

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT
AND THE COURTS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Wednesday, April 5, 2000 at 9:30 a.m., in SH216.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent Dave Carney, a member of Senator ABRAHAM's staff, be allowed access to the floor.

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

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Caroline Chang, a Fellow working in my office, be permitted floor privileges during the pendency of S. Con. Res. 101.

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

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Gabriel Lam of my staff be accorded the privilege of the floor for today only.

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

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that John Stoodly, a detailee to the Committee on Small Business staff, be granted the privilege of the floor during pendency of S. Con. Res. 101.

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

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that David Cross, a Fellow in my office, be afforded privilege on the floor during debate on Amendment No. 2955 and also during the vote, whenever it should occur.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 6,
2000

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, April 6. I further ask consent that on Thursday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 101, the budget resolution, with 8½ hours of debate remaining.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will continue consideration of the budget resolution at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow. The first votes are scheduled

to occur at 10:30. In addition, the so-called vote-arama should begin at some point tomorrow by late afternoon or early evening. Therefore, Senators should adjust their schedules accordingly.

CONGRATULATING THE U-CONN
WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM
FOR THEIR NCAA CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 282, introduced earlier today by Senators DODD and LIEBERMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 282) congratulating the Huskies of the University of Connecticut for winning the 2000 women's basketball championship.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed upon en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 282) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 282

Whereas the University of Connecticut women's basketball team won its second national championship in 5 years by defeating the University of Tennessee by the score of 71-52;

Whereas the University of Connecticut Huskies entered the 2000 NCAA Tournament with a perfect 15-0 record in the Big East Conference and with just one loss during the regular season;

Whereas National Coach of the Year Geno Auriemma's team began the season ranked number one in the Nation and will finish the season ranked number one in the Nation;

Whereas the University of Connecticut Women Huskies brought the State of Connecticut its second straight NCAA Basketball Title, following the 1999 championship of the University of Connecticut Men's team;

Whereas both Shea Ralph and Svetlana Abrosimova were chosen consensus All-Americans; Ralph was selected the NCAA tournament's Most Outstanding Player; Kelly Schumacher set a championship-game record for blocked shots with 9; and Ralph, Abrosimova, Sue Bird, and Asjha Jones were named to the All-Tournament team;

Whereas the Huskies dominated March Madness, averaging 91.3 points and a 19-point margin of victory in the tournament;

Whereas University of Connecticut's 19-point win over Tennessee, the other powerhouse of women's collegiate basketball, was the second largest margin of victory ever in a championship game;

Whereas the high caliber of the University of Connecticut Women Huskies in both athletics and academics has again advanced the sport of women's basketball and provided in-

spiration for future generations of young female athletes; and

Whereas the Huskies' season of accomplishment rallied Connecticut residents of all ages, from Stamford to Storrs, from Norwalk to Norwich, behind a common purpose and inspired a wave of euphoria across the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the Huskies of the University of Connecticut for completing the 1999-2000 season with a 36-1 record and winning the 2000 NCAA Women's Basketball Championship.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the Durbin statement and amendment introduction.

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

FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET—
Continued

AMENDMENT NO. 2953

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] proposes an amendment numbered 2953.

Mr. DURBIN. 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:

FEDERAL REVENUE TOTALS

On page 4, line 3, decrease the amount by \$0.

On page 4, line 4, decrease the amount by \$4,843,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, decrease the amount by \$35,146,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by \$65,248,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by \$99,450,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by \$128,552,000,000.

FEDERAL REVENUE CHANGES

On page 4, line 12, increase the amount by \$0.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by \$4,843,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by \$35,146,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by \$65,248,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by \$99,450,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by \$128,552,000,000.

NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY

On page 4, line 21, increase the amount by \$0.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by \$136,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by \$1,280,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by \$4,186,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$8,785,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$15,334,000,000.

BUDGET OUTLAYS

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$0.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$136,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$1,280,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$4,186,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by \$8,785,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by \$15,334,000,000.

NET INTEREST BUDGET AUTHORITY

On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by \$0.

On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by \$136,000,000.

FEDERAL REVENUE TOTALS

On page 26, line 11, increase the amount by \$1,280,000,000.

On page 26, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,186,000,000.

On page 26, line 19, increase the amount by \$8,785,000,000.

On page 26, line 23, increase the amount by \$15,334,000,000.

NET INTEREST OUTLAYS

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by \$0.

On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by \$136,000,000.

On page 26, line 12, increase the amount by \$1,280,000,000.

On page 26, line 16, increase the amount by \$4,186,000,000.

On page 26, line 20, increase the amount by \$8,785,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, increase the amount by \$15,334,000,000.

PUBLIC DEBT

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$0.

On page 5, line 23, increase the amount by \$4,979,000,000.

On page 5, line 24, increase the amount by \$36,426,000,000.

On page 5, line 25, increase the amount by \$69,434,000,000.

On page 6, line 1, increase the amount by \$108,235,000,000.

On page 6, line 2, increase the amount by \$143,886,000,000.

DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC

On page 6, line 5, increase the amount by \$0.

On page 6, line 6, increase the amount by \$4,979,000,000.

On page 6, line 7, increase the amount by \$36,426,000,000.

On page 6, line 8, increase the amount by \$69,434,000,000.

On page 6, line 9, increase the amount by \$108,235,000,000.

On page 6, line 10, increase the amount by \$143,886,000,000.

TAX CUT

On page 29, line 3, increase the amount by \$4,843,000,000.

On page 29, line 4, increase the amount by \$333,239,000,000.

DEFICIT INCREASE

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$0.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$4,979,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$36,426,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$89,434,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$108,235,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$143,886,000,000.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the hour is late and I have a special sensitivity to the fact that many of the staff people have been here for a long time, and I know we will return to this amendment and debate first thing in the morning. I will make my remarks mercifully brief and just alert the Members of the Senate and those who follow this debate of the nature of the amendment I am offering.

I think this amendment goes to the heart of politics, the best part of politics. It goes to a clash of ideas, a difference of opinion, a true choice for the Members of the Senate and for the people of the United States because the amendment I offer has become the cornerstone of the Presidential debate for the year 2000.

The two candidates who are the likely nominees of their party, George W. Bush and Vice President AL GORE, have one marked difference. Governor Bush has proposed a substantial—some would say massive and risky—tax cut. Vice President GORE believes that, as do many of the Members of the Senate and the House, with this surplus we anticipate in the coming years, our first priority should be the reduction of the national debt so that our children don't bear that burden, and that we don't have to generate in taxes every day of every year the interest payments on old debt.

Furthermore, Vice President GORE and many of us believe that we should take our surplus and dedicate it to preserving Social Security, making certain that Medicare will be there for many years to come. He believes, as many of us do, that we should have targeted tax cuts well within our means, consistent with our goal of reducing the national debt, and that we should then have specific spending priorities for education and health care.

On the other side of the coin, there is quite a different proposal. Governor Bush has suggested perhaps the largest tax cut that has been proposed in recent memory. Every politician applauds a tax cut, and most of us like to offer one. But certainly we don't want to do something that is unrealistic. I suggest to my colleagues that the Bush tax cut being offered in the Presidential campaign is not only unrealistic; it is risky. And if we are not careful, if we follow his campaign pledge and his advice, we could jeopardize the economic growth that we have seen over the past 7 years.

Twice in the Senate Budget Committee, I allowed my colleagues—both Republicans and Democrats—to go on record in reference to the Bush tax cut. I thought it was only fair that the Republican members of the Senate Budget Committee would have that opportunity to stand by their Presidential candidate and the cornerstone of his campaign, the Bush tax cut because, you see, the Senate budget resolution we are considering today, proposed by Senate Republican leaders, doesn't include Governor Bush's tax cut.

I think this is a terrible oversight and omission that the standard bearer of the Republican Party would come forward with a vision of America that includes a tax cut, and for some reason the Senate Republicans don't want to include it in their proposal for the course of action in America for the next 5 or 10 years.

So twice in the Senate Budget Committee I offered the Bush tax cut for an up-or-down vote, take it or leave it, stand by your man, the Republicans with the Democrats, make it clear you disagree.

I was disappointed to find that my Republican colleagues in the Senate Budget Committee did not want to go on record when it came to the tax cut proposed by the standard bearer of the Republican Party, the possible Presidential nominee, Governor George W. Bush. I think there is good reason for that. I will explain it in a minute.

But I said in the committee that if the Senate Republicans in the Budget Committee didn't want to vote for Bush's tax cut in the committee, I would feel duty bound to offer that same opportunity to all of the Members of the Senate here on the floor. After all, as we debate important policy questions such as funding and education and whether we are going to drill in ANWR, these are policy questions on which we go on record. We establish our positions by our votes.

I am hoping by offering this amendment that the Senate will go on record. The Republican Members have their chance with this amendment to stand up for the tax cut proposed by their Presidential candidate. I think they should vote no. Above all, I hope they don't continue to duck this vote. They cannot duck this vote any more than Governor Bush can duck the responsibility to explain his tax cut and what it means to America.

Take a look at where we have been in this Nation over the past 7 years and the progress we have made. Record budget deficits have been erased. We have had the largest paydown of debt in the history of the United States with \$297 billion in debt reduction. We are on the right track. We have seen the smallest Government in over three decades while we have increased key investments in education and in training for the people of this country. The typical family has seen their tax burden lowered to a level where you would have to reach back to the 1970s to find a comparison. Investment has boomed.

Take a look at the investment that is mirrored by our stock exchanges and our investments across America and you will see that people have been putting money into companies for growth. It has paid off. Unemployment is the lowest in decades, the welfare rolls the lowest in decades, inflation under control, housing starts at record levels, and business creation at record levels.

Frankly, everything you like to see that is positive in our economy has been moving forward under the Clinton-Gore administration. Of course,

they can't take complete credit for that, but they can take some credit for it. They would certainly be blamed if we were back in the recessions of previous Presidents.

We have to say as well that some credit should go to the Federal Reserve because they have tried to quell the flames and forces of inflation, and they have been very effective in doing so. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, deserves credit for his leadership. I was happy recently to vote to reconfirm him for another term as Chairman of that important body.

But, on balance, most Americans believe we are headed in the right direction.

One American who apparently does not believe that is the Republican candidate for President because George W. Bush has proposed a dramatic change and a drastic shift in America's economic policy. He said we should take the surplus we see coming because of a strong economy and dedicate it to a massive and risky tax cut primarily for the wealthiest people in America.

If you take a close look at what this means, this chart shows our economy moving forward as a great ocean liner and a \$168 billion proposed tax cut from the Presidential candidate, George W. Bush, that masks an iceberg of a tax cut that is so large, it would exceed the available surplus and force us to move into the Social Security trust fund to pay for it.

Our fear, and the fear of Chairman Greenspan and many others, is that such a tax cut at this moment in history would fire up an economy, create inflation, force increases in interest rates, and, frankly, doom the economic expansion we have seen for over 108 months, a record in the history of the United States.

Take a look at what the Bush tax cut would cost over a 5-year period of time based on research by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. It would be a \$483 billion tax cut, and over 10 years it would be a \$1.3 trillion tax cut.

What would be the impact of a \$1.3 trillion tax cut on the Social Security surplus? As you can see, the non-Social Security surplus is \$171 billion. That is what we can consider using for such things as debt reduction, targeted tax cuts, and expenditures on education. But George W. Bush would take \$483 billion out for his tax cut. You may note that is far in excess of the amount that is available outside of the non-Social Security surplus.

The obvious conclusion is, to pay for the George W. Bush tax cut, you would have to raid Social Security. I find we have decided on a bipartisan basis that won't happen, that we will protect the Social Security trust fund.

That is why I believe the Republican Members of the Senate, if they share that belief, as I do, that Social Security should be protected, should vote against the George W. Bush tax cut. My amendment gives them a chance to go on record against this tax cut to

make it clear that they want to protect Social Security and avoid a raid on the Social Security trust fund to make up the \$312 billion difference in the first 5 years we would see if we followed George W. Bush's plan.

The obvious question is whether this Bush tax cut is fair and whether it would help American families. As I said earlier, all of us would like to see tax cuts. We would certainly like to go back to families in Illinois and across America and say to them, We can give you a break to help pay for your bills. Most of them would welcome it. But if you take a close look at the proposal from George W. Bush for his tax cut, you will see that most working families and middle-income families in America won't even notice a change.

If you notice, the bottom 60 percent of wage earners in America, those making below \$39,300 a year, will see an average tax cut of about \$249 a year, a little over \$20 a month. That comes down to 75 cents a day they might see by way of George W. Bush's tax cut—60 percent of American families. But in the top 1 percent, the people who are making over \$300,000 a year already, the George W. Bush tax cut is worth over \$50,000 a year. Not only does this tax cut raid Social Security but the beneficiaries of it turn out to be wealthiest people in this country. Frankly, that isn't fair.

If we are going to jeopardize our economic growth, if we are going to in some way avoid the debt reduction, which most economists agree is important for the growth of America, you would think a tax cut on the table would at least benefit most American families. Honestly, it doesn't or, if it does, it is so small, they wouldn't notice it. Twenty dollars a month? That is what 60 percent of the working families of America would see. As I mentioned earlier, it would be at great expense and peril to the Social Security trust fund and others.

As I offer this amendment, I am hoping we can have a bipartisan consensus to tell Governor George Bush to go back to the drawing board, to come forward with a proposal, if you will, that is consistent with continuing the economic growth in this country and that in fact identifies as the highest priority the reduction of our national debt and doesn't jeopardize Social Security. Frankly, his tax cut does. That is why I think this Senate should go on record in opposition to it on a bipartisan basis.

There is a lot of criticism of current political campaigns across America: They are too long; they are too nasty; they are too negative. And virtually all of those criticisms are true. But if our political campaigns in this democracy are of any value, they are because we have a true clash of ideas, a difference of opinions, and a real choice for voters.

When it comes to the George W. Bush tax cut, there couldn't be a clearer choice.

I hope my colleagues in the Senate will accept their responsibility, step

up, and say whether they endorse the proposal of the Presidential candidate on the Republican side for this tax cut or whether they believe, as Chairman Greenspan does, Vice President GORE, and most American people do, that it is an unwise course of action.

I understand, as most people do, that there are a lot of differences of opinion in the course of a campaign. But Governor Bush has been very specific in spelling out his tax cut. In order to achieve his tax cut, you not only have to raid Social Security, but when you go in the outyears beyond 5 years, to achieve it you have to cut dramatically in spending on very important programs for America.

If that is something which the Republican side of the aisle wants to embrace, so be it. I, frankly, think it is shortsighted to take over \$3.7 million low-income women and children off the WIC Program, a nutrition program for children and pregnant women so their babies are born healthy and get off to a good start.

If you follow through on the George W. Bush tax plan, you see massive spending cuts in key programs such as WIC. There is a \$4.8 billion cutback in the Pell Grant Program, meaning 784,000 college students who receive grants—not loans, because they are low income—would see those disappear.

Mr. President, 400,000 kids, \$2.9 billion cuts in Head Start—does it make sense to offer a tax cut of \$50,000 a year to some of the wealthiest people in America and at the same time cut back and eliminate 400,000 kids from the Head Start Program?

The community development block grant programs and so many other job training assistance and support programs would be decimated by the proposal of the Presidential candidate on the Republican side, Governor Bush.

I believe if we are to stand on the record for this Bush tax cut plan, we have to answer to the voters in Illinois and across the Nation why we are prepared to threaten the future of Social Security and Medicare; why would we make deep cuts in Medicare spending; why would we fail to invest in debt reduction and help these important programs to provide the largest tax cuts in history to the richest people in our Nation.

Eliminating the estate tax primarily benefits millionaires. I asked a group who came to my office recently who said they wanted to see the estate tax eliminated: What percentage of estates in America pay the tax? They didn't know. The answer is 1.3 percent. It is a very small percentage. It comes down to the fact that if we are going to eliminate those taxes on the richest people in America, we should only do it if we can justify it. I don't believe Governor Bush can justify it in terms of the benefits that it would mean for the rest of the people who live in this country.

I hope we will not jeopardize our economic prosperity. I hope we will follow

the model that has been suggested by Vice President GORE. I sincerely hope my colleagues in the Senate will not duck this opportunity to vote on the George W. Bush tax cut plan. If they are proud of their candidate, if they believe in his platform, if they share his vision, for goodness sake, have the courage to stand up and vote yes; if you disagree with his position, at least have the courage to go on the record and say so.

I hope, as in the Budget Committee, we don't run into the same experience

on the floor where the Republican majority refuses to go on the record when it comes to the cornerstone of the campaign of the Republican Presidential candidate George W. Bush.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, April 6, 2000.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:33 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, April 6, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 5, 2000:

THE JUDICIARY

Jay A. Garcia-Gregory, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, vice Raymond L. Acosta, retired.