

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report on the study conducted pursuant to paragraph (1).

(3) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for volunteer income tax assistance clinics \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

(B) USE OF FUNDS.—Such amounts appropriated under subparagraph (A) shall be used for the operating expenses of volunteer income tax assistance clinics, expenses for providing electronic filing expenditures through such clinics, and related expenses.

(C) TELE-FILING.—The Secretary shall ensure that tele-filing is available for all taxpayers for the filing of tax returns with respect to taxable years beginning in 2001.

(d) DEPOSIT INDICATOR PROGRAM.—

(1) REVIEW.—The Secretary shall review the decision to reinstate the Deposit Indicator program.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress a report on the review made pursuant to paragraph (1).

(e) DIRECT DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS.—The Secretary shall allocate resources to programs to assist low income taxpayers in establishing accounts at financial institutions that receive direct deposits from the United States Treasury.

(f) PILOT PROGRAM FOR MOBILE TAX RETURN FILING OFFICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a pilot program for the creation of four mobile tax return filing offices with electronic filing capabilities.

(2) LOCATION OF SERVICE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The mobile tax return filing offices shall be located in communities that the Secretary determines have a high incidence of taxpayers claiming the earned income tax credit.

(B) INDIAN RESERVATION.—At least one mobile tax return filing office shall be on or near an Indian reservation (as defined in section 168(j)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986).

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 354. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 354. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1, to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 1125, insert the following:

SEC. 1125B (20 U.S.C. 6336). STUDY, EVALUATION AND REPORT OF SCHOOL FINANCE EQUALIZATION.

The Secretary shall conduct a study to evaluate and report to the Congress on the degree of disparity in expenditures per pupil among LEAs in each of the fifty states and the District of Columbia using the distribution formula described in this section. The Secretary shall also analyze the trends in State school finance legislation and judicial action requiring that states equalize re-

sources. The Secretary will attempt to evaluate and report to the Congress whether or not it can be determined if these actions have resulted in an improvement in student performance.

In preparing this report, the Secretary may also consider the following: other measures of determining disparity; the relationship between education expenditures and student performance; the effect of Federal education assistance programs on the equalization of school finance resources; and the effects of school finance equalization on local and state tax burdens.

Such report shall be submitted to the Congress not later than one year after the date of enactment of the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place Thursday, May 3, 2001, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-336 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this oversight hearing is to review FERC's April 26, 2001, order addressing wholesale electricity prices in California and the Western United States.

Request to testify may be made in writing to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please call Jo Meuse at (202) 224-6567.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Jay Barth and Nicky Yuen have floor privileges today and for the remainder of the debate on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

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

RELIEF OF RITA MIREMBE REVELL A.K.A. MARGARET RITA MIREMBE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 560, and that the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 560) for the relief of Rita Mirembé Revell (a.k.a. Margaret Rita Mirembé).

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements pertaining to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 560) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 560

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR RITA MIREMBE REVELL (A.K.A. MARGARET RITA MIREMBE).

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), Rita Mirembé Revell (a.k.a. Margaret Rita Mirembé) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fees not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBERS.—Upon the granting of permanent residence to Rita Mirembé Revell (a.k.a. Margaret Rita Mirembé), the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by the appropriate number, during the current or next following fiscal year, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)) or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 202(e) of such Act.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MAY 1, 2001

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, May 1. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then proceed to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1 as under the previous order.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hour of 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

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

PROGRAM

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will convene at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow and will immediately have a cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1, the education reform bill. Following that vote, it is expected that the 30 hours of postcloture debate will begin. However, it is hoped that time will be yielded so the Senate can begin full consideration of the bill as early as tomorrow afternoon. Numerous amendments are expected to be offered to this important legislation, and therefore Senators may expect votes throughout the week.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of Senator DORGAN.

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

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

 NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, tomorrow President Bush will make a speech on the subject of national missile defense. I want to comment briefly about that.

A national missile defense sounds perfectly plausible to a good many people. In fact, we have colleagues in this Chamber who believe very strongly that we ought to begin deploying a national missile defense immediately, despite the fact, of course, that we don't have a national missile defense that works. The last time we did a test of the system was last summer. In that test, we sent up a missile with a target warhead. We knew what the target was, we knew where it was going to be, and we knew when it was going to be there. Despite that, we could not hit it with our interceptor.

These are very simple, rudimentary tests, and we have not been able to demonstrate through those tests that we have a national missile defense system that works.

Some say: Well, but shouldn't we have a national missile defense system in the event that someone launches missiles at this country?

What they need to understand is that the national missile defense program that is being discussed by the administration, and that was discussed by past administrations, is not a national missile defense program that would safeguard this country against, for example, a nuclear missile attack by Russia or China. No. It is in fact a system that is very narrow, which, if it worked, would provide a kind of catcher's mitt against an attack by a rogue nation of one or two or three or four missiles.

A rogue nation or a terrorist leader getting access to an ICBM, as improbable as that might be, and wanting to launch that ICBM would confront an American national missile defense program that would be able to go up and catch that missile as it came in and explode it. That is the theory. It has never been an approach that has been advertised to protect us against a more robust attack by just one submarine launching missiles from all of its tubes coming from Russia. It would not defend us against that.

So people should understand what is being talked about here. Despite the fact that we don't have a system that works, we have people saying we ought to deploy it immediately. Deploy what?

What kind of a system? The last test failed. Ought not we have a system that is demonstrated to have worked before we talk about deploying it?

Second, there are other problems. In order to deploy a national missile defense program—some call it Star Wars, and others have other names for it—in order to deploy that with the time of deployment that is envisioned, we would have to violate the ABM Treaty.

That ABM Treaty has been the centerpiece of our arms reduction efforts. Our arms reduction efforts with the old Soviet Union and now Russia have been quite successful. We have far fewer nuclear weapons than we used to—far too many, but far fewer than we used to have, and fewer delivery vehicles as well.

The centerpiece of those reductions in nuclear arms has been the ABM Treaty. Some say this treaty is obsolete, let's get rid of it. If we do that, we will have, in my judgment, dealt a significant blow to the future of arms reductions.

If we get rid of the ABM Treaty, as President Bush suggests and as some of my colleagues suggest, in my judgment, we will retreat back to a situation where Russia and China and other countries will build more offensive weapons even as we try to build this limited national missile defense system.

In addition to the issue of the ABM Treaty and the violation of that treaty by building a national missile defense system, we also are encountering vigorous opposition from virtually all of our allies who are very concerned that if we build a new national missile defense program it will ignite a new arms race, especially with Russia and with the Chinese. That is a very real and valid concern.

I would like to urge my colleagues and President Bush to try to develop a balanced view of all of this and understand that there are consequences to all of it. We have a range of threats. Yes, let's deal with that range of threats. I happen to support research and development for our national missile defense system. I do not support deployment of a system we have not yet demonstrated to be workable. The threat it is supposed to counter is one of the least likely threats this country faces.

By far the most likely threat we face is for a terrorist or a rogue nation to get a hold of a suitcase-size nuclear bomb and put it in the trunk of an old rusty Desoto car and park it on a dock somewhere in New York or Chicago. That is by far a much more likely scenario of a terrorist act. Or instead of a suitcase bomb, perhaps someone will use a deadly vial of chemical or biological agents that can kill millions of people. That is a much more likely scenario—a much more likely weapon of mass destruction to be used by a rogue nation or a terrorist state.

We ought to deal with all of those issues. We ought to be concerned about all of them.

As a country that is as free and open as this country, we need to be very concerned about terrorism and about rogue nations. But we also need to be concerned about continuing the effort to reduce the number of nuclear weapons. I mentioned that we have done some of that. I would like to ask, by consent, to be able to show a couple of pieces that resulted from the efforts in the Senate.

The Nunn-Lugar Program is the program that most people probably won't recognize. It is a program to spend money funding certain activities that reduce the threat to this country. One of those activities is to cut up Russian bombers.

This piece in my hand is from a wing strut on a Backfire bomber. This bomber used to fly around carrying nuclear weapons that would have threatened this country. But now this is not a wing strut on a Russian bomber, it is a piece of metal that is in my desk here in the Senate. Do you know how I got this wing strut? No, we didn't shoot this bomber down. The wing was sawed off this bomber as a result of arms control reductions—arms reductions that were negotiated between the United States and the old Soviet Union, and which are continuing to be carried on by us and the Russians. We saw the wings off bombers, we dismantle nuclear submarines, and we take missiles out of their silos, separate them from their warheads. That way we reduce the number of nuclear weapons on their side and our side. It has happened, and it has worked. It is the reason I am able to hold up a piece of a Russian bomber that we didn't shoot down, but we paid money to destroy it.

This is ground-up copper from a Russian submarine. We didn't sink that submarine. It was dismantled under terms of an arms control agreement with the Russians.

Does it make sense for us to continue agreements by which we reduce the number of nuclear weapons on both sides? You bet it does. Does it make sense for us to say to the Russians: Look, the treaties under which we have reduced nuclear weapons are now no longer very important to us. We are going to violate the ABM Treaty. It doesn't matter what you think of it, we are going to produce a national missile defense system that has not yet been demonstrated to work—at the risk of backing away from the ABM Treaty, and having both Russia and China build more offensive weapons? That does not seem like much of a bargain to me.

I hope, as President Bush discusses these issues tomorrow, he will understand that the Nunn-Lugar Program and the arms control agreements that we have had with Russia and the old Soviet Union have worked to reduce the number of nuclear weapons. His appreciation for those facts would be a step in the right direction, in my judgment.