

tasty feast for overly hungry tax collectors from Bonn to Beijing and Manila to Milan.

The same questions we dealt with in the United States become vastly more complex at the international level. For example, during the course of the debate about the Internet Tax Freedom Act last year, I asked what happens when Aunt Millie in Iowa uses America Online in Virginia to order Harry and David's pears from Medford, Oregon, pays for them with a bankcard in California and ships them to her old friend in Florida?

In the global arena, we have to ask what happens when a tax collector in Germany tries to collect a Value Added Tax on a U.S. e-entrepreneur from Coos Bay, Oregon with no physical presence in Europe? This is a very real threat because not long ago, the tax chief of a key European nation called trade over the Internet "a threat to all government tax revenue—a very serious threat."

In addition, we have heard about the possibility of discriminatory bit taxes, which are taxes levied on the volume of e-mail that passes over the Net. And we have recently learned that the European Union is discussing something known as "blocking and takedown." This is not a rugby term, but if established, it would allow the EU to bar the use of an American entrepreneur's website in Europe if he or she was unwilling to participate in an EU tax registration scheme.

Moreover, some countries are blurring the line between services and products in an effort to impose still more special, targeted tariffs and taxes on global e-commerce. At present, some digital delivery—for example, downloading a CD or software program—is not taxed, but there's considerable support for turning this service into a product that could be the subject of discriminatory taxes.

Developing fair ground rules for the global digital economy is not a job for the faint hearted. That is why strong U.S. leadership is imperative in key multinational groups that are beginning to consider how to update old laws and regulations to apply in the global electronic marketplace.

That is the point of the resolution we are introducing today. Again, the resolution does two things: it urges the President to seek a global consensus supporting a global moratorium on tariffs on electronic commerce at the upcoming WTO ministerial meeting in Seattle, and second, it urges the President to seek through the OECD a global moratorium on discriminatory, multiple and special taxes on electronic commerce and the Internet.

This resolution builds upon the good work we accomplished in the 1998 Internet Tax Freedom Act. It is time to take the effort to stop discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce to the international level. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the resolution.●

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join Senator WYDEN in support of this resolution to urge the United States to seek a global consensus supporting a moratorium on tariffs and discriminatory taxation of electronic commerce. I thank Senator WYDEN and Congressman COX for their leadership in keeping the Internet free of discriminatory taxes in the United States and around the world.

The Internet allows businesses to sell their goods all over the world in the blink of an eye. This unique power also presents a unique challenge. That challenge facing the United States and the world is developing tax policies to nurture this exciting new market. That is why I am pleased to cosponsor this resolution to urge the President to seek a global moratorium on discriminatory taxes and tariffs on electronic commerce.

The growth of electronic commerce is everywhere, including my home state of Vermont. Today hundreds of Vermont businesses are doing business on the Internet, ranging from the Vermont Teddy Bear Company to Al's Snowmobile Parts Warehouse to Ben & Jerry's Homemade Ice Cream. These Vermont businesses are of all sizes and customer bases, from Main Street merchants to boutique entrepreneurs to a couple of ex-hippies who sell great ice cream. But what Vermont online sellers do have in common is the fact that Internet commerce lets them erase the geographic barriers that historically have limited our access to markets where our products can thrive. Cyberselling is paying off for Vermont and the rest of the United States.

As electronic commerce continues to grow, the United States must take the lead in fostering sound international tax policies. The United States was the incubator of the Internet, and the world closely watches the Internet policies that we debate and propose. Our leadership is critical to the continued growth of commerce on the Internet. Our resolution advances the leadership role of the United States by urging the administration to secure a global moratorium on discriminatory e-commerce taxes.

With more than 190 nations around the world able to levy discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce, we need this resolution to contribute to the stability necessary for electronic commerce to flourish. We are not asking for a tax-free zone on the Internet; if sales taxes and other taxes would apply to traditional sales and services, then those taxes would also apply to Internet sales under our resolution. But our resolution would urge a global ban on any taxes applied only to Internet sales in a discriminatory manner. Let's not allow the future of electronic commerce—with its great potential to expand the markets of Main Street businesses—to be crushed by the weight of multiple international taxation.

Today, there are more than 700,000 businesses selling their sales and serv-

ices on the World Wide Web around the world. Estimates predict that the number of e-business Web sites will top 1 million by 2003. This explosion in Web growth has led to thousands of new and exciting opportunities for businesses from Main Street to Wall Street.

The International Internet Tax Freedom Resolution will help ensure that these businesses and many others will continue to reap the rewards of electronic commerce.●

SENATE RESOLUTION 192—EXTENDING BIRTHDAY GREETINGS AND BEST WISHES TO JIMMY CARTER IN RECOGNITION OF HIS 75TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. CLELAND (for himself and Mr. COVERDELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 192

Whereas October 1, 1999, is the 75th birthday of James Earl (Jimmy) Carter;

Whereas Jimmy Carter has served his country with distinction in the United States Navy, and as a Georgia State Senator, the Governor of Georgia, and the President of the United States;

Whereas Jimmy Carter has continued his service to the people of the United States and the world since leaving the Presidency by resolutely championing adequate housing, democratic elections, human rights, and international peace;

Whereas in all of these endeavors, Jimmy Carter has been fully and ably assisted by his wife, Rosalynn; and

Whereas Jimmy Carter serves as a living international symbol of American integrity and compassion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends its birthday greetings and best wishes to Jimmy Carter; and

(2) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to Jimmy Carter.

SENATE RESOLUTION 193—TO RE-AUTHORIZE THE JACOB K. JAVITS SENATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. DODD submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 193

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the "Jacob K. Javits Senate Fellowship Program Resolution".

SEC. 2. FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM EXTENDED; ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.

(a) REAUTHORIZATION.—In order to encourage increased participation by outstanding students in a public service career, the Jacob K. Javits Senate Fellowship Program (in this resolution referred to as the "program") is extended for 5 years.

(b) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS.—The Jacob K. Javits Foundation, Incorporated, New York, New York, (referred to in this resolution as the "Foundation") shall select Senate fellowship participants in the program. Each such participant shall complete a program of graduate study in accordance with criteria agreed upon by the Foundation.

SEC. 3. SENATE COMPONENT OF FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Senate (in this resolution referred to as the

“Secretary”) is authorized from funds made available under section 5, to appoint and fix the compensation of each eligible participant selected under section 2 for a period determined by the Secretary. The period of employment for each participant shall not exceed 1 year. Compensation paid to participants under this resolution shall not supplement stipends received from the Secretary of Education under the program.

(b) NUMBER OF FELLOWSHIPS.—For any fiscal year not more than 10 fellowship participants shall be employed.

(c) PLACEMENT.—The Secretary, after consultation with the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader, shall place eligible participants in positions in the Senate that are, within practical considerations, supportive of the fellowship participants’ academic programs.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.

The Secretary of Education may enter into an agreement with the Foundation for the purpose of providing administrative support services to the Foundation in conducting the program.

SEC. 5. FUNDS.

An amount not to exceed \$250,000 shall be available to the Secretary from the contingent fund of the Senate for each of the 5 year periods beginning on October 1, 1999 to compensate participants in the program.

SEC. 6. PROGRAM EXTENSION.

This program shall terminate September 30, 2004. Not later than 3 months prior to September 30, 2004, the Secretary shall submit a report evaluating the program to the Majority Leader and the Senate along with recommendations concerning the program’s extension and continued funding level.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

DODD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 1813

Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. JEFFORDS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. JOHNSON) proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 1650) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the matter under the heading “PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT” in the matter under the heading “ADMINISTRATION FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES” in title II, strike “\$1,182,672,000” and insert “\$2,000,000,000”.

HUTCHISON (AND BINGAMAN) AMENDMENT NO. 1814

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. BINGAMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by this to the bill, S. 1650, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . The United States-Mexico Border Health Commission Act (22 U.S.C. 290n et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking section 2 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 2. APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BORDER HEALTH COMMISSION.

“Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this section, the President shall appoint the United States members of the United States-Mexico Border Health Commission, and shall attempt to conclude an agreement with Mexico providing for the establishment of such Commission.”; and

(2) in section 3—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; and”;

(B) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “; and” and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking paragraph (3).

ASHCROFT AMENDMENT NO. 1815

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. ASHCROFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1650, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

To amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms.

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 “Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(A) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Congress and the President joined together to enact the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 to end decades of deficit spending;

(2) strong economic growth and fiscal discipline have resulted in strong revenue growth into the Treasury;

(3) the combination of these factors is expected to enable the Government to balance its budget without the Social Security surpluses;

(4) the Congress has chosen to allocate in this Act all Social Security surpluses toward saving Social Security and Medicare;

(5) amounts so allocated are even greater than those reserved for Social Security and Medicare in the President’s budget, will not require an increase in the statutory debt limit, and will reduce debt held by the public until Social Security and Medicare reform is enacted; and

(6) this strict enforcement is needed to lock away the amounts necessary for legislation to save Social Security and Medicare.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to prohibit the use of Social Security surpluses for any purpose other than reforming Social Security and Medicare.

SEC. 3. PROTECTION OF SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.—Section 312 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) POINTS OF ORDER TO PROTECT SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.—

“(1) CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS ON THE BUDGET.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any concurrent resolution on the budget, or conference report thereon or amendment thereto, that would set forth an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

“(2) SUBSEQUENT LEGISLATION.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report if—

“(A) the enactment of that bill or resolution as reported;

“(B) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

“(C) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report, would cause or increase an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—The point of order set forth in paragraph (2) shall not apply to Social Security reform legislation or Medicare reform legislation as defined by section 5(c) of the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999.

“(4) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘on-budget deficit’, when applied to a fiscal year, means the deficit in the budget in the budget as set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301(a)(3) for that fiscal year.”.

(b) CONTENT OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET.—Section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (7) and (8) respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) the receipts, outlays, and surplus or deficit in the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance trust Fund, combined, established by title II of the Social Security Act;”.

(c) SUPER MAJORITY REQUIREMENT.—(1) Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting “312(g),” after “310(d)(2).”.

(2) Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting “312(g),” after “310(d)(2).”.

SEC. 4. REMOVING SOCIAL SECURITY FROM BUDGET PRONOUNCEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any official statement issued by the Office of management and Budget, the Congressional Budget Office, or any other agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government of surplus or deficit totals of the budget of the United States Government as submitted by the President or of the surpluses or deficit totals of the congressional budget, and any description of, or reference to, such totals in any official publication or material issued by either of such Offices or any other such agency or instrumentality, shall exclude the outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act (including the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund) and the related provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) SEPARATE SOCIAL SECURITY BUDGET DOCUMENTS.—The excluded outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act shall be submitted in separate Social Security budget documents.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment and the amendments made by this Act shall apply only to fiscal year 2000 and subsequent fiscal years.

(4) EXPIRATION.—Sections 301(a)(6) and 312(g) shall expire upon the enactment of the Social Security reform legislation and Medicare reform legislation.

(c) DEFINITION—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM LEGISLATION.—The term “Social Security reform legislation” means a bill or a joint resolution that is enacted into law and includes a provision stating the following: “For purposes of the Social Security and Medicare Safe Deposit Box Act of 1999, this Act constitutes Social Security reform legislation.”.