the 2001 budget and are current through March 26, 2001. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 290, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001.

Since my last report, dated January 25, 2001, the Congress has taken no action that has changed budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

Sincerely,

STEVEN LIEBERMAN
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosures.

TABLE 1.—FISCAL YEAR 2001 SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT, AS OF MARCH 23, 2001

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget resolution	Current level [1]	Current level over/under resolution
ON-BUDGET			
Budget Authority	1,534.5	1,568.4	33.9
Outlays	1,495.9	1,517.7	21.8
Revenues:			
2001	1,498.2	1,512.3	14.1
2001–2005	8,022.4	8,155.9	133.5
Debt Subject to Limit	5,663.5	5,654.3	−9.2
OFF-BUDGET			
Social Security Outlays:			
2001	336.5	337.2	0.7
2001–2005	1,765.0	1,767.3	2.3
Social Security Revenues:			
2001	501.5	501.5	(2)
2001–2005	2,740.8	2,740.8	(2)

[1] Current level is the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that the Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest information from the U.S. Treasury.

[2] Less than $50 million.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2001 SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES, AS OF MARCH 26, 2001

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,514,820
Permanents and other spending legislation	972,555	923,811	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	911,231	892,084	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−298,597	−928,677	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions	1,585,189	1,517,218	1,514,820
ENTITLEMENTS AND MANDATORIES			
Adjustments to appropriated mandatories to reflect baseline estimates	−16,743	519	n.a.
Total Current Level	1,568,446	1,517,737	1,514,820
Total Budget Resolution	1,534,546	1,495,924	1,498,200
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	33,900	21,813	16,620
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
MEMORANDUM			
Emergency designations for bills enacted this session	8,744	11,225	0

Note.—n.a. = not applicable.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

SURVIVING SCHOOL VIOLENCE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, earlier this week, a Today Show reporter interviewed Mr. Bob Stuber, a former police officer from California, who maintains a website called Escapeschool.com. Mr. Stuber's website gives advice to students who may one day find themselves caught in the crossfire of a shooting at school. The former police officer offers practical information in this day and age, such as what gunfire sounds like, what to do when a student hears gunfire, and what a student should look for in a hiding place.

It is simply heart breaking that this type of advice is even necessary. Yet, students in school are increasingly worried for their safety. Escapeschool.com is a valuable resource because in addition to giving advice to students, it also gives advice to schools and communities to try to prevent such shootings, and information for parents who want to communicate with their children about these events.

I encourage students and parents to look at this website and talk to each other about some of the dangers associated with guns. I also encourage my colleagues to look at the website with the hope that we in Congress can restart a dialogue about how to limit youth access to guns and reduce such shootings in American schools.

I ask consent to print in the RECORD excerpts from the transcript of the interview with Mr. Bob Stuber.

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

BOB STUBER DISCUSSES HIS ESCAPESCHOOL.COM PROGRAM TO TEACH CHILDREN WHAT TO DO DURING A SCHOOL SHOOTING

(Soledad O'Brien, co-host)

O'BRIEN. You give very specific advice. I want to get into some of it. If there is a shooting at a school, what should a student do?

Mr. STUBER. One of the very first things a student needs to know is that it's very hard to tell the difference between firecrackers and gunfire. Lots of times when you hear about these reports, you hear people say, 'I thought it was firecrackers. I went to see, and then I saw a shooter.' If you hear a sound, and you're not sure what it is, assume it could be gunfire and begin to take that defensive posture. It doesn't mean you have to jump under a table, just start thinking that way. That's the very first thing they need to know.

O'BRIEN. If it becomes clear that it is gunfire, should a student run?

Mr. STUBER. Absolutely! There are certain policies in place in some of the schools where under the best case scenario, they want them to go to a certain room and hide, and if you can do that, that's fine. But most of the time, you can't. Then we start talking about running. You want to keep this thing logical. Kids need to know how to run. For instance. . .

O'BRIEN. Where to run.

Mr. STUBER. Right. Where you—you don't want to run in a straight line. You want to either run in a zigzag fashion or you want to turn a corner because bullets don't turn corners. If you're going to hide and you pick a car, you want to hide at the front of the car where the engine block is, because that can stop a bullet. The middle of the car, the back of the car can't. Those little tips, and they're not frightening, those little tips are the things that make a difference.

O'BRIEN. Do you think a student should hide in a—in a shooting?

Mr. STUBER. Yeah, absolutely. What we think students should do first of all is—is, know the difference between cover and concealment. What they want to find is cover. For instance, a big tree with a giant trunk, that's cover. That will hide you and protect you. A hedge is concealment. It will hide you, but it won't protect you. Students have to find a place to hide where they can be safe. So the very first thing you begin to teach them, what to look for in a hiding spot.

O'BRIEN. If students are inside the classroom, is the best advice to stay inside the classroom? Or is the best advice to leave that classroom as soon as possible?

Mr. STUBER. It really—it really depends. There is no absolutes. If you can stay in that classroom, the teacher can lock the door. You can line up against the—the opposite wall, and—and you're going to be safe, that's fine. But if this action is coming down the hall, and it's coming to your classroom, you have to get out of there. So then you have to know, how should I get out? Should I go down the hall or should I go to the window, try to escape through the window? You know, we work with kids all the time. We—we set scenarios up. In one case I remember, we had kids go to the window to make an exit and because the windows wouldn't open, they naturally said, 'Well, we have to go down the hall.' They didn't think they could break the window and make an exit. You have to tell them that.

O'BRIEN. In one recent school shooting, there was an armed officer inside the school which managed to bring the shooting to a close pretty quickly.

Mr. STUBER. Right.

O'BRIEN. Do you think then that that's an indication that that's the way to go? Schools should have armed officers in the hallways?

Mr. STUBER. Well, you know, in the last two shootings, it kind of helped out, but there is no strong evidence that says it's a preventive tool. It was good that they were there. I'm not so sure schools have to go in that direction. There's so little data right now, you can't make a conclusive observation. So right now what we're trying to center on is the techniques that the students themselves can practice while all the data is being collected to make definitive prevention prognosis.

O'BRIEN. It seems critical that students report any threats that they hear. And yet time and time again, we hear that they don't. Oh, there were threats. They didn't think it was important.

Mr. STUBER. Right.

O'BRIEN. They didn't believe them. How do you make the threats actually get to the notice of the teachers?

Mr. STUBER. That is a big deal. You know, in almost every one of these shootings there has been threats, rumors or jokes. And some students haven't reported them. One of the reasons some students give is that there was no system for reporting anonymously. Schools have to provide a system where the student can report anonymously. It—because if the person finds out that you're the one that reported him, you're—you may end up getting in more trouble. So students are reluctant to report. They're also thinking, 'Well, I'm going to get my friend in trouble.' Look, it's like being at the airport. No jokes allowed in this area. Parents and schools have to tell them, report. Even a joke, you have to report.

O'BRIEN. Some good advice.

RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to imagine the following nightmare:

You have spent years in the uranium mines helping to build America's nuclear programs. As a result, you have contracted a debilitating and too often deadly radiation-related disease that has caused severe emotional and physical suffering. Most of life's joys have long since ended.

Your only solace is that the government is going to pay you for this suffering. Certainly, the money will never be enough to compensate you for what you've lost, but at least your medical bills will be paid. At least, if you lose this fight your family will be left with money.

However, when you open the Justice Department letter that you have long awaited, it reads:

I am pleased to inform you that your claim for compensation under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act has been approved. Regretfully, because the money available to pay claims has been exhausted, we are unable to send a compensation payment to you at this time. When Congress provides additional funds, we will contact you to commence the payment process. Thank you for your understanding.

Unfortunately, my fellow Senators, this is not a bad dream, but rather the terrible reality for hundreds of uranium miners, federal workers, and downwinders who have contracted these deadly radiation-related diseases. One such individual is Bob Key.

Bob Key helped build our nation's nuclear arsenal and end the Cold War through his difficult work as a uranium miner. Little did he know at the time that the uranium was slowly ravaging his body. As a result, Mr. Key has spent many years enduring the grueling pain associated with pulmonary fibrosis, which requires him to be hooked to an oxygen tank for hours on end. Recently, Mr. Key, 61, needed a tracheotomy simply to help him breathe.

Yet, despite his enormous suffering, Mr. Key has not received the $100,000 compensation from the government for which he is entitled under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of 1990. Instead, he received a five-line IOU from the Justice Department stating that there was not enough money to indemnify him for his suffering. This is a disgrace.

Unfortunately, Mr. Key's horror story is a familiar one for many uranium miners, federal workers, and downwinders from New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, and Utah. In some cases,the miners have died and their loved ones are left holding nothing but a Justice Department IOU. In 1990, when we passed the Domenici-authored Radiation Exposure Compensation Act, we never envisioned that these miners would receive IOUs. However, the fund is now bankrupt because of expansions in the program and Congress' failure to appropriate enough money.

This injustice must be rectified. I rise today to urge my colleagues to remedy this lack of funding. Those who gave so much for our nation's security through their work on our nuclear programs must be compensated for the enormous price they paid. Anything less is unacceptable.

Senator HATCH and I have introduced two bills that will provide full funding for the Radiation Exposure Compensation Trust Fund. We proposed legislation seeking $84 million in emergency supplemental appropriations to pay those claims that have already been approved as well as the projected number of approved claims for fiscal year 2001. This legislation would also make all future payments for approved claims mandatory.

With this legislation, we will ensure that those who gave so much for our nation will at least receive their deserved benefits. We must never again let their sacrifice go unanswered. I again ask my Senate colleagues to help us right this wrong and give these victims their just compensation. I ask unanimous consent that the March 27 New York Times article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, March 27, 2001]

ILL URANIUM MINERS LEFT WAITING AS PAYMENTS FOR EXPOSURE LAPSE

(By Michael Janofsky)

GRAND JUNCTION, COLO., MARCH 20.—For all the reminders of Bob Key's cold war effort, mining uranium for American nuclear weapons programs, none stands out more than the tank of oxygen tethered to his throat. Mr. Key, 61, has pulmonary fibrosis, a scarring of the lungs that is often fatal. A recent tracheotomy helps air flow to his lungs through a tube connected to the tank.

A decade ago, Congress recognized the contributions of Mr. Key and other uranium miners and passed the Radiation Exposure and Compensation Act of 1990. Signed by President George Bush, the law established one-time payments of up to $100,000 to miners or their families and to people who lived downwind from the nuclear test sites in Nevada. Last year, Congress increased the payout to $150,000, added new medical benefits and expanded the number of workers eligible.

But after years of smooth operations, the program is broke. Scrambling last year to pass President Bill Clinton's final budget, lawmakers never debated the Justice Department's request for additional money to cover the expanded program even as new applications were pouring in, and by May, nothing was left. And Congress has been reluctant to act until it decides how to apportion the federal surplus and how much to cut taxes.

As a result, for the first time, claims from hundreds of eligible applicants like Mr. Key have been held up, with many of the applicants receiving i.o.u. letters from the Justice Department, which administers the program, saying their requests will be processed only after Congress appropriates more money.

And the demand is only increasing. Claims from another 1,600 applicants under the original law are pending, and the department estimates that as many as 1,050 new applicants are expected to file for benefits this year, a number that would raise the cost of the program to more than $80 million.

''It's been a bureaucratic travesty,'' said Representative Scott McInnis, a republican from Grand Junction, a city in western Colorado, who introduced legislation this year seeking $84 million to restore the program. ''These people are due their compensation. There is nothing to be adjudicated. The money is owed. The debt is due.''

For now, Congress has not decided how or when to continue the program. Lawmakers are discussing the possibility of legislation as part of the current year's budget to provide money right away.

Meanwhile, almost 200 people who have been approved for the money are still holding the i.o.u.'s, including relatives of some miners who have died of their illnesses while waiting.

''Just since January, we've lost five clients, and I'm sure there are more we're not aware of,'' said Keith Killian, a lawyer here who represents former uranium miners and their families. Rebecca Rockwell, a private investigator in Durango, Colo., said she represented the families of at least 10 clients with i.o.u. letters who have died.

Senator Pete V. Domenici of New Mexico and Senator Orrin G. Hatch of Utah, both Republicans, have introduced legislation similar to Mr. McInnis's, asking for enough money to pay all claims through this year and to make the program a permanent entitlement so Congress does not have to authorize spending each year. They have urged President Bush to include money for the program in a supplemental budget proposal for the current fiscal year.

But miners and their families have been told that no new spending is likely until Congress resolves its fiscal issues, a process that could delay disbursement of the miners' money for months, even a year.

''I'm bitter about it,'' said Mr. Key, who worked in the mines from 1959 through 1963 and, like other mine workers, said he was never warned of the health consequences of exposure to uranium.

''I wonder how well those guys in Washington would do, see how they would like it, tied to a chain like I am 24 hours a day,'' Mr. Key said. ''I know I owe taxes this year. I'm just going to tell them to take it out of my i.o.u.''

Worried that he will not live long enough to receive a check because of his lung disease, Jack Beeson, 67, a former miner from Moab, Utah, said: ''We worked in those mines, waiting for our golden years. Well, now it's our golden years, and it's done nothing but cost us gold. This is no way to live. I felt I was doing the government a service. Now, I feel they're doing me a disservice.''

To many of the former miners who extracted uranium from hundreds of mines in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico and Arizona, the i.o.u.'s are insulting. From the 1940's through 1971, when mining for the nuclear weapons program ended, they regarded themselves as patriots, equal to servicemen. The relatively high wages paid by the mines were a lure, but so was the idea that uranium mining was crucial to national security.

Lorna Harvey's father, Loren Wilcox, was a cattle rancher. But he disliked Russia so much, Ms. Harvey said, that he took a mining job in 1954 and worked it for two and a half years. ''He felt we needed to protect ourselves,'' she said. Mr. Wilcox died of lung cancer in 1969 at 62.

Most workers had no idea that the yellow ore they were mining could destroy their health. Wayne Hill, 69, who has lung cancer, said a tin cup hung at the entrance to one mine for miners and drivers to drink water dripping out of the rocks. ''It was cool, clear water,'' he said. ''I didn't know it was going to make me light up.''

So little was known or revealed about the health consequences of uranium exposure that workers used uranium dust for fertilizer and uranium rocks for doorstops. ''My mother made earrings out of it,'' Ms. Harvey said.

With deaths and illnesses mounting and ample scientific evidence to show that uranium exposure was a cause, Congress passed

legislation to compensate the miners in 1990. And for nearly 10 years, the Justice Department's annual requests for financing the program were met. To date, $268.7 million has been paid to 3,595 people. About the same number were denied because they lacked proper medical records or copies of company logs that showed how long they had worked in the mines.

The financial crunch arose when Mr. Clinton expanded the program at a time Congress appropriated only $10.8 million to cover existing claims, an amount that was exhausted quickly. Efforts by Mr. Domenici and others to cover the shortfall, as well as the new applicants, failed.

Some of the i.o.u. holders have lost hope of seeing the money. Darlene Pagel's husband, Duane, died of pulmonary fibrosis in 1986 at 55. Since then, Ms. Pagel said, she has worked two jobs to pay off his medical bills, which still amount to $26,922.

''He didn't know uranium could kill him,'' she said. ''If he'd have known he would have been dead at 55, he never would have taken the job.''

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF WASHINGTON METRO

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, tomorrow, March 29, 2001, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority will celebrate the 25th Anniversary of passenger service on the Metrorail system. I want to take this opportunity to congratulate WMATA on this important occasion and to recognize the extraordinary contribution Metro has made to this region and to our Nation.

For the past quarter century, the Washington Metro system has served as a shining example of a public investment in the Washington Metropolitan area's future. It provides a unified and coordinated transportation system for the region, enhances mobility for the millions of residents, visitors and the federal workforce in the region, promotes orderly growth and development of the region, enhances our environment, and preserves the beauty and dignity of our Nation's Capital. It is also an example of an unparalleled partnership that spans every level of government from city to state to federal.

Since passenger service first began in 1976, Metrorail has grown from a 4.6 mile, five station, 22,000 passenger service to a comprehensive 103-mile, 83 station, and 600,000 passenger system serving the entire metropolitan region, and with even more service and stations on a fast track toward completion. Today, the Metro system is the second busiest rapid transit operation in the country, carrying nearly one-fifth of the region's daily commuters traveling to the metropolitan core and taking more than 270,000 vehicles off the roads every day. It is also one of the finest, cleanest, safest and most reliable transportation systems in the Nation.

Reaching this important milestone has not been an easy task, by any measure. It took extraordinary vision and perseverance to build the 103 mile subway system over the past twenty five years and, as the Washington Post has recently underscored in two articles about the Metro system, it will require an equal or even greater commitment to address the challenges that lie ahead. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the first of these articles be included in the RECORD immediately following my statement.

The great communities throughout the world are the ones that have worked to preserve and enhance their historic and natural resources; provide good transportation systems for citizens to move to their places of employment and to public facilities freely; and invest in neighborhoods and local business districts. These are among the things that contribute to the livability of our communities and enrich the lives of our citizens. I submit that the Metro system and the regional cooperation which it has helped foster has helped make this region a community in which we can all be proud.

This week's celebration is a tribute to everyone involved in the continuing intergovernmental effort to provide mass transit to the people of the Washington Metropolitan area—those local, State and federal officials who had the vision to begin this project 25 years ago and who have worked so steadfastly over the years to support the system. This foresight has been well rewarded and I join in celebrating this special occasion.

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

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 25, 2001]

REGION'S SUBWAY SYSTEM BEGINS TO SHOW ITS AGE

(By Lyndsey Layton)

As Washington's Metro trains hummed to life 25 years ago, many people didn't know what to expect. It was, after all, among the first U.S. subway systems built from scratch, rather than cobbled together from several existing railroads, as in New York and Boston.

But from its opening on March 27, 1976, Metro was a new American monument. Embraced by locals and tourists, it became a $9.4 billion model for moving people swiftly between suburbs and the city. Riders have lately flocked to Metro faster than it can buy rail cars to carry them, a fortune never anticipated by its designers.

The Metro would provide to be far more than a people mover. It shaped the region in dramatic ways, turning the village of Bethesda into a small city, reviving sagging Clarendon, pumping new life into downtown by creating mass transit access that eventually lured the MCI Center and its professional sports teams to Gallery Place.

The Metro system has become—among many other things—a gathering place, a unifier, a matchmarker, a land developer, an economic power and a community planner.

But while Metro fulfilled some dreams, it left others unrealized. Ideas that made sense when the subway was built turned out to be mistakes. Escalators open to the sky are falling apart after decades of soaking in rain and snow. The two-track design of the railroad is too simple for increasing demands for service.

Metro is lapping up tax dollars to keep its aging equipment running.

And the rail lines don't reach where most movement now takes place: suburb to suburb. Transit managers have grand visions for Metro's next 25 years: They want to connect major suburbs with rail and to use the more flexible bus system to follow the market, joining suburbs, carrying the spillover from rail lines, stepping in to fill gaps.

They dream of a transit system that forges the region's destiny for the next quarter-century as it did for the past.

MOLDING THE REGION

The transit system has sprouted restaurant rows in Bethesda and Ballston, shops and offices in Pentagon City and around Union station, affordable housing in Virginia Square, economic revival on U Street. Metro means cheap mobility for college students.

It has helped diversify the inner suburbs, encouraging immigrants from Bolivia and Peru to settle in Arlington. It made it possible for many of the 300,000 federal employees to buy single-family homes in close-in communities and work in downtown Washington. It even gave a name to the neighborhood of Friendship Heights, which most called Chevy Chase in the days before the subway station.

Metro has tied together a region fractured by state lines, race and class.

''You've got people of different races, different classes, different job descriptions, from city and from suburb, old and young, able and disabled,'' said Zachary Schrag, a graduate student at Columbia University who is writing his dissertation about the Metro. ''And they actually treat each other pretty civilly most of the time.''

MOVING PEOPLE

Alan Sussman studies Torah on the Red Line. Frank Lloyd takes his twin girls for all-day rides as a cheap diversion. Oren Hirsch, 14, always tries to claim the seat directly behind the operator so he can peer through the smoked-glass window and watch the controls and the track bed rushing under the train.

Metro is carrying about 600,000 passengers a day on its trains and 500,000 on buses, making it the nation's second-busiest transit system behind New York's.

That's a ranking that none of the original planners dreamed of when they were designing the system in the late 1060s.

''I'm a believer, and it has even outstripped my expectations,'' said Cleatus Barnett, 73, who was appointed to the Metro board of directors in 1971 and is the longest continually serving member.

The subway takes more than 270,000 cars off the road each day, Metro officials say. Those cars would have used more than 12 million gallons of gasoline a year and needed 30 additional highway lanes and 1,800 acres of parking.

Mary Margaret Whipple, a state senator from Arlington and a past member of the Metro board, puts it this way, ''One hundred thousand people a day go underneath Arlington on the Metro system instead of through Arlington in their cars.''

As highway traffic gets worse, subway ridership has soared. Ridership records are shattered regularly, thanks in part to a robust economy, strong tourism, a new transit subsidy extended to federal workers and fares that haven't increased since 1995.

AN EARLY VISION

Before it opened, Metro had trouble recruiting workers, who were wary abut toiling in the dark underground. ''All people knew about subways was New York,'' said Christopher Scripp, a Cleveland Park Station manager, who was a Metrobus driver when he became one of the first subway employees.

The architect, Harry M. Weese, had been sent on a tour of European subways with instructions to combine the world's best designs into a new American monument.