

a vote. We understand every Senator has a right to take his or her amendment to a vote, but if everyone insists on their absolute right, we are going to be here 16 hours. Truthfully, it would probably be more than that because we have not been able to do three votes an hour.

That is the reality of the situation we confront. We urge our colleagues to try to work with us as the morning proceeds and to reduce amendments.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Just for the record, would the Senator do me the favor of emphasizing this amendment dealing with veterans' health care benefits is an amendment from yesterday? I have, indeed, withdrawn my other two amendments, just so colleagues will know that. Will the Senator amplify that?

Mr. CONRAD. I am pleased to say the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota was actually scheduled for last night for a vote and it was held over because of a parliamentary situation that developed last evening. So I am not making this request of the Senator from Minnesota. He has been patient. He has been one who has cooperated and dropped amendments, which we appreciate very much.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Does the chairman wish we go to a quorum call or go to the vote?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me suggest we have three or four Senators we want to talk with on the phone. We may significantly change our numbers. We do not have anything like those—we are one-third of your number or one-fourth.

I believe we ought to proceed. I believe Senator BOND is ready on our side with a second-degree.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation? I understood we were going to have votes at 9:30?

Mr. DOMENICI. We are ready to go. We will get an amendment up and be ready to go.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 2001—2011

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of H. Con. Res. 83, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011.)

Pending:

Domenici amendment No. 170, in the nature of a substitute.

Motion to reconsider the vote by which Harkin amendment No. 185 (to amendment No. 170) was agreed to.

Wellstone amendment No. 269 (to amendment No. 170) to increase discretionary funding for veterans' medical care by \$1.718 billion in 2002 and each year thereafter to ensure that veterans have access to quality medical care.

AMENDMENT NO. 269

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be 2 minutes for debate on the Wellstone amendment No. 269.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Colleagues, this amendment adds \$1.7 billion to the veterans' health care budget over the next 10 years. The President's budget proposal is a terrible proposal; it leaves so many gaps, there is no question about it. This amendment has the support of AMVETS, VFW, Paralyzed Veterans, Disabled American Veterans, and many colleagues have signed on to it. I especially thank Senator JOHNSON and Senator ROCKEFELLER.

The problem is between \$900 million of medical inflation and then the commitment we made to elderly veterans with the Millennium Program and the commitment for mental health services, hepatitis C, and the commitment to treat veterans who have no health care coverage, this is totally inadequate.

This is not a game. If we are committed to veterans, you are going to vote for this amendment. This really does deal with some of the unmet needs. There are amendments that can come in with less funding, but this is the only way we say thank you to veterans. It is extremely important. I can't think of any more important vote from the point of view of working with a very, very important group of people.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Who seeks time?

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute on this side to respond to the comments of the proponent of the underlying amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 351

Mr. President, I send a second-degree amendment to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] proposes an amendment numbered 351.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: Increase Veterans discretionary spending for FY02)

On page 36, line 6, increase the amount by \$967,000,000.

On page 36, line 7, increase the amount by \$967,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by \$967,000,000.

On page 43, line 16, decrease the amount by \$967,000,000.

On page 48, line 8, increase the amount by \$967,000,000.

On page 48, line 9, increase the amount by \$967,000,000.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, this underlying amendment, as others before and after, chips away at the tax relief package proposed by the President. All citizens, including our veterans, deserve tax relief. This amendment that I have just offered on behalf of Senator DOMENICI would increase veterans' discretionary spending for the coming year by almost \$2 billion, including a \$1.7 billion increase for medical care. This is the highest increase ever; this is the first increase in recent years.

Let me make a point that the President's budget request for VA is an excellent one. This body should recall from previous years that the prior administration proposed to freeze veterans' medical care with no increase at all.

This amendment also provides the highest increase ever for the Veterans' Benefit Administration, where a backlog of claims continues to mount. This is a problem that the prior administration refused to address.

Finally, this amendment does not assume spending beyond fiscal year 2002 because VA has a new administration, new management, and a massive strategic review.

I urge support of the second-degree amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 269

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President and colleagues, please follow the arithmetic. The President's budget is opposed by so many veterans organizations.

With \$1 billion for the whole VA budget, medical inflation alone is \$900 million. We passed a millennium bill with a commitment to elderly veterans with another \$100 million. We talk about mental health services, and another \$100 million for treating veterans with hepatitis C. That provides more resources.

I do not know, in all due respect, where my colleague gets his numbers. I am glad that we have an amendment on the other side of the aisle that calls for a \$900 million increase. I am pleased we are pushing this forward. But, in all due respect, the President's budget is no way to say thanks to veterans. Sure, we can take a little bit out of tax cuts with 40 percent going to the top 1 percent and make the commitment to veterans' health care.

This is a clear vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute out of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Senator MIKULSKI, who has waited patiently for 2 days to offer her amendment, came to us a few minutes ago and said, because of the rush

of things, she would be willing to take a voice vote.

The reason I mention that is I think Members have a pretty good idea how the votes are going to turn out. She sets a very good example for this body, as she always does. I suggest others follow her example.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask that we proceed in the following manner: No amendment be in order to these amendments prior to the vote; that the votes occur in relation to these amendments in a stacked sequence; first, in relationship to the Wellstone amendment and then in relation to Senator BOND's amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the Wellstone amendment.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) is necessary absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 84 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Akaka Dorgan Lieberman
Baucus Durbin Lincoln
Bayh Edwards McCain
Biden Ensign Mikulski
Bingaman Feingold Murray
Boxer Feinstein Nelson (FL)
Breaux Graham Nelson (NE)
Byrd Harkin Reed
Cantwell Hollings Reid
Carnahan Inouye Rockefeller
Carper Jeffords Sarbanes
Cleland Johnson Schumer
Clinton Kennedy Specter
Conrad Kerry Stabenow
Corzine Kohl Torricelli
Daschle Landriou Wellstone
Dayton Leahy Wyden
Dodd Levin

NAYS—46

Allard Frist Nickles
Allen Gramm Roberts
Bennett Grassley Santorum
Bond Gregg Sessions
Brownback Hagel Shelby
Burns Hatch Smith (NH)
Campbell Helms Smith (OR)
Chafee Hutchinson Snowe
Cochran Hutchinson Stevens
Collins Inhofe Thomas
Craig Kyl Thompson
Crapo Lott Thurmond
DeWine Lugar Voinovich
Domenici McConnell Warner
Enzi Miller
Fitzgerald Murkowski

NOT VOTING—1

Bunning

The amendment (No. 269) was agreed to.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 351

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Bond amendment.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following votes in this series be limited to 10 minutes each. We managed to get through with only 45 minutes on that first vote. I think if we can do it in 10 minutes, it might get us home before Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 85 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Akaka Durbin Lugar
Allard Edwards McCain
Allen Ensign McConnell
Baucus Enzi Mikulski
Bayh Feingold Miller
Bennett Feinstein Murkowski
Biden Fitzgerald Murray
Bingaman Frist Nelson (FL)
Bond Graham Nelson (NE)
Boxer Gramm Nickles
Breaux Grassley Reed
Brownback Gregg Reid
Burns Hagel Roberts
Byrd Harkin Rockefeller
Campbell Hatch Santorum
Cantwell Helms Sarbanes
Carnahan Hollings Schumer
Carper Hutchinson Sessions
Chafee Hutchinson Shelby
Cleland Inhofe Smith (NH)
Clinton Inouye Smith (OR)
Cochran Jeffords Snowe
Collins Johnson Specter
Conrad Kennedy Stabenow
Corzine Kerry Stevens
Craig Kohl Thomas
Crapo Kyl Thompson
Daschle Landriou Thurmond
Dayton Leahy Torricelli
DeWine Levin Voinovich
Burns Hatch Lieberman Warner
Campbell Helms Lincoln Wellstone
Chafee Hutchinson Snowe Wyden
Cochran Hutchinson Stevens
Collins Inhofe Thomas
Craig Kyl Thompson
Crapo Lott Thurmond
DeWine Lugar Voinovich
Domenici McConnell Warner
Enzi Miller
Fitzgerald Murkowski

NOT VOTING—1

Bunning

The amendment (No. 351) was agreed to.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 85, I voted "no." It was my intention to vote "yes." Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to change my vote. It would in no way change the outcome of the vote.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

Mr. BOND. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

AMENDMENT NO. 284

Mr. DOMENICI. We are ready to proceed with amendment No. 284, the Enzi-Carper amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI], for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BAYH, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. MILLER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. NICKLES, proposes an amendment numbered 284.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the resolution to reflect that there should be no new Federal fees on State-chartered banks)

On page 2, line 17, decrease the amount by \$82,000,000.

On page 2, line 18, decrease the amount by \$86,000,000.

On page 3, line 1, decrease the amount by \$90,000,000.

On page 3, line 2, decrease the amount by \$95,000,000.

On page 3, line 3, decrease the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 3, line 4, decrease the amount by \$105,000,000.

On page 3, line 5, decrease the amount by \$110,000,000.

On page 3, line 6, decrease the amount by \$115,000,000.

On page 3, line 7, decrease the amount by \$120,000,000.

On page 3, line 8, decrease the amount by \$125,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$82,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, increase the amount by \$86,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, increase the amount by \$90,000,000.

On page 3, line 16, increase the amount by \$95,000,000.

On page 3, line 17, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 3, line 18, increase the amount by \$105,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, increase the amount by \$110,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by \$115,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by \$120,000,000.

On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by \$125,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$95,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$106,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$116,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$317,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by \$177,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by \$192,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by \$206,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$222,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by \$105,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by \$110,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by \$115,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by \$120,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by \$125,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by \$95,000,000.

On page 21, line 20, increase the amount by \$106,000,000.

On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by \$116,000,000.

On page 22, line 3, decrease the amount by \$317,000,000.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be no amendments in order to the Enzi amendment, No. 284.

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

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, this might be one of the most important amendments you will vote on if you are interested in your State banks. This is an issue we have dealt with every year recently. Mr. CARPER, the Senator from Delaware, and I have worked on this diligently. Members would be amazed at the cosponsors. We have nine Democrats and nine Republicans on it. We have other Members who have pledged their support.

The budget resolution would impose a new federal fee on State banks, but it would be a fee that receives no service. It is a fee we have rejected every year as a new tax.

Don't approve a new tax in this budget. Help roll it back one more time and make sure that State banks will not be charged a new fee.

I especially thank the junior Senator from Delaware, Mr. CARPER, for working with me on this amendment. As a former Governor, he understands the importance of state banks and their contribution to a healthy banking system. I also thank the other cosponsors of this amendment, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KERRY, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. BAYH, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MILLER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. DODD, and Mr. NELSON.

The budget resolution before us assumes that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and the Federal Reserve will impose new fees on state-chartered bank and bank holding companies. The amendment we are offering will ensure that these new fees will not be assessed.

The proposal included in the budget would amount to a federal tax on state-chartered entities that have already paid their state chartering agencies for the same service. In effect, these banks would be double-charged, with no added benefit.

The dual-banking system, consisting of both state and national bank charters, has served the United States and its communities well for many years. The current fee structure is identical for state and national banks. They both pay their chartering organization for their examinations. They are also both subject to deposit insurance premiums assessed by the FDIC. Additional fees for state banks will not increase safety and soundness.

Banks should have an option of a federal or state charter, depending upon their particular needs. The new fees assumed to be a part of the budget resolution would reduce the attractiveness of state bank charters, which traditionally have provided a lower-cost alternative to the federal bank charter. The effect would be to drive up costs for both banks and consumers.

Our amendment will help preserve the competitiveness of state-bank charters and maintain the balance of the dual banking system. The amendment would save state banks and bank holding companies approximately \$2 billion over 10 years. It would allow these banks to invest this money in their local communities, rather than paying a discriminatory fee.

The Congress has rejected new federal fees on state banks in each of the previous seven budgets. The Senate Banking Committee has consistently opposed this proposal. The major banking associations—the American Bankers Association (ABA), the Independent Community Bankers of America (ICBA), America's Community Bankers (ACB), the Conference of State Bank Supervisors (CSBS) and the Financial Services Roundtable—have all endorsed the amendment. In addition, the National Governor's Association and the National Conference of State Legislatures are supporting the amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the National Governor's Association and the correspondence from the banking associations be printed in the RECORD.

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

APRIL 3, 2001.

To: Members of the U.S. Senate.

From: American Bankers Association, America's Community Bankers, Conference of State Bank Supervisors, Independent Community Bankers of America, The Financial Services Roundtable.

Re: Support Enzi/Carper Amendment to Strike Bank Exam Fees from Budget.

The FY 2002 budget that the Senate is expected to vote on this week would require the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) and Federal Reserve Board (FRB) to charge for their examinations of state-chartered banks and bank holding companies. Similar language was also included in seven Clinton Administration budgets, but was rejected by Congress each time.

The above-noted national member organizations and trade associations, representing all segments of the U.S. banking industry,

are united in opposition to this examination fee requirement. It would impose an unfair, new tax on state-chartered banks and bank holding companies, costing them over \$2 billion in the next ten years.

The FDIC and FRB have had authority to charge examination fees since 1991, but they never have charged such fees and are already financially healthy, self-funded entities. All banking institutions already pay examination fees to their chartering agencies (whether federal or state), as well as deposit insurance premiums to the FDIC. Thus, imposing examination fees on state-chartered banks and bank holding companies would constitute a discriminatory, double fee imposed on these entities simply on the basis of their charter and/or organizational structure. It would also be a threat to the balance of the dual banking system, which has so well served this country by providing much needed diversification to the U.S. economy.

Senate Banking Committee members Mike Enzi (R-Wyoming) and Tom Carper (D-Delaware) will join together to offer an amendment to strike the examination fees provision. The above-noted parties urge you to support the Enzi/Carper amendment. Just last week, the House of Representatives rejected this new tax during its consideration of the budget. Also, last month, the Senate Banking Committee informed the Senate Budget Committee that it "has consistently opposed" such new examination fees for many of the reasons noted above. Finally, the proposal is quite simply at odds with the Administration's overall tax reduction goals.

Please support the Enzi/Carper amendment to strike new banking examination fees from the FY 2002 budget. We thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

APRIL 4, 2000.

Senator PETE DOMENICI,
Chairman, Senate Budget Committee, U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

Senator KENT CONRAD,
Ranking Member, Senate Budget Committee, U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR DOMENICI AND SENATOR CONRAD: On behalf of the nation's Governors, we urge you to support Senator Enzi and Senator Carper's amendment to strike the examination fee on the state-chartered banks provision contained in H. Con. Res. 83, the Congressional Budget Resolution For FY2002. The Governors oppose the imposition of the new fee on the basis that it is discriminatory, costly, and a double fee on the more than 6,000 state-chartered banks and holding institutions in the U.S.

The new fee would only be assessed on state-chartered banks and holding institutions impacting the competitiveness of our dual banking system. The Governors strongly oppose any effort that would penalize the state system for attempting to develop high quality yet cost-effective operations.

The Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office have reported that the new fee would cost state-chartered banks and holding institutions two billion dollars over the next ten years. A new fee would also run counter to the declining trend in bank regulatory fees. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) has slashed deposit insurance premiums. The Office of Comptroller General has also reduced supervisory fees. Congress rejected seven budget proposals for the previous administration that included these proposed fees.

Although the FDIC and the Federal Reserve Board have existing authority to charge examination fees since 1991, they

have elected not to do so as they are financially healthy, self-funded entities. All banking institutions, including state-chartered banks, already pay examination fees to their chartering agency to conduct examinations. The new fee would not increase the number or quality of these examinations. The fee would also penalize the economic efficiencies that state-chartered banks have gained and are represented in declining examination fees.

Thank you for considering our views on this important matter. If the NGA can assist you in any manner on this issue, please contact Frank J. Principi of the NGA staff at 202.624.7818.

Sincerely,

Gov. MIKE JOHANNIS,
*Chair, Committee on
Economic Develop-
ment and Commerce.*

Gov. DON SIEGELMAN,
*Vice Chair, Committee
on Economic Devel-
opment and Com-
merce.*

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, this budget resolution includes a proposal to require new Federal fees on State-chartered banks and bank holding companies. The amendment that I am offering with Senator ENZI would strike these unnecessary and inequitable fees from the budget.

Currently, the exam fee structure for both federally and State-chartered banks is identical: federally chartered banks pay the Federal Government for their examinations, and State-chartered banks pay States for theirs. Charging State-chartered banks a fee on top of what they already pay does not increase safety and soundness or provide for additional exams. These fees only increase the Federal fisc at the expense of the State banking system.

We have seen State-chartered banks be engines of innovation. As a former Governor, I believe this is one of the great values of our dual banking system. Under this system, States and the Federal Government independently charter and regulate financial institutions. A key benefit of our dual banking system is that it provides for innovations at both the State and Federal level. In fact, State initiatives have spurred most advances in U.S. bank products and services. Everything from checking accounts to adjustable-rate mortgages, from electronic funds transfers to the powers and structures endorsed by Gramm-Leach-Bliley, originated at the State level. State-chartered banks also play an important role in credit availability and economic development. Additional Federal fees for State banks would stifle the innovation taking place at the State level. The very innovation which benefits all consumers by providing competition and creativity in the marketplace.

On seven prior occasions, Congress has wisely rejected these Federal fee proposals. Last week, the House refused to include these fees in its budget resolution. The Senate Banking Committee also opposed these fees in its views to the Budget Committee. In ad-

dition, the American Bankers Association, America's Community Bankers, the Conference of State Bank Supervisors, the Independent Community Bankers of America, the Financial Services Roundtable, National Conference of State Legislatures, and the National Governors Association all oppose these new fees on State-chartered institutions.

I urge you to support the dual banking system and vote for this amendment to strike these harmful Federal fees.

Mr. DOMENICI. Senator GRAMM asked to address this issue for 30 seconds, and I ask unanimous consent he be permitted.

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

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, as chairman of the Banking Committee, I support this amendment. Obviously, nothing in the proposal actually changes banking law, it merely sets out budgetary assumptions. Broader issues are involved and I pledge to both authors of the amendment to hold hearings or otherwise deal with these broader issues. Given that understanding, I ask our colleagues to not force a rollcall vote so that we can save that time and get on about our business.

Mr. DOMENICI. What is the pleasure of the Senator?

Mr. ENZI. Would the Senator accept a voice vote?

Mr. GRAMM. I would ask for a voice vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not been ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, No. 284.

The amendment (No. 284) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 249

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. I call up amendment No. 249.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], for himself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. REID, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BIDEN, and Mr. JEFFORDS, proposes an amendment numbered 249.

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of April 5 under "Amendments Submitted.")

AMENDMENT NO. 249, AS MODIFIED

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be permitted to modify the amendment, and I send a modification to the desk.

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(For the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, addressing global climate change concerns, protecting the global environment, and promoting domestic energy security; to provide increased funding for voluntary programs that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the near term; to provide increased funding for a range of energy resources and energy efficiency programs; to provide increased funding to ensure adequate U.S. participation in negotiations that are conducted pursuant to the Senate-ratified United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change; to provide increased funding to encourage developing nations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and, to provide increased funding for programs to assist U.S. businesses exporting clean energy technologies to developing nations)

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.

On page 12, line 16, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 12, line 17, increase the amount by \$33,000,000.

On page 12, line 20, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 12, line 21, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 12, line 24, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 12, line 25, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 13, line 3, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 13, line 4, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 13, line 7, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 13, line 8, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 13, line 11, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 13, line 12, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 13, line 15, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 13, line 16, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 13, line 19, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 13, line 20, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 13, line 23, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 13, line 24, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 14, line 2, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 14, line 3, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 14, line 11, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 14, line 12, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 14, line 15, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 14, line 16, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 14, line 19, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 14, line 20, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 14, line 23, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 14, line 24, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 2, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 3, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 6, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 7, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 10, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 11, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 14, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 15, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 18, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 19, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 22, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 15, line 23, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.
 On page 16, line 5, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 16, line 6, increase the amount by \$192,000,000.
 On page 16, line 8, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 16, line 9, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 16, line 11, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 16, line 12, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 16, line 14, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 16, line 15, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 16, line 18, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 16, line 19, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 16, line 22, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.

On page 16, line 23, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 17, line 2, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 17, line 3, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 17, line 6, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 17, line 7, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 17, line 10, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 17, line 11, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 17, line 14, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 17, line 15, increase the amount by \$205,000,000.
 On page 17, line 23, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 17, line 24, increase the amount by \$60,000,000.
 On page 18, line 2, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 3, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 6, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 10, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 11, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 14, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 15, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 18, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 19, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 22, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 18, line 23, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 19, line 2, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 19, line 3, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 19, line 6, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 19, line 7, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 19, line 10, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 19, line 11, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.
 On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 19, line 20, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 19, line 23, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 19, line 24, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 2, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 3, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 6, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 7, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 10, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 11, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 14, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 15, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 18, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 19, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 20, line 22, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.

On page 20, line 23, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 21, line 2, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 21, line 3, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 21, line 6, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 21, line 7, increase the amount by \$45,000,000.
 On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by \$450,000,000.
 On page 43, line 16, decrease the amount by \$369,000,000.
 On page 48, line 8, increase the amount by \$450,000,000.
 On page 48, line 9, increase the amount by \$369,000,000.

Mr. KERRY. Let me say to my colleagues, this is an amendment to add money back on behalf of Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator COLLINS, and others, to the areas which we have already funded, to try to determine what we can do to understand global warming better, to fund new technologies, and to fund the export of American products with respect to those technologies. There is no unauthorized plan in this. There is nothing regulatory in it. This has nothing whatever to do with Kyoto. It is all preauthorized, existing programs, which we bring back to a funding level which most people think is appropriate, \$4.5 billion over 10 years. It does not come out of the tax cut; it comes out of the contingency funds. I hope on a bipartisan basis we could signal our approval of the efforts to continue to understand the impact of global climate change on the technologies which can help us respond.

Mr. President, There is a world-wide consensus among climate scientists that global average temperature will rise over the next 100 years if greenhouse gas emissions continue to grow. Scientists report that some of the signs of this warming are already evident: the 90s was the hottest decade on record; glaciers around the world are receding at record rates; 1,000 square miles of the Larsen ice shelf in Antarctica have collapsed into the ocean; Arctic sea ice has thinned by 40 percent in only 20 years; and ocean temperatures throughout the world are rising. And scientists warn that the potential impacts of global warming include the intensification of floods, storms and droughts; the dislocation of millions of people; the spread of tropical diseases; destructive sea level rise; the die-off of species; the loss of forests, coral reefs and other ecosystems and other far reaching and adverse impacts.

To address the threat of global warming, the U.S. has invested in a range of programs aimed at understanding the global climate, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other pollutants, saving energy and money, spurring innovation in energy technologies, and sequestering carbon. At the same time, we have engaged internationally to encourage the global use of clean energy technologies developed and manufactured here in the U.S. and to craft an international solution to the threat of climate change. Unfortunately, overall

funding levels in the Bush budget proposal and press reports of Administration budgeting plans make clear that these important programs are facing drastic cuts—cuts that could cripple even these minimal efforts to understand and mitigate climate change. The Climate Change Amendment increases budget authority by \$4.5 billion over 10 years to make up for anticipated cuts to these essential programs. The increased budget authority in the amendment is offset by an equal reduction in the proposed Bush tax cut that amounts to a mere three-tenths of 1 percent of the overall tax cut.

The Climate Change Amendment provides additional budget authority of \$4.5 billion over 10 years. It is offset by a reduction in the Bush tax cut of three-tenths of 1 percent. The additional budget authority is allocated to essential programs described below.

International Affairs—Function 150: The amendment increases budget authority by \$500 million for 10 years. The increase is to offset cuts to the Global Environment Facility, USAID, State Department offices engaged in international negotiations on climate change and related programs. The GEF forges international cooperation to address critical threats to the global environment, including climate change but providing financial and technical assistance primarily in developing nations. USAID programs accelerate the development and deployment of clean energy technologies around the world and assist U.S. manufacturers in establishing a position in a clean energy market that it expect to total \$5 trillion over the next 20 years. Additional authority for the State Department is to ensure that the budget includes sufficient funding for the U.S. to fully engage with the international community in on-going and highly complex negotiations pursuant to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Science, Space and Technology—Function 250: The amendment increases budget authority by \$500 million over 10 years. The increase is to offset cuts to programs like the United States Global Change Research Program and similar efforts that provide basic and essential research into the global climate system and how pollution may be impacting it. The program is working to improve climate observations and our understanding of the global water cycle, ecosystem changes and the carbon cycle. It is a multi-agency effort that draws on the expertise of USDA, NASA, Energy, NOAA and other agencies. This research is fundamental to understanding and responding to the threat of global warming.

Energy—Function 270: The amendment increases budget authority by \$2 billion over 10 years. The increase is to offset cuts in energy efficiency, renewable energy and other programs at the Department of Energy that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and save con-

sumers money. These programs are the cornerstone of the U.S. effort to produce clean energy through technological innovation. They include the research, development and deployment of solar, wind, biomass, geothermal and other renewable power and technologies that will increase efficiency and reduce pollution from fossil fuel energy sources. The increased authority will also offset cuts to energy efficiency programs that cut energy use, reduce pollution and save consumers money. These programs also strengthen U.S. energy security by reducing demand and increasing clean domestic energy production.

Natural Resources—Function 300: The amendment increases budget authority by \$1 billion over 10 years. The increase is to offset cuts in a range of programs that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, save energy and provide essential research. The Environmental Protection Agency has established several successful, incentive-based, non-regulatory programs to reduce emissions and save money, such as the EnergyStar labeling program for products ranging from computers to refrigerators. Similar programs achieve emissions reductions through increased building efficiency, business-wide efficiency gains and increased transportation efficiency. Also included in this increased budget authority is funding to offset cuts to the US Forest Service and NOAA programs investigating carbon sequestration and basic research into the global climate.

Agriculture—Function 350: The amendment increases budget authority by \$450 million over 10 years. The increase is to offset cuts to programs that develop technologies that can produce energy from switchgrass, agricultural waste, timber waste and other biomass. These bioenergy technologies produce very low or no net greenhouse gas emissions and provide a market for U.S. farm products. Also offset are cuts to USDA programs studying how different farming practices and farmland conservation can increase carbon sequestration and reduce atmospheric concentrations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we are trying to work on this issue for a couple of minutes. It will not take us long. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I ask Senator JEFFORDS be added as a co-sponsor, as well as Senators LIEBER-

MAN, REID, BINGAMAN, LANDRIEU, CANTWELL, BIDEN, KENNEDY, FEINSTEIN, MURRAY, LEAHY, and COLLINS.

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

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I understand the primary sponsor and those cosponsoring it will accept a voice vote. Is that the case?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. The Senator from Massachusetts has been here all week working on this amendment. It is one of the most important issues we have taken up all week. The Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Maine should be complimented for their brilliant work on this piece of legislation.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the amendment sponsored by my distinguished colleagues from Massachusetts and Maine to ensure full funding of all Federal programs aimed at addressing a growing and increasingly troubling international problem, global warming.

If left unchecked, global warming has the potential to dramatically alter life as we know it, leaving our children and grandchildren to inherit a planet suffering from all manner of ailments. While we cannot know precisely how dramatic these changes may be over time, recent science paints a rather bleak picture of what we can expect to happen. The implication to act now could not be more clear. Yet the Bush Administration has inexplicably withdrawn its support for almost all of the initiatives, both domestic and international, to begin to nurse our planet back to health. We must not let this happen. This amendment would ensure that those initiatives are properly funded.

Over the last three months, the United Nation's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, or the IPCC, released its third report on global warming. The report was authored by over 700 expert scientists.

According to these experts, unless we find ways to stop global warming, the Earth's average temperature can be expected to rise between 2.5 and 10.4 degrees Fahrenheit during this next century. Such a large, rapid rise in temperature will profoundly alter the Earth's landscape in very real and consequential terms. Sea levels could swell up to 35 feet, potentially submerging millions of homes and coastal property under our present-day oceans. Precipitation would become more erratic, leading to droughts that would make hunger an even more serious global problem than it is today. Diseases such as malaria and dengue fever could spread at an accelerated pace. Severe weather disturbances and storms triggered by climatic phenomena, such as El Nino, would be aggravated by global warming and become more routine.

This new data should end serious debate about whether global warming is a fact. The science is now incontrovertible.

The only thing left to do is debate and decide how we should respond, not if we should.

As the latest scientific report reminds us, this threat is being driven by our own behavior. Let me quote the scientists directly, "There is new and stronger evidence that most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities." Mr. President, human beings have added more than three billion metric tons of carbon to the atmosphere every year for the past two decades. More amazing, and more disturbing, is the fact that current levels of carbon dioxide are likely the highest they have been in 20 million years of history and 31 percent higher than those present in 1750.

Faced with these findings, President Bush has said that he "takes the issue of global warming very seriously." Unfortunately, his recent acts contradict his statement. In fact, it appears that the only cooling of the globe that will occur under President Bush is the cooling of our foreign relations.

I was deeply disappointed last month when the President reneged on his campaign pledge to regulate carbon dioxide emissions from power plants. Just last week, the Bush Administration unilaterally also announced, without consultation with Congress and apparently without regard for our interests abroad, that it had "no interest in implementing" the Kyoto Protocol. In doing so, they did not just back away from the United States' signature on an international agreement; they backed away from the international process that resulted in the accord. Finally, while we do not yet have the exact numbers of the President's budget, it appears that he plans to significantly cut a number of the programs aimed at reducing greenhouse emissions domestically and overseas.

Most troubling are the reductions in the budgets of the Nation's energy efficiency programs and the funding for USAID's program to encourage developing countries to reduce emissions. How can the White House justify walking away from the Kyoto Protocol because of inadequate participation by developing countries when they are cutting the chief U.S. program aimed at securing that participation?

Global warming is a real threat to us, our children, and our grandchildren. We must demonstrate leadership and confront it now. This amendment will fund the programs we have to provide that leadership. We must pass it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 249), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 238

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator HARKIN and myself, I call up amendment 238.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY], for himself and Mr. HARKIN, proposes an amendment numbered 238.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide an increase of \$1,500,000,000 in fiscal year 2002 to Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance)

On page 38, line 2, increase the amount by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 38, line 3, increase the amount by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 43, line 16, decrease the amount by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 48, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,500,000,000.

On page 48, line 9, increase the amount by \$1,500,000,000.

SEC. —. FUNDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS FOR STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the national rate of serious crime dropped for the last 8 years in a row;

(2) the national rate of violent crime, including murders and rapes, is at its lowest level since 1978;

(3) the success in reducing serious crime and violent crime rates across the Nation is due in large part to the crime-fighting partnership between the Department of Justice and State and local law enforcement agencies and benefits from Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(4) on February 28, 2001, President George W. Bush submitted to Congress the Administration's budget highlights, "A Blueprint For New Beginnings," which proposed "re-directing" \$1,500,000,000 out of a total of \$4,600,000,000 that has been dedicated for Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(5) for fiscal year 2001, Congress appropriated \$523,000,000 for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program, including \$60,000,000 to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America for grants to Boys and Girls Clubs across the Nation, within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(6) for fiscal year 2001, Congress appropriated \$25,500,000 for the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance and Congress passed the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-517) to authorize \$50,000,000 for the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program for fiscal year 2002 within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(7) for fiscal year 2001, Congress appropriated \$569,050,000 for the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Assistance Program for Byrne discretionary and formula grants within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(8) for fiscal year 2001, Congress appropriated \$686,500,000 for State prison grants,

including the Violent Offender Incarceration Grant Program and Truth-In-Sentencing Incentive Program, within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(9) for fiscal year 2001, Congress appropriated \$250,000,000 for the Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(10) for fiscal year 2001, Congress appropriated \$470,000,000 for Police Hiring Initiatives, \$227,500,000 for the Safe Schools Initiative, \$140,000,000 for the COPS Technology Program, and \$48,500,000 for the COPS Methamphetamine/Drug "Hot Spots" Program under the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Program within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(11) for fiscal year 2001, Congress appropriated \$288,679,000 for grants to support the Violence Against Women Act within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance and Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-386) to authorize grants of approximately \$390,000,000 for grants to support the Violence Against Women Act for fiscal year 2002 within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(12) for fiscal year 2001, Congress appropriated \$130,000,000 for the Crime Identification Technology Act within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(13) for fiscal year 2001, Congress appropriated \$279,097,000 for Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Programs within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(14) in 2000, Congress passed the Computer Crime Enforcement Act (Public Law 106-572) to authorize \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance;

(15) in 2000, Congress passed the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-546) to authorize \$65,000,000 for fiscal year 2002 within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance; and

(16) in 2000, Congress passed the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Act of 2000 to authorize \$85,400,000 for fiscal year 2002 within the Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume an increase of \$1,500,000 for fiscal year 2002 for the following Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance to be provided for without reduction and consistent with previous appropriated and authorized levels: Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program; Boys and Girls Clubs of America Grant Program; Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program; Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Assistance Program; Violent Offender Incarceration Prison Grant Program; Truth-In-Sentencing Prison Grant Program; Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program; COPS Program; Violence Against Women Act; Crime Identification Technology Act; Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Programs; Computer Crime Enforcement Act; DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act; and Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have offered this amendment on behalf of Senator HARKIN and myself to provide an increase of \$1.5 billion in fiscal year 2002 for Department of Justice programs for State and local law enforcement assistance.

Our amendment pays for these additional funds for our State and local crime-fighting partners from the surplus funds in the budget resolution's contingency reserve.

Senator HARKIN and I are concerned that the Senate is being called upon this week to vote on the Federal budget without having seen a detailed submission of where the Bush Administration may propose cuts in law enforcement programs.

I, for one, would hate to see cuts in our federal assistance to State and local law enforcement. Those programs to help acquire bulletproof vests, reduce DNA backlogs, encourage modern communications, provide modern crime labs, and place cops on the beat have been so helpful to our crime control efforts.

Under Attorney General Reno, and due in part to her emphasis on a coordinated effort with State and local law enforcement, crime rates fell in each of the past 8 years. Violent crimes, including murder and rape, have been reduced to the lowest levels in decades, since before the Reagan Administration. In fact, the national rate of violent crime is at its lowest level since 1978.

We need to redouble our efforts, not cut them short or leave them short of funds.

Unfortunately, President Bush's budget highlights in his "Blueprint for New Beginnings" appears to call for cutting federal assistance to State and local law enforcement by 30 percent—by "redirecting" \$1.5 billion in Department of Justice programs for state and local law enforcement assistance.

This is quite troubling.

In addition, this budget resolution cuts \$7.5 billion in Department of Justice funding over the next 5 years when compared to the Congressional Budget Office baseline. Over the next 10 years, this budget resolution cuts \$19 billion in Department of Justice funding when compared to the CBO baseline.

Why does this budget resolution cut funding for the Department of Justice?

With school shootings continuing across the country and the use of heroin, methamphetamine and other dangerous drugs in rural and urban settings, now is not the time to be "redirecting" \$1.5 billion away from federal assistance to State and local law enforcement.

Now is not the time to be pulling back from the strong national commitment we should be making to continue to assist those on the front lines in the fight against crime and battle over illegal drug use.

The success in reducing serious crime and violent crime across the nation is due in large part to the crime-fighting

partnership between the Department of Justice and state and local law enforcement agencies, which benefits from Department of Justice state and local law enforcement assistance.

We should all remember the bipartisan success stories that make up the Department of Justice's state and local law enforcement assistance programs.

For example, last year, Congress appropriated \$60 million to the Boys and Girls Clubs of America for grants to Boys and Girls Clubs across the nation within the Department of Justice's programs for state and local law enforcement assistance. In Vermont and every other state in the nation, Boys and Girls Clubs are a great and growing success in preventing crime and supporting our children.

In FY 2001, Congress appropriated \$523 million for the Local Law Enforcement Block Grant Program within the Department of Justice's programs for state and local law enforcement assistance programs.

Republicans and Democrats support this essential block grant for law enforcement equipment and other needs for state and local police departments.

The Department of Justice's programs for state and local law enforcement assistance include the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program. Senator CAMPBELL and I authored the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Act in 1998.

In its first two years of operation, this program funded more than 325,000 new bulletproof vests for our nation's police officers, including more than 536 vests for Vermont law enforcement officers.

In FY 2001, Congress appropriated \$569 million for the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Assistance Program for Byrne discretionary and formula grants within the Department of Justice's programs for state and local law enforcement assistance programs.

In Vermont, the Department of Public Safety receives about \$2 million in Byrne grant funding a year to maintain the Vermont Drug Task Force to combat heroin and other illegal drugs. Byrne grants fund drug task forces in many other states as well.

The Department of Justice's programs for state and local law enforcement assistance also include such proven crime-fighting and drug-prevention programs as the Violent Offender Incarceration Prison Grant Program; Truth-In-Sentencing Incentive Prison Grant Program; Juvenile Accountability Incentive Block Grant Program; COPS Program; Violence Against Women Act; Crime Identification Technology Act; and Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Programs.

Moreover, this year's budget request for Department of Justice state and local law enforcement assistance should include new bipartisan crime-fighting programs that Congress passed last year. In 2000, on a bipartisan basis, the Senate and House passed the Com-

puter Crime Enforcement Act, the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act and the Paul Coverdell National Forensic Science Improvement Act.

These Department of Justice programs are needed to support our nation's police officers.

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to adopt the Leahy-Harkin amendment to increase funding by \$1.5 billion for the 2002 fiscal year for the Department of Justice programs for state and local law enforcement assistance.

I yield to my friend from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, these are the programs that go right down to our local cops on the beat in our towns and communities all over America, especially the Byrne grant program, which has done much in my State and in the upper Midwest to fight the methamphetamine plague that has surged all over this country. The Bush budget cuts it out—a \$1.5 billion shortfall. The Leahy amendment puts that money back to help support local law enforcement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I say to the distinguished Senators who offered the amendment, I think their intentions are wonderful, but essentially all we are doing is adding more money to the appropriated accounts. No matter what anybody says it is going to be used for, it will not be used for that; it will be used for what the appropriators say.

With that in mind, we accept the amendment if they do not insist on a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LEAHY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Minnesota be added as a cosponsor.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 238) was agreed to.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we are going to try to take up six amendments here—three on our side, three on their side. They do not affect the appropriations, total appropriations, because they are offset within the budget, each one, for the amount that is being sought.

Can we proceed with Senator Smith, No. 217, in that regard? Is there objection to that?

Mr. CONRAD. We have no objection to Smith amendment No. 217.

AMENDMENT NO. 217

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. SMITH] for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mrs. SNOWE, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. SARBANES, proposes and amendment numbered 217.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To protect public health, to improve water quality in the nation's rivers and lakes, at the nation's beaches, and along the nation's coasts, to promote endangered species recovery, and to work towards meeting the nation's extensive wastewater infrastructure needs by increasing funding for wastewater infrastructure in fiscal year 2002 in an amount that will allow funding for the State water pollution control revolving funds at an amount equal to the amount appropriated in fiscal year 2001 and to fully fund grants to address municipal combined sewer and sanitary sewer overflows)

On page 17, line 23 increase the amount by \$800,000,000.

On page 17, line 24 increase the amount by \$800,000,000.

On page 43, line 15 decrease the amount by \$800,000,000.

On page 43, line 16 decrease the amount by \$800,000,000.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I am pleased to join today with my colleagues, Senators SMITH of Oregon, COLLINS, SNOWE, SARBANES and BAYH to provide additional funding that will help meet our Nation's critical wastewater infrastructure needs.

Specifically, this amendment provides an additional \$800 million in fiscal year 2002 for grants for wastewater infrastructure projects, including \$50 million for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and \$750 million to fully fund the new grant program authorized under the Wet Weather Water Quality Act of 2000.

These new grants will help municipalities address one of our largest remaining water quality challenges, combined and sanitary sewer overflows. Sewer overflows remain the leading cause of beach closures across the country, putting public health at risk and robbing communities of millions of tourism dollars annually.

This is a real problem in New York where so many cities, big and small, are confronted with pipe and equipment failures or have undersized systems that can't meet the increased demands of their growing populations. According to EPA's most recent estimates, there is a 20-year need of \$139 billion for wastewater infrastructure nationwide. And this doesn't even account for the funding needed to adequately address the sanitary sewer overflows problems facing our communities.

This amendment is an important first step towards meeting our country's enormous water infrastructure needs. This amendment will ensure that our beaches are safer for swimming. And it will lead to significant improvements in the quality of the Nation's rivers, lakes, bays and estuaries.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to the Senate Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2002. This amendment will in-

crease the amount available to fully fund the sewer overflow control grants program at a level of \$750 million for FY2002. It is important that Congress makes this level of commitment to clean water for a number of reasons.

The condition of our nation's wastewater collection and treatment facilities is alarming. In its 1996 "Clean Water Needs Survey," the EPA estimates that nearly \$140 billion will be needed over the next 20 years to address wastewater infrastructure problems in our communities. In March 1999, the EPA revised its figures, infrastructure needs are now estimated at \$200 billion. Other independent studies indicate that EPA has undershot the mark, estimating that these unmet needs exceed \$300 billion over 20 years.

In my state of Oregon, the challenge of municipal water treatment is ever-present. Roughly seventy percent of Oregon's population lives in the Willamette River watershed, with that number continuing to grow. The increasing demand on water supply and treatment is made even more acute by the responsibility to protect endangered salmon and steelhead in the Willamette River. Add to that the extremely low water and poor snowpack conditions facing the Northwest this year, and the urgency of maintaining high water quality in the river is greatly intensified.

The city of Portland is Oregon's largest, and its proximity to the Willamette River has been a contributor to water quality problems. At its worst, Portland's combined sewage overflow system dumped an estimated 10 billion gallons of combined sewage annually into the river in years past. During the past 7 years, however, Portland has invested over \$300 million in clean water infrastructure, and will spend another \$300 million in the next 5 years to meet its obligations under the Clean Water Act. I am working closely with the City of Portland to infuse targeted federal funds into its unique efforts to meet rigorous environmental requirements and responsibilities.

I am sponsoring this amendment because I strongly believe that Congress must make a firm commitment to helping cities like Portland, OR that are fully engaged in updating and improving their water treatment programs. The effects of such a commitment will be manifold, particularly upon a river like the Willamette that is long treasured, but heavily used by the many that derive their lives and livelihood from it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 217) was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, could we have order in the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Chamber, please. Senators please take your seats.

Is this a motion to vote on these amendments en bloc or separately?

Mr. DOMENICI. If the Senator is willing, I would like to do them en bloc.

Mr. CONRAD. We would be willing to do them en bloc as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Let me go back to the chairman for the next amendment that would be in this en bloc group.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Have we accepted 217?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have accepted 217.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 334, 236, 196, 244, AND 335, EN BLOC

Mr. DOMENICI. The five amendments I ask be called up and then be considered en bloc for voice vote are Inhofe No. 334, DeWine No. 236, Dorgan No. 196, Mikulski No. 244, and Nelson of Florida No. 335.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 334

(Purpose: To increase Impact Aid funding to \$1,293,302,000)

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by \$300,000,000.

On page 27, line 4, increase the amount by \$150,000,000.

On page 27, line 8, increase the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 27, line 12, increase the amount by \$50,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by \$300,000,000.

On page 43, line 16, decrease the amount by \$150,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by \$100,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by \$50,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 236

(Purpose: To provide additional funding for the United States Coast Guard for the fiscal year 2002)

On page 23, line 11, increase the amount by \$250,000,000.

On page 23, line 12, increase the amount by \$250,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by \$250,000,000.

On page 43, line 16, decrease the amount by \$250,000,000.

At the end of the amendment, insert the following:

SEC. . SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING UNITED STATES COAST GUARD FISCAL YEAR 2002 FUNDING.

It is the sense of the Senate that any level of budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2002 below the level assumed in this resolution for the Coast Guard would require the Coast Guard to—

(1) close numerous units and reduce overall mission capability, including the counter narcotics interdiction mission which was authorized under the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act;

(2) reduce the number of personnel of an already streamlined workforce; and

(3) reduce operations in a manner that would have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of valuable fish stocks in the

North Atlantic and Pacific Northwest and its capacity to stem the flow of illicit drugs and illegal immigration into the United States.

AMENDMENT NO. 196

(Purpose: To increase the amount of funding for the trade enforcement programs of the International Trade Administration)

- On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$40,000,000.
- On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$55,000,000.
- On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 10, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 11, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$40,000,000.
- On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$55,000,000.
- On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 19, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 20, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 7, decrease the amount by \$40,000,000.
- On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by \$55,000,000.
- On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 13, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 14, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 15, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$40,000,000.
- On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$55,000,000.
- On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 3, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 4, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.

- On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$40,000,000.
- On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$55,000,000.
- On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 11, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 12, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 13, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 14, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 15, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 16, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 6, line 17, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 21, line 15, increase the amount by \$40,000,000.
- On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by \$40,000,000.
- On page 21, line 19, increase the amount by \$55,000,000.
- On page 21, line 20, increase the amount by \$55,000,000.
- On page 21, line 23, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 2, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 3, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 6, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 7, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 10, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 11, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 14, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 15, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 18, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 19, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 22, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 22, line 23, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 23, line 2, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 23, line 3, increase the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by \$40,000,000.
- On page 43, line 16, decrease the amount by \$40,000,000.
- On page 43, line 19, decrease the amount by \$55,000,000.
- On page 43, line 20, decrease the amount by \$55,000,000.
- On page 43, line 23, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 43, line 24, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 2, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 3, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 6, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 7, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 10, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 11, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 14, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 15, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.

- On page 44, line 18, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 19, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 22, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 44, line 23, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 45, line 2, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.
- On page 45, line 3, decrease the amount by \$70,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 244

(Purpose: To increase education technology funding to \$1.5 billion per year)

- On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by \$628,000,000.
- On page 27, line 4, increase the amount by \$35,000,000.
- On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by \$657,000,000.
- On page 27, line 8, increase the amount by \$438,000,000.
- On page 27, line 11, increase the amount by \$687,000,000.
- On page 27, line 12, increase the amount by \$619,000,000.
- On page 27, line 15, increase the amount by \$716,000,000.
- On page 27, line 16, increase the amount by \$678,000,000.
- On page 27, line 19, increase the amount by \$747,000,000.
- On page 27, line 20, increase the amount by \$707,000,000.
- On page 27, line 23, increase the amount by \$778,000,000.
- On page 27, line 24, increase the amount by \$738,000,000.
- On page 28, line 2, increase the amount by \$808,000,000.
- On page 28, line 3, increase the amount by \$768,000,000.
- On page 28, line 6, increase the amount by \$841,000,000.
- On page 28, line 7, increase the amount by \$799,000,000.
- On page 28, line 10, increase the amount by \$873,000,000.
- On page 28, line 11, increase the amount by \$831,000,000.
- On page 28, line 14, increase the amount by \$907,000,000.
- On page 28, line 15, increase the amount by \$864,000,000.
- On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by \$628,000,000.
- On page 43, line 16, decrease the amount by \$35,000,000.
- On page 43, line 19, decrease the amount by \$657,000,000.
- On page 43, line 20, decrease the amount by \$438,000,000.
- On page 43, line 23, decrease the amount by \$687,000,000.
- On page 43, line 24, decrease the amount by \$619,000,000.
- On page 44, line 2, decrease the amount by \$716,000,000.
- On page 44, line 3, decrease the amount by \$678,000,000.
- On page 44, line 6, decrease the amount by \$747,000,000.
- On page 44, line 7, decrease the amount by \$707,000,000.
- On page 44, line 10, decrease the amount by \$778,000,000.
- On page 44, line 11, decrease the amount by \$738,000,000.
- On page 44, line 14, decrease the amount by \$808,000,000.
- On page 44, line 15, decrease the amount by \$768,000,000.
- On page 44, line 18, decrease the amount by \$841,000,000.
- On page 44, line 19, decrease the amount by \$799,000,000.

On page 44, line 22, decrease the amount by \$873,000,000.

On page 44, line 23, decrease the amount by \$831,000,000.

On page 45, line 2, decrease the amount by \$907,000,000.

On page 45, line 3, decrease the amount by \$864,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 335

(Purpose: To provide public water systems the initial funding needed in Fiscal Year 2002 of \$43,855,000 to comply with the 10 parts per billion standard for arsenic in drinking water recommended by the National Academy of Sciences 1999 study and adopted by the World Health Organization and European Union)

On page 17, line 23, increase the amount by \$43,855,000.

On page 17, line 24, increase the amount by \$42,538,450.

On page 48, line 8 increase the amount by \$43,855,000.

On page 48, line 9, increase the amount by \$42,538,450.

On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by \$43,855,000.

On page 43, line 16, decrease the amount by \$42,538,450.

AMENDMENT NO. 244

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I call up amendment number 244 on behalf of myself and my cosponsors—Senators BINGAMAN, BOXER, KENNEDY, LEVIN, and SARBANES. My amendment is very simple: it provides \$1.5 billion annually for education technology programs, and will be offset by a reduction in the tax cut. It will give every American child a “digital opportunity ladder” to climb to success, as well as help every child to be computer literate by the 6th grade, regardless of race, ethnicity, income, gender, geography, or disability.

My amendment does 3 things: it provides \$1 billion a year for consolidated education technology programs, which will go to states based on formula grants. Schools could use these funds for almost any technology-related activity: wiring, hardware, software, training, maintenance or repair.

Second, my amendment doubles teacher training funds by adding \$400 million, per year for the next ten years. Teachers want to help their students cross the digital divide but less than 20 percent of them feel confident using technology in their daily lesson plans. Technology without training is a hollow opportunity.

Finally, my amendment also provides \$100 million to create one thousand community technology centers. Community technology centers are necessary because kids don't just learn in school—they also learn in their communities. Technology centers make it easier for children to do their homework or to surf the web under adult supervision, and also make it easier for parents to upgrade their skills or write a resume.

The opportunities here are tremendous: to use technology to improve our lives, to use technology to remove barriers such as income, race, ethnicity, or geography. Every student in America should have access to a digital opportunity ladder. My amendment does that and I urge my colleagues' support.

AMENDMENT NO. 236

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, I thank the chairman and ranking member of the Budget Committee, Senators DOMENICI and CONRAD, for working with me, Senator GRAHAM from Florida, Senator SNOWE from Maine, and so many others in support of our amendment that would provide additional assistance for one of our most important agencies, the U.S. Coast Guard.

The amendment we have offered would provide an additional \$250 million increase in Coast Guard operating expenses above the fiscal year 2002 level recommended by the President. The House has included this \$250 million increase in its budget resolution, and I am pleased that the Senate will do the same.

Over the past few years, our Coast Guard has faced significant funding shortfalls, which are directly impacting its operations on an annual basis. Additional funding, would eliminate Coast Guard vessel and aircraft spare parts problems, improve personnel training, fund new Department of Defense entitlements, and run drug interdiction operations at optimal levels.

Because of funding shortfalls in the Fiscal Year 2001 budget, the Coast Guard has been forced to reduce operations by 10 percent in the second quarter of this year. If funding shortfalls go unaddressed, the Coast Guard anticipates cutting operations by 30 percent in the third and fourth quarters. To address budget shortfalls and restore vital operations, the Coast Guard has requested \$91 million in supplemental funding from the Office of Management and Budget.

The same thing happened last year. The Coast Guard was forced to reduce operations by 30 percent last summer, and Congress again had to come to the rescue with \$77 million in supplemental operating funding.

The Coast Guard has developed an unhealthy budgetary dependence on emergency supplementals to pay for normal ongoing mission operations. The recent enactment of two successive Defense Authorization bills, which increased personnel costs dramatically, has exacerbated the Coast Guard's funding problems even further. These bills mandated pay raises, new medical entitlements, recruiting and retention incentives, and other entitlements that far exceeded what was appropriated in the Transportation Appropriations Bill for the Coast Guard.

The money to fund these initiatives doesn't just magically appear. It must come from someplace. And, what usually happens is that the Coast Guard either absorbs these costs directly from within its own budget, creating service-related cutbacks, or it simply doesn't match benefits provided to other defense personnel. Neither scenario is ideal, and in the end, it is the Coast Guard personnel who lose.

The Coast Guard is reaching the point where it is stretched so thin and the condition of its equipment is so

poor that it is essentially cannibalizing equipment for parts, deferring maintenance, and working its people overtime—and this is just to sustain daily operations. This doesn't even take into account rapidly rising fuel costs, which have been exacerbating problems this fiscal year.

We need to provide the Coast Guard with the resources necessary to restore normal operations through the normal budget and appropriations process. We need to adequately fund the Coast Guard on an annual basis so the American people can have the services that they not only expect, but require from our Coast Guard.

Drug interdiction is one of those services and one of our Coast Guard's most important missions. As my colleagues all know, the scourge of drugs is a national and international challenge that threatens our communities here at home, as well as many fragile democracies in the Caribbean and South and Central America.

I am very pleased to report, however, that with the help of additional funding provided by the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act, WHDEA, which my dear friend, the late Senator Coverdell and Senators GRASSLEY, GRAHAM, and I sponsored, our Coast Guard has increased cocaine seizures by an astounding 60 percent over the last two years.

As my colleagues may recall, we passed the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act as part of the Fiscal Year 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Bill. Through this legislation, we were able to allocate an additional \$844 million to upgrade U.S. counter-drug and interdiction programs. Out of this funding, the Coast Guard received \$276 million. Since receiving this added investment, our Coast Guard went from seizing 82,623 pounds of cocaine in Fiscal Year 1998 to seizing 132,800 pounds in Fiscal Year 2000 at an estimated street value of over \$4 billion. That amount represents the value of nearly the entire Coast Guard annual budget.

With adequate resources, this is the kind of success we can expect because we are able to level the playing field with the drug smugglers. In other words, the drug smugglers in the past have had the upper hand in terms of technology and resources to transport drugs into the United States. By giving the Coast Guard additional funding, we are giving them the means to fight against the drug traffickers, and the means to beat them.

Resources allow the Coast Guard to seek innovative solutions to improve the efficiency of counter-drug operations in drug transit zones. Take for example, Operation New Frontier, which was conducted mainly in the Western Caribbean (Windward Passage, off of Haiti, Jamaica, and Colombia), and tested the concept of the Coast Guard's “use of force” helicopters and used Over-the-Horizon cutter boats to successfully seize six “go-fast” drug-smuggling vessels in six attempts. This

is an unprecedented success rate. Similarly, the Coast Guard's Deployable Pursuit Boats, DPBs, high-speed, 38-foot, 840-horsepower fiberglass boats—have been operating as another tool to stem the threat posed by drug smugglers' "go-fast" boats.

But unfortunately, despite recent successes, the fact is that we need to do more to help our Coast Guard in the long-term. Past funding shortfalls for the Coast Guard have had negative impacts on its operations. We need to do more. We need to make sure that every year our Coast Guard receives the funds it needs to continue its high level of service and necessary counter-drug operations.

The Coast Guard must be able to perform routine and emergency operations, while still providing vital training and maintenance functions. The Coast Guard must do this within their annual budget and without placing an unreasonable workload on its people.

I stand ready to continue working with my colleagues to make sure our Coast Guard has the funding and the support to meet its missions now and well into the future.

AMENDMENT NO. 244

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, my amendment is very simple: it provides \$1.5 billion annually for education technology programs, and will be offset by a reduction in the tax cut. It will give every American child a "digital opportunity ladder" to climb to success, as well as help every child to be computer literate by the 6th grade, regardless of race, ethnicity, income, gender, geography, or disability.

My amendment does 3 things: it provides \$1 billion a year for consolidated education technology programs, which will go to states based on formula grants. Schools could use these funds for almost any technology-related activity: wiring, hardware, software, training, maintenance or repair.

Second, my amendment doubles teacher training funds by adding \$400 million, per year for the next ten years. Teachers want to help their students cross the digital divide but less than 20 percent of them feel confident using technology in their daily lesson plans. Technology without training is a hollow opportunity.

Finally, my amendment also provides \$100 million to create one thousand community technology centers. Community technology centers are necessary because kids don't just learn in school—they also learn in their communities. Technology centers make it easier for children to do their homework or to surf the web under adult supervision, and also make it easier for parents to upgrade their skills or write a resume.

The opportunities here are tremendous: to use technology to improve our lives, to use technology to remove barriers such as income, race, ethnicity, or geography. Every student in America should have access to a digital opportunity ladder. My amendment does that and I urge my colleagues' support.

AMENDMENT NO. 335

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, 2 years ago following an indepth study requested by Congress, the National Academy of Sciences recommended we reduce the level of arsenic in drinking water by a significant amount.

This is the standard that was, in fact, required in a rule issued by the previous administration, but one that the present administration abruptly overturned last month.

In response, I have filed legislation that aims to impose the safer standard of having 80 percent less arsenic in our drinking water than the Bush administration would allow.

I believe this is a step needed to protect consumers, children and our environment. Better safe than sorry is a good rule in such matters.

This amendment would provide first-year funding of \$43 million the Environmental Protection Agency says is needed for smaller cities to be able to improve water systems.

This amendment is needed to ensure that cost doesn't prevent public water systems from providing safe, clean drinking water.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of an amendment offered by myself and Senator MIKULSKI.

Today, teachers expend significant money out of their own pocket to better the education of our children. Most typically, our teachers are spending money out of their own pocket on three types of expenses: education expenses brought into the classroom—such as books, supplies, pens, paper, and computer equipment; professional development expenses—such as tuition, fees, books, and supplies associated with courses that help our teachers become even better instructors; and interest paid by the teacher for previously incurred higher education loans.

These out-of-pocket costs placed on the backs of our teachers are but one reason our teachers are leaving the profession, and why this country is in the midst of a teacher shortage.

Therefore, I introduced The Teacher Tax Credit. This legislation creates a \$1,000 tax credit for eligible teachers for qualified education expenses, qualified professional development expenses, and interest paid by the teacher during the taxable year on any qualified education loan.

This legislation, S. 225, is cosponsored by Senators MIKULSKI, ALLEN, DEWINE, COCHRAN, and HARKIN. It is supported by the National Education Association.

We all agree that our education system must ensure that no child is left behind. As we move towards education reforms to achieve this goal, we must keep in mind the other component in our education system—the teachers.

This amendment to the budget resolution will set a reserve fund of \$39.5 billion over the next 10 years to reimburse teachers for these out-of-pocket

costs. Teachers will benefit and our children will benefit as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. On this side we agree and support all of those amendments en bloc and ask our colleagues' support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 334, 236, 196, 244, 335) en bloc were agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, last night we called up amendment No. 237, the Grassley amendment. We agreed to it and then withdrew it. It has now been corrected technically. It was agreed to last night, and we ask that it now be agreed to without a vote.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the Senator describes correctly what happened last night. This is a Grassley-Kennedy amendment. It has been cleared on both sides. We ask again the support of our colleagues. It was a technical glitch last night that has been corrected.

AMENDMENT NO. 237, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will please report the amendment as modified.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for Mr. GRASSLEY, proposes an amendment numbered 237, as modified.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a reserve fund for the Family Opportunity Act)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . RESERVE FUND FOR FAMILY OPPORTUNITY ACT.

If the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill or joint resolution which provides States with the opportunity to expand medicaid coverage for children with special needs, allowing families of disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the medicaid program for such children (commonly referred to as the "Family Opportunity Act of 2001"), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise committee allocations for the Committee on Finance and other appropriate budgetary aggregates and allocations of new budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) in this resolution by the amount provided by that measure for that purpose, but not to exceed \$200,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2002 and \$7,900,000,000 in new budget authority and outlays for the period of fiscal years 2002

through 2011, subject to the condition that such legislation will not, when taken together with all other previously-enacted legislation, reduce the on-budget surplus below the level of the Medicare Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund surplus in any fiscal year covered by this resolution.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I would like to express some concerns I have regarding the Family Opportunity Act. I agree with Chairman GRASSLEY's position that it is critically important to make sure that our federal safety net programs do not create disadvantages for families to work and therefore earn their way off federal assistance. He has made the argument that it is wrong that families, who are currently served by public programs such as Supplemental Security Income, must decline promotions and raises which would improve their situation for fear of losing their health care coverage. I agree and will support an effort to address these inequities and help those families move off of federal programs. The legislation currently contemplated by Senators GRASSLEY and KENNEDY does not simply remove the work disincentive in SSI. In fact, the legislation applies to families who have never been on SSI nor would ever qualify for SSI. This legislation would open up Medicaid to a family who earns up to \$51,000 for a family of four.

In this situation, these families would be competing against families who do qualify for SSI and are currently waiting, in some cases, up to 900 days to simply get on the program they desperately need. These are the poorest of the poor. They are the people for whom this program was designed but they are not being served effectively. In my opinion it is unacceptable to punish lower income Medicaid eligible persons presently waiting for needed assistance. There are many of us who would wonder about adding more applicants who would not be receiving the SSI benefit but rather just the certification for this Medicaid expansion to an overburdened system.

In recent years, we have seen a series of rifle shot expansions to the Medicaid program based on specific disease categories or groups. I am concerned that those expansions are not consistent with the intention of the program and undermine its purpose. It would be my hope that we could address these issues in the broader context of Medicaid reform and that the Finance Committee could responsibly evaluate any new federal entitlements to ensure that we are not duplicating existing health programs like SCHIP or discouraging private employer insurance.

This country has 43 million uninsured Americans. This bill, which costs \$7.9 billion, impacts 200,000 kids; 60,000 of whom have, or have access to, employer sponsored insurance and many of whom have access to SCHIP as well. It is a higher priority to provide health care to the uninsured with no health options than to create multiple health insurance options for a select population.

I do commend Chairman GRASSLEY for his hard work with Senator KENNEDY on this bill. I know that they have been working on this program for a number of years now and hope we can work together in this process toward a final bill. I look forward to working with the chairman and others on the committee to ensure this bill addresses the issue it was designed to fix.

Mr. DOMENICI. We yield back any time in favor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 237), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I wish to announce to everyone that we are down to three amendments on our side. There are a few more than that on the other side. I wonder if we could have just a little bit of time. I think it would permit us to work out a number of these. I am going to put in a quorum call. I think it might last as long as 10 or 15 minutes for those who are interested.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico. Mr. DOMENICI. First, I want to say to the Senate, we are getting very close. We only have about four amendments on each side. We think we can work them out. And if not, we would not have more than three or four votes on what we have remaining. We need some time to work on modifying these amendments to make them acceptable, in most cases. So we can do that properly, we need until about 12:30. We have consulted with the leadership. I ask unanimous consent that we now stand in recess until 12:30.

Mr. CONRAD addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the chairman of the committee describes it very well. We have worked through a lot of amendments. We still have some outstanding that will require some additional staff time. Also, we need to do a careful analysis of where we are in terms of spending, where we are on a year-by-year basis. This additional time will help us do that final analysis so Senators, when we are voting on a final package, will have a very accurate picture of where we are in terms of the tax cut, in terms of spending, and in terms of debt reduction.

We hope we can take this time and then come back and finish our business expeditiously.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I have a question for either of the managers. My understanding is that we have a Senator who will not be back until 2:30. Is that affecting our voting schedule?

Mr. DOMENICI. From what I can tell, we need the time now to do some work. We can't move ahead with any dispatch now. We would like this time to work on it. There is no outside reason for this. It is our reason, internal to our work.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate stands in recess.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 11:10 a.m., recessed until 12:31 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2001-2011—Continued

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, we have been working diligently to get a series of amendments we can accept. We are operating on the premise that any of the amendments that were offered either from our side or the other side—that they be budget neutral in the language that is used to formulate them.

AMENDMENT NO. 214, AS MODIFIED

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify amendment No. 214 offered by Senator COLLINS.

I send the amendment, as modified, to the desk.

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

The clerk will report. The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], for Ms. COLLINS, for herself, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. DASCHLE, proposes an amendment numbered 214, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, reads as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for a reserve fund for veterans' education)

At the appropriate place, insert the following: