

you reduce marginal rates, you pay down debt, "but, most importantly, you don't spend it."

"Most importantly, you don't spend it."

He said the reason is quite simple. Don't send a message to the economy of this country that you are going to lift the caps and start spending money. He said it will be a most negative message because the available resources of this country are now dedicated to growth and job creation in the private marketplace. And if you suggest that you are going to increasingly take more of it and spend it in Government, you will send a more negative signal. Don't do it.

Before the August recess, after we had shaped a tax bill and we were in the final days of debating it and getting ready to send it to the President, the headlines in the papers were "Alan Greenspan not in favor of tax cut."

The reason I use that example is because it typifies what we knew very early on—that we have many enemies out there as did the taxpayers have in pushing this message. Enemy No. 1, Bill Clinton; No. 2, a collective press that would not fairly write to the American people the broad base of this argument.

Let me tell you what Alan Greenspan said that extrapolated itself into headlines as "not in favor of tax cut." He said, and I am not going to extrapolate; I am going to quote:

My first priority, if I were given such a priority, is to let the surplus run. As I have said before, my second priority is if you find that as a consequence of those surpluses they tend to be spent—

In other words, Alan Greenspan is consistent with February and late July—

Then I would be more in the camp of cutting taxes because the least desirable is using those surpluses to expand outlays or to spend.

Greenspan continued:

I give great sympathy to those who wish to cut taxes now to preempt that process, and, indeed, if it turns out that they are right then I would say moving on the tax front makes a good deal of sense to me.

Do you know that Alan Greenspan is right? Already the forces of the idea that the President will veto this package are at hand saying: Can we have another \$10, \$15, or \$20 billion?

Can we have all of the surplus that will be generated out of the general fund and spend it because the priorities are so important?

If we send a signal to the American economy, and Bill Clinton helps it with a veto of this tax bill that will go to him next Tuesday, that we are turning on the spending machine, I am not so sure that a year or two from now we will see near zero unemployment in our country; we will see the vibrant economy; we will see the investment capital; we will see the job creation that has given the American people more reason for optimism than anything we have done or we could do as a government in the last good many decades.

I am suggesting what the Republican Congress has done in proposing a very broad-based tax cut is responsible, consistent with our economy, fair, and it is intended to help people. It is intended to say to the American family: Taxpayers are entitled to more than 50 percent of what they earn, to save, to invest, to buy a new home or a car, to do what is truly a part of the American dream; and that is to not consistently have government take away more of it. That has always been the great energy of our society.

After Alan Greenspan was at the policy committee, I asked him about this phenomenon in the stock market and this high-tech economy. I said: How do you read this one, Mr. Greenspan? He said: I am not sure I can, other than to say the genius of the American people turned loose in a private marketplace is beyond imagination.

Today we have seen that genius simply because we have reduced the level of intensity of government upon that genius. And we want to reduce it a little more. Of all the surplus moneys that will come rolling into government over the next 10 years, we are saying, for every dollar, we only want to give one quarter of it back—not all of it, one quarter of every dollar. Three quarters of it stays in government to shore up Social Security, to reform Social Security, to protect new and future Social Security recipients, to spend a little in selected areas when we find it necessary.

Yet one would think, from listening to folks on the other side of the aisle, that this tax cut would destroy government as we know it. I heard a Democrat Senator the other day say it will destroy all the environmental programs; it will destroy all the educational programs; it will destroy all of the welfare programs. After listening to that, my only thought was: Get a life. Where are you coming from?

We are talking surplus moneys, not current moneys. We are talking surplus moneys. We are only talking about giving a quarter of it back out of every dollar and keeping three quarters of it to do much of what that Senator was talking about.

The reason that Senator was in such an illogical, untruthful panic was that over the August recess Republicans, led by the Senator from Georgia, went home to hold town meetings and press conferences and to visit with our taxpayers and our voters and explain the package. All of a sudden, the numbers started shifting because the national media didn't have control of the message. All of a sudden, the tax bill moved up into the high fifties and sixties as something the American people thought was probably the right thing to do. Still frustrated, they want the debt paid down. But when they found out that over the course of the life of this tax bill we pay down about \$2 trillion in debt, they said that is fair and reasonable.

Of course, when agricultural America, where the Senator from Georgia

and I were visiting with our farmers, saw what we had done for them in farming and in the tax package to help production agriculture, they said that makes sense, that gives us tools to survive and to be productive.

I am absolutely amazed this President blindly, without listening, reading, or sensing the character of the American people, but only the politics of his party, says "veto" from day 1, "veto" from day 2, "veto" from day 3, instead of saying we have an opportunity to keep this economy growing to allow the private sector to thrive, to hold down the influence of government over the private sector, and, most importantly, allow the American family to pursue its dream.

That is what this tax package is all about. It is all about the right things. It is about fairness, responsibility, helping people, and controlling government.

I thank my colleague from Georgia for his leadership in this area, for helping send the messages out unfettered, clear and simple, to the American people so they can make up their own minds. They are making up their minds. It is very clear to me where they come down. They come down on the "no spending" side, and they come down on the side of splitting the differences between a tax cut and paying down the debt. That is right and responsible. I hope the President will listen as that bill comes to him this coming week.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LOTT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I do have a series of requests that I will need to make. I have notified the Democratic leadership that we will be making these requests, and I believe Senator DORGAN is here to respond and perhaps comment on them.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—MESSAGE ACCOMPANYING S. 1437

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House to accompany S. 1437, the FAA reauthorization. I further ask consent the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, agree to the request for a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

Before the question is put, I do want to say the FAA reauthorization is a very important piece of legislation, obviously. It never seems to be easy getting it through the Congress. I remember in 1996 it was the last bill that we

passed of the session, and it took an extra week of the session to get it through. Now we find, after a lot of work involving issues all the way from safety and improvements in airports and questions of slots at various airports—New York, Chicago, as well as what to do with Reagan National Airport—the Senate has developed what I think is a good bill. The House has passed a bill, but it has provisions in it that are of great concern to the chairman of the committee in the Senate and the chairman of the Budget Committee. So there are, once again, complications.

Because of the need to stay on the appropriations bills and fulfill our commitments, it is very difficult to schedule a lengthy debate on FAA reauthorization. I have spoken to Senator DASCHLE and said: Is there some way we can work out an agreement to perhaps bring it up in a short period of time so we get it done, even in the midst of all the appropriations bills? The other option is to go straight to conference with the bill the Senate Commerce Committee reported and the bill the House has reported. That is what this would attempt to do so we could move on with the process.

That effort was made during the latter part of July. We thought we had it cleared a couple of times, and then we ran into objections. I do have a list of proposed conferees who would come both from the Commerce Committee and from another committee that is interested in this, the Transportation Appropriations Committee, I believe, Senator SHELBY; and Budget, Senators DOMENICI and GRASSLEY, and of course their counterparts from the Democratic side.

I make that unanimous consent request at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall object on behalf of Senator DASCHLE, the Democratic leader. But before doing so, I would like to point out the Senate passed S. 1467, which is a 60-day extension of the airport grant program. We have dealt with this issue of the reauthorization act for some long while.

In fact, in the Commerce Committee on which I and the majority leader both serve, we have passed S. 82. It has been waiting to be brought to the floor of the Senate for debate. The process that is described by Senator LOTT would, in effect, prohibit Senators from debating this issue on the floor of the Senate. Because the House passes an omnibus bill and attaches it to the 60-day extension, the Senate does not have the opportunity to debate. It means people who have amendments they would like to offer, perhaps, to the bill that we wrote in the Commerce Committee will not have that oppor-

tunity. This will then be decided in conference. That is not appropriate and not something we could agree to.

But I do want to say, and I expect the majority leader probably disagrees, this process has been abysmal. We have a system in this country with radical expansion of the number of people flying. The FAA is an organization that desperately needs some assistance and some predictability and consistency with a reauthorization they can count on. We should have done this long ago. Passing 60-day extensions doesn't serve anybody's interest.

Several days on the floor of the Senate would resolve this from the standpoint of the larger reauthorization bill and move this process forward. I will be forced to object to the unanimous consent request for those reasons, the request offered by the majority leader. I do so object, and then I would like to offer a unanimous consent request on a different way to accomplish the same result. But I object to the unanimous consent request by the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DORGAN. If I might ask the majority leader for the opportunity to offer a unanimous consent request?

I ask consent the Senate disagree to the House amendments so the message on this bill can be returned to the House this afternoon. That would enable the House to recede from its amendment and send S. 1467, the short-term extension bill the Senate passed on August 2, to the President immediately for his signature. This would ensure this process would continue, local airports would be able to receive the estimated \$290 million in funds due through the end of this fiscal year, and do that until the Senate has had an opportunity to consider the FAA reauthorization bill. We should do that. Senators have that right. It ought to be a priority. I hope we can accomplish that. I make this in the form of a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would have to object at this time. However, I find some interest in the offer. But I would need to consult with the chairman and the ranking member and make sure all Senators are aware of that. I have a number of Senators who have put me on notice, on both sides of the aisle, that before we agree to a further, or some other, agreement or unanimous consent, they would want to be notified. I know Senator FITZGERALD of Illinois was one of those. I believe one of the New York Senators had notified me to that effect also. So we would need to clear it with a number of people.

I personally think the 60-day extension is the way to go and that is why I supported the 60-day extension before we went out. We had not been able to resolve the scheduling problems or resolve the substance of the issues, and while we were doing that, I thought the

responsible thing to do was the 60-day extension, and I will continue to advance the need for that. Unfortunately, the House didn't agree with that and they took our 60-day extension and attached their bill to it and sent it back, which, in effect, meant that we did not have the extension because this was the final couple of days of the July recess.

There are disagreements on how to resolve the FAA reauthorization. I noted we had a similar disagreement over a very narrow point back in 1996 and the whole session was delayed an extra week because Senator KENNEDY had a point that he was concerned about. But we got it done, and I am determined we are going to get it done this time.

I must say to the Senator, if I could create an extra 10 days in a month, I would probably do that because it is very hard to accommodate what we must do and accommodate agreements that are reached so we can have not 1 week but 2 weeks of debate on a juvenile justice bill. We find many of our bills are taking longer because Senators offer 100 amendments or a whole variety of things.

I am determined to get this done and I will continue to work with the chairmen and the ranking members on both sides of the aisle, in both Houses, and I will be pursuing the 60-day extension. I will get back to the Democratic leadership about how we proceed with that.

Again, I note I did talk to Senator DASCHLE about trying to come up with an agreement on a process where we could deal with this, even with the limited time we have before us.

Mr. DORGAN. May I make just one comment?

Mr. LOTT. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DORGAN. I observe on March 8 the Commerce Committee took action on S. 82, which is the reauthorization of the FAA. So we have had a substantial amount of time elapse. I think the Senator from Mississippi agrees with me that the number of people using the aviation system in this country has expanded dramatically. The capacity is being substantially taxed in many ways, and we really do need to pass a reauthorization bill. It is critically important that we get at this business. I respect the difficulty of time that a majority leader has to deal with, but this is a big issue, the issue of safety and protecting the system by which we have an aviation transportation system in our country, one that we are very proud of but one that desperately is waiting for and needs a reauthorization bill passed by the Senate. We ought to have the opportunity to debate that in the Senate, get to conference, and we ought to make this a priority.

Mr. LOTT. Further reserving the right to object, if Senators will show up, we can have work on Mondays and Fridays. If we do not have objection to having a full day's work, such as this

coming Monday, we can get more done. But I should note also, transportation in general is important. Roads and ports and harbors, Amtrak, railroads, airlines—it is all important.

Yet, just yesterday, the Democrats insisted on blocking a maneuver to get to consideration of the Transportation appropriations bill. They threatened to filibuster because they did not like one provision in the Transportation appropriations bill that will benefit two States, that affects two States. Therefore, we could not invoke cloture on the Transportation appropriations bill.

I agree, air safety is important but so is road safety. My father was killed on an unsafe, narrow, two-lane highway. I get very excited and determined when it comes to transportation, whether it is an appropriations bill or transportation in general, and FAA reauthorization. I hope we can find a way to work together to move both these bills. I am committed to that.

I object.

I will move to the next request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

**UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—  
S.J. RES. 33**

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 274, S.J. Res. 33, regarding the actions of President Clinton in granting clemency to the FALN terrorists.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I shall object on behalf of Senator DASCHLE. I observe that Senator DASCHLE and Senator LOTT had conversations about the specific language in the proposal. My understanding is there are meetings, in fact, scheduled midday today to review the language. I expect there may be some opportunity to come to some common understanding on language that will be acceptable. There has been no such agreement at this point. While these discussions are ongoing, on behalf of Senator DASCHLE, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of Senator DORGAN with regard to the possibility of trying to work out some language on which there can be agreement. Even though I will proceed to file a cloture motion, if we can come up with some language that expresses the outrage of the American people and the feelings of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, we will withdraw that cloture motion and will go to the vote.

I note that just yesterday the House of Representatives debated a resolution on this issue. Over 300 voted for the resolution expressing criticism of this clemency; 41 or so voted no; 70 voted "present," which I think is a very curious thing. I do not recall the last time I have seen as many as 70 vote

"present." The House has shown leadership in this area in a bipartisan way. I hope the Senate can do the same.

**DEPLORING THE GRANTING OF  
CLEMENCY—MOTION TO PROCEED**

**CLOTURE MOTION**

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 274, and I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

**CLOTURE MOTION**

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 33, a joint resolution deplored the actions of President Clinton regarding granting clemency to FALN terrorists:

Trent Lott, Conrad R. Burns, Ted Stevens, Peter Fitzgerald, Jim Bunning, Larry E. Craig, Michael D. Crapo, Chuck Hagel, Fred Thompson, Bill Frist, Michael B. Enzi, Judd Gregg, Craig Thomas, Jesse Helms, Pat Roberts, and Paul Coverdell.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, this cloture vote will occur on Monday, September 13.

I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote occur at 5 p.m. on Monday and the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. I now withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—RESUMED**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Interior appropriations bill, H.R. 2466, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Gorton amendment No. 1359, of a technical nature.

Hutchison amendment No. 1603, to prohibit the use of funds for the purpose of issuing a notice of rulemaking with respect to the valuation of crude oil for royalty purposes until September 30, 2000.

Mr. LOTT. What is the pending business now, Mr. President?

**AMENDMENT NO. 1603**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Hutchison amendment No. 1603.

**CLOTURE MOTION**

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk on the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

**CLOTURE MOTION**

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 1603 to Calendar No. 210, H.R. 2466, the Interior appropriations bill:

Trent Lott, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Gordon Smith, Thad Cochran, Larry E. Craig, Bill Frist, Mike Crapo, Don Nickles, Craig Thomas, Chuck Hagel, Christopher S. Bond, Jon Kyl, Peter Fitzgerald, Pete V. Domenici, Phil Gramm, and Slade Gorton.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, again, so Senators will know when to expect the vote, it will occur Monday, September 13. So on Monday, with the two cloture votes and a vote or two on Federal judicial nominations, we can expect three or four votes in a stacked sequence on Monday afternoon beginning at 5. I ask unanimous consent that this vote occur immediately following the cloture vote regarding S.J. Res. 33 and the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will note also this is an unusual procedure. Let me just explain. We are on the Interior appropriations bill. There is an amendment pending. Because the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, is concerned she may lose on a vote on the amendment, it is being filibustered, or there is the threat of a filibuster. I think that is unusual.

We do have disagreements sometimes on how to proceed to a bill or whether or not to even take up a bill, but it is a little unusual to have this occur on an individual amendment.

Senator DASCHLE and I quite often talk about how we prefer not to do this sort of thing to each other, at least on amendments. What we try to accommodate each other on is a debate, vote, somebody wins, somebody loses, and we move on. Sometimes individual Senators can exercise their right, and they have that right.

I hope we will not get into a pattern of doing this. It will make an already cumbersome process even more difficult to complete important work. The Interior appropriations bill, as all appropriations bills, is very important for our country. It has a lot of important provisions, all the way from parks to land management, that we need to get completed. We certainly will work to do that, and that is why I filed this cloture motion.

**ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now