

real battle because although the Senate passed a sense-of-the-Senate resolution in 1997 calling for doubling within 5 years, when the issue has come before the budget resolution on amendments sponsored by Senator HARKIN, who is the ranking Democrat, and myself as chairman of the relevant appropriations subcommittee, those increases in funding have been rejected. But with a sharp pencil and with very substantial help from staff on allocation of funding, we have succeeded in increasing the funding for the National Institutes of Health by more than \$5 billion over the last 3 years.

Three years ago, the Senate passed an increase of \$950 million. It was pared down somewhat in conference to \$907 million. Two years ago, we increased NIH funding by some \$2 billion, and last year we increased National Institutes of Health funding by \$2.3 billion.

It is true the National Institutes of Health is the crown jewel of the Federal Government. In fact, it may be the only jewel of the Federal Government. This year, with a long list of cosponsors who are being added incrementally each day—and I expect quite a few more by the end of the day, and more even before Senator HARKIN, the principal cosponsor, and I offer this for a budget resolution—we are proposing an increase in funding of \$2.7 billion, which is the minimal amount necessary to keep funding for the National Institutes of Health on a track to approximate the goal of doubling NIH funding over the 5-year period.

In addition to Senator HARKIN and myself, we have cosponsorship by Senator MACK, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator FRIST, Senator SCHUMER, Senator COLLINS, Senator DEWINE, Senator SARBANES, and Senator HUTCHINSON. The advances which have been made by NIH over the course of the past several years have truly been astounding with the projection that Parkinson's may be on the verge of being solved within a 5-year period, enormous advances on Alzheimer's, enormous advances on a variety of cancer problems—breast cancer, prostate cancer, cervical cancer—enormous advances on heart disease. As a capital investment in the health of America, there is no better investment. As a capital investment for cutting costs for Medicare and Medicaid, there is no better investment.

Last year, the Clinton administration proposed an increase of some \$300 million which was far under the mark. That was raised by Congress to \$2.3 billion and signed into law by the President.

This year, I think, noting the strong congressional support, the administration has proposed an increase of \$1 billion in NIH funding, but that, too, is short of the mark on meeting the objective of doubling NIH funding within a 5-year period.

I have sought recognition today to submit, with my distinguished colleague Senator HARKIN, an important resolution calling for increased funding

for the National Institutes of Health, to keep us on track to double NIH funding by 2002. Specifically, the resolution which we are offering today calls for the fiscal year 2001 Budget Resolution to include an additional \$2.7 billion in the health account, to be allocated for biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health.

As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, I have said many times that the National Institutes of Health is the crown jewel of the Federal Government—perhaps the only jewel of the Federal government. We all remain enthralled by the advances realized by the National Institutes of Health, which has spawned innumerable breakthroughs in our knowledge and treatment for diseases such as cancer, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, severe mental illnesses, diabetes, osteoporosis, heart disease, and many others. It is clear that a substantial investment in the NIH is crucial to allow the continuation of these advances into the next decade.

On May 21, 1997, the Senate passed a Sense of the Senate resolution submitted by our distinguished colleague, Senator MACK, which stated that funding for the National Institutes of Health should be doubled over five years. Regrettably, even though that resolution was passed by an overwhelming vote of 98 to nothing, when the budget resolution was considered on the Senate floor, the appropriate health account had a reduction of \$100 million. That led to the introduction of an amendment to the resolution by myself and Senator HARKIN. We sought to add in \$1.1 billion to carry out the expressed sense of the Senate. Our amendment, however, was defeated 63–37. We were extremely disappointed that while the Senate had expressed its druthers on a resolution, they were simply unwilling to put up the actual dollars to accomplish this vital goal.

The following year, during debate on the fiscal year 1999 Budget Resolution, Senator HARKIN and I again introduced an amendment which called for a \$2 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health, and which provided sufficient resources in the budget to accomplish this. While we gained more support on this vote than in the previous year, our amendment was again defeated, this time by a vote of 57–41. Not to be deterred, Senator HARKIN and I again went to work with our Subcommittee and we were able, by making economies and establishing priorities, to add an additional \$2 billion to the NIH account for fiscal year 1999, which at the time was the largest increase in history.

Most recently, for fiscal year 2000, Senator HARKIN and I again introduced an amendment to the Budget Resolution which would have added \$1.4 billion to the health accounts, over and above the \$600 million which had been already been provided by the Budget

Committee. Despite this amendment's defeat by a vote of 47–52, we were able to provide, through the maximization of our limited resources, a \$2.3 billion increase for fiscal year 2000—truly an historic accomplishment.

In 1981, when I was first elected to the Senate, NIH funding was less than \$3.6 billion; for fiscal year 2000, it is \$17.9 billion, a 95% inflation-adjusted increase. Through several years and several Subcommittee Chairs—Senator Weicker, Senator CHILES, Senator HARKIN, and myself—the budgets were always tight and frequently faced Administration-proposed cuts. Still, we managed to increase NIH funding tremendously. This resolution seeks to reiterate the intent of the Senate to double our investment in the National Institutes of Health: we must provide \$2.7 billion to stay on track to reach that goal. I believe that this goal can be achieved if we make the proper allocation of our resources.

Our investment has resulted in tremendous advances in medical research. A new generation of AIDS drugs are reducing the presence of the AIDS virus in HIV infected persons to nearly undetectable levels. Death rates from cancer have begun a steady decline. The human genome is on track to be 90 percent mapped by this spring, and fully sequenced by 2003. We are seeing the advent of a relatively new field of pharmacogenomics, which seeks to solve whether there is something about an individual's genetic instructions which prevent them from metabolizing a particular drug as intended. In essence, drugs may soon be designed to fit the patient's genetic makeup. I anxiously await the results of all of these avenues of remarkable research.

I, like millions of Americans, have benefitted tremendously from the investment we have made in the National Institutes of Health. But to continue that commitment takes actual dollars, not just the discussion of dollars. That is why we offer this resolution today—to call upon the Budget Committee to add \$2.7 billion to the health accounts so we can carry forward the important work of the National Institutes of Health.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS COVENANT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

MURKOWSKI (AND AKAKA) AMENDMENT NO. 2807

Mr. MURKOWSKI (for himself and Mr. AKAKA) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1052) to implement further the Act (Public Law 94-241) approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 29, lines 20–21, strike “regard to” and insert “counting against”.

On page 34, lines 7-8, strike "to be made available during the following fiscal year" and insert "that will not count against the numerical limitations".

On page 34, strike line 15 and all that follows through page 35, line 4.

On page 34, strike "(C)" and insert "(B)".

On page 35, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 36, line 18.

On page 36, strike "(E)" and insert "(C)".

On page 37, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 38, line 9.

On page 38, strike line 10 and all that follows through line 24.

On page 39, line 1, strike "(I)" and insert "(D)".

On page 40, line 6, strike "and reviewable".

On page 41, lines 3-6, strike "The determination as to whether a further extension is required shall not be reviewable."

On page 41, lines 20-21, strike "The decision by the Attorney General shall not be reviewable."

On page 42, lines 6-7, strike "The determination by the Attorney General shall not be reviewable."

On page 45, line 16, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 46, line 10.

On page 46, line 11, strike "(h)" and insert "(g)".

On page 46, line 20, strike "(i)" and insert "(h)".

On page 47, line 3, strike "(j)" and insert "(i)".

On page 47, line 9, strike "regard to" and insert "counting against".

On page 47, line 14, strike "(C) through (H)" and insert "(B) and (C)".

On page 48, line 5, strike "five-year" and insert "four-year".

On page 48, line 9, strike "5-year" and insert "four-year".

On page 48, line 18, strike "five years" and insert "four years".

On page 48, line 23 and all that follows through page 49, line 4.

On page 49, line 5, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)".

On page 49, line 10, strike "(4)" and insert "(3)".

On page 49, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following new subsection:

"(k) STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to count the issuance of any visa to an alien, or the grant of any admission of an alien, under this section toward any numerical limitation contained in the Immigration and Nationality Act."

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Small Business will hold a hearing entitled "The President's Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request for the Small Business Administration." The hearing will be held on Thursday, February 24, 2000, beginning at 9 a.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

INTEL'S TEACH TO THE FUTURE PROGRAM

• Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, I wanted to take a few minutes to talk about an exciting new project that was announced recently—Intel's "Teach to the Future" program. Intel has joined

forces with Microsoft and a number of other companies to train 100,000 of our elementary and secondary school teachers in how to use information technology to improve what our kids learn. Intel will invest \$100 million in this project and Microsoft will contribute more than \$300 million in software, its largest donation ever. Intel and its partners deserve to be strongly commended by the Senate and the Congress for their forward thinking efforts.

The goal of Intel's Teach to the Future Program is to train 100,000 American teachers in 1,000 days. This year Intel will make grants to 5 regional training agencies in Northern California, Oregon, Texas, and Arizona that will each train 100 Master Teachers in a 40-hour curriculum on effectively applying computer technology to improve student learning. This award-winning curriculum was developed over the last two years by the Institute for Computer Technology; over 80% of the teachers who've been trained by it felt that it enhanced their student's learning. These 500 Master Teachers will return to their school districts, embedding the expertise locally by training an additional 20 teachers. By the end of this year, 10,000 teachers will be trained. Next year, the program will expand to include my home state of New Mexico, along with Washington State, Massachusetts, Utah, Southern California, Washington, DC, and elsewhere in order to train 40,000 teachers. Finally, the program will again expand to train 50,000 teachers in 2002.

We have been working hard on the federal, state, and local levels to provide schools with computers, software and access to the Internet. I authored several programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1994 that have gone a long way toward these goals. Studies of the existing uses of technology in schools demonstrate, however, that these investments have not been optimized because teachers have not been adequately trained in its use—particularly its curriculum-based use. The availability of hardware is irrelevant if teachers are not properly trained, because it's teachers who teach, not technology.

Only 20% of today's teachers feel really prepared to use technology in the classroom. Given the dynamic nature of technology and the influx of new teachers we expect to enter the classroom in the next few years, it's easy to see how this problem could get worse if we don't focus on it. The average school spends less—often significantly less—than 1% of its technology funds on training. The Department of Education, the CEO Forum and other experts have determined that the appropriate investment should be closer to 30%.

In response to this need, I have worked closely with Senator Murray to secure funding for a pre-service technology training program in the education budget. As we approach reauthorization of the Elementary and Sec-

ondary Education Act, I also have made teacher training the centerpiece of my proposal for reauthorization of the Education Technology programs in ESEA—"S. 1604: the Technology for Teaching Act." Even with the continued commitment of companies like Intel, we must provide federal support and leadership for technology training for all teachers in all fifty states.

Intel's "Teach to the Future" project is an outstanding example of good corporate citizenship; one that should be instructive for politicians, educators, and corporations across the nation. Intel and its corporate partners clearly recognize that—just as information technology has revolutionized the workplace and the marketplace—it also promises to transform the schoolhouse. Perhaps, more importantly, however, these companies recognize that we must transform the schoolhouse in order to continue the economic revolution. We in Congress must support their efforts by increasing the federal commitment to educational technology and teacher training in this area.●

PRAISING FORD MOTOR COMPANY FOR COMPUTER DONATIONS TO EMPLOYEES

• Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today to praise Ford Motor Company's president and chief executive, Mr. Jacques Nasser, and Ford Motor Company's unprecedented gift of a home computer, color printer and unlimited access to the Internet to each and every one of Ford's 350,000 thousand employees worldwide.

Through this act, Ford Motor Company has shown that it has truly recognized the need to provide all Americans with computer and Internet access. Not a single Ford employee will be left out of Ford's initiative to provide its people with access to the Information Age. To its great credit, Ford has recognized that competing in today's high-tech global marketplace means doing everything possible to secure and train a skilled and informed workforce.

What is more, Mr. President, Ford has recognized that any company that wants to continue to succeed must see to it that everyone in its workforce, and not just a select few "specialists" be fully plugged in to the Information Age.

Mr. President, there is a growing digital divide in this country. Although over 40 percent of all households owned computers and one-quarter had Internet access by the end of 1998, figures show a disturbing and significant gap between two growing classes: the technical haves and the technical have-nots. This divide is defined by income and education levels, race and geographical location.

Household with incomes of \$75,000 and greater are more than twenty times more likely to have Internet access in the home than households in the lowest income levels. Wealthier