cut. I support a tax cut. And I think it should be retroactive to January 1 of this year to provide a needed boost to our economy.

Cutting taxes now will be helpful both to individual taxpayers and to our economy. But we also need to use some of the expected available surplus to pay down our Federal debt. If a country runs up a debt during tough times, it should pay it down during good times. And some of the surplus should be used to do other important things like improve our schools, provide emergency help to family farmers, and help the elderly afford prescription drug costs.

There is an effort by some to frame this tax cut debate in terms of whether one supports the President. But it is not about who we support. Rather, it's about what we support. What kind of a tax cut should we enact and how large should it be?

Here's what I think we should do:

One, enact the income tax cut in phases. The projected 10 year budget surpluses are just that, projections, and are not at all certain. Therefore we should be conservative. Enact the first phase of the tax cut now, and make it retroactive to January 1. In 2 years, if our economy is still producing the expected surpluses, add to the tax cut.

Two, cut income tax rates and do it in a way that provides fair tax cuts for all tax brackets.

Three, eliminate the marriage tax penalty in the income tax code.

Four, simplify filing requirements by allowing ''return free filing'' for up to 70 million Americans.

Five, totally exempt all family farms and family businesses from the estate tax and increase the estate tax exemption to two million dollars for all estates—$4 million for married couples.

Six, add a tax credit for investments that are made in rural States, where there is out-migration of people. We should use this opportunity to use tax cuts to stimulate new jobs and economic growth in rural states that have been left behind.

Here are some of the major issues that we must consider as we enact this tax cut.

The President's plan assumes we will have budget surpluses for the next 10 years. I hope that is the case, but with the current slowdown in our economy, we ought to be cautious. Economic forecasts are no more reliable than weather forecasts. If we lock in a large tax cut and then do not get the expected surpluses, we will once again put our country in financial trouble.

One of the major priorities for using the surplus should be to pay down the Federal debt. It grew by trillions in the 80s and early 90s. Now we have the opportunity and an obligation to use part of these surpluses to pay down that debt.

Our Government collects about $1 trillion in personal income taxes and about $650 billion in payroll taxes from individuals each year. The top 1 percent of all income earners in the U.S. pay 21 percent of all taxes, but under the President's plan they would receive 43 percent of the tax cut. That's not fair. We should make changes to the President's plan to provide a larger share of the tax cuts to working families.

A tax cut is a priority, but so too is fixing our schools, helping family farmers through tough times, dealing with the high prices of prescription drugs, and strengthening Medicare and Social Security. Yes, surpluses need to be used to cut taxes and reduce the debt, but some should be used to address other urgent needs that improve our country.

This debate is larger and more important than partisan politics. And these decisions are bigger than whether the Congress is supporting a new President.

Our country works best when we think ahead and think together. That is what we need to do on this issue.

VETERANS' HIGHER EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 2001

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am privileged to be a cosponsor of the Veterans' Higher Education Opportunities Act of 2001, S. 131, and I will explain why this legislation is so important.

No one from either side of the aisle questions the importance of education as the steppingstone to success in the 21st century. We all know that the economy of the future is going to require people with specialized training and skills, while the unskilled labor that typified the 18th and 19th centuries is becoming less and less useful. In this regard, it is hardly surprising that Congress is flooded with proposals to enhance access to high-quality elementary education, secondary education, and higher education. I myself have strongly supported expansion of Pell Grants, broadening of student loans, and tax incentives to help families pay for a college education.

As we rightly promote the importance of government help for higher education, it might be useful to recall that one of the first, and most successful, of these higher education initiatives was the GI bill that was enacted back in 1944. Following World War II, millions of veterans were able to obtain college educations through the GI bill, with the result that many were able to attain a standard of living they could not have imagined. Furthermore, all this college-trained talent contributed to the burst of economic advances that improved life for all of us over the ensuing decades.

Fast forward 57 years. We still have a GI bill, and in our highly successful all-volunteer military, it turns out that the single most important factor that attracts many young people to join the military is the availability of educational benefits after discharge. Yet the current GI bill suffers from one big flaw: the educational stipend is no longer sufficient to pay for the cost of a college education.

The current monthly payment in the GI bill has not come close to matching the rate of inflation in educational costs over the past 50 years. Just consider these statistics. At present, the standard GI bill benefit is $650 per month for 36 months. That is it. Moreover, we now ask servicemembers who want educational benefits after discharge to contribute $1200 while they are in the military. By contrast, when it began in 1944, the GI bill benefit included full tuition and fees at any educational institution to which the veteran could gain admittance, PLUS a monthly stipend equivalent to $500 in 2001 dollars, $750 for married veterans.

We thus find ourselves in an anomalous situation: at the same time that the Government is ramping up its support and subsidy for non-veterans seeking college educations, the program that started this whole thing, and which provides key benefits for those who put their lives at risk for the country, is lagging way behind.

The Veterans' Higher Education Opportunities Act of 2001 goes a long way toward redressing this situation. The key provision of this bill is quite simple: the total VA educational stipend under the Montgomery GI Bill will be increased to a level equal to the average cost of tuition at 4-year public colleges. In other words, the standard 36 months of GI bill benefits will be sufficient to allow a veteran to attend college and complete a degree.

The Veterans Higher Education Opportunities Act of 2001 provides the minimal benefit that we should be offering to those who are willing to make the ultimate sacrifice to keep our country free and prosperous, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

FARMERS AND RANCHERS ON NATIONAL AGRICULTURE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today marks National Agriculture Day. Unfortunately, what should be a celebration is instead overshadowed by the grim reality that many of the hard-working families producing food for this Nation and world are having a difficult time making ends meet.

I salute our farmers and ranchers for many reasons. First, Americans spend less than anyone in the world on their grocery bill. Roughly 11 percent of our household income is spent on food, and it takes a mere 38 days to earn enough income to pay a food bill for the entire year. We truly enjoy the most nutritious, affordable, and stable food supply in the world.

Furthermore, the American economic engine depends upon a strong agricultural sector to run on all cylinders. Indeed the agricultural economy is central to my State's prosperity or adversity. According to South Dakota State University, the multiplied value of agriculture's impact on South Dakota's economy was $16 billion in 1999, one-fourth of our total economic output and more than double that of

any other industry in my State. I believe the public institutions and private businesses that lay the foundation for rural communities thrive only when we have a strong base of independent family farmers and ranchers in South Dakota.

Finally, agricultural producers are the day-to-day stewards of our land. Environmental and conservation benefits like clean water and air, rich soil, and diverse wildlife habitat are enjoyed by the public largely due to the care and management of family farmers and ranchers.

So, why aren't we truly celebrating National Agriculture Day?

Because current economic conditions are poised to squeeze many of South Dakota's 32,500 farmers and ranchers right out of business—conditions set to reverberate across the entire country. Absent farm aid and long-term farm policy fixes that provide true economic security to family farmers and ranchers, the environmental benefits and food security enjoyed by so many in this country may not survive on a sustained basis.

I believe Congress must take two fundamental steps to remedy this situation: modify the farm bill now and strengthen our laws so the marketplace is truly competitive and fair for all.

Since 1997, U.S. farmers have experienced a price crisis of enormous proportions, exacerbated by a series of weather-related disasters in many regions of the Nation. Surplus crop production, both here and abroad, weak global demand, marketplace concentration, and an inadequate farm income safety net are prime reasons for this price crisis.

Moreover, given the input-intensive nature of production agriculture, many farmers and ranchers are paying more each year for critical inputs like fuel and fertilizer. Corn and wheat farmers in South Dakota may be forced to pay up to twice per acre for fertilizer this year, and still not cover enough acres to boost yields to profit-producing levels. This situates farmers in a price-cost squeeze making it nearly impossible to earn income that covers total expenses.

As a result of an inadequate farm bill, Congress has enacted multi-billion dollar disaster programs in the last 3 years—a record $28 billion in fiscal year 2000. USDA economists predict 2001 may be the worst year ever. Without supplemental income or emergency aid, USDA estimates that net farm income in 2001 could approach its lowest level since 1984. Clearly, the 1996 farm bill fails to provide a meaningful, fiscally-responsible, safety-net for farmers when prices are poor on an annual and sustained basis.

I am concerned that the administration's budget blueprint apparently does not grasp the economic obstacles facing the Nation's farmers, ranchers, and rural communities, as illustrated by the fact that the budget includes zero funding for emergency aid or a farm bill rewrite. This seems ironic, since every major farm group has sent myself and others on the Senate Budget Committee a letter agreeing that roughly $10 billion per year will be needed to modify the farm bill for future years, and that around $9 billion is needed in fiscal year 2001 to offset income losses due to low prices and failed farm safety-net policies.

Already, these farm groups and some Members of Congress are suggesting that we will simply assemble a fourth consecutive aid package for farmers in 2001. I will support this imperative aid when the time comes, but suggest American farmers and taxpayers deserve better. These ad hoc emergency bills, totaling billions of dollars each year, are a poor excuse for a long term policy fix. I believe Congress can and should amend current farm policy immediately to provide a more predictable, secure safety-net for farmers now.

One farm bill alternative I have introduced is S. 130, the Flexible Fallow farm bill amendment. Rep. DOUG BEREUTER (R–NE) has introduced an identical bill in the House. Under my Flex Fallow bill—an idea developed by two South Dakota agricultural producers—farmers voluntarily devoting part of their total cropland acreage to a conservation use receive greater price support on their remaining crop production. My proposal embodies the planting flexibility so popular under ''Freedom to Farm,'' yet strengthens the underlying farm income safety net. In fact, my Flex Fallow bill has been endorsed by Iowa State agricultural economist Neil Harl, who believes the proposal works in a market-oriented fashion and said Flex Fallow ''is the missing link to the 1996 Farm Bill.''

Furthermore, I believe agricultural producers want to derive income from the marketplace, and in order to assure that can happen, Congress must restore fair competition to crop and livestock markets. The forces of marketplace concentration are squeezing independent farmers and ranchers out of profit opportunities.

The livestock market is one case in point. Meatpacker ownership and captive supply arrangements tend to transpire outside the cash market. As a result, the process of bidding in an open fashion for the purpose of buying slaughter livestock—which is central to competition—is fading away. As such, livestock producers—who depend upon competitive bidding to gain a fair price—are forced to either enter into contractual, ownership, or marketing arrangements with a packer or find themselves left out of market opportunities.

I have authored a bipartisan bill, S. 142, with Senators GRASSLEY, THOMAS, and DASCHLE to forbid meatpackers from engaging in these anticompetitive buying practices. While my legislation is just one of many steps that should be taken to bolster our laws to protect true market competition, I believe Congress should move to address this issue in earnest.

Former President Eisenhower once said, ''farming looks mighty easy when your plow is a pencil and you're a thousand miles away from a farm.'' Because we live in a country where the food is safe and affordable, and the environment is not taken for granted, perhaps some have forgotten President Eisenhower's simple yet honest-to-goodness words.

So today, let us not overlook the critical role farmers and ranchers play in weaving the economic, social, and environmental fabric of this country. Instead, I join all Americans to salute farmers and ranchers on National Agriculture Day. And I invite all Americans to support efforts to ensure a brighter future for the families who put food on our tables every day.

CONDEMNATION OF THE TALIBAN'S WAR ON GLOBAL CULTURE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to condemn an act of mindless destruction by a regime known for its intolerance. I am referring to the reported destruction of the two ancient statues of Buddha carried out by the Taliban government in Afghanistan and the Taliban's call for complete elimination of all artifacts in the region.

The Bamiyan Buddha statues were priceless artifacts. They stood for centuries as guardians of the silk route that connected the ancient Greek and Roman Empires to Asia. Once one of the most cosmopolitan regions in the world, Afghanistan is now one of the most intolerant and repressive nations due to the actions of the ruling Taliban faction. The destruction of these 1,500-year-old statues was ordered and carried out for fear that they would be used for idol worship. Destroying those creations because of an irrational fear motivated by intolerance of other cultures and religions should be condemned by thoughtful people everywhere.

The country of Afghanistan and the global community has lost two of its greatest treasures, and the world is poorer for it. We cannot tolerate the willful destruction of international treasures that are a part of the world's heritage.

People of all faiths and nationalities, including Muslim communities around the world, have condemned this action. It is imperative that the United States Senate join the people and governments around the world in condemning these senseless acts of destruction, and call on the Taliban regime to immediately cease the destruction of other Pre-Islamic relics.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG SOLUTION MUST BE A PRIORITY

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, few issues have caught the public's attention more than prescription drugs, and