

thing again with a national security education act that says we want to train our workers for the future needs in America to make certain they can fill the jobs with Boeing Aircraft in St. Louis or Motorola in the Chicago area? We are not doing that.

This Congress won't address that. It won't address school modernization. It won't address the question of the deduction for college education expenses. It won't address the need to improve teacher skills. That is something we don't have time for on the agenda of this Congress.

Businesses across America look to us for leadership. Families across America expect us to create opportunities. Time and again, we have seen instead efforts by the Republicans in the Senate to give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America and to ignore the realities facing our families. I think our agenda has to be an agenda closer to the real needs of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, our colleague from Illinois and others have talked about the things we have not passed and that they would like to see passed in this session. But we have a big problem. We have a problem because the absolutely essential work that this body must do is being held up. The work on appropriations bills that fund the agencies of Government for the next year must be done before the end of the fiscal year—September 30.

Many of the things my colleague has talked about have already been passed and are in conference. But we can't get floor time to do it when we are dealing with filibusters. The Democratic plan has been to stall, delay, and block.

We will have an opportunity to vote on cloture on the Treasury-Postal bill. That means cutting off a filibuster. But that goes through the lengthy process of the 30 hours that are required for debate.

We are also ready to take up the energy and water appropriations bill. But the minority leader has raised objection to that.

Energy and water carries many important things. It carries funding for projects that are vitally important to South Dakota—to river States such as Missouri, to the Nation, the national laboratories in New Mexico, and others.

All of these vital appropriations are being held up because the minority leader is now objecting to a provision that was included in the bill this year but has been included in four previous bills Congress has sent to the President and which have been signed by the President. The state of affairs is, we are ready for a time agreement. If there are objections to particular items in a bill, we have a process called

amendments. You can move to strike; you can move to amend. We are ready to do business.

Let there be no mistake. Let the American people understand. We are watching a series of Democratic stall, moves—delay, stall, and block. Sometimes we call them a filibuster. But filibusters don't need to be people talking on the floor. It can be refusal to allow a bill to come up. It can be filibustered by amendments. Basically, it is the Democratic side that is trying to keep the Senate from doing its work.

We have lots of important votes. They may win; we may win some. The Senate has its rules. It permits debate and amendment. We are willing to do so and debate a commonsense provision that happens to be in this bill to see what the will of the Senate is.

The provision in the bill as reported out of committee that has existed in four previous appropriations bills, previously signed by the President, is designed to prevent changes to Missouri River management which would increase the risk of spring flooding and bring many dire consequences. I intend to lay out some of the problems and a number of leaders in this country who oppose it.

The provision is very simple. It is also very important. The provision is designed to stop flooding. Out West we hear the Fish and Wildlife Service is now proposing to tear down dams. Here the Fish and Wildlife Service wants to take action on flow management to pretend that dams don't exist. They have gone out of their way to try to dictate the work of the Corps of Engineers. There are all kinds of procedures—there are public hearings, there are assessments, there are impact statements, and many other things—required before an agency can take action. The Fish and Wildlife Service wants to jump over all that and say: Corps of Engineers, you do our bidding. They sent a letter on July 12 which said: You must establish a plan to increase spring flooding on the Missouri River and to cut off the possibility of effective barge transportation, environmentally sound barge transportation in the summer and the fall, affecting not only the Missouri River but the Mississippi River as well.

The Fish and Wildlife Service wants to do to the communities, to the States along the Missouri River, what the National Park Service did to the community of Los Alamos when it tried a control burn. We don't need a controlled flood that the Fish and Wildlife Service has proposed.

While we have a lot to debate with our friends in the upper basin about the way the river is managed, I never expected they would ever support an action simply designed to increase downstream flooding. As far as I know in the debates—and they have been vigorous debates in the past—that was never their intent. I don't know what the intent now is of the minority leader. We have fought vigorously and hon-

estly with our friends in the upper river States about their desire to keep fall water for their recreation industry. We want to work out ways to help them. We need that late year water to ensure we keep river transportation so our farmers have an economical and environmentally sound way of getting their products to the market. We also need flood control. We have never had them complain about flood control. Dams were built in the middle of the last century, principally to prevent flooding on the lower Mississippi and lower Missouri Rivers. Mr. President, 85 percent of the population in the Missouri River basin lives in the lower basin below Gavin's Point. That doesn't include the lower Mississippi River which gets that water from the Missouri.

As with the dams out West, the Fish and Wildlife Service has a theory that we should travel back in time and have rivers that "mimic the natural flow of the river." Dams were built to stop the natural flow because the natural flow was flooding many hundreds and thousands of acres. It was killing people and damaging billions of dollars of property. One third of our State's food production is in the floodplain of the Missouri River and the Mississippi River. In 1994, the Corps of Engineers proposed to change the river and have a spring rise.

On a bipartisan basis, we communicated our opposition to the President. Twenty-eight Senators representing States along the Missouri and Mississippi and Ohio Rivers signed this letter to the President. The Corps went back to the drawing board and began fresh to develop a consensus plan. Between then and early this year, a consensus among the States—with the exception of Missouri—was developed that included conservation measures but had no spring rise.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, at the table with the States for years, came to Washington, and the next thing we know they are insisting on a spring rise, the will of the States, the comments of the people, the overwhelming objection of State and local officials notwithstanding.

The Fish and Wildlife Service doesn't want public comments. They heard them. They know what the comments are. Don't flood us out. The Fish and Wildlife Service has no mandate to protect people from the dangers of flooding. I invite them out the next time we have a spring flood in Missouri to see the devastation, to comfort and console the families who have lost loved ones in floodwaters. We lost some this year in floods in Missouri. The public has gone on record strongly opposing this spring rise. In 1994, the public opposed it, from Nebraska to St. Louis to New Orleans to Memphis and beyond. To prevent the risk of downstream flooding in 1995, Congressman BEREUTER from Nebraska put a provision in the energy and water appropriations bill to block any change in river management that included a spring rise.

The same provision was included again in 1996, 1998, 1999, and again by the Senate subcommittee. As I repeat, this provision has been adopted by voice vote in the House and has been included in four previous conference reports, signed by the President four times before.

Let me note two additional realities. According to our State Department of Natural Resources, not only is this plan experimental, but it could injure species. I quote from the assistant director for science and technology who said the plan calls for a significant drop in flow during the summer. This will allow predators to reach the islands upon which the terns and plovers—the endangered species—nest, giving them access to the young still in the nest. While the impacts on the pallid sturgeon are more difficult to determine because we know less about them, low flows during the hottest weather may pose a significant threat. In other words, there is a real danger to the environment and to the endangered species.

The U.S. Geological Survey is studying what can be done to encourage and protect the habitat for the pallid sturgeon. I visited them. They do not know—and they are the ones who have the most expertise; they have been studying—they do not know yet that anything like a spring rise would have any impact on the pallid sturgeon. They say the jury is still out. I can explain that better. They don't know if this would protect the pallid sturgeon. We do know that the spring rise will increase flood risk. It is totally experimental in terms of improving habitat. The Missouri Department of Natural Resources had a very good argument that it may make it more dangerous for the endangered species.

Finally, this proposal by the Fish and Wildlife Service ignores the hard and fast and undisputed reality that on the lower Missouri we already have a spring rise, courtesy of the Kansas River, the Osage River, the Platte River, the Blue River, the Grand River, the Tarkio River, the Gasconade River, and others.

Each flows into the Missouri, and when it rains, the Missouri lifts from the tributaries into its basins. We already have a spring rise. It floods Missouri regularly. We don't need another source of flooding to carry out some experiment that the Fish and Wildlife Service is trying to conduct at the peril of our citizens. We cannot stand the Fish and Wildlife Service sending an additional "pulse" of water downstream that will put it above our heads.

When they release water at the last dam in Nebraska, it takes 12 days to arrive in St. Louis. In those 12 days, we can experience thunderstorms and flash floods in the spring, and there is no way to get that water back once it is sent down the river. Unless the Fish and Wildlife Service can predict 12 days of weather, or 14 days of weather for

Cape Girardeau, then they are betting on the safety of the hundreds of people whose lives may be put at danger if they put out a spring release as proposed.

As I said, I have worked with them and others. I worked with our upstate upper-river people. I have worked with Senator KERREY, Senator SMITH, Senator DOMENICI, and others to fund conservation efforts that do not imperil our citizens. These are the ones on which we ought to be focusing, these are the ones that would be tested, these are the ones that do not flood us.

This is not a partisan issue. It is a philosophical issue and it is a regional issue. Our Governor is a strong Democrat. He has sent me a letter, which I will ask be printed in the RECORD, which outlines very strongly his opposition. Governor Carnahan wrote:

An analysis of the flooding that occurred along the Missouri River during the spring of 1995 showed that, had the spring rise proposed by the Fish and Wildlife Service been in effect, the level of flooding downstream would have been even greater. The Corps could not have recalled water already released hundreds of miles upstream. If the current plan is implemented and the state incurs heavy rains during the spring rise, there is a real risk that farms and communities along the lower Missouri River will suffer extensive flooding.

In addition, a spring rise has a detrimental effect on Missouri agricultural land. Sustaining high river flow rates over several consecutive weeks will exacerbate the problem of poor drainage historically experienced by farmers along the river. The prolonged duration of an elevated water table will limit the productivity and accessibility of floodplain croplands. The combination of an increased risk of flooding and damage to some of the state's most productive farmland poses too much of a risk for the economy and the citizens of Missouri.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from the Governor and the statement by the Department of Natural Resources.

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

STATE OF MISSOURI,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Jefferson City, MO, July 24, 2000.

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

DEAR KIT: I am writing regarding recent developments surrounding efforts to revise the Missouri River Master Manual. I am especially concerned about proposed plans by the Fish and Wildlife Service for a spring rise and request your continued assistance in averting these plans.

The proper management of the Missouri River is critical to the economic and environmental health of the state. As you know, the July 12, 2000, letter from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to the Corps of Engineers outlined plans for a spring rise of 17,500 cubic feet per second. I have consistently opposed a spring rise from Gavins Point Dam as detrimental to the state's interests and would again like to state my opposition to the current proposal. Implementation of a spring rise would result in an increased risk of flooding and would have a negative impact on Missouri farmland. The

frequently-cited experimental releases on the Colorado River in no way compare to the situation in Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri where so many working farms and river communities would be harmed by the spring rise.

An analysis of the flooding that occurred along the Missouri River during the spring of 1995 showed that, had the spring rise proposed by the Fish and Wildlife Service been in effect, the level of flooding downstream would have been even greater. The Corps could not have recalled water already released hundreds of miles upstream. If the current plan is implemented and the state incurs heavy rains during the spring rise, there is a real risk that farms and communities along the lower Missouri River will suffer extensive flooding.

In addition, a spring rise has a detrimental effect on Missouri agricultural land. Sustaining high river flow rates over several consecutive weeks will exacerbate the problem of poor drainage historically experienced by farmers along the river. The prolonged duration of an elevated water table will limit the productivity and accessibility of floodplain croplands. The combination of an increased risk of flooding and damage to some of the state's most productive farmland poses too much of a risk for the economy and the citizens of Missouri.

I support any efforts that would prevent the Corps from initiating the recent proposal to initiate a spring rise. Thank you for your continued support in this matter.

Very truly yours,

MEL CARNAHAN.

PROPOSED RIVER CHANGES WILL FURTHER
ENDANGER SPECIES

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is currently considering changes to the way that it operates the dams along the Missouri River. These dams control the level of reservoirs and the flow of water in the river from South Dakota to St. Louis. The Corps has to take into account all the users of the river and its water and balance the agricultural, commercial, industrial, municipal and recreational needs of those living near the river. As part of this review, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is examining the potential effect on three endangered species that may result from the proposed changes. The pallid sturgeon, least tern, and piping plover depend on the river and the areas along its banks for their survival.

There are three major problems with the operations plan proposed by the Fish and Wildlife Service that may actually harm the species rather than help them recover. The plan would increase the amount of water held behind the dams, thus reducing the amount of river between the big reservoirs by about 10 miles in an average year. The higher reservoir levels would also reduce the habitat for the terns and plovers that nest along the shorelines of the reservoirs. Finally, the plan calls for a significant drop in flow during the summer. This will allow predators to reach the islands upon which the terns and plovers nest giving them access to the young still in the nests. While the impacts on the pallid sturgeon are more difficult to determine because we know less about them, low flows during our hottest weather may pose a significant threat.

Some advocates of the proposed plan claim that this plan is a return to more natural flow conditions. However, the proposal would benefit artificial reservoirs at the expense of the river and create flow conditions that have never existed along the river in Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas and Missouri. Balancing the needs of all the river users is complicated. Predicting the loss of habitat and

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