and say they want to give it all back to the poor taxpayer, the taxpayer who is middle income and poor. Before we are finished, that debate is going to be talked about, too.

What we have to do when we have a tax cut, we have to give it back to people who are paying taxes. One would not think that tax relief would mean giving it back, in some way, so the people paying taxes do not get any relief, and those who are not paying, or paying very little, they get some relief—even a check from the Federal Government. To say we think you are paying too much taxes, even if you are not paying any, so we give you back more money—that may be one of the propositions. We ought to debate that for the American people. You can then say the tax relief is going to the working poor. Frankly, you are not giving it to anybody who earns money enough to pay a tax. I thought this all was about tax reduction. I thought the overage was giving back Americans who paid it a little more, a little bit more than what is being talked about by the other side.

I close by saying some people think it is a mystery about all this new revenue we have, this surplus, part of which goes to Social Security and part of it is left over. There is no mystery about it. Cumulatively, all the taxpayers who are paying taxes, the American people, the combined amount has increased. Some will come up and say, ''but the median income has not increased, this has not increased, and the tax on these people has not increased''—how does the tax take go up $3.35 trillion? Everybody out there combined is paying more taxes—and is it really more? Yes, it is. On average, America existed and existed beautifully with 18 percent of the gross domestic product coming into the Government as taxes.

We are now at 20.4 percent, 2.4 percent higher in terms of a tax take versus the gross domestic product of our Nation, a way to measure what we want to measure, and that is out of the total economy how much are we taking away and putting in our coffers. It is very high at 20.4 percent, and the economy is booming. The reason we have the surplus is because we are taking more from the taxpayers.

I believe if it can be understood and if we can get around ads that are confusing the issue and attack ads that have nothing to do with the real problems and issues, if we can boil it down to: Mr. and Mrs. America, if the surplus is this much, would it seem fair to you that we should give back 25 percent of it to the American people by way of tax relief? I think most people would probably end up saying: I guess that seems fair; maybe that is even a little low.

That would leave 75 percent of this surplus for the things everybody says we will take care of when we get a new Congress. I submit that we cannot forget the taxpayers as we think about new ways to spend this surplus. We ought to probably start with them, not stop with them at the end of the line. That is what we will be talking about, it seems to me, in the next few months, at least I hope so.

Then we can look at whose tax cuts are fair. We will see the other side stack up dollars and say the Republicans give it back to the rich people. The marriage tax penalty relief in this bill, in terms of to whom it goes—if the President of the United States would listen to us instead of listening to the technical advice of the Treasury Department—it is eminently fair; it is loaded at the bottom end of the earnings and yet gives people in the middle- and high-income categories something.

If you do not want that, what do you want? Stack up the dollar bills—rich versus the poor—all you want when it comes to the marriage tax penalty, which is a very big and fair tax cut and tax reform at the same time.

Obviously, I am on a subject on which I could talk for a long time, and I continue to have a lot of interest buildup in me. Sooner or later, people listening cannot pay attention, and I believe we are getting close to that.

I yield the floor and thank the Senate for giving me the privilege of speaking.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONSERVATION AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2000

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor and spend a few minutes this afternoon talking about a very important bill that is moving through this Congress—it is the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 2000—and to talk about some of the more important aspects of this legislation as it passed the House by an overwhelming bipartisan majority a couple of weeks ago. This bill is being considered as I speak in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which is ably chaired by my good friend from Alaska and the leadership of our friend from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN.

It is appropriate I follow with my remarks on the heels of our other Senator from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, because as I appreciate his remarks, he was speaking about the obligation we have to make good and wise decisions about the surplus. He, of course, was arguing for as much of that money as possible to go to tax cuts, supported by many members of his party. Along that same line, we will be judged in this Congress by the discipline, restraint, and good judgment we show on this issue. Truly, these are happy days in Washington because we are talking about an extraordinarily historic surplus. A lot of that should be credited to the current administration and the President's policies regarding discipline in budgets, spending restraint, as well as a strategic investment for America's working families.

Nonetheless, it is much better when we can all agree to talk about allocating these surpluses than trying to fairly distribute sacrifices or fairly distributing cuts. It is a good time to be here so we can make good judgments on behalf of all the people whom we represent—of course, coming from the State of Louisiana, that is 4.5 million people—in the country and, frankly, the world as to our obligations to our neighbors around the world.

In this great discussion about how much should go for tax cuts and then when we set aside money for tax cuts, how should it be allocated, what families should receive those tax cuts, how can we help to strengthen and widen the circle of economic opportunity, that clearly has a role and, hopefully, we will have more discussions about that in the days ahead.

There will be, as the Senator from New Mexico pointed out, an opportunity to make some strategic investments. We should pay down our debt, and we should give a significant portion of tax breaks to working families in America, helping them with the things that are most important to them—sustaining the strength of their family, providing educational opportunities and economic opportunities for children and grandchildren. That is what every parent in America wants, to see the opportunities for their children greatly expanded.

The third thing we are going to be discussing is how to take some of this money, hard earned by the American people—not necessarily the Government's money, but the people's money—how should we allocate the people's money on their behalf for the good of their future.

That is part of our job as Members of Congress. I am very proud to be leading a great bipartisan effort by many Senators in this Chamber and House Members who are arguing that a small portion of this surplus, a small portion of the $2.2 trillion surplus—let me say our portion represents about 1 percent of this surplus; less than 1 percent actually—should be invested in the environmental resources of this Nation, along our coasts, in our interior portions of the Nation, for wildlife conservation, preservation of our coastlines, and investments in other types of environmental programs that have been underfunded and undernourished for decades. There have been promises made by Congresses in the past but promises not kept. It is time that we make strategic investments to fund those programs and to hold and keep our promises to our children and grandchildren.

I wanted to come to the floor to show you the front page of USA Today. I am going to include this entire, lengthy, and well-researched and well-written article in the RECORD. The headline is: ''Growth Reshapes Coasts: A Wave of Development Overwhelms Our Shores.''

I want to read a couple of the important highlights from this article for this debate and conversation this afternoon because the essence of the CARA bill is that now is the time to take a portion of offshore oil and gas revenues that are currently streaming right into the general fund, to intercept some of these funds and send them back to coastal counties and interior counties for investments, strategic investments in the environment, to help us have good growth, to make wise decisions, so that we can start this century by laying down some resources that will help us to grow and develop in the right ways in the years to come.

According to this article, again, the growth along the coasts is going to be explosive. Let me read a little bit from this article:

A USA TODAY analysis has found that an estimated 41 million people—more than one in seven Americans—now reside in a county that abuts the eastern or southern seaboard. That number swells by several million when inland residents with second homes near the shore are included. . . .

In making that choice, these coastal migrants are transforming seasonal resort towns that used to bustle for just a few summer months—

We are all used to communities such as this—

into sprawling, year-round communities that are starting to look and feel like, well, everyplace else. Up and down the coast, development is spreading for miles inland. New residents attract new businesses to serve them, workers move in to fill the new jobs that are created, and new housing, schools, malls and hospitals spring up to serve the workers.

What are we doing today to prepare for this coming boom? It goes on to say:

This shoreline strip is growing significantly faster than the rest of the country in population, employment and gross domestic product. In many cases, these counties have the fastest-growing economies in their states.

I think this is a very key point:

Since 1993, the population of these hot 100 counties has grown nearly 50 percent faster than the entire USA. About 1,000 year-round settlers are arriving each day. Jobs have been created at a 30 percent greater clip, and GDP through 1997, the latest year for county breakdowns, grew 20 percent faster.

These counties are growing rapidly, as our more mobile, more affluent population seeks and chooses to live along the coasts.

In an interesting quote in the article by Cleveland State's Hill:

It used to be that you moved to where the jobs are. Now, people are deciding where they want to live, and the jobs are following them.

Part of our goal in Congress is to be leaders, and part of the job of being a leader is to have enough vision to see past where you are today, to be able to see where we are going, so that we can lay down and make the strategic decisions that will benefit our children and our grandchildren.

I have a 3-year-old and an 8-year-old. Frank and I are doing our best to be good parents in raising them. I often think about the fact that what I do here I want to do so that when Mary Shannon is 40 or 50 or 60, and is finished raising her family and beginning to have grandchildren, that everyone in America will be better off. What will this country look like when she is that age or when Connor is in his 40s or 50s or 60s?

That is what this bill is actually about, because CARA mandates that we should take a small portion of our revenues to make important investments, which are shown by these projections that are listed here and in many articles and which are cited in many speeches, including those given by Governors and local officials. They are saying, look what is happening. Let's make plans now.

Quoting the article further:

Urban planners say growth along the coast should be propelled for another 10 to 20 years by demographic, economic and social trends.

Additionally, it is clear—and the Senator from Florida was just speaking about this earlier in the week in committee—

Until the 1990s, the destination of choice was Florida —

That one State has seen explosive and extraordinary growth in the last 20 years—

with its perpetually balmy, one-season climate. But now the entire coast lures settlers. Up north, the shore in winter has higher temperatures and less snowfall. Farther south, [along the shores] the winters are moderate, and mild sea breezes offer relief from stifling heat.

People would flock to Florida in the 1980s and 1990s, but what these demographers are saying is that in the next 20 to 30 years, all the coast along the south and the eastern seaboard will experience similar growth.

My question to this Congress is, What are we doing today to prepare? One of the things we can do is to pass CARA and to reinvest at least $1 billion in our coastal resources to help our communities, our Governors, our county commissioners, and our mayors cope with this explosive growth, so we do have good development but that we preserve the precious beaches; that we allow for public spaces, so that all people, whether they are affluent enough to own a second home or whether they can just manage to get their kids in the car and spend a weekend on a beach at a moderately priced hotel, or whether they can just manage a day or two camping outside—we must preserve our coast and invest some of this money so that as this country grows over the next 20, 30, and 40 years, we can say we have done something.

I feel so passionately about these revenues. While they are general fund revenues, their source is from oil and gas, from the bounty that God has given to this country. Oil and gas in the Outer Continental Shelf is a depletable resource. One day, as those of us from Louisiana know, these wells will be dried up. There will be no more gas. There will be no more oil to be drawn. They will be depleted.

Hopefully, we will find other sources of fuel, some that are more environmentally friendly. I most certainly support that. Actually, natural gas is a very environmentally friendly fuel.

My question to my colleagues is: When these oil and gas wells are dried up, and we no longer receive the taxes that are currently being paid, what will we have to show for our money?

I would like to look up and say: We invested those revenues well; we have expanded through the interior of our Nation a great park system; we have expanded hunting and fishing areas to preserve them for our children and grandchildren, and, yes, we were smart enough to take taxes from resources from our coasts and invest them in coastlines all across the United States, so that we would have sand dunes and beaches, and our fisheries would be protected, as well as to provide for the proper development of our coastal areas.

It would be a great shame to leave this Congress without making a serious commitment to the environment of our Nation and to coastal communities everywhere, not just in the South, not just on the east coast, but in the Great Lakes region and along our precious western seaboard. This is the time to act.

I suggest to my colleague from New Mexico, in speaking about tax cuts, it is most appropriate to return some money from this great surplus to hard-working Americans and middle-class families throughout the Nation. There are many ways we can provide tax relief, and we should certainly do that. But it is also equally important that we make strategic investments, to lay down bills and initiatives and funding sources now that will help us, as our population in this Nation is expected to double from 260 million to over 500 million people in the next 100 years, much of that population moving to the coastal areas. As people will decide where they want to move, the jobs will follow. There is going to be a migration to our coasts.

Let us begin this new century by making a smart choice and a wise investment and invest in some of our coasts.

The Chair has been patient because, representing Nebraska, we have not figured out a way to get him a coastline yet, but we are working on it. He knows this bill takes care of interior States as well as coastal States by allowing all Governors and local officials to make some wise investments with these funds.

I came to the floor to share this article. I will submit it for the RECORD. I hope my colleagues will take an opportunity in the next couple of days to read it. I again thank Senator MURKOWSKI from Alaska and Senator BINGAMAN from New Mexico for their leadership and also acknowledge the support of Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE, as we have moved this bill through the process, and the President of the United States, for their commitment and support to this effort.

I look forward to debating this even further next week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the article to which I referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From USA Today, July 20, 2000]

GROWTH RESHAPES COASTS

(By Owen Ullmann, Paul Overberg and Rick Hampson)

A new American migration, one that rivals the exodus from the Frostbelt to the Sunbelt a generation ago, is transforming the Atlantic and Gulf shorelines.

From the rock-strewn shoreline of Maine to the sandy barrier islands hugging Texas, an unprecedented influx of residents is converting laid-back, seasonal resort towns into year-round communities with burgeoning economies.

Sixtysomething retirees and aging baby boomers, aided by fattened stock portfolios and flexible work arrangements, are settling on the coast full-time or snapping up vacation homes for retirement later. Al are drawn by a simple, alluring premise: The weather, the recreation, the scenery—it's better at the beach.

A USA TODAY analysis has found that an estimated 41 million people—more than one in seven Americans—now reside in a county that abuts the eastern or southern seaboard. That number swells by several million when inland residents with second homes near the shore are included.

''We're in the midst of an amenities movement,'' observes Edward Hill, a professor of urban studies at Cleveland State University in Ohio. ''Improved technology, greater wealth and better transportation are giving people more choices about where to live. They're choosing the coast.''

In making that choice, these coastal migrants are transforming seasonal resort towns that used to bustle for just a few summer months into sprawling, year-round communities that are starting to look and feel like, well, everyplace else. Up and down the coast, development is spreading for miles inland. New residents attract new businesses to serve them, workers move in to fill the new jobs that are created, and new housing, schools, malls and hospitals spring up to serve the workers.

To a large extent, this migration is being fed by the booming metropolitan centers along the East Coast: Boston, New York, Washington, Charlotte, N.C., and Atlanta. Many urban residents start out buying or renting a weekend home along the coast and eventually move permanently.

To determine the extent of this boom at the beach, USA TODAY examined development in the 100 counties along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts that are magnets for new settlers. The findings: This shoreline strip is growing significantly faster than the rest of the country in population, employment and gross domestic product (GDP). In many cases, these counties have the fastest-growing economies in their states.

Since 1993, the population of these hot 100 counties has grown nearly 50% faster than the entire USA. About 1,000 year-round settlers are arriving each day. Jobs have been created at a 30% greater clip, and GDP through 1997, the latest year for country breakdowns, grew 20% faster. Gross domestic product is the total value of goods and services produced.

''There's no question the growth along coastal areas is a national phenomenon,'' says Dennis Gale, a professor or urban and regional planning at Florida Atlantic University in Fort Lauderdale. ''Harry and Jane Average are moving to the coast.''

At least to the eastern and southern shorelines. The West Coast has not experienced the same recent mass migration. Its beaches and bluffs enjoy far stronger protection from development. There are no barrier islands to tempt development. And unlike the north-flowing Gulf Stream, which tempers surf temperatures along the East Coast, the south-flowing California Current chills even summer bathers.

The Atlantic Ocean's allure is hardly new. Americans have been flocking there since at least 1802, when the Philadelphia Aurora advertised beachfront tourist accommodations along the beautiful Cape May, N.J., shore. Back then few Americans had time for recreation. Most of the population lived near the ocean because the great cities grew up around shipping ports, the primary mode of commerce.

Then, as the USA entered the industrial age in the 19th century, the population began stretching inland, where factories needed raw materials and agricultural products to process.

Now the emergence of the information economy, which has spurred telecommuting, and the growing popularity of a recreational lifestyle have sparked a mass yearning to return to the coast.

COASTAL COUNTIES EXPLODING

How much is the boom at the beach transforming the coastline?

In Maine, the top five counties in employment and GDP growth are all along the coast. Their growth rates are double the state average.

In Massachusetts, the four counties with the fastest job creation include those covering Cape Cod, Nantucket Island and Martha's Vineyard.

In South Carolina, five of the seven counties with the fastest employment growth lie along the coast. Beaufort County, which includes Hilton Head, tops the list with a 46% increase in jobs since 1993, more than three times the state average.

In Alabama, only two of the state's 67 counties touch the coast. One of them, Baldwin County, which borders the Gulf and Mobile Bay, led the state in GDP growth: 51% vs. a statewide average of 24%.

''It used to be that you moved to where the jobs are,'' says Cleveland State's Hill. ''Now, people are deciding where they want to live, and the jobs are following them.''

Just look at what's taking in Maine. ''Ten years ago, Knox County had one traffic light and the main industry was fishing,'' says Rutgers University political science professor Ross Baker, 62, who owns a vacation home near Rockland. ''Now you have a big bank-processing center here, and downtown Rockland is filled with cappuccino bars and bayberry candle stores.''

The same boom that is altering the rugged coast of Maine is taking place 1,200 miles south near the lush greens of Hilton Head, S.C. Along a 15-mile stretch of mainland, starting at the bridge from Hilton Head Island, unspoiled Low Country vistas have given way to mass development: golf-oriented retirement communities, shopping malls, banks, office buildings, new car showrooms, hospitals, even a new campus for the University of South Carolina.

''It just keeps growing and growing,'' says Carol Della Vecchia, 58, formerly of Massapequa, N.Y., who moved to the area in 1997 to escape the congestion of Long Island. ''But in another five to 10 years, you're going to see another Sunrise Highway all over again,'' she says, referring to the commercial thoroughfare that runs through Long Island.

Urban planners say growth along the coast should be propelled for another 10 to 20 years by demographic, economic and social trends.

Foremost is the aging of the USA's 78 million baby boomers. They are entering their pre-retirement years (the oldest are 54) and looking for more pleasant surroundings to spend their post-working years. Developers in Hilton Head cite surveys that show a majority of boomers want to retire within 50 miles of the East or West coasts.

Millions of boomers, as well as people in their late 50s and 60s, are expected to have the financial resources to fulfill their retirement dreams. Barring a collapse on Wall Street, the boomers' 401(k)s and individual retirement accounts will keep growing. Plus, they will be on the receiving end of an estimated $10 trillion to $20 trillion of inherited wealth, the largest transfer of assets in history.

SEEKING A BETTER LIFE

Thanks to the technological revolution, workers don't have to wait until retirement to move to the coast; computers and cell phones make it possible to do their jobs long-distance. And for those who need to check in regularly at the office, improved roads and the vast growth of regional airports and commuter airlines put coastal destinations within a few hours of most Eastern cities.

''We're riding the crest of a new boomer craze,'' says Michael Lawrence, president of Sea Pines, the largest private development on Hilton Head. ''First it was Nike sneakers, then oversized tennis rackets and BMWs. Now it's vacation and retirement homes.''

The driving force behind this migration to the coast is the quest for a better life: less congestion, crime and pollution; better weather and scenery.

Until the 1990s, the destination of choice was Florida, with its perpetually balmy, one-season climate. But now the entire coast lures settlers. Up north, the shore in winter has higher temperatures and less snowfall. Farther south, the winters are moderate, and mild sea breezes offer relief from stifling summer heat.

These migrants are coming predominantly from aging suburban counties in the Northeast and Midwest that were hot destinations 30 or 40 years ago.

Consider Horry County, S.C., which includes Myrtle Beach and nearby towns known as the ''Grand Strand.'' IRS data show that from 1997 to 1998, the county gained 2,000 households, most from more than 100 counties in the Northeast and mid-Atlantic.

Top feeder counties: suburban Washington's Fairfax, Va., and Montgomery and Prince George's, Md. (119 households); Long Island's Suffolk and Nassau (107); Allegheny, Pa., including Pittsburgh (42); and Franklin, Ohio, including Columbus (41). Other big sources: Syracuse, N.Y.; Philadelphia; Hartford, Conn.; northern New Jersey; and Hudson River valley; Cincinnati; Akron, Ohio; and Charleston, W.Va.

The housing industry has been a chief beneficiary of this coastal craze. The median household wealth of those living in counties that abut the Atlantic and Gulf coasts is 26% higher than the national median—$81,753 a year vs. $64,718. That means more money to buy houses. Developers along the coast say business is the best they have seen in over 30 years.

The fastest residential growth has been on barrier islands, those exposed bands of sand that lie just offshore. In 1998, more than 50,000 housing units were built on barrier islands from Maine to Texas, double the construction rate of 1992.

High-end homes seem most in demand. David Wilgus, a real estate agent in Bethany Beach, Del., says demand has never been higher for homes in the $1 million to $2 million price range, thanks to a tech boom in the nearby Washington area.

In Florida last year, during a six-hour ''sale'' of condo units averaging $1 million at a Naples project, 99 people plunked down $25,000 each for apartments that won't be built until at least 2002. ''Staggering,'' says Michael Curtin, vice president of WCI, the development company.

And in Folly Beach, S.C., where modest bungalows lined the shore for decades, quarter-acre lots that sold for $50,000 just 10 years ago now fetch as much as $500,000.

Less-expensive properties also are in great demand. Sam Greenough, a contractor in North Carolina for 16 years, says he's building $200,000 homes along the Outer Banks faster than ever.

While the rush to the shore has been great for developers, it has cost many coastal communities the quaint characteristics that first attracted tourists.

COPING WITH A NEW CAPE

For decades, permanent Cape Cod residents have gathered on highway overpasses to wave goodbye—and good riddance—to hordes of summer visitors heading home in bumper-to-bumper Labor Day traffic. But those ''bridge'' parties might have to be scrapped because the tourists aren't leaving.

What was once a sparsely populated coastal retreat for 10 months of the year has turned into a suburbanized extension of metropolitan Boston.

''It's like living anywhere else—but nicer,'' says Jacquie Newson, 48, a radio station sales manager who has lived on the Cape for 20 years.

In just the past five years, the year-round population has increased 12% to 225,000. The Cape and the islands also have eight of the state's 12 fastest-growing school districts. Mashpee's enrollment has tripled the past 20 years.

Cape Code Hospital has 50% more doctors than in 1990, and the Cape Cod Mall has just increased its retail space by 25%. The number of radio stations on the Cape has risen from four in 1985 to 13. There is a fledgling high-tech industry, with hopeful talk of a ''Silicon Sandbar.'' There are even the once unthinkable: wintertime traffic jams in Hyannis.

And with a third of the Cape's land still available for development, the boom is unlikely to slow anytime soon.

The Cape's development is the result of a self-perpetuating cycle: more people move to the area, so more businesses stay open year-round, so more tourists visit all year, so new businesses open, so more jobs are created, so more people live there.

Each day, on average, six new homes are built on the Cape. The number of residential building permits issued in 1998 was more than 40% higher than two years earlier. Cozy two-bedroom cottages by the water are being bought, torn down and replaced by 5,000-square-foot mansions. In Truro, a quaint outer-Cape town, the median sale price for an existing single-family home last year was $310,000.

To keep up with the affluent newcomers, the Cape Code Mall has brought in higher-end stores. Thirty years ago, almost all the non-anchor stores were locally owned. Today, there is only one, Holiday's Hallmark.

''Last year, we opened 27 new, national brand-name stores,'' says mall manager Leo Fein. ''The people who are moving here have been exposed to upscale shopping in Boston, and they want it here.'' Hence, Ann Taylor, J. Crew, Abercrombie & Fitch.

Cape Cod Hospital in Hyannis is changing its marketing strategy as well, expanding cardiology and cancer services so patients won't have to go back to Boston. Emergency angioplasty is offered seven days a week, and the hospital it trying to start an open-heart surgery program. ''In most of the country's mind, Cape Cod is still beaches,'' says hospital spokeswoman Deborah Doherty. ''But we've been named one of the top 100 community hospitals in the country for the last three years.''

Most people wouldn't think of the Cape as a tech hot spot, either. Yet several thousand high-tech jobs have been created in recent years, according to the Cape Cod Technology Council, which has 300 member businesses.

One result of the boom on the beach is what everyone described as the ''changing character'' of the Cape—the fading of a quaint, picturesque backwater that was virtually deserted most of the year. ''New people move in and want it like it was back home,'' says Marilyn Fifield, a researcher at the Cape Cod Commission. ''It's easy to wind up looking like everyplace else.''

Provincetown, once the third-biggest whaling port in America, has become ''one big condominium,'' grumbles George Bryant, 62, a longtime resident. ''There are mornings when I feel it's the worst thing ever.'' But Bryant also remembers when there was never enough work to keep local people employed all winter, and when men used to ''die like flies'' whaling and deep-sea fishing.

Today, the biggest problem for natives isn't finding a job, but finding affordable housing. Rents and home prices have soared, and property-tax rates in some communities have doubled because new residents have demanded schools and services.

''What good is prosperity if our kids can't afford to stay here?'' asks Marilyn Salisbury of Bourne. Her three adult children live and work on the mainland.

Clem Silva, 48, co-owner of Clem & Ursie's restaurant in Provincetown, says there is almost no affordable housing for restaurant workers. He and his sister/partner each have six seasonal workers from Eastern Europe living in their homes. They also have rented a third house for seasonal workers from Jamaica. ''It's an amazing burden,'' he says. ''It really takes the wind out of my sails.''

Another problem is water pollution. One cause is an increase in incidents of well-water pollution from septic tanks, which serve 86% of the Cape's homes. Higher levels of contaminated water also are blamed on runoff from roads and parking lots.

Some shellfishing areas have been restricted. The Mashpee River, a tidal river, has gotten murkier and smellier because of algae buildup caused by increased run-off from septic systems. Shellfishing in Sulphur Springs, a bay in Chatham off Nantucket Sound, has been restricted because of high coliform counts.

The downside of development didn't deter Tom and Barbara Joyce from moving to West Barnstable in June after raising four children (the youngest is now 23) in a Boston suburb. Tom, 65, is a recently retired vice president of a textbook publisher, but Barbara still freelances in publishing and wants to be able to go to the city if and when she needs to.

Their four-bedroom home is near a golf course and a conservation area, it's an easy one-hour drive to Boston. ''Cape Cod is a state of mind,'' Barbara says. ''When you're here, you feel like you're on vacation, even if you're living here.''

Nevertheless, the Joyces admit that life on the Cape has changed from 30 years ago, when they recall having had trouble finding a restaurant. This year, Barbara says, ''we tried to go to dinner in Hyannis one Saturday night in February and we couldn't even get in, it was so crowded.''

The truth is, Tom says, the Cape has become just another suburb. ''The Cape is no longer the place to go for isolation. There's no escape now. There's very little open space that hasn't been developed or bought for development. I guess we've added to that.''

BEAUFORT'S GROWING PAINS

Beaufort County, S.C., is another microcosm of the benefits and the detriments of explosive growth along the coast. Though it's a long distance from Cape Cod in geography and culture, the area has experienced many of the same problems as coastal New England.

''The growth has been astronomical,'' says Beaufort County Magistrate Charles ''Bubba'' Smith, 55. He says the county's rapid expansion has meant higher wages and job opportunities but also traffic jams, overcrowded schools, higher crime and a shortage of affordable housing.

The county had been largely unaffected by the golf-oriented vacation development that began 30 years ago on Hilton Head, the county's southernmost tip. But the county hasn't been the same since 1994, when Del Webb, which developed the Sun City retirement communities in the Southwest, started its first upscale project on the East Coast, 10 miles inland from the Hilton Head Island bridge.

So far, Sun City has built 1,600 homes, and it is adding 500 more each year. When the mammoth, 5,600-acre project is finished, Sun City will have 16,000 year-round residents.

Sun City has spawned other retirement communities, a half-dozen shopping malls, a Super Wal-Mart, a Target, several supermarkets, Lexus and Mercedes car dealerships, and other retail establishments along U.S. Route 278. At the same time, lawyers, accountants, financial planners and health care providers are flocking to offer their services. Route 278, once lined with Spanish oaks and lowland shrubs, is now flanked by retail developments and professional office buildings interspersed with occasional empty lots with signs that read, ''Future home of . . .''

The area has attracted transplants from the East Coast, Midwest and Southeast, including New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Virginia, Georgia and Florida. And its residences appeal to people across the economic spectrum. Sun City homes start at $130,000, although the strongest demand has been for the top-of-the-line models, which sell for $750,000. As a result, the company is breaking ground on an upscale section eight years earlier than planned.

Del Webb officials say every house type, even the least expensive, includes a home office. Marketing studies have found that most buyers are still working or intend to work part-time during retirement.

Just down the road from Sun City, the exclusive Belfair development is quickly selling out its 770 lots for up to $2 million each. The corporate CEOs and other wealthy buyers also shell out $900,000, on average, to build custom homes on their lots.

Belfair's two championship-level golf courses are the ostensible draw, but developer John Reed says the real attraction is the sense of a small town that residents long for. ''They're in their mid-50s and they've lived in four different cities, on average,'' he says. ''They feel they have no roots and are searching for the close-knit community they remember from their youth. That's how they want to spend their final years.''

The mass migration to the area has been great for developers and other businesses, but it has put enormous strains on the local government.

Since 1900, Beaufort County's population has grown 31%. That's three times the national average. The county has had to keep expanding its roads, and in just the past three years, it has built 13 schools, making it one of the fastest-growing school districts in the USA.

The boom has been especially traumatic for the little town of Bluffton (population 800), which finds itself suddenly surrounded by explosive growth.

Last year, the town had to hire its first full-time city manager to deal with development issues. And the town has annexed 30,000 acres over the past three years to exert more control over land use. That has expanded the town's size from 1 square mile to 50.

This year, the town is asking residents for permission to double its budget so it can add a planning department, increase existing departments and augment its tiny police force.

Although construction is bringing in new property tax revenue, the town laments that it has lost revenue from speeding tickets. Bluffton used to be a well-known speed trap, but the traffic is so bad now, it's hard to exceed the 25 mph posted limit.

''Bluffton has become the biggest little town in South Carolina,'' says Town Councilman Hank Johnston, 58, who claims that Johnny Mercer wrote the lyrics to Moon River while sitting on Johnston's porch, which overlooks the May River.

The town's transformation is upsetting to the locals, even those who profit from all the tour buses that roar through the town's historic center, disturbing the tranquility Bluffton had known for 100 years.

''People used to come Memorial Day and leave Labor Day. Now they're here to stay,'' sighs Babby Guscio, owner of a general store. ''It's sad. It's the end of an era. Our small town is gone.''

As the economic transformation along the shore continues, that refrain is being echoed up and down the coast. But there's no indication that the mass exodus to the beach will slow anytime soon. ''People are seeking out a different lifestyle,'' says urban planner Hill of Cleveland State. ''Quality of life matters.''

''There's no stopping the trend,'' agrees Rutgers professor Baker. ''It's like the primordial urge of sea turtles (to lay their eggs in the exact same spot). The instinct to live near the water is that strong.''

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

THE BULLETPROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT ACT OF 2000

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will try not to delay my good friend from Kansas too long. I know he, like others, wishes to leave.

I speak only because I am disappointed the Senate has not yet passed the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 that is S. 2413. The Senate Judiciary Committee passed this bill unanimously on June 29. All Members, Republicans and Democrats, voted for it. Since then, I have checked with the Democratic caucus. All 45 Democratic Senators support this bill. All 45 are perfectly agreeable to have it either come to an immediate vote or passed by unanimous consent.

But it still has not passed the full Senate. This is very disappointing to our nation's law enforcement officers who need life-saving bulletproof vests to protect themselves. Protecting and supporting our law enforcement community should not be a partisan issue.

Senator CAMPBELL and I worked together closely and successfully with the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the last Congress to pass the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998 into law. Senator HATCH is an original cosponsor this year's bill to reauthorize this grant program. Senators SCHUMER, KOHL, THURMOND, REED, JEFFORDS, ROBB, REID, SARBANES, our late colleague, Senator Coverdell, BINGAMAN, ASHCROFT, EDWARDS, BUNNING, CLELAND, HUTCHISON, and ABRAHAM also cosponsored our bipartisan bill.

I mention this because I have been receiving calls from a number of people in the law enforcement community asking why it has not passed. I did not know the answer. As I said, I checked and found the 45 Democratic Senators all said they had no objection to it being passed by voice vote today, yesterday, whenever—but we have been told a Republican Senator has stopped this bill from passing. He has a hold on the bill, a bill that is intended to provide protection to our Nation's law enforcement officers.

According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, more than 40 percent of the 1,182 officers killed by a firearm in the line of duty since 1980 could have been saved if they had been wearing body armor. Indeed, the FBI estimates that the risk of fatality to officers while not wearing body armor is 14 times higher than for officers wearing it.

When we introduced the original Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998, President Clinton invited Senator CAMPBELL and me down for the signing of it. Shortly after it was passed into law, we funded 92,000 new bulletproof vests for our Nation's police officers. You can now make application on web sites. The whole thing has worked extremely well.

To better protect our nation's law enforcement officers, Senator CAMPBELL and I introduced the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 1998. President Clinton signed our legislation into law on June 16, 1998 (Public Law 105–181).

The law created a $25 million, 50 percent matching grant program within the Department of Justice to help state and local law enforcement agencies purchase body armor for fiscal years 1999–2001.

In its first year of operation, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program funded 92,000 new bulletproof vests for our nation's police officers, including 361 vests for Vermont police officers. Applications are now available at the program's web site at http://vests.ojp.gov/ for this year's funds.

The entire process of submitting applications and obtaining federal funds is completed through this web site.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 builds on the success of this program by doubling its annual funding to $50 million for fiscal years 2002–2004. It also improves the program by guaranteeing jurisdictions with fewer than 100,000 residents receive the full 50–50 matching funds because of the tight budgets of these smaller communities and by making the purchase of stab-proof vests eligible for grant awards to protect corrections officers in close quarters in local and county jails.

More than ever before, police officers in Vermont and around the country face deadly threats that can strike at any time, even during routine traffic stops. Bulletproof vests save lives. It is essential the we update this law so that many more of our officers who are risking their lives everyday are able to protect themselves.

The Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 will provide state and local law enforcement agencies with more of the assistance they need to protect their officers.

Our bipartisan legislation enjoys the endorsement of many law enforcement organizations, including the Fraternal Order of Police and the National Sheriffs' Association.

We need to recognize the hard work of those who have sworn to serve and protect us. And we should do what we can to protect them, when a need like this one comes to our attention.

Our nation's law enforcement officers put their lives at risk in the line of duty every day. No one knows when danger will appear.

Unfortunately, in today's violent world, even a traffic stop may not necessarily be ''routine.'' Each and every law enforcement officer across the nation deserves the protection of a bulletproof vest.

I hope this mysterious ''hold'' on the other side of the aisle will soon disappear. The Senate should pass without delay the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000, S. 2413, to ensure that each and every law enforcement agency in Vermont and across the nation can afford basic protection for their officers.

I just want to speak a little bit personally about this. I spent the first 8 years of my public life in law enforcement. I have said many times on the floor of the Senate that it was in so many ways the most rewarding career I had. I got to know the men and women in law enforcement who are called upon to go out at 3 o'clock in