exist.

Frankly, such budgetary maneuvers are very damaging to our party. We Republicans take pride in our history protecting public lands to Alaska and honor the legacy of past Republican leaders. In 1907, when President Theodore Roosevelt established the Tongass and Chugach National Forests, he faced tremendous pressure from special interests lined up to exploit public lands for short-term gain. Presidents Eisenhower and Nixon used executive authority to protect the Arctic Refuge, and as recently as 1990, many Republicans listened to mainstream America and cosponsored the Tongass Timber Reform Act. President George Bush did us all a great service when he signed this important piece of conservation legislation.

As Republicans, the members and directors of REP America urge you and your colleagues to halt these kinds of budgetary charades, if for no other reason than the fact that it is absolutely destroying our party’s image with respect to the environment. Inclusion of funds supposedly derived from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge will hasten the already shaky support our party has for maintaining control of the Congress.

Thank you for doing your part to keep the “conservation” in “conservative.”

Sincerely,

MARTHA A. MARKS, Ph.D.,
President.

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,
Washington, DC, March 24, 2000.

DEAR SENATOR: The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is a spectacular wilderness on the north coast of Alaska. The refuge protects lands of abundant wildlife and tremendous beauty. Millions of migratory birds nest or feed on the refuge each spring and summer between annual migrations that bring them through the backyards and nearby parks and refuges of Americans throughout the rest of the country. The refuge also contains the calving grounds of the 130,000 member Porcupine River Caribou herd on which the Gwich’ in people of northeast Alaska and northwest Canada have relied for some 20,000 years.

With rising fuel prices, some would have you believe that oil drilling in the Arctic Refuge would somehow lower the price of gasoline. This is a terrible sham. This proposal is not about filling American’s fuel tanks; it’s about lining the pockets of the oil companies in Alaska. We understand that the Budget Resolution that will soon come to a vote in the Senate may assume federal revenues from oil drilling in the Arctic Refuge. This proposal was rejected by the American public and vetoed by President Clinton in 1995. To assume revenues from this highly controversial and currently prohibited activity is a complete hoax.

Some have argued that drilling in the Arctic Refuge will somehow eliminate our dependence on oil imports. But just five years ago, Senator Murkowski pushed through a measure to allow oil from Alaska’s North Slope to be exported to China and other Asian countries. In its pending review of the proposed BP/Arco merger, the Federal Trade Commission found that “BP ships Alaska

North Slope crude to Asia to short the West Coast market and elevate prices.”

Ninety-five percent of the North Slope is already available to oil and gas exploration and development. Under the Reagan Administration, the Department of Interior determined that there is less than a one-in-five chance of finding recoverable oil there. More recently, the U.S. Geological Survey have said that oil companies could most likely only recover around 3.2 billion barrels—only enough oil to meet U.S. needs for a few months. At no time would oil from the refuge be expected to provide more than 2 percent of U.S. oil supply. Of course, no amount of oil would ever justify destroying this great national treasure.

We urge you to listen to the American public and the Gwich’ in people and reject efforts to include oil revenues from the Arctic Refuge in the Budget Reconciliation bill.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. MEADOWS,
President.

NATIONAL PARKS
CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2000.

OPPOSE DEGRADATION OF THE ARCTIC COASTAL
PLAIN

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of our 400,000 members, the National Parks Conservation Association strongly urges you to oppose efforts to include projected revenues from oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge’s coastal plain in the pending Budget Reconciliation bill.

The Arctic coastal plain has long been recognized as a spectacular national gem because of its spectacular scenery and diverse and abundant wildlife. The coastal plain richly deserves its tag of “America’s Serengeti,” as over 130,000 caribou of the Porcupine herd migrate there every spring to their calving grounds, and more than 300,000 snow geese are found there in the fall.

Attempts to open the coastal plain for drilling for oil have reared their head in Congress over the past three decades. Recent increases in gasoline prices have renewed the call to open the plain for oil production, resulting in an “assumption” of revenue from drilling in the Arctic Refuge in the Budget Reconciliation bill.

Opening up the coastal plain would not be a solution to the short-term increases in gasoline prices, nor would it address the nation’s long-term energy strategy. In fact, the United States Geological Service estimates that even if oil were found in the coastal plain, production would never meet more than two percent of our nation’s oil needs at any given time. This supply would hardly justify the production facilities and related infrastructure that would destroy the unique character of the coastal plain.

Your support in opposing efforts to promote oil development and drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is critical. Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Sincerely,

TOM KIERNAN,
President.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2000.

Re Protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—Vote “yes” on the Roth Arctic wilderness amendment to the 2001 Budget Resolution.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) is the bipartisan political voice of the national environmental community. Each year, LCV publishes the National

Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the press.

The League of Conservation Voters urges you to protect the biological heart of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge by supporting an amendment offered by Senator Roth (R-DE) to the 2001 Budget Resolution that opposes opening the Refuge to oil drilling. Currently the budget resolution assumes revenues from drilling in the Refuge.

Some members of Congress are using the current high price of gasoline as a pretext to open the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil drilling. The current price of gasoline in no way justifies destroying this national treasure. Development of the Refuge's coastal plain will not impact oil supplies until far into the future, and the amount of oil that lies beneath it is minimal compared to our national energy needs.

The Arctic Refuge is home to wolves, polar bears, caribou and millions of migratory birds. It is also the last 5% of Alaska's vast north coastline that remains off-limits to the oil companies. And the Refuge plays an integral part in the lives of the Gwich'in people who depend on the seasonal migrations of the caribou for both survival and cultural identity.

Protecting the wilderness values of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is one of the top priorities of the national environmental community. LCV urges you to vote "yes" on Senator Roth's amendment to protect the Arctic Refuge.

LCV's Political Advisory Committee will consider including votes on this issue in compiling LCV's 2000 Scorecard. If you need more information, please call Betsy Loyless in my office.

Sincerely,

DEB CALLAHAN,
President.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I want to read from the letter of the League of Conservation Voters, which is the bipartisan political voice of the national environmental community. They write:

The League of Conservation Voters urges you to protect the biological heart of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge by supporting an amendment offered by Senator Roth to the 2001 Budget Resolution that opposes opening the Refuge to oil drilling. Currently the budget resolution assumes revenues from drilling in the Refuge.

It goes on to say:

Protecting the wilderness values of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is one of the top priorities of the national environmental community.

How true that is. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge contains our Nation's greatest wilderness. No conservation area in America contains as much vast wild land free of industrialization. It is the essence of our country's wilderness areas.

Consider three or four points. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is the only conservation area that protects a complete spectrum of arctic and sub-arctic ecosystems in North America. The Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge is the only wild stretch of coast on Alaska's North Slope that is off limits to oil and gas exploration and development.

President Dwight Eisenhower was the first to set aside the original Arctic

National Wildlife Range in 1960 for the purpose of protecting the wilderness, the wildlife, and recreational values.

While many refuges in America have been set aside to protect wildlife populations and habitat, the Arctic Refuge is the only refuge in which wilderness was recognized as a purpose for establishment, the controversial 1002 area proposed for oil development as a part of the original Arctic range.

I could go on. It is critically important that we protect this valuable refuge for future generations. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the Roth amendment. I yield the floor.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, how much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 8 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I certainly agree with my friend, the chairman of the Finance Committee, relative to the interest of America's environmental community.

This is a big issue for them because it generates membership and it generates dollars. They have a cause. We have heard from them, the eloquence expressed by my friend, the chairman of the Finance Committee.

But what we did not hear was any of the 500,000 American men and women who were sent to the Mideast to fight a war against Saddam Hussein. They left their loved ones. They risked their lives. What did America's environmental community say about that? They did not say a word.

What are they saying today about our increased dependence on Iraq? Seven hundred thousand barrels a day of oil; the fastest growing source of oil coming into this country. What is the environmental community saying? What we all believe in: More conservation, more alternative energies, as they drive in their automobile or pick up their plane to fly to the next point.

Come on, let's get real around here. We talk about ANWR potentially having a 200-day supply. Under that logic Prudhoe Bay should have been a 600-day supply. In reality, it has been supplying this Nation with 20 to 25 percent of our total crude oil for the last 23 years. That is a ridiculous comparison. It suggests that all other oil production is going to stop, all other domestic production is going to stop, and that is all you are going to have from one source.

Come on, get real. We can come up with better arguments than that. They say 95 percent of the Arctic Coastal Plain is open to oil and gas development. That is false. Try and get a lease up there. Only Fourteen percent is open.

This map shows the Naval Petroleum Reserve that was dedicated in the 1900s. You think you can get a lease in there? Try. Go over to the Secretary of Interior and see if you can get a lease. They put up a few leases, but you cannot go in and even lease where the high potential for oil is in the Naval Petro-

leum Reserve. If that isn't where you are supposed to find oil, I do not know where is.

Where are you going to find oil? The ANWR area isn't open. This other area of the State is partially open. But the reality is, the wilderness is closed. The Coastal Plain is closed. The Teshepuk Lake area is closed; Barrow is closed. The western portion of NPRA is closed to oil production. That is the reality. So do not buy their arguments that 95% of the Coastal Plain is available for development because it is "pie in the sky."

We are concerned about our Gwich'in people. However, what they propose to do is lease their open lands for oil development. They offered to lease more than land than the entire 1.5 million acre Coastal Plain of ANWR. They offered to lease 1.799 million acres. They signed a lease. Unfortunately, the oil company did not find any oil there. Maybe they should have taken the leases anyway.

So we have more myth around here than fiction. No reality. No credit for American ingenuity or technology or the realization that this area we are talking about is the size of the State of South Carolina.

Mostly the Members here cannot comprehend size. We had four time zones in Alaska during the time I grew up—most of the time I was here. We cut them down to one.

If you overlay Alaska on the United States—you know it and I know it—we extend from Canada to New Mexico; Florida to California. The Aleutian Islands go out forever. They almost go to Japan. It is a big hunk of real estate.

We have heard a lot of romantic and fanciful notions tonight about the Coastal Plain. But we have not discussed and resolved the obligation to oversee the national security interests of this Nation. This is the Senate. We make decisions on war and peace.

ANWR is a serious issue. It is so serious that I hope you will all remember that if this amendment is adopted, I can assure every single Member of this body, we will well be on our way to jeopardizing our national security by further increasing our dependence on imported oil.

I do not want that obligation on my shoulders. It is time to turn around the direction in this country, reduce our dependence on imported oil, move into the areas where we have potential oil and gas discoveries in the Rocky Mountains, the overthrust belt, and my State of Alaska.

We have a Vice President who says he is going to cancel all OCS leases. Where are we going to get oil from? Where are we going to get the energy? Where are you going to get the fuel for that 747 called Air Force One to fly back and forth to New York or wherever it goes? Are you going to do it with hot air?

The Vice President goes around town. Does he drive a battery-operated car with the back seat full of batteries?

Does he drive an electric car? No. We are not there yet.

It is serious. This is an issue of national security. We fought a war over oil in 1991. We lost 147 lives. We have \$10 billion of the taxpayers' money invested in keeping Saddam Hussein fenced in.

It is an issue of the environment. We have the best environmental stipulations in the world in the United States. Most of the OPEC countries have the worst.

They are drilling in the rain forests of Colombia. We have proven what we can do it right in the Arctic. We have a record. We have produced between 20 percent to 25 percent of our domestic crude oil in the United States in Alaska for the last 23 years.

It is an issue with the economy, sending our dollars overseas, our jobs overseas. It is a third of our trade imbalance. It is an issue that you—when I say “you,” I apologize to my colleagues—but no Member has addressed the people of my State, the Eskimo people who support development of this area.

You know what they say? They say, “please put my people, the Inupiat Eskimo people, into the picture of ANWR. Stop airbrushing us out.” Try being airbrushed out of the picture or out of your State. That is kind of the position to which these people feel they have been relegated. What a tragedy.

This is serious. This is not something that should be taken for granted.

The Eskimo people support development. One of my Eskimo friends, Oliver Levitt, to a group of us in Barrow, said: I used to come to school to keep warm. My job every morning was to go out on the beach and pick up what little driftwood floated down from the McKenzie River to the shores near Barrow.

He came to school to keep warm. That isn't the case in Barrow anymore because not only do they have the revenue from oil, but they have jobs. They have an alternate way of life that used to depend totally on subsistence and following the game herds. That is the record and the reality.

It was 20 below in Kaktovik yesterday, if it makes those of you in this body who have been listening to a little of my hot air cool off.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. That is the real world we live in.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues for the opportunity to express what I hope is recognized as a reasonable balance, to send a signal to Saddam Hussein, and to say that it is time to turn around America's energy policy and lessen our dependence on imported oil. This is the place to start. And the time is now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. On behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent the

votes relative to the Byrd-Warner amendment and the Roth amendment occur at 10:30 a.m. on Thursday, with no second-degree amendments in order, and there be 2 minutes for explanation prior to each vote.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, we will tentatively accept this. I just need to say this first: I have spoken to the manager of the bill, Senator DOMENICI. We want to make sure there is an understanding, however, that the amendments that we finish tonight or that we work on tonight, that there will be a vote on those amendments some time prior to the votes in the vote-arama tomorrow.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Assuming the intention of the majority to work toward that, they would pursue that tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, is all time yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I yield back those 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia has an amendment to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 2965

(Purpose: To reduce revenue cuts by \$5.9 billion over the next five years to help fund school modernization projects)

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators HARKIN, LAUTENBERG, DORGAN, KENNEDY, MIKULSKI, KERRY of Massachusetts, BINGAMAN, BAUCUS, and GRAHAM of Florida, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB], for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. GRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 2965.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$78,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$521,300,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$1,011,200,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,223,400,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,361,200,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$78,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$521,300,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,011,200,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$1,223,400,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$1,361,200,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$1,300,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,322,100,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,344,600,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$1,367,400,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$1,390,700,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$78,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$521,300,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,011,200,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$1,223,400,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,361,200,000.

On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by \$1,300,000,000.

On page 18, line 8, increase the amount by \$78,000,000.

On page 18, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,322,100,000.

On page 18, line 12, increase the amount by \$521,300,000.

On page 18, line 15, increase the amount by \$1,344,600,000.

On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by \$1,011,200,000.

On page 18, line 19, increase the amount by \$1,367,400,000.

On page 18, line 20, increase the amount by \$1,223,400,000.

On page 18, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,390,700,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by \$1,361,200,000.

On page 29, line 3, decrease the amount by \$97,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, decrease the amount by \$5,938,100,000.

On page 29, after line 5, insert the following:

“Not later than September 29, 2000, the Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than \$19,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and \$1,743,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.”

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, this amendment is designed to help ensure that no child attends a school with a leaky roof, or crowded classrooms, or that lacks access to the latest technology and the Internet.

In the words of Yogi Berra, “It's déjà vu all over again.” Last year's debate about our Budget Resolution is almost a carbon copy of this year's debate. There are few times in the legislative process that the contrasts between ideologies are more clear than in our debate on the Budget Resolution—and this year is no exception. While some

would have us focus on funding a massive tax cut which will likely be directed to those who need it least, others would focus on strengthening Social Security and Medicare, paying down the debt, and making critical investments in areas like education. While, understandably, there are bound to be philosophical differences about achieving these objectives, I am again disheartened that education is not higher on our list of fiscal priorities. While I compliment the Chairman for including \$2.2 billion dedicated to IDEA funding, I'm back again to urge that more of my colleagues to support an amendment which reduces the size of this massive tax cut to help finance school modernization efforts. Mr. President, education should truly be a common priority—we certainly know that it's a national priority.

Mr. President, I'm sure that none of us could imagine holding Senate proceedings in a trailer, nor could we imagine having to place buckets around our desks to catch rainwater leaking in through the Capitol dome. We simply can't imagine what it would feel like to hold our summer debates in a chamber that wasn't air-conditioned. And Mr. President, if we couldn't stand the heat, we'd get out of the chamber and take a recess, but our nation's students simply don't have that luxury. A heat-related recess for them means fewer math lessons. It means less time with a qualified teacher. It means reduced learning. And Mr. President, I'm sure our dedicated clerks here in the Senate couldn't imagine doing their jobs today without being able to scan our amendments into a computer, making them accessible to staff and the nation at a moment's notice. We shouldn't then expect our nation's children to master core skills as well as information technology skills if we don't give them the keys to the information highway.

Mr. President, five years ago, the GAO estimated that our national school modernization needs totaled \$185 billion. This year, that figure has risen to \$307 billion, according to a recent report by the National Education Association. The report indicates that the State Departments of Education across the country are reporting a 65% increase in school modernization needs over the last five years. That translates into \$66,849,315 a day. Much like our national debt clock, the tape is also running on our school modernization needs. With record enrollments, deteriorating facilities, and the immense need to modernize our schools with the latest technology, we simply can't afford to sit back and claim that the federal government can't or shouldn't help.

There is an often used argument that the federal government should have no role in building or renovating schools. And if you look at last year's federal outlays for capital expenses, school construction occupies the smallest slice of that pie. Of the \$400 billion the

federal government spent on national infrastructure, only one-tenth of one percent—this little piece right here—went to education, training, and employment capital expenses. Roughly 55 percent of our capital costs were spent on highways, 15 percent on housing, 13 percent on community and regional development, with the remaining portion allotted to mass transit, airports, and pollution control facilities.

With over \$300 billion in unmet needs, Mr. President, I believe we need to expand this pie and invest more in our schools. Our capital costs over the years can vary from category to category, depending upon what our needs are. Today, the average age of our nation's schools is 42 years. The last time we made a major investment in our nation's educational infrastructure was under the leadership of a Republican President, Dwight Eisenhower. Over the course of his tenure, we spent roughly \$1 billion specifically for school construction—due to the boom in our student population. Well, Mr. President, we're in the Baby Boom Echo now; those children now have their own children in our schools. We have a record 53.2 million children now enrolled in our schools today and by 2009, we'll add about one million more. We need to make a commitment similar to the one made by our parents and grandparents in the 1950's. A billion dollars in 1953 would be about \$5.4 billion today, if you adjusted for inflation. This amendment merely seeks to set aside \$5.9 billion over the next five years.

For every one million students, our nation must build about 1300 schools, and at an average cost of over \$12 million per school, we're talking about \$16 billion. That's on top of the costs to remedy safety code violations, retro-fit schools to accommodate technology, and relieve overcrowding.

Mr. President, in Virginia, there are over 3,000 trailers in use. This is a picture of Loudoun County High School in Leesburg, Virginia, just 33 miles from here. You see a crane hoisting just one of a whole line of trailers that sit in a parking lot of this Northern Virginia high school. Loudoun County alone needs to build 22 new schools over the next six years to accommodate their skyrocketing enrollments. At an average cost in Northern Virginia of about \$18 million per school, that's almost \$400 million for just one county!

Mr. REID. Will my friend yield time off the resolution?

Mr. ROBB. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. My friend talked about Loudoun County. Clark County, where Las Vegas is located, must build one school a month to keep up with its growth.

Mr. ROBB. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada. A similar statistic could be quoted by any one of our 99 colleagues in this Chamber. Many of those colleagues have similar stories to tell.

This amendment is not an attempt to dictate what kind of school modernization legislation we should pass; it merely reserves enough funding to pay for such an effort. Given the fact that the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Sen. ROTH, has reported at least three tax bills within the last year or so which contain tax incentives for school modernization and the fact that Republican and Democratic members alike have various proposals to use discretionary spending as a vehicle to finance school modernization, there is clearly an interest on both sides of the aisle to find a way to do this.

Even more illustrative of the momentum to fund school modernization legislation was the introduction last Tuesday of a truly bipartisan school construction and renovation bill in the House. It's sponsored by Representatives NANCY JOHNSON and CHARLIE RANGEL and has 130 other co-sponsors. School modernization has been a top priority of the education community for the past three years. And this community is joined by engineers, architects, mayors across the country, civil rights groups, and even some religious groups.

Mr. President, Let's make it a priority this year. This amendment reflects a commitment similar to the one that our parents and grandparents made a generation ago. I hope we can summon similar courage in this generation.

Even more illustrative of the momentum to fund school modernization legislation was the introduction last Tuesday of a truly bipartisan school construction and renovation bill in the House.

It is sponsored by Representatives NANCY JOHNSON and CHARLIE RANGEL and has 103 other cosponsors.

School modernization has been a top priority of the education community for the past 3 years. This community is joined by engineers, architects, mayors across the country, civil rights groups, and even some religious groups.

Mr. President, let's make it a priority this year. This amendment reflects a similar commitment to the one that our parents and grandparents made a generation ago. I hope that we can summon similar courage in this generation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I strongly support Senator ROBB's amendment which encourages the Senate to make school modernization a top priority by providing \$1.3 billion in discretionary spending for grants and loans for the urgent repair and renovation of public elementary and secondary schools in high-need areas, and to leverage \$25 billion in interest-free bonds in FY2001.

I also commend Senator ROBB and Senator HARKIN for their leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment that is necessary to help the nation meet the critical need to modernize and rebuild crumbling and overcrowded schools.

Nearly one third of all public schools are more than 50 years old. 14 million children in a third of the nation's schools are learning in substandard buildings. Half of all schools have at least one unsatisfactory environmental condition. The problems with ailing school buildings are not the problems of the inner city alone. They exist in almost every community—urban, rural, or suburban.

In Massachusetts, 41 percent of schools report that at least one building needs extensive repairs or should be replaced. 80 percent of schools report at least one unsatisfactory environmental factor. 48 percent have inadequate heating, ventilation, or air conditioning. And 36 percent report inadequate plumbing systems.

In addition to modernizing and renovating dilapidated schools, communities need to build new schools in order to keep pace with rising enrollments and to reduce class sizes. Elementary and secondary school enrollment has reached an all-time high this year of 53.4 million students, and will continue to grow. The number will rise by 324,000 in 2000, by 282,000 in 2001, and by 250,000 in 2002. It will continue on this upward trend in the following years.

For example, in Fitchburg, Massachusetts, enrollments are rising by 200 students a year. Educators there would like to reduce class size, extend special education and bilingual education programs, and hire new teachers, but the school system does not have the facilities or resources to accomplish these important goals. Instead, Fitchburg has been forced to construct four portable facilities—and a fifth is under construction—to deal with overcrowding.

According to a report this year, total unmet school modernization needs, including technology and infrastructure, totals \$307 billion—almost three times the amount estimated in 1995. Massachusetts has \$9.9 billion in unmet technology and infrastructure needs.

The time is now to do all we can to help rebuild and modernize public schools, so that all children can succeed in safe, technologically-equipped schools. I urge my colleagues to support Senator ROBB's amendment.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, this is a unique moment in our history.

We are at the dawn of a new century. And the United States is in a period of unprecedented economic prosperity.

We have the lowest unemployment rate in decades, the number of families on welfare has declined and new jobs continue to be created at a record pace.

However, we know that despite the longest economic boom in history, some Americans have been left behind. As we look to the future, one of our challenges will be to make sure the rising tide lifts all boats. In addition, we also face the challenge of keeping the prosperity going.

The pending budget resolution jeopardizes our prosperity. It jeopardizes the economy, threatens the Social Se-

curity surplus, and shortchanges Medicare. The resolution does not provide an adequate prescription drug benefit, provide sufficient debt reduction or invest in education.

The budget resolution undermines the public's priorities and will impose deep cuts in domestic programs. Fewer children will be served by Head Start, there will be fewer new teachers to reduce class size and no additional officers for community policing.

Instead, the budget proposes a risky tax scheme that jeopardizes our nation's future prosperity and productivity.

The GOP's budget plan squanders the entire non-Social Security surplus on a reckless tax cut and provides no funding for national priorities such as school modernization. It rejects the President's proposal to provide \$25 billion in bonds to underwrite construction of 6,000 new schools. It also rejects \$1.3 billion in grants and loans for emergency repairs to public schools.

This budget sets the wrong national priorities. It chooses tax cuts for the wealthy over modernizing our children's schools. The Robb-Harkin amendment corrects this serious shortcoming by providing a comprehensive national strategy to repair, renovate and modernize our public schools.

States and local communities are struggling to renovate existing schools and build new ones to alleviate overcrowding. School construction and modernization are necessary to equip classrooms for the 21st Century, improve learning conditions, end overcrowding, and make smaller classes possible.

Our school buildings are simply wearing out. Nearly three-quarters of all U.S. public schools were built before 1970.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, when a school is between 20 and 30 years, frequent replacement of equipment is necessary.

When a school is between 30 and 40 years old all of the original equipment should have been replaced, including the roof and electrical systems.

After 40 years of age, a school building begins to deteriorate rapidly and most schools are abandoned after 60 years.

The average school building is 42 years old and technology is placing new demands on schools. As a result of increased use of technology, many schools must install new wiring, telephone lines and electrical systems. The demand for the Internet is at an all-time high, but in the nation's poorest schools, only 39% of classrooms have Internet access.

In 1998, the American Society of Civil Engineers issued a report card on our nation's infrastructure. The report found many problems. However, the most startling finding is with respect to our nation's public schools.

ASCE reports that public schools are in worse condition than any other sector of our national infrastructure. This

is an alarming fact and should be our call to action.

The need to modernize our nation's public schools is clear, yet the Federal Government lags in helping local school districts address this critical problem.

Because of increasing enrollments and aging buildings, local and State expenditures for school construction have increased dramatically—by 39% from 1990 to 1997. However, this increase has not been sufficient to address the need.

The National Education Association recently surveyed states about the need to modernize public schools and upgrade education technology. According to their preliminary report, \$253.9 billion is needed to modernize the school facilities and \$53.7 billion is needed to upgrade education technology. For Iowa—\$3.4 billion for school facilities and \$540 million for education technology.

It is a national disgrace that the nicest places that our children see are shopping malls, sports arenas and movie theaters and the most run down place they see is their public schools. What signal are we sending them about the value we place on them, their education and future?

How can we prepare our kids for the 21st century in schools that did not make the grade in the 20th century?

This amendment provides a comprehensive, two-prong response to this critical national problem.

First, we would provide \$1.3 billion each year to make grants and no interest loans for emergency repairs to public schools. The Public School Repair and Renovation Program would help local school districts fix the roof that is leaking, repair fire code violations and put in new electrical wiring.

Mr. President, 25% of schools in New York City are still heated by coal and 46% of U.S. schools lack adequate electrical wiring to support the full-scale use of technology. Sixteen million children attend schools without proper heating, ventilation or air conditioning. Twelve million students attend classes in schools with defective plumbing. These grants and loans would make it possible to install the modern heating systems, plumbing, and new electrical wiring that are desperately needed in schools across America.

In addition, these grants and loans could be used to remedy violations of state or local fire codes. The Iowa Fire Marshal reported a five-fold increase in the number of fires in schools over the past decade. During the 1990's there were 100 fires in Iowa schools. During the previous decade there were 20.

It is clear that public schools have an urgent need to make repairs now and these grants and no-interest loans will finance up to 8,300 repair projects in 5,000 schools. We will install modern heating systems, upgrade the electrical wiring, and repair the fire code violations.

These grants and loans will address problems that literally endanger the lives and safety of our children.

However, some buildings have simply outlived their usefulness and need to be replaced. In addition, enrollment in elementary and secondary schools is at an all time high of 53.2 million and will continue to grow over the next 10 years. Therefore, it will be necessary for the United States to build an additional 6,000 schools to educate the growing number of students.

The second part of our comprehensive strategy is to underwrite the cost of building nearly \$25 billion of new school facilities. Our amendment provides tax credits to subsidize the interest on new construction projects to modernize public schools. School districts would be able to replace outdated buildings or add more classrooms so they can reduce class size. The school modernization bonds would finance modernization projects for 6,000 schools.

Our amendment provides a modest national investment to modernize our nation's schools and will make a big difference for millions of children. Further, the amendment is fully offset by reducing the ill-conceived tax scheme in the Budget Resolution.

I know this kind of approach will work because it is working in Iowa. Iowa is in the second year of a school modernization and repair demonstration project.

Like the Robb-Harkin Amendment, the Iowa demonstration also takes a two-prong approach toward solving this critical problem. First, the Iowa project provides grants for the repair of fire code violations. Secondly, the Iowa project provides grants to subsidize the cost of constructing new school facilities.

In a relatively short period of time, we have already begun to see a difference in Iowa. Over the past two years, 138 grants have been awarded for projects to repair fire code violations. The federal government provided \$6.5 million to install fire alarms, upgrade electrical systems and other repairs to make Iowa schools safer.

Last year, six Iowa school districts received grants to underwrite the cost of building new school facilities. Over and over, school officials said the availability of the federal grant was responsible for convincing local citizens to support the school bond issue that finance the bulk of the project.

Several school districts passed school bond issues after several tries. One superintendent said, "In the past, our school district ran three bond issues unsuccessfully and it is a credit to the Department of Education . . . for providing this Iowa Demonstration Grant funding as an incentive to help voters pass bond issues."

Another Superintendent said, "It is our opinion that both of these grants played a very important role regarding the successful passing of the bond issue."

The most recent competition was just closed and applications for the second year of funding are being reviewed.

The Iowa School Construction Grant is beginning to show the kind of major impact a modest federal investment can have on improving the safety of schools and spurring construction of new school facilities. The school modernization provisions mirror the Iowa Demonstration and will spur the same kind of activity across the nation that we are witnessing in Iowa.

The Iowa School Construction Grant is beginning to show the kind of major impact a modest federal investment can have on improving the safety of schools and spurring construction of new school facilities. Our amendment mirrors the Iowa Demonstration and will spur the same kind of activity across the nation that we are witnessing in Iowa.

Modern, up-to-date school buildings are essential for student achievement. Studies show that students in overcrowded schools or schools in poor physical condition scored significantly lower on both math and reading than their peers in less crowded conditions.

The General Accounting Office reports that 14 million American children attend classes in schools that are unsafe or inadequate. This is a serious national problem. And, it demands a comprehensive national response. The Robb-Harkin Amendment provides that effective national response. I commend Senator ROBB for his leadership on this issue and urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair. I appreciate the Senator allowing me, on behalf of the leader—

Mr. REID. I could not hear the Senator. Would he start over?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am going to speak on behalf of the leader for the wrap-up that has been prepared.

I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the budget resolution for Senator DURBIN to offer his amendment and the appropriate debate. I further ask unanimous consent that following his remarks, the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object. Somebody was talking to me. Please repeat that last request.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of Senator DURBIN, the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, we don't have a previous order. Before we agree to this, why don't we do the rest of the unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I will proceed and omit any reference to the previous order. I will go to Thursday's consent.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes at 9:30 on Thursday, there be 8 hours and 30 minutes remaining on the concurrent resolution,

and the pending resolution be the Durbin amendment relative to tax cuts. I further ask consent that prior to the vote, relative to the Robb education amendment, there be 10 minutes remaining, to be equally divided between Senator ROBB and Senator DOMENICI for the closing debate.

Mr. REID. The minority has no objection to these last two paragraphs the Senator just read.

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

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, there is strong bipartisan support for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). To date, 45 Senators have signed a letter in support of \$1.4 billion in regular funding, and \$300 million in emergency funding, for LIHEAP during Fiscal Year 2001.

I, along with my colleagues from the Northeast-Midwest Senate Coalition, will offer this Sense of the Senate to demonstrate the broad support for increased LIHEAP funding. The amendment expresses the sense of the Senate with respect to increasing LIHEAP regular funding from the current level of \$1.1 billion to \$1.4 billion.

In my home State of Vermont, this past winter brought temperatures of fifteen below zero; and home heating oil prices soared to \$2 a gallon. Approximately 11,400 Vermont families received benefits, which averaged \$310 in regular funding for the entire season. Emergency funding contributed an additional \$50-\$135 depending on the fuel source. These numbers reveal the frugality with which this program now has to operate.

I am concerned that emergency LIHEAP funding is being used to make up for regular appropriations funding shortfalls. During the first four and half months of FY2000, all available emergency LIHEAP funding (\$300 million) was released. There are requests for additional emergency funding. This situation demonstrates the need to increase regular funding to at least the sum of last year's regular and emergency funding amounts.

There is no doubt that emergency funding was critical during this past winter's severe weather conditions and volatile fuel prices. However, LIHEAP funding is most effective when states have it in the form of regular funding, allowing proper advance budgeting and providing funding assistance to low income households before a crisis situation.

In addition, it is critical that we maintain the integrity of the LIHEAP program through the regular funding cycle. The decision was made last year to consider the program an additional non-routine expense. I am concerned that this designation threatens the foundation of the program. This amendment seeks to return LIHEAP to its regular funding structure.

LIHEAP is an effective tool for maintaining the basic needs of low-income households. Nevertheless, stagnant funding has resulted in a growing eligible population not receiving benefits

due to lack of funding. The safety net for our low-income households is getting ever smaller and ever thinner.

The statistics demonstrate the need for LIHEAP best. More than two-thirds of LIHEAP-eligible households have annual incomes of less than \$8,000, approximately one-half have annual incomes below \$6,000. It has been estimated that low-income households typically spend four times what middle-income households spend on utility services. Middle-income households spend about four percent of their income for energy purposes, whereas low-income households spend between 14% and 16%, and in many instances up to 25% for utility costs.

Thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to address the funding needs of this important program. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise as a proud cosponsor of this important amendment for women who are diagnosed with breast and cervical cancer through the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program (NBCCEDP) at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). I am pleased to join Senators CHAFEE, SNOWE, GRASSLEY, HARKIN, and others in support of this amendment. This amendment says that we Senators believe that we should pass legislation to provide Medicaid coverage for certain women screened and found to have breast or cervical cancer under the CDC screening program.

Through March 31, 1999, the CDC screening program has provided more than one million mammograms and almost 1.2 million Pap tests. Among the women screened, over 6,200 cases of breast cancer and over 550 cases of cervical cancer have been diagnosed. Right now, the CDC screening program does not pay for breast and cervical cancer treatment services, but it does require participating states to provide treatment services.

The late Senator John Chafee, Senator SNOWE, Senator MOYNIHAN, and I along with others introduced the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act of 1999 (S. 662) which currently has 57 cosponsors. This bill gives states the option to provide Medicaid coverage for breast and cervical cancer treatment to eligible women who were screened and diagnosed with these cancers through the CDC screening program. It is not a mandate for states. It is the Federal Government saying to the States "we will help you provide treatment services to these women, if you decide to do so." I am pleased to be working with the bipartisan team of Senators LINCOLN CHAFEE, SNOWE, GRASSLEY, and MOYNIHAN to pass this important legislation.

Women screened and diagnosed through the CDC screening program depend on staff and volunteer time to find free or more affordable treatment; they depend on the generosity of doctors, nurses, hospitals, and clinics who provide them with free or reduced-cost

treatment. The demands of managed care can also make it more difficult for physicians to provide free or reduced-fee services. In the end, thousands of people who run local screening programs are spending countless hours finding treatment services for women diagnosed with breast and cervical cancer. I salute the individuals who spend their time and resources to help these women. But we must not force these women to rely on the goodwill of others. Right now, the CDC is only screening 12-15 percent of the women who are eligible. As more women are screened, treatment efforts will become even more difficult. The lack of coverage for treatment services has hurt the program's ability to recruit providers, further restricting the number of women screened.

In short, it is clear that the short-term, ad-hoc strategies of providing treatment have broken down. Because there is no coverage for treatment, state programs are having a hard time recruiting providers; volunteers are spending a disproportionate amount of time finding treatment for women; and fewer women are receiving treatment. We can't expand the program to serve the other 85 percent of eligible women if we can't promise treatment to those we already screen.

The CDC screening program is celebrating its 10th anniversary in 2000. I am proud to be the Senate architect of the legislation that created the breast and cervical cancer screening program at the CDC. Over ten years ago we saw a need—low-income women were not receiving basic well-woman care—they were not getting their mammograms and Pap smears to detect breast and cervical cancer. At that time, I and others wanted to ensure that we not only diagnosed these low-income women with breast and cervical cancer, but that we also provided treatment for those cancers. But 10 years ago, we had great deficits and we simply did not have the money for a treatment component of the CDC screening program. So we made a down payment. We took the first step with the belief that it would not be the only step. Well, now the time has come to take the next step and include Federal resources for treatment for women who are diagnosed with breast and cervical cancer through the CDC screening program.

There are three reasons why we should act now to pass this important legislation. First, times have changed since the creation of the CDC screening program ten years ago. We are now running annual surpluses, instead of annual deficits. We have the resources to provide treatment to these women. I think we ought to put our money into ensuring that we save lives. Second, prevention, screening, and early detection are very important, but alone they do not stop deaths. Screening must be coupled with treatment to reduce cancer mortality. Finally, it is only right to provide Federal resources to treat breast and cervical cancer for those

screened and diagnosed with these cancers through a Federal screening program.

I am proud that my own state of Maryland realized the importance of providing treatment services to women who were screened through the CDC screening program. Maryland appropriates over \$6 million in state funds annually for the Breast and Cervical Cancer Diagnostic and Treatment Program for eligible low income Maryland women. The program has provided services to over 15,650 women in Maryland, including eligible women screened through the CDC screening program and eligible women screened outside the CDC program. The breast cancer mortality rate in Maryland has started to decline, in part because of programs like the CDC's. But not all states have the resources to do what Maryland has done. That's why this bill is needed.

This bill is the best long-term solution. It is strongly supported by the National Breast Cancer Coalition; the American Cancer Society; the National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems; the National Partnership for Women and Families; YWCA; National Women's Health Network; the American Medical Women's Association, and many more.

I urge the Senate Finance Committee to take up this legislation before Mother's Day and I urge the Senate leadership to promptly bring it to the full Senate for consideration. The Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act (S. 662) has 57 bipartisan cosponsors. President Clinton has included funding in his 2001 budget to give states the option of providing Medicaid coverage to women who have been diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer through the CDC screening program. The Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives has already unanimously approved this legislation (H. R. 1070).

We must act now to provide a treatment opportunity to all women who are diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer through the CDC screening program. Breast and cervical cancer treatment is not a partisan issue. It's a family issue. It affects mothers, sisters, and daughters, and their fathers, husbands, and children. I can't think of any better way to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the National Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program than by passing the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this important amendment.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, the amendment that I have submitted is a simple one. In fact, it's the same one that I offered last year, and it takes the tax cuts proposed in this fiscal year 2001 budget resolution and uses that money, instead, to pay down the debt.

Let me say again: under my amendment, we would take \$150 billion that is projected to accumulate as a result of our on-budget surpluses over the next five years, and use those funds, not for

tax cuts, but for debt reduction instead.

Why should we do this rather than use this money to reduce taxes?

First of all, if we pay down the debt, we are going to decrease our interest payments on the national debt—a debt which stands at \$5.7 trillion today. This fiscal year, it will cost us more than \$224 billion to service our national debt—more than \$600 million a day in interest costs alone!

Out of every federal dollar that is spent this year, 13 cents goes to pay the interest on the national debt.

In comparison: 16 cents goes for national defense; 18 cents goes for non-defense discretionary spending; and 53 cents goes for entitlement spending.

We'll spend more on interest this year than we'll spend on Medicare.

When I consider these numbers, it makes me determined to do all that I can to decrease our debt even further.

That's why I believe that every fiscal decision we make in this Congress should be measured against the backdrop of how it will decrease our \$5.7 trillion national debt. And I'm not the only one who believes that.

In fact, in testimony before the Senate Budget Committee this past January, CBO Director Crippen stated that "most economists agree that saving the surpluses, paying down the debt held by the public, is probably the best thing that we can do relative to the economy."

And on the very same day, Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan said, "my first priority would be to allow as much of the surplus to flow through into a reduction in debt to the public. From an economic point of view, that would be, by far, the best means of employing it."

Lowering the debt sends a positive signal to Wall Street and to Main Street. It encourages more savings and investment which, in turn, fuels productivity and continued economic growth. It also lowers interest rates, which in my view, is a real tax reduction for the American people.

Furthermore, devoting on-budget surpluses to debt reduction is the only way we can ensure that our nation will not return to the days of deficit spending should the economy take a sharp turn for the worse or a national emergency arise.

As Alan Greenspan has testified before Congress, "a substantial part of the surplus . . . should be allowed to reduce the debt, because you can always increase debt later if you wish to, but it's effectively putting away the surplus for use at a later time if you so choose."

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle oppose the tax cuts, preferring instead to use the money to increase spending. I believe that spending the surplus is an even worse use of the money.

Now, many have argued that putting the Social Security surplus in a "lock-box" will be enough to pay down our

debt. However, I should remind my colleagues that in the near future, we might not have Social Security surpluses available for debt reduction, because we may need them for Social Security reform, especially if we go to a system of private accounts.

We cannot keep putting off our responsibilities. If we have the ability—like we do now—we have a moral obligation to pay back our debts.

We must face the fact that because of 30 years of irresponsible fiscal policies our national debt has increased 1,300%. During that time Congress and our Presidents weren't willing to pay for the things they wanted, or, in the alternative, do without those items they could not afford.

I agree with General Accounting Office (GAO) Comptroller General David Walker, who, in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee last year, said:

. . . this generation has a stewardship responsibility to future generations to reduce the debt burden they inherit, to provide a strong foundation for future economic growth, and to ensure that future commitments are both adequate and affordable. Prudence requires making the tough choices today while the economy is healthy and the workforce is relatively large—before we are hit by the baby boom's demographic tidal wave.

As most of my colleagues know, Congressional Budget Office (CBO) figures show that the United States will achieve a \$26 billion on-budget surplus this current fiscal year, FY 2000.

However, it is of utmost importance that we oppose the temptation to squander this surplus.

In that regard, I have to commend Majority Leader TRENT LOTT for sticking to his guns on not moving forward on a fiscal year 2000 supplemental appropriations bill. He has stated his opposition to a separate bill, preferring instead, to include funding in the regular appropriations bills.

And we need to get moving on those bills quickly, especially because of the need for money to ensure our nation's defense readiness, our Kosovo peace-keeping mission and Colombia's drug eradication efforts.

All we need to do is look at the version of the supplemental that passed in the House of Representatives to see why we should not move forward with a supplemental bill. Indeed, the House started with the President's request of \$5.1 billion, reported a bill out of the Appropriations Committee that was some \$9 billion and passed a final bill that was \$12.7 billion.

Imagine the size of the supplemental once the Senate got through with it?

The worst thing that Congress could do now is throw away any portion of that \$26 billion on-budget surplus that was achieved in FY 2000 on non-emergency spending.

And another reason that we should not pass the supplemental is that it can be argued that \$22 billion of the \$26 billion on-budget surplus that Congress would be tapping into comes from the Medicare Part A trust fund.

Instead of squandering this surplus, let's use it to pay down the debt. It will be our first sizable on-budget surplus that we've been able to use for debt reduction in 40 years, and a truly historical accomplishment.

And let's continue to make history by using future on-budget surpluses to pay down our national debt.

Mr. President, I believe that if we can pass this amendment, and add it to the fine work that the Budget Committee Chairman has accomplished in this resolution—and with the promise from the Majority Leader on the supplemental—I believe we will have made a real difference.

We will have provided a decent budget that should address some of our most pressing problems, and, we will take whatever on-budget surplus dollars that come in and use them to reduce the national debt. Not spending increases, not tax breaks, but simply paying down the debt.

Mr. President, again, my amendment is simple: it takes the \$150 billion in tax cuts assumed by this budget resolution and instead says to spend it on debt reduction. I urge my colleagues who believe that we should do all that we can to bring down our national debt to support this amendment.

Thank you Mr. President. I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

LEADERSHIP OF SOUTH DAKOTA BASKETBALL GREAT MIKE MILLER

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, it is a great honor for me to represent the people of South Dakota in the United States Senate. They are the best resource in a state with an infinite number of tremendous attributes, and the best part of my job is getting to know and work with them on a daily basis.

I have often stood before my colleagues here in the Senate to recognize the accomplishments of South Dakotans. Many times, the names sound unfamiliar to those in this chamber. Today, however, I want to congratulate a young man who made the country stand up and take notice—and who showed the country how we play basketball in South Dakota. His name is Mike Miller, and, as every college basketball fan knows, he recently led the Florida Gators to the NCAA Division I National Championship basketball game. Although the Gators fell in a hard fought battle to the Michigan State Spartans, anyone who saw that game knows that Mike Miller is a very special basketball player.