

to hearing the results of this investigation. I think it should be on the front burner.

TAX INITIATIVE

Mr. SMITH. Let me also say in regard to the tax initiative that the Senator brought up a few moments ago, this again goes to the heart and soul of the differences between our two parties.

George Bush said recently on national television that it might be nice if the American people just gave—it has not happened since 1952—one party, in this case the Republican Party, the opportunity to govern. The Democrats have had that opportunity once under Clinton, under Carter, to do it, and we did not see the debt go down. We did not see deficits diminish. On the contrary, we saw the opposite. Give us a shot at it. If we do not do well, throw us out. That is fair. Give us a shot. That is what President Bush said.

There is such a dramatic difference. How many times have we heard the debate from our friends on the other side that somehow growth is bad, making a profit is evil, that there is something wrong with that; and yet at the same time this debate occurs we see dollars being taken away, almost stolen, from the families of America. So we promote big government with the dollars taken from our families and at the same time denying them the opportunity to do the things that they would like to do for themselves, including education, getting a job, and being able to be productive in society.

There are no jobs, as the Senator pointed out, if there is no growth in America and if there is no opportunity for businesses to create those jobs. Government should not be in the business of creating jobs. The economy—business—should be creating jobs. That is what we are all about.

Somehow we have gotten into this debate that it is evil for anybody to make any money. I am pleased to hear when people make money. It delights me because I know somebody is getting dollars when somebody is making money.

The Senator brought up the point about the luxury tax, which I am proud to say I opposed and voted against, where all the people who built boats and luxury cars lost their jobs because of the tax increase, and people did not buy them.

When are we going to get the message that the greatness of America—we grew more at any time in the history when we did not have an income tax. Again, it is taking dollars. If all of the dollars that have been taken away from the American families throughout especially the last 40 or 50 years—if it worked, welfare would have been a success. We would not have all the crime we have today. We would not have to be spending money on crime or on welfare and other things that we find we are not satisfied with in America. The

truth is, it has not worked. Since it has not worked, we should try something new.

What we have—and you hear the American people say they are tired of the gridlock, the deadlock, tired of you fighting with each other. Again, the issue here is standing for principle, standing up for principle, because we believe deep in our hearts that these principles we espouse are right, they are correct, and we need to move this President. He is not moving. We understand that. If he is not moving, and we go as far as we go, we go to the American people, and essentially the decision is, very simply, we either move on with more debt and more deficits, or we move toward more growth, more economic prosperity, and more revenues to the Treasury, as the Senator pointed out.

Again, going back to the issue of missile defense, same thing—two very, very, important issues, if not the two most important issues that we face today in America, and a President with a distinctly different position than the House and the Senate.

I really want to compliment the Senator from Arizona, who is now in the chair, and the Senator from Oklahoma for two very, very worthwhile points in bringing to the attention of the Senate—although it is in the middle of the debate on a farm bill. Sometimes when other Senators are not here to participate in that debate, we have the opportunity, under Senate rules, to make these points. They are excellent points. I want to compliment both Senators.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AGRICULTURAL MARKET TRANSITION ACT OF 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, may I inquire, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is S. 1541.

AMENDMENT NO. 3184

(Purpose: To provide a substitute amendment)

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I send an amendment to S. 1541 to the desk. In doing so, let me say this amendment is in behalf of myself, Senator LEAHY, Senator LUGAR, Senator BREAUX, Senator DOLE, Senator JOHNSTON, Senator COCHRAN, Senator GRAHAM of Florida, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator JEFFORDS and Senator MCCONNELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG], for Mr. LEAHY, for himself, Mr. CRAIG, Mr.

LUGAR, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. DOLE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. JEFFORDS and Mr. MCCONNELL, proposes an amendment numbered 3184.

(The text of the amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Amendments Submitted.")

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, 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 clerk 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 substitute amendment to S. 1541, the farm bill.

Larry E. Craig, James M. Jeffords, Don Nickles, John H. Chafee, Robert F. Bennett, Thad Cochran, Ted Stevens, Trent Lott, Richard G. Lugar, Craig Thomas, Alan Simpson, John Warner, Larry Pressler, Dan Coats, Connie Mack, Kay Bailey Hutchison.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, this cloture and another one I filed earlier will occur back-to-back beginning at 1:30 on Thursday.

Mr. CRAIG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, the amendment that has just been filed for Senator LEAHY and myself and others is a substitute to S. 1541 as I earlier introduced this afternoon. This substitute is an effort to put together a bipartisan coalition of Senators with all of us very intent on producing farm legislation as soon as possible to do exactly what I talked about doing earlier today; that is, sending a clear message to the agricultural community of this country as to the certainty and the timing of key farm bill legislation. There are a variety of adjustments in the substitute—the language which deals with \$100 million per year in additional mandatory funding for crop-oriented conservation cost-sharing programs similar to S. 854 that was introduced by Senator LUGAR and LEAHY earlier this year.

There is a grazing lands conservation initiative program which will encourage innovative rangeland management techniques across the country. Certainly in my State of Idaho and other States, this can be a valuable resource in improving livestock grazing lands. State technical commitments would make it possible for farmers to serve on these committees where they now do not have standing.

There are some nutritional reauthorizations that would reauthorize food stamps and other nutritional programs for the period of time of this legislation. Much of this will be corrected and adjusted when the House, the Senate, and the President agree on welfare legislation.