

over \$300,000 a year but to say to working families and middle-income families: Here are targeted tax cuts that you can use, that will help your life. Let's provide for a marriage tax penalty elimination for working families. Let's expand educational opportunities by making tuition costs tax deductible. Think about your concern of sending your son or daughter through college and the increasing cost of a college education. For a family who is struggling to try to make ends meet and to give their kids the best opportunity, to be able to deduct those college education expenses means an awful lot more to them than the comfort in knowing that Donald Trump does not have to pay estate taxes under the Republican proposal.

That is the difference in our view of the world. The Republicans feel the pain of Donald Trump, that he might have to pay these estate taxes. We believe that families across America face a lot more anxiety and pain over how to pay for college education expenses. We had a vote on the floor here, up or down, take your pick: Estate tax relief for Donald Trump or college deductions for the families working across America. Sadly, the Republicans would not support the idea of college education expense deductions.

Let's talk about caring for elderly parents. Baby boomers understand this. Everyone understands it. As your parents get older, they need special help. You are doing your best. I cannot tell you how many of my friends this affects. I am in that generation of baby boomers—slightly older, I might add—but in a generation where a frequent topic of conversation for my age group is how are your mom and dad doing? The stories come back, and some of them are heartbreaking, about Parkinson's and Alzheimer's and complications with diabetes that lead to amputations and people finally having to make the tough decision of asking their parents to consider living in a place where they can receive some assistance.

It is expensive. We, on the Democratic side, believe that helping to pay for those expenses the families endure because of aging parents is a good tax cut, one that is good for this country and good for the families. Not so on the Republican side. When we offered this, they voted against it. They would rather give estate tax relief to the wealthiest people.

How about child care? Everybody who got up this morning in America and headed to work and left a small child with a neighbor or at a day-care center understands that this is tugging at your mind constantly during the day. Is my child in safe hands? Is this a quality and positive environment for my child to be in? How much does it cost? Can we afford it? Can we do a little better?

We, on the Democratic side, think we ought to help these families. They are working families who should have

peace of mind. Senator DODD offered an amendment that proposed tax credits, not only for day care, but also tax credits for stay-at-home moms who decide they are going to forgo working, to stay with the children and try to raise them. We want to help in both of those circumstances. We think those are the real problems facing America. The Republicans instead believe that estate tax relief for the superrich is much more important.

Expand the earned-income tax credit for the working poor, help families save for retirement, provide estate tax relief—particularly to make sure that a family-owned farm or a family-owned business can be passed on to the next generation. I think the estate tax needs reform. We support that. We voted for it. But we think the Republican proposal goes way too far in proposing we abolish it.

I see my time is coming to a close. We think the agenda before this Congress is an agenda of missed opportunities. The Republicans are in control in the House and Senate. They decide what will be considered on the floor, if anything. They have failed to bring forward commonsense gun safety legislation after Columbine, to try to keep guns out of the hands of kids and criminals. We passed it in the Senate with AL GORE's vote, sent it to the House—the gun lobby killed it. We lose 30,000 Americans every year to gun violence; 12 children every single day. For the Republicans, it is not a priority to bring this bill forward.

The Patients' Bill of Rights, so your doctor can make the call on your medical treatment or your family's medical treatment—most people think that is common sense. The insurance companies do not. They want their clerks to make the decision based on the bottom line of profit and loss. It is not a medical decision for them, it is a financial decision. And for a lot of families it is disastrous when they cannot get the appropriate care for their kids and their families. We think a Patients' Bill of Rights makes sense. The insurance lobby opposed it. The insurance lobby prevailed. The special interest groups won on the floor and we have gone nowhere with this proposal.

Minimum wage: \$5.15 an hour for a minimum wage that affects some 10 million workers across America. It is about time for a pay raise. These folks deserve to do better. It used to be bipartisan. We didn't even argue about it. Now the Republicans say: No, no no, we can't give a 50-cent-an-hour pay raise to people making \$5.15 an hour. Do you realize that 50 cents an hour comes out to, what, \$1,000 a year that we will give these people?

Yet we are going to turn around and give Donald Trump a \$400 million tax break on his estate? You cannot give working families a thousand bucks a year, but you can give the one of the superrich \$400 million tax relief? Is something upside-down in this Chamber? I think so.

Take a look at the prescription drug benefit. Ask Americans—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents—the one thing we ought to do this year? A guaranteed universal prescription drug benefit under Medicare. The pharmaceutical companies oppose it. They are pretty powerful characters in this town. They have stopped this Senate and this House from considering it. Here we are, languishing, doing nothing, when it comes to a prescription drug benefit.

Finally, something for our schools. Seven million kids in America attend schools with serious safety code violations; 25,000 schools across our country are falling down. Are we going to be ready for the 21st century? Will our kids be ready? Will our workforce be ready? You can answer that question by deciding at this point in time whether education is truly a priority and, if it is such a priority, then for goodness' sakes we should invest more than 1 percent of our Federal budget in K-12 education. That is what we invest. The Democrats, under the leadership of Senator KENNEDY, believe that investment is overdue. We think that is what families in America are looking for, not for tax relief for the wealthiest among us.

I yield the floor.

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

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2924 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I see that the Senate majority leader has come to the floor, so I yield to him. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. L. CHAFEE). The Senate majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine for her comments, her leadership on so many important issues in the Senate, and for yielding to me at this time so we may proceed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, obviously I had hoped we would be making a lot more progress this week on appropriations bills and other issues. That has not transpired yet. But we have been filing cloture motions, and we will be getting votes. In some way we will deal this week with the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill. I hope we can find a way to proceed on the energy and water appropriations bill. We will get to a vote at some point on the intelligence authorization bill. So, hopefully, we can still go forward.

I do not feel as if we are proceeding appropriately, but in spite of that, I think it generally was interpreted or understood that I would try to begin the discussion on the China PNTR bill. Even though it will be difficult to get through the maze of clotures we have

had to file this week, I still think it is the appropriate thing to do to begin this process because we do not know exactly how long it will take to get to a final vote on the China trade issue.

I am still going to do my best to find a way to have the Thompson-Torricelli legislation considered in some manner before we get to the substance of the China trade bill because I think Chinese nuclear weapons proliferation is a very serious matter. We should discuss that and have a vote on it. I think it would be preferable to do it aside from the trade bill itself.

In the end, if we can't get any other way to get at it, these two Senators may exercise their right to offer it to the China PNTR bill. But I am going to continue to try to find a way for that to be offered in another forum. I think Senator DASCHLE indicated he would work with us to try to see if we could find a way to do that. But I do think if we can go ahead and get started—and since there will be resistance to the motion to proceed—then we will file cloture and have a vote on it then on Friday.

NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LOTT. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 575, H.R. 4444, regarding normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. I am sorry there is objection just to proceeding to the bill. But I know that Senator REID is objecting on behalf of others who do not want us to proceed to it. I hope we can get to a vote on Friday; and then when we come back in September this will be an issue we can go to soon rather than later in the month.

CLOTURE MOTION

I move to proceed to the bill. So I make that motion to proceed at this time, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 575, H.R. 4444, a bill to authorize extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to the People's Republic of China:

Trent Lott, Pat Roberts, Larry E. Craig, Christopher Bond, Chuck Grassley, Ted Stevens, Connie Mack, Orin Hatch, Frank H. Murkowski, Wayne Allard,

Kay Bailey Hutchinson, Don Nickles, Bill Roth, Michael Crapo, Slade Gorton, and Craig Thomas.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this cloture vote will occur on Friday, unless consent can be granted to conduct the vote earlier or we are in a postcloture situation on the Treasury-Postal Service appropriations bill. There is opposition, obviously, to this motion to proceed. But I still think that adequate time can be used for discussion. I know there are a number of Senators who would like to see this vote occur on Thursday instead of Friday. I am willing to accommodate that. But if that cannot be worked out, then we will have the vote on Friday. If we are in a postcloture situation, the vote could be postponed for some time. But I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. I now withdraw the motion to proceed. I believe I have that right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. LOTT. In conclusion, while we seek Utopia in dealing with these appropriations bills, the promised land of how we can work together to do the people's business, which we are not doing right now, at least in the case of this bill, I believe we will have broad bipartisan support for the China PNTR bill. I might add, there is going to be some bipartisan opposition, too.

So as we get into the substance of this—which I would rather be getting into rather than having to once again file cloture on a motion to proceed—I think we will have a good debate. I think it is going to serve the Senate well. I think it will serve the American people well. I believe when we do finally get to a vote, it will pass—and probably should. But there are a lot of serious questions still involved in how we are going to deal with China. So I look forward to this discussion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar number 704, H.R. 4871, a bill making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes:

Trent Lott, Ben Nighthorse Campbell, Pat Roberts, Richard G. Lugar, Jesse Helms, Jeff Sessions, Larry E. Craig, Jon Kyl, Craig Thomas, Don Nickles, Strom Thurmond, Michael Crapo, Mitch McConnell, Fred Thompson, Judd Gregg, and Ted Stevens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call under the rule has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 4871, an act making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are required under the rule. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 227 Leg.]

YEAS—97

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

NOT VOTING—2

Thomas Torricelli

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no Senators wishing to vote or change their votes, on this vote, the yeas are 97, the nays are 0. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from South Carolina. (The remarks of Senator THURMOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 2925 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")