

Fire Ant; Quarantined Areas and Treatment Dosage" (Docket # 99-078-2), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-8929. A communication from the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of Pay-As-You-Go Calculations, Report Number 505, dated May 2, 2000; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-8930. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Acquisition Regulation: To Amend the EPA Acquisition Regulation Clause 1552.216-70, Award Fee" (FRL # 6606-6), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8931. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District" (FRL # 6606-3), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8932. A communication from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District" (FRL # 6602-7), received May 9, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-8933. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "36 CFR Part 51 Concession Contracts, Final Rule", received May 4, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BURNS (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. LANDRIEU, and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 2542. A bill to protect individuals, families, and ISPs from unsolicited and unwanted e-mail; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2543. To amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to include airplane and rail accidents within the meaning of the term "major disaster"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 2544. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children of female Vietnam veterans who were born with certain birth defects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. KERREY):

S. 2545. A bill to provide for the enhancement of study, research, and other activities in the United States relating to information

technology and information protection technology; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

S. 2546. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the use of methyl tertiary butyl ether, to provide flexibility within the oxygenate requirement of the reformulated gasoline program of the Environmental Protection Agency, to promote the use of renewable ethanol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 2547. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes national Preserve in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2548. A bill to provide that extension of nondiscriminatory trade treatment to the People's Republic of China be contingent on the United States and People's Republic of China entering into a bilateral agreement relating to enforcement; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. Res. 305. A resolution commending participant in the Million Mom March; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. Res. 306. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to Mother's Day that the United States Senate should reject the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) as it demeans motherhood and undermines the traditional family; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HELMS:

S. Res. 307. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to Mother's Day that the United States Senate should reject the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) as it demeans motherhood and undermines the traditional family.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. Con. Res. 112. A concurrent resolution to make technical corrections in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 434.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2543. A bill to amend the Robert R. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to include airplane and rail accidents within the meaning of the term "major disaster"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

AMENDMENT TO STAFFORD ACT TO COVER AIRLINE AND RAIL ACCIDENTS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. Senator Stafford, my Vermont colleague

whose seat in this body I am honored to hold today, authored the legislation creating FEMA more than 25 years ago. Thanks to his foresight and leadership in this area, the federal government has helped thousands of ordinary citizens recover from disasters and other incidents beyond their control.

Today we have a chance to build on the legacy of Senator Stafford by adding airline and rail accidents to the list of "major disasters" defined in the act that governs the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

While extremely rare occurrences, major airline and rail disasters place an incredible burden on the states and municipalities in which they occur. Due in part to the extraordinary level of national attention these accidents receive, states and municipalities face millions of dollars in unexpected and unbudgeted expenditures that often cripple local finances. Fees associated with initial response, security, and other health and safety measures often cost several million dollars.

This legislation standardizes procedure for federal reimbursement of affected communities. While the federal government has regularly reimbursed states and municipalities during the 1990s for their role in these most national of disasters, the process is an ad hoc one. This body has considered and approved at least three special line item appropriations for areas affected by the recent ValueJet, TWA, and COMAIR accidents. A bill to reimburse Rhode Island for its costs associated with last fall's Egypt Air disaster is currently working its way through the Congress as part of the appropriation for the National Transportation Safety Board.

This process causes needless headache and anxiety for local communities, as well as unnecessary chores for the NTSB and Congress. It forces states and municipalities to wait as reimbursement requests find their way through the complicated appropriations process while creating more work for our overburdened appropriators.

The numbers speak for themselves. States and local communities spend millions of dollars to respond to these accidents. While they are ultimately reimbursed by the federal government, the uncertainty and slow pace of the process often places affected communities in a financial bind. Money that could be spent on education, health care, or public safety is lost in an unnecessary limbo.

Under this bill, airline and rail accidents will be treated like any other disaster under the Stafford Act. Like an earthquake, blizzard or any other disaster, FEMA, upon the request of a governor, will examine the scene of such an accident and advise the President on whether federal reimbursement is appropriate.

Mr. President, this bill simply standardizes procedure for a commitment already made by the federal government. It requires to new costs or expenses

and actually saves money by streamlining a bureaucratic and complicated process. The International Association of Emergency Managers and the NTSB supports this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join these groups in supporting this bill that will bring standardization to an ad hoc process that has the potential to cause so much harm to our states and communities.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER (for himself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. DASCHLE):

S. 2544. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children of female Vietnam veterans who were born with certain birth defects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CHILDREN OF WOMEN VIETNAM VETERANS' BENEFITS ACT OF 2000

• Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senator MURRAY, I wish to introduce a bill, the Children of Women Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000, which would amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children born with certain birth defects to women Vietnam veterans.

This bill is essentially similar, except for minor technical corrections, to S. 2494, the Children of Female Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000, which I introduced on May 2, 2000. Mrs. MURRAY had asked to be an original cosponsor of that bill, but through an inadvertent clerical error, she was not listed as an original cosponsor on the bill when it was printed. I wish to note, for the record, that it was her intent to be an original cosponsor of S. 2494.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2544

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Children of Women Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. BENEFITS FOR THE CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS WHO SUFFER FROM CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 18 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER II—CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS

"§ 1811. Definitions

"In this subchapter:

"(1) The term 'child', with respect to a female Vietnam veteran, means a natural child of the female Vietnam veteran, regardless of age or marital status, who was conceived after the date on which the female Vietnam veteran first entered the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as specified in section 101(29)(A) of this title).

"(2) The term 'covered birth defect' means each birth defect identified by the Secretary under section 1812 of this title.

"(3) The term 'female Vietnam veteran' means any female individual who performed active military, naval, or air service in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as so specified), without regard to the characterization of the individual's service.

"§ 1812. Birth defects covered

"(a) IDENTIFICATION.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall identify the birth defects of children of female Vietnam veterans that—

"(1) are associated with the service of female Vietnam veterans in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as specified in section 101(29)(A) of this title); and

"(2) result in the permanent physical or mental disability of such children.

"(b) LIMITATIONS.—(1) The birth defects identified under subsection (a) may not include birth defects resulting from the following:

"(A) A familial disorder.

"(B) A birth-related injury.

"(C) A fetal or neonatal infirmity with well-established causes.

"(2) The birth defects identified under subsection (a) may not include spina bifida.

"(c) LIST.—The Secretary shall prescribe in regulations a list of the birth defects identified under subsection (a).

"§ 1813. Benefits and assistance

"(a) HEALTH CARE.—(1) The Secretary shall provide a child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect such health care as the Secretary determines is needed by the child for such birth defect or any disability that is associated with such birth defect.

"(2) The Secretary may provide health care under this subsection directly or by contract or other arrangement with a health care provider.

"(3) For purposes of this subsection, the definitions in section 1803(c) of this title shall apply with respect to the provision of health care under this subsection, except that for such purposes—

"(A) the reference to 'specialized spina bifida clinic' in paragraph (2) of such section 1803(c) shall be treated as a reference to a specialized clinic treating the birth defect concerned under this subsection; and

"(B) the reference to 'vocational training under section 1804 of this title' in paragraph (8) of such section 1803(c) shall be treated as a reference to vocational training under subsection (b).

"(b) VOCATIONAL TRAINING.—(1) The Secretary may provide a program of vocational training to a child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect if the Secretary determines that the achievement of a vocational goal by the child is reasonably feasible.

"(2) Subsections (b) through (e) of section 1804 of this title shall apply with respect to any program of vocational training provided under paragraph (1).

"(c) MONETARY ALLOWANCE.—(1) The Secretary shall pay a monthly allowance to any child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect for any disability resulting from such birth defect.

"(2) The amount of the monthly allowance paid under this subsection shall be based on the degree of disability suffered by the child concerned, as determined in accordance with a schedule for rating disabilities resulting from covered birth defects that is prescribed by the Secretary.

"(3) In prescribing a schedule for rating disabilities under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall establish four levels of disability upon which the amount of the monthly allowance under this subsection shall be based.

"(4) The amount of the monthly allowance paid under this subsection shall be as follows:

"(A) In the case of a child suffering from the lowest level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, \$100.

"(B) In the case of a child suffering from the lower intermediate level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

"(i) \$214; or

"(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the lowest level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

"(C) In the case of a child suffering from the higher intermediate level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

"(i) \$743; or

"(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the intermediate level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

"(D) In the case of a child suffering from the highest level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

"(i) \$1,272; or

"(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the highest level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

"(5) Amounts under subparagraphs (A), (B)(i), (C)(i), and (D)(i) of paragraph (4) shall be subject to adjustment from time to time under section 5312 of this title.

"(6) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 1805 of this title shall apply with respect to any monthly allowance paid under this subsection.

"(d) GENERAL LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF BENEFITS AND ASSISTANCE.—(1) No individual receiving benefits or assistance under this section may receive any benefits or assistance under subchapter I of this chapter.

"(2) In any case where affirmative evidence establishes that the covered birth defect of a child results from a cause other than the active military, naval, or air service in the Republic of Vietnam of the female Vietnam veteran who is the mother of the child, no benefits or assistance may be provided the child under this section.

"(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of the administration of the provisions of this section."

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—That chapter is further amended by inserting after subchapter II, as added by subsection (a) of this section, the following new subchapter:

"SUBCHAPTER III—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

"§ 1821. Applicability of certain administrative provisions

"The provisions of sections 5101(c), 5110(a), (b)(2), (g), and (i), 5111, and 5112(a), (b)(1), (b)(6), (b)(9), and (b)(10) of this title shall apply with respect to benefits and assistance under this chapter in the same manner as such provisions apply to veterans' disability compensation.

"§ 1822. Treatment of receipt of monetary allowance on other benefits

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, receipt by an individual of a monetary allowance under this chapter shall not impair, infringe, or otherwise affect the right of the individual to receive any other benefit to which the individual is otherwise entitled under any law administered by the Secretary.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, receipt by an individual of a monetary allowance under this chapter shall not impair, infringe, or otherwise affect the right of any other individual to receive any

benefit to which such other individual is entitled under any law administered by the Secretary based on the relationship of such other individual to the individual who receives such monetary allowance.

“(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a monetary allowance paid an individual under this chapter shall not be considered as income or resources in determining eligibility for or the amount of benefits under any Federal or Federally-assisted program.”

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED MATTER.—Section 1806 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.

(d) REDESIGNATION OF EXISTING MATTER.—Chapter 18 of that title is further amended by inserting before section 1801 the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA”.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Sections 1801 and 1802 of that title are each amended by striking “this chapter” and inserting “this subchapter”.

(2) Section 1805(a) of that title is amended by striking “this chapter” and inserting “this section”.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1)(A) The chapter heading of chapter 18 of that title is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 18—BENEFITS FOR CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS”.

(B) The tables of chapters at beginning of that title, and at the beginning of part II of that title, are each amended by striking the item relating to chapter 18 and inserting the following new item:

“18. Benefits for Children of Vietnam Veterans 1801”.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 18 of that title is amended—

(A) by inserting after the chapter heading the following:

“SUBCHAPTER I—CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA”;

(B) by striking the item relating to section 1806; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“SUBCHAPTER II—CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS

“1811. Definitions.

“1812. Birth defects covered.

“1813. Benefits and assistance.

“SUBCHAPTER III—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

“1821. Applicability of certain administrative provisions.

“1822. Treatment of receipt of monetary allowance on other benefits.”

(f) APPLICABILITY.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning more than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall identify birth defects under section 1822 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section), and shall prescribe the regulations required by subchapter II of that title (as so added), not later than the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(3) No benefit or assistance may be provided under subchapter II of chapter 18 of title 38, United States Code (as so added), for any period before the effective date specified in paragraph (1) by reason of the amendments made by this section.●

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. KERREY):

S. 2545. A bill to provide for the enhancement to study, research, and other activities in the United States relating to information technology and information protection technology; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

BARRY GOLDWATER SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION ENHANCEMENT ACT

● Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to increase the Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation from the current \$61 million to \$81 million. I am pleased to have the support and able assistance of the Senior Senator from Nebraska, Senator J. ROBERT KERREY in joining me to introduce this bill. This increase allows the Foundation to add another 100 young people to the 300 that they now support. This substantial increase will augment the influence the Foundation already has on American higher education.

Goldwater scholarships are awarded to college juniors and seniors in math and science. The increased funding in this legislation is set aside for information technology students. Channeling these funds through the existing Goldwater framework will maximize the amount of money directly available to students. These students are selected on the basis of academic merit from a field of approximately 1,200 mathematics, science and engineering students nominated by the faculties of colleges and universities from the fifty states and Puerto Rico. Since 1988, 2,711 scholarships have been awarded, providing about \$28 million to outstanding scholars from colleges and universities throughout the United States.

Goldwater Scholars are top notch. As evidence, I cite the large number of Goldwater Scholars who have been awarded prestigious graduate scholarships. Goldwater Scholars have won a total of 25 Rhodes Scholarships over the years. Last year alone, almost 20 percent of the awards—six out of 32—were Goldwater Scholars. Goldwater Scholars also populate the ranks of other distinguished fellowships. In the last eleven years, the scholars have won 19 Marshall, six Churchill, nine Fulbright, 23 Hughes, and 65 National Science Foundation fellowships.

These are the students we need in our economy. For the U.S. to continue to be competitive and support our growing economy, we must encourage our young men and women to enter the high technology industry. America's explosive demand for highly skilled workers is creating a new labor shortage. Under current conditions, we do not have enough U.S. workers trained in high technology fields. This forces our local businesses to resort to immigration to make up for this shortfall. Highly skilled immigrants enter the country under the H1-B visa waiver program. To help meet the growing demand, Congress raised the cap on H1-B visas from 65,000 to 115,000 in FY 1999 and 2000, and 107,500 in 2001. Unfortu-

nately, even this increase is not enough. A tight labor market, increasing globalization and burgeoning economic growth continue to increase U.S. demands for highly skilled workers. The 1999 cap on H-1B visas was reached in June of last year and it is projected we will reach the cap even earlier this year. Later this month, we expect the Senate to consider another increase of H1-B visas to raise the cap to 195,000 a year for FY 2000, 2001 and 2002.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I firmly believe that we have the responsibility to adequately train our own labor force to meet the business and industry demands of today and tomorrow. We simply cannot rely on workers from other countries to do our sensitive technology work. As we saw in the Y2K reprogram with our great dependence on foreign security workers, we are sorely in need of a domestic technology workforce.

Mr. President, I strongly encourage my colleagues to join me in support of this effort to expand the Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation and renew our commitment to educating young people in the fields of math and science. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2545

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

SECTION 1. SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS UNDER BARRY GOLDWATER SCHOLARSHIP AND EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR STUDY RELATING TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND INFORMATION PROTECTION TECHNOLOGY.

(a) AVAILABILITY.—Section 1405(a) of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Act (title XIV of Public Law 99-661; 20 U.S.C. 4704(a)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence of paragraph (1), by striking “science and mathematics” and inserting “science, mathematics, and information technology and information protection technology”; and

(2) in paragraphs (2) and (3), by striking “mathematics and the natural sciences” and inserting “mathematics, the natural sciences, and information technology and information protection technology”.

(b) FUNDING.—(1) There is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2001, \$20,000,000 for deposit in the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Fund established by section 1408(a) of the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Act (20 U.S.C. 4707(a)).

(2) Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) in the Fund referred to in that paragraph shall be available for purposes of providing scholarships and fellowships under section 1405(a) of that Act, as amended by subsection (a) of this section, for persons pursuing study in the field of information technology and information protection technology.●

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, in today's information age, the threat of electronic attack is more likely than a

nuclear attack. Words such as “cyber-terrorism” and “hackers” have crept into everyday talk, no longer confined to the world of computer nerds and geeks. Despite being one of the most technologically-advanced countries in the world, United States technology is not capable of keeping intruders out and secrets in. Flaws have been found in the computer systems of the Pentagon, IRS, bank networks, utility companies, and telecommunications providers, among others, making all of them vulnerable to attack.

The question, then, is what can we do as a country to protect both the government and industries from electronic attack? I believe we need to start early to equip more people with technological skills needed to build and maintain secure information technology networks. Today, along with my good friend Senator ROBERTS from Kansas, I am pleased to be introducing legislation that will do just that.

The vehicle we use to achieve this is the highly reputable Barry M. Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation, which currently awards scholarships to college juniors and seniors studying math and science. I doubt any of my colleagues would dispute the vast success of the Goldwater foundation. Nearly 20 percent of last year’s Rhodes Scholars were Goldwater Scholars first; and in the last eleven years, Goldwater Scholars have won 19 Marshall, 6 Churchill, 9 Fulbright, 23 Hughes, 65 NSF and numerous other fellowships.

Our bill is simple: We increase funding for the Goldwater foundation by 20 million dollars, taking it from 61 to 81 million dollars. That money will go for scholarships to a new category of students, those studying “information protection technology”. By training these young people, we can set up our technological infrastructure so it becomes safe from intruders.

Let me paint you a picture. Fifty years ago we suffered a devastating attack on Pearl Harbor. The siege lasted five hours. 2403 lives were lost, as were twenty ships and 188 aircraft. That attack catapulted the United States into World War II. As a country, however, we emerged from the war more powerful than we had been entering it. Along with the Soviet Union, the U.S. was deemed a “superpower,” and we have yet to give up that title.

A devastating attack today would take a much different form and have much more catastrophic consequences. We are not likely to be attacked by airplanes and ships. Rather, it is far more likely that we will be attacked through our technology systems. The attack can occur in as little as ten seconds, and the effects can devastate our whole industrial and governmental infrastructure. A cyber-terrorist can wipe out all financial records, plunge aircraft from the air with no warning, corrupt our entire national defense system, and render telecommunications useless. And it can happen in just sec-

onds, virtually undetected. And we were worried about Y2K.

If this scenario frightens you, good. These threats are very real, and with our growing dependence on informational systems, as a country we become more vulnerable every day. One needs to look no further than the now infamous “I love you” computer virus that swept this world last week to get a glimpse at how quickly this can occur, and how devastating such an attack can be.

The Pentagon, other government agencies, and many industries have set up departments to handle cyber-security, but we need to do everything we can to ensure that these departments can be staffed by knowledgeable information-protection experts. Without skilled staff, these departments are useless. The Information Protection Technology Scholarships will help ensure that the students in college have the opportunity to learn as much as possible about protecting technology. In turn, these students will repay the nation by putting their skills to work to make our technological infrastructure more secure. Twenty million dollars is not much to ask for to protect the entire United States from the possibility of wide-ranging cyber-terrorism.

One final note. With such a shortage of qualified American workers, America’s high tech industry is hiring people from other countries to come to the United States and fill these jobs. Highly trained immigrants enter this country under the H1-B visa program. Congress raised the cap on H1-B visas from 65,000 to 115,000 for FY ‘99, and it wasn’t enough: we reached that cap by June last year. Later this month, the Senate is expected to consider another increase of H1-B visas to 195,000 per year for FY00, 01 and 02. I support this proposed increase; however, I firmly believe we must do everything in our power to grow our own labor force. That is why I intend to offer this bill as an amendment to S. 2045 when it is considered on the Senate floor.

By Mr. BOND (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ASHCROFT, and Mr. FITZGERALD):

S. 2546. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the use of methyl tertiary butyl ether, to provide flexibility within the oxygenate requirement of the reformulated gasoline program of the Environmental Protection Agency, to promote the use of renewable ethanol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environmental and Public Works.

CLEAN AIR AND WATER PRESERVATION ACT OF
2000

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to introduce the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000 with my colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN. Our bill will accomplish the following: 1. Phases down to elimination MTBE within 3 years of enact-

ment; 2. Maintains the oxygenate standard; 3. Probably has the strongest environmental anti-backsliding provisions of any bill; 4. A temporary waiver from oxygenate standard could be granted if the USDA and DOE certify that there is an issue with supply; and 5. Highway apportionment percentages will stay the same.

Low grain prices high fuel prices, and the clean water problems associated with MTBE have highlighted the need for this bipartisan effort to protect our water, protect our air, and to protect our rural economy. Our region and the nation require a renewable, environmentally friendly alternative to MTBE that helps create local jobs, which adds value to our farmer’s product, which moves us away from an energy-hostage situation where our reliance on foreign-produced oil makes our producers, consumers and economy subject to the whims of international cartel autocrats, and protects our air and water.

My colleagues and friends on this issue, Senators DASCHLE and LUGAR, have also introduced a bill on this issue. I commend them for their involvement and look forward to working with them; however, I do not believe their bill solves all the problems. Specifically, their bill eliminates the oxygenate requirement.

The federal oxygen-content requirement was adopted for several reasons. First, Congress understood that oxygenates provide a source of clean octane-displacing toxic compounds such as benzene and reducing ozone-forming exhaust emissions of hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. Second, Congress recognized the energy-security benefits of substituting a certain percentage of imported petroleum with domestically-produced, renewable fuels such as ethanol. Finally, the Congress hoped the Federal oxygen requirement could provide new market opportunities for farmers by stimulating new demand for ethanol. I believe each of these objectives remain as valid today as they were in 1990.

Unfortunately, the refiners’ decision to utilize MTBE, rather than ethanol, has created a serious and growing problem nationwide. The U.S. Geological Survey reports that MTBE has been detected in 21 percent of the drinking water wells in RFG areas nationwide. States with detected MTBE water contamination include Missouri, Illinois, California, Texas, Virginia, Florida, Connecticut, and many more.

It is important to recognize that the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 did not mandate the use of MTBE. Indeed, in Chicago and other areas where ethanol RFG is used, the program has been declared a huge air quality success. Replicating the Chicago ethanol RFG model in areas where MTBE is being used today would assure continued air quality progress without compromising water quality by its use. It would also provide a tremendous economic stimulus to rural America by creating value-added demand for as

much as 500 million bushels of grain. The Department of Agriculture recently reported that replacing MTBE with ethanol in RFG markets would increase net farm income \$1 billion annually, create 13,000 new jobs, enhance our balance of trade and reduce farm program costs over the next ten years. Moreover, USDA reports ethanol can replace MTBE without price spikes or shortages in supplies within three years.

Let us be very clear about this issue. The environmental problem at hand is real. However, the problem is not ethanol, the problem is MTBE.

Fortunately some States are already taking action to ban MTBE. Some are not moving fast enough. We need to make certain that all States ban MTBE to eliminate its contamination of our water supplies. To ensure that we do not have a piecemeal approach to banning MTBE it is important to pass legislation to ensure we have a national solution.

This bill is supported by the National Corn Growers, Missouri Corn Growers, Renewable Fuels Association, and the Missouri Farm Bureau. I look forward to other groups supporting this bill as well.

I am pleased that Senator DURBIN, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator ASHCROFT have joined me in introducing this vitally important bill. I look forward to working with them and all the other members that join us in this endeavor to ensure that we have a national solution that will protect our water and still ensure that we maintain our air quality benefits produced from the Federal oxygenate requirement. In addition, we will be promoting positive energy and rural economic policy objectives, which includes ethanol.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague from Missouri, Senator BOND, in introducing the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000, a bill that will ban the gasoline additive MTBE and promote the use of renewable ethanol fuel.

By now, many of us are aware of the dangers methyl tertiary butyl ether (MTBE) poses to our environment, our water supply, and our communities. Although this additive has only been widely used for about five years, it is now one of the most frequently detected volatile organic chemicals in drinking water supplies across the nation. In fact, MTBE contamination has affected communities in my home state of Illinois raising many public health concerns.

This legislation addresses these problems by banning MTBE within three years and urging refiners to replace it with ethanol. The bill also increases consumer protection by requiring gasoline stations to label pumps that still sell MTBE. And the Environmental Protection Agency is directed to assist states in getting the chemical out of their groundwater.

Furthermore, the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000 includes

strict anti-backsliding provisions to ensure we do not lose the air quality benefits that we have already achieved. Protection from toxic chemicals and environmentally sound emission levels will not be compromised.

Most important, this legislation upholds the air quality benefits of the reformulated gasoline (RFG) program by maintaining the oxygenate standard. Adding oxygen to our gasoline has helped clean the air in many cities across the nation. With the use of ethanol, the Chicago RFG program has proven highly successful in improving the air quality in Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin.

I am proud to say that Illinois is the nation's largest ethanol producer and that one in every six rows of Illinois corn—280 million bushels—goes to ethanol production. But, an expanded role for this renewable fuel is more than a boost to industry; it is jobs to rural America, and it is energy security. As we look for solutions to high oil prices, we must remember that ethanol is a viable alternative fuel—domestically produced and environmentally friendly. In fact, every 23 gallons of ethanol displaces a barrel of foreign oil.

I commend the Clinton administration and Senators DASCHLE and LUGAR for their efforts aimed at solving the problems associated with MTBE and opening a dialogue on renewable fuel content standards. However, I strongly feel we need to maintain our commitment to preserving the oxygenate standard, which has proven to be integral to achieving the goals of the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000 is good for our environment and public health and a boost for rural economies. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleagues Senator BOND and Senator DURBIN, as an original cosponsor to the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000. I commend them for their leadership in resolving a very real problem—not a phony problem.

The real problem is that MTBE is contaminating our Nation's water supplies.

The phony problem is the proposition that the Clean Air Act's oxygenate standard caused the MTBE water contamination.

Unfortunately, powerful, influential forces are trying to sucker Congress and the American public into embracing the phony problem.

Some propagandists of the phony problem may be motivated by greed. After all, if the petroleum industry gets its way, its profits will balloon. If they can get Congress or the administration to grant waivers of the oxygenate standard, big oil will be able to squeeze out the 3 to 4 percent of the market currently supplied by alternatives.

The Department of Energy has determined that even a small amount of al-

ternative fuels can save consumers billions of dollars each year by leveraging lower gasoline prices.

Petroleum companies also tell us that they can produce a gasoline just as clean for the air, but without oxygenates. Of course, they tell you that it will come at some extra cost.

Mr. President, I must ask my colleagues: Do we really need to give the petroleum industry both the ability and the excuse to jack up gasoline prices and further gouge American consumers?

Of course not. And the way to make certain this does not happen is by enacting the Clean Air and Water Preservation Act of 2000.

Other propagandists of the phony problem may be political opportunists seeking to engage in some self-serving election-year shenanigans.

The Clinton administration is facing a tough political dilemma. Chevron and other petroleum interests have convinced California's Governor that the only solution to the MTBE problem is to waive the oxygenate requirement.

California represents enormous political stakes for November's elections. Understandably, the Clinton administration does not want to say "no" to California.

But the Clinton administration does not want to say "no" to America's farmers. If the administration gives California and other states a waiver from the oxygenate standard, they will have single-handedly destroyed a \$1 billion per year market for America's farmers.

So, what's the easy political solution? Simple. Throw the hot-potato into the laps of Congress. Hold a press conference laying out quote, end-quote, legislative principles for solving the MTBE problem.

By dumping this on Congress, the administration does not have to make the tough decisions, and will be in a position to second-guess and attack anything and everything Congress does do to try to work this out.

And the irony of all of this, is that had the Clinton administration followed Congressional intent about the Clean Air Act Reformulated Fuels Program, instead of listening to the oil companies and some misguided environmentalists, other oxygenates such as ethanol could have competed with MTBE, and we would have far less MTBE water contamination today.

The Clinton administration was warned loud and clear about the health and environmental problems of MTBE. I personally sent many letters and made a lengthy floor statement in 1993 warning then about MTBE and urging that they not give Big Oil a regulation guaranteeing them a market monopoly over the oxygenated problem.

Anyone who has ever smelled MTBE, knows that had consumers been given a choice, they would have overwhelmingly chose to buy reformulated fuel made with ethanol, not MTBE.

So the Clinton administration created this MTBE problem in the first

place, and now they tell the world that the only way to correct it is for Congress to fix it.

That's just not true. But the truth sort of got lost during the administration's press conference by EPA's Carol Browner. She forgot to tell the American public the truth that each and every State has the authority to protect its water supplies from MTBE contamination. As long as the States pass laws designed to protect the water, as opposed to protecting the air, the Clean Air Act does not legally preempt the States from taking action on their own.

And I received assurances from EPA during a recent hearing that they would never attempt to stop a State from protecting water supplies from MTBE contamination.

Now, some would argue that the oil industry would try to challenge such efforts in court.

Mr. President, that proposition is ridiculous. The oil companies chose to use MTBE instead of ethanol. They are now liable for what could be billions of dollars of MTBE clean up costs. And these liability costs mount with every day that passes, that the oil companies refuse to replace MTBE with other oxygenates.

Therefore, who in their right mind could think that the oil companies are stupid enough to take court action to block a State from banning the use of MTBE?

So, why didn't EPA's Carol Browner announce to the world the States already have the authority to ban MTBE—the source of the real problem?

Well, if the administration admits the truth, and if they fail to convince Americans and Congress that only Congress can fix this problem, then the Clinton administration is stuck back at "square one" having to choose between California or America's farmers who have suffered the lowest prices in decades.

Mr. President, there are others pushing the phony problem who may simply be struggling to save face, hoping that they not suffer the embarrassment of being proven wrong—wrong in their efforts to help petroleum interests in securing a Clinton administration regulation guaranteeing that MTBE would monopolize the oxygenate market.

These environmentalists would like the public to believe that ethanol was never really a viable option—not then, not now. If they ever concede that point, then it will be clear to Americans that these environmentalists were key promoters of what has turned out to be one of the biggest environmental crises ever to face America.

Mr. President, there are some environmentalists who do not like ethanol, simply because it is something that can be made by farmers. They don't like farmers because sometimes they have to use fertilizers and chemicals. It is that simple-minded.

Mr. President, the real problem is MTBE, and the real solution to this

problem is passing the bill introduced today by our colleagues Senator BOND and Senator DURBIN.

I warn my colleagues, however, that if they buy into the phony problem, they will end up having to buy into phony solutions.

For instance, the Clinton administration suggested that Congress might want to only reduce the amount of MTBE used, as opposed to banning it altogether. Well, that's a phony solution.

No level of MTBE in gasoline can protect our water supply.

My State of Iowa is facing an MTBE water contamination disaster. First, understand, we sell no Clean Air Act reformulated gasoline in Iowa. Second, understand that for years now, no gasoline was supposed to be sold in Iowa that contained more than 1 percent MTBE unless warning labels were posted.

Nevertheless, the Iowa Department of Natural Resources recently found that 29 percent of Iowa's water supplies tested contained MTBE above the acceptable levels established by EPA.

So what does this mean? Simply this: MTBE is used in conventional fuel as an octane enhancer and will contaminate your water.

If a State is allowed to waive out of the oxygenate requirement, MTBE will still be used and will continue to contaminate our water supplies.

It is phony to argue the oxygenate requirement is the problem, and it is phony to argue waiving or eliminating the oxygenate requirement will protect our water supplies.

Mr. President, this is just one of many phony issues that we are being asked to embrace. I will be speaking further about this at a later time.

But in closing, I ask my colleagues to cosponsor our legislation. It provides real solutions to the real problem: MTBE water contamination.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

S. 2547. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

GREAT SAND DUNES NATIONAL PARK ACT OF 2000

• Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to establish the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve.

This legislation is a major step in protection and preservation of the Great Sand Dunes and San Luis Valley water. I along with Congressman MCINNIS decided to introduce companion bills at the request of valley residents, locally elected officials and the Rio Grande Water Conservation District. In an era of Presidential threats and questionable uses of the Antiquities Act, a locally driven legislative process is something I strongly support.

Anyone who has visited the Sand Dunes understands the unique feeling they offer the visitor, the dunes seem out of place—a contradiction in nature. The San Luis Valley serenely placed between the Sangre De Cristo and the San Juan Mountains is the last place one would expect to see 750 foot high sand dunes. Still, the Sand Dunes offered the early residents and explorers a unique look into the earth's geological wonders. This bill will help to ensure that future generations have that same opportunity.

Developing legislation that satisfies everyone is a difficult task, but this bill reflects compromises on all sides and puts forth a unique proposal for a complicated issue. The provisions of the bill allow for (1) establishing the Great Sand Dunes National Park; (2) establishing the Great Sand Dunes National Preserve; (3) the acquisition of the Luis Maria Baca Grant No. 4; (4) protection of San Luis Valley's water resources; (5) hunting in the new Great Sand Dunes National Preserve; (6) creation of a new National Wildlife Refuge and (7) a local advisory council.

Protection of the valley's water resources is very important to the citizens of Colorado and a primary motivation for virtually everyone's support for this measure. An integral part of the water component is the federal acquisition of the Baca Ranch. While I am usually very skeptical of additional federal ownership of land, it makes sense here to purchase the land from willing sellers and incorporate it into the combination park, wildlife refuge and forest. The legislation requires the Department of the Interior to work with the State of Colorado to protect the water dependent resources of the Sand Dunes while not jeopardizing valid existing water rights held by others. I want to assure everyone that this bill does not create a federal reserve water right.

The Great Sand Dunes National Preserve allows the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to transfer existing Forest Service lands to the Park Service and manage these lands as a Preserve. The transfer would allow the Park Service jurisdiction of the watershed affecting the Sand Dunes, while not affecting the wilderness status or existing hunting in the area. As a veterinarian I understand and recognize hunting as an important tool in game management. The bill stipulates that the Colorado Division of Wildlife will play an integral role in continued game management of the area.

The bill also creates a new National Wildlife Refuge on the western edge of the existing Baca Ranch and adjacent state trust lands. This new Refuge will provide additional hunting opportunities in an area that has been historically closed to public hunting. It has extensive wetlands and is home to an extensive diversity of plants and animals, including a large elk herd. The Refuge would also give the affected county an additional source of revenue

through the Refuge and Revenue Sharing Act as an offset to the loss of property taxes from the federal acquisition of the Baca.

President Herbert Hoover in 1932 recognized the unique characteristics of the sand dunes and wanted to protect their scenic, scientific and educational features. With the support of the local community, the Great Sand Dunes National Monument was established. Now sixty-eight years later, residents of the San Luis Valley are advocating expansion and upgrade of the national monument to a national park.

Last December, I along with Senator CAMPBELL, Congressman MCINNIS, Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt and Colorado Attorney General Ken Salazar met at the Great Sand Dunes to discuss the merits of expanding and protecting the resources of the San Luis Valley. We all recognized the significance of the meeting and vowed to work towards passage of a bill.

Our time is short in Congress this year, and soon I will be asking for a hearing in the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. This is an important issue to Coloradans, and I look forward to Senate passage of my legislation.●

By Mr. ASHCROFT:

S. 2548. A bill to provide that extension of nondiscriminatory trade treatment to the People's Republic of China be contingent on the United States and People's Republic of China entering into a bilateral agreement relating to enforcement; to the Committee on Finance.

SECURING HEIGHTENED OPPORTUNITIES FOR WORKERS, MANUFACTURERS, AND AGRICULTURE EXPORTERS ACT

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, today I want to discuss an issue that, judging from my discussions with Missourians, establishing the right trade policy with China is of increasing concern to Americans, and Missourians in particular.

Missourians want more opportunities to use their economic freedom to shape the future for their families. They want increasing opportunities to sell their products. They want reciprocity and fairness. This is why I want to ensure that Missouri businesses, farmers, and workers will get what they are promised. Access to a market that is almost one-fourth of the world's population can create higher paying jobs. But if China doesn't live up to its agreements like in the past—no new jobs will be created in Missouri.

The WTO agreement that the United States concluded with China last November could give Missourians substantial benefits. Tariffs on industrial goods could fall from 25 to 9 percent—this means that all of the parts manufacturer's for aerospace, automobiles, appliances would all face substantial "tax decrease." Also, tariffs on agricultural goods would be reduced from 31 to 17 percent. Missouri, as a leader in agricultural production,

would benefit substantially from these reductions. Cattlemen and pork producers would experience significant gains when tariffs are dropped to 12 percent. I also want Missouri farmers to have direct access to Chinese consumers instead of having to go through a bunch of middle-men. In addition, China has made commitments to eliminate eventually many of its current restrictions on services, such as distribution, banking, insurance, telecommunications, accounting, consulting, and other financial services.

But these are the promises that are on paper. Missourians in the "Show Me" state are leery of relying only on promises when they don't know whether there is adequate enforcement. I've visited many factories where the workers want to make sure that they get a fair shake. They want real opportunities. They don't want hollow promises. I've been all over the state visiting farm families, and this is what they want as well.

Several of my constituents have a fairly accurate perspective on China's record of not voluntarily living up to its agreements. Let me read from a constituent letter, from the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, District 9, Bridgeton, Mo., dated March 17, 2000:

China has a history of failing to live up to every other trade agreement it has signed with the United States (the 1992 Memorandum on Prison Labor, the 1996 Bilateral Agreement on Unilateral Property Rights, the 1994 Bilateral Agreement on Textiles, and the 1992 memorandum of Understanding on Market Access).

I think this constituent has a pretty accurate assessment of China's dismal trade record. Quite honestly, China's trade record has been poor. In a 1992 agreement, the so-called "Market Access" Agreement, Missouri farmers, ranchers, and workers weren't actually given much market access. In 1995 China eliminated 176 licensing requirements, but then imposed 400 new de facto licensing requirements. By 1999, China had removed over 1,000 quotas and licenses, but the U.S. Trade Representative reports that China is erecting new barriers to restrict imports. Also, despite the commitment not to require import substitution, China announced a new "Industrial Policy for the 1990s" which could undermine the U.S. automobile, telecommunications, transportation, machinery, electronics, and construction industries.

Another one of my constituents has additional concerns that once we approve PNTR, the U.S. will lose substantial leverage. From the International Association of Fire Fighters of Kansas City, Mo, Local Union No. 42, dated March 28, 2000:

Granting PNTR will . . . reduce our ability to use unilateral tools to respond to continued Chinese failure to live up to its commitments. Our ability to take unilateral action is our only leverage against the Chinese government. Proponents of PNTR admit that only by using unilateral actions we were able to make even modest progress on intellec-

tual property rights. The Chinese government has not lived up to the promises they made in every single trade agreement signed with the U.S. in the past ten years.

This Missourian is absolutely correct. In 1994 when we negotiated the WTO, the United States gave up the right to threaten a level of retaliation that was "appropriate in the circumstances" to get compliance. However, now we are bound to retaliate at a level that the WTO decides. We have seen where this has taken us with exporting our beef to Europe—absolutely nowhere.

We need to avoid creating an endless lawsuit with China that gets us nowhere. Missourians want some guarantees that they will in fact get export opportunities and not just a lot of litigation with no real results as with the Europeans in the beef and banana cases, where the retaliation level was reduced by the WTO body.

My goal is consistent with the "show me" state. It is straight-forward. Open China's market to Missouri goods and services. In order to do that, however, we must have enforcement that works. That is why I am proposing the "SHOW ME" Act.

My bill is simple. It would require the Administration to work out an arrangement with China whereby if the U.S. wins a WTO case but can't get compliance, China would agree not to challenge the U.S. level of retaliation. The Administration could negotiate this concession from China as a side letter to the November agreement or could negotiate as a part of the protocol of the accession phase.

There is precedent for this requirement. The Administration negotiated a 12 to 15 year phase out of special rules for safeguards and anti-dumping and countervailing duties (which are tools to protect our market), yet they did not work out a 15 year phase out of use of Section 301 (which is a foreign market opening tool). Both are needed—surge protection and market access tools. Market access is crucial to the farming community in Missouri, which gets about one-fourth of its farm income from overseas sales.

In closing, Mr. President, quite frankly, there is declining satisfaction in America's heartland with our inability to pry open foreign markets. The only way we will rebuild is with real enforcement. A lot of my constituents from the "Show Me" state want to see more assurances from us and the Administration that what happened on the EU beef and banana cases won't re-verbate through the Chinese market. They want our trade policy to create jobs in practice, not just in theory.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 74

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 74, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more