

I thank the number of people who voted for this bill on final passage. I am not sure I expected that large a number of votes. I expected a sizable number of Democrats, but many more voted than I anticipated. Quite frankly, I didn't expect to get every Republican vote, which we did in the final analysis. I thank all of my colleagues who voted for the bill. Those who didn't vote for it, I thank them very much for their cooperation in letting this come to final passage, even though they did not like it.

So with passage of the RELIEF Act, I feel that struggling families will have more money to make ends meet. Parents and students will be able to more easily afford the cost of a college education. A successful businesswoman will be able to expand and hire more people. A father finally getting a good paycheck after years of work will be able to provide for his aging mother. A farmer won't have to worry about passing on to his children the family farm without selling half of the land, maybe, for estate taxes. The examples are endless, but the great benefits that we realize when we give tax relief to working men and women are great.

I thank many members of the committee staff, both Republican and Democrat. Most of all, I think we have to thank the members of the Finance Committee—each one—for sitting through 10 hours of debate. Roughly a week ago now, we worked day and night to get that bill through. I thank my Finance Committee staff, Mark Prater, with me here, our chief tax counsel; and other tax counsels, including Ed McClellan, Brig Pari, Elizabeth Paris, who is here with me; Dean Zerbe, as well as Diann Howland. These individuals have been the workhorses of the committee, keeping the lights burning long into the night to make this final product the statutory language that it is and the perfection that statutory language must have.

I also thank the entire staff support, particularly Gina Falconio, Leah Shimp, Jeanne Haggerty, and Carla Martin. Lastly, on my side, I thank Kolan Davis and Ted Totman, the committee staff director and deputy staff director, for riding herd on all of this work.

This is a bipartisan bill. It would not have been possible without the close work and cooperation at the staff level. So as chairman of the committee, I have to appreciate and thank the minority staff for their good work, particularly Russ Sullivan, chief tax counsel; as well as Cary Pugh, Pat Heck, Maria Freese, Frank Rodriguez, and Mitchell Kent. In addition, I thank John Angell and Mike Evans for their time and hard work as leaders of the staff for the Democrats.

Let me extend my thanks as well to a person who is not very public—Lindy Paull and her staff at the Joint Committee on Taxation, who probably want to be known for their anonymity. They provide a great deal of extensive

knowledge and guidance to this effort, particularly not only in writing but also in their analysis of the cost of legislation—what different policies add up to particular income into the Federal Treasury or less income into the Federal Treasury.

Then I think we should not forget the Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, Mark Weinberger, and his staff for their assistance because even though they don't have a vote on Capitol Hill, there is a lot of expertise at the U.S. Department of Treasury that this committee—the Senate Finance Committee—has on a regular basis called upon for analysis for their opinions, and also to some extent to give us a view of the executive branch of Government as one more issue in consideration that we ought to have.

My thanks also goes to Jim Fransen and Mark Mathiesen and their capable staff and legislative counsel for taking our ideas and drafting them into statutory language.

Then, finally, as Senator BAUCUS has done, I thank people on his side of the aisle who worked so hard as leaders of the Senate Finance Committee or Senate Budget Committee. I also believe that we would not be here if we had not had a successful budget resolution passed to make room for this third largest tax cut in 50 years, the largest tax cut in the last 20 years. So I thank Senator PETE DOMENICI and his staff director, Bill Hoagland, and the entire Budget Committee staff for their assistance. They were assistants to me during this deliberation, as Senator CONRAD was for Senator BAUCUS, but also that sort of leadership provided the budget resolution.

This is a historical bill for historical times, and I am honored and privileged to be a part of it. Once again, as Senator BAUCUS has said so often, and I have said often, I hope this spirit of bipartisanship continues, as it has, as a tradition in the Finance Committee through our leadership but will also be a standard for other work we do in the Finance Committee; more importantly, that it is something which is contagious, and that there will be closer working relationships and more bipartisanship between all Senators and the products of the Senate.

We go to conference now, and there again we are going to have to produce legislation that hopefully gets the same bipartisan support this bill did. If it is something a little less than that, it can't be much less. I don't want to be gambling that we will get 51 votes when we come to the floor of the Senate after the negotiations are done. I want to make sure that when we come to the floor, we come to the floor in a way that, before we bring the bill up, we have bipartisanship.

The fact is there aren't a lot of Democrats voting for this bill. We can't take for granted the 62 people who have voted for it already.

I wish we could. It would make for a very easy conference. We go there now

to negotiate with the other body. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleagues from Iowa and Montana for the great job they have done. It was a tremendous amount of work, a tremendous amount of patience. I congratulate them.

VITAL DRUG SHORTAGE

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an emergency situation facing many of our hospitals across the country. It is an emergency that faces our hospitals, many of our doctors but, much more importantly, it is an emergency that faces the tiniest members of our society, and they are babies who are about to be born and premature babies.

Right now, we have a drastically short supply of a vital drug that is used to help save the lives of babies who are born prematurely. Let me explain.

There is a drug called betamethasone, commonly known as Celestone, which is given to mothers who are about to deliver their child early. The drug is designed to help the premature baby's lungs develop more fully and more completely and to help reduce the risk of bleeding in the baby's brain.

This drug is absolutely essential to giving these tiny newborns a chance to live and grow into healthy children.

An obstetrician at Riverside Hospital in Columbus, Dr. Tracy Cook, contacted me about the current shortage of this very necessary drug. From what I understand, many hospitals no longer have a supply of the drug on hand at all, and others have only a few day's worth left in stock. In fact, I have taken a survey around Ohio, and I suspect what I found in Ohio is true across the country, that doctors and hospitals are running low, many are out, some will be out in just a few days.

I have contacted the Secretary of HHS, Mr. Tommy Thompson, as well as the FDA, to enlist their help in getting emergency supplies of the drug shipped to hospitals as soon as possible. The FDA tells us there are some manufacturing problems with the drug which is causing this shortage.

Whatever the delay, I believe it is absolutely critical that we get these drugs to our hospitals so that no lives are lost, no matter what the cause is for this delay. This is a problem which has to be dealt with.

This drug is critical to the health and future of premature babies. I urge my colleagues to support me in urging the FDA to take whatever action is necessary to resolve this problem. The lives of so many newborns hang in the balance.

This is a problem the FDA must address immediately. We have contacted the FDA, and the response we get back is: These are manufacturing problems. That does not tell us what the exact

problem is, nor does it tell us what the FDA is doing and what the manufacturer is doing to resolve this problem.

We need some answers from the FDA. This is something that cannot wait 2 weeks or 1 month or 6 months. This problem has to be resolved over the next few days. It is critical for the safety of these newborn children.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

TAX RELIEF

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we have been spending all of our time this week on taxes. I am delighted the tax bill has passed. Certainly there are different views on how to do it. There will always be different views when one raises the question of taxes or spending. There are different points of view. Much has to do with the priorities of people. Much has to do with the philosophy of what one thinks the appropriate role of the Federal Government is, what kinds of programs should be funded by the Federal Government. Those are the broad issues.

I was very pleased when we did follow through, and the House, of course, passed tax relief in the amount of approximately \$1.6 trillion, which is what the President requested. The bill that passed the Senate is something less than that. It is still a huge amount of money. Most of us cannot conceive what \$1.3 trillion is, but nevertheless it is very close to the same amount and I think deals with the same principles that are so important.

Taxes are one of the highest priorities for this Congress and, indeed, should be. Taxes are high priorities for this Congress because of the fairness question. It is a question of adequately funding appropriate programs.

It is a high priority for the American people for much the same reason in that no one wants to pay more taxes than they have to, but most of us are willing to pay taxes. It is necessary to do that. Fairness is an issue. This is one of the President's first priorities.

Interestingly enough, this and education are the two highest priorities, and soon we deal with the energy issue. Those are the three things that have been talked about the most in the last several months, so it is appropriate this Congress has focused on and made progress in those areas.

The Senate will be going to conference with the House, and hopefully we will have it down to the President perhaps before this week is over. That is an excellent performance.

On the tax bill we went through 50-some votes on amendments, which gave everybody a good opportunity to talk about the different issues. Yet the bill survived pretty much as it was reported out of committee. I congratulate the committee and the leaders.

There are a number of principles involved. We talk about amount always but limited Government is part of it. One of the reasons for a return of taxes is because the citizens, the American

people have paid more taxes than are necessary, and we have a surplus. Clearly, it should go back to the people who paid it.

Quite frankly, my experience is if we have a surplus for very long, we will find a way to spend it even though it may not be one of the highest priorities. The principles of limited Government are very much a part of what we do.

There are questions as to, when one projects out 10 years, how close the projections will come to the actual surpluses. I think any economic projection for 10 years has some variability in it. However, I believe all the professionals who have made this projection indicate it is a very modest projection and, indeed, it is very likely the surpluses will, in fact, even be higher.

It is a time, too, when it is necessary to stimulate the economy. This is one of the ways the economy is stimulated—by letting people spend more of their own money. It is true it takes a while for all of this to kick in, but there will be some immediate impact, and that is vital to the economy.

Fairness in the Tax Code is very important, and we have a hard time with fairness in the Tax Code. This bill provides more fairness in the marriage penalty where two single people who earn a certain amount of money marry, and their tax on the same amount of money is increased. That is a fairness issue and needs to be changed.

It is something we need to do. We talk a lot about the simplicity of the Tax Code.

We didn't do much about that. We are always wanting to give tax credits, so the Tax Code keeps getting larger.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AGAINST WITHDRAWAL FROM BOSNIA

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to take strong issue with remarks by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld as summarized in the Washington Post on May 18 and subsequently reproduced in their entirety on the paper's website, that he is "pushing" to pull U.S. troops out of Bosnia. According to Secretary Rumsfeld, "the military job [in Bosnia] was done three or four years ago."

I firmly believe that Secretary Rumsfeld's analysis of the situation in Bosnia is incorrect, and that his policy prescription would be seriously detrimental to the national security interests of the United States.

First, let me turn to Mr. Rumsfeld's statement that the "military job was done three or four years ago." It is true that IFOR, and then SFOR, successfully separated the largely exhausted warring parties without much difficulty. But to assert that this separation spelled the end of our troops' mission is to define "military" in such a narrow way so as to make it nearly meaningless in the Balkan context.

Putting it in other terms, Secretary Rumsfeld seems to belong to the school

that begins talking about so-called "exit strategies" as soon as troops are committed. Of course we need an "exit strategy," and we have had one. The Clinton Administration early on outlined ten detailed benchmarks for Dayton implementation that need to be met before we can say "mission accomplished" and honorably withdraw. These are not secrets. The U.S. Embassy in Sarajevo hands out a list of the benchmarks to all visitors. I must assume that Secretary Rumsfeld is familiar with them, so it seems that he either believes they no longer apply, or that our troops no longer have anything to do with most aspects of Dayton implementation.

From Secretary Rumsfeld's published remarks, I get the impression that he sees anything short of actual combat or the separating of warring parties as inappropriate tasks for our soldiers. If he does, I disagree with him. In fact, his view strikes me as the old syndrome of "preparing to fight the last war." The last two so-called "Strategic Concepts" of NATO have made clear that the most likely security challenges of the twenty-first century will be ethnic and religious strife, transnational crime, terrorism and the like—rather than a frontal attack on the territory of alliance members.

The details bear examination. Little more than two years ago in this city, NATO celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. At that Washington Summit, NATO issued the latest version of its Strategic Concept. I would like to quote several parts of the Strategic Concept in order to show that we and our allies have clearly understood that the military's function is not bound in a narrow straightjacket.

The document, agreed upon by all nineteen NATO members on April 23 and 24, 1999, declares in Article 20 that "large-scale conventional aggression against the Alliance is highly unlikely." It goes on to say the following: "Ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the dissolution of states can lead to local and even regional instability."

It then graphically outlines the possible ramifications of such developments: "The resulting tensions could lead to crises affecting Euro-Atlantic stability. . . [and] could affect the security of the Alliance by spilling over into neighboring countries, including NATO countries, or in other ways, and could also affect the security of other states."

Moreover, Article 25 of the 1999 Strategic Concept specifically states that "The Alliance is committed to a broad approach to security, which recognizes the importance of political, economic, social and environmental factors in addition to the indispensable defense dimension."

How can these factors be addressed? Article 29 mentions the "Alliance's ability to contribute to conflict prevention and crisis management