

date by which the Trust Fund would become insolvent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that Congress should reject the reductions in guaranteed Social Security benefits proposed by the President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, today, along with Senator LIEBERMAN, I am submitting a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should reject the reductions in guaranteed Social Security benefits proposed by the President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security.

The central purpose of Social Security is to ensure that Americans who work hard and contribute to our Nation can maintain a decent standard of living in their old age. The program provides a critical safety net. Only 11 percent of American seniors live in poverty, but without Social Security that figure would be 50 percent.

It is hard to overstate the importance of Social Security in protecting seniors' retirement security. For two-thirds of the elderly, Social Security is their major source of income. For one-third of the elderly, Social Security is virtually their only source of income.

Despite its critical importance for seniors, the level of Social Security benefits generally is quite modest. In fiscal year 2001, the average benefit for retired workers was about \$10,000 per year. This clearly is insufficient to maintain a decent standard of living in most parts of the country, especially for seniors with relatively high health care costs.

Unfortunately, even the modest level of guaranteed benefits under current law is now at risk. Last year, the President's Commission to Strengthen Social Security, appointed by President Bush to help promote his goal of partially privatizing Social Security, proposed a set of options for changes in the program that included significant reductions in the level of guaranteed benefits.

The Commission's report included a proposal in which guaranteed benefit levels would be reduced by changing the way that benefits are adjusted over time. The details of this change are complicated, but the bottom line is not: compared to current law, the proposal could reduce the benefits provided to workers who retire in the future by about 45 percent. The Commission's report also suggested changes that would reduce benefits for those who retire early, which could force many Americans to delay their retirement.

The Commission justified proposed cuts in guaranteed benefits by pointing to long-term projected shortfalls in the Social Security Trust Fund. And it is true that as the baby boomers begin to retire, they will put significant new demands on our budget. However, the Commission's proposals for private accounts actually would make the Trust Fund's financial problems worse. By proposing to divert payroll tax revenues from the Trust Fund into private

accounts, the Commission would only accelerate the date by which the Fund would become insolvent.

Proponents of privatizing Social Security like to argue that the returns for assets held in private accounts are likely to be high. That may be true for some fortunate seniors, but others will suffer with the inevitable fluctuations in the market. In any case, we need to remember why we have Social Security in the first place, to provide a floor to ensure that seniors can live out their lives in dignity. The real question for the Congress is where to set that floor. And, in my view, \$10,000 a year for the average beneficiary is, if anything, too low.

It is important to keep Social Security's long-term problems in perspective. According to estimates by the Social Security Administration, the present value of the Trust Fund's unfunded obligations amounts to \$3.2 trillion over the next 75 years. By contrast, the 75 year cost of last year's tax cut, if made permanent, has been estimated to be \$7.7 trillion. In other words, the long-term cost of the tax cut is more than twice as large as the long-term deficit in Social Security.

There is simply no excuse for making dramatic cuts in guaranteed Social Security benefits, as the President's commission has proposed.

So, I hope my colleagues will support this resolution and join in rejecting the cuts in guaranteed benefits proposed by President Bush's commission.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3040. Mr. REID (for Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. LEAHY)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes.

SA 3041. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. SMITH, of Oregon) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3042. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mrs. CARNAHAN, and Mr. BOND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3043. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SPECTER, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3044. Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, and Mr. NELSON of Nebraska) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3045. Mr. ROCKEFELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr.

DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3046. Mr. ROCKEFELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3047. Mr. CRAIG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3048. Mr. SMITH of Oregon submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3049. Mr. CRAIG proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3016 proposed by Mr. BINGAMAN to the amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3050. Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. KYL) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3051. Mr. FITZGERALD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3052. Mr. MURKOWSKI proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3016 proposed by Mr. BINGAMAN to the amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3053. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3054. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3055. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3056. Mr. GRASSLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3057. Mr. KYL (for himself and Mr. HELMS) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3016 proposed by Mr. BINGAMAN to the amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3058. Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. SNOWE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3016 proposed by Mr. BINGAMAN to the amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3059. Mr. BINGAMAN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3060. Mr. BINGAMAN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3061. Mr. BINGAMAN proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3062. Mr. BINGAMAN (for Ms. CANTWELL) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3063. Ms. CANTWELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3064. Mr. BINGAMAN (for Ms. CANTWELL) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3065. Mr. BINGAMAN (for Ms. CANTWELL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Oregon)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3066. Mr. MURKOWSKI (for Mr. INHOFE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3067. Mr. BINGAMAN (for Mr. BAYH) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3068. Mr. BINGAMAN (for Mr. AKAKA) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3069. Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, and Mr. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3070. Mr. GRAHAM proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra.

SA 3071. Mr. MURKOWSKI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3072. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3073. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3074. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3040. Mr. REID (For Mr. DASCHLE) (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the appropriate place, add the following:

SEC. . FAIR TREATMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL JUDICIAL NOMINEES.

That it is the sense of the Senate that, in the interests of the administration of justice, the Senate Judiciary Committee should along with its other legislative and oversight responsibilities, continue to hold regular hearings on judicial nominees and should, in accordance with the precedents and practices of the Committee, schedule hearings on the nominees submitted by the President on May 9, 2001, and resubmitted on September 5, 2001, expeditiously.

SA 3041. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2917 proposed by Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN) to the bill (S. 517) to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through technology transfer and partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 186, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

SEC. 8. CREDIT FOR HYBRID VEHICLES, DEDICATED ALTERNATIVE FUEL VEHICLES, AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

Section 507 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13258) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(p) CREDITS FOR NEW QUALIFIED HYBRID MOTOR VEHICLES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) 2000 MODEL YEAR CITY FUEL EFFICIENCY.—The term ‘2000 model year city fuel efficiency’, with respect to a motor vehicle, means fuel efficiency determined in accordance with the following tables:

“(i) In the case of a passenger automobile:

“If vehicle inertia weight class is:	The 2000 model year city fuel efficiency is:
1,500 or 1,750 lbs	43.7 mpg
2,000 lbs	38.3 mpg
2,250 lbs	34.1 mpg
2,500 lbs	30.7 mpg
2,750 lbs	27.9 mpg
3,000 lbs	25.6 mpg
3,500 lbs	22.0 mpg
4,000 lbs	19.3 mpg
4,500 lbs	17.2 mpg
5,000 lbs	15.5 mpg
5,500 lbs	14.1 mpg
6,000 lbs	12.9 mpg
6,500 lbs	11.9 mpg
7,000 to 8,500 lbs	11.1 mpg.

“(ii) In the case of a light truck:

“If vehicle inertia weight class is:	The 2000 model year city fuel efficiency is:
1,500 or 1,750 lbs	37.6 mpg
2,000 lbs	33.7 mpg
2,250 lbs	30.6 mpg
2,500 lbs	28.0 mpg
2,750 lbs	25.9 mpg
3,000 lbs	24.1 mpg
3,500 lbs	21.3 mpg
4,000 lbs	19.0 mpg
4,500 lbs	17.3 mpg
5,000 lbs	15.8 mpg

“If vehicle inertia weight class is: **The 2000 model year city fuel efficiency is:**

5,500 lbs	14.6 mpg
6,000 lbs	13.6 mpg
6,500 lbs	12.8 mpg
7,000 to 8,500 lbs	12.0 mpg.

“(B) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

“(C) ELECTRICAL STORAGE DEVICE.—The term ‘electrical storage device’ means an on-board rechargeable energy storage system or similar storage device.

“(D) FUEL EFFICIENCY.—The term ‘fuel efficiency’ means the percentage increased fuel efficiency specified in table 1 in paragraph (2)(C) over the average 2000 model year city fuel efficiency of vehicles in the same weight class.

“(E) MAXIMUM AVAILABLE POWER.—The term ‘maximum available power’, with respect to a new qualified hybrid motor vehicle that is a passenger vehicle or light truck, means the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(i) the maximum power available from the electrical storage device of the new qualified hybrid motor vehicle, during a standard 10-second pulse power or equivalent test; by

“(ii) the sum of—

“(I) the maximum power described in clause (i); and

“(II) the net power of the internal combustion or heat engine, as determined in accordance with standards established by the Society of Automobile Engineers.

“(F) MOTOR VEHICLE.—The term ‘motor vehicle’ has the meaning given the term in section 216 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7550).

“(G) NEW QUALIFIED HYBRID MOTOR VEHICLE.—The term ‘new qualified hybrid motor vehicle’ means a motor vehicle that—

“(i) draws propulsion energy from both—

“(I) an internal combustion engine (or heat engine that uses combustible fuel); and

“(II) an electrical storage device;

“(ii) in the case of a passenger automobile or light truck—

“(I) in the case of a 2001 or later model vehicle, receives a certificate of conformity under the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.) and produces emissions at a level that is at or below the standard established by a qualifying California standard described in section 243(e)(2) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7583(e)(2)) for that make and model year; and

“(II) in the case of a 2004 or later model vehicle, is certified by the Administrator as producing emissions at a level that is at or below the level established for Bin 5 vehicles in the Tier 2 regulations promulgated by the Administrator under section 202(i) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7521(i)) for that make and model year vehicle; and

“(iii) employs a vehicle braking system that recovers waste energy to charge an electrical storage device.

“(H) VEHICLE INERTIA WEIGHT CLASS.—The term ‘vehicle inertia weight class’ has the meaning given the term in regulations promulgated by the Administrator for purposes of the administration of title II of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7521 et seq.).

“(2) ALLOCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall allocate a partial credit to a fleet or covered person under this title if the fleet or person