

its impact on the terns and plovers should not be subject to disagreements.

The Fish and Wildlife Service and Corps of Engineers need to examine the implications of this proposal and recognize its failure to protect these species.

Dr. JOE ENGELN,

*Assistant Director for Science and Technology, Missouri Department of Natural Resources.*

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, our Department of Natural Resources representatives are as green and pro-environment as any group around. They believe it is a bad idea. Farm groups oppose it. The ports and river transportation and flood control people oppose the spring rise. The Southern Governors' Association opposes the spring rise.

There should be an important conservation element in any balanced plan, but balance is not in the Fish and Wildlife Service mandate nor in its plan. They want to manage a river solely for critters. We need to have it managed for people. We cannot have the next flood laid at the doorstep of the Congress that is now considering whether to experiment with the lives and property of millions of people who live along the river.

Some say the President may veto the bill, but he signed it four times before. If he were to do that, he could answer to the people from Omaha to Kansas City to Jefferson City to St. Louis to Cape Girardeau to Memphis down the delta to New Orleans.

I urge my colleagues to move forward on this bill. We can debate this provision, but I believe it is important for safety.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters of support for this position from the National Corn Growers Association, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Soybean Association, the Agricultural Retailers Association, the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, the National Grain and Feed Association, the Missouri-Arkansas River Basins Association.

I also ask a resolution from the Southern Governors' Association printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 24, 2000.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,  
*U.S. Senate,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR BOND: We are writing concerning an important provision in the fiscal year 2001 Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

Section 103 of H.R. 4733 stipulates that changes in the management of the Missouri River cannot be made to allow for alteration in river flows during springtime. Removing this provision would not only affect farmers in Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa and Kansas by potentially flooding their land, but also affect barge traffic movements on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. Without proper management of river flows over the course of the year, transportation movements could be hampered by insufficient water levels on the

Missouri River and the Mississippi River between Memphis, Tennessee and Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

If an amendment is offered to strike Section 103, we urge you to vote against it. Removing this provision would have significant impacts on productive agricultural lands as well as the movement of agricultural commodities and input supplies along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers.

Sincerely,

American Soybean Association, Agricultural Retailers Association, Midwest Area River Coalition 2000 (MARC 2000), National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Growers Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Grain and Feed Association.

#### MISSOURI RIVER FLOW MANAGEMENT RESOLUTION

SPONSORED BY GOVERNOR RONNIE MUSGROVE OF MISSISSIPPI & GOVERNOR MEL CARNAHAN OF MISSOURI, APPROVED MARCH 23, 2000

Whereas, the flow of commerce on the Mississippi River is essential to the economic welfare of the nation; and

Whereas, the United States Department of Agriculture reports that 70 percent of the nation's total grain exports were handled through Mississippi River port elevators; and

Whereas, more than one half of the nation's total grain exports move down the Mississippi River to Gulf ports; and

Whereas, free movement of water-borne commerce on the Inland Waterway System is critical to the delivery of goods to deep-water ports for international trade; and

Whereas, the reliability of adequate flows for navigation is a key requirement for fulfillment of delivery contracts, employment in ports and terminals, and energy efficiency; and

Whereas, delays and stoppages would threaten the successful implementation of international trade agreements under NAFTA and GATT; and

Whereas, the Missouri River contributes up to 65 percent of the Mississippi River flow at St. Louis during low water conditions; and

Whereas, reduction of Missouri River flows above St. Louis would result in more frequent and more costly impediments to the flow of commerce on the Mississippi River; and

Whereas, the reach of the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Missouri River at St. Louis and the mouth of the Ohio River at Cairo, Illinois is at higher risk for delays and stoppages of navigation because of low-water conditions; and

Whereas, the Northwestern Division of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is considering several proposed alterations to the current edition of the Master Water Control Manual for the Missouri River that would reduce support of water-borne commerce by restricting the flow of the river during the summer and fall, low-water period at St. Louis;

Then let it be resolved that the Southern Governors' Association would strongly oppose any alterations that would have such an effect and would urge the Corps to consult with affected inland waterway states prior to endorsing any proposal that would alter the current edition of the manual.

#### ORDER OF PROCEDURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak as in morning business, to ex-

tend the morning business for at least 5 minutes so I would have about 10 minutes.

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

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit about taxes, as my Democratic colleagues have done already this morning. I want to go back over what the President said on Saturday in his weekly radio address to the Nation.

I also had the honor this week to respond to the President's radio address. But at the time I wrote up the speech, I had not had an opportunity to see exactly what the President was going to say. I assumed he was going to be talking about taxes this week because that is what the Senate concentrated on last week. But I have now had the opportunity to look through the President's speech. I want to comment on some of the things the President talked about, now that I have had the opportunity to see it.

I want to go back to Saturday morning, when the President gave his radio address. In his speech to the Nation he said:

Now we have the chance to pass responsible tax cuts as we continue to pursue solid economic policy.

What the President is talking about is that he is willing to give some kind of tax relief to the American public but only the kind the President thinks you need; not what your family needs or not what you are looking at in your budget this month but what Washington, inside the beltway, has determined you should have and, by the way, what amounts you should have.

But these are targeted tax cuts. In other words, you only can receive these dollars back, or this tax relief, if you do what the President tells you to do. If you invest here or if you do this or you do that, then you can receive back or be able to keep some of your hard-earned money. But if you don't, Washington is going to take it. It is telling you what to do, how to spend your money.

Then he went on to say:

Instead of following the sensible path that got us here, congressional Republicans are treating the surplus as if they had won the lottery.

We are talking about giving the money back to the people who earned it, and by the way, the "risky, budget-busting tax cuts" we are talking about—that is eliminating the death tax and marriage penalty, the unfair taxes—would be less than 10 percent of the projected budget surplus. It is less than a dime on the dollar, and this is what the President is saying is going to create complete chaos because somehow we are going to give back to the American taxpayer about 10 percent of the projected surplus. But he says we are acting as if we won it in the lottery. It is the President and my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle who think this is a lottery that they have won; that the surplus is

there and they are somehow going to find the best way of spending it for you. They are going to determine the best way of spending it for you.

They say we think it is a lottery when our proposal is to give the money back to those who earned it, not spending it. Even Alan Greenspan—and again we had him before our Banking Committee last week where we went over the same thing: The surplus is here; what's the best thing we can do with the surplus? Mr. Greenspan says: Pay down the debt.

We are paying down the debt. A huge amount of these surplus dollars is targeted to reducing the debt, but also there is money left that can be and should be given back in the form of tax relief. But he said the worst thing we could do is what the President is advocating and my Democratic colleagues are advocating. The worst thing, Alan Greenspan said, that we could do is spend the money.

That is what they want to do. They want to find new ways to spend it—but, of course, to benefit you. But they want to determine how to spend it, so they are going to enlarge Government or fatten existing programs. But who is going to pay the bill? It is going to be taxpayers. If we do not get tax relief today and we allow these dollars to be spent to enlarge or fatten the Government, who is going to support that larger, fatter Government tomorrow? It is going to have to come from possibly even in an increase in taxes. So if we miss this opportunity during times of surplus to cut taxes now, you can almost bet we are going to be facing the possibility of tax increases in the near future.

We are talking about eliminating unfair taxes, and the majority of Americans agree with this. The marriage penalty and the death tax—even the President has called these unfair taxes.

The President said in his speech:

Taken together, the tax cuts passed last year and this year by this Congress would completely erase the entire projected surplus over 10 years.

Of course, he is talking about the \$800 billion tax cut package last year which he vetoed, that is dead and in the wastebasket, and combines it with the cuts we have this year, only 10 percent of the surplus. But he puts them together and says Republicans want to give it all back.

That is not all bad. It should be given back. We are talking about overcharges, surpluses. These are dollars over and above what the Government has projected to need to carry out all of its responsibilities.

We have \$1.8-plus trillion earmarked to pay for programs the Government has said we need to do.

These dollars are over and above that. Taxpayers fund every agency, every program, every project, every bureaucrat in that \$1.8 trillion budget. Taxpayers are the most used, abused, and underappreciated people in our society. In other words, if they can get

more money from you by twisting you a little bit harder, they are going to do that.

One of my colleagues earlier this morning said if you make \$75,000 a month and you receive through this tax cut another \$2,000 a month, would that really make a difference? That is not for him to decide. These are dollars that somebody has worked for and earned.

By the way, they are not talking about how much in taxes this individual is already paying on that \$75,000, but they are saying: \$2,000, what difference would it make to them? In other words, Washington can use it and spend it better than they can, so it should be no problem that we take these tax dollars away from them, even if they are unfair.

Again, the majority of Americans agree, the death tax is unfair. You have paid all your taxes all your life to accumulate your estate, and the Government wants to come in after you die and take more than half of it again. It is the same with the marriage tax penalty. Because you are married, you are going to be taxed at a higher rate—on average, per couple, \$1,400 per year—and somehow that is fair.

Think of it. If someone asked you, what is your projected income over the next 10 years, would you want to sign a contract committing you to spend every single penny of it right now? The President is distorting this whole story. We are talking about a surplus, the overcharge. We are not talking about the base wage which the Government is receiving in taxes, but he is talking about the surplus.

We should give the surplus back. I like to use a story about finding a wallet. Say this family is sitting around their kitchen table. They find a wallet, and it has \$1,000 in it. They say: If we take our regular budget and now add this \$1,000 to it, we can buy that big-screen TV we always wanted. They say: We have the money; we found it.

Congress has found this wallet with all these surplus tax dollars in it. I was taught—and I think most parents continue to teach their children today—that if you find a wallet with money in it, you should do your best to find the owner and give it back, not to run with it and say: Oh, we found this money; how can we better spend it? We can spend this money.

That is what is happening here. These are overcharges. Would you spend all your money now? All we are saying is we should give it back to the taxpayers so they can decide how to spend it best.

The President said:

We should have tax cuts this year, but they should be the right ones.

We should have tax cuts, but they should be the right ones. The President 2 years ago in Buffalo, NY, said something to this effect, and I will paraphrase it: We could give back all of this surplus, but what if Americans do not spend it right?

That is the same thing he is doing here: We could have tax cuts, but they should be the right ones. In other words, if we give the taxes back to the American people, the overcharge, the surplus—we are not even talking tax cuts here. That is a misused term. We are not cutting taxes. What we are trying to decide is how much of the surplus should go back to you, the taxpayer, that you have been overcharged.

The President said: We could give it all back, but what if you don't spend it right? In other words, you are smart enough to go out and earn your money, but somehow you are too dumb to know how to spend your money, and Washington can do that for you and do it better and do it in these targeted programs that are going to help everybody. But it will not let you have the opportunity to spend the money the way that will best benefit your family.

Every family is a little different. Your needs are different from mine and your neighbors' or even your brothers' and sisters' in raising their families. You should have the opportunity to decide how this prosperity, these extra dollars, should be spent.

What the President is saying is, send them to Washington, or keep sending this surplus to Washington, and we will decide what is best for you and how best to spend it.

The President said: In good conscience, I cannot sign one expensive tax break—again, it is not a tax break; it is an overcharge—after another without coherent strategy. In other words, they want to control how these extra tax dollars are spent—not you, taking it out of your control. They want to determine exactly how these tax dollars should be spent.

The President also says he supports this marriage tax penalty we passed, but he said it should be a carefully targeted marriage tax penalty that will cost less. Why will it cost less? Because the President eliminates a great number of these couples who currently qualify for the marriage tax penalty. He is saying that if you make too much money, if you itemize, or do not itemize, somehow you will not qualify.

The President says "targeted." Again we hear that word "targeted." When we hear that, it means Washington believes it can best determine what you need or what program the Government can create or how the Government can spend your tax money.

I want to say one other thing before I close, and that is what the President said at the end of his speech. I agree with these last few lines:

The surplus comes from the hard work and ingenuity of the American people. We owe it to them to make the best use of it, for all of them and for our children's future.

I agree with that statement. The only thing is we disagree on how to accomplish it. "The surplus comes from hard work and ingenuity of the American people. We owe it to them to make the best use of it. . . ." To me, the best use would be to give the surplus back.

We are not talking tax cuts at all. We are not talking about reducing the revenues Washington needs to run this Government and its programs. What we are talking about is the surplus. We owe it to them to make the best use of it. That will be in rebating, returning those dollars to you so you can then decide what is best for your family. Is it braces for one of your children, or dancing lessons? Is it to begin an educational fund for your child? He is 5 years old, and you want to prepare for his college. You will make that decision, and you will not have to worry or wait for a Government program and then stand there with a hand out asking: Do I qualify, and can I get some of my tax dollars back?

You will have to wait for somebody in Washington to say yes or no. That is not what should be happening. You should have control over your dollars. We all need to pay taxes. We know that. There are a lot of good things the Federal Government does. We know that. But Washington should not have the control of determining how to spend the additional dollars, the surplus.

I strongly urge the President to sign our two tax bills that we want to send him: the death tax repeal and the marriage tax penalty. I hope the President will consider them and, as he said in the last line of his speech—again I will read it—we owe it to them to make the best use of it for all of them. And my opinion is to give it in tax relief.

I thank the Chair.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until 12:30 p.m., with the time equally divided in the usual form.

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

Mr. GRAMS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

#### THE PAST AND THE FUTURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in 1993, one of the most interesting times in my legislative career was when we in this Chamber voted on President Clinton's deficit reduction plan. It was a historic vote.

As the Presiding Officer will remember, the bill passed the House of Representatives by a single vote without a single Republican voting for the President's plan. It came to the Senate and ended up in a tie vote, and the Vice President of the United States, AL GORE, broke the tie. It was a very difficult vote for everyone. In the Senate, as in the House, not a single Republican voted for the budget plan.

There were people on the other side of the aisle who told of all the calamities that would take place in the coun-

try if that passed. Seven years ago, this is what we heard from the other side of the aisle, Senate Republicans, from then-Representative WAYNE ALLARD:

In summary, the plan has a fatal flaw—it does not reduce the deficit.

Of course, it has reduced the deficit from some \$300 billion a year to where we now have a surplus.

Senator CONRAD BURNS:

So we are still going to pile up some more debt, but most of all, we are going to cost jobs in this country.

What the Senator from Montana said, in truth and in fact, was wrong. In fact, over 20 million new jobs have been created; over 60 percent of those jobs are high-wage jobs. Contrary to what the Senator from Montana said, we didn't pile up more debt. We have reduced the debt. We have not only cut down the annual yearly deficit, we have actually paid down the debt—not enough, in my estimation, but we have begun to pay down the debt.

Senator HATCH of Utah said:

Make no mistake, these higher rates will cost jobs.

Again, not true.

Senator PHIL GRAMM of Texas on August 5, 1993, on the Senate floor:

I want to predict here tonight that if we adopt this bill the American economy is going to get weaker and not stronger, the deficit four years from today will be higher than it is today and not lower. . . . When all is said and done, people will pay more taxes, the economy will create fewer jobs, Government will spend more money, and the American people will be worse off.

Everything he predicted is the direct opposite. The economy didn't get weaker; it got stronger. The deficit isn't higher; it is lower. Americans aren't paying more taxes; they are paying less taxes. He said, "The economy will create fewer jobs." Of course, as I have indicated, it created more jobs. "Government will spend more money." The fact is, the Federal Government today has 300,000 fewer Federal employees than it had when this statement was made by Senator GRAMM. We have a Federal Government today that is smaller than when President Kennedy was President.

He went on to say in September of 1993:

. . . [T]his program is going to make the economy weaker. . . . Hundreds of thousands of people are going to lose their jobs as a result of this program.

Wrong, absolutely wrong; not even close. The program the President asked us to vote for, and we did, made the economy stronger. We have had the lowest inflation, the lowest unemployment in more than 40 years. There had been economic growth as high in the past but never any higher than we have had. We hold the record for the longest period of economic growth in the history of this country.

PHIL GRAMM went on to state, on another occasion on the Senate floor:

I believe that hundreds of thousands of people are going to lose their jobs as a result

of this program. I believe that Bill Clinton will be one of those people.

Well, hundreds of thousands of people didn't lose their jobs; tens of millions of people got new jobs. And President Clinton was reelected. Again, my friend from Texas was wrong.

The Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY:

I really do not think it takes a rocket scientist to know this bill will cost jobs.

Well, my friend from Iowa was wrong, too. It didn't take a rocket scientist. It took people with courage to follow a leader who said: Do this and the economy is going to turn around. We did that. We are not rocket scientists, but common sense dictated if we did the things that were in that budget, it would make the economy better. It would set a new course in the United States for economic viability. We followed that lead, and here is where we now are.

My friend CONNIE MACK, with whom I came to Congress in 1982, said in 1993:

This bill will cost America jobs, no doubt about it.

Senator WILLIAM ROTH, chairman of the Finance Committee now, said back then:

It will flatten the economy.

Not true. Quite the contrary. My friend from Delaware went on to say:

I am concerned about what this plan will do to our economy. I am concerned about what it will do to jobs. I am concerned about what it will do to our families, our communities, and to our children's future.

Well, he should not have been concerned. Or if he was concerned, I am sure he feels much better today because everything about which he was concerned has been to the good of the country. The economy is better. It has been better for families and communities and the future of our children.

Senator RICK SANTORUM of Pennsylvania:

People know it's bad policy. . . . Let's do something . . . that creates jobs, that really will solve the deficit, not just feed this monster of government with more and more money for it to go out and spend more and more.

He was reading a different set of blueprints than everyone else because he was wrong.

Senator STROM THURMOND, longest serving Senator in this body, said in 1993:

It contains no real spending cuts to reduce the deficit or improve the Nation's outlook.

Representative DICK ARMEY, majority leader in the House:

The impact on job creation is going to be devastating.

DAN BURTON, Representative from Indiana of longstanding, said:

The Democratic plan means higher deficits, a higher national debt, deficits running \$350 billion a year.

He was only about \$450 billion wrong about the deficit. In fact, it has turned around. We have a \$100 billion surplus or more.

JOHN KASICH, with whom I came to Congress in 1982, a Representative from Ohio, said: