ensuring we move forward. Of course, I must pay special note of all the work done by Senators LIEBERMAN and FEINGOLD. I am proud not only to call them friends but partners in this crusade to return the Government to the people. I could be in no better company.

As I noted last night to all those who believe in reform, today is only the first step, but it is a great first step and it is, indeed, a great day for democracy and a Government that is accountable to the governed. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. President, I yield my remaining time to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has 25 seconds remaining.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Connecticut be allowed to speak for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Arizona whom I have come to call our commanding officer in the war for campaign finance reform. I am proud to serve under him.

In this long struggle to cleanse our campaign finance system, we are about to achieve a victory. In a campaign finance system that is wildly and dangerously out of control today, we are about to draw a line. We are about to establish some controls based on the best of America's national principles.

The campaign finance reform adopted after the Watergate scandal had two fundamental principles: that contributions to political campaigns be limited, and that they be fully disclosed.

These so-called 527 organizations totally violate and undermine both of those principles. Individuals, corporations, and associations can give unlimited amounts to 527 organizations, and those contributions are absolutely secret, unknown to the public. The contributors then audaciously enjoy a tax benefit for those contributions. Today, we say no more of that. Unfortunately, contributions will continue to be unlimited to 527 organizations, but at least now the public will know.

As Senator MCCAIN indicated, this is not the end of the effort to reform our campaign finance system. It is only the beginning, but it is a significant beginning. I urge my colleagues across the aisle to support it. I thank the Chair.

Mr. MCCAIN. 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, Shall the bill, H.R. 4762, pass? The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUNNING). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Leg.]

YEAS—92

Abraham	Edwards	Lugar
Akaka	Enzi	McCain
Allard	Feingold	Mikulski
Ashcroft	Feinstein	Moynihan
Baucus	Fitzgerald	Murkowski
Bayh	Frist	Murray
Bennett	Gorton	Reed
Biden	Graham	Reid
Bingaman	Gramm	Robb
Bond	Grams	Roberts
Boxer	Grassley	Rockefeller
Breaux	Hagel	Roth
Brownback	Harkin	Santorum
Bryan	Hatch	Sarbanes
Bunning	Hollings	Schumer
Burns	Hutchinson	Sessions
Byrd	Hutchison	Shelby
Campbell	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Chafee, L.	Johnson	Smith (OR)
Cleland	Kennedy	Snowe
Cochran	Kerrey	Specter
Collins	Kerry	Stevens
Conrad	Kohl	Thomas
Craig	Kyl	Thompson
Crapo	Landrieu	Thurmond
Daschle	Lautenberg	Torricelli
DeWine	Leahy	Voinovich
Dodd	Levin	Warner
Domenici	Lieberman	Wellstone
Dorgan	Lincoln	Wyden
Durbin	Lott	

NAYS—6

Coverdell	Inhofe	McConnell
Helms	Mack	Nickles

NOT VOTING—2

Gregg	Inouye

The bill (H.R. 4762) was passed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first, I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their persistence in negotiating a Section 527 disclosure bill that has passed both chambers of Congress. The overwhelming vote in both the House and Senate in support of H.R. 4762, a bill mirroring a successful amendment we made to the Defense Authorization bill several weeks ago, is an important step in fixing our broken campaign finance reform system.

Both parties have now acknowledged that some change in our campaign finance laws is warranted, the first such legislative consensus on this issue since technical changes were made in 1979 to the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1974.

A majority has agreed that Section 527 organizations need to both follow federal campaign law and to file tax returns. H.R. 4762, like our amendment to the Defense Authorization bill, requires Section 527s to disclose any contributors who give more than $200, and report any expenditures of more than $500. Unlike our original amendment, it requires a Section 527 organization that fails to disclose contributions and expenditures to the IRS to pay a penalty tax on the amounts it failed to disclose. The amendment we made to the Defense Authorization bill would have removed a Section 527's tax exempt status for the same violation. Although not as severe a penalty, I believe that this change in the House version of this legislation does reflect the spirit of the original Senate amendment.

Although disclosure is only part of the solution, the passage of H.R. 4762 ensures that the public understands what these committees are, who gives them their money, and how they spend that money to impact election outcomes. This law, once signed by the President, will close a major loophole and stop these stealth PACs from skirting campaign finance requirements, and I was pleased to vote in support of it. However, we still have much to do.

We cannot, and must not, rest with this vote today. Our campaign finance system still needs major overhaul if we are going to reduce the influence of almost unlimited amounts of campaign cash on our electoral system. Until a majority of our citizens believe again that our government is ''by and for'' the people, we cannot stop our battle to reform this process. We need to pass a ban on soft money, reduce skyrocketing campaign expectations, and return our electoral process to the people, where it belongs. The power in our country should rest with the vote, not with the purse.

—

THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 2001

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H.R. 4577, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Frist modified amendment No. 3654, to increase the amount appropriated for the Interagency Education Research Initiative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are now 7 minutes of debate prior to a vote on the Frist amendment, with 5 minutes under the control of Senator FRIST.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, my amendment fully funds the Department of Education's share of the Interagency Education Research Initiative, IERI, which is a collaborative joint research and development education effort between the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Quality education depends on quality research. We need to know the answers, if our goal is accountability and student achievement, on what works and what does not work. As we all know, advances in education, as in other fields, depend on knowing what works and what doesn't. If you look at our past investments in research in the field of education, pre-K through 12,

our efforts have been woefully inadequate in terms of dollars and in the quality of the research that has been produced in the past.

This is a joint collaborative effort, where we link three agencies together and demand accountability, credibility, good science, and the exactness of science in determining what works and what does not work. The primary objective of this joint program is to support the research and development and the wide dissemination of research-proven educational strategies that improve student achievement from pre-K all the way through 12 in the key areas of reading, mathematics, and science.

I urge my colleagues to support this very worthwhile investment in our children's education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Tennessee for this amendment. It is a worthwhile amendment. It is a relatively small sum of money. We are prepared to accept it, as we have accepted a number of amendments where the funds are not too high, and where we can offset it against administrative costs. I believe this one can be held in conference. I can't make an absolute commitment because we are going to have to balance this along with many others on the administrative cost line. But I think it is meritorious. We are trying to meet the leader's deadline of final passage by midafternoon, and in the interest of time and the value of the amendment, we are prepared to accept it.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 161 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Abraham	Byrd	Edwards
Akaka	Campbell	Enzi
Allard	Chafee, L.	Feingold
Ashcroft	Cleland	Feinstein
Baucus	Cochran	Fitzgerald
Bayh	Collins	Frist
Bennett	Conrad	Gorton
Biden	Coverdell	Graham
Bingaman	Craig	Gramm
Bond	Crapo	Grams
Boxer	Daschle	Grassley
Breaux	DeWine	Hagel
Brownback	Dodd	Harkin
Bryan	Domenici	Hatch
Bunning	Dorgan	Helms
Burns	Durbin	Hollings
Hutchinson	Lugar	Schumer
Hutchison	Mack	Sessions
Inhofe	McCain	Shelby
Jeffords	McConnell	Smith (NH)
Johnson	Mikulski	Smith (OR)
Kennedy	Moynihan	Snowe
Kerrey	Murkowski	Specter
Kerry	Murray	Stevens
Kohl	Nickles	Thomas
Kyl	Reed	Thompson
Landrieu	Reid	Thurmond
Lautenberg	Robb	Torricelli
Leahy	Roberts	Voinovich
Levin	Rockefeller	Warner
Lieberman	Roth	Wellstone
Lincoln	Santorum	Wyden
Lott	Sarbanes	

NOT VOTING—2

Gregg	Inouye

The amendment (No. 3654) was agreed to.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and 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 Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Helms amendment regarding school facilities be included in the amendment sequence following the Dorgan amendment.

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

The Senator from Iowa.

AMENDMENT NO. 3688

(Purpose: To prohibit health insurance companies from using genetic information to discriminate against enrollees, and to prohibit employers from using such information to discriminate in the workplace)

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 3688 and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN], for Mr. DASCHLE, for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. DODD, proposes an amendment numbered 3688.

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

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

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Amendments Submitted.'')

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, we just received the amendment. I am going to suggest the absence of a quorum for the moment so we can look at it. 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. SPECTER. 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. SPECTER. Mr. President, we have just had a discussion, and it may be that someone on our side of the aisle will want to offer a second-degree amendment. We are prepared, and have taken the quorum call off, on the assurance that that opportunity will be present.

I ask unanimous consent at this time there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided, and that at the end of 30 minutes someone on our side will have an opportunity, if he or she chooses, to offer a second-degree amendment.

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

The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, this week, we got our first glimpse of the first rough draft of the human genetic code.

The public-private partnership known as the Human Genome Project is the genetic equivalent of putting man on the moon.

By decoding our genetic makeup, researchers may soon discover how to cure and even prevent heart disease, cancer, birth defects, and other serious medical conditions.

We have every reason to be hopeful about this breakthrough. But we also have some reason to be concerned, because genetic information—used improperly—can also cause great harm.

Improvements in genetic testing can determine whether a person has an increased chance of developing breast cancer, or colon cancer, or some other serious illness—years before symptoms even appear.

In the right hands, that information could save your life. In the wrong hands, that same information could be used to deny you insurance, a mortgage, or even a job.

We need to make sure this new research—which has been funded largely by American taxpayers—is used to help America's families, not hurt them. That is the goal of this amendment.

Francis Collins probably knows more about the potential of genetic testing than anyone in the world. He is the head of the international research team that makes up the Human Genome Project.

Listen to what Dr. Collins said on Monday, the day the results of the first phase of the Human Genome Project were unveiled:

Genetic discrimination in insurance and the workplace is wrong and it ought to be prevented by effective federal legislation.

He added:

If we needed a wake-up call to say that it's time to do this, isn't today the wake-up call?

Dr. Collins is right. It would be an absolute travesty if a test that could save your life ends up costing you your job or your financial security.

Genetic discrimination isn't just a theoretical possibility. It isn't just something that might happen in the future. It is already happening—even without the information the human genome promises to uncover.

It is already happening to people like Terri Seargent.

Terri was a model employee who was moving up the corporate ladder—until

the day a test revealed that she carried a gene that might—here I emphasize ''might''—make her more susceptible to a potentially fatal pulmonary condition.

Before her employers saw those test results, they used to give Terri glowing job performance reviews. But after they saw the results, they asked her to resign. She did, because she had no choice, because genetic discrimination is not clearly prohibited—in the workplace, or anywhere else.

The solution is obvious. Dr. Collins is right. Our laws must keep pace with advances in science and technology. No one should suffer discrimination solely because of his or her genetic makeup.

Last year, the President signed an executive order outlawing genetic discrimination in the workplace for Federal employees. It is now time to expand these important protections to all Americans.

That is why I am offering, along with my colleagues—Senators KENNEDY, DODD, and HARKIN—the Genetic Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance and Employment Act as an amendment to this bill.

Our bill has three major components:

First, it forbids employers from discriminating in hiring, or in the terms and conditions of employment, on the basis of genetic information;

Second, it forbids health insurers from discriminating against individuals on the basis of genetic information; and

Third, it prevents the disclosure of genetic information to health insurers, health insurance data banks, employers, and anyone else who has no legitimate need for information of this kind.

Discrimination based on genetic factors is just as unacceptable as that based on race, national origin, religion, sex or disability. In each case, people are treated unfairly, not because of their inherent abilities but solely because of irrelevant characteristics.

Genetic discrimination, like other forms of discrimination, hurts us all. It hurts our economy by keeping talented people out of the workforce and diminishes us as a people. We cannot take one step forward in science but two steps back in civil rights.

And we will all pay the price in increased health care costs if we allow employers or insurers to use genetic information to discriminate. If fear of discrimination stops people from getting genetic tests, early diagnosis and preventative treatments, they may suffer much more serious and more expensive health problems in the long run. And we all have to pay for that, as well.

Finally, genetic discrimination undercuts the Human Genome Project's fundamental purpose of promoting public health. Investing resources in the Human Genome Project is justified by the benefits of identifying, preventing and developing effective treatments for disease. But if fear of discrimination deters people from genetic diagnosis, our understanding of the humane genome will be in vain.

A CNN/Time Poll released earlier this week, found that a full 80 percent of the respondents said genetic information should not be available to insurance companies.

And almost half of all Americans believe there will be negative consequences from the Human Genome Project. I think we ought to prove today that they are wrong.

Let us make sure that Americans are not afraid to take advantage of breakthroughs in genetic testing. Dramatic scientific advances should not have negative consequences for our health care.

We have an historic opportunity to preempt this problem. Today, Congress should expand the scope of its antidiscrimination laws to include a ban on genetic discrimination. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this important amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, earlier this week, as the leader has pointed out, scientists announced the completion of a task that once seemed unimaginable; and that is, the deciphering of the entire DNA sequence of the human genetic code. This amazing accomplishment is likely to affect the 21st century as profoundly as the invention of the computer or the splitting of the atom affected the 20th century. I believe that the 21st century will be the century of life sciences, and nothing makes that point more clearly than this momentous discovery. It will revolutionize medicine as we know it today.

Already, genetic tests can be used to identify and help those who are at risk for disease, and those who are already diagnosed. Scientists are using new knowledge gained from the genetic code to design better treatments for cancer, AIDS, depression, and many other conditions and diseases.

Tragically, the vast potential of genetic knowledge to improve health care will go unfulfilled it patients fear that information about their genetic characteristics will be used as the basis for job discrimination or other prejudices. To realize the unprecedented opportunities presented by these new discoveries, we must guarantee that private medical information remains private and that genetic information cannot be used for improper purposes.

I commend our leader, Senator DASCHLE, for offering this important amendment that would do just that. It would give the American people the protections against genetic discrimination they need and deserve.

The amendment would prohibit health insurers and employers from using predictive genetic information to discriminate in the health care system and the workplace. It would bar insurance companies from raising premiums or denying patients health care coverage based on the results of genetic tests, and prohibit insurers from requiring such tests as a condition of coverage. In the workplace, the amendment would outlaw the use of predictive genetic information for hiring, advancement, salary, or other workplace rights and privileges. And, because a right without a remedy is no right at all, this important measure would provide persons who have suffered genetic discrimination in either arena with the right to seek redress through legal action.

In too many cases, the hopeful promise of genetic discoveries is squandered, because patients rightly fear that information about their genes will be used against them in the workplace or the health system. That fear is clearly well-founded. Today, employers and insurers can and do use this information to deny health coverage, refuse a promotion, or reject a job applicant—all in the absence of any symptoms of disease.

Although many genetic discoveries and technologies are new, the problems they raise with respect to discrimination in insurance and in employment have been with us for decades.

It was clear in 1973 that new developments in genetics had the potential for enormous good, as well as significant harm. That's why I worked with the scientific community to bring together legal scholars, medical professionals, and scientists at the Asilomar Conference Center to assess the risks and benefits of genetics. That conference formed the basis for laws and established procedures for the use of genetic technology that helped create today's thriving biotechnology industry.

It was clear in 1993 and 1996 that genetic tests and information had the potential not only to help patients, but also to harm them. That's why we included protections against genetic discrimination in the Health Security Act of 1993 and the Kassebaum-Kennedy Act of 1996. While the Health Security Act did not become law, Kassebaum-Kennedy did. Its protections were an important step forward, but were far from complete. Insurers can still use genetic information to outright deny coverage or charge outrageous rates to individuals who are currently healthy, but may have a genetic pre-disposition to a particular disease or condition.

And, with this week's announcement, it is more clear than ever before that in the year 2000 the American people need strong federal laws to protect them against the malicious misuse of genetic data. The century may have changed, but the problem of discrimination hasn't—and neither has my commitment to protect the American people from discrimination in all its ugly forms. Discrimination is discrimination whether it's done at the ballot box, on a job application, or in the office of an insurance underwriter who denies an otherwise healthy patient

the health care they need based solely on the result of a genetic test or medical history of a family member.

This is the same form of discrimination that would be evident on the question of race. Individuals have virtually no kind of control over their genetic makeup. What we are saying now is, without these kinds of protections, it will be permissible for insurance companies or for employers to say: I am not going to hire that person because of the genetic makeup they have, because it may mean they are going to get sicker over time and cost me in the workplace. Therefore, I am going to deny that person. On the other hand, it will require workers to take the test as a condition for employment. And then if they find that their genetic makeup demonstrates some kind of proclivity to acquire this kind of disease, they won't hire them. That is what is happening. They are going to find out that the workers are not going to take the test, which is increasingly the case, because they don't want to risk not being hired in a particular employment situation.

What happens is, they put themselves at greater risk of getting the disease because they deny themselves all the preventive health care that could keep them healthy and avoid getting sick and being more useful and valuable citizens in the community.

Fear of genetic discrimination causes patients to go without needed medical tests. The Journal of the American Medical Association reported that 57 percent of women at risk for breast or ovarian cancer had refused to take a genetic test that could have identified their risk for cancer and assisted them in receiving medical treatment to prevent the onset of these diseases because they feared reprisals for doing so.

As the potential for discrimination increases, more and more Americans are becoming concerned about the danger that employers and insurers will misuse and abuse genetic information. Just this week, in the aftermath of the historic completion of the genome sequencing project, a new CNN-Time magazine survey found that 46 percent of Americans believe that sequencing the genome would have harmful results.

Surely, using genetic information as a basis for discrimination would be one of the most harmful consequences of this remarkable scientific accomplishment. Experts in genetics are virtually unanimous in calling for strong protections to prevent such a misuse of science. Secretary Shalala's advisory panel on genetic testing—consisting of experts in the fields of law, science, medicine, and business—has recommended unambiguously that ''Federal legislation should be enacted to prohibit discrimination in employment and health insurance based on genetic information.''

Dr. Craig Venter, the president of the company that led the privately-financed genome sequencing effort, has testified before the Joint Economic Committee that genetic discrimination is ''the biggest barrier against having a real medical revolution based on this tremendous new scientific information.''

Without strong protections, the health and welfare of large numbers of our fellow citizens will be unfairly at risk. Last week, I was proud to stand with Terri Seargeant, a woman who carries a genetic trait that can—if untreated—lead to a lung disease often called ''Alpha-1 deficiency.'' Let me emphasize that this trait only carries the potential to develop the lung disease. If persons at risk for the disorder take a simple genetic test and are appropriately treated, they can prevent development of the disease.

Terri Seargent is such a person. She received a genetic test that revealed her risk for this disease, and took the preventive measures needed to avoid the onset of symptoms. She worked hard at her job and received consistently positive performance reviews and salary increases. Nonetheless, her employer—who had access to her medical files and the records of her genetic tests—decided to terminate this hard-working, healthy employee. What are we to conclude except that she had been fired on the basis of her genetic potential for disease?

And for every Terri Seargent, who has suffered actual discrimination, there are millions of men and women across the nation who are either at risk of genetic discrimination or fear getting tested because of possible reprisals in the workplace or health system.

National Human Genome Research Institute, ''Already, with but a handful of genetic tests in common use, people have lost their jobs, lost their health insurance, and lost their economic well being because of the misuse of genetic information.''

Make no mistake: The potential for genetic discrimination is growing. Already DNA ''chips'' are available that can determine a person's genetic traits in only a few minutes. In the near future, genetic tests will become even cheaper and more widely available than they re today. If we do not pass legislation to ban genetic discrimination, it may become commonplace for an employer to require such tests, and to use the results of these tests to decide which employees to hire or promote and which to deny such advancement, based in whole or in part on their perceived risk for disease.

Even now, some employers require information about a person's genetic inheritance as a condition of employment or part of the job application process. A recent American Management Association survey of more than 2,000 companies showed that more than 18 percent of companies require genetic tests or family medical history data from employees or job applicants. According to the same survey, more than 26 percent of the companies that require this information use it in hiring decisions.

President Clinton recognized the need for employees to be protected from the dangers of genetic discrimination. In an action of great vision and wisdom, President Clinton signed an Executive order on February 8 of this year to ban any use of predictive genetic information as a basis for hiring, firing, promotion or any other condition of employment in the federal workplace. With the stroke of a pen, the President instituted for federal workers the types of protections that this amendment would provide for all workers and all patients.

Our amendment is strongly supported by leading patient groups, medical professional societies, and scientists. The need for these kinds of protections has been clearly and repeatedly endorsed by the two leaders of the genome sequencing project and by experts in law, medicine, and science. A host of editorial boards have written in favor of congressional action to protect people in this area.

In many respects, people's genetic composition is essentially a blueprint of their medical past and a crystal ball of the possibilities for their medical future. It is difficult to imagine more personal and more private information. This powerful information should be shared between patients and their doctors—not their employer and their coworkers.

The threat of genetic discrimination faces every American, because every American carries unique genetic characteristics that indicate risk of disease. This is not about Terri Seargent. This is about each and every one of us, and everyone we know.

The vote cast today in this Chamber will help determine whether the secrets of our DNA will be used for beneficial or for harmful purposes. Congress should give the American people the strong and comprehensive protection from genetic discrimination that they need and deserve. I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I understand, it is the purpose of the Senator from Pennsylvania now to send a second-degree amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, has time expired for the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, we have asked people on our side who have worked on this in the HELP Committee to come over. We believe this amendment addresses important considerations and the objectives are very valid: to stop discrimination in employment and in health coverage.

What we would like to do is have an opportunity to propose a second-degree amendment and then to arrange an orderly debate and have the votes. That

is going to take a few minutes for us to accomplish. In the interim, it is our hope that we can move along and get a short time agreement on the Ashcroft amendment, to present that and conclude it. By that time, our people will be in a position to present the second-degree amendment. We can figure out a time agreement and move ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania is absolutely right. We need to move on with this issue. However, there are a number of people who have come to the floor. We believe it is appropriate they be allowed to complete their statements. It may take a little bit of time. Senator DASCHLE has agreed at the appropriate time to move on this and to go to something else. But Senator KENNEDY would like to finish his statement. There are others who want to speak on this issue. We would like to stay on this issue for a while.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, might I inquire of the Senator from Nevada how long he would like to stay on it—for 15 more minutes?

Mr. REID. I think it will take a little more time than that.

Mr. KENNEDY. I could just take 2 more minutes to conclude.

Mr. REID. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. SPECTER. What I would like to do would be to establish a parameter. This is the kind of subject which we could usefully debate for several days. I would like to see what our amendment is on this side. We can compare them. Then we are in a position to have a discussion as to how long we ought to spend. If we are to finish this bill this afternoon or even today, we are going to have to move through this amendment. We have other complicated amendments coming up.

Mr. REID. That is very appropriate. The Senator from Massachusetts desires another 5 minutes; the Senator from Connecticut, 15 minutes; the Senator from North Dakota, 10 minutes. Senator HARKIN also wishes to speak.

Mr. SPECTER. We just had an offer of 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. Senator KENNEDY, 5; the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. SPECTER. Did my colleague say 5 for Senator DORGAN?

Mr. REID. Senator DORGAN wishes 7 minutes.

Mr. SPECTER. So we have a total of 22 minutes—10, 7, and 5.

Mr. REID. Yes, with the understanding that we will come back for further debate on this issue at a subsequent time.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be an additional 22 minutes, at which point we will return to the Ashcroft amendment. After that, we will present a second-degree amendment and work through the time sequence.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as I understand it, CBO says the cost impact of this proposal on business is negligible but a destructive impact on individuals and society of the failure to act will be immense.

On the part of this proposal that deals with employment, without this kind of amendment, those who have been responsible for the breakthrough in terms of the sequencing of the gene understand very well, and have stated repeatedly, we are going to have a new form of discrimination in employment. We want to avoid that. Two, from a health point of view, if people don't believe they are going to be secure either in employment or in getting health insurance, they are not going to take the tests and they are going to, therefore, deny themselves the kind of treatment that is going to be available to them in order to remain healthy. So we ought to take these steps that this amendment includes; it is essential.

We already know from what is happening today that a number of people aren't taking these genetic tests because they fear genetic discrimination. This is one of the most important health issues we are going to face in this century. It has been identified by those on the cutting edge of progress in terms of the sequencing of the gene. We should take their advice and counsel and accept the Daschle amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to address this amendment, but first I want to speak to another issue. I know people are meeting on the conference report on the emergency supplemental. One of the provisions being considered is whether to add the Nethercutt language in the House supplemental.

I care deeply about a lot of provisions in the supplemental, including the Colombian aid package, but I want to let my colleagues know I will use whatever parliamentary procedure is available to me if that language comes over on the emergency supplemental. I know we all want to get out of here in the next few days. I care about the bill, but I also care about that language. I think it is wrong for it to be included in the bill. I want people to know I am serious about this. I will use whatever procedures are available to me when it comes to the supplemental if the Nethercutt language is included. I am going to meet with members of the conference shortly and express that view there as well.

I strongly support what Senator DASCHLE is proposing in his amendment on genetic discrimination. The world received wonderful news this past week that the genetic code had been deciphered. This discovery is breathtaking in scope, and I suspect over the next 50 years we are going to see it change the nature of medicine in this country. So it is really a remarkable occurrence, one that has been heralded, and properly so, for giving us the ability to understand ourselves better. I applaud the remarkable work done by the NIH and Celera.

Why is it important to offer this amendment today in the context of this bill? As we have seen with all the advances in technology, generally—and it has been a remarkable decade in that sense, with the Internet and communications technology—there is a great unease in the country about how much information people have about us as individuals.

We pride ourselves, I suppose, on the notion that we protect privacy in this country. It goes back to the founding days of our Republic. The right of privacy is as deeply rooted in the American conscience as almost any other principle I can think of. Yet, there is this uneasy sense that with the explosion of technology, too many people have too much information about us that they ought not to have—at least without our permission. The idea that people can peer into our financial records and our medicine cabinets and that information can be disseminated to broad audiences, violating our sense of privacy, is of great concern. And the genome breakthrough raises similar issues.

Let me share with you one anecdote. Last year I visited Yale University to hear about some of the genetics research that is being conducted there. One of the studies is attempting to determine the likelihood of certain women developing breast cancer by studying twin girls. They are getting to the point where they can determine almost at the birth, the possibility of individuals contracting breast cancer as adults. It is incredible information to have. Imagine parents of a newborn baby knowing, because of the genetic makeup of that child, that the baby has a possibility of contracting breast cancer. All of a sudden, diets change and lifestyles change. Prevention measures can be taken. These are the kinds of things the deciphering of the genome is going to be able to do for us.

It is wonderful to be able to have that kind of information. But imagine just that the information Yale Medical School is uncovering becomes available, as that child gets older, to an employer or to an insurance company—not information that the person has contracted the disease—but just that they might possibly do so. Just that predisposition for a certain illnesses can have a devastating impact on whether than individual gets insurance or keeps their job.

This amendment says that when it comes to that information—the propensity for acquiring these problems—we ought to be able to protect people in their jobs and in their ability to receive or get health insurance.

This need not be a partisan issue. Senator DOMENICI and I, 3 years ago, introduced legislation similar to this bill. We thought it was critical to bring

up and address both insurance and employment discrimination. Two years ago, many colleagues joined our colleague from Maine, Senator SNOWE, who also offered strong legislation protecting patients from genetic discrimination in insurance. We have an opportunity today, with the breakthroughs announced on Monday of this week, to really say as a body—Republicans and Democrats across the board—this is an area where we are going to, early on, establish some ground rules when it comes to the use of genetic information.

I see that time has expired in terms of my few minutes.

I want our colleagues to know how important this amendment is, and I urge them to support it when the vote occurs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, am I to be recognized for 7 minutes? Is that the order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I had intended to speak about this amendment. But I am compelled to speak about the point that the Senator from Connecticut discussed at the start of his comments because it is so important, and it is timely.

At this moment, I understand there are meetings going on right now somewhere in this building by a small group of people who are dealing with a piece of legislation that was cobbled together around 3 o'clock in the morning a couple of days ago dealing with the issue of imposing sanctions on food and medicine around the world, and whether that will be added to the supplemental bill that will be considered perhaps later today or tomorrow. If that is added, in my judgment, it is going to cause significant trouble.

Here is why: The House leaders have done what I am reminded of as the ''Moon walk''. You know the Moon walk Michael Jackson used to do. It looked like he was walking forward, but he was actually going backward. That is what they have done with respect to this issue of sanctions.

Senator DODD from Connecticut, myself, and others are saying we ought to end the use of sanctions on food and medicine anywhere in the world where it exists. This country has imposed sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine. It is wrong. When we take aim at dictators, we hit poor people and hungry people and sick people. It is not the best of what America stands for.

We ought to end all sanctions on food and medicine. Yet what was done in the House of Representatives 2 days ago, in my judgment, comes up far short. In fact, in some areas, it loses ground.

I want to point out an article in the Washington Post. I will come later with the legislation itself. But the Washington Post describes this legislator from Florida who opposes eliminating sanctions. She said the agreement will make it as difficult as possible for such sales to take place with respect to Cuba. Why? Because they prohibit private financing of the sale of food to Cuba. What is that about? It has nothing to do with good or common sense. They are not trying to get rid of sanctions. It has everything to do with the irrational notion about Cuba, and that if we can somehow restrict the food and medicine going to Cuba, we will enhance America's foreign policy. It is crazy. It doesn't make any sense at all.

Here is where we have sanctions: Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, and Sudan. These countries are countries that our Government has decided are not behaving properly. I support slapping them with economic sanctions. I do not support including food and medicine in those sanctions.

I do not support using food as a weapon. We are trying very hard to get rid of this practice of using food as a weapon. Seventy Senators voted last year to stop using food as a weapon.

We have a provision in the Senate agriculture appropriations committee bill that will come to the floor of the Senate within several weeks that includes an approach that will eliminate the use of food and medicine as part of our sanctions.

I think we ought not give up here. We ought to fight on behalf of our family farmers and others to say that we want to abolish the use of sanctions that include food and medicine.

The proposition that was cobbled together over in the House at 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock in the morning by some people who really do not want to do this, have made it seem as if they have made progress in this area. But, in fact, they have lost ground in a couple of cases, and especially with respect to Cuba in a couple of other circumstances. There will be no U.S. sales of food to Cuba. Canadian farmers can sell to Cuba. European farmers can sell to Cuba. Venezuelan farmers can sell to Cuba.

Seventy Members of the Senate said we ought to get rid of sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine—yes, to all countries, including Cuba. But now we have cobbled together a deal sometime early in the morning by a group of people who are going to apparently put it on a supplemental bill so we will have a circumstance where we don't solve this problem. The proposal that fails to solve this problem was not debated in the House. It was not debated in the Senate. But it was concocted at 3 a.m. in the morning and apparently was stuck on a supplemental appropriations bill. It is the wrong way to do it.

I just talked to a farm group that supports this. When I asked them a question about it, they admitted they had not read the language. They read the paper, I guess. The implication was that I was impeding the efforts to remove sanctions.

Another major farm group has just come out in opposition to it, saying this doesn't solve the problem; let's fight to solve the problem. The problem is that we include medicine and food as part of our sanctions.

The solution is that this country should not include food and medicine in sanctions that we impose on these countries. We should not use food as a weapon.

It is a very simple proposition. Seventy Senators have already weighed in in the Senate saying let's stop it. If they would allow a vote in the House, they would get 70 percent in the House of Representatives as well.

I hope we will not decide to cave in on this issue. Let's not make the perfect the enemy of the good. But let us at least continue to fight. We have some more months in this legislative session. We have a provision coming to the floor of the Senate in about 3 weeks that includes a real effort to stop using food and medicine as part of our sanctions. Let's fight for that. Let's not let a couple of people who run the other body decide for us at 3 a.m. in the morning what we were going to do in this circumstance.

Let's stand up and fight for family farmers, and let's fight for the moral principles that this country ought to hold dear. We should not use food and medicine as a weapon any longer. This is not about Republicans and Democrats.

Both administrations in recent years have used this approach, and they were wrong.

The Senate was right last year with 70 votes that said let us stop it.

And what was put together over in the House is now billed as some sort of a compromise. It is not a compromise at all. It falls far short of what we ought to expect. Those of us who are clearheaded enough believe we should not use food and medicine as part of economic sanctions in this country.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. DORGAN. Yes.

Mr. DODD. I urge people to read the bill. Unfortunately, a lot of people do not read the legislation. But if you read this legislation, section 808 imposes a prohibition on financing U.S. assistance. One part of this says no more sanctions. Then it says no more sanctions, except—''Notwithstanding any of the provisions of this law, the export of agricultural commodities, medicine, and medical devices to the government of a country''—as of June 1, 2000.

These are the countries that have been termed by the Secretary of State to be ''terrorist states.'' Those are the very countries. The only countries that we have sanctions against are those countries. The very countries we say we have sanctions against are these countries. If you are on the list on June 1, 2000, none of this law applies.

Second, it says on financial assistance that you can't have any Government support for Libya, Iran, North

Korea, and Sudan. And then, on private financing, it says no financing on the part of the U.S. Government, any State or local government, private person, or entity—including, I suspect, even foreign financing.

This says if sanctions are coming off, then we eliminate all means of financing it—both public and private—and we continue with the same list that was in effect June 1, 2000, which lists only countries on whom we have unilateral sanctions.

This is a bill that needs more work. The Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee bill is vastly superior to this. It is a bipartisan bill that colleagues cosponsored, and it deserves the consideration of this body.

For those reasons, I will strenuously object to the sanctions being included as part of a supplemental.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the Daschle amendment to prohibit genetic discrimination in employment. I commend the Senator for his leadership in this area, and I thank him for bringing this amendment to the floor.

The issue of genetic discrimination is a timely debate in light of the recent announcement that science has conquered the genetic code. This is a major milestone that brings us closer to finding cure for cancer, heart disease, diabetes, Parkinsons, M.S., and a whole host of other tragic diseases.

The science is moving ahead rapidly, and our standards for the use of that science must not lag behind. We must ensure that genetic information is not used in discriminatory ways. If we do not take a stand prohibiting discrimination based on one's genetic make up, we could jeopardize the benefits offered by science. We must ensure that our genetic finger print is used only for good, and not as a tool to discriminate.

I've talked to many women in my state who are concerned about breast cancer. They know they should undergo genetic testing to find out if they are predisposed to breast cancer, but they don't. They avoid getting tested because they are afraid that the results could be used against them and could adversely affect their employment or insurance coverage.

They are concerned that if they use the science, it will be used against them. Enacting a tough federal ban on genetic discrimination will give these women, along with thousands of other people across the country, the peace of mind that they can take advantage of the latest tools of medicine without being taken advantage of in the process.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment now. We have made a significant investment in genetic research. Let's make sure that we all benefit from this investment. If we act now, we will ensure this information is used to treat patients and not to penalize them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Missouri, Mr. ASHCROFT, is recognized to offer an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 3689

(Purpose: To protect Social Security and Medicare surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), for himself and Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. GRAMS, and Mr. ABRAHAM, proposes an amendment numbered 3689.

Mr. ASHCROFT. 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, insert the following:

On page ___, after line ___, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SAFE DEPOSIT BOX ACT OF 2000.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 2000''.

(b) PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SURPLUSES.—

(1) MEDICARE SURPLUSES OFF-BUDGET.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the net surplus of any trust fund for part A of Medicare shall not be counted as a net surplus for purposes of—

(A) the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President;

(B) the congressional budget; or

(C) the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(2) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SURPLUSES.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SURPLUSES.—

''(1) CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, that would set forth an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

''(2) SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

''(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported;

''(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

''(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report,

would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

''(3) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'on-budget deficit', when applied to a fiscal year, means the deficit in the budget as set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301(a)(3) for that fiscal year.''.

(3) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—

(A) POINT OF ORDER.—Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(g),'' after ''310(d)(2),''.

(B) WAIVER.—Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(g),'' after ''310(d)(2),''.

(c) PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SURPLUSES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of subtitle II of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding before section 1101 the following:

''§ 1100. Protection of social security and medicare surpluses

''The budget of the United States Government submitted by the President under this chapter shall not recommend an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year covered by that budget.''.

(2) CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—The chapter analysis for chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item for section 1101 the following:

''1100. Protection of social security and medicare surpluses.''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect upon the date of its enactment and the amendments made by this section shall apply to fiscal year 2001 and subsequent fiscal years.

AMENDMENT NO. 3690

(Purpose: To establish an off-budget lockbox to strengthen Social Security and Medicare)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), for Mr. CONRAD and Mr. LAUTENBERG, proposes an amendment numbered 3690.

Mr. REID. 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:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

TITLE ___—SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE OFF-BUDGET LOCKBOX ACT OF 2000

SEC. ___1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Social Security and Medicare Off-Budget Lockbox Act of 2000''.

SEC. ___2. STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY POINTS OF ORDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 643) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''(g) STRENGTHENING SOCIAL SECURITY POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget (or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon) or any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would violate or amend section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.''.

(b) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(g),'' after ''310(d)(2),''.

(2) WAIVER.—Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(g),'' after ''310(d)(2),''.

(c) ENFORCEMENT IN EACH FISCAL YEAR.—The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended in—

(1) section 301(a)(7) (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(7)), by striking ''for the fiscal year'' through the period and inserting ''for each fiscal year covered by the resolution''; and

(2) section 311(a)(3) (2 U.S.C. 642(a)(3)), by striking beginning with ''for the first fiscal year'' through the period and insert the following: ''for any of the fiscal years covered by the concurrent resolution.''.

SEC. ___3. MEDICARE TRUST FUND OFF-BUDGET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) GENERAL EXCLUSION FROM ALL BUDGETS.—Title III of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''EXCLUSION OF MEDICARE TRUST FUND FROM ALL BUDGETS

''SEC. 316. (a) EXCLUSION OF MEDICARE TRUST FUND FROM ALL BUDGETS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the receipts and disbursements of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund shall not be counted as new budget authority, outlays, receipts, or deficit or surplus for purposes of—

''(1) the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President;

''(2) the congressional budget; or

''(3) the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

''(b) STRENGTHENING MEDICARE POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider a concurrent resolution on the budget (or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon) or any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would violate or amend this section.''.

(2) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—

(A) POINT OF ORDER.—Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''316,'' after ''313,''.

(B) WAIVER.—Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''316,'' after ''313,''.

(b) EXCLUSION OF MEDICARE TRUST FUND FROM CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET.—Section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The concurrent resolution shall not include the outlays and revenue totals of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund in the surplus or deficit totals required by this subsection or in any other surplus or deficit totals required by this title.''

(c) BUDGET TOTALS.—Section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) For purposes of Senate enforcement under this title, revenues and outlays of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for each fiscal year covered by the budget resolution.''.

(d) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS.—Section 301(i) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(i)) is amended by—

(1) striking ''SOCIAL SECURITY POINT OF ORDER.—It shall'' and inserting ''SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE POINTS OF ORDER.—

''(1) SOCIAL SECURITY.—It shall''; and

(2) inserting at the end the following:

''(2) MEDICARE.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget (or amendment, motion, or conference report on the resolution) that would decrease the excess of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund revenues over Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund outlays in any of the fiscal years covered by the concurrent resolution. This paragraph shall not apply to amounts to be expended from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for purposes relating to programs within part A of Medicare as provided in law on the date of enactment of this paragraph.''.

(e) MEDICARE FIREWALL.—Section 311(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642(a)) is amended by adding after paragraph (3), the following:

''(4) ENFORCEMENT OF MEDICARE LEVELS IN THE SENATE.—After a concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would cause a decrease in surpluses or an increase in deficits of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund in any year relative to the levels set forth in the applicable resolution. This paragraph shall not apply to amounts to be expended from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for purposes relating to programs within part A of Medicare as provided in law on the date of enactment of this paragraph.''.

(f) BASELINE TO EXCLUDE HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—Section 257(b)(3) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by striking ''shall be included in all'' and inserting ''shall not be included in any''.

(g) MEDICARE TRUST FUND EXEMPT FROM SEQUESTERS.—Section 255(g)(1)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Medicare as funded through the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.''.

(h) BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND.—Section 710(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 911(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' the second place it appears and inserting a comma; and

(2) by inserting after ''Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund'' the following: '', Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund''.

SEC. ___4. PREVENTING ON-BUDGET DEFICITS.

(a) POINTS OF ORDER TO PREVENT ON-BUDGET DEFICITS.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 643) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) POINTS OF ORDER TO PREVENT ON-BUDGET DEFICITS.—

''(1) CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, that would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

''(2) SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION.—Except as provided by paragraph (3), it shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

''(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported;

''(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

''(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report,

would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.''.

(b) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(h),'' after ''312(g),''.

(2) WAIVER.—Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting ''312(h),'' after ''312(g),''.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3689 AND 3690

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I want to address the amendment which I sent to the desk because for decades, in a business-as-usual context, Washington has constantly invaded various trust funds to spend for a variety of purposes and programs. One of those trust funds was the Social Security trust fund. We spent a lot of time and energy finding a way to protect the Social Security trust fund.

Having developed at least a budget rule to protect the Social Security trust fund, I think it is important for us to look to the protection of other trust funds that are important to the well-being of the people of this country and to protect them as well.

One of the other trust funds which remarkably has been invaded over and over and over again as a source for spending money for a variety of Government programs has been the Medicare trust fund. For over 30 years, working people have been contributing to the country's welfare by paying the taxes they owe, paying their debts, saving for the future. Those values were rejected inside the beltway when we went into the trust funds in order to meet our spending desires.

Washington tried to impose its own rules and values on the rest of the country. These misdirected rules—spending beyond our means, making promises we did not keep, misleading the American people about how their money is being spent—for too long these rules were allowed to continue. We have taken some very strong steps in the right direction.

Last year, this Congress took the first step toward stopping this raid on the Social Security trust fund by enacting the Social Security lockbox rule on the budget resolution. That creates a point of order against any budget for spending money out of what would be called the Social Security surplus. The Social Security surplus is pretty easy to understand. It is defined in our accounting as the amount of money that comes into Social Security because of Social Security taxes that aren't required in that year to meet the obligations in that year of Social Security.

Obviously, because we have a lot of young people working now, we have far more money coming in than we have going out with the relatively small group of older Americans consuming. In the years ahead, though, when this bulge of young people now contributing to the fund become consumers of the fund, we will need a lot of the money they are sending in. That money they are sending in is called the Social Security surplus. For years we spent that. I worked very hard to stop that spending. I worked to get included in the budget resolution a measure that would make it out of order for the Congress to spend money on other things that was sent in by taxpayers for Social Security purposes. That is the protection of the Social Security surplus.

In addition, last year Senator DOMENICI, Senator ABRAHAM, and I tried several times to enact a law, not just a budget rule which we did get put in place, but a law which would protect Social Security proceeds as a statutory measure. Obviously, the President would have to sign it for it to become a law. The President said he wanted a Social Security lockbox, but, unfortunately, despite all the words of support for saving the Social Security surplus and locking away the surplus, the Senate was unable to end the filibuster by Members of the Senate who opposed us and their President on the issue.

Despite that opposition, Congress was able to change how business in Washington was done on the Social Security surplus. We are far better off as a result.

Last year, for the first time since 1957, not one penny of the Social Security surplus was spent. Again this year, we passed a budget resolution that will not touch the off-budget or Social Security surplus, the Social Security trust fund. It will also provide tax relief for married couples and dedicate over $40 billion over the next 5 years to provide prescription drug coverage for needy, older Americans who receive Medicare.

When I saw what we accomplished last year, I knew we could, as well, protect Part A of the Medicare surplus. Part A of Medicare is the only Medicare provision of which there is a trust fund. It is not funded out of the general revenue. It is something people pay specifically their taxes for, with an anticipation that those resources will be available.

On November 18 of last year, I introduced S. 1962, the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act. I did this because Social Security is not the only trust fund that has been raised over the recent years, over decades. Over the next 5 years, taxpayers will pay in an estimated $179 billion more into the Medicare Part A trust fund than will be required to sustain the purpose of that trust fund, which is patient hospital care in Medicare.

The amendment I offer today will add the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act to this pending bill. The Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act takes the Medicare Part A trust fund off budget and creates a permanent 60-vote point of order in the Senate and a majority point of order in the House against any budget resolution or subsequent bill that uses Medicare Part A or Social Security surpluses to finance on-budget deficits. This amendment protects the Medicare Part A surplus in the same way we protect the Social Security surplus. It says that Congress and the President cannot consider the Medicare surplus as part of the on-budget surplus. They can't look to this fund for ordinary spending. Therefore, Congress and the President should be unable to spend the Medicare surplus for additional spending or for additional tax cuts.

This lockbox protects the Medicare trust fund from the raids of the past. This is a historic time. I hope this will be a historic day. In this, an election year, we have an unusual bipartisan opportunity to support this measure. It is not surprising that this is the right policy. It is the right thing to do. The House of Representatives has already taken this step to protect the Medicare trust fund from invasion of spending for other Government programs. Last week, the House passed their version, a little different version, of the Medicare lockbox legislation, by a vote of 420–2. The House bill was offered by Representative Wally Herger and opposed by only two House Members.

Now, there are a lot of Members of this body who will want to protect, I believe, the Medicare trust fund sustaining the capacity of our Government to provide the hospitalization we have promised to individuals who are eligible for Medicare. I am pleased there are Members of this body who join me in cosponsoring this amendment, one of whom is Senator ABRAHAM from Michigan. He has been active in the lockbox movement to protect Social Security, to make sure that Social Security is not invaded for other spending, and much of the success we have had in protecting every dime of Social Security in the trust fund this year should flow to Senator ABRAHAM of Michigan. I am pleased he has endorsed this and is a cosponsor of this measure with me in the Senate.

It is just not several Senators who endorse this. Both the Vice President and the President of the United States have endorsed enactment of a Medicare lockbox such as the one I introduced last November. Earlier this month Vice President GORE announced his support for this kind of proposal. On June 13, GORE announced he would ''place Medicare in a lockbox so its surpluses could only be used to pay down the national debt and to strengthen Medicare, not for pork barrel spending or tax cuts.''

I am pleased that the Vice President has endorsed this Medicare lockbox. I welcome that support. Obviously, when he says ''so its surpluses,'' he is referring to the kind of thing we are talking about—dedicated tax resources designed to support the program that are in excess of the needs of the program in any current year.

As we have already recounted this morning, there are 175 billion of anticipated such surplus that would be directed toward the Medicare trust fund for Medicare Part A, which is the only Medicare trust fund we have. I am pleased he would endorse this concept. I think it is a concept that is bipartisan that deserves our support.

Two days ago, the President of the United States called for protecting Medicare Part A surpluses through a lockbox. Allow me to quote from the President's announcement. This is from a text provided by the administration:

> President Clinton is proposing to take Medicare off budget. This would mean that, like the Social Security surplus, the projected $403 billion Medicare surplus would not count toward on-budget surplus and therefore could no longer be diverted for other purposes. Taking the Medicare surplus off-budget would ensure that Medicare is protected for paying down the debt to help strengthen the life of the Medicare Program.

So the President has recognized there are funds specifically paid in, and that they are in surplus of what is needed immediately to be paid out. He has indicated that for those surpluses, we should be safeguarding them with a Medicare lockbox.

Let me quote further from the White House release, because I believe the President has described the Medicare lockbox proposal in my amendment, which I proposed last November, in a very simple, understandable manner:

What taking Medicare off budget means, the administration, speaking of itself says, is:

> The Administration projects that if current policies are continued, Medicare Part A, which covers hospital expenses, will run a surplus of $403 billion from [the year] 2001 through [the year] 2010. This surplus is the excess of Medicare income, principally from the 2.9 percent payroll tax, combined employer and employee, over benefit payments and administrative costs. The Medicare surplus has grown from $4 billion in 1993 to $24 billion in the year 2000.

I am still quoting the President and the statement of the White House here:

> Under previous budget accounting conventions, this Medicare surplus was treated as part of the total on-budget surplus and was thus available for new spending on other programs or tax cuts.
>
> By taking Medicare Part A off budget, the President proposes to make it unavailable for other spending or tax cuts.

That is exactly what I proposed last November. I quote again from the White House:

> Instead, the projected baseline Medicare surplus would be used to pay down the debt.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, if I might interrupt the distinguished Senator from Missouri for a moment?

Mr. ASHCROFT. I will be happy to yield with the understanding that at the conclusion of this interruption I continue to have the floor for my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania, without objection.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri. We were conferring about the last amendment so I was unable to be on the floor when this debate started. We are interested in a time agreement. I have just discussed the matter with the Senator from North Dakota, who has the second-degree amendment. It would be in the managers' interest to see if we could limit debate to 1 hour equally divided on the first-degree and second-degree amendment, and then have votes on both amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ASHCROFT. Reserving the right to object, I do not want to object, but I want to clarify. How much time have I consumed already with my explanation? Maybe I should ask, is the hour in addition to what I have already used?

Mr. SPECTER. If it is acceptable to the Senator from North Dakota. I hadn't discussed that with him earlier.

Mr. ASHCROFT. What I want to do is protect the right of my colleague, Senator ABRAHAM from Michigan, to make remarks. I don't want to have consumed all the time. That is what I am interested in doing. So if we can work something out with that in mind, I am willing.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask the Senator from Missouri, would 15 additional minutes satisfy you on your side?

Mr. ASHCROFT. Let's say we would take 20 additional minutes?

Mr. SPECTER. I suppose we then have 30 minutes. I discussed 1 hour equally divided with the Senator from North Dakota, so you would have 30 minutes and 20 minutes on the other side?

Mr. CONRAD. That will be acceptable if the understanding is this is ''on or in relation to,'' any votes ordered for that period?

Mr. SPECTER. We would have two votes then on the two competing amendments: One on the Ashcroft amendment, and one on the Conrad amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. That would be on or in relation?

Mr. SPECTER. On or in relation.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I object and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. 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. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Conrad amendment and the Ashcroft amendment each be considered amendments in the first degree; that there be 30 minutes for Senator CONRAD, 20 minutes for Senator ASHCROFT, and that there be votes on both of their amendments with no point of order being permitted, and that the time of the votes be determined later in the day by agreement of the leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. SPECTER. The Conrad amendment will be voted on first.

Mr. REID. I was talking to Senator CONRAD. I apologize.

Mr. SPECTER. The unanimous consent agreement provides that each amendment, the Conrad amendment and the Ashcroft amendment, be considered as amendments in the first degree; that the Conrad amendment be voted on first, that there be no points of order raised, that Senator CONRAD will have 30 minutes, and Senator ASHCROFT 20 minutes, and the time of the votes will be determined later in the day by agreement of the leaders.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow us to go into a quorum call for a minute, Senator CONRAD and I have a couple of things about which we want to talk. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. 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. LOTT. Mr. President, just so nobody will get nervous, I want to talk about the schedule. I am working with Senator REID on a couple unanimous consent requests that we may offer later. But I wanted to talk about the progress being made and what our hopes are.

I realize this is a very big, very important bill—the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations bill. It is important we get it done, and it is important we have a few minutes to think through critical amendments that are offered. We are in that process. I thank the managers for what they have been doing. I urge them to keep pushing forward. The number of amendments has been substantially reduced. The ones still pending are not easy amendments. But I think if we can keep focused, we can complete this very important appropriations bill at a reasonable hour today.

I urge my colleagues, when they have an amendment, when there is an amendment on both sides, that we find a way to accept them both or get a vote on both of them and let the Senate speak its will and then move on. I think that would be the best way to do it.

What I really want to comment on today about this bill, and others, is that there are Senators thinking we are going to finish tonight and there won't be votes tomorrow. Senator DASCHLE and I have been indicating for quite some time now that that is not going to happen. We have to complete this bill. I still would like to go to the Interior appropriations bill. But we also have a very important military construction appropriations bill with a title II that involves emergencies. That has to be completed and considered by the House Rules Committee, the House has to vote, and then it comes over here. That could be late this afternoon or tonight or tomorrow or later. If there are complications, it could take more time than that.

I assure everybody that we are going to be in session and voting tomorrow. I think that hoping we can wave a magic wand and miraculously complete this bill and the other measures by a reasonable time tonight is just not likely.

I wanted to say that now. Those who have planes booked for 10 o'clock tonight or 10 o'clock in the morning, you better start making other arrangements, unless you are willing to miss votes. Quite often, some Senators think that if enough of us leave, there won't be votes. That is not going to be the case this time. This work is too important. I urge my colleagues to help us get this very important work done in this critical week.

Mr. REID. If the Senator will yield, I say to my colleagues that I was here last night about 7 o'clock when the majority leader came to the floor. To say that he was upset is an understatement. I heard him clearly that there will be no more windows for the end of this session.

I also say to the leader that it would be a big help to those of us on the floor if we could shorten the time of the votes. We wasted tremendous time yesterday. We wasted at least 2½ hours on votes when people weren't here. We waited 20, 30 minutes for Senators on both sides. I believe that if a vote is completed within 15 or 18 minutes, we should go on to something else. If people miss a vote or two, everybody's record will be down a little bit, and it will be the same for everybody.

Mr. LOTT. Obviously, the Senator from Nevada is correct. We do allow these votes to drag on too long, and we should be prepared to cut them off after the 15 minutes and the 5-minute overtime. On both sides we try to be understanding, but the more we are understanding, the more it is abused by our colleagues. So, for today, I will work with Democrats and Republicans and be prepared to cut these votes off. It could save us a lot of time.

Let me say to the Senator from Nevada, we would not be making the progress we have made on this and other bills without his diligence, his presence on the floor, and the hard work he does. I appreciate that. Last night, even though I was disturbed about the timing because of commitments that have been made, we worked that out and we got a lot of good work done last night. I thank those who were involved.

—

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2340

Mr. LOTT. I have a unanimous consent request I would like to propound now. I believe the Senators involved in this are on the floor. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of the NCAA gambling bill, S. 2340, and following the reporting of the bill by the clerk, the committee amendments be immediately agreed to.

I further ask consent that there be 4 hours of debate on the bill, to be equally divided in the usual form, and only relevant amendments be in order during the pendency of the bill.

Finally, I ask consent that following the conclusion of the time and the disposition of any amendments, the bill be advanced to third reading and passage occur, all without any intervening action or debate.

I know Senator REID will want to make some comments. This is an issue that has been pending for some time. We have tried to find a way to have it as an amendment on other bills. I know Senator BROWNBACK has been diligent and also very much interested in this matter, as are other Senators, including Senator MCCAIN.

Senator REID has indicated he would like to work with us on it. But I will let him speak for himself.

Part of what I am doing here is this: I made a commitment to the sponsors to try to find a way to consider this on some bill, or freestanding at some