

Docket No. 99-NM-341 [12-8/12-9]" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0507), received December 9, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7294. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model 4101 Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-296 [12-8/12-9]" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0508), received December 9, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7295. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model 4101 Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-302 [12-28/12-30]" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0539), received January 4, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7296. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAC 1-11 200 and 400 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-31 [1-4/1-6]" (RIN2120-AA64) (2000-0003), received January 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7297. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAe 146 and Avro 146RJ Series Airplanes; Docket No. 98-NM-331 [12-28/12-30]" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0536), received January 4, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-7298. A communication from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model HS 748 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99-NM-147" (RIN2120-AA64) (1999-0483), received November 29, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1053. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to incorporate certain provisions of the transportation conformity regulations, as in effect on March 1, 1999 (Rept. No. 106-228).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 2022. A bill to provide for the development of remedies to resolve unmet community land grant claims in New Mexico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ABRA-

HAM, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. BAYH):

S. 2023. A bill to provide for the establishment of Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) that will allow individuals and families with limited means an opportunity to accumulate assets, to access education, to own their own homes and businesses, and ultimately to achieve economic self-sufficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2024. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for an additional place of holding court in the District of Oregon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAMS:

S. 2025. A bill to facilitate the naturalization of aliens who served with special guerrilla units or irregular forces in Laos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2026. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize appropriations for HIV/AIDS efforts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself and Mr. GRAMM):

S.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution to provide for a Balanced Budget Constitutional Amendment that prohibits the use of Social Security surpluses to achieve compliance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KOHL, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. ROBB, Mr. ROTH, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. WARNER, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. EDWARDS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. REED, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. ENZI):

S. Res. 251. A resolution designating March 25, 2000, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELLSTONE:

S. Res. 252. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Rebiya Kadeer, her family member and business associate, should be released by the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. DOMENICI):

S. 2022. A bill to provide for the development of remedies to resolve unmet community land grant claims in New Mexico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

NEW MEXICO COMMUNITY LAND GRANT REVIEW ACT

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill, along with Senator DOMENICI, which will move us toward resolving a long standing issue

of great controversy in my State of New Mexico.

Today marks the anniversary of one of the most significant dates in the creation of modern America. On this date one hundred and fifty-two years ago, our government and the government of Mexico entered into an agreement which ended a bloody war, and which brought a huge swath of territory into the United States.

The addition of this new territory, which became the American Southwest, forever changed the makeup of our nation, its place on the world stage, and its culture. The infusion of a large Hispanic population and a myriad of Native American communities into fabric of American society enriched the diversity of country and strengthened the dynamism of our culture.

It is day which should be one for celebration. A day in which New Mexicans should reflect on the confluence of cultures which make up our state. It is a day to remember the sweat and grit of the people who traveled north up El Camino Real (the Royal Road) passing through one area that was so arduous that it was known as La Jornada del Muerte (the Journey of Death), and those who came west over the Santa Fe trail to reach New Mexico and who, together with the Pueblo, Apache, and Navajo peoples who had already carved a life out of this arid land, built our modern culture.

It is a day for celebration, but unfortunately it is also a day which recalls great pain for many. For that agreement between nations which established the American Southwest, the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, also carried with it a promise to the new citizens of America. That promise was that their ownership of lands established under Spanish and Mexican law would be respected and validated by their new government. Many who would be celebrating today do not believe that that promise was kept. The serious questions that have been raised concerning the validation of Spanish and Mexican community land grant claims in New Mexico cast a cloud over this day, and a cloud over our national honor.

Given the long history of dispute over community land grant claims in New Mexico, and the large amount of disputed land, a credible neutral analysis of the United States' implementation of the Treaty has been needed. To that end, Senator DOMENICI and I have requested that the General Accounting Office review the United States' legal obligations under the Treaty and whether the Federal government met those obligations with regard to community land grant claims.

This will be the first national study of the issue, and it is overdue. Given how long it has taken for the heirs of these land grants to get a credible review of their claims, it is that important that this study not end up gathering dust on some shelf. If the GAO finds that the United States denied

these communities their rights under the treaty, then it is imperative that the Federal government develop a remedy to resolve this issue.

Therefore I, along with Senator DOMENICI, am introducing a bill today which will move us in that direction. This bill would require that, should the GAO find that the United States has failed to meet its Treaty obligations, the Justice Department prepare for the President a list of methods to remedy the problem, and that the President must propose to Congress his preferred remedy.

Unlike the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, which was an agreement between nations, this bill represents a promise directly to land grant heirs that their claim will be fully considered by the United States Government. I hope we can pass this measure, and make that promise to them.

Mr. President I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The bill follows:

S. 2022

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "New Mexico Community Land Grant Reivew Act."

SEC. 2. PURPOSE, DEFINITIONS, AND FINDINGS.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this Act is to provide for the development of potential remedies to resolve unmet obligations by the United States with regard to community land grant claims in New Mexico under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—As used in this Act:

(1) **TREATY OF GUADALUPE-HIDALGO.**—The term "Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo" means the Treaty of Peace, Friendship, Limits, and Settlement (Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo), between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, signed February 2, 1848, with the amending Protocol of Queretaro signed May 26, 1848; entered into force on May 30, 1948 (TS 207; 9 Bevans 791).

(2) **COMMUNITY LAND GRANT.**—The term "community land grant" means a village, town, settlement, or pueblo consisting of land held in common (accompanied by lesser private allotments) by three or more families under a grant from the King of Spain (or his representative) before the effective date of the Treaty of Cordova, August 24, 1821, or from the authorities of the Republic of Mexico before May 30, 1848, in what became the State of New Mexico, regardless of the original character of the grant.

(3) **LAND GRANT CLAIM.**—The term "land grant claim" means a claim to land owned by a community land grant.

(4) **GAO.**—The term "GAO" means the United States General Accounting Office.

(c) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds:

(1) New Mexico has a unique and complex history regarding land ownership due to the substantial number of land grants awarded by the King of Spain and the Republic of Mexico as an integral part of the colonization of New Mexico prior to the takeover of the area by the United States under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo.

(2) Under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, the United States agreed to respect valid land grants claims.

(3) Several studies, including the New Mexico Land Grant Series published by the University of New Mexico, have called into question whether the United States has fulfilled

its obligations under the Treaty. There continue to be claims that citizens of the United States were illegally deprived of the property rights protected by the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo through the actions of the Office of the Surveyor General established in 1854, the Court of Private Land Claims established in 1891, and the Territory of New Mexico.

(4) There was a remarkable difference in outcomes between the land claims adjudications in the State of California, where approximately 73 percent of the claimed acreage was confirmed, and the former Territory of New Mexico, where only 24 percent of the claimed acreage was confirmed. This difference in outcomes raises serious questions as to whether adjudications in New Mexico were equitably and fairly administered.

(5) Following the United States' war with Mexico and for much of this century, the economy of New Mexico was dependent on land resources. When the land grant claimants lost title to their land, the predominantly Hispanic communities in New Mexico lost a keystone to their economy, and the effects of this loss had long lasting economic consequences for these communities.

(6) Whether the United States failed to meet its obligations under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo has been a source of continuing controversy and has left a lingering sense of injustice in some communities in New Mexico over the last one-hundred and fifty years.

(7) This issue, which regards the integrity of the United States with regards to its international commitments and its commitments to its citizenry, must be resolved.

(8) The GAO has been requested to review how the United States implemented the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo which pertain to the protection of community land grant claims New Mexico, and to provide a report to the Congress and the President by December 31, 2002, which includes an assessment of whether the procedures established by the United States to implement the treaty appear to have been adequate, and whether the community land grants claims appear to have been equitably adjudicated.

SEC. 3. DEVELOPMENT OF REMEDY RECOMMENDATIONS AND PRESIDENTIAL PROPOSAL.

If the GAO concludes, in the report to Congress and the President described in Section (2)(c)(8) of this Act, that the obligations of the United States under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo regarding the protection of the community land grant rights do not appear to have been met, the Department of Justice shall prepare for the President a list of alternative methods to remedy the problem. The President shall then submit to Congress recommendations to resolve these claims within six months of the submission of the GAO report. In no event shall these recommendations include the divestiture of private property rights.●

● Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joining Senator BINGAMAN in introducing legislation to help resolve whether the federal government inadequately implemented the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in New Mexico. Today is the 152d anniversary of the signing by the United States of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo with Mexico. Under this 1848 treaty, the United States acquired the territory that is now California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado and Wyoming. Unfortunately, the potential failure of this country to meet its obligations under the Treaty of Guadalupe-

Hidalgo has been a source of continuing controversy, and many New Mexicans claim they were illegally deprived of property rights by the federal government. For example, in California, about seventy-three percent of land grant claims have been confirmed compared to only twenty-four percent in New Mexico, which raises questions as to whether adjudications in New Mexico were equitably and fairly administered.

We must take the opportunity to reverse the heritage of ill-will between the Hispanic people of New Mexico and the Federal government. Hispanic descendants in our state have been waiting over 150 years to get the federal government to fairly look into the community land grants issue. In 1848, land grant claimants were led to believe that their property rights would be honored and protected, but they have repeatedly been frustrated by government officials. One Surveyor General for New Mexico has been described by historians as "steeped in prejudice against New Mexico, its people and their property rights." Other opportunists used long legal battles to acquire empires that extended over millions of acres—all at the expense of local Hispanics.

In 1891, the Surveyor General was replaced by the Court of Private Land Claims, but the court's procedures heavily favored the government. The Court of Claims required that claimants prove that the Spanish or Mexican granting official had the legal authority to issue the land grant. The claimants did not have access to necessary documentation, and often did not speak English. Consequently, the court rejected two-thirds of the New Mexico claims presented before it. Ultimately, by one account written by Richard Griswold del Castillo, only eighty-two grants received Congressional confirmation. This represented only six percent of the total area sought by land claimants, leaving a bitter legacy.

In the 105th Congress, Congressman Redmond was able to pass a bill out of the House of Representatives creating a Presidential Commission to evaluate the community land grants located in New Mexico. I was proud to introduce a companion bill, including a few changes based on the lessons I learned from talking to the heirs of some of the land grants; from reviewing the history; and from talking to scholars, historians and land grant lawyers.

After hearings and continuing dialog with land grant heirs, we realized that the natural first step in the process was determining whether the grantees' rights had been violated under the Treaty. It became clear that adequate time for a thorough study of the issue was needed. Documents had to be gathered. Resolution of the dispute must take into account intervening legal rights.

Last year, Senator BINGAMAN and I originally proposed that the Attorney General, acting through the Assistant

Attorney General for Civil Rights, should investigate whether the United States properly implemented the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo which pertain to the protection of valid land grant claims in New Mexico. If that investigation found that the federal government needed to rectify past abuses, the President would submit a proposal to Congress to resolve those claims. The Senate supported our desire last fall to include in the Commerce, Justice, State Appropriations bill the requirement that the Justice Department conduct such a study. However, the Justice Department objected on the grounds that it could not be a neutral examiner of the legal obligations of the United States in this situation.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) was recommended by House appropriators as an alternative, and language directing GAO conduct a study was included in the original conference report for Department of Justice appropriations. However, that provision was written in the waning hours of the conference, without time for consultation with the GAO, and while the focus of the conference was turned to other matters. Consequently, we believed that language was inadequate to serve New Mexico's needs. At our request, the appropriations conferees removed the inadequate study language from the final version of the CJS conference report.

I must say that I respectfully disagree with the Justice Department's contention that they could not properly conduct such a study. What better arm of the government should investigate whether the United States properly implemented the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo which pertain to the protection of valid land grant claims in New Mexico?

Nonetheless, after meeting with top-level representatives at the Department of Justice, Senator BINGAMAN and I met with GAO's General Counsel Robert Murphy and Principal Assistant Comptroller General Gene Dodaro to craft language that more closely reflected the needs of New Mexico, and the capabilities of the GAO. We have formally asked GAO to review how the United States implemented the provisions of the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo which pertain to the protection of community land grant claims in New Mexico.

The GAO will submit an interim report to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources and the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, and to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and to the President of the United States, by the end of this year. A final report will be submitted by the end of 2002. This will allow the GAO adequate time to investigate this complicated issue.

The report will include a description of the legal obligations of the United States to protect the rights of community land grants and its actions in car-

rying out the provisions of the treaty, an assessment of the issues raised concerning the implementation of the treaty provisions, and identification of potential methods of resolving any failure by the United States with regard to community land grant claims. The GAO shall also discuss the potential effects of resolution options on intervening legal rights and on Tribal land claims. In no event should any identification of remedies include divestiture of private property rights.

The bill we introduce today directs that if the GAO concludes that the obligations of the United States under the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo regarding the protection of the community land grant rights do not appear to have been met, the Department of Justice shall prepare for the President a list of alternative methods to remedy the problem. The President will then submit to Congress recommendations to resolve these claims within six months of the submission of the GAO report. Again, we also wish to ensure that no recommendations include the potential divestiture of private property rights. We do not wish to transplant one potential injustice with another.

Trying to do justice 150 years after the fact is complicated. I am hopeful that this bill can address what has been, for too long, a tale of land loss and bitterness between the United States and some of its New Mexico citizens.●

By Mr. LIEBERMAN (for himself, Mr. SANTORUM, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. BAYH):

S. 2023. A bill to provide for the establishment of Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) that will allow individuals and families with limited means an opportunity to accumulate assets, to access education, to own their own homes and businesses, and ultimately to achieve economic self-sufficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SAVINGS FOR WORKING FAMILIES ACT OF 2000

● Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to proudly introduce with my esteemed colleagues, Senators SANTORUM, ABRAHAM, FEINSTEIN, LANDRIEU, BAYH, and ROBB, the Savings for Working Families Act of 2000. This legislation directly addresses a problem that is now starting to receive the attention that it deserves: the growing wealth gap in our country. This legislation builds on a bipartisan effort begun last session to help more low-income working families join our country's economic mainstream by addressing that wealth gap. Passing this legislation will help expand our economic winner's circle to include more working families. Because what goes up for the richest families, particularly in these boom times, need not come down for other families.

Today with my colleagues, I put forward a modest yet promising proposal

that we believe will help more low income families share in our country's economic prosperity. Today we will introduce new legislation to support the expansion of Individual Development Accounts, or IDAs, an innovative and powerful tool to help the working poor save and develop the assets they need to get ahead and thrive in the new economy—to enter the winner's circle.

The Savings for Working Families Act of 2000 will benefit working, low-income families across this country to share in the unprecedented prosperity of our booming economy. Our bill brings together Republicans and Democrats, policy wonks and working mothers, and even financial institutions and consumers, all in support of a new approach to sustaining some American ideals—hard work, thrift, individual responsibility, and entrepreneurship. The Savings for Working Families Act of 2000 provides the real incentives and real opportunities for the working poor to build assets, both human and financial capital, which they in turn will be able to invest in our national economy.

Today's economy is defying gravity. The stock market is jumping to record highs while inflation and unemployment are hovering at record lows. Millions of Americans are reaping the benefits of the longest economic expansion in our history, including millions of working middle class families. Unfortunately, millions more are not.

Several recent studies have documented a growing income gap in the U.S.—an increasing income disparity between the rich and poor with declining incomes for both poor and low-income families. In addition to that income gap, a report released recently by the Federal Reserve Bank, has identified a significant asset gap in this country. A gap where the net worth—or assets—of the typical American family has risen substantially since 1989, while the net worth—or assets—of lower income families has actually declined during the economic boom of recent years.

According to the Fed report, families earning under \$10,000 a year had a median net worth of \$1,900 in 1989. That climbed to \$4,800 in 1995, but had slipped back to \$3,600 by 1998. Those families earning \$10,000 to \$25,000 saw their net worth drop from \$31,000 in 1995 to \$24,800 in 1998. More specifically, while the percent of all U.S. families that own a home or business has risen during the boom years of 1995–98, the percent among lower income families has decreased. For example, in 1995, 36.1% of families earning under \$10,000 annually owned their home. By 1998 the rate had dropped to 34.5%. The drop for families earning \$10,000 to \$25,000 was from 54.9% to 51.7%. The same story is true for the percent of lower income families owning a business.

The Savings for Working Families Act of 2000 will directly address exactly this asset gap. Our bill seeks to address this imbalance by dramatically expanding the use of IDAs. IDA programs

do work and are reporting real success in spurring savings and asset building on a small scale in hundreds of communities across the country. Already 27 states have passed some form of IDA program legislation.

In my home state of Connecticut, there is today only one pilot IDA program in existence. A handful of low income individuals are now starting to take part in a strong IDA program run by the Committee for Training and Employment, or CTE, a cutting edge community-based organization providing a range of services and activities to address poverty issues in the greater Stamford area. In Connecticut we are hopeful that we will soon be seeing an expansion of IDA accounts and programs. A statewide IDA Task force, convened by Connecticut State Treasurer, Denise L. Nappier, recently released a report to jump-start more IDA activity in the state. Its thoughtful analysis and authoritative recommendations will certainly help to increase IDAs in our state. The Savings for Working Families Act of 2000 was drafted in consideration of the excellent IDA work under way in states and communities all across the country.

The idea is simple, but powerful. Low income workers who put their hard earned dollars into IDAs would get matching funds from financial and other private entities. A federal tax credit will provide the incentives for those private sector investments in IDAs. The IDA savings could then be used by low income working families to develop assets, specifically for the purchase of a home, the pursuit of a post-secondary education, or to start a business. In essence, this legislation extends to lower income working families the type of incentives for building assets, such as the home mortgage interest deduction, preferential capital gains rates and pension funds exclusions and incentives, that are now available on a large scale to the non-poor and wealthy.

Just last week, President Clinton underscored the promise of this approach in his State of the Union Address, when he put forward his Retirement Savings Account (RSA) proposal. Those RSAs are similar to the IDAs in this bill. In his proposal, the President rightly identified the potential of the private sector in strengthening the economic security of many of our most vulnerable citizens. Just as important, he made clear, as we do in the Savings for Working Families Act, that these IDA accounts are not simply an empty promise for a handout. They are a means to integrate more Americans into the broader economic mainstream.

In drafting this new IDA legislation, our objective was to keep it simple and based closely on S. 895, a bill that Senator SANTORUM and I introduced last year and that enjoyed strong bipartisan support. Modifications in the Savings for Working Families Act of 2000 are primarily technical in nature, recognizing that the IDA field has

grown and evolved in the last year. We have also made a concerted effort in the new bill to realize the potential of critical private sector and nonprofit organizations to be effective IDA providers, including credit unions and community service organizations.

Moving forward, we are confident that we can get this bill passed because it addresses a threat to our fundamental faith in the American dream and to the vitality and long-term stability of our national economy. Our bill cannot singlehandedly eliminate the wealth gap, but we are confident that it will help carve out a little more space in that winner's circle and move us a step closer to making the American dream real for more working families.

Finally, I would like to thank each of the cosponsors of this bill, especially Senators SANTORUM and ABRAHAM. Through their hard work, and in conjunction with the financial services industry and the IDA field, we have legislation that achieves a very public interest. In particular, I would like to note the leadership of the Corporation for Enterprise Development (CFED) for helping to bring the voice of the IDA community to this creation of this bill. With the Savings for Working Families Act of 2000, we are able to harness the creative forces of the marketplace to help secure our core democratic values, holding out the hope of free enterprise without the false promise of a free lunch, and giving some tangible meaning to those core values of community, opportunity and responsibility. In expanding the use of IDAs across the country as an empowerment tool for working families, this legislation speaks to our shared aspirations as Americans.●

Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2026. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize appropriations for HIV/AIDS efforts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE GLOBAL AIDS PREVENTION (GAP) ACT OF 2000

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, last month, the United States held the rotating presidency of the U.N. Security Council. And something historic happened. Under the leadership of Ambassador Holbrooke and Vice President Gore, the Security Council for the first time ever discussed an international health issue.

The issue was the spread of AIDS, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. In raising the profile of this issue—in putting it before the U.N. Security Council—there was a recognition that the AIDS crisis is a security threat—a threat to the peace, stability, and prosperity of nations around the world.

Nowhere is that more true than in sub-Saharan Africa, where the United Nations has said that AIDS is “the worst infectious disease catastrophe since the bubonic plague.”

Since the beginning of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, 13.7 million people in sub-Sa-

haran Africa have died of AIDS. That is 84 percent of all the people in the world who have died of AIDS since the beginning of the epidemic. Last year, two-thirds of all new cases of HIV/AIDS were in sub-Saharan Africa. And of all the people in the world living with HIV/AIDS, 69 percent of them live in sub-Saharan Africa.

Mr. President, this is not just a matter of more deaths and more cases because there are more people. Of adults in sub-Saharan Africa who are aged 15–49, eight percent of them have HIV/AIDS. Percentages from specific countries are even more dramatic. In Zimbabwe, it is estimated that 26 percent of all adults aged 15–49 are living with the disease. In Botswana, it is 25 percent, and in Namibia, it is 20 percent.

Unlike any other area of the world, the HIV/AIDS epidemic in sub-Saharan Africa is predominately a woman's disease. A majority of infected adults—55 percent to be exact—are women.

This creates ripple effects. When women get the disease, they often pass it along to their unborn babies. As a result, about 10 percent of the HIV/AIDS cases in sub-Saharan Africa are children. More dramatically, when women die, their children often become orphans. By the end of this year, the HIV/AIDS epidemic will be the reason that over 10 million children in sub-Saharan Africa are orphans.

How many children is that? There are about 10 million people 18 years old and younger in California. Imagine if every single one of them was an orphan. That is what we are talking about in sub-Saharan Africa. Ten million children. Even worse, according to those who are working on this issue in Africa, the number of children orphaned there because of HIV/AIDS could double, triple, or even quadruple in the next decade.

I have mentioned, Mr. President, a lot of statistics, a lot of numbers, but behind each number there is a face. A face of a man living with HIV; a face of a woman dying of AIDS; a face of an orphan with no family and no place to go. In Sub-Saharan Africa, there are faces upon faces upon faces.

This is a global tragedy, a global catastrophe, a global emergency. It requires a global response. And the United States must lead the way.

So today, I am introducing, along with my colleague on the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator GORDON SMITH, the Global AIDS Prevention Act—the GAP Act. It calls on the United States Agency for International Development—USAID—to make HIV/AIDS a priority in the foreign assistance program and to undertake a comprehensive, coordinated effort to combat HIV/AIDS. That effort must include primary prevention and education; voluntary testing and counseling; providing medications to prevent the transmission of HIV/AIDS from mother to child; and care for those living with HIV/AIDS.

To accomplish this, the GAP Act would increase funding for USAID's international HIV/AIDS effort. Over five years, the bill would authorize \$2 billion for the fight against AIDS, and at least \$1 billion of that is dedicated to the problem in sub-Saharan Africa.

I want to commend the work done so far by USAID. This year, the Agency will spend \$200 million to fight HIV/AIDS abroad. Unfortunately, this is the first time in six years that there has been an increase in the funding for this important effort. And it is still far short of what is needed. It is time to close the gap. Passing the GAP Act would be a great step forward.

Now, Mr. President, I have talked about the problem in sub-Saharan Africa. That is where the problem is the worst and where the need is most urgent. It has also been the focus of most of the public attention in the last few months.

But, be warned. We must not fool ourselves into thinking that sub-Saharan Africa is the only place with a problem. In terms of raw numbers, India has more people living with HIV/AIDS than any other nation in the world. And experts tell us that in the near future, the problem may actually grow faster in Southeast Asia than in Africa.

The GAP Act recognizes the need to be flexible. As I mentioned, it dedicates at least 50 percent of the funding to sub-Saharan Africa. USAID is actually spending about 65 percent of its AIDS dollars in that region now. This bill will continue to allow USAID to spend that higher percentage, but it will also provide the Agency with the flexibility to address the problem elsewhere in the world.

As I mentioned, Mr. President, I am joined in this effort by Senator GORDON SMITH. He and I worked together last summer in introducing a bill to fight the international tuberculosis problem. I am pleased and honored to join with him again in introducing bipartisan legislation to address an urgent international health problem.

Mr. President, in the United States, When the epidemic first hit two decades ago, too many people in positions to make a difference ran inside, locked the doors, closed the curtains, and just hoped it would go away. The victims were blamed instead of helped. Those at risk were ridiculed instead of educated. Those who were dying were shunned instead of cared for.

We did not begin to make progress against HIV/AIDS in this country until we discussed the problem in the light of day and until we made a serious investment in education, prevention, treatment, care, and research. Progress will not be made in Africa or anywhere else in the world unless we do the same. Now is not the time to pretend the problem does not exist or that it does not matter to us. Now is the time to act.

The GAP Act would help to close the gap between what we need to fight this

disease and what we are now spending. The GAP Act would help to close the GAP between the developed and the developing world in dealing with this epidemic. The GAP Act would help to close the gap between our words and our actions. I ask my colleagues to close these gaps by cosponsoring the GAP Act.

Finally, I ask that a copy of the bill and a letter of endorsement from Family Health International be inserted in the RECORD.

The material follows:

S. 2026

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Global AIDS Prevention Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Since the beginning of the HIV/AIDS epidemic 2 decades ago, more than 16,300,000 people worldwide have died of the disease.

(2) More than 33,600,000 people in the world are living with HIV/AIDS; more than 3,000,000 of them are children.

(3) Sub-Saharan Africa has been particularly hard hit by the disease, as the region has accounted for—

(A) 84 percent of the worldwide deaths from HIV/AIDS;

(B) two-thirds of the new infections in 1999; and

(C) 69 percent of those living with the disease.

(4) In sub-Saharan Africa, 55 percent of the infected adults are women and, as a result, more than 10,000,000 children have been orphaned in sub-Saharan Africa because of HIV/AIDS—a figure that could double or triple in the next decade.

(5) According to the United Nations, HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa is the "worst infectious disease catastrophe since the bubonic plague".

(6) The HIV/AIDS problem in Southeast Asia is growing dramatically. In 1999, 20 percent of the new infections in the world were in Southeast Asia.

(7) New investments and treatments hold out promise of making progress against the HIV/AIDS epidemic. For example, a recent study in Uganda demonstrated that a new drug could prevent almost one-half of the HIV transmissions from mothers to infants, at a fraction of the cost of other treatments.

(8) Making progress against HIV/AIDS requires a global commitment, with a leadership role from the United States.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961.

Section 104(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4)(A) Congress expects the agency primarily responsible for administering this part to make HIV/AIDS a priority in the foreign assistance program and to undertake a comprehensive, coordinated effort to combat HIV/AIDS. This effort shall include providing—

"(i) primary prevention and education;

"(ii) voluntary testing and counseling;

"(iii) medications to prevent the transmission of HIV/AIDS from mother to child; and

"(iv) care for those living with HIV/AIDS.

"(B)(i) In addition to amounts otherwise available for such purpose, there are authorized to be appropriated to the President to carry out this paragraph \$300,000,000 for fis-

cal year 2001, \$350,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, \$400,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, \$450,000,000 for fiscal year 2004, and \$500,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.

"(ii) Not less than 50 percent of funds made available each fiscal year under clause (i) shall be used to combat the HIV/AIDS epidemic in sub-Saharan Africa.

"(iii) Funds appropriated under this subparagraph are authorized to remain available until expended."

FAMILY HEALTH INTERNATIONAL,
FAMILY HEALTH INSTITUTE,
Arlington, VA, January 31, 2000.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
Hart Senator Office Building, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: Based on Family Health International's 14 years of experience managing more than 1,200 HIV/AIDS prevention and care projects in 60 countries—the majority in sub-Saharan Africa—we strongly support The Global AIDS Prevention Act of 2000.

The need for scaling up HIV/AIDS prevention and care programs in Africa is urgent. We know firsthand that the United States needs to provide more assistance than it has in the past to save more lives, bolster regional security and protect the interests of the United States not only in sub-Saharan Africa, but around the world.

We are pleased that you and members of the U.S. Senate and Congress recognize the urgency of this need and the crucial role the United States plays in international HIV/AIDS prevention and care programming. We have the tools and expertise needed to make a dramatic difference in preventing more people from being infected with HIV and caring for people living with HIV/AIDS. But, this difference can only be made by providing the level of resources it will take to greatly expand the initiatives the United States already has underway with our hundreds of local partners overseas.

We appreciate your recognition and support for the critically important work being done by nongovernmental organizations, including Family Health International, and the United States Agency for International Development. Continuing leadership by the United States on HIV/AIDS initiatives is needed more urgently now than ever before: by the end of this year, some 60 million people, including over a million Americans, will have been infected with HIV since this global pandemic began.

Your support and that of the U.S. Senate is needed now more than ever, Senator Boxer. We need much more support to save more lives, increase the basic health, well-being and productivity of millions threatened by, infected with or affected by HIV/AIDS, including millions of children, worldwide.

Sincerely,

PETER R. LAMPTEY, M.D. DR. P.H.,
Director, IMPACT Project,
Senior Vice President, AIDS Programs.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to join Senator BOXER in introducing the Global AIDS Prevention Act. This legislation authorizes \$2 billion over the next five years to support the Agency for International Development's [AID] efforts to prevent and treat HIV/AIDS abroad. Fully half of the funds authorized would go to fight AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa. The remainder will go to other areas, including some countries of Southeast Asia where infection rates are growing at alarming rates.

While the nations of sub-Saharan Africa have faced a myriad of disasters in

the last decades of the 20th century, few reach the cataclysmic proportions that the spread of AIDS has wrought on every level of life in that area. The statistics are mind-numbing—in some countries, one of four adults are living with HIV/AIDS. Life expectancies in those countries over the next 5 years have been slashed from the mid-60s to the early forties. Cumulative deaths attributable to AIDS numbered over 13 million by 1999 and the number of children orphaned by AIDS is estimated between 7 and 10 million. An estimated 1 million children in Africa are HIV positive.

These numbers impact every facet of life in this region of Africa. Where populations of adults aren't likely to enter the workforce or care for their children, an economy cannot prosper and grow. Where millions are orphaned, many times watching their parents die, a future that includes any basic education is likely not to happen. Where governments struggle with civil strife, the basic medical needs of its populations go unmet. I am proud of the private and religious organizations that have heroically struggled to fight the impact on families, however it is clear that the scope of the AIDS crisis requires additional support.

In an area where some country infection rate reaches one out of four of the adult population, our diplomatic efforts must first and foremost include a means to stop this epidemic. While the internal political strife in some of these countries can be equally heart-breaking in outcome, the ongoing devastation spread by AIDS in some of these countries needs to be addressed in a broad and immediate way.

I would like to commend my colleagues from California for her strong leadership in this area and I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation and meet this devastating epidemic.

By Mr. VOINOVICH (for himself and Mr. GRAMM):

S.J. Res. 38. A joint resolution to provide for a Balanced Budget Constitutional Amendment that prohibits the use of Social Security surpluses to achieve compliance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, released figures last week showing that the United States is on track to achieve a \$23 billion on-budget surplus this fiscal year. If CBO's figures hold up, then the United States will have achieved a true, on-budget surplus for the first time in 40 years.

In addition, the United States could enjoy an on-budget surplus ranging somewhere between \$11 billion and \$69 billion in fiscal year 2001, depending on which set of figures you use.

But what I find truly amazing is what CBO reports could occur over the next 10 years. Under the most realistic

assumptions about discretionary spending, CBO estimates we could achieve an on-budget surplus of nearly \$900 billion.

As good as this sounds, we must remember not to get ahead of the game. Just because we could obtain an on-budget surplus, does not mean we have obtained an on-budget surplus.

Whatever on-budget surplus we actually achieve this year—and the years that follow—is predicated on the ability of Congress and the President to resist the urge to spend it. Unfortunately, with an amount of unobligated money that large, there will be calls from all segments of society and Government to increase funding for this program, or create that program, or institute massive tax cuts.

That is why the very first priority for this year must be to oppose the temptation to squander this year's surplus on a pork-laden supplemental appropriations bill. I implore my colleagues to maintain the necessary discipline that will let these surpluses grow.

Even though I am cautiously optimistic about the on-budget surpluses projected for this year and the next, I still do not believe we should treat CBO's projections as the gospel truth as we plan 10 years, or even 5 years, down the road.

That is because, as most any economist will tell you, the only thing certain about projections is their uncertainty.

In testimony before the House Banking Committee last year, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said:

... it's very difficult to project with any degree of conviction when you get out beyond 12, 18 months.

In addition, he stated:

Projecting five or ten years out is a very precarious activity, as I think we have demonstrated time and time again.

Last July, CBO Director Dan Crippen said, in testimony before the Senate Budget Committee that "10-year budget projections are highly uncertain" and that "economic forecasting is an art that no one has truly mastered." And that is from the Director of CBO—the man in charge of making Congress' surplus projections.

More alarming, as we all know, these surplus projections don't reflect the ticking time bomb of Social Security and Medicare costs that will explode when the baby boomers begin to retire—something that Congress and the President must address now.

More importantly as we bask in the euphoria of these projected surpluses, we must not forget the sobering fact that we still have a \$5.7 trillion national debt—a national debt that costs us more than \$224 billion a year to service. That is more than \$600 million a day in interest costs alone.

Out of every Federal dollar spent, 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.

Here is the chart. I think most people are not familiar with it. This shows where the Federal dollar goes: net interest, 13 percent; national defense, 16 percent; nondefense discretionary spending, 18 percent; and 53 percent for mandatory spending.

Think about it. We spend more on interest each year than we spend on Medicare. It is easy to understand our difficulty in reforming Medicare or providing a prescription drug benefit or funding countless other beneficial programs when the money we could use to pay for such programs or activities is being spent on interest.

That is why I believe every fiscal decision we make from here on must be measured against the backdrop of how it will decrease our \$5.7 trillion national debt.

In fact, in testimony before the Senate Budget Committee last week, CBO Director Crippen stated:

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.

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 we really need in the country, and, in turn, it fuels productivity and continued economic growth. It also lowers interest rates, which in my view, is a "bird-in-the-hand" cost reduction for most Americans, and better than the "two-in-the-bush" tax-reduction proposals floating around this Congress.

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 recently testified:

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.

Even as most economists agree that the best use of any surplus is to apply it against the debt, the bad news is, the President and some of my colleagues believe the best use of this possible surplus is to increase spending and provide tax expenditures.

By merely proposing his plan, as he outlined at his State of the Union Address, the President has assured a path of confrontation both with this Congress and within this Congress.

I believe that Congress and the President need to avoid such partisan politics and work together on reaching an agreement as to how best to utilize these surpluses.

Further, I believe the best option available to us is to agree on a realistic

adjustment to the 1997 budget caps, do the best we can to respond to the needs of the American people within that limit, and use the balance of the surplus to pay down the national debt.

If we can't start paying down our national debt now, with the longest period of economic growth in the history of our Nation, with record low unemployment and low inflation, when will we ever be able to do it?

We have a moral obligation to do it now.

I am ashamed, and so should my colleagues be ashamed, that because of 30 years of irresponsible fiscal policies our national debt has increased 1,300 percent. My granddaughters, Mary Faith and Veronica, and my 2-week-old grandson, John, have each inherited a debt of nearly \$21,000 because Members of 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 Comptroller General David Walker, who, in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee 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.

Fortunately, that message is starting to be heard. Last month, Speaker of the House, Dennis Hastert, announced his goal of eliminating all federal debt held by the public by 2015. Not soon enough, but Speaker Hastert gets it. And I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join us in supporting debt reduction as our primary fiscal goal because it is in the best interest of this nation.

In order to ensure fiscal discipline and prevent us from "backsliding" into the fiscal mess we've been in for the past 30-plus years, I am introducing today a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution, or what I like to refer to as the "backbone budget amendment."

I believe it is the only guarantee that we will never return to the days of deficit spending and the accumulation of debt, and we should do it now. Now! The time is right, and those of my colleagues who have championed this in the past should seize upon this opportunity to join me in this effort, because, as they know, or should know, a Balanced Budget Amendment is the most effective method of keeping a handle on spending.

My proposal is a departure from previous proposals by stipulating that Social Security surpluses be exempt from deficit calculations. That is, a true balanced budget must be achieved without using off-budget Social Security surpluses to finance spending in other areas. A federal balanced budget constitutional amendment will help Con-

gress and the President make the hard decisions because they will no longer be able to tap the Social Security surplus.

It is a simple matter of fact that without constitutional and statutory balanced budget provisions at the state and local level, many of our state and local governments would be in the same degree of debt as the federal government.

And let me just touch on my own personal experience, because I've had to deal with very real financial problems in my state. Without a charter provision and a constitutional requirement, it would have been virtually impossible for me to bring the City of Cleveland out of the default I inherited when I was Mayor, and to deal with Ohio's \$1.5 billion deficit when I was Governor.

Think about it—if we had a Balanced Budget Constitutional Amendment, and if we were to have a President who didn't want to make tough budget choices on his or her own, the Balanced Budget Constitutional Amendment would give the President the backbone he or she needs to make those tough choices.

And believe me, I've discovered after just 1 year in the Senate, this Congress needs the "Backbone Budget Amendment" to force us to make those tough choices. If we pass the amendment, I'm confident that three-fourths of our state legislatures would ratify it without question, because most of them are required by laws in their respective states to balance their budgets.

And there is one other thing we need to do now, and that is enact Senator DOMENICI's biennial budget legislation.

I am a co-sponsor of this legislation because I believe it is an important tool to help use federal funds more efficiently and strengthen Congress' proper oversight role.

Right now, we spend far too much time debating the federal budget, particularly discretionary spending. Conversely, we don't devote nearly as much time as we should on oversight of the federal agencies because of the time and energy consumed by the budget resolution, budget reconciliation and the appropriations process.

Indeed, when he introduced his legislation last year, Senator DOMENICI pointed out in his statement that in 1996, 73% of the votes taken in the Senate that year were related to the budget—often the same subject is voted upon 3 or 4 times a year.

A biennial budget will help Congress and the Executive Branch avoid the annual, lengthy budget and appropriations process and allow us to increase our attention on the government oversight portion of our job.

As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management and Restructuring, I have noted that GAO report after GAO report sits on the shelf and no one does anything about them because no one has the time to conduct the follow-up.

And from career bureaucrats to Cabinet Secretaries, nearly everyone in the

Executive branch knows that when they're asked to come up to the Hill for an oversight hearing, once it's over, it's over—rarely do they have to worry about any follow-up hearings because Congress just doesn't have the time.

Unfortunately, that reality can create problems that impact public safety or national security.

As a freshman Senator, I was shocked to learn when we had hearings this past year regarding Dr. Lee and the situation at the Los Alamos National Lab that for 20 years we've had a problem with security at the Department of Energy, and no one did anything about it. But GAO knew: they've released 31 major reports on nuclear-security problems at the Department since 1980. That's just incredible!

We need the time for oversight, and the 2-year budget cycle will make that possible, just like it did when I was Governor of Ohio.

There is an old saying, "prepare for tomorrow, today." The President and Congress must make a real commitment to fiscal responsibility, and if we need an example, all we have to do is emulate what most American families do when they have extra money. They don't go out and start spending wildly. They look to pay off their debts—their credit cards, their loans and their mortgages.

With our booming economy and with inflation and unemployment at historically low levels, there exists the best opportunity in a generation to pay down the national debt, reform and preserve Social Security and Medicare and ensure that our Nation meets its constitutional obligations. Such a legacy of fiscal responsibility would be the best possible gift we could give to our children and grandchildren, and to our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print a copy of my legislation in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years after the date of its submission to the States for ratification:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. Total outlays for any fiscal year shall not exceed total receipts for that fiscal year, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House of Congress shall provide by law for a specific excess of outlays over receipts by a rollcall vote.

"SECTION 2. Total receipts shall include all receipts of the United States Government except those derived from borrowing. Total outlays shall include all outlays of the United States Government except for those for repayment of debt principal.

"SECTION 3. Any surplus of receipts (including attributable interest) over outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and

the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds shall not be counted for purposes of this article. Any deficit of receipts (including attributable interest) relative to outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds shall be counted for purposes of this article, and must be completely offset by a surplus of all other receipts over all other outlays.

"SECTION 4. The limit on the debt of the United States held by the public shall not be increased, unless three-fifths of the whole number of each House shall provide by law for such an increase by a rollcall vote.

"SECTION 5. Prior to each fiscal year, the President shall transmit to the Congress a proposed budget for the United States Government for that fiscal year, in which total outlays do not exceed total receipts.

"SECTION 6. No bill to increase revenue shall become law unless approved by a majority of the whole number of each House by a rollcall vote.

"SECTION 7. The Congress may waive the provisions of this article for any fiscal year in which a declaration of war is in effect. The provisions of this article may be waived for any fiscal year in which the United States is engaged in military conflict which causes an imminent and serious military threat to national security and is so declared by a joint resolution, adopted by a majority of the whole number of each House, which becomes law.

"SECTION 8. The Congress shall enforce and implement this article by appropriate legislation, which may rely on estimates of outlays and receipts.

"SECTION 9. This article shall take effect beginning with fiscal year 2002 or with the second fiscal year beginning after its ratification, whichever is later."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 189

At the request of Mr. INOUE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 189, a bill to restore the traditional day of observance of Memorial Day.

S. 510

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 510, a bill to preserve the sovereignty of the United States over public lands and acquired lands owned by the United States, and to preserve State sovereignty and private property rights in non-Federal lands surrounding those public lands and acquired lands.

S. 660

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 660, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under part B of the Medicare program of medical nutrition therapy services furnished by registered dietitians and nutrition professionals.

S. 1045

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1045, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on persons who ac-

quire structured settlement payments in factoring transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 1144

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1144, a bill to provide increased flexibility in use of highway funding, and for other purposes.

S. 1163

At the request of Mr. BENNETT, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1163, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and services with respect to lupus.

S. 1237

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1237, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive military retired pay concurrently with veterans' disability compensation.

S. 1448

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1448, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to authorize the annual enrollment of land in the wetlands reserve program, to extend the program through 2005, and for other purposes.

S. 1895

At the request of Mr. BREAU, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1895, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to preserve and improve the Medicare program.

S. 1921

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1921, a bill to authorize the placement within the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial of a plaque to honor Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war, but as a direct result of that service.

S. 1934

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1934, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a tax credit for business-provided student education and training.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2003, a bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services.

S. 2005

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

SNOWE), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2005, a bill to repeal the modification of the installment method.

S. 2010

At the request of Mr. HELMS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2010, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to follow normal rulemaking procedures in establishing additional requirements for noncommercial educational television broadcasters.

S. 2013

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2013, a bill to restore health care equity for medicare-eligible uniformed services retirees, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 69

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 69, a concurrent resolution requesting that the United States Postal Service issue a commemorative postal stamp honoring the 200th anniversary of the naval shipyard system.

S. RES. 128

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 128, a resolution designating March 2000, as "Arts Education Month."

S. RES. 248

At the request of Mr. ROBB, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SSRBANES), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 248, a resolution to designate the week of May 7, 2000, as "National Correctional Officers and Employees Week."

AMENDMENT NO. 2763

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of Amendment No. 2763 proposed to S. 625, a bill to amend title